Title
Stories of Sexual Violence as Boundary Markers in Early Jewish Reception of the Hebrew Bible

Author
Smith, Julianna Kaye

Publication Date
2022

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Stories of Sexual Violence as Boundary Markers in Early Jewish Reception of the Hebrew Bible

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements

for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

by

Julianna Kaye Smith

2022

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Stories of Sexual Violence as Boundary Markers

in Early Jewish Reception of the Hebrew Bible

by

Julianna Kaye Smith

Doctor of Philosophy in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2022

Professor William M. Schniedewind, Chair

Stories of sexual violence are central to the Hebrew Bible. This dissertation examines three of those stories found in Gen 34, Gen 19 and Judg 19–20 through a feminist critical lens. The analysis of the three stories focuses on the politics of sexual violence at play in each of them. It argues that a primary function of these stories is marking out social boundaries between various communities. Furthermore, the dissertation traces the reception of the three stories in early Jewish literature. It finds that early Jewish writers recognized the boundary-setting function of the stories and engaged with them in their own contexts to explore communal boundaries. The dissertation demonstrates that the biblical and early Jewish writers' use of stories of sexual violence as boundary markers is rooted in a larger phenomenon, historical and modern, of using stories of sexual violence to mark out boundaries.

The dissertation of Julianna Kaye Smith is approved.

Lisa Cleath

Catherine E. Bonesho

Kathlyn M. Cooney

William M. Schniedewind, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2022

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

The process for writing a dissertation often feels lonely, but as I reflect on my writing process and the years of preparation leading up to it, I recognize that I was far from alone. I owe a debt of gratitude to countless individuals and institutions for helping me reach the end of the dissertation process.

At the top of my acknowledgement list is my doctoral advisor and chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. William Schniedewind. Dr. Schniedewind advocated for me at every turn, and was always willing to discuss ideas and offer helpful comments. I cherish our conversations on this project and mourn that there are no more dissertation meetings ahead of us.

I have benefited from the input of all the committee members for this dissertation. Over the past four years, Dr. Catherine Bonesho has helped me hone my thinking, writing, and research skills. I am a better scholar because she did the hard work of an educator. Dr. Lisa Cleath challenged me to expand my vision and seek out more voices. My scholarship and teaching are forever changed because of Dr. Cleath's challenge. Dr. Kara Cooney pushed me to consider the question "who benefits?" in my analysis. Beyond the realm of analyzing ancient texts, her question is helpful for navigating careers, politics, and life.

While my committee put in the hard work of reading drafts and offering comments, several others contributed to this project specifically and getting me through graduate school more generally. Those folks include Timothy Hogue, Martin Luther Chan, Stephen Ward, Brian Donnelly-Lewis, Andrew Bock, Aaron Cash, Sarah Harrington, and Crystal Melara. Special acknowledgment goes to my graduate program "brother," Bryan Elliff, who talked through countless ideas with me. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Elizabeth VanDyke, Marilyn Love, and Megan Remington. Our circle of friendship has brought me inspiration, light, and life.

I would be remiss to not acknowledge the funding I received through the Del Amo fellowship as well as the Graduate Research Mentorship and Graduate Summer Research Mentorship programs. These fellowships have allowed me to focus on the research here in this dissertation.

At the bottom of my list, not because they are last in terms of contribution but because they are my solid foundation, are my fiancé, Nathan Widdicombe, and parents, Jim and Brenda Smith. Nathan shares in everything with me—idea generation, excitement for my projects, frustration, disappointment, joy, and everything in between. His love and support have sustained me through two degrees and several writing projects. I could not ask for a better partner in life. My parents have stood by my side through all my endeavors, academic and otherwise. Like Nathan, they listen to me muse on the finer points of ancient Near Eastern studies and ask thoughtful questions. Brenda was the first person to offer feedback on my dissertation. It was only fitting that she did though as she has read every word of every paper I have submitted since I started my journey in higher learning in 2004. She ran away a long time ago with the "mom of the year" award.

Vita

Previous Degrees

- M.A. Portland Seminary of George Fox University, Biblical Studies, 2018
    - Thesis Title: Tamar's Legacy: Early Jewish Reception of Genesis 38
- M.A. The Ohio State University, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, Arabic, 2013
    - Thesis Title: Coptic Papacy and Power in a Changing Post-Mubarak Egypt
- B.A. Malone University, Political Science, 2008

0. Introduction

Stories of sexual violence are central to some of the foundational narratives of the Hebrew Bible. While these stories are disturbing on a number of levels, they provide insight into many facets of ancient Israel, particularly their concerns for the boundaries that separated "us" from "them." Early Jewish communities followed in this tradition and engaged with the boundaries drawn by stories of sexual violence in order to redraw and explore their own diverse sets of communal boundaries. As modern readers, distant from the historical and geographical contexts that produced and interpreted these stories, it is often difficult to fully appreciate the communal prerogatives of these stories of sexual violence. Indeed, these violent stories' very inclusion in the Hebrew Bible and the canons of many religious traditions only adds to their confusion. Why would stories of such violence be included in a religious community's text? Who would ascribe holiness to them? And why would people continue to engage the stories long after they were penned?

I argue that the key to answering these questions is understanding their function of marking out boundaries. In using these stories of sexual violence to help set those boundaries, biblical and early Jewish writers engage in a practice that can be observed in various cultural settings throughout history. A certain politics underlies sexually violent stories. In some ways, describing violence is not the point. It is a means to an end, specifically to engender outrage that can be harnessed and directed at an outside group. That outgroup can be one already known to the community or one that the story is helping to create. The more heinous the crime, the stronger the rallying force of the story. One need not look into the distant past to see this dynamic at play. In the run-up to the 2016 US presidential election, the then candidate Donald Trump raised the specter of sexual assailants flooding the US border with Mexico. In comments

directed toward native-born, white Americans he said, "They're not sending their best...They're bringing crime. They're rapists." As president, he repeated these claims that rapists were flooding the southern border, even providing specific comments on a victim of rape and murder.[1] Trump's use of stories—real or imagined—of sexual violence performed "racial boundary-work."[2] Beyond creating a rhetorical or conceptual division between groups, stories of sexual violence in modernity and, as I will argue, antiquity are part of a larger strategy to shape policy.[3]

Although the biblical stories addressed in this study all participate in the establishment or maintenance of ethnic or tribal boundaries, not all of the early Jewish writers redeploy those stories for a similar purpose in their own writing. Some redeploy the stories in order to nuance or challenge notions that a strict boundary between certain communities need to be preserved. The early Jewish writers who redeploy the stories of sexual violence in their own work are not a monolith in their interpretations of them, but the vast majority engage in the discourse around boundaries. The myriad ways they participate in the discourse of sexual violence is explored in the following chapters.

For some, my framing of these stories as serving some sort of communal function might come across as minimizing the horror the victims–historical persons or fictional characters–in the texts faced. Examining the function of the story and where it fits into the writers' historiographic project is not meant to evade, minimize, or obfuscate the harm of rape.[4] Several scholars, many

[1] Teresa C. Kulig, Amanda Graham, Francis T. Cullen, Alex R. Piquero, and Murat Haner, "'Bad Hombres' at the Southern US Border? White Nationalism and the Perceived Dangerousness of Immigrants," *Journal of Criminology* 54.3 (2021): 285.

[2] Alex E. Chavez, "Gender, Ethno-Nationalism, and the Anti-Mexicanist Trope," *The Journal of American Folklore* 134 (2021): 13.

[3] Chavez, "Gender, Ethno-Nationalism," 13.

[4] Susanne Scholz addresses the myriad ways that scholars engage in obfuscation around sexually violent stories in *Rape Plots: A Feminist Cultural Study of Genesis 34*, StBibLit 13 (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

of them cited within this dissertation, have done important work reading the stories "on behalf of their female victims in order to recover a neglected history" and "tell[ing] sad stories….tales of terror with women as victims."[5] The goal of this dissertation is to build on this research by acknowledging the terror, and then asking why these stories of terror exist.

0.1 The Corpus

In this dissertation, I examine three interconnected stories of sexual violence, the rape of Dinah in Gen 34, the destruction of Sodom in Gen 19, and the rape and dismemberment of the concubine in Judg 19–20.[6] The three stories have different settings, protagonists, and contexts within the biblical narrative. In two of the stories (Gen 34 and Judg 19–20), women are the victims of the violence, and in one, those threatened with sexual violence present as men (Gen 19). Even still, the three stories share similar words and phrases suggesting certain scribes might have intended audiences to discern a connection between them. Thematically, the three biblical passages also share a concern for communal boundaries with an outside group being associated with perpetrators of violence and "insiders" being the victims. The result of each of these stories is unbridled violence against the perpetrator. Using an intertextual approach undergirded by philological methods, I analyze these three texts together and demonstrate how they are connected in their biblical context.

0.2 The Outline

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I define important terms for this study as well as lay out the conceptual frameworks and methodologies I utilize. Through the use of ancient and

---

[5] Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*, OBT (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 3 and 1.

[6] I have described these texts by common names. Some might contest my use of "rape" to describe Gen 34 or my use of "concubine" for Judg 19–20. I address these issues in the chapters examining those stories.

modern case studies I explore the politics of sexual violence and demonstrate how stories of sexual violence can create, extend, and reify boundaries between communities. After examining these case studies, I describe the theoretical frameworks that influence my writing as well as the methodological approaches for my study. This chapter highlights feminist literary critical approaches and reception history. With respect to the latter, each of the subsequent chapters are structured using the logic of reception history. I start by analyzing the earliest form of the story, the biblical account, and then analyze how that story was received in early Jewish literature. My analysis is in the mold of feminist literary critics. In my analysis, I pose questions about gender, sex, sexuality, other markers of identity, power, and boundaries of each text, biblical and early Jewish, in order to elucidate the function of sexual violence in the story.

Following my discussion of terms, theoretical frameworks, and methods, I examine the story of Dinah (Gen 34) and its early Jewish reception. In the story, Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, is raped by Shechem, the son of Hamor. This event provokes Dinah's brothers to violent retribution against Shechem and his people. At the beginning of the chapter, I historically situate the story and analyze the story as it appears in the Masoretic Text (MT). Contra some biblical scholars, I argue that Gen 34, in its language, does describe a rape. Furthermore, I argue that the sexual violence it describes serves the political purposes of the writer and their royal patron: it demonstrates that Shechem and his people are violent, sexually deviant Others and thereby justifies the seizure of land. After analyzing the story in the MT, I examine its translation in the Septuagint (LXX) as background for my discussion of the story's reception in other early Jewish works. Some early Jewish works interact with and respond to the LXX instead of or in addition to the MT. I argue that early Jewish writers redeploy the Dinah story in their own works to two different ends, some to challenge conceptions of closed communal boundaries and others to

create and reify boundaries. I argue that writers use various strategies to create and reify boundaries including vilifying the Other, alleging collective culpability for crimes, and appealing to a divine license for violently enforcing a boundary after a crime is committed.

In the next chapter, I examine the story of Sodom (Gen 19) and its early Jewish reception. The city of Sodom is destroyed by God after the men of the city direct sexually violent threats at messengers sent by God. After historically situating the story, I provide an overview of the story as it appears in the MT and argue for understanding the story as one of sexual violence in contradistinction to those who understand it primarily as a story of hospitality or same-sex sexual relations. I then offer an analysis of the politics of sexual violence at play in MT Gen 19 and argue that the story is best understood as working in concert with Judg 19–20 as part of an anti-Saul, pro-David set of stories. Sexual violence is leveraged in an historiographic project to malign Saul and uphold the place of the southern kingdom and its leadership. Following the discussion of MT Gen 19, I examine its translation in the LXX to support my analysis of the story's reception in early Jewish literature. As the story is redeployed in early Jewish literature it is used to both create and bolster boundaries. One of the strategies early Jewish writers use in this effort is to align certain groups current to their context with the Sodomites to create an Other and establish a boundary with that Other. Early Jewish writers were also concerned with what the story of Sodom had to offer in terms of the social-sexual boundary between humans and semi-divine beings. I argue that these writers redeployed this story to create a boundary between humanity and the semi-divine realm. Finally, I demonstrate that some early Jewish writers understood the Gen 19 and Judg 19–20 stories to relate to one another.

In the final chapter I analyze the story of the concubine (Judg 19–20) and its early Jewish reception. The story of the concubine describes the brutal gang rape of an unnamed woman, a

concubine of a Levite, and her dismemberment at the hands of her husband. Following the pattern of the previous two chapters, I contextualize Judg 19–20 historically and argue that the writers of it are aware of both Gen 19 and 34 at the time of the story's composition. Furthermore, I argue that the story of the concubine was harnessed to undermine the legacy of Saul as part of the Hezekiah and the southern kingdom's authorization to reign over an expansive kingdom. After examining the story's politics of sexual violence in the MT, I analyze the Greek translations of the story to demonstrate a growth in the tradition. Finally, I explore the story's reception in two early Jewish works and demonstrate that the politics of sexual violence worked out in the MT do not carry over into later tradition. Josephus minimizes the boundaries in his retelling, and Pseudo-Philo retells the story to denigrate the Amalekites as representative Others.

In addition to the main body of each of these chapters addressing stories of sexual violence, each of the three chapters includes excursus on writings that reference the stories but do not engage them in a substantive way as well. The excursus are meant to offer the reader a complete picture of where these stories show up in early reception. Their presence show that the vast majority of early Jewish engagement of these stories of sexual violence center on issues of boundaries. Finally, the conclusion synthesizes some of the main findings of the dissertation as well as suggests areas for future research.

1. Methodology

The following chapter discusses the terminology, conceptual frameworks and methods used in this dissertation. Inspired by Gale Yee's 2019 Society of Biblical Literature presidential address calling biblical scholars to "think intersectionally," I aim to take into account "interacting systems of oppression and privilege" in both ancient works and the modern scholarship on those works through the conceptual frameworks I have adopted.[7] I have made every effort to bring to light the power relations embedded in these interacting systems, particularly naming "default and normative" categories present in the texts analyzed herein.[8] As I identify systems of oppression and privilege in the texts under study in this dissertation, I also believe it is necessary to acknowledge my own positionality. I am a white woman who experiences the privileges associated with my age, able-body, education, geography, and social class. The intersection of my privileges shapes the way I read texts, the power dynamics I can see, and the ones which remain elusive to me. I have made every effort to read a range of scholars to help bring into focus the dynamics that the privileged aspects of my lens might obscure. I acknowledge that there are likely areas where my vision remains obscure, and I look forward to learning more as various people interact with my research.

[7] Gale Yee, "Thinking Intersectionally: Gender, Race, Class, and the Etceteras of Our Discipline," *JBL* 139 (2020): 11. Before giving this address and calling the field to think intersectionally, Yee had written on intersectionality in biblical studies. She offers more extended thoughts in "Introduction: Definitions, Explorations, and Intersections" in *The Hebrew Bible: Feminist and Intersectional Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018), 1–40.

[8] For the language of power relations See Yee, "Thinking Intersectionally," 8. For the language of "default" see Yee, "Thinking Intersectionally," 13.

1.1 Terminology

1.1.1 Sexual Violence

Sexual violence is a term used to describe a range of phenomena. Global institutions that measure occurrences of violence and study issues relating to health and wellness define sexual violence as "any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting."[9] There are certain merits in applying this definition to biblical and ancient Jewish texts that are often terse concerning the exact details of a sexual act. Qualifying words such as "any" and "attempt" allow for a broader range of texts to be considered under the heading of "sexual violence." However, applying this definition to representations of violence in ancient texts also has its challenges. In terse narratives, the desires and motivations of characters are under-explored making it difficult to determine whether an action is "unwanted" or "coerced." In the low-information environment of ancient narrative, interpreters are called upon to fill in the gaps left by the ancient writers.

Filling the gaps in ancient narrative requires a certain amount of creativity and flexibility in how one thinks about defining sexual violence. Joanna Bourke, in writing a history of rape and sexual aggression, proceeds with an admittedly subjective definition of sexual abuse as "any act called such by a participant or a third party."[10] Bourke's subjective definition is born out of the difficulties in using legal—and by extension lexical—frameworks to a range of events across history.[11] The "third party" in Bourke's definition represents a more ambiguous group than

[9] *World Report on Violence and Health*, eds. WHO, UNDP and UNODC (Geneva: World Health Organization, 2014), 76.

[10] Joanna Bourke, *Rape: A History from 1860 to Present Day* (London: Virago, 2007), 9.

[11] Bourke notes that modern legal definitions of sexual violence, specifically rape, "are often written from a male perspective." *Rape: A History*, 8. An additional challenge which Bourke notes naming and describing sexual

"participant;" it refers to those who might advocate for children or others with some sort of cognitive impairment *not allowing them to describe events for themselves*. In this dissertation and within the context of ancient narratives, the victims and survivors of sexual violence are often denied the opportunity to reflect on the event in their own words through the narrative. In a sense, the characters require a third party to evaluate the event and describe it on their behalf.[12] The interpreter, ancient or modern, can play the role of the "third party" who identifies sexual violence as such and adjudicates whether an act is "unwanted" or "coerced."

Some might object to the subjective nature of the definition of sexual violence and how it is applied by third party interpreters to ancient texts. The critique has some merit. However, the "heterogeneous quality of sexual violences,"[13] even in high-information environments in modern contexts with eyewitnesses, is "fuzzy, messy, and icky" as Rhiannon Graybill describes it.[14] The definition offered here, albeit imperfect, is an attempt to define the subject of this dissertation because eschewing definitions hinders dialogue on a topic. Still, some gray area, particularly on sensitive subjects like sexual violence, must be accounted for and embraced.

---

violence across time and place is the variable definitions of what is viewed as "sexual." Taking into account the challenge of even identifying what is sexual in ancient writings, this dissertation focuses on lexemes with overt and demonstrable sexual connotations in its analysis. For Bourke's comments on this topic see Forward to *Theorizing Sexual Violence*, eds. Renée J. Heberle and Victoria Grace (London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009), xi.

[12] It is important to note that the "third party" intervention on behalf of silent characters to name sexual violence as such is not applicable or helpful in other instances where individuals can offer their *own* interpretation of events. Third party intervention in instances where individuals——fictitious or real—can and do offer their own assessment smacks of "patriarchal and colonialist desire to save women (Rhiannon Graybill, *Texts After Terror: Rape, Sexual Violence, and the Hebrew Bible* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2021], 9)."

[13] Renée J. Heberle and Victoria Grace, Introduction to *Theorizing Sexual Violence*, 4.

[14] Graybill, *Texts After Terror*, 8–29.

1.1.2 The Language of Boundaries

The language of boundaries—boundary setting, boundary markers, crossing boundaries, breaking boundaries—is ubiquitous in humanities and social science academic literature.[15] The ubiquity is due to the growing recognition that identity, individual and social, is constructed, and that individual and group identities affect one's perception of their world.[16] Given its use across several disciplines, it is worth specifying the sense in which the language of boundaries is used in this dissertation. Essential to a discussion on boundaries is distinguishing between "symbolic" and "social" boundaries.[17] Symbolic boundaries are the "conceptual distinctions" individuals make to order or "categorize" themselves and others. These distinctions can be based upon a range of factors including an individual or groups' material culture, cultural practices, or qualities.[18] Social boundaries are the reification of those distinctions through institutions and practices.[19] The world of symbolic boundaries is a competitive space as symbolic boundaries become social boundaries when they gain traction among a group's decision makers.[20] Within this competitive space, a group's relative power vis-à-vis other groups matters for how those boundaries are constructed and enforced. Factors like class, ethnicity, and race are always operating in the background.

[15] Michèle Lamont and Virág Molnár, "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences," *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (2002):167.

[16] For the connection between the boundary metaphor and identity see Judith Lieu, "'Impregnable Ramparts and Walls Of Iron': Boundary and Identity in Early 'Judaism' and 'Christianity,'" *NTS* 48 (2002): 298.

[17] Lamont and Molnár, "The Study of Boundaries," 168.

[18] Lamont and Molnár, "The Study of Boundaries," 168.

[19] Lamont and Molnár, "The Study of Boundaries," 168.

[20] Lamont and Molnár, "The Study of Boundaries," 168–9.

The writings analyzed in this dissertation are entering into that competitive space, and their writers are performing "boundary work" by defining themselves in relation to the Other, within the texts they produce.[21] Conducting a thorough literary analysis of the texts helps to reveal, not without some ambiguity, the conceptual boundaries these writers envision. In some cases, the writers are participating in the reification of an already existing boundary. In other cases, they are advocating for the establishment of a boundary nascent in its development. Still other writers might engage the stories of sexual violence to remap or remove boundaries. The question of whether these symbolic boundaries map onto a social reality in terms of institutional inclusion/exclusion, commensal regulations, endogamy/ exogamy, or other practices is outside of the scope of this dissertation. Instead, this dissertation focuses on how stories of sexual violence are used to create and reify those conceptual distinctions between the writers' community and others, or, using a binary logic, the Other.[22]

Concerning the writers and their communities, this dissertation is exclusively concerned with writings produced by Israelite and Judahite scribes as well as early Jewish communities and writers.[23] The way in which the diverse group of writers conceive of their communities'

---

[21] Michèle Lamont, *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 3.

[22] Lamont and Molnár, "The Study of Boundaries," 174.

[23] At what point it is appropriate to use the term "Jewish" in relation to ancient communities and their writings is a point of debate among those in Jewish and classical studies. The debate is typically framed around when "Judaism" as a religion became a separate category from "Judean" ethnicity. At one pole, there are those who argue the term "Jewish" can reasonably be projected back as far as the origins of what is commonly termed early Israelite religion seeing a continuity between Israelite, Judeans, and Jews. For this perspective see Marc Brettler, "Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism," *CBQ* 61 (1999): 429–47. At the other pole, there are those who argue that scholars cannot properly speak of "Jewish" writings until at least Late Antiquity. For this view see Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512. Cynthia M. Baker calls into question whether dividing these categories is ever appropriate in "A Jew By Any Other Name?" *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011): 173–78. While I am sympathetic to Brettler's argument around continuity, for this dissertation it is important to rhetorically preserve a distinction between Israelite and Judahite communities on the one hand and Jewish communities in the post-Second Temple Period on the other. Concerning the timeframe for "early" Jewish communities and literature, this dissertation is particularly concerned with the third century BCE to the second century BCE.

boundaries is shaped by their spatiotemporal location as well as various power dynamics internal to the group and external. Who "counts" as Other changes in relation to political and historical circumstances. How permeable the boundary is between the writers' communities and others is also a perennial question. Sexual relations, licit and illicit, are often at the heart of discussions around the permeability of boundaries.[24]

1.2 Theorizing Sexual Violence

In their introduction to the edited volume *Theorizing Sexual Violence*, Renée J. Heberle and Victoria Grace write, "We perceive that while sexual violence as a phenomenon is heavily researched, it remains undertheorized."[25] Over a decade after their volume was published, it is clear that great gains have been made in the space of theory, grappling with the messiness and meaning of sexual violence, including in biblical and biblical-adjacent studies.[26] This dissertation places itself in that larger theoretical conversation around sexual violence particularly focusing on the politics and representation of sexual violence. In the following sections, I discuss both topics and provide case studies from outside of biblical and early Jewish literature to clarify the themes discussed in this dissertation and demonstrate their broad applicability across disciplines.

1.2.1 The Politics of Sexual Violence

When I discuss "the politics of sexual violence," what precisely do I mean? In this dissertation, I understand "politics" to be operating on multiple levels: gender/ sex/ sexuality

---

[24] Christine Hayes writes that "intermarriage and conversion" are "the two processes by which boundaries are penetrated" for ancient Jews (*Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2002], 4–5). The relationship between sexual relations and marriage is an interesting one in the ancient world. In some circumstances it seems that an illicit sexual relationship can be used as a pretext for marriage negotiations (Gen 34).

[25] Heberle and Grace, introduction to *Theorizing Sexual Violence*, 3.

[26] Graybill's *Texts After Terror* (2021) represents the most recent strides in theorizing sexual violence.

politics, communal politics, and narrative/ historiographic politics. This tripartite schematization of the politics of sexual violence is somewhat artificial as we will see how interdependent the three levels are on one another. However, it is worth considering each in turn in order to nuance the discussion on the politics of sexual violence.

Gender, sex, and sexuality is the first level upon which politics are operative in sexual violence. This understands sexual violence in the context of the way individuals marked by their biological sex, socially constructed gender, and sexual desire fit into the larger social structure.[27] Sex and gender politics concerns the relative power accorded to individuals through institutions — formal and informal —upheld by ideologies based upon sex and gender differences.[28] The sex and gender politics of society are contextually specific but seem to be universally at play.[29] It is important to note that while this study foregrounds sex and gender politics in its analysis, it also attends to other aspects of identity (class, ethnicity, tribe, etc.).[30] Sex and gender do not operate independently but are interconnected with other facets of identity.

---

[27] The description of sex being entirely biological is admittedly reductionist. Sex is also constructed in the political and legal realm. For a brief discussion on the difference between sex and gender and the social construction of sex for political and legal purposes see Mary Hawkesworth, "Sex, Gender, and Sexuality: From Naturalized Presumption to Analytical Categories," in *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*, eds. Georgina Waylen, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and S. Laurel Weldon (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 31–56 especially 33–37.

[28] Hawkesworth, "Sex, Gender, and Sexuality," 51.

[29] In her essay "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," Joan W. Scott argues for an approach to gender in historical analysis that recognizes gender must be "contextually defined" as it is "repeatedly constructed." That said, she argues gender is a useful category of analysis. Implicit in her argument is that one finds gender politics at play in societies across space and time although she stops short of making this argument. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *The American Historical Review* 91.5 (1986):1053–1075.

[30] bell hooks provides an example of the interconnectedness of gender and race politics within the context of sexual violence as well as explicates the importance of intersectionality in our methods. See "Reflections on Race and Sex," in *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge, 2015), 57–64, esp. 59. Patricia Hill Collins identifies studies on social problems, particularly violence against women, as one of six key areas of scholarship where intersectional frameworks have been deployed noting its usefulness for such studies. Patricia Hill Collins, "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas," *Annual Review of Sociology* 41 (2015): 12.

The second level the politics of sexual violence operates at is the communal level. At this level, the most heinous interpersonal violations of one's body become the concerns of an organized group of people such as the body politic, tribe, nation, ethnic/racial identity group, or religious community.[31] While many interpersonal violations occur out of the view of the public eye, some rise to the level of public scrutiny as the stories of the violations are shared verbally or recorded in text and transmitted across space and time.[32] The stories have a personal dimension, and, as they spread, gain a communal dimension. The personal is political.[33] In the stories of sexual violence that enter the public domain, often the individuals involved are subsumed by the groups with whom they identify or those which identify with them. Individuals become symbols, tokens, or martyrs. Their stories are enveloped into history and serve to shape group identity.

Modern people are not the first to recognize the public dimension of sexual violence and reflect on it in academic prose. For example, Machiavelli, a medieval Italian political philosopher, explores the political nature of sexual violence and its consequences for those ruling over polities in his work reflecting on Greek and Roman history. While Machiavelli "lacks a specific concept of rape," he recognizes that "sexual assault... is both an intrinsic injury and...a

[31] "Communal" is the broad term I use to encompass the myriad ways humans organize themselves into groups. Nation and state are fitting for many modern contexts, but less so for ancient contexts. Body politic should be understood in its broadest construal as those comprising a polity including its marginalized communities who might be excluded from the polity's governance. Within some polities, individuals or organized into smaller groups based on religious, racial, ethnic, or tribal identities.

[32] On the paradox of the private and public aspects of sexual violence see Tanya Horeck, *Public Rape: Representing Violation in Fiction and Film* (London: Routledge, 2004), 1.

[33] This statement and variations of it was a cornerstone claim of the Second-wave feminist movement. Audre Lorde critiques this claim for the failures of many of its white proponents to recognize the *different* personal experiences of women of varying races, sexualities, ages, and classes. Only when the differences of the personal are appreciated, the "personal as political" can provide insight to affect change. See "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," in *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, eds. Reina Lewis and Sara Mills (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003), 25–28.

potential risk to ruling elites."[34] He analyzes the sexual assault of Pausanias, a male member of Philip of Macedon's court as well as generalized examples of leaders assaulting women who were not their own wives.[35] In these scenarios, Machiavelli understands men's honor (either the honor of the assaulted man or the kinsman of the assaulted woman) to be the primary victim of the sexual violence, and the outcome of the assault on those individuals to be violent against leadership—whether or not those leaders were directly involved in the violation. Machiavelli's understanding of sexual violence centers men and frames the issue of sexual violence in terms of consequences for polity leadership. In Renaissance Italy, interpersonal, sexual violence is subsumed into the larger communal narratives of the Italian elite, one which was defined by patriarchal assumptions.

Like Machiavelli, modern political theorists have examined the role of sexual violence at the communal level, more specifically the level of the nation-state. V. Spike Peterson considers how rape, a specific form of sexual violence, functions in the context of groups that hold "state-centric national" identities and the "heterosexist" assumptions undergirding those identities.[36] In the state-centric national context, Peterson argues that "women...serve as symbolic markers of the nation and of the group's cultural identity" largely based upon the (legally enforced) reproductive and child-rearing roles women play in states.[37] Given their symbolic status, sexual

[34] Yves Winter, "Machiavelli and the Rape of Lucretia," *History of Political Thought* 40 (2019): 408.

[35] Winter, "Machiavelli," 408–9.

[36] By heterosexist, Peterson means "the institutionalization and normalization of heterosexuality" and the commitment to the hierarchical gender binary which presupposes heterosexuality. V. Spike Peterson, "Sexing Political Identities/ Nationalism as Heterosexism," International Journal of Feminist Politics 1 (1999): 39.

[37] Peterson, "Sexing Political Identities," 48.

violence is perceived as a violation of the nation. It is worth quoting Peterson at length on this point:

> The personification of nature-as-female transmutes easily to nation-as-woman, where the Motherland is a woman's body and as such is ever in danger of violation—by 'foreign' males/ sperm. To defend her frontiers and her honor requires relentless vigilance and the sacrifice of countless citizen-warriors. Nation-as-woman expresses a spatial, embodied femaleness: the land's fecundity, upon which the people depend, must be protected by defending the body/nation's boundaries against invasion and violation. But nation-as-woman is also a temporal metaphor: the rape of the body/nation not only violates frontiers but disrupts—by planting alien seed or destroying reproductive viability—the maintenance of the community through time. Also implicit in the patriarchal metaphor is a tacit agreement that men who cannot defend their woman/nation against rape have lost their 'claim' to that body, that land.[38]

Peterson demonstrates the power of the nation-as-woman metaphor and how claims of rape in its metaphorical sense (rape of land, a violent dominance over a place including its people and resources) or actual sense (interpersonal violence) can rally people and other nations to violent reactions. While Peterson's work is focused on state-centric nationalism, I believe the implications of her work can be translated to different, pre-nation-state, political environments and various political identities (ethnic, tribal, religious, etc.).[39]

While one might imagine that communities, or states in the case of Peterson's research, call up "countless citizen-warriors" to battle one another on level metaphorical battlegrounds and equal terms, postcolonial theorists have demonstrated that a group's status as colonizer or colonized can determine whether charges of sexual violation are brought or retribution and recompense is sought.[40] Accusations or stories of sexual violence perpetrated by colonized

---

[38] Peterson, "Sexing Political Identities," 48.

[39] Peterson, "Sexing Political Identities," 34–65.

[40] Bourke, Forward to *Theorizing Sexual Violence*, xi–xii. Mary Ticktin arges that "sexual violence is noted primarily when it is attached to other types of difference." Ticktin, "Sexual Violence as the Language of Border Control: Where French Feminist and Anti-immigrant Rhetoric Meet," *Signs* 33 (2008): 865.

people earn a swift response by colonizers in the form of "intervention, occupation and other kinds of legalist civilizing missions."[41] Embedded within the civilizing mission is a rescue narrative that "[revolves] around the presumed weakness of women, whether Native or European, and *the moral superiority of white men*, proven through their ability to rescue women from rape and exploitation committed by those deemed uncivilized."[42] In this framework, colonized men are often viewed as being capable of "spectacular violence" particularly in the area of sexual violence against women.[43] The presumed moral superiority on the part of the colonizers covers over a multitude of unjustified and disproportionately violent responses to allegations of sexual violence perpetrated by the colonized.[44]

These power dynamics around sexual violence observed by postcolonial theorists and scholars are not confined to a discrete historical period of European colonization,[45] but are rooted in broader economic and political power structures. For example, Elizabeth Philipose

---

[41] Elizabeth Philipose, "Feminism, International Law, and the Spectacular Violence of the 'Other' Decolonizing the Laws of War," in *Theorizing Sexual Violence*, eds. Renée J. Heberle and Victoria Grace (London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009), 177.

[42] Philipose, "Feminism, International Law, and Spectacular Violence," 178.

[43] Philipose, "Feminism, International Law, and Spectacular Violence," 176. Lila Abu-Lughod offers a succinct explanation of how this dynamic plays out in the Islamic world in a discussion of 'gendered Orientalism' which sees colonized women as victims of "lascivious and violent men." *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), 88.

[44] For a critique of an approach to understanding sexual violence that takes into account intersectional issues and economics, see Beverly A. McPhail, "Feminist Framework Plus: Knitting Feminist Theories of Rape Etiology Into a Comprehensive Model," *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 17 (2016): 318–9.

[45] Although these power dynamics are not confined to the period of European colonization, there are many cases from that period. For example, see reflections on the historiography of the Indian Mutiny of 1857 in British media in Gautam Chakravarty, *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 38–9 and Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in Colonial Texts* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 4. For reflections on colonial Zimbabwe, the perceived threat of black men to white-settler women, termed "black peril," and the extreme reactions of settlers see John Pape, "Black and White: The 'Perils of Sex' in Colonial Zimbabwe," *Journal of South African Studies* 16 (1990): 699–720. Similar extreme behavior in response to *perceived* sexual threat from black men to white-settler women occurred in Kenya as well. See David M. Anderson, "Sexual Threat and Settler Society: 'Black Perils' in Kenya, c. 1907–30," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 37 (2010): 47–74.

demonstrates how international legal forums "[serve] a neocolonial global order" as those who are held legally accountable for sexual violence are "non-Euro-descended peoples, or people of color."[46] Philipose is not arguing that documented instances of sexual violence ought to be ignored; rather, her argument concerns the pattern of violence followed by outside intervention. She states that this pattern in the "neocolonial era reflects a colonial pattern in that the narrative of violence against women recurs throughout Euro-colonial imaginaries as evidence of the inferiority and backwardness of Native men and women, and as a racializing trope."[47] Writing within an intersectional framework, Patricia Hill Collins explains, "Violent acts become legitimated or censured not exclusively in reference to some external moral, ethical code, *but in relationship to power relations of race, gender, class, age and sexual orientation* mediated through the legal system, government agencies and other social institutions. As a result, the same violent act will be viewed and treated differently *depending on the race and gender* of the individuals 'inflicting injury' and who its victims are."[48] Philipose from a postcolonial perspective and Hill Collins from an American intersectional perspective both draw attention to reasons why any analysis of sexual violence and the response to it might require attention to various aspects of identity. The postcolonial and intersectional critique of the discourse around the politics of sexual violence is important to bear in mind as we examine stories of sexual violence from the past.[49]

---

[46] Philipose, "Feminism, International Law, and Spectacular Violence," 178–80.

[47] Philipose, "Feminism, International Law, and the Spectacular Violence," 177.

[48] Patricia Hill Collins, "The Tie that Binds: Race, Gender and US Violence," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21.5 (1998): 922. Emphasis mine. Hill Collins revisits and affirms her arguments in "The Tie that Binds" in another article almost 20 years later "On Violence, Intersectionality and Transversal Politics," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40 (2017): 1460–73.

[49] On the importance of assessing power dynamics in biblical/bible-adjacent scholarship, see Yee, "Thinking Intersectionally," 8.

Musa Dube, a postcolonial-feminist theologian and biblical scholar, demonstrates the import of reading biblical stories through a postcolonial-feminist lens. Applying literary critical methods, Dube highlights how Exodus and Joshua use literary-rhetorical methods to justify conquest.[50] The justification is worked out through several rhetorical strategies, but part of the justification method includes constructing the identities of the colonizers and colonized "as acute opposites of superior and inferior, Godly and ungodly, civilized and barbaric."[51] The construction of these identities as opposites results in drawing a boundary, and specifically a sexual boundary between groups.[52] Dube also shows how gender intersects with these constructed identities.[53] Women become representative of their lands. On the side of the colonizers, women are "keepers of the purity or holiness of their nation."[54] Colonized women, if won over by colonizing men, portend the "enter[ing] and domesticat[ion] of the land they represent.[55] Dube uses the story of Rahab in the conquest narrative in Joshua to explore the gender dynamics of imperialist activity. Rahab represents her people and is a sign of the subjugation they will face. Critically, for this project, Dube proves the relevance of modern, critical theories and methods, particularly postcolonial and feminist, for understanding ancient and bibilcal narrative.

---

[50] Musa W. Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000), 57–58.

[51] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 65.

[52] Dube describes the boundary as relating to marriage, a prohibition against exogamy. I argue that part-and parcel of this ban is a sexual contact ban. Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 66.

[53] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 70–82.

[54] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 75.

[55] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 76

Lastly, the politics of sexual violence is operationalized on the level of story. The narratives—moored to or unmoored from historical realities—communities and individuals tell about their past, present, and social world. The politics of sexual violence on the level of story are often most clearly seen in historiographies, written history recognized for its selective nature, ideological underpinnings, and narrative artistry.[56] Stories about sexual violence have the power to shape the way individuals and communities view themselves and others. The way the stories are framed, what aspects of the individuals involved (the victims/survivors and assailants), and the details of the event included or omitted all can influence that view of oneself and world. The stories themselves can have a formative effect on communal relations. Philipose points to late nineteenth and twentieth century America arguing that, "Rape stories play a function in the meting out of 'extra-judicial justice' as well, as many victims of lynchings in the United States were accused of raping white women and brutalized for their presumably perverse and violent sexualities."[57] While there are many examples of this dynamic at play, the violent murder of Emmett Till at the hands of white men serves as a concrete and salient example of the dynamic in American historical memory. Till, a Black child of fourteen years, was accused of flirting with a white woman, violating an unwritten code in the Jim Crow south. The story of Till's interaction with the woman provoked a certain response, namely an extra-judicial lynching based in white supremacy. The observation of how the politics of sexual violence work on the level of story is not disconnected from sexual politics on the level of gender, sexuality, and community, but the politics of storytelling itself should not be minimalized or ignored.

---

[56] For discussions on historiography as it relates to biblical material see Mark Z. Brettler, "The New Biblical Historiography," in *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*, ed. V. Philip Long (Winona: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 43–50 and V. Philip Long, "History and Fiction: What Is History?" in V. Philip Long, 232–54.

[57] Philipose, "Feminism, International Law, and Spectacular Violence," 177.

In summary, the politics of sexual violence can be described in three ways: on the level of sex, gender, and sexuality, community, and story. Disambiguating the ways in which one understands the politics of sexual violence is somewhat artificial as each of these acts in concert with one another, but it can be helpful for thinking through how sexual violence and stories of sexual violence function within communities. In the following section I examine a few case studies to further our analysis on the politics of sexual violence.

1.2.2 The Politics of Sexual Violence: Case Studies

This section explores the politics of sexual violence, as defined in this dissertation, through a series of case studies in order to concretize the framework I have laid out for thinking about how to understand those politics. The case studies are drawn from the ancient and modern worlds, but they share common themes relating to the politics of sexual violence. That these stories are not confined to a single era or location underscores a certain universal quality to the politics of sexual violence.

The first case study comes from the founding of the Roman republic in the sixth century BCE as recorded by Livy, a Roman historian living in the first century BCE, in his *History of Rome (Ab Urbe Condita Libri)*.[58] During the reign of Lucius Tarquin, the last king of Rome's regal period, Livy reports that during a customary drinking party of princes and their comrades

[58] The earliest extant story of Lucretia is recorded by Livy. See Melissa M. Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics: Readings in Livy, Machiavelli, and Rousseau* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 23. Other early accounts are found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* and Ovid's *Fasti*. In this section, I reference Livy, *The History of Rome* (Foster, LCL). Whether or not the story of Lucretia as recorded by Livy comports with some set of actual historical events is immaterial for this discussion as this dissertation is concerned with how histories are written as opposed to verifiable events in history. For more on this issue as it relates to the story of Lucretia see S.R. Joshel, "The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia," in *Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World: Readings and Sources*, ed. Laura K. McClure (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 166–7. This dissertation is not the first work to find the story of Lucretia helpful for thinking through instances of sexual violence in early Jewish literature. See Helena Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters: Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 49–56.

on furlough from war, the gathered men began boasting about the praiseworthiness of each of their wives (Livy, 1.57.6–7). In order to settle the contest between the men, they secretly spy on their wives in order to assess whose wife was the most virtuous. They find Lucretia, the wife of Tarquinius Collatinus, weaving and she is deemed to be the most virtuous. However, as a result of the competition, she falls under the sinister gaze of Sextus Tarquinius, the king's son (Livy, 1.57.9–11). After staying as a guest at Tarquinius Collatinus' house, Sextus Tarquinius enters Lucretia's room and, threatening her with a knife, vows to destroy her reputation by accusing her of adultery with a slave if she does not comply with his sexual demands of her (Livy, 1.58.1–5).

After Sextus Tarquinius rapes Lucretia, she calls for her father and husband asking them to bring trustworthy friends (Livy, 1.58.5–6). When they are gathered, Lucretia recounts what Sextus Tarquinius did to her, requests their vow to hold him accountable, and takes her own life (Livy, 1.58.7–12). Tarquinius Collatinus' friend Brutus is the first to heed Lucretia's call to action and rallies those who watched her testimony to take action by killing the king and his whole family, including Lucretia's rapist, the king's son Sextus Tarquinius. Parading Lucretia's body into the street, the men gather others to their cause, beginning the campaign to overthrow the last king of Rome (Livy, 1.59.1–13).

The various levels of the politics of sexual violence are all on clear display in this case study of Livy's account of "the rape of Lucretia," as it is commonly called.[59] The following paragraphs provide a cursory overview of how the politics of sexual violence are at work in this story. The analysis is not meant to be comprehensive; rather, it is to introduce the reader to how

[59] Regarding the name of the story see publication titles like Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics* and Debora Shuger, "Castigating Livy: The Rape of Lucretia and *The Old Arcadia*, *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 526–48.

the politics work in corpora outside of biblical and ancient Jewish literature and to demonstrate larger patterns in the politics of sexual violence.

Gender, sex, and sexuality politics are foundational to understanding the rape of Lucretia in Livy's account. The story begins with explicit references to gendered expectations for men and women based upon their class standing. For example, Lucretia draws the attention of Sextus Tarquinius based upon her outstanding conformity to those idealized gender roles.[60] Sextus Tarquinius, for his part, is overcome with a wicked desire (*mala libido*) to take Lucretia by force (Livy 1.57.10–11). Sextus Tarquinius also violates other Roman values, particularly the Roman conception that a husband had sole sexual access to his wife. Sextus Tarquinius' rape of Lucretia can thus be viewed as a violation of the patriarchal structure in which women's sexuality is controlled to "[guarantee] the certainty of paternity" operating in the background in Rome.[61] Paternity is inherently uncertain in a way that maternity is not. The pregnant body confirms maternity. Women's sexuality, thus, is socially regulated in order to remove any doubt about fatherhood. The regulation of women's sexual activity gains greater urgency and scrutiny when inheritance enters the conversation.[62] When a person with political power, like Sextus Tarquinius, violates the patriarchal order, it calls into question the rights and powers of other men in society. As Matthes puts it, "To violate Lucretia is in effect to violate her father and husband…to demonstrate forcibly that they cannot control their women, cannot guarantee

---

[60] For more on those gendered expectations see Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia,* 34–5. For an alternative highlighting the ways in which Lucretia defies gender roles see Eleanor Glendinning, "Reinventing Lucretia: Rape, Suicide and Redemption from Classical Antiquity to the Medieval Era," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 20 (2013): 64–5.

[61] Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics*, 27. Matthes points to the scholarship of Carole Pateman among others who writes most compellingly on the issue of paternity.

[62] Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 34.

paternity and therefore cannot assume political authority/power."[63] In the story, Lucretia's rape raises questions of patriarchal power and authority in their community.

On the levels of the community and historiography, the violation of Lucretia sparks the overthrow of the king ushering in a new era of Roman republican governance. From a historiographical perspective, it is interesting to note that "the physical violation of a woman" accompanied some of Rome's most significant political changes.[64] There is a pattern for how sexual violence functions within Roman historiography, ultimately sexual violence facilitates political change. The pattern, however, is not confined to Roman historiography. In her discussion of the reception of Lucretia's story, Matthes argues that though the content story does not seem to have implications outside of ancient Roman history, it still is re-counted and re-presented across time and throughout Europe.[65] She writes further that "the variations in the historical incarnations of the story are intriguing, *especially the logic that seems to necessitate the rape of a woman in order to found a republic*."[66] In other words, various (male) writers recognize that 1) sexual violence can be a catalyst for political change, and 2) the appeal to sexual violence serves a historiographical purpose. Namely, it justifies—logically, and I would add morally—the founding of a republican government. To borrow the phrase of Kristina

[63] Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics*, 28.

[64] Thomas E. Strunk, "Rape and Revolution: Livia and Augustus in Tacitus' 'Annales.'" *Latomus* 73 (2014): 126. In addition to the rape of Lucretia, Strunk also points to violations of Rhea Silvia and the Sabine women as well as the attempted rape of Verginia.

[65] Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics*, 5. Lucretia's story is recounted by writers such as Augustine, Machiavelli, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Rousseau, and many others. For more on the story's reception see Glendinning, "Reinventing Lucretia," 61–82.

[66] Matthes, *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics*, 5.

Milnor, the violated, dead body of a woman "has a clear historiographical task to perform" in founding myths of republics.[67]

The next case study concerns a man named Pausanias in Macedon in the fourth century BCE as recounted in Diodorus Siculus' *The Library of History* (*Bibliotheca Historica*) written in the first century BCE.[68] Pausanias was the bodyguard of King Philip II of Macedon in addition to being "beloved of him [Philip] because of his beauty" (Diod.Sic. 16.93.3–4).[69] When Pausanias saw the king "enamored" with another man who was also named Pausanias, he accused the other Pausanias of being ἀνδρόγυνος, that is having characteristics of both a man and woman, and eager to accept any sexual advances (Diod.Sic. 16.93.4). This second Pausanias was so deeply offended by the accusation, he made a plan to die in service of the king in battle. Before doing so, however, he shared his plan with a friend, Attalus, who was also influential with the king (Diod.Sic. 16.93.5–6). After the second Pausanias' death, Attalus invites the first Pausanias to dinner, gets him drunk, and passes him off in an unconscious state to mule-handlers to drunkenly violate him sexually (Diod.Sic. 16.93.7). When Pausanias awoke and realized what had happened to him, he appealed to Philip II to punish Attalus. While Philip II agreed that Attalus was in the wrong, he chose to not hold him accountable because of his political connections and service to his court (Diod.Sic. 16.93.8–9). Philip II attempted to appease Pausanias with gifts, but

[67] Kristina Milnor, "Women in Roman Historiography," *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, ed. Andrew Feldherr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 280.

[68] Pausanias' story is also recorded in Just. 9.6–7 and his role in the assassination of Philip II in Arist. *Pol*. 1311b and Plut. *Alex*. 10.4. The following analysis uses the story as recorded in Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History* (C.H. Oldfather, LCL). The primary difference between the various accounts is the level of detail they provide on Pausanias' story. Diodorus Siculus provides the greatest level of detail.

[69] The Greek text reads "διὰ τὸ κάλλος φίλος γεγονὼς τοῦ Φιλίππου".

ultimately could not curb Pausanias' wrath. As a result, Pausanias assassinated Philip II (Diod.Sic. 16.93.9–94.4).

With respect to the politics of sexual violence in this story, several aspects are notable. On the level of sex and gender, the story begins with an insult leveled by the first Pausanias leveled at the second Pausanias' manhood. To contextualize this insult, there was a fluidity in understandings of biological sex and gender. Sex was on a continuum and one's place on that continuum was continually negotiated, and gender followed suit.[70] Sex and gender hierarchies were thoroughly entrenched with masculine men on the top.[71] Given the fragility of place on that scale, "a skilled speaker could unman his enemies through the use of clever vitriolic and abusive speech" which is what the first Pausanias sought to do.[72] Pausanias sought to "unman" the second Pausanias in two ways. First, he accused him of having sex characteristics of both man and woman.[73] The male body was the ideal and any deviation from that—including having female sex organs—was a deviation from the ideal.[74] Moreover, in Greek constructions of gender and power having female sex characteristics opens the door for one to be the penetrated party during intercourse. It is important to note that the act of two men engaged in intercourse

---

[70] Susanna Asikainen, *Jesus and Other Men: Ideal Masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels* (Boston: Brill, 2018), 22.

[71] Asikainen, *Jesus and Other Men*, 24.

[72] Scott Rubarth, "Competing Constructions of Masculinity in Ancient Greece," *Athens Journal of Humanities and Arts* 1 (2014): 28.

[73] Concerning ἀνδρόγυνος, Pliny the Elder writing about one hundred years after Diodorus Siculus writes, "Persons are also born of both sexes combined—what we call Hermaphrodites, formerly called *androgyni* and considered as portents, but now as entertainments (*Nat.* 2.7.34 [Rackham, LCL])." Assuming Pliny had some insight into how androgynos might be construed in a time prior to his, one might consider the deleterious effects of being associated with bad events might have on an individual accused of being androgynos.

[74] Asikainen, *Jesus and Other Men*, 20. Female sex organs were an inversion of the normative male sex organs.

did not impact whether they were considered masculine in Greek society; rather, it is the role they played—penetrator or penetrated, active or passive—that mattered for their masculinity.[75] Second, Pausanias accused the second Pausanias of lacking control when it comes to the sexual advances of others.[76] To be a masculine man, one needed to avoid excesses.[77] Not only was the first Pausanias accusing the second Pausanias in a subordinated sexual role, by claiming he could not say no to sexual advances he was underscoring what specimen of a man he was. While these insults are not directly connected to the instance of sexual violence, the scene is important for framing of the incident. The insult scene has historiographical significance and introduces the themes of manhood and masculinity to the record of events.

Turning to the sex and gender politics as they relate to the violation of the first Pausanias, two points are notable. First, Pausanias' violation comes as a result of being intoxicated, lacking control in his consumption of alcohol.[78] Recalling Pausanias' insult of the second Pausanias regarding his lack of control, Pausanias shows the same weakness thus calling his masculinity into question. Moreover, he is penetrated in his moment of loss of control. Pausanias' masculinity is in question. By seeking retribution through the king, he can begin to regain his masculinity. Some Classical Greek writers suggest that being a masculine man required one to

---

[75] Asikainen, *Jesus and Other Men*, 33; Andrew Lear, "Ancient Pederasty: An Introduction," in *Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, ed. Thomas K. Hubbard (Malden: Wiley- Blackwell, 2014), 119. For more on how Diodorus Siculus' thought about sexual relationships between men see Heckle, Howe, and Müller, "'The Giver of the Bride, the Bridegroom, and the Bride,'" 108.

[76] Waldemar Heckel, Timothy Howe, and Sabine Müller, "'The Giver of the Bride, the Bridegroom, and the Bride': A Study of the Murder of Philip II and Its Aftermath," in *Ancient Historiography on War and Empire*, eds. Timothy Howe, Sabine Müller, and Richard Stonemaker (Philadelphia: Oxbow, 2017), 97.

[77] Asikainen, *Jesus and Other Men*, 33.

[78] Heckle, Howe, and Müller, "'The Giver of the Bride, the Bridegroom, and the Bride,'" 99.

seek revenge for being wronged.[79] His appeal to the king is an essential part of Pausanias' climb back up the sex-gender hierarchy.

Pausanias' appeal to the king regarding the injury he suffered is worth analyzing as it reveals how gender intersects social class and standing. The Greek term used to describe the sexual assault Pausanias experienced is ὕβρις. Within a Greek legal context, the term ὕβρις is underdetermined but does denote an arrogance of the offender accompanied by excessive violence bringing shame to the offended party. It is frequently used with reference to sexual violence and is legally "actionable."[80] In cases of sexual assault, if the victim is under the care of a κύριος, that person is responsible for acting legally on behalf household members. Moreover, the crime is legally understood as an offense against the κύριος.[81] Borja Bernádez suggests that based on Pausanias' appeal to Philip II to punish Attalus, Philip II should be understood as Pausanias' κύριος.[82] There was a synonymity between κύριος and man.[83] As a man in a socially subordinate position, Pausanias understood that it was both Philip's responsibility to defend him, and that in fact Philip, the king, himself was the offended party making Philip's inaction more galling. From Pausanias' perspective, what type of legitimate κύριος would allow such an

---

[79] Asikainen, *Jesus and Other Men*, 28. Asikainen notes that there is some controversy on this point in ancient sources as there is a competing value of self-restraint.

[80] Susan Guettel Cole, "Greek Sanctions Against Sexual Assault," *CP* 79 (1984): 99.

[81] Borja Antela Bernárdez, "Philip and Pausanias: A Deadly Love in Macedonian Politics," *ClQ* 62 (2012): 860. Hunter describes κύριος as an institution signifying a bundle of roles and responsibilities. Virginia J. Hunter, *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 18.

[82] Bernárdez, "Philip and Pausanias," 860–1. There has been considerable debate on the accuracy of Diodorus Siculus' description of events. It is not for this dissertation to decide how accurate his description is; rather, the *way he chooses to frame his history* is particularly compelling. Sexual violence is a centerpiece of his account, and it does not feature in other accounts. For a discussion on the accuracy of Diodorus Siculus' account see Heckle, Howe, and Müller, "'The Giver of the Bride, the Bridegroom, and the Bride,'" 98.

[83] Rubarth, "Competing Constructions of Masculinity," 27.

offense against his person to go unpunished? His conclusion is evidently no legitimate king should allow those who carry out plots of sexual violence to roam unpunished.[84]

The king's loss of legitimacy leads to an analysis of the communal aspect of the politics of sexual violence, it is worth noting that, as in the case of Lucretia, Pausanias' violation also is a catalyst for political change although the mechanism is different. Lucretia's violation raises questions about property rights, control over women's sexuality, and the patriarchal order. Within the context of Diodorus Siculus' account of political change, Pausanias' violation raises different questions about the king's own masculinity and his ability to avenge wrong-doers and protect the patriarchal order in that way. Pausanias' violated body was not a rallying point for the overthrow of the king. The insult to Pausanias' own masculinity and recognition that the king was a weak κύριος allowed for Pausanias to assert his own masculinity by assassinating the king who would not avenge him.

Finally, the place of historiography is an important piece of this analysis. Diodorus Siculus' account of Pausanias and the assassination of Philip II is one of competing narratives about the assassination. It has some areas of overlap with each of the accounts, but the background it offers on Pausanias and his interactions with the second Pausanias are unparalleled in other accounts.[85] Diodorus Siculus brings to the fore issues of manhood, masculinity, and sexual violence. Again, sexual violence is a catalyst for change in Diodorus Sicilius' history, but the sex and gender politics influence how that change happens. The politics of sexual violence

[84] Winter notes that from Pausanias' story Machiavelli takes the lesson that there is a "political cost to princes of failing to administer justice ("Machiavelli and the Rape of Lucretia," 408)." Other sources suggest that Olympias, Philip II's wife and mother of Alexander the Great, played a role in encouraging Pausanias to assassinate Philip II. See Ian Worthington, *By the Spear: Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 113.

[85] Bernárdez, "Philip and Pausanias," 859n4.

are operative even in instances where all the actors are men. This point is particularly important for the discussion of Gen 19.

Shifting attention to the modern era, the final case study allows us to analyze the politics of sexual violence from a decidedly different angle than the previous two case studies. Namely, they highlight how racial differences impact the politics of sexual violence. These modern categories—race, ethnicity, and religion—for describing identity and defining difference in the modern era can serve as proxies for ancient ways of describing identity and difference. The case studies are meant to clarify, in a context closer to the modern reader, how the politics of sexual violence work.

The modern case study is drawn from an 1872 United States of America congressional report entitled *Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States*. The thirteen volume report recounts testimony regarding many accounts of violence directed toward Black individuals as well as other white targets of violence (schoolteachers, clergy members, etc.) by white paramilitary groups.[86] As it was stated to one witness called by the committee, the purpose of the Joint Select Committee's hearing was to "[inquire] into the condition of affairs in Mississippi and Other states, especially in reference to the safety and property of life and the due execution of the law."[87] The story of James Hicks, a Black man, as recounted by himself and others is particularly relevant to discussions of sexual violence, communal boundaries, and post-colonial critiques on how sexual violence/alleged sexual violence is addressed across lines of racial, ethnic and religious difference.

[86] Racial terminology as it relates to American history is a debated issue. I have chosen to follow the New York Times in capitalizing Black but not white. Nancy Coleman, "Why We're Capitalizing Black," *New York Times*, July 5, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/05/insider/capitalized-black.html (accessed June 22, 2022).

[87] U.S. Congress, Congressional Globe, *Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States*, 42d Cong., 2d sess., 1872, S. Rept. 41, pt. 1, 11:417.

In his testimony to the Joint Select Committee, James Hicks reports that he was beaten with between one hundred fifty and two hundred lashes because the disguised Ku-Klux Klan members said, "they understood I [James Hicks] had talked some talk about a white woman."[88] Hicks believed, however, that the charge was a pretense, and their concern was actually his crop, the products of his labor.[89] As stated by Hicks, the pretense for the beating stretches the boundaries to the very limit what might be considered "unwanted sexual comments" under the definition of sexual violence. Hicks' account was corroborated, more or less, in the committee hearing by the white mayor of Columbus, Mississippi where Hicks lived. The mayor stated Hicks was beaten because "it was charged that...he had used some inappropriate language with regards to some white ladies."[90] The judge of Columbus reported that he had heard of Hicks' case, "a man boasting about having criminal intercourse with a respectable white woman."[91] The judge then offered a justification for the extra-judicial beating, indicating that he had not violated Mississippi code but rather "the common law which exists in the public mind and heart of the white men of this country."[92] Others offered testimony indicating that "criminal intercourse" or talk about sex with one or more white women was at issue in the extra-judicial attack.[93]

---

[88] *Report of the Joint Select Committee,* 12:891. The mayor of Columbus estimates he was lashed no less than 300 times, 12:704.

[89] A local teacher familiar with the incident agreed with Hicks' assessment that the root of the beating was a crop dispute. *Report of the Joint Select Committee,* 12:671.

[90] *Report of the Joint Select Committee,* 11:417.

[91] *Report of the Joint Select Committee,* 12:704.

[92] *Report of the Joint Select Committee,* 12:704. The judge was unsure of Hicks' name, but the details he knew were in line with other testimony regarding Hicks.

[93] Testimony on Hicks' case can be found in *Report of the Joint Select Committee* 11:417–18, 445; 12:672, 704–7, 720, 727, 776, 891–4, 1038, 1046–47, 1081–3.

Hicks' case is an important case to consider in a discussion about the politics of sexual violence particularly because many of the allegations directed at him skirt around the very edge of what might be considered sexual violence. The woman/women in question never testify and is/are in fact never named. Hicks' supposed actions are never properly investigated or litigated, but the allegation that he spoke to a white woman provokes an extreme response by a band of forty or more disguised white men.

In the previous section, I noted how gender, sex, and sexuality politics cannot be disentangled from other aspects of individuals' identities. Within the context of the changing post-war cultural landscape of the late nineteenth century United States, Hicks embodied a level of threat in white men's imagination—imaginations formed by a white supremist society. Of this image of Black men emerging in the postbellum period bell hooks writes, "That story, invented by white men, is about the overwhelming desperate longing black men have to sexually violate the bodies of white women. The central character in this story is the black male rapist...It is a story of revenge, rape as the weapon by which black men, the dominated, reverse their circumstance, regain power over white men."[94] This invented story about race and gender in the white male imagination took root in the post-war period Hicks lived. At the same time the story hooks describes is taking root in the white male imagination, the threat white men posed to Black women is being obscured, suppressing inconvenient stories of Black women's violation, as well as creating a new category of white womanhood.[95] Specifically, it turned white women into a group that inherently deserved protection against any and all, real or imagined, slights.[96]

---

[94] hooks, "Reflections on Race and Sex," 58.

[95] hooks, "Reflections on Race and Sex," 57–58.

[96] Feimster, *Southern Horrors: Women and the Politics of Rape and Lynching* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 41–42.

The gender, sex, and racial politics of sexual violence were bound up with the communal aspect of sexual violence. Hicks' case occurred in a moment of United States' history when Black individuals, primarily men, were beginning to gain political rights and economic access.[97] Analyzing the historical event, Crystal Feimster writes, "Although [Hicks'] economic success was probably at the root of the Klan's resentment, by linking it to the supposed insult to white womanhood Klansmen justified their violent behavior as chivalrous and honorable, while portraying [Hicks] as unmanly and unworthy. [Hicks'] beating reveals how the alleged protection of white womanhood from insult or injury was tied to the question of black citizenship and thus became part of the political discourse of Reconstruction."[98] Feimster cogently links the larger political dynamics, Black men gaining relative political and economic standing vis-a-vis white men, to race-gender dynamics of alleged protection of white womanhood. The latter race-gender dynamics is a pretense for violent reactions against the former political-economic dynamics.

Using "protection of white womanhood" as a pretense for violent actions to prevent Black men from making relative political and economic gains should recall Peterson's observation that "women...serve as symbolic markers of the nation and of the group's cultural identity," in this case a particular white-nationalist identity.[99] In their capacity as symbolic markers in the white male imagination, they demand vigorous defense and avenging. As

---

[97] Feimster, *Southern Horrors*, 39.

[98] Feimster, *Southern Horrors*, 49. Feimster refers to James Hicks as Joseph Beckwith. Within the congressional record, Beckwith's testimony immediately precedes Hicks' testimony. The name confusion is clear. Despite the name confusion, Feimster's analysis is astute and worth quoting. For another assessment of this event see Martha Hodes, *White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth Century South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 268n21.

[99] Peterson, "Sexing Political Identities," 48.

previously discussed, Peterson's observation should be combined with the postcolonial critique that there is an asymmetry to how alleged sexual violence of the colonized (here Black Americans) is addressed through formal, and in this case informal, processes. This asymmetry, the extra-judicial beating for alleged discussions about crossing racial sexual boundaries, is the outcome of a set of beliefs including the "presumed weakness of [white] women," "the moral superiority of white men" as well as the belief in the "spectacular violence" of Black men.[100] These ideological commitments and the political-economic backdrop of the Reconstruction era are essential components for understanding the politics of sexual violence in Hicks' case.

Concerning the politics of sexual violence at the historiographic level, it is difficult to assess how Hicks and other stories like his will be understood and recounted by later generations. Neither Livy nor Diodorus Siculus recorded the history they described as it was happening or even within two hundred years of its occurrence. If historians like Feimster are given the last word, Hicks' story will be recalled as part of a larger narrative about white backlash to Black political and economic ascendence in the post-civil-war period. Moreover, the narratives developed about Black men and white women during this period would follow both for generations into the future.

In presenting these case studies, the aim is not to discount the importance of the various social and historical circumstances that led to each. The politics of Roman republicanism are different from those of the kingdom of Macedon. The racial politics of the United States finds no direct parallel with either. That said, the throughlines of the politics of sexual violence running between these case studies are compelling and can act as a guide for analyzing other cases of sexual violence including those in biblical and early Jewish literature.

[100] Philipose, "Feminism, International Law and Spectacular Violence," 177.

As a final note, in the foregoing discussion of sexual violence, one might have noted a conspicuous silence on the personal dimensions of sexual violence and an absence of comment on trauma as a lens for understanding sexual violence. The reason for this silence is connected to the aims of this dissertation to focus on the "context" of sexual violence in biblical and early Jewish literature. This approach is in contrast to previous studies on sexual violence in biblical texts that have privileged the personal dimension of sexual violence, which make the "subjects of rape" the primary locus of analysis.[101] The shift in focus to the context, to the politics of sexual violence, however, is not without some challenges. In focusing on the context of the violence in a narrative, I run the risk of "leaving the violated body in the background in a way that reifies cultural silences surrounding sexual violence."[102] In order to counteract this silencing my approach might lead to, I draw readers attention to different and more subject-centered studies on sexual violence in the dissertation text and footnotes.

1.2.3 Representation of Sexual Violence

This dissertation uses the language of "representation" of sexual violence to distinguish its subject from those studies that explore the embodied realities of sexual violence and concomitant psychological and social trauma.[103] With this distinction articulated, representation,

---

[101] For the language of "subjects of rape" versus "contexts" see Régine Michelle Jean-Charles, *Conflict Bodies: The Politics of Rape Representation in the Francophone Imaginary* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014), 63.

[102] Jean-Charles, *Conflict Bodies,* 63. The context for Jean-Charles' statement is Haitian literature in which the political (namely state-related politics) dimensions of sexual violence are situated in the foreground of the academic analysis. Jean-Charles' caution has cross-disciplinary applicability.

[103] Elizabeth Robertson and Christine M. Rose use "representation" of sexual violence as opposed to "historical accounts of events of rape." This distinction becomes ambiguous when the line between fiction and historical reality is unclear. Robertson and Rose's definition does not align well with "representation" as it is used here. Tanya Horeck distinguishes "representation" from "the physical crime." Horeck's use of representation aligns more with how it is used in this study. I would like to further distinguish studies of representation of sexual violence from studies that treat sexual violence and trauma. Robertson and Rose, Introduction to *Representing Rape in Medieval and Early Modern Literature*, eds. Elizabeth Robertson and Christine M. Rose (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 4; Tanya Horeck, *Public Rape: Representing Violation in Fiction and Film* (London: Routledge, 2004), vi.

as a term, still requires some unpacking. Tanya Horeck contends that representation can be understood in two senses.[104] In the first sense, representation refers to something's likeness presented in the artistic realm. In the second sense, it denotes someone(s) advocating for a particular ideology on behalf of others in the public sphere. Horeck argues, rightly, that both senses are applicable to the study of depictions of sexual violence.[105] This dissertation explores how these scenes of sexual violence function in their narrative context (artistic representation), how the stories function in their broader socio-political and ideological settings (public representation) and the interconnectedness of both types of representation.

Investigating representations of sexual violence as opposed to other ways of examining the issue of sexual violence is worthwhile in (at least) two very important respects. First, representations of sexual violence often serve the function of "mapping out public space." [106] The representations draw some individuals and groups together and drive a wedge between others.[107] Ancient and modern communities (national, ethnic, religious, etc. communities) are invested in, consciously or not, the stories that shape the boundaries of their community, including those sexually violent stories.[108]

Secondly, and related to the first point, stories of sexual violence "serve as foundational myths of Western culture."[109] Elizabeth Robertson and Christine M. Rose in their volume on

---

[104] Horeck, *Public Rape,* 7.

[105] Horeck, *Public Rape,* 7.

[106] Horeck, *Public Rape,* 4.

[107] Horeck, *Public Rape,* 4.

[108] Horeck, *Public Rape*, vii.

[109] Robertson and Rose, Introduction to *Representing Rape*, 1.

representation of sexual violence in Medieval and Early Modern literature recognize the role of sexual violence in the Bible in creating the "skeleton system" upon which the authors of this literature could produce their own representations of sexual violence.[110] Robertson and Rose's volume "explore[s] the artistic thread that links early depictions of rape to contemporary rape, a thread that although twisted in different ways, at different times will remain unbroken as long as sexual access to women is controlled by patriarchal structures."[111] Robertson and Rose beautifully articulate with their analogy of a thread the tension that this dissertation embraces. On the one hand, the dissertation attempts to demonstrate certain consistencies in the depiction and use of sexual violence across time and space. On the other hand, this dissertation attempts to highlight the way in which socio-historical contexts are important for understanding the specific social function of different stories of sexual violence and their interpretation.

1.3 Feminisms and Method

In the following section I discuss feminist theory and methods, what motivates their work and how they do their work, and describe how those theories and methods shape this dissertation. Concerning theory, feminism resists a single definition, hence my subheading feminism*s*. Feminisms encompass a range of aims and concerns including oppressive power structures, power dynamics related to gender, sex, and sexuality, and other issues related to gender, sex, and sexuality. This dissertation aims to call attention to these concerns within the biblical and early Jewish texts. Feminist interpretations in biblical and early Jewish literature have developed alongside of the feminisms of the political and larger academic spheres. While there were some studies that would fit under the heading of "feminist biblical interpretation" prior to the 1970s,

[110] Robertson and Rose, Introduction to *Representing Rape*, 2–5.

[111] Robertson and Rose, Introduction to *Representing Rape*, 7.

after the rise of the second-wave feminist movement, a greater number of studies—either self-consciously labeled "feminist" or situated within women's liberation discourses—entered into mainstream academic presses and journals.[112] These early concerns during the 1970s and 1980s were varied, and at times, incompatible.[113] Some of the aims of these early studies included raising the visibility of women in the Bible, highlighting "tales of terror with women as victims" within the biblical text, exploring theological issues as they related to women and biblical interpretation, identifying patriarchy within traditional biblical interpretation and "depatriarchalizing" it, and countering the Bible and its cultural import as a patriarchal document.[114] A few of these aims, particularly highlighting "texts of terror" and identifying patriarchal elements and interpretations of the text, are reflected in this dissertation. The aims and approach of this period are not without critique. Within the confines of the academy during this period, feminist biblical studies largely reflected the concerns and perspectives of white

[112] There are several good overviews of feminist biblical scholarship which highlight the developments prior to the 1970s including Sarah Shectman, *Women in the Pentateuch: A Feminist and Source Critical Analysis*, Hebrew Bible Monographs 23 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 11–14; Anthony Thiselton, *Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2009), 143–44; Claudia Setzer, "Feminist Interpretation of the Bible," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in America*, ed. Paul C. Gutjahr (New York: Oxford, 2018), 164–66. Setzer's overview is particularly commendable as it recognizes the place of Black women interpreters prior to the 1970s who are often excluded in these summaries. Susanne Scholz devotes particular attention to the correspondence, or in her opinion, lack thereof between feminist biblical scholars and their approaches to those of the broader second-wave feminist movement. See "Second-Wave Feminism," in *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender Studies*, vol. 1, ed. Julia M. O'Brian (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

[113] For example, the aims of Phyllis Trible and Mary Daly are incompatible. See the next footnote of this chapter.

[114] Trible represents these goals in her summary of articles to the first issue of the *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* dedicated to exploring the effects of women's studies on biblical studies. Phyllis Trible, "The Effects of Women's Studies on Biblical Studies: An Introduction," *JSOT* 22 (1982): 2–5; Trible also tells tales of terror in *Texts of Terror*, 1. Trible also articulates her "depatriarchalizing" hermeneutic in "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," *JAAR* 41 (1973): 30–48; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza advocates for making women visible in the Bible or "[restoring] women to history" *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 4; Daly pursues an agenda to recreate theology and philosophy beyond the inherited patriarchal texts. In response to Trible she writes, "it might be interesting to speculate about...the length of a 'depatriarchalized' Bible. Perhaps there would be enough… material to comprise… a pamphlet (*Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation* [Boston: Beacon Press, 1973], 206n5)."

and/or Western women scholars. Although many were construed as representing all women, the limitations of their views were critiqued largely by the women whom they did not represent.[115] These critiques were important for establishing the limitations of white feminist scholarship as well as opening the door to a broader range of voices.

One of the important critiques of feminist biblical interpretation came from biblical scholars rooted in postcolonial discourses, or postcolonial feminists.[116] Central to this critique is the charge that Western feminists have participated in a discourse that "constructs the Two-Thirds World women as helpless victims, burdened by several layers of oppression, who must now be redeemed by their Western counterparts."[117] In so doing, Western feminists have failed to appreciate the diversity of experiences of women across the world while simultaneously re-inscribing colonial notions of the West and Western values being a good and redemptive force in the world.[118] Another aspect of the postcolonial critique is that Western feminist interpretive approaches "maintain the imperial rhetorical strategies of subjugation."[119] By centering questions

[115] For an example of works being constructed on the premise that they represent all women see Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 24, 58–9. Musa W. Dube critiques Schüssler Fiorenza's construction of her project as being for all women by naming women who are excluded or marginalized in her project in *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation,* 31. Nyasha Junior lists a series of edited volumes focused on feminist biblical interpretation from the 1980s and 1990s which do not include essays from a Black feminist or womanist perspective. Nyasha Junior, "Womanist Biblical Interpretation," in *Engaging the Bible in a Gendered World: An Introduction to Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Honor of Katherine Doob Sakenfeld*, eds. Linda Day and Carolyn Pressler (Louisville: John Knox Press), 44.

[116] I use the term postcolonial feminist/feminisms as a shorthand to reference the overlapping concerns of postcolonial, global, and transnational feminists. This is not to erase the differences between the terms, but to recognize the overlapping concerns of those identifying with each of these three labels. For a broader discussion of the terms see Rosemarie Tong's discussion of "Women of Color Feminisms on the World Stage," in *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*, Fourth edition (Boulder: Westview Press, 2014).

[117] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 24.

[118] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 25. Dube particularly points out Mary Daly's (referenced in a footnote above) homogenizing rhetoric.

[119] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 25. With this phrase, Dube is pointing to Laura Donaldson's insights on Western feminist interpretation in *Decolonizing Feminisms: Race, Gender & Empire Building* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

of sexism, questions about racism and colonialism are set aside as the locus of oppression is found within the patriarchy. As the oppressive force of patriarchy is foregrounded, imperial oppression fades into the background and is thus able to operate unchecked. Postcolonial feminisms articulate a way forward that considers overlapping systems of oppression, namely patriarchy and imperialism. As discussed in the previous section on the politics of sexual violence, postcolonial feminist criticism draws out how boundaries are constructed between colonizer and colonized. Gender and status as colonizer or colonized both matter as power relationships are negotiated. Recognizing my own positionality as a Western white woman and taking to heart the critique of post-colonial feminist scholars, this dissertation seeks to take into account overlapping systems of oppression into its analysis of the politics of sexual violence.

Another related critique came from womanist and Black/African American feminist biblical scholars.[120] Outside of the academic area of biblical interpretation, some Black women recognized how feminism tended to belong to white women and thus only addressed a narrow set of concerns that did not consider the experiences of Black women.[121] Within the field of biblical scholarship, for example, Renita Weems distinguishes the white feminists' focus on women from that of African Americans, who focus on the liberation of all oppressed peoples.[122] Related to

---

[120] Kwok Pui-lan highlights some of the overlapping perspectives between postcolonial and womanist interpreters. "Sexual Morality and National Politics: Reading Biblical "Loose Women," in *Engaging the Bible: Critical Readings from Contemporary Women*, eds. Choi Hee An and Katheryn Pfisterer Darr (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 29–31. On the terms womanism(s) and Black/African American feminism(s) see Nyasha Junior, *An Introduction to Womanist Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: John Knox Press), xi–xvii. In this section, I address both womanist and Black feminist approaches together recognizing that the two approaches (if not also groups of scholars using them) are distinct. To borrow the phrase of Gay L. Byron and Vanessa Lovelace, the two approaches "favor" each other and have overlapping concerns. See "Introduction: Methods and the Making of Womanist Biblical Hermeneutics," in *Womanist Interpretations of the Bible: Expanding the Discourse*, SemeiaSt 85, ed. Gay L. Byron and Vanessa Lovelace (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 8. My comments are focused on womanist interpretive approaches from an American context as opposed to African womanism.

[121] Junior, *An Introduction to Womanist Biblical Interpretation*, xiv.

Weem's critique, and similar to those of postcolonial feminists, Koala Warsaw-Jones argues that the "feminist hermeneutic" like that of Trible, does not recognize the "multivariate victimization" women of color face. Instead, the feminist hermeneutic focuses on the male-female power dynamic to the exclusion of other dynamics.[123] Womanist approaches to biblical interpretation, however, should not be reduced to being merely a derivative of or a reaction to white feminist interpretations without its own genesis and distinct aims.[124] Rather, according to Wil Gafney womanist approaches are "interdisciplinary, collaborative and/or multicontextual," "[prioritizing] women's experience and the social location of the reader," "[eradicating] all forms of human oppression," and "[being] accessible to the widespread worshipping community."[125] With respect to the common themes addressed in womanist and Black feminist interpretative literature, gender and sexuality, particularly as they relate to various forms of oppression, are among the perennial themes addressed by womanist writers.[126] As such, this dissertation seeks to incorporate insights from this literature by highlighting interconnected aspects of characters' identities in the stories I analyze and examining how those identities function in the narrative.[127]

---

[122] Renita Weems, "Re-reading for Liberation: African American Women and the Bible," in *I Found God in Me: A Womanist Biblical Hermeneutics Reader*, ed. Mitzi J. Smith (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2015) 54–5. Junior critiques this essay and other of Weems' essays on womanism for not citing other womanist writers as she speaks for womanist scholars. *An Introduction to Womanist Biblical Interpretation*, 101–2. Weems' statement, however, is similarly echoed by Wil Gafney who says the aim of womanist interpretation is the "eradication of all forms of human oppression" in "A Black Feminist Approach to Biblical Studies," *Encounter* 67 (2006): 392.

[123] Koala Warsaw-Jones, "Toward A Womanist Hermeneutic: A Reading of Judges 19–21," in *A Feminist Companion to the Book of Judges*, ed. Athalya Brenner-Idan (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1993) 172.

[124] Junior, *An Introduction to Womanist Biblical Interpretation*, 42.

[125] Gafney, "A Black Feminist Approach," 392.

[126] In their edited volume, Byron and Lovelace identify common themes addressed by womanist interpreters, gender and sexuality being one of the four themes. *Womanist Interpretations of the Bible: Expanding the Discourse*, 9–14.

[127] The dissertation does not apply the approaches used by womanist interpreters as the approaches are rooted in the experiences of women of color. Junior, *An Introduction to Womanist Biblical Interpretation*, 115–16.

The final critique of feminist discourses addressed here comes from Jewish feminists who argue, like postcolonial feminist and womanist writers, that Christian feminists have "falsely universalized a particular cultural, religious, and class perspective."[128] Some Christian feminist studies depict the New Testament, and the Jesus it constructs, as liberating for women *in contrast to* the Hebrew Bible and the God it depicts.[129] Such a constructed binary with Christianity and a liberating New Testament ethic on one side and Judaism and an oppressive ethic of the Hebrew Bible on the other side is particularly problematic and it also does not reflect the ancient sources. Amy-Jill Levine also describes how "Christian terms" pervade areas of scholarship seeking to be open and pluralistic. For example, in a multidimensional project called "Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation" dedicated to taking into account social location including gender, race, class, and religious affiliations, Levine, a contributor to the volume, notes how the project took for granted the definition of "Bible."[130] She writes, "the underlying presupposition [of the project] is that the reference is to the Bible of the church, not the Bible of the synagogue. The talk of pluralism is a pluralism on Christian terms."[131] Levine's critique of canon and how canon is deployed in academic writing from a Jewish feminist perspective is of particular importance for this project as it navigates the complicated world of scriptures, canons, and texts in antiquity.

---

[128] Judith Plaskow, "Feminist Anti-Judaism and the Christian God," *JFSR* 7 (1991): 100. Other critiques of the white feminist approach include those from Chicana, Indigenous, AAPI, and Queer communities.

[129] Judith Plaskow, "Anti-Judaism in Feminist Christian Interpretation," in *Judith Plaskow: Feminism, Theology, and Justice*, eds. Hava Tirosh-Samuelson and Aaron W. Hughes (Boston: Brill, 2014), 86–92.

[130] Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, eds. *Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); Amy-Jill Levine, "Hemmed in on Every Side: Jews and Women in the Book of Susanna," in *Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 176.

[131] Levine, "Hemmed in on Every Side,"176.

The critiques of feminism and feminist biblical interpretation from postcolonial, womanist, Black feminist, and Jewish feminist perspectives have emerged alongside of a growing and diverse body of biblical and early Jewish studies from a variety of feminist perspectives, most of which consider such critiques. Most relevant are those studies that follow a more intersectional approach. For example, scholar of ancient Judaism, Amy-Jill Levine writes, "As the following studies indicate, an investigation merely of 'what women do' is insufficient; one must also include narrative analysis and *social reconstruction issues such as class, ethnicity, provenance, familial situation and religious orientation*."[132] Levine's framing of the studies reflects the growing recognition during the 1990s that gender interacts, or intersects to use Yee's language, with other aspects of identity in social systems.[133]

In addition to highlighting the importance of addressing intersectionality when approaching early Jewish and biblical writings, Levine calls attention to the issue of methods. To this point, I have focused on the motives of feminist scholars, but little on their methods. Like there are feminisms, plural, feminist scholars utilize several methodologies, plural.[134] Within biblical and early Jewish studies feminist scholars frequently adopt the methods of social scientists, anthropologists, and literary critics.[135] This dissertation is profoundly influenced by

---

[132] Amy-Jill Levine, Preface to *"Women like This:" New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*, EJL (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), xi–xii. Emphasis mine.

[133] Other examples of work that addresses intersectionality issues in early Jewish literature include Eds. Ute Eisen, Christine Gerber, and Angela Standhartinger, *Doing Gender - Doing Religion: Fallstudien Zur Intersektionalität Im Frühen Judentum, Christentum Und Islam*, WUNT 302 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) and Eds. Eileen Schuller and Marie-Theres Wacker, *Early Jewish Writings*, The Bible and Women (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017).

[134] Cheryl Exum, "Feminist Criticism: Whose Interests Are Being Served?" in *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*, ed. Gale Yee (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 68.

[135] Exum, "Feminist Criticism," 68.

studies produced by feminist literary critics and asks questions of the writings analyzed herein raised by other feminist literary critics.[136] How does gender, sex, and sexuality function in the story?[137] How do characters' gender, sex, and sexuality relate to other aspects of their identity? What boundaries are discernable in the story? Who has power in the story and how is that power expressed? How does power relate to those boundaries? What point of view is represented in the story and how does that point of view relate to broader power dynamics? And finally, where does sexual violence figure into the various power dynamics at play in the story? Or how does sexual violence function in this narrative context?

While these questions frame my reading of different texts, I have not limited this study to these critical questions. Like many feminist scholars who draw on a variety of methodological approaches for their studies, I augment my critical reading strategy with insights gained from historical and philological research. With respect to history and questions concerning gender, sex, and sexuality, there are several methodological challenges for determining how gender/sex/sexuality functions. Those methodological challenges include the "distinction between writers and their worlds," the cross-section of cultural influences, as well as the "temporal displacement" of certain writings are all challenges that face interpreters of early Jewish literature.[138] The way scholars address these challenges has implications for their

[136] Lists of common questions feminist literary critics ask of writings appear in both Exum, "Feminist Criticism," 68, and Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre,"Texts and Readers, Rhetorics and Ethics," *Feminist Biblical Studies in the Twentieth Century: Scholarship and Movement*, eds. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 221. Musa Dube poses questions that reflect a concern for intersectionality in *Postcolonial Feminism*, 57.

[137] It has been common in biblical studies for feminists to analyze the writing at hand as a single literary unit as opposed to dissecting the writing into its compositional parts (Johnson-DeBaufre, "Texts and Readers," 219). This dissertation does provide some discussion on various passages composition and a justification for establishing the boundaries of any given unit.

[138] Levine, Preface to *"Women Like This,"*xiii–xvii.

understanding of the representation of women in literature and their roles in the societies in the ancient Mediterranean world. Levine's identification of these methodological challenges, particularly that of the text reporting incidents of an earlier time, is pertinent for this study as the historical location of writings is of particular importance. The challenge of historically locating writings is addressed in more detail later in this chapter.

1.4 Masculinity Studies

In addition to and flowing out of the feminist theory and method used in this dissertation, I also utilize the theoretical underpinnings of masculinity studies in this dissertation. A fundamental tenet of feminism is that gender is constructed, all gender that is.[139] In biblical studies, however, the gender or gender performance of the male subject has only recently been interrogated. Indeed, he, his sex, and his gender have often been understood as neutral. Rhiannon Graybill succinctly identified the problem of the phenomenon of the neutral masculine commenting, "There is nothing neutral, however, about allowing the masculine to pass as an unsexed neutral subject."[140] In full recognition of the methodological challenges in describing a fluid, constructed masculinity, this dissertation attempts to disrupt the reification of masculine as "neutral."

Given the relative nascency of masculinity studies as applied to early Jewish texts as well as the complexities of working with the unstable category of gender, it is worth reviewing key assertions of masculinity studies, how masculinity studies has been deployed in biblical and early

[139] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2007; repr. of New York: Routledge, 1990), 175–193.

[140] Rhiannon Graybill, *Are We Not Men?:Unstable Masculinity in the Hebrew Prophets* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 12.

Jewish studies, and how it is deployed in this dissertation.[141] A key assertion is that at any given historical point and in any given society there are multiple operative masculinities.[142] Several scholars in masculinity studies use the language of "hegemonic," "subordinate," "complicit," and "marginalized" to help distinguish between various expressions of masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity refers to a form of masculinity related to wealth and power in its various forms, and subordinate masculinities are those that do not conform to the pattern of hegemonic masculinity.[143] Subordinated masculinities are those which do not conform to the hegemonic ideal, and as such, are often "expelled from the circle of legitimacy" established by those conforming to the hegemonic ideal.[144] Complicit masculinity refers to those who neither realize the hegemonic ideal nor fall into a subordinated category of masculinity but still realize many of the benefits hegemonic masculinity earns for men.[145] The language of marginalized masculinities denotes when gender intersects with other social structures like race and class.[146] As in the discussion of feminisms, intersectional approaches help illuminate how various systems are

[141] With respect to nascency, the mid-1990s marks the first appearance of masculinity studies within biblical studies. Susan Haddox, "Masculinity Studies of the Hebrew Bible: The First Two Decades," *CBR* 14 (2016): 183.

[142] Raewyn Connell and James Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender and Society* (2005): 846.

[143] This language for describing hegemonic and subordinated masculinities was first deployed in academic research in Tim Carrigan, Raewyn Connell, and John Lee, "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity," *Theory and Society* 14 (1985): 577, 587, 590–604. Since the publication of the concept of hegemonic and subordinated masculinities in 1985, Connell expanded the language in *Masculinities* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1995), 76–81. Connell and James Messerschmidt revisited and refined the concept of hegemonic masculinity in "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," 829–859. In the latter article, Connell and Messerschmidt clarify that there is no "fixed, transhistorical model" of hegemonic masculinity; rather, there is a fluidity to the concept. On the relationship between hegemonic and subordinate masculinities see Haddox, "Masculinity Studies of the Hebrew Bible," 179.

[144] Connell, *Masculinities*, 79.

[145] Connell, *Masculinities*, 79–80.

[146] Connell, *Masculinities*, 80.

affected by multiple aspects of identity. In my analysis of ancient sources, I will return to these categories of masculinity to explore the differences and dynamics between male characters in the story.

Although hegemonic masculinities manifest themselves differently in various historical and social settings, certain features have been identified in biblical studies including military might,[147] bodily integrity,[148] honor (often expressed as controlling the sexuality of women in the household although not exclusively),[149] self-control,[150] and provisioning for the household.[151] These five features are particularly important for this study and are used as a starting place to think about how masculinity is expressed in the biblical texts considered herein. This list, however, is not the end of the conversation on masculinity in the Bible. The Bible contains books written in various contexts and determining those contexts often has its challenges. In her study on masculinity in the Gideon story found in Judges, Kelly Murphy writes, "Any construction of masculinity in a biblical text *may or may not reflect the historical period it claims to represent* and likely only provides glimpses into the worlds of nonelite men. As such, *our received texts*

[147] David J.A. Clines' article on King David is a foundational article for this connection between masculinity and the military. "David the Man: The Construction of Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible," in *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTSup 205, GCT 1, ed. David J.A. Clines (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 212–43.

[148] Using the language of impermeability, vulnerability, impenetrability, and penetrated, this concept is particularly explored in Graybill, *Are We Not Men?* 21, 102–105. Haddox "Masculinity Studies of the Hebrew Bible," 180.

[149] Ela Lazarewicz-Wyrzykowska, "Samson: Masculinity Lost (and Regained?)," in *Men and Masculinities in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*, The Bible in the Modern World 33, ed. Ovidiu Creangă (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 171–88; Stephen M. Wilson, *Making Men: The Male Coming-of-Age Theme in the Hebrew Bible* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2015), 42–44; Ken Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 41–46.

[150] Wilson, *Making Men*, 39–40; Mark K. George, "Masculinity and Its Regimentation in Deuteronomy," in *Men and Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*, The Bible in the Modern World 33, ed. Ovidiu Creangă (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 64–82.

[151] Haddox, "Masculinity Studies of the Hebrew Bible,"180–1.

may contain echoes of historical Israel's experiences but also reflections on the ideals of masculinity held by later author(s) and/ or editor(s)."[152] As Murphy takes care to consider the historical layers of the texts she considers, this dissertation applies the same care to biblical and other early Jewish texts.

This dissertation also employs insights from postcolonial masculinity studies. Postcolonial masculinity studies have drawn attention to how colonization as well as concomitant changes in the political economy of certain regions have impacted conceptions of masculinity.[153] Gender norms are upended by imperial disruption of local economies and institutions. For example, as the economic order changes because of colonial activity, the ability of men to provide for their families—a key element for many constructions of masculinity—becomes increasingly difficult. This disruption can impact how gender, and particularly masculinity is constructed and expressed.[154] Conquest and colonial activities do not just shape the masculinities in colonized spaces, but they also shape the way masculinity is constructed for those exercising imperial power.[155] For example, the men who participate in conquest are segregated into groups like soldiers and sailors which develop particular forms of masculinity that are more violent.[156] In an ancient world that witnessed multiple changes in the global order, the postcolonial perspective is important for evaluating how expressions of masculinity might

[152] Kelly J. Murphy, *Rewriting Masculinity: Gideon, Men, and Might* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 9. Emphasis mine.

[153] Robert Morrell and Sandra Swart, "Men in the Third World: Postcolonial Perspectives on Masculinity," in *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, eds. Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and Raewyn Connell (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005), 101–3.

[154] Morrell and Swart, "Men in the Third World," 102–4.

[155] Raewyn Connell, "Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities," in *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, eds. Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and Raewyn Connell (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005), 75.

[156] Connell, "Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities," 74.

change in moments of conquest, occupation, and migration, the latter of which is important for this dissertation.

Finally, because this dissertation deals with violence extensively, it is important to reflect on the intersection of masculinity and violence lest the connection between masculinity or hegemonic masculinity as presented here be taken as normative in all spatiotemporal contexts. Aggression, although more frequently enacted by men currently (and I would suspect historically as well), is not the result of biologically determined characteristics. Aggression belongs to the constructed man, not that which was ascribed to him biologically.[157] Within many, but not all, of the texts reviewed in this dissertation, men are the violent aggressors, and in some of the texts that violence is held up as a part of the masculine ideal, but there is nothing biologically essential to this.

1.5 Innerbiblical Discourse

In addition to feminist literary critical approaches, this dissertation also appeals to the theoretical and methodological approaches of innerbiblical interpretation or discourse.[158] Three biblical texts serve as the starting point for this study: Gen 34, Gen 19, and Judg 19–20. A cursory read of the three texts reveal a shared theme of sexual violence. Their relationship also extends beyond this shared theme to a shared set of words and phrases. Several texts within the Hebrew Bible are thematically linked around sexual violence; however, not all those texts have the same level of textual parallels to demonstrate that they are a part of the same *innerbiblical*

[157] Robin Nelson, "The Sex in Your Violence: Patriarchy and Power in Anthropological World Building and Everyday Life," *Current Anthropology* 62 Sup. 23 (2021): S95.

[158] For clarity, I am not applying Michael Fishbane's method articulated in *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), but I am inspired by his work and others who read the Bible innerbiblically.

discourse.[159] It is indeed the identification of those shared words and phrases (addressed fully in the final chapter) that motivated delimiting the corpus to Gen 34, Gen 19, and Judg 19-20 in this dissertation. The term innerbiblical discourse is born out of scholarship that built upon the idea of *innerbiblical exegesis* as articulated in Michael Fishbane's pioneering work *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. The idea, as presented by Fishbane, envisions a web of texts interacting with and responding to one another. This interaction is evidenced by various scribal techniques deployed to add to and redact the text.[160] Innerbiblical discourse is the term developed by William Schniedewind who critiques the purely textual approach of Fishbane noting that it ignores the cultural discourse, situated in historical settings, that underlie the developments in the textual products.[161]

Schniedewind is not the only one to critique Fishbane. Molly Zahn offers additional critiques of Fishbane's innerbiblical exegesis.[162] Zahn argues that Fishbane obscures the various types of editing techniques that are used and how they might be deployed differently in new editions of a work and entirely new compositions. Additionally, she argues that Fishbane imposes an innerbiblical-extrabiblical distinction that is anachronistic as the biblical text as we understand it now was not fixed prior to 70 CE.[163] Extrabiblical texts are relevant to the

---

[159] Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David: The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1–17* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 7–9.

[160] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 1–22, esp. 7–13.

[161] Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 7–9. An alternative and related explanation of innerbiblical discourse is found in Jeremy D. Smoak, "Building Houses and Planting Vineyards: The Early Inner-Biblical Discourse on an Ancient Israelite Wartime Curse," *JBL 127* (2008): 20.

[162] Molly Zahn, "Innerbiblical Exegesis The View from beyond the Bible," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, FAT 111, eds. Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 107–20.

[163] Zahn, "Innerbiblical Exegesis," 115.

development of what are now considered books of the Bible. While Zahn's critiques are historical in nature, they dovetail with Levine's critique from a Jewish feminist perspective that argues the bounds of canon cannot be assumed.

Both Schniedewind and Zahn's critiques provide important correctives to Fishbane's thesis. Zahn's second critique regarding the innerbiblical-extrabiblical dichotomy pairs nicely with Schniedewind's critique regarding broader cultural discourses in historical moments missed by a purely textual approach. Together Schniedewind and Zahn are asking what we are missing by limiting our investigation to the biblical text? Schniedewind argues that "the relationship between textual artifacts is not purely textual: it is part of an ongoing cultural discourse." The ongoing cultural discourse is *embedded in historical moments*. While Zahn maintains the importance of texts turning to texts outside of a biblical canon, an investigation of texts outside of the canon provides evidence of the broader ongoing cultural discourse which Schniedewind highlights.

While one might take Schniedewind and Zahn's critiques seriously, there is still a question of what contemporaneous extrabiblical texts or evidence of historical processes exist for any given biblical texts. Schniedewind notes the challenge of understanding the historical moments in which texts are situated and the need to look outside of the text, specifically to archaeology, to bring greater clarity to historical moments.[164] Zahn argues that canonical assumptions can act as blinders causing scholars not to see extrabiblical texts, particularly those of the Second Temple period, that might be important for any thoroughgoing analysis of any early Jewish text, biblical or not. In examining extrabiblical texts, however, it is important to not

[164] Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 10–12.

collapse the diachronic aspect of their development. Andrew Teeter articulates the point this way,

> That is, the results and methods of biblical studies are of crucial importance for Qumran studies. Second Temple literature in general, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in particular, *develop out of the Hebrew Bible.* To make such an assertion is no mere anachronistic fancy. Certainly the external boundaries and the precise transmission-historical shape of the scriptural corpus are somewhat undefined, even fluid, during this period. Yet nothing could be more clear than that the literature that constitutes the Hebrew scriptures was an absolutely determinative force in the life of these authors.[165]

While Zahn's concern about a term like innerbiblical reifying a distinction between biblical and other early Jewish texts that might not be historically defensible, for some, likely many, biblical texts there are good reasons to use the text preserved in the MT as a starting place for looking at other early Jewish literature.[166]

The reasons for starting with the biblical texts and their relationship between one another is twofold. First, the innerbiblical relationship between Gen 34, Gen 19, and Judg 19 helps delimit a corpus for this study. As previously stated, these texts share a compelling set of words and phrases that indicate some sort of literary dependence between them. Second, the relationship between the biblical texts represents an important stage in the historical development of literary traditions contained in these stories. The question of where texts fit in history is an important part of this study. These historical concerns are further expounded upon in the next section on reception theory and history.

1.6 Reception History

Reception historians are interested in tracking the influence of a particular work across time. For biblical stories, plotting lines of influence between biblical stories and later traditions is

[165] Teeter, "The Hebrew Bible and/as Second Temple Literature," 354.

[166] For Zahn's concerns about reification, see *Genres of Rewriting*, 79.

more complicated than it might seem at the outset. This section explores those complications to applying the methods of reception historians after providing an overview of the origins of reception theory, and by extension reception history.

Reception theory and the related area of reception history emerges from the study of humanities, philosophical hermeneutics, and literature, in mid-twentieth century Germany. Two key figures, Hans-Georg Gadamer and Robert Jauss are most often credited with the development of reception theory. Gadamer articulated the philosophical hermeneutic underlying Jauss' literary theory.[167] Gadamer's hermeneutic is born of a disillusionment with the Enlightenment notion that "method" can lead to complete understanding of history.[168] Gadamer was convinced that one's own context mattered for understanding. One's consciousness is bound by one's historical location. Each individual holds a set of historically bound "prejudices," and those prejudices "constitute the horizon of the particular present."[169] When an individual "[encounters] the past," their horizon of the present is challenged. For Gadamer, "understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing by themselves."[170] This notion of a fusion of horizons forms the background for Jauss' reception theory.

Jauss posits that an audience, with its present horizon of expectations—that is, the audiences' expectations based upon their social and cultural location—shape the way a text is received. When the audience meets a work there is a negotiation that occurs between their

---

[167] Anthony C. Thiselton, "Reception Theory, H. R. Jauss and the Formative Power of Scripture," *SJT* 65 (2012): 290.

[168] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 1995), 299. John Roberts, Introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception History of the Bible*, eds. Michael Leib, Jonathan Roberts, and Emma Mason (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3.

[169] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 1995), 304–5.

[170] Gadamer, *Truth and Method,* 305.

horizon of expectations of the work and the work itself. This negotiation between audience and text constitutes the text's reception. The dynamic between text and audience is also the productive material used to form new texts.[171] Jauss writes, "The art [or, in our case, texts] of the past, just like history, does not interest merely because it was, but because 'in a certain sense it still is' and invites one to new adaptations."[172] This dissertation explores those ancient "new adaptations" that resulted from the authors' recognition that there was a value in the texts of the past that "in a certain sense" formed their present.

Recognizing the creative process is reflexive, writers mediate between earlier texts and their own horizon of expectations, Jauss offers three points for considering the historical relevance of literature forming the basis for reception history method.[173] First, one must attempt to see the work in its diachronic frame and the historical forces that shape transitions in literature.[174] Second, a work must be seen within a synchronic frame. Synchronic analysis works hand-in-hand with diachronic analysis allowing one to see whether a work echoes or diverges from work contemporaneous with it.[175] Finally, and importantly for this study, the work's social function must be explored by viewing it in relation to its historical setting. This dissertation is particularly concerned with the social function of the literature in its purview.

Jauss' approach to literary history and Gadamer's approach to philosophical hermeneutics has benefited the field of biblical studies spawning several studies and shaping the

---

[171] Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," *New Literary History* 2 (1970): 23–7.

[172] Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 59.

[173] Jauss, "Literary History," 23.

[174] Jauss, "Literary History," 23–7.

[175] Jauss, "Literary History," 27–31.

way biblical commentaries are constructed to give more consideration to biblical stories within a diachronic frame.[176] The arrangement of these studies typically begin with the biblical text as preserved in the MT before turning to Greek translations, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other early Jewish texts (pseudepigraphic, apocryphal, etc.).[177] Recent scholarship, notably that of Eva Mroczek and Molly Zahn, calls into question the organization of these studies by pointing out that the assumption of a fixed, stable, complete biblical text established in the early-to-mid Second Temple period is difficult to support.[178] How should reception historians approach the task of creating a diachronic order if the MT only reflects one of several biblical texts in the early-to-mid Second Temple period? Or only partially reflects one of those texts? How does the reception historian account for textual pluriformity and instability? What if determining which text of many texts during the Second Temple period was the "complete" version of a text is an effort "doomed to fail?"[179]

Liane Feldman offers a slightly different critique of the assumption of biblical texts standing at the head of a chain of reception and response. In her study of the Second Temple text,

---

[176] For examples of studies, see James Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretative Life of a Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994) and Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*. For examples of commentaries see Carol A. Newsom and Brennan W. Breed, *Daniel: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014) and C. L. Seow, *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013).

[177] Brennan Breed outlines various "typical" methods for reception histories in the introduction to *Nomadic Text: A Theory of Biblical Reception History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014), 1–2.

[178] Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 3–13; Molly Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 27. See also Andrew Teeter, "The Hebrew Bible and/as Second Temple Literature: Methodological Reflections," *DSD* 20 (2013): 352 and Breed, *Nomadic Text*, 1–3. These scholars are not without contemporary challengers. For example, Drew Longacre argues for a greater sense of a fixedness for biblical works. Contra Mroczek, Longacre's treatment of the Psalms argues that "ancient readers and scribes did indeed generally recognize and formally distinguish a traditional "Book" of Psalms (in multiple versions) from the many diverse forms of reuse of its contents ("Paleographic Style and the Forms and Functions of the Dead Sea Psalm Scrolls: A Hand Fitting for the Occasion?" *VT* 72 [2022]: 84)."

[179] Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting*, 135.

the *Aramaic Levi Document* and its relationship (or lack thereof) to the Pentateuch, she notes that the "the reception and adoption of this text [the Pentateuch] was likely uneven and inconsistent prior to the late second century BCE."[180] By drawing attention to this inconsistency in the reception of the Pentateuch, she argues that genetic relationships between texts like the Pentateuch and early-to-mid Second Temple texts cannot be assumed. Not all early Jewish authors are "responding" to the biblical text because it is possible that they have not *received* the biblical text, or at least the biblical text modern readers have preserved in the MT.[181]

In addition to Feldman's critique of biblical texts and their often-assumed relationship to other early Jewish Literature, Brennan Breed offers a critique of traditional reception history methods surrounding the issue of a text's context as it relates to social function.[182] Ostensibly, one must be able to reconstruct a text's social, political, and historical context in order to make any claims about the text's social function. Breed's critique seems to strike at the heart of one of the basic steps for constructing a reception history. Without context there is no social function.

With these critiques in mind, this dissertation aims to thoughtfully proceed with articulating a reception history that approaches "precanonical textual culture" with clear and

---

[180] Liane Feldman, "Sanitized Sacrifice in Aramaic Levi's Law of the Priesthood," *JAJ* 11 (2020): 351.

[181] Related to Feldman's critique is the classic article by Robert Kraft which calls into question "the tyranny of canonical assumptions." See Robert A. Kraft, "Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies," *JBL* 126 (2007): 10. While Kraft's critique of placing a biblical canon at the center of discussions is largely born out of a concern that scholars see early Jewish and Christian literature on its own terms and not just "beside" the Bible, womanist biblical scholar, Gay Byron makes a different point about the problem of "canonical assumptions." Byron argues that canons, including the biblical canon are given priority while certain other "extracanonical" works—particularly those preserved in the Ethiopic tradition—are marginalized by labeling them as "legendary," "subjective," and "ideologically burdened." Gay L. Byron, "Black Collectors and Keepers of Tradition: Resources for a Womanist Biblical Ethic of (Re)Interpretation," in *Womanist Interpretations of the Bible: Expanding the Discourse*, SemeiaSt 85, ed. Gay L. Byron and Vanessa Lovelace (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 200–1.

[182] Breed, *Nomadic Text*, 74–92. James Kugel raises a similar point about the challenges of determining if and how a text might be responding to its historical and social location. See James Kugel, "The Story of Dinah in the 'Testament of Levi,'" *HTR* 85 (1992): 1–34. For a response to Kugel see Louis Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus on the Rape of Dinah," *JQR* 94 (2004): 253–77.

nuanced thinking.[183] The first important point to address is that in this dissertation the MT represents a version of the text, albeit with roots in the Iron Age, but not by any means "an original" text.[184] Moreover, the MT is not privileged as a some sort of "intended" form of the work while other texts, such as the LXX/OG as a bastardization of the intended form. Denying a place of privilege to one canon over another not only takes heed of the critiques of traditional reception history methodologies, but also responds to critiques womanist, post-colonial and Jewish feminist biblical scholars have raised around privileging certain canons over others. Regarding the issues of originality and intention, Brennan Breed notes, "This is not "anything goes" relativism: on the contrary, it is far more historically specific and less arbitrary than privileging one contingent historical moment (or an ideal representation of one) as the original, the primary, the intended form, of the work."[185] The concern here is not relativism for the sake of appealing to the modern mind; rather, it is born out of a concern for history and antiquity's texts.

On the issue of history, however, this dissertation holds that diachrony and historical context *still* matter. Attempting to order texts based on historical criteria, even if the order at which one arrives is tentative, conditional, and contains caveats, is still a valuable way of sorting texts like other ways of sorting texts (theologically, authorially, etc.).[186] Finally, concerning the related question of context, this dissertation accepts Breed's critique that "original contexts" are a figment of the imaginations of scholars of biblical and early Jewish literature. That said, reading texts in some historical context with attention to clues in the text which suggest they are commenting on social, political and otherwise historical events is a fruitful exercise. As William

[183] Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 4.

[184] Breed, *Nomadic Text*, 204–5.

[185] Breed, *Nomadic Text*, 37.

[186] Breed, *Nomadic Text*, 49.

Schniedewind writes with reference to newer literary approaches that downplay the biblical text's interaction with a real world context, "The brilliance of biblical literature begins with its relation to particular sociopolitical contexts."[187] I might expand Schniedewind's statement by adding that the brilliance of early Jewish literature, including biblical literature, is its relation to particular sociopolitical contexts and its continued relevance is its socially formative function. This dissertation attempts to read texts in various contexts.

While the majority of this section has addressed the methodological challenges associated with relating the Hebrew Bible to early Jewish literature, it is important to offer a few thoughts on the relationships among different early Jewish works. As a general statement, there are more holes in the fabric of our collective knowledge on the relationships between various early Jewish writings than there are threads holding it together. While our overall knowledge is limited, it does seem that several writings, and certainly the ones addressed in the following chapters have access to either MT Genesis, LXX Genesis, or some writing very closely mirroring one of those two. Throughout my analyses of these writings, I offer specific evidence supporting this assumption. There is also evidence to suggest that some of the early Jewish writings addressed in the following chapters influenced one another. For example, Jubilees, a text composed in Hebrew during the second century BCE appears to have influenced the Testament of Levi given their shared interest in exalting the character of Levi.[188] The influence of one on the other, however, is only conjecture. One could imagine several vectors of transmission, including oral storytelling, to explain parallels between the two writings. Likewise, Theodotus in his epic

---

[187] Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 11.

[188] James VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2001), 146.

echoes some of the themes presented in Jubilees but drawing a straight line of dependence from one to another is difficult if not impossible.[189] As another example, *Jewish Antiquities*, written by Josephus after the turn of the era, is one of the later works addressed in the following chapters, and as such, might have had access to several writings produced prior to it. Louis Feldman suggests that Josephus might have been influenced by Theodotus, and that there is evidence to suggest he was influenced by Jubilees.[190] In the following chapters, I suggest the possibility of dependencies between various writings; however, I will stop short of definitively drawing lines between these early writings respecting the limitations of our evidence.

As a final note on early Jewish literature, it is important to note that each writing likely went through its own revision process. For example, manuscript evidence from Qumran suggests that Jubilees was edited over time.[191] The manuscript evidence on Joseph and Aseneth also underscores how drastically a work can change.[192] It is important to recognize that the analysis of these writings offered in the following chapters is looking at a snapshot (or a series of snapshots for texts with good critical editions) of the writings which conceals layers of editing. The purpose of looking at snapshots is not to obscure textual evidence but to identify broad themes in the interpretive history of each story of sexual violence. As I draw out those broad themes, I demonstrate how they each intersect to varying degrees with the issue of communal boundaries.

---

[189] For more on the shared themes between Theodotus' epic, *Jubilees* and *T. Levi* see John J. Collins, "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans," *HTR* 73 (1980): 95-8.

[190] Louis Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus on the Rape of Dinah," *JQR* 94 (2004): 262n10; Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 51, n. 60. Josephus mentions a Theodotus in *Ag. Ap.* 1.216; however, Ben Wacholder argues that the Theodotus Josephus mentions is not the writer of the epic. See Wacholder, "Theodotus," *EncJud* 19:693.

[191] Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting*, 101.

[192] For a summary of the complexity of the manuscript tradition see Angela Standhartinger, "Recent Scholarship on Joseph and Aseneth (1988-2013)," *CBR* 12 (2014): 354–63.

1.7 Conclusion

This dissertation represents a blending of interpretive approaches. An innerbiblical interpretive approach guides the selection of the biblical corpus. An interest in reception and the life of the traditions found in the biblical text outside of their current canonical context motivates the selection and investigation of other early Jewish literature. With respect to reading strategies, my own approach is deeply influenced by feminist literary critics.[193] The concern with literature, and the Bible and early Jewish texts *as literature*, can be detected in the framing of the research question concerning the narrative function of sexual violence of sexual violence in literature and how it reflects and/or shapes communal identity. The assumption underlying the question is that particular ideologies and worldviews are present in the narrative, and that a close reading can reveal those worldviews.[194] The original text is the starting place for this kind of analysis. The text's contexts are elucidated by the content of the text itself, albeit ambiguously.[195] The literary approach is attentive to semantics on the micro level and narrative structure on the macro level. Words and their historically contingent meanings are of particular interest in this study.[196] The

---

[193] The use of "literary" here should not be conflated or confused with the biblical studies' "literary critical," meaning a concern for identifying discrete sources within a biblical book. John Barton acknowledges the confusing usage of "literary critical" in the field of biblical studies. Literary approaches are sometimes referred to as "new criticism" within biblical studies, but that also does not quite accurately describe the whole of literary approaches to the Bible or other related ancient texts. John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Studies* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 20 and 140–156. Sarah Shectman's overview of interpretive approaches under the umbrella of "feminist biblical criticism" explains the varied methods feminist scholars have used and how the literary approach became privileged over other approaches. See Sarah Shectman, *Women in the Pentateuch: A Feminist and Source Critical Analysis*, Hebrew Bible Monographs 23 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 9–54 esp. 38–47.

[194] For more on where this conviction about reading the text fits into a diachronic analysis of interpretive methods see Barton, *Reading the Old Testament*, 162. It should be noted, however, that the historical concerns of this dissertation do not perfectly align with the method Barton describes in this chapter.

[195] Stone, *Sex, Honor, and Power*, 29–31.

[196] Dennis T. Olson, "Literary and Rhetorical Criticism," in *Methods for Exodus*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 13.

approach is attentive to characters and symbols and rooting those, as much as possible, in their historical location.

While a literary approach guides much of the interpretation of texts in this dissertation, this should not signal a disregard for historical concerns.[197] Writers and their ideologies are shaped by their historical location. The words and symbols along with their meanings are historically contingent. Moreover, the task of reception history, a key component to this study, is to draw out those connections between the text, the ideology it promotes, and its historical location. Even in an environment where data is limited and the historical location and trajectory for a text is difficult to map, whenever possible, historical data should be incorporated into the analysis of the text.

Through the blending of literary and historical approaches, I will argue stories of sexual violence, in their origin and reception, perform boundary work. Boundary work includes the act of creating boundaries that did not previously exist, reenforcing preexistent communal boundaries, and subverting boundaries. Each work, biblical and non-biblical, is in conversation with its own historical moment. Later works engage the biblical stories of sexual violence in order to create, reenforce, or subvert boundaries relevant to their own context. In so doing, these authors use narratives of sexual violence in a way that is familiar to different societies across time and space, from the ancient to the modern day.

[197] The use of "historical" here should not be conflated or confused with "historical critical," referring to uncovering the historical origins of the text. Shectman notes that the historical approach most frequently used by feminist historians interpreting the Bible is social-scientific in nature. Shectman, *Women in the Pentateuch*, 37.

2. The Dinah Story and Its Reception

The story of sexual violence against Dinah, as articulated in the MT (Gen 34), is terse and morally ambiguous.[198] It leaves unaddressed most of the questions the story naturally raises. The story's gaps and opacity may have added to its appeal in the eyes of interpreters. Several early Jewish writers rearticulated, interpreted, and referenced the Dinah story in their own works, including Philo, Josephus, and others.[199] I argue that communal boundaries were a central theme in these writings. For these early Jewish writers, this story of Dinah opened up a broader conversation on boundaries with others. As people situated in specific times and places, they had this conversation on boundaries in light of their own situation, or within their own horizon of expectation to use the language of reception historians.

This chapter closely examines the Dinah story starting with the way it is articulated in MT Gen 34. It situates the story historically at the point of its textualization within the larger work of Genesis. The chapter then addresses the scholarly debate around whether Gen 34 is a story about sexual violence at all. Several biblical scholars contend that Dinah, the primary female character in the story, is not a victim of sexual violence. I argue that Dinah is a victim of sexual violence in the story. The discussion on MT Gen 34 ends with an analysis of the politics of sexual violence at play in the story. This critical analysis poses questions around gender, power, and boundaries in the text as well as considering the point of view and interests of the

[198] Using the akedah as an example, Erich Auerbach elaborates on the terse and ambiguous style of biblical Hebrew narrative and compares that style to ancient Greek literature. Erich Auerbach, "Odysseus' Scar" in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature- New and Expanded Edition*, trans. Willard R. Task (Princeton University Press, 2003), 1–23, esp. 7–11.

[199] Throughout this chapter I refer to "the Dinah story" or "the Dinah narrative" by which I mean the story as it is known in the MT and various manuscripts of the LXX.

writers. It argues that the story was used as part of Hezekiah's justification for an expansive kingdom incorporating northern people and places.

Following the discussion of MT Gen 34, the chapter examines the story's reception. First, it examines its translation into Greek. The investigation of LXX Gen 34 focuses on the unique words and phrases the Greek text uses that find their way into various other Greek redeployments of the Dinah story such as in the books of Judith and Joseph and Aseneth. The chapter ends with an analysis of how the Dinah narrative is used in other early Jewish writings outside of the Bible as a catalyst for exploring communal boundaries. I argue that early Jewish writers use the story to two primary ends. The majority of early Jewish writers redeploy the Dinah story to create, build upon, and reify communal boundaries. A few, however, redeploy or allude to the Dinah story to *challenge* communal boundaries, identifying points of permeability. The latter group's use of the story to reimagine more permeable communal boundaries is somewhat counterintuitive. As such, the chapter devotes outsized attention to the two writings that use the Dinah story to challenge boundaries.

2.1 MT Genesis 34

2.1.1 Dating and Context

Securing an historical context for any part of the Pentateuch is in some ways like a fool's errand. One of the many challenges to dating portions of the Pentateuch is the argument that there is a complex and dynamic interplay between oral tradition and written tradition.[200] Isolating the text of either Genesis or the Pentateuch, does little to simplify the challenge posed by the oral culture into which the text was born. The concept of the Pentateuch's composite nature is widely

[200] Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996).

agreed upon in biblical studies, while the content of those layers is highly contested.[201] In addition to that, the Pentateuch bears few (if any) internal markers that would suggest a date of composition.[202] Even with these challenges, this dissertation argues that there is value in attempting to historically contextualize MT Gen 34:1–31 and advances a hypothesis for its moment of textualization.

How one understands the history of the composition of MT Gen 34 likely depends on their broader understanding of the composition of the works in the Pentateuch. For example, proponents of some form of the documentary hypothesis might see Gen 34 as belonging to the J source. And, at a moment in history, it was woven into Genesis by a redactor or a priestly editor along with other sources.[203] Alternatively, others might understand Gen 34 as existing in oral form before being textualized by J, some other writer, or group of writers.[204] Still others might view Gen 34 as an integral part to a pre-existing Jacob cycle incorporated into Genesis or as a Judean insertion tacked onto a pre-existing Jacob cycle when it was incorporated into Genesis.[205]

---

[201] For a conventional division of sources in the vein of Wellhausen's documentary hypothesis, see Richard Elliot Friedman, *Bible With the Sources Revealed: A New View Into the Five Books of Moses* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2003). Others have argued for a different way of conceiving of Pentateuchal sources as independent literary units woven together (i.e., the Song of the Sea, the Jacob cycle, the Joseph novella, the decalogue, the covenant code, etc.). See Joel Baden, Introduction to "The Integration of Preexisting Literary Material in the Pentateuch and the Impact upon Its Final Shape," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, FAT 111, eds. Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 607–8.

[202] William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 81.

[203] For example, Friedman attributes Gen 34:1–31 to the J source *Bible With the Sources Revealed*, 88–89. S.R. Driver assigns the majority of Gen 34:1–31 to J, but some to P as well *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Meridian, 1956), 16–17. For the debate on a P source or a priestly editor see Jakob Wöhrle, "There's No Master Key! The Literary Character of the Priestly Stratum and the Formation of the Pentateuch," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, FAT 111, eds. Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 391–403.

[204] Hermann Gunkel describes this idea of an underlying oral tradition behind the legends found in Genesis in *Genesis*, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997), vii–xxiii, esp. xvi. While upholding a place for orality and oral tradition, Susan Niditch problematizes Gunkel's flat oral-to-written progression of biblical tradition in *Oral World and Written Word*, 1–4.

Most of these theories primarily concern hypothetical early forms of the story and are less concerned with the moment of its textualization in the broader Genesis narrative. Within the framework of this dissertation, the moment of textualization within a text largely like MT Genesis is the primary context of concern.[206] That said, the prehistory one imagines for the story does inform one's understanding of its textualization. In what follows, a tentative account of the origins and inclusion of Gen 34 into the larger work of Genesis is offered.

The following comments on the origins of Gen 34 are guided by limited evidence internal to Genesis and represent a plausible—but far from definitive— theory of its origins. Genesis is often conceived as a book in two parts, chapters 1–11 comprising the primeval history and 12–50 as the history of the patriarchs. Three different blocks of text comprise the latter section: the Abraham cycle, the Jacob cycle, and the Joseph novella.[207] Genesis 34 is generally considered as part of the Jacob cycle, but its place within that set of chapters is uneasy. The Jacob cycle (Gen 25:19–35:29), as a whole, has a northern orientation. The focus on northern cities, northern cultic sites, and the culmination of the birth stories in Joseph, the progenitor of two central tribes in the northern kingdom (Gen 30:24) all point to the cycle's northern origin.[208]

---

[205] The textual boundaries of the Jacob cycle vary based upon who is describing it, but Gen 25:1–35:29. Albert de Pury believes Gen 34 to be a part of a complete Jacob cycle incorporated into the Pentateuch in and between a *priestergrundschrift*. See Albert de Pury, "The Jacob Story and the Beginning of the Formation of the Pentateuch," in *A Farewell to the Yahwist: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, eds. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 51–72. For the argument that Gen 34 was appended to the Jacob cycle see Erhard Blum, "The Jacob Tradition," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup, eds. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Boston: Brill, 2012), 181–211, esp. 193, and David Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 472–76.

[206] I write "largely like" to account for the diversity in the manuscript tradition of what are now considered biblical texts that the Dead Sea Scroll discoveries brought to light.

[207] For further reading on this textbook summary of the structure of Genesis see John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible and Deuterocanonical Books*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2018), 71–106.

[208] Blum, "The Jacob Tradition," 207–8; Marvin Sweeney, "Hosea's Readings of the Pentateuchal Narrative," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, FAT 111, eds. Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 865; Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 472–

While the argument for a northern orientation for the Jacob cycle as a whole finds some level of agreement among biblical scholars, views on the orientation of Gen 34 within that cycle are more fractured. Several commentators have noted the chapter's discontinuity with the material around it.[209] Moreover, various elements of the story would suggest that the writers were Judahite apologists. For example, the story paints a disturbing portrait of Shechem, a capital city of the northern kingdom (1 Kgs 12:25).[210] (In a similar fashion, Judg 19–20 portrays Saul's hometown as dangerous, depraved, and chaotic.) Additionally, the violence undertaken by Simeon and Levi against the Shechemites could be understood as a "disqualifying act" in the eyes of Jacob the patriarch (Gen 34:30). The disqualifying act paves the way for the younger brother Judah, progenitor of the tribe who ran the southern kingdom, to lead instead of his older brothers. In the same way that the Davidic throne is transferred to Solomon after his older brothers, "Amnon, Absalom, and Adonijah disqualified themselves," Simeon, Levi, and Reuben, all of Judah's older brothers, disqualify themselves placing Judah, the progenitor of David's clan, in a position to rule.[211] Thus, while most of Gen 25:19–35:29 appears to have roots, oral or

---

75. Contra Blum, Sweeney, and Carr, Nadav Na'aman argues for a primarily southern orientation of the Jacob cycle. As opposed to reading the birth stories as culminating in Joseph (and by extension the northern tribes associated with him), he sees the author as foregrounding the southern tribes, "The Jacob Story and the Formation of Biblical Israel," *TA* 41 (2014): 108–9.

[209] Michael Fishbane, "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Gen 25:19–35:22)," *JJS* 26 (1975): 24. Claus Westermann refers to Gen 34 as an "independent patriarchal narrative" with an oral background. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12–36: A Commentary,* CC, trans. John J Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), 536. See also Na'aman, "The Jacob Story," 109. In contrast to these interpreters, John Goldingay sees the story as fitting into the long close of section three of Genesis anchored on the other end by Gen 26. See John Goldingay, *Genesis*, BCOTP (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 528.

[210] Sweeney, "Hosea's Readings of the Pentateuchal Narrative," 866; Yairah Amit, "How to Slander the Memory of Shechem," in *Memory and the City in Ancient Israel*, eds. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 232. While the memory of Shechem is decidedly negative in Genesis, other portraits of the city that were recorded in other canonized literature are more ambiguous according to Amit.

[211] For an explanation of the succession narrative of Samuel and Kings as well as information that problematizes my overly simplistic description of it here see Andrew Knapp, "The Succession Narrative in Twenty-first-century Research," *CBR* 19 (2021): 228. For more on the disqualification of Simeon and Levi see Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 474. Identifying parallels between Genesis and the Samuel-Kings complex is not

written, in the northern kingdom of Israel prior to its fall in 722 BCE, Gen 34 appears to be, at least in its form in the MT, a product of Judean writers.

How does a story with a Judean orientation find its way into a cycle of stories with a northern orientation? And under what conditions might a Jacob tradition from the northern kingdom of Israel make its way to the southern kingdom where it is folded into a larger historiographic project?[212] There are no easy answers to these questions, and the field of biblical studies offers different and competing potential answers.[213] Following Schniedewind, this dissertation argues that the eighth century BCE is the most likely historical context for the textualization of MT Gen 34 in its form within an early form of Genesis.[214] Schniedewind

---

unique to this dissertation. For a long list of parallel features see Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1986), 107–20.

[212] An overall southern kingdom orientation is assumed for the book of Genesis because of stories like Gen 34 in addition to historical reasons such as the early fall of the northern kingdom and the role of Jerusalem in the southern kingdom in terms of text production. William M. Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew: Its Origins through the Rabbinic Period* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 77.

[213] Concerning some of those alternatives to the theory I advance here, see Nadav Na'aman who suggests a mid-sixth century BCE. context for the cycle pushing the date for a complete Genesis even later. Na'aman argues a post- exilic writer composed it as a part of an intellectual project "intended for an audience comprised of the elite and broader community of the 'New Israel'—the inhabitants of the former kingdoms of Israel and Judah," in "The Jacob Story and the Formation of Biblical Israel," *TA* 41 (2014): 118–19. Looking specifically at MT Gen 34, Yairah Amit argues for a post-exilic Gen 34 in *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative,* trans. Jonathan Chipman (Boston: Brill, 2000), 189–211. Blum notes that Gen 34 is "part of a rather late pro-Judahite (pro-Davidic) thread of traditions." Although not specific in his dating, I would suspect that "rather late" for Blum is not the eighth nor probably even the seventh century. Blum, "The Jacob Tradition," 193. Stephen A. Geller dates MT Gen 34 to the period of Josiah in the seventh century BCE due to the consistencies he sees between the story and Deuteronomic ideology, "The Sack of Shechem: The Use of Typology in Biblical Covenant Religion" *Proof* 10 (1990): 4–7.

[214] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 63. Some might find this statement overly general. Those individuals are right. There are undoubtedly sections of Genesis that were incorporated into the narrative after the eighth century. Studies like David Carr's, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible* offer complex models of textual development that attempt to identify, at the verse level, which portions of the text belong to which historical period. While I do not follow Carr in all his conclusions, there is certainly value in his approach to the text. Others might argue that I assume a certain level of stability in the text between the eighth century BCE to our medieval manuscripts. Several scholars have demonstrated a fluidity in the textual tradition of what are now described as 'biblical' texts such as Molly Zahn *The Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism,* and Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. In the absence of an eighth century BCE manuscript in hand demonstrating the textual stability for this portion of Genesis is an impossibility. I have offered some reasons above for holding to an eighth century dating for much of Genesis recognizing that some will find it and the generalities unsatisfying.

identifies two main reasons why Genesis, as well as the remainder of the first four books of the Pentateuch, could not have been composed during the exilic or Persian period. First, the linguistic features of the book do not reflect those of compositions dated to the Persian period.[215] Secondly, there is a concern for the northern tribes and northern tradition. This concern suggests a cooperation between northern and southern scribal communities that would fit well with an influx of northern populations after the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel.[216] These specific reasons for Genesis's place in the eighth century are embedded in a broader set of reasons for the flourishing of Hebrew literature in the eighth and seventh centuries BCE. Urban areas in Judah and particularly Jerusalem, the primary locus of scribal activity, expanded in response to threats from an expanding Assyrian empire and a flood of refugees from the north displaced because of that empire's activities.[217] Moreover, there is ample evidence (including the Siloam tunnel

---

[215] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 82. Linguistic dating is central to how this dissertation conceives of the moment of textualization of MT Genesis. By looking at epigraphic Hebrew sources during the eighth century, Schniedewind explores the linguistic aspect of his argument in *A Social History of Hebrew*, 99–125. General information on the pre-exilic language of the Pentateuch, or classical biblical Hebrew, can be found in Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, trans. John Elwolde (Cambridge: Cambridge, 1993), 51–52 and 68–75. With respect to articulating a method for linguistic dating of biblical texts, see Avi Hurvitz, "Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew," *VTSup* 80 (2000): 143–60, and also a later articulation of that method in Hurvitz, *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew* (Boston: Brill, 2014), 9–11.

[216] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 82. It should be noted that this is not the only period of cooperation between northern and southern scribal communities. Gary Knoppers understands the Pentateuch to be the product of "a prolonged collaboration between the two communities (*Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2013], 178)." Still, there is good reason to believe that the composition of Genesis belonged to an early period of cooperation.

[217] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 67–73; Aaron A. Burke, "Coping with the Effects of War: Refugees in the Levant in during the Bronze and Iron Ages," in *Disaster and Relief Management: Katastrophen Und Ihre Bewaltigung*, FAT 81, ed. Angelika Berlejung (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 270–77, esp. 271n35. Burke notes the debate between Israel Finkelstein and Nadav Na'aman on whether the population expansion in Jerusalem the result of influx of refugees from the north was. Finkelstein argues that the population growth stemmed from northern refugees in "The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC," *RB* 115.4 (2008): 499–515. Na'aman writes a rejoinder to Finkelstein in "The Growth and Development of Judah and Jerusalem in the Eighth Century BCE: A Rejoinder," *RB* 116.3 (2009): 321–35.

inscriptions, Lachish letters, countless inscribed jar handles and seals, etc.) to suggest a writing culture, both state-sponsored and popular.[218]

During this period of centralization and urbanization in Judah, Hezekiah, attested in both the Judahite (biblical) and Assyrian record, sat on the throne in Jerusalem. With the fall of the northern kingdom and refugees from the north flooding into his territory, Hezekiah had the opportunity to reimagine the shape of a unified kingdom centralized in Jerusalem. In Schniedewind's words, Hezekiah was "restoring a golden age" that "would be textualized by the collection, composition, and editing of literature by the royal scribes of Hezekiah."[219] Stories from the northern kingdom, like that of the house of Jacob, flowed down to the southern kingdom and were reframed in a southern work. This literature would project the power of the southern kingdom, the superiority of the house of David of the tribe of Judah against the backdrop of a recently fallen northern kingdom.[220] Stories of conquest articulated this expansionist ideology, particularly stories about expansion in the northern kingdom.[221] In this

---

[218] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 67–77; Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew*, 99–125; Seth L. Sanders, *The Invention of Hebrew* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 103–55. Erhard Blum also addresses the role of institutions in building up state-sponsored writing in the eighth and seventh century in "Institutionelle und kulturelle Voraussetzungen der israelitischen Traditionsliteratur," in *Tradition(en) im alten Israel Konstruktion, Transmission und Transformation Herausgegeben*, eds. Ruth Ebach und Martin Leuenberger (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 3–44.

[219] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 73.

[220] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 76. Schniedewind does not highlight the tribe of Judah, but it is important for this dissertation to underscore David's tribal identity. A word of caution should accompany my analysis. Knoppers reminds us, "In this respect, medieval Samaritan interpreters follow the basic pattern advanced by their Jewish counterparts, but adjust certain important details to accommodate their own distinctive traditions…Early interpreters could read basically the same texts and reach different conclusions about their significance (*Jews and Samaritans*, 205)." In other words, what I have deemed as evidence of clear southern editing might easily be interpreted differently in a northern context.

[221] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 80.

environment of engaging northern traditions, reframing them through a southern lens, and imagining a restored and expanded "golden age" of Israel, the story of Gen 34 is put into writing.

2.1.2 Overview of MT Genesis 34

The story of Gen 34 picks up on a narrative thread at the end of Gen 33. Jacob and his family, *en route* from Paddan-Aram, arrive outside of the city Shechem where they encounter the sons of Hamor and purchase a plot of land where they set up camp (Gen 33:18–19). At the end of Gen 33 Jacob establishes an altar there, and at the beginning of Gen 35 he establishes another altar. In the intervening chapter, however, the narrative turns its focus to three of Jacob's children and their interactions with Shechem, son of Hamor, and the eponymous town in which he resides.

The narrative opens with Dinah, the daughter of Leah, going out to see the "daughters of the land" (בנות הארץ). By identifying Dinah as the daughter of Leah, the narrative signals Simeon and Levi are her full brothers (Gen 34:1).[222] While out of her family's camp, Shechem, the prince of the city, sees, seizes and rapes Dinah (Gen 34:2).[223] During or shortly after the sexual assault, the narrative indicates that Shechem's heart clings (ותדבק נפשו) to Dinah (Gen 34:3).[224] The narrative describes Shechem's love for Dinah and how he speaks tenderly to her (וידבר על-לב הנערָ) (Gen 34:3). One can detect a loose pattern in the few instances of a man "speaking to the heart" of a woman in the Hebrew Bible. The idiom is used elsewhere to describe some sort of breach in their relationship and a subsequent effort to repair that relationship (Gen 34:3, Judg

[222] Her other full brothers include Reuben, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun.

[223] The appropriateness of the term "rape" in reference to this passage is a point of scholarly debate, the terms of which are discussed fully in the next section. For now, my use of the term here should indicate where I stand on the matter.

[224] The language of Gen 34:3 mirrors the language in the second creation narrative, after woman was created. It states that man shall leave his family and cling (ודבק) to his wife (Gen 2:24).

19:3, Isa 40:2, Hos 2:16).[225] Significantly, one of the uses of this idiom is in Judg 19, another narrative about sexual violence addressed in the final chapter of this dissertation.[226]

Having raped Dinah, Shechem turns to his father to broker a marriage deal between himself and "this girl" (הילדה הזאת) (Gen 34:4).[227] In the meantime Jacob receives word that Shechem has defiled (טמא) his daughter and surprisingly does not react to this report (Gen 34:5).[228] Hamor and Shechem set out to discuss the issue of marriage with Jacob, but before the parties meet Jacob's sons learn of Shechem's actions (Gen 34:6–7). Jacob's sons are incensed because Shechem committed "an outrage in Israel" (כי נבלה עשה בישראל) by raping the daughter of Jacob (Gen 34:7). Phrases similar to "כי נבלה עשה בישראל" are repeated twice in Judg 20:6 and 20:10.[229] This lexical connection helps to build a case for literary dependence.[230]

---

[225] Isaiah 40:2 concerns speaking tenderly to Jerusalem, a city personified as a woman after assault. Ruth 2:13 also uses the phrase directed toward Boaz, but it does not seem that there was any breach in their relationship. For this reason, I describe the pattern as "loose."

[226] While this data point does not demonstrate a textual link between Gen 34 and Judg 19, when it is considered alongside other data points it helps to reveal a genetic relationship between the two texts. The idiom is used eight times in biblical literature.

[227] The use of ילדה, conventionally translated as "girl," appears alongside נערה, conventionally translated as "young woman," both in reference to Dinah in Gen 34. The use of both terms has raised questions about how readers should understand Dinah's age. Unfortunately, we lack any uses of the term with reference to age in contemporaneous material, so readers are left to speculate how young or old Dinah is in the narrative. The second excursus in this chapter addresses how early interpreters approached Dinah's age.

[228] While Shechem is not named in the clause, it is certain he is the subject of the third-person, masculine verb. On the issue of defilement and the word טמא, this is one of the key words used to discuss the concept of impurity in the Hebrew Bible and early Jewish literature composed in Hebrew. Christine Hayes and Jonathan Klawans helpfully distinguish between ritual and moral impurity. Under the heading of moral impurity, sexual misdeeds operate in a unique way relative to other moral impurities. Hayes notes that "sexually immoral deeds can create a lasting degradation of status" (*Gentile Impurities*, 25). For Klawans distinction between ritual and moral impurity see *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 22–31. For his note on impurity relating to sexual relations with a foreigner and Gen 34 see *Impurity and Sin*, 29.

[229] Variations of the phrase are also used in 2 Sam 13:12, another sexually violent text as well as Deut 22:21 in the context of law surrounding rape and other forms illicit sex. Jeremiah 29:23 uses it in reference to illicit sex. One also finds the phrase in Jos 7:15 concerning the taking of sacred items.

[230] More evidence to support this point is provided under the heading "The Tie That Binds" in the chapter on Judg 19–20.

When Hamor, Shechem, Dinah's brothers, and Jacob meet, Hamor indicates that Shechem longs (חשקה נפשו) for Jacob's daughter (Gen 34:8).[231] He asks Jacob to give Dinah to Shechem in marriage, couching the request in a larger argument for their two clans to be linked through a series of marital and trade relations (Gen 34:8–10). Through an exchange of women, the two would also be able to exchange goods and land. Shechem also offers to pay a high bride price for Dinah (Gen 34:11–12). However, Jacob's sons are not persuaded by the offer and respond to the two men deceitfully "because Shechem had defiled their sister" (אשר טמא את דינה אחתם) (Gen 34:13).[232] The brothers explain to Hamor and Shechem that they cannot give their sister to a man who is not circumcised because it would be a disgrace to them. However, if "every male" (כל זכר) became circumcised like them, they would consent to giving their sister in marriage as well as other women to other members of Hamor's tribe (Gen 34:14–17).[233]

Hamor and Shechem agree to the brothers' deceitful deal, and Shechem hastily moves to gather his kinsmen to present the offer using his power as the most honored member of his father's household (Gen 34:18–19). Speaking to the men of the city at its gate, Shechem and Hamor make the economic argument for bringing the tribes together through circumcision and

[231] The language of longing mirrors that of the Deuteronomic law condoning Israelite men to take for themselves captive women for whom they long (Deut. 21:11).

[232] The reason clause is somewhat notably introduced by אשר. While translators often gloss the אשר as because, Yair Zakowitch raises questions about whether the awkward syntax in this verse including its use of אשר might be an indication that the text is stitched together by a redactor as opposed to a unified narrative. The fact that אשר seems to have a causal force later in the chapter (Gen 34:27), and it carries a causal force elsewhere in the MT (Jos 4:7, et. al.) suggests, however, its use here should not raise too many questions. See Yair Zakowitch, "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey Tigay (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 186.

[233] There is something of an irony in the text likely only perceived by modern readers in an age in which the language of consent defines how we distinguish between licit and illicit sex. This notion of consent (נאות) appears three times (Gen 34:15, 22, 23), none of its uses in reference to the woman who is violated. Rather, the language of consent is a way to talk about the men's deals with each other concerning the exchange of Dinah and the other women of their respective clans.

then marriage, noting that there is plenty of land for both clans and that the Shechemites will gain access to their livestock (Gen 34:20–23). All agree and "every male" (כל זכר) is circumcised (Gen 34:24). With the procedure having incapacitated the men, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's full brothers, descend on the city with swords drawn and kill "every male" (כל זכר) (Gen 34:25). After killing Shechem and Hamor, they take Dinah from Shechem's house.

After the initial assault, the remainder of the brothers plunder the city. The narrator provides insight into their motivation stating that they did so *because they defiled their sister* (Gen 34:27).[234] The brothers take the livestock of the Shechemites and enslave their women and children. No longer are the women of Shechem part of a mutual economic agreement: they are captives to Jacob and his sons (Gen 34:29). With this description the writer(s) of Gen 34 reverses the circumstances at the story's beginning: the story begins with Dinah going out to see the daughters of the land, and now the daughters of the land are brought to her as captives. Just as she was seized, they are seized.

Now, Jacob, having been silent throughout this episode, finally breaks his silence and rebukes Simeon and Levi for bringing trouble to him and "making him odious" to the inhabitants of the land, namely the Canaanites and the Perizzites.[235] He worries aloud that his numbers are not great enough to ward off an attack from these groups if they seek retribution (Gen 34:30). Without responding to their father's concern, Jacob's sons ask the rhetorical question, "Should he treat our sister like a whore?" (הכזונה יעשה את-אחותנו) (Gen 34:31).[236] The question is vague in

[234] The reason clause here, as in Gen 34:13, utilizes אשר. See note 32 above.

[235] The use of the Canaanites and the Perizzites to the exclusion of the other peoples (Jebusite, Hittites, etc.) is notable, but not odd. There are seven different peoples of the land, but often only a handful are mentioned in any given list. Niels Peter Lemche, *The Canaanites and Their Land: The Tradition of the Canaanites*, JSOT Sup 110 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 84.

[236] The Hebrew word זונה and its translation have been the subject of considerable discussion from the early days of feminist biblical scholarship. Words like whore, harlot, and prostitute are commonly used in biblical

several ways. It is unclear who is speaking (Simeon and Levi or all Jacob's sons) and to whom the "he" is referring (Shechem, Hamor, or Jacob). The question's intended audience is ambiguous (Jacob, his whole household, the peoples of the land). The sense of the comparison between their sister and a whore is also obscure (through the rape or the marriage negotiations).[237] Finally, how the narrator assesses Shechem and Levi's actions is not made clear in this ending.[238] The open-ended nature of the story invites interpreters to offer their own takes the story. Early Jewish interpreters responded to this invitation, and later in the chapter I examine their varied takes.

2.1.3 Debating Sexual Violence in MT Genesis 34

Before proceeding with an analysis on the politics of sexual violence in the story, it is important to consider a pivotal question several scholars have raised: Is Dinah raped? As this dissertation is devoted to stories of sexual violence and their interpretation, one might rightly presume that I would answer this question with a resounding "yes."[239] The question has been

translations. Discussions around the translation of this word have paralleled conversations of moving from terms like "prostitute" to "sex worker" to recognize sex work as work and remove the stigma around it. In some ancient settings, "sex worker" might be an appropriate translation for זונה; however, here I use "whore" to capture the disgust and indignation of the brother's statement. They believe Shechem has made their sister a derogatory term, not a worker with dignity. For an example of an early discussion on the word see Phyllis Bird, ""To Play the Harlot': An Inquiry into an Old Testament Metaphor," in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*, ed. Peggy L. Day (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 75–94.

[237] Ronald Hyman articulates the myriad ways that the question is unclear. Ronald T. Hyman, "Final Judgement: The Ambiguous Moral Question that Culminates Genesis 34," *JBQ* 28 (2000): 93–101.

[238] Several chapters later in Genesis, in Jacob's final blessings and curses of his sons (Gen 49), there is a definitive negative assessment of Simeon and Levi's actions (Gen 49:5-7). Depending on how one views the editing of Genesis, the brothers' assessment in Gen 49 carries more or less weight for the interpretation of Gen 34.

[239] My assessment of the text has been influenced by the following scholars among others. Caroline Blyth, "Redeemed by His Love? The Characterization of Shechem in Genesis 34," *JSOT* 33 (2008): 3–18; Sandie Gravett, "Reading 'Rape' in the Hebrew Bible: A Consideration of Language, *JSOT* 28 (2004): 279–99; Susanne Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 3; Leah Rediger Schulte, *The Absence of God in Biblical Rape Narratives* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), 103–7; Yael Shamesh, "Rape is Rape is Rape: The Story of Dinah and Shechem (Genesis 34)," *ZAW* 119 (2007): 2–21, and Frank Yamada, *Configurations of Rape in the Hebrew Bible: A Literary Analysis of Three Rape Narratives*, StBibLit 109 (New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 35–45. My interpretation is also influenced by the writings of Meir Sternberg, Danna Fewell and David Gunn, who debate several aspects of Gen 34, but still agree on rape

raised from several interpretive angles, namely literary, legal, and lexical with different conclusions. I provide an overview of this scholarship, including the recent hypothesis that MT Gen 34 includes what is best described as abduction marriage that indicates a concern for competing marriage practices.[240]

First, some have objected to the interpretation that Dinah is raped through an analysis of the narrative structure of the chapter. Étan Levine points to both Shechem's heartfelt affection for Dinah described in Gen 34:3 as well as her silence as evidence that "this tragic love story hardly involves rape."[241] In the same vein as Levine, Lyn Bechtel writes, "Sociological studies reveal that rapists feel hostility and hatred toward their victims, not love."[242] Apart from a questionable reading of social-scientific literature, from a literary perspective, characters can contain contradictions. A character who rapes their victim and is then said to love them is not a character beyond the literary imagination. Moreover, a perpetrator's love for a victim in no way implies a victim's consent. Carolyn Blyth has interrogated each of the verbal phrases used describe Shechem's love (דבק ב, אהב את, דבר על לב) and has determined there is nothing within the biblical Hebrew corpus that demands these be understood as being entirely virtuous. Therefore,

---

being an appropriate word to describe the scene. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, ISBL (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1985), 445–47, and Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Sternberg's Reader and The Rape of Dinah," *JBL* 110 (1991): 193–211.

[240] Adele Berlin situates this development in thinking about the text in the history of scholarship in "Literary Approaches to Biblical Literature: General Observations and a Case Study of Genesis 34," in *Hebrew Bible: New Insights and Scholarship*, ed. Frederick E. Greenspahn (New York: New York University Press, 2008), 62–64.

[241] Étan Levine, *Marital Relations in Ancient Judaism*, BZAR 10, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 216. Levine also makes a lexical argument for ענה in the *piel* stem indicating something other than rape, but his argument seems to rely on textual evidence from diachronically and geographically distant places.

[242] Lyn M. Bechtel, "What If Dinah is Not Raped? (Genesis 34)," *JSOT* 62 (1994): 29. Mayer Gruber also draws on social science research in order to confirm, alongside his philological argument, that Shechem is not a rapist. " דיון חוזר — ההאשמות כלפי שכם בן חמור," *Beit Mikra* 44 (1999): 119–20. In addition to the social scientific argument being outdated, these studies seem to fundamentally miss the point that sexual violence performs a certain function in narrative and historiography.

the narrator's use of the words should not be understood as exonerating Shechem's rape.[243] With respect to sociology, unfortunately, Bechtel cites no studies supporting her statement. While in some cases, Bechtel's statement seems to hold true, more contemporary research demonstrates "sexual aggression is a complex, polymorphic phenomenon," "that sexual aggressors do not appear to be fundamentally different from other members of their community, and that not all sexual aggressors are the same."[244] In other words, the most salient point that research bears out time and again is that throughlines in terms of traits, attitudes, and backgrounds are difficult to find among sexual offenders. In some ways though, sociology is beside the point if one accepts that a writer might write a rape story for reasons other than accurately reflecting the mind of a rapist.[245]

Others have objected to the interpretation that Dinah is raped by appealing to the legal-lexical framework presented in Deut 21–22. Alison Joseph most clearly articulates this argument by exploring the use of ענה in the *piel* in legal frameworks to understand when the word denotes rape.[246] For example, in her analysis of Deut 21:14, which addresses Israelite men who want to discard female captives they have done ענה to, Joseph writes, "Her participation in sex with the

---

[243] Blyth, "Redeemed by His Love?" 6–12.

[244] Jonathan James and Jean Proulx, "Theories That Explain Sexual Aggression Against Women," *The Wiley Handbook of What Works with Sexual Offenders: Contemporary Perspectives in Theory, Assessment, Treatment, and Prevention*, eds. Jean Proulx, Franca Cortoni, Leam A. Craig, Elizabeth J. Letourneau (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2020), 18.

[245] Mayer I. Gruber argues the same point that the portrait of a rapist painted in social science research does not comport with that of Shechem. "דיון חוזר — ההאשמות כלפי שכם בן חמור," *Beit Mikra* 44 (1999): 119–27. Shemesh offers a counter argument to Bechtel and Gruber's social science research argument citing different studies Shemesh, "Rape is Rape is Rape," 7–9.

[246] Alison Joseph, "Understanding Genesis 34:2: 'Innâ," *VT* 66 (2016): 663–68. Joseph reiterates many of the arguments she offers in this 2016 article in "Why 'Is Dinah Raped?' Isn't the Right Question: Genesis 34 and Feminist Historiography," *JHebS* 19.4 *Gendered Historiography: Theoretical Considerations and Case Studies* (2019): 27–37.

man may not have been consensual, but the law does not consider it rape."[247] Joseph argues that the legal category of rape in the Hebrew Bible is indicated by the *hiphil* form of חזק. She uses the Deuteronomic code to inform this definition and notes that a lack of crying out during the act (as suggested by Deut 22:23–24) implies consent and therefore not rape.[248] In regard to the Dinah narrative, Joseph compares Gen 34:2 to the law in Deut 22:28–9, which states that if a man meets a woman who is not betrothed, and he seizes (תפש) and lies (שכב) with her, and they are found (in the act), then the man must give her father 50 shekels, and she will become his wife, and he may never divorce her *because he did* ענה *to her*. Joseph argues that this law is "not primarily concerned with rape;" rather, it is concerned with the woman's father who lost the opportunity to negotiate the terms of a marriage contract and is forced to concede to the man who violated her.[249] Joseph is correct in stating that Deut 22:28–29 is not primarily concerned with rape, but that does not mean the law does not also apply to rape cases, and that ענה might denote rape as well as other forms of illicit sex.[250]

Taking Joseph's argument further, Tikva Frymer-Kensky also makes a legal-lexical argument concerning rape in Gen 34. Frymer-Kensky, like Joseph, relies heavily on the *hiphil* form of חזק to validate an interpretation of rape as well as word order (ענה evidently must precede שכב for the rape interpretation to be valid).[251] She also makes a legal argument. Frymer-Kensky

---

[247] Joseph, "Understanding Genesis 34:2," 667. When discussing various scholars' interpretations of ענה, I leave the word untranslated.

[248] Joseph, "Understanding Genesis 34:2," 667.

[249] Joseph, "Understanding Genesis 34:2," 667.

[250] For an alternative discussion to Joseph's on law and ענה see Gravett, "Reading 'Rape,'" 285–87.

[251] Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky, "Virginity in the Bible," *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East.* JSOTSup 262, eds. Victor Harold Matthews, Bernard M. Levinson, and Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 87.

states, “Shechem did not rape Dinah, but he did wrong. From the Bible’s point of view, an unmarried girl’s consent does not make the sex a permissible act. She has, after all, no right of consent.”[252] Like Joseph, Frymer-Kensky uses the logic of ancient Israel’s law in order to determine whether Shechem’s interactions with Dinah meet that law’s standard of rape. While it is important to understand the logic of the legal codices in reference to sexual activity, one is certainly not required to adopt the perspective of the law as some sort of neutral arbiter.

Both Joseph and Frymer-Kensky’s use of biblical legal material to determine what qualifies as rape demands scrutiny. Unfortunately, laws and other legal norms across time and space have often failed to effectively defined rape, to punish those who committed the action, and to protect victims. For example, in 2015 more than half of the world’s states had not criminalized sexual assault within marriage. During the twenty-first century, in the United States, some states impose lesser penalties on spouses who sexually assault their partners.[253] According to Joseph’s line of argumentation, if the law is constructed in a way that negates or minimizes the offense, then readers must be bound to its interpretation. This line of argumentation, however, places law above an ethical concern for victims. Societies construct laws for culturally and politically contingent reasons. A critical lens critiques the law and exposes the underlying frameworks (patriarchy, classism, ethnocentrism, etc.) that motivate a society’s construction of the law as opposed to adopting it as an objective lens on reality.[254] Individuals can still be victims of crimes even if the law does not recognize them as victims.

---

[252] Frymer-Kensky, “Virginity in the Bible,” 87.

[253] Melanie Randall and Vasanthi Venkatesh, “Introduction to ‘The Right to No: The Crime of Marital Rape, Women’s Human Rights, and International Law,’” *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* 41 (2015): 154.

[254] An example of a critical reading of biblical law and its relationship to Gen 34 is found in Blyth, “Redeemed By His Love?” 16–17. Susanne Scholz also discusses competing epistemologies in approaching ancient law in “‘Back Then It Was Legal’: The Epistemological Imbalance in Readings of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Rape Legislation,” *The Bible and Critical Theory* 1.4 (2005): 36.1–36.22.

Intertwined with the legal debate around sexual violence in the Hebrew Bible is the issue of lexemes that describe sexual violence. The crux of the lexical debate is the verb ענה in the *piel* stem. Nick Wyatt, citing the multivalency of the ענה, suggested that the Masoretic pointing was incorrect, and that the verb is better understood in the *qal* stem, meaning respond in a sexual sense. Thus, it should be translated "he had intercourse with her."[255] Wyatt's reading gained little traction, but it represents an early attempt to obfuscate the sexual violence in the story.

Four years after Wyatt published his article, Bechtel offered another way to circumvent the rape reading of ענה. Bechtel suggests that ענה in the *piel* should be read as "humiliate" through shaming. She notes that shaming a woman sexually might entail rape, but it does not have to. A woman can experience shame by not meeting her group's sexual standards in other ways.[256] Appealing to Deuteronomic law, she evaluates biblical passages in which ענה is used to describe a sexual encounter in order to determine whether ענה indicates "rape" (Deut 22:23–29).[257] Bechtel's readings of ענה seem to be guided by the punishments meted out: if ענה is used to describe a sexual act, and the woman is killed, then ענה should be defined as shame, not rape. Additionally, she seems to apply a definition for rape that requires "force" and "aggression" on the part of the perpetrator and "obvious resistance" or "vigorous struggle" on the part of the victim.[258] First, as already discussed, the notion that laws are inherently ethical, just, and on the side of the victim—in any society—is unfounded. Second, her definition does not account for an

---

[255] Nick Wyatt, "The Story of Dinah and Shechem," in *The Archaeology of a Myth: Papers on Old Testament Tradition*, (New York: Routledge, 2014; repr. *UF* 22 (1990): 433-458), 15–16.

[256] Bechtel, "What If Dinah is Not Raped?" 24–25.

[257] Bechtel, "What If Dinah is Not Raped?" 25–26.

[258] Bechtel, "What If Dinah is Not Raped?" 20.

unequal power dynamic (say, for example, a prince and a migrant woman) that might produce a situation in which a man through non-physical aggressive coercion has sex with a woman against her will. With respect to Bechtel's condition that there needs to be "obvious resistance" or a "vigorous struggle," one might consider that a victim, to stay alive, might not fight back.

To conclude the discussion on lexical arguments, the most convincing argument that Dinah is not raped is articulated by Ellen Van Wolde. Van Wolde argues that ענה in the *piel* stem most often denotes "debasement" in a social sense.[259] She examines several passages that use the verb in the context of sexual intercourse and concludes that the verb's semantic field is "social, spatial, and judicial." In contrast, the semantic field for the English word "rape" is "individual, physical, and psychological." Therefore, for Van Wolde, the Hebrew "ענה" should not be translated into English as rape but debase. For example, Van Wolde translates Gen 34:2, Shechem "took/seized her (ויקח אתה), laid her (וישכב אתה), and debased her (ויענה)." In response to this translation, however, one might question *how* did Shechem debase Dinah? Even the classic *BDB* Hebrew-English Lexicon perceives the need to provide a means by which "humbling" is done for its definition of "humble" with reference to ענה for certain passages and offer the additional "a woman by cohabitation."[260] This is not dissimilar from some of the ways English has used defile as synonymous with rape. Discussing rape in terms of defilement taps into notions of sexual purity and impurity and is not dissimilar from some of the ways English has used "defile" as synonymous with rape.[261] Van Wolde is correct that the verb ענה has a base

[259] Ellen van Wolde, "Does 'innâ denote rape? A Semantic Analysis of a Controversial Word," *VT* 52 (2002): 528–44.

[260] BDB, s.v. "III. ענה."

[261] Jessica M. Keady connects the language of defilement (טמא) in Gen 34 to modern notions of rape and defilement in the West. See "Rape Culture Discourse and Female Impurity: Genesis 34 as a Case Study," in *Rape Culture, Gender Violence and Religion*, eds. Caroline Blyth, Emily Colgan, Katie B. Edwards (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018), 67–82.

meaning of "debase," but it is the context that informs the reader's interpretation that the narrative is discussing debasement by rape.

Finally, to conclude this discussion on the questions that scholars have raised around sexual violence in Gen 34, it is important to examine the issue of clashing marital strategies.[262] One proponent of understanding the story as one not primarily of sexual violence but one of marital strategies is Helena Zlotnick. She writes,

> With hardly an exception [numerous commentators] have all operated on the assumption that Genesis 34 reports a crisis generated by a rape, in the conventional, contemporary sense of the term…But this point of departure provides a false premise and shaky foundations…[T]he main hypothesis of this section is that Dinah's tale reflects a clash between two marital strategies, or ideologies, and specifically between arranged marriage and the so-called abduction marriage or bride theft.[263]

Zlotnick's analysis of the story is based upon the conviction that "the ancient layers of the tale" are recoverable, and that at the base of those layers is an expression of the Canaanite practice of bride theft.[264] Zlotnick hypothesizes a later redactor for whom the "institutions of abduction marriage" were unknown "created a sequence based on the only item that was fully understood in his time, namely a rape."[265] In other words, the astute reader might acknowledge that what appears in the MT is about rape but also recognize that a story of abduction underlies it. Joseph Fleishman, in contrast to Zlotnick, also understands abduction marriage to be present in MT Gen 34, not as a hidden layer covered over by a rape story, but as a salient feature of the story's current form.[266]

---

[262] Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters*, 34.

[263] Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters*, 34.

[264] Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters*, 35.

[265] Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters*, 48.

Concerning Zlotnick's argument, the notion that there are literary layers to this story that might include abduction marriage is certainly plausible. However, there does not seem to be clear evidence of those layers, and we are left to speculate whether other Mediterranean evidence for this marriage practice influenced the text at hand. Fleishman's assertion that in current form the story is a not a rape story; rather, it is an abduction story does not comport with the details of the narrative itself. In the one clear "abduction-to-marriage" story in MT Judg 21, two key words are used to describe the act which are not present here (חטף ,גזל) and the abduction plot forms a crucial part of the narrative. If abduction was at play in this narrative, one might expect that to be clearer through vocabulary or explanation. Still, if it is an abduction story, rape could very well still be implied.

In the previous paragraphs, I have reviewed several arguments made by scholars against reading Gen 34 as a rape story and have challenged the logic of those arguments. In contrast to many of these scholars, I read ענה simply as meaning rape in Gen 34:2. I agree with Van Wolde that, at the word's root, it means debase, but the narrative provides context for how that debasement is accomplished. In the case of Gen 34:2, Shechem debases Dinah by raping her. Dinah's lack of voice indicates a lack of consent. If one is tempted, however, to posit her silence might indicate consent, the outcome of the story provides more clues that, from a narrative perspective, Shechem has crossed a social-sexual boundary by raping Dinah. The next section explores that social-sexual boundary, the function of sexual violence and the sexual politics underlying the narrative. Although some observations about the function of sexual violence in this narrative might find resonance outside of the eighth century BCE, this ancient context is of particular concern in this analysis.

[266] Joseph Fleishman, "Shechem and Dinah, in Light of Non-Biblical and Biblical Sources," *ZAW* 116 (2004): 27.

2.1.4 The Politics of Sexual Violence in MT Genesis 34

This section examines the sexual politics of MT Gen 34 according to the tripartite division described in the introduction beginning with the gender, sex, and sexuality politics at work. The gender politics of Gen 34 are complex, particularly relating to the multiple masculinities presented in the narrative. With respect to gender analysis on the story, however, Dinah has received the lion's share of the attention. Dinah's status as a named daughter of a matriarch and patriarch in Genesis is noteworthy as daughters, in comparison to sons, are mentioned less often in biblical texts.[267] Given the relative infrequency of their appearance, the status of daughters in Iron Age Israel and Judah is a matter of debate. Some have suggested that Dinah, as a daughter, is of no value and only a "liability" to Jacob and her family.[268] While this might have been the case for some daughters in ancient Judah, the evidence is not conclusive in this direction.[269] At least in an economic sense, daughters were *potentially* quite valuable in that their marriage and offspring had the potential to create social and political alliances between families and peoples.[270] There is a difference, however, between value as a commodity and value as a participant in social relations.[271] Evidence from other biblical writings dated to roughly the same period as Genesis would suggest that young daughters (and sons to an extent too) had little value as persons imbued with agency in social or legal contexts.[272] The narrative of Gen 34

[267] Tammi J. Schneider, *Mothers of Promise* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2008), 115.

[268] Kimberly D. Russaw, *Daughters in the Hebrew Bible* (Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018), 7. Naomi Graetz describes daughter "as a temporary and dangerous status," ("Dinah the Daughter," in *The Feminist Companion to the Bible*, ed. Athalya Brenner [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], 306).

[269] Joanna Stiebert, *Fathers and Daughters in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 38–39.

[270] T.M. Lemos, *Violence and Personhood in Ancient Israel and Comparative Contexts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 143.

[271] Lemos, *Violence and Personhood in Ancient Israel*, 12.

suggests that Dinah had a certain amount of economic value based on the negotiations around her marriage, but she had limited to no value as a person with legal and social agency accorded to her by society.[273] Her lack of value is indicated by the story's disinterest in her and her agency. Dinah is an object, not a subject.[274] In short, Dinah's gender and status as a daughter, within this ancient context, meant her standing was only slightly above that of other forms of property. This status is underscored in the negotiations between Jacob's family and the Hivites that include women along with other forms of property.

In addition to Dinah's status as a daughter, her act of "going out" (ותצא) to see the daughters of the land has received considerable attention, especially related to young women and gender norms in the ancient Near East. Some commentators have read Dinah's "going out" as a transgressive or overtly sexual activity.[275] There is no evidence, however, to suggest that Dinah was transgressing any sort of expectation for women in ancient Israel or Judah.[276] Among the

---

[272] Following Schniedewind's dating presented in *How the Bible Became a Book*. The issue of Dinah's age is challenging. Both נערה and ילדה are used to describe Dinah. As an unmarried woman, she is likely young. It would seem as if she occupies a subordinated position within her father's household, a child. For more on the Hebrew Bible's ambivalence toward the ages of children see Lemos, *Violence and Personhood*, 137.

[273] T.M. Lemos' work has informed this distinction between value as person and property. For more on defining personhood in ancient Israel see *Violence and Personhood*, 6–15. In her review of several biblical texts, primarily from the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic History, she concludes that "In the case of children, it is easier to make the case that children were the property of their parents, and particularly of their fathers. If nothing else, their subordination had even more in common with that of slaves than did the subordination of wives (*Violence and Personhood*, 162)."

[274] I use the terms "subject" and "object" in both the grammatical sense and in the critical sense. In the grammatical sense, Dinah is the subject of one verb, יצא, and the object of more verbs. She is most often acted upon in the story. Tammi Schneider makes this point as she analyzes female characters in the Bible by their relationship to verbs. See *Mothers of Promise*, 138–48. In the critical sense of subject, Dinah lacks autonomy accorded to persons. As an object, she is one through whom and by who others achieve their own desires and aims.

[275] Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *Reading the Women of the Bible* (New York: Schocken Books, 2002), 180–81; Alice Ogden Bellis, *Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes: Women's Stories in the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd ed. (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1994, repr. 2007), 73; Lesleigh Cushing Stahlberg, "Sex and the Singular Girl: Dinah, Tamar, and the Corrective Art of Biblical Narrative," *BTB* 47 (2017): 198–99 (195–204). Some interpreters cite Rashi's comments which link Leah and Dinah as women who "go out."

[276] Schulte, *The Absence of God*, 106–7.

relatively few occurrences of the verb יצא inflected for a female subject in the Hebrew Bible, several suggest that women "went out" without any indication that such action went against social norms or otherwise indicated sexual deviance.[277] In sum, Dinah's status as a daughter places her in a subordinated position relative to others in her society, and the one action ascribed to her is not noteworthy with respect to her gender performance.

The gender politics among the men in Gen 34 is complex with each character embodying different forms of masculinity and none of them conforming completely to hegemonic masculinity. To review, some of the characteristics identified as belonging to hegemonic masculinity as presented in the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic History include military might, bodily integrity, honor (often expressed as controlling the sexuality of women in the household although not exclusively), self-control, and provisioning for the household.[278] The hegemonic ideal of masculinity operates in the background as something by which to compare the male characters; however, none of the men in the story live up to this ideal.

First, Jacob does not embody the "culturally exalted" form of masculinity, primarily by failing to maintain his honor.[279] Honor is a culturally specific and often difficult to fully appreciate concept, but in ancient Israel part of honor seems to include protecting one's family from attack and controlling the sexual encounters of the women in the household.[280] Jacob is

---

[277] Judg 4:22; 2 Sam 6:20; 2 Kgs 4:21, 37, 8:3; Ruth 1:7 all inflect יצא for a female subject whose "going out" is not overtly sexual or otherwise transgressive. Gen 30:16 and Judg 4:18 might have sexual overtones, but the former likely would not be interpreted as 'sexually transgressive.'

[278] For citations for each of these characteristics, see the series of footnotes (145–149) under the subheading "Masculinity Studies" in the Methodology chapter.

[279] Carrigan, Connell, and Lee, "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity," 592.

[280] Susan Haddox, "Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities," in *Men and Masculinities in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*, The Bible in the Modern World 33, ed. Ovidiu Creangă (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 5; Wilson, *Making Men*, 43.

unable to protect Dinah from Shechem and unable to control her sexual encounters. In his role as a father, Jacob is supposed to negotiate his children's marriages, but Jacob even seems to abdicate this role to his sons.[281] Additionally, the ideal man is capable of using violence but also prudent in his exercise of that violence.[282] Jacob recognizes that he has lost standing (and, speculatively, that he has not embodied the ideal masculinity) when he chastises his sons at the end of the story (Gen 34:30). Was it the sons' impetuous actions that demonstrated Jacob had no control of his family that provoked this chastisement? Or was it that by taking matters into their own hands regarding Dinah's violation they showed Jacob to be incapable of protecting the women of his family? Or was it that their deception or violence showed Jacob and his family to be less than honorable?[283] With respect to violence, Jacob expresses fear that his sons were imprudent in their exercise of violence, and that their indiscretion might draw the ire of the Canaanites and the Perizzites against whom he cannot mount a defense. Jacob, as presented in this story, demonstrates on multiple fronts his failure to conform to any ideal form of masculinity.[284]

Jacob's sons, particularly Simeon and Levi, also fail to meet the standards of hegemonic masculinity. The first significant action Jacob's sons take is negotiating deceitfully with Hamor and Shechem (Gen 34:13).[285] Haddox notes that deceit, or trickery, is typically a tool of the

---

[281] Stiebert, *Fathers and Daughters*, 38. Tammi Schneider notes that this is not the only instance in Genesis in which brothers participate in the marriage negotiations of their sister (Gen 24:50). Schneider, *Mothers of Promise,* 121.

[282] Wilson, *Making Men*, 39-40.

[283] Haddox, "Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities," 14.

[284] Haddox notes that the later Jacob stories (Gen 34, 35, and 37) underscore that Jacob embodies a subordinate masculinity. Haddox, "Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities," 13–14.

[285] The text is ambiguous regarding which of Jacob's sons acted in deceit. Were they all in on the plan to attack, or just Simeon and Levi with the rest joining later?

powerless, not the tool of one who embodies the masculine hegemonic ideal.[286] While the sons demonstrate their military prowess, slaughtering other men (albeit somewhat incapacitated men) and taking property, women, and children for spoil, they fail to exercise even a modicum of self-control becoming of a man in ancient Israel.[287] To be sure, in his final days Jacob will remind Simeon and Levi of their shortcomings in this regard (Gen 49: 5–7).[288]

Hamor and Shechem, like Jacob and his sons, also fail to live up to masculine standards, but the portrait of the two Hivite men is complicated by their status as tribal Others at least from the perspective of the narrative. According to Wilson, Shechem's actions are characteristic of younger men who have failed to reach the social maturity of their older counterparts.[289] He writes, "Shechem's sexual violence against Dinah, in addition to his hasty decision to reveal to Jacob his willingness to pay any price for Dinah's hand (Gen 34:11–12)—a poor negotiating tactic if ever there was one!—displays this violence and impetuousness associated with a youth's lack of wisdom."[290] In other words, Shechem fails to meet hegemonic masculinity's standard through lack of self-control and wisdom, which Wilson considers a part of the culturally

---

[286] Haddox, "Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities," 11.

[287] Wilson, *Making Men*, 39–40. Wilson demonstrates how Samson (Judg 13–16) also fails to meet the ideal through a balance of might and self-control. *Making Men*, 150.

[288] In personal correspondence, Schniedewind drew attention to the importance of the antiquity of Gen 49. Genesis 49 is considered by many archaic poetry based on its distinctive linguistic features. If this archaic poetry is indeed referencing Simeon and Levi's indiscretions at Shechem, it might suggest the relative antiquity, possibly in oral form, of the Gen 34 narrative.

[289] Wilson argues that we know Shechem is young by the use of the term נער in reference to him. While there is considerable debate around whether an age range can be attached to נער, the narrative context does suggest Shechem is a younger as he "is unable to negotiate for the hand of Dinah without the assistance of his father, suggesting his inferior social power." *Making Men*, 54.

[290] Wilson, *Making Men*, 55.

dominant portrait of masculinity.[291] Shechem's father likewise falls short of the hegemonic ideal. On the one hand, Hamor fulfills his duty by brokering the marriage of his son. On the other hand, he was unable to keep his son from acting impetuously thereby putting Hamor and his family in a compromised position vis-a-vis Jacob's household.

Shechem is not just marked by his gender, he is also marked by his identity as a Hivite, and thus, descendant of Ham (Gen 10:6–17).[292] From the perspective of Genesis, which takes up the story of Israel's patriarchs, Shechem is Other, a Canaanite inhabiting the land given to Abraham and his descendants. Reading the story through a postcolonial lens, Dube argues that Shechem is portrayed as a "native" of Canaan "with uncontrolled sexual passions, attested by his "seeing and taking" Dinah by force— rape."[293] Dube states that the uncontrolled sexual passions of characters outside of the patriarchs' family (or, in Dube's words "natives") directed toward members of the patriarchs' family (or "colonizing travelers") is a common trope in the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History.[294] This trope is explored further in the next section, but here it is sufficient to say that Shechem's performance of masculinity must be considered alongside his tribal identity.[295]

---

[291] Wilson, *Making Men*, 33. Wilson follows Clines in including wisdom as a trait of hegemonic masculinity. Clines, "David the Man," 219–21.

[292] Randall C. Bailey notes that Ham is depicted as sexually deviant in "They're Nothing But Incestuous Bastards: The Polemical Use of Sex and Sexuality in Hebrew Canon Narratives," in *Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, vol. 1, eds. Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 133–37.

[293] Musa Dube, "Dinah (Genesis 34) At the Contact Zone: 'Shall Our Sister Become a Whore?'" in *Feminist Frameworks and The Bible: Power, Ambiguity, and Intersectionality*, eds. L. Juliana Claassens and Carolyn J. Sharp (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 52.

[294] Dube, "Dinah (Genesis 34) At the Contact Zone," 53. I have imposed the language of "Pentateuch" and "Deuteronomistic History" onto Dube's examples.

[295] Recalling the work of Connell presented in the methodology section of this dissertation. Connell, *Masculinities*, 80.

Why tell a story about sexual violence in which no man exhibits the traits of hegemonic masculinity? It is possible that stories with unfulfilled masculinity standards actually work to uphold hegemonic masculinity. The story of Dinah would thus demonstrate the adverse consequences of men not living up to the standards of hegemonic masculinity: abduction, rape, intercommunal violence, and chaos. The pattern of men failing to achieve the hegemonic ideal of masculinity followed by chaos and violence, as this dissertation demonstrates, is repeated in biblical narratives. When men fail to be "real men," everyone, and especially women, are harmed.

In addition to the gender politics at work in stories of sexual violence, one also finds evidence for communal politics, especially in the background of the narrative of Gen 34. Concerning the story's communal politics, Helena Zlotnick writes

> In the retelling of the affair of Dinah and Shechem the narrator turned a familial and intimate matter into a 'national' concern. The frontiers between the private and the public were deliberately blurred in order to convey a series of messages…In Dinah's case, marriage outside the boundaries of the paternal group presented insoluble problems… When intimate relations extend to men or women deemed by biblical narrators as 'foreigners,' and hence as potentially dangerous to genealogical and religious cohesion, drastic solutions are applied to resolve the situation. Shechem has to die."[296]

While Zlotnick's assessment of the scene between Shechem and Dinah as "an affair" as opposed to a case of sexual violence differs substantively from the view of this dissertation, she properly identifies that this story raises "national concerns."[297] Dinah becomes a symbol for her people

---

[296] Zlotnick, *Dinah's Daughters*, 48.

[297] The concept of a nation is most certainly modern, but I take Zlotnick's point that the matter affected a larger group of people who imagined themselves as a community with a common characteristics and a shared history.

(expressed in its "genealogical cohesion"), and Shechem becomes a symbol for his people (the "dangerous foreigners").[298]

There are several pieces of evidence within the narrative that suggest a concern with foreigners. At the opening of the story, Dinah goes out to meet the "daughters of the land" (בנות הארץ). The phrase is used only one other time in the Hebrew Bible when Rebekah expresses her concern over Jacob seeking a foreign woman from among the daughters of the land to be his wife (Gen 27:46).[299] By going out to mingle with those outside of Jacob's family, Dinah is opening the door to the potential for exogamous relationships, those feared by Rebekah. The daughters of the land are symbols of that fear. The act of Dinah's going out is not the problem; the daughters of the land whom she is going to see are the problem.

The text's concern with the Other can also be detected in the brother's highlighting the difference between their genitals and those of Shechem and his people (Gen 34:14). The rite of circumcision was introduced in Gen 17. The pericope acknowledges that "one purchased with money from any member of a foreign (people)" (מקנת-כסף מכל בן-נכר) might join Abraham's household through circumcision (Gen 17:12). The scenario in Gen 34 by which two tribes merge through circumcision is not addressed in the passage where the rite was introduced. Circumcision stands as a sign of the covenant (אות ברית) for Abraham and his descendants, and it accompanies a promise to be the rightful inhabitants of Canaan, including the city of Shechem (Gen 17:8, 11).

---

[298] Zlotnick's assessment can be fruitfully compared to Peterson's quote in the chapter on methodology. "Sexing Political Identities," 48.

[299] Fishbane also draws this connection between Gen 27 and 34 and "the concern with ethnic continuity and purity ("Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle," 35–36)." In personal correspondence, Schniedewind raised the possibility that Rebekah's concern about the "daughters of the land" might (also) signal a rural-urban divide and anxieties around urban and rural people mixing. There are certainly hints of this divide in the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic history (Gen 19 is an example). The possibility of the rural-urban divide cropping up in Gen 27 and 34 ought not to be ruled out.

When Jacob's sons invoke the right, they underscore the foreignness of the Shechemites and remind their own of their claim to the land.[300]

The concern regarding the "daughters of the land" and Jacob's son's acknowledgment of the physical manifestation of the difference between them and the Hivites is consistent with broader concerns about foreigners (Canaanites, Egyptians, etc.) in the book of Genesis.[301] Randall C. Bailey notes that these foreigners are often portrayed as "sexual deviants" adding a level of concern to any interactions with them. He notes that this portrayal of non-Israelites as "sexual deviants" is part of Genesis' literary strategy and "agenda of discrediting these individuals and nations and thereby sanctioning or sanctifying Israelite hatred and oppression of these people."[302] While Bailey does not include Gen 34 in his analysis, the pattern he identifies seems to hold true for the chapter. Shechem's rape of Dinah marks him as sexually deviant. Within the story, the rape then serves to justify the violence enacted against him, his father, and the people of the city at the hands of Jacob's sons. From the narrative's perspective, Jacob's sons might not be *ideal* men, but they are morally justified men in that they retaliated against the sexually deviant rapist.

---

[300] Fishbane finds a connection between the threat of the uncircumcised Hivites in Gen 34 and the uncircumcised Philistines in Gen 26. While I am compelled by his logic, I am hesitant to make the connection myself given Gen 26 does not mention circumcision. Fishbane, "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle," 35–36.

[301] Robert Cohn argues that concerns about Canaanites, Egyptians, etc. is a theme throughout Genesis and "the boundary between ancestors and natives [i.e., Canaanite] is defined" on sexual grounds. Robert L. Cohn, "Negotiating (with) the Natives: Ancestors and Identity in Genesis," *HTR* 96 (2003): 152.

[302] Bailey, "They're Nothing But Incestuous Bastards," 124. To support his claim, Bailey analyzes the stories of the endangered matriarch in Gen 12, 20, and 26. The patriarch's presumption in these stories (and indeed the logic of the narrative turns on this presumption) is that these foreign rulers are "sexual deviants" who would seize the chance to take advantage of the patriarchs' wives, even if in the end they do not. Bailey also looks at Lot's daughters who give birth to the incestuous peoples of Moab and Ammon in addition to the story of Ham uncovering Noah's nakedness.

The politics of sexual violence are also manifest in how the story is woven into Genesis' larger historical narrative. The composition of Genesis alongside various other works, including the first draft of the Deuteronomistic History, was a part of Hezekiah's "projection of royal power and ideology."[303] Schniedewind writes,

> The military vision of Hezekiah appears in the Book of Joshua. The narrative story of Joshua gives a utopian interpretation of the conquest of the entire land of Israel, both north and south. The inclusion of the north, and in fact, the emphasis on the north, is itself quite telling...It is also noteworthy that the famous covenant ceremony in Joshua 24, at which Joshua gathers all the tribes together to pledge their fidelity to YHWH, takes place in Shechem, the first capital of the northern kingdom.[304]

Schniedewind is right to underscore the significance of inclusion of the conquest of the north as well as the covenant ceremony held in Shechem in Josh 24. The story in Gen 34 only further underscores this claim to Shechem.[305] Shechem was won by the ancestors. Still, the mark of southern editing is clear: while Jacob's sons, Simeon and Levi, successfully take Shechem, their use of extreme violence disqualifies them from leading a people (Gen 49:5–7). That honor goes to Judah from whom David will arise and to whom the kings of the Judah point as their ancestor.

The historiographic project of Genesis and its use of a story of sexual violence toward that end has been critiqued by Dube. Although Dube reads the Genesis narrative as belonging to the exilic/post-exilic context, the main thrust of her overall assessment of the project has merit.[306] She writes, "the writers/ compilers/ editors of Genesis set out to weave a narrative that constructs

---

[303] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 76.

[304] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 80.

[305] Niels Peter Lemche offers a different historical context for this story and the mention of Shechem. He sees the story as functioning to "legitimate the reduction of Shechem's importance" after Jeroboam moved the capital from Shechem, or it was part of a much later anti-Samaritan polemic. *The Canaanites and Their Land: The Tradition of the Canaanites*, JSOT Sup 110 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 89.

[306] Dube, "Dinah (Genesis 34) At the Contact Zone," 51.

their own colonial dreams and desires, and that stretches into the whole Pentateuch: God will also make them a great nation; God will give them an occupied land; and God will make them a blessing to the world."[307] Schniedewind and Dube both recognize the purpose of the project was to project an image of a "great nation" and the "golden age" of an expansive kingdom. This story of sexual violence authorized that expansion into inhabited lands. After all, they were inhabited by uncircumcised sexual deviants. The story underscored the Otherness of the Hivites and marked a boundary between the "us" of Israel and the "them" of Canaan. As the story travels into new contexts, it is reworked to mark a new set of boundaries between communities.

2.2 LXX Genesis 34

A key moment in the reception history of Genesis was its translation into Greek as a part of the Septuagint.[308] Within the large (and often ill-defined) subset of literature called early Jewish literature, one finds writers interacting with traditions from Genesis, some using the work's translated form.[309] After providing an overview of LXX Genesis, this section examines LXX Gen 34 specifically, primarily focusing on difference between it and MT Gen 34. The purpose of this section is to identify relevant aspects of the Greek translation that shape its reception in other early Jewish literature.

Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva helpfully open their introduction to the Septuagint and Septuagint studies stating, "Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as *the Septuagint*."[310] Their

[307] Dube, "Dinah (Genesis 34) At the Contact Zone," 52.

[308] Concerning terminology, this dissertation uses Septuagint/LXX to refer specifically to the Greek Pentateuch and Old Greek/OG to Greek versions of other biblical books, not inclusive of books for which we only have a Greek version (i.e., Judith). For more on the ways these terms are deployed in scholarship see Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Publishing, 2015), 13–17.

[309] In the following section of this dissertation the reader will find direct quotes extracted from LXX Gen 34 and redeployed in their literary secondary setting.

[310] Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 14. Emphasis theirs.

succinct introduction properly alerts their readers to the complexities that underlie what is often presented as a unified Greek translation. While an in-depth analysis of the various manuscript witnesses to Greek Genesis is beyond the scope of the current study, it does take into account the pluriform nature of the tradition through the use of the Göttingen critical edition of LXX Genesis.[311] In so doing, this dissertation attempts to take seriously the nuances of the Greek text(s) and their history.

In minding the variations noted in the critical apparatus, this dissertation is also tacitly acknowledging a certain level of uncertainty concerning the Greek texts and their *Vorlage(n)*. The central question, quite possibly, in the study of LXX Genesis is whether the *Vorlage* is some early form of the MT (sometimes identified as "proto-MT" in some scholarly works).[312] In the notes to his critical edition, Wevers states that he operates "based on the presupposition that the parent text being translated was in the main much like the consonantal text of the MT."[313] The problem, of course, with Wevers' presupposition is that it fails to take into account the complicated textual history of the Pentateuch as demonstrated by some Qumran texts of the Pentateuch that "have clear affinities" with their Greek counterparts.[314] Maintaining perspective on the issue of the differences between MT Genesis and LXX Genesis is important, however. When compared to books like Jeremiah and Samuel, the differences between the Hebrew and

---

[311] John William Wevers, *Genesis LXXG-GEN*, SVTG 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974. For a discussion of which uncials and minuscules have proven most important for the study of LXX Genesis, see Susan Ann Brayford, *Genesis*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Boston: Brill, 2007), 6–12.

[312] Brayford, *Genesis*, 13; Emmanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 25.

[313] Wevers' notes, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), xiii.

[314] For a critique of Wevers work following this line of argumentation see Ronald S. Hendel, Review of *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* by John William Wevers, *JR* 75 (1995): 103–4. For a list of Pentateuchal manuscripts from Qumran that "have clear affinities with the Greek text(s) see Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 16.

Greek versions of the text are on a much smaller scale.[315] Therefore, one can simultaneously affirm the *relative* stability of the traditions found in Genesis, in both its Hebrew and Greek manifestations and that LXX Genesis might have a *Vorlage* that is different from the MT (or a proto-MT).

Textual questions are not the only questions surrounding the LXX. The question of what value the LXX was to the Greek-speaking Jewish communities that produced it in Egypt and used it across the Hellenistic world is also a central question. While some have held up the LXX as the "cornerstone" of Judaism during the Hellenistic period or its "determining principle," it is important to recognize that neither Judaism*s* nor *their* varied approaches to the LXX can be easily distilled to some sort of essence.[316] Given the diverse nature of Jewish communities during the Hellenistic period and their approaches to the LXX, it should come as no surprise that LXX Genesis is deployed in different and possibly mutually exclusive ways across the texts surveyed in this section.

Despite what one might describe as a high degree of correspondence between MT Genesis and LXX Genesis, a few variations between the texts merit highlighting especially as the variations which appear to influence other early Jewish interpretations of the Dinah narrative. One of the differences that merits attention is the writer's use of παρθένος to describe Dinah where the MT uses נערה (LXX Gen 34:3). Typically, in Greek versions of the Hebrew Bible, παρθένος is used where the MT uses בתולה whereas παῖς and νεᾶνις are used for נערה. Wevers

---

[315] Martin Rösel is quick to make this point in arguing for a position like Wevers. Martin Rösel, "The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis," BIOSCS 31 (1998): 62.

[316] For a critique of these totalizing approaches see Tessa Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 210–12. One of the central problems with speaking of Hellenistic Judaism in the singular is that it can properly be applied to geographically diverse communities across the Mediterranean and beyond over a period of hundreds of years.

suggests the use of παρθένος here (as well as in LXX Gen 24 to describe Rebekah) is because typically candidates for marriage are assumed to be virgins.[317] What is problematic about Wevers' explanation is that, assuming Dinah was a virgin at the start of the narrative, she is almost certainly not by the time this descriptor is applied to her in LXX Gen 34:3. This might suggest an understanding of παρθένος as relating to marital/age status as opposed to a sexual status.[318] Whatever the author's intent, the appellation παρθένος follows Dinah into other Greek works.

Another example of a translative choice that undoubtedly influences later writings is how the Greek writer expressed the incredulity of the brothers and the narrator in MT Gen 34:7. First, in reference to the "outrage," נבלה is translated by ἀσχήμων. According to Wevers the Hebrew term connotes folly while the Greek connotes shame.[319] This translational choice is likely one that has lead Susan Ann Brayford to argue that "this story more than most in Genesis, reflects the social and psychobiological aspect of the Mediterranean model of honor and shame, namely, that male honor depends on the degree to which men protect the sexual purity, i.e., shame, of their women."[320] Shame is a recurring concept in the story's reception. The final phrase in LXX Gen 34:7, καὶ οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται, also is worth noting. Wevers notes that "it does not translate the sense of the Hebrew," which reads וכן לא יעשה, "and thus it shall not be done," the difference, of course,

---

[317] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 348. Wevers explanation reflects his commitment to the idea that a proto-MT Genesis was the *Vorlage* of LXX Genesis.

[318] Mary F. Foskett, *A Virgin Conceived: Mary and Classical Representations of Virginity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 25. Foskett note that marital and sexual status are often not distinguished in Greek literature.

[319] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 560.

[320] Brayford, *Genesis*, 375. It should be noted that it is unclear whether Brayford's comments apply to the story in general or specifically the story as it exists in Greek. Given the comment's context within her commentary on the LXX Genesis, I have understood it to apply to the Greek text specifically.

being the sense of εἰμί (to be) and עשה (to do).[321] Like παρθένος, this translation of this final phrase is found in early Jewish literature redeploying the Dinah story.

One of the important continuities between the Hebrew and Greek text is the emphasis on the language of defilement (טמא and μιαίνω). One of the notable verses dealing with defilement is Gen 34:7. The first clause in the verse indicates that the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor with deceit. The second clause of the MT notes this is because "he defiled" Dinah their sister while most Greek manuscripts indicate the reason being that "they defiled" Dinah their sister. Wevers interprets this change as being prompted by the plural father and son in the first part of the verse.[322] One might also note, however, that the MT inflects טמא for a third plural subject in Gen 34:27. Either way, the Greek writers are considering the question of who is responsible for "defiling" Dinah.

Some Greek manuscripts of Genesis also consider Dinah's relationship to Simeon and Levi emphasizing that they are siblings of the same mother, Leah. Where MT Gen 34:14 is ambiguous regarding who is speaking to Shechem and Hamor, LXX Gen 34:14 notes that Simeon and Levi, the brothers of Dinah and sons of Leah are leading the discussion between the families. Simeon and Levi's status as sons of Leah, Jacob's wife as opposed to a maidservant, matters particularly for Joseph and Aseneth.

The final verse this section examines is LXX Gen 34:24 in which many Greek manuscripts include τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν, "the flesh of their foreskin," after περιετέμοντο, "they circumcised themselves." The inclusion of "the flesh of their foreskin" has

---

[321] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 560. Note that some versions of Greek text insert ειπον after καὶ.

[322] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 564.

no parallel in MT Gen 34:24, but an equivalent for the Greek phrase, בשר ערלת, does occur in MT Gen 17:14, 23, 24, and 25. Importantly, the phrase "to circumcise the flesh of one's foreskin" is not the most common way of discussing circumcision in Greek or in Hebrew as the verbs can stand on their own without an object, much less an object in construct with another noun. This phrase for circumcision as it appears in LXX Gen 34:24 is also invoked in an early Jewish writing that examines the permeability of communal boundaries through this rite.

Having reviewed some key features of the Greek text(s) of Genesis, the next section of this dissertation examines how Dinah's story was interpreted in early Jewish texts outside of the MT and LXX.

2.3 Early Reception

Political concerns are at play in Dinah's story. Within the context of Genesis, it reflects concerns about the boundary between the "us" of Israel and the "them" of Canaan, and within its historical setting it affirms a southern kingdom's right to the land where the perpetrator of sexual violence once lived. As I have shown, boundaries are at the heart of the story. Early Jewish audiences seemed to recognize this concern and used the story in order to construct their own boundaries. Some of these writings use the story to advocate for a tightening of boundaries while others use it to explore the permeability of the boundaries. Because this latter group is smaller and somewhat unique, this section examines it first and in greater depth. The group of writings that use the story to advocate for stricter boundaries are addressed after the smaller group.

2.3.1 Reversals and Permeable Boundaries

The two early Jewish works of Judith and Joseph and Aseneth both demonstrate a familiarity with LXX Gen 34 and weave aspects of it into their own stories.[323] Significantly, both

[323] For Judith's use of LXX Gen 34 see Judith Newman, "The Scripturalization of Prayer in Exilic and Second Temple Judaism," in *Prayers That Cite Scripture*, ed. James L. Kugel (Cambridge: Harvard University

works depict female protagonists, Judith and Aseneth, threatened by violence, sexual or otherwise physical. The writers identify their protagonists with Dinah and the violence she faced.[324] Judith and Aseneth, unlike Dinah, both evade a violent encounter through quick action, strength, and intervention from the divine who was conspicuously absent during Dinah's assault.[325] Moreover, they are given voices. Far from being silent (or silenced) victims, readers hear directly from the women and gain insight into their emotional response to the threat of violence. In addition to these two stories giving life and voice to their female characters and allowing them to escape sexual violence, they also use the Dinah story and the threat of sexual violence to explore communal boundaries in nuanced ways. Judith, like LXX Gen 34, establishes a hard boundary between "us" and "them" using sexual violence as a wedge to separate between the two, but it draws on the circumcision narrative thread in the Dinah story to explore permeability in the boundary. Joseph and Aseneth, on the other hand, imagines communal boundaries to be highly permeable and uses the LXX Gen 34 story and the threat of sexual violence to explore the extent of the permeabilities of those communal boundaries.

Judith is a Greek novel of the Hellenistic period (between the mid-second and mid-first centuries BCE) and is marked by its Jewish cultural and historical referents.[326] The novel is

---

Press, 2006), 161. For Joseph and Aseneth's use of LXX Gen 34 see Angela Standhartinger, "Recent Scholarship on Joseph and Aseneth (1988-2013)," *CBR* 12 (2014): 354.

[324] It is important to note, Judith is also heavily identified with Simeon from the LXX Gen 34 story. This dual identification of Judith with Dinah and Simeon is explored below.

[325] Angela Standhartinger, "Um zu sehen die Töchter des Landes: Die Perspektive Dinas in der Jüdischhellenistischen Diskussion um Gen 34," in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*, NovTSup 74, eds. Dieter Georgi, Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger (Boston: Brill, 1994), 112.

[326] For a discussion on Judith's genre see Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 71–76. For its specific Jewish character see Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015), 132–41 and Deborah Levine Gera, *Judith*, CEJL (Boston: DeGruyter, 2013), 11–12. For placing the Jewish novels within the broader tradition of ancient Greek novels see Lawrence M. Wills, "Jewish Novellas in a Greek and Roman Age: Fiction and

divided into two parts.[327] The first part (Jdt 1–7) introduces the reader to the story's imagined world, its topography, geopolitical situation as well as key characters in the empire.[328] After the Medes and Assyrians vie for supremacy in the Levant, and the Assyrians under their fictitious leader Nebuchadnezzar emerge victorious, Nebuchadnezzar and his general Holofernes enact a reign of terror on the region. They particularly target Bethulia, a small Judean town.[329] The town resists the Assyrian incursion. Before Holofernes besieges the town, he is warned by his Ammonite colleague, Achior, that the town might be defended by the God of its people. Holofernes rejects Achior and his claims since "Who is god if not Nebuchadnezzar?" (τίς ὁ θεὸς εἰ μὴ Ναβουχοδονοσόρ, Jdt 6:2). Achior is banished from the Assyrian camp, goes to Bethulia, and reports his exchange with Holofernes to the town leadership.

The second part focuses on Bethulia, and particularly one beautiful widow, Judith, within it who works for the town's salvation. Just as the leader of Bethulia is about to surrender to Holofernes under duress, Judith chastises the town leadership for its lack of trust in God. She

---

Identity," *JSJ* 42 (2011): 141–65 and Gera, *Judith*, 57–78. This dissertation relies on the Greek text of Judith found in Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, *According to the Septuagint*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1909). Finally, this dissertation follows Jeremy Corley's assessment that the original language of Judith is Greek with "Septuagintal style." See Jeremy Corley, "Septuagintalisms, Semitic Interference, and the Original Language of the Book of Judith," in *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac, S.J.*, CBQMS 44, eds. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008), 65–96. The date and provenance is discussed later in this section.

[327] Craven provides an excellent summary of the developments in scholarship regarding the structure of Judith, including her own seminal contributions on the bipartite structure see Toni Craven, "The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth-Century Studies of the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books," *CBR* 1.2 (2003): 201–2.

[328] Due to the true-to-life nature of the geographic and political details presented in this section, some scholars have attempted to assess the historicity of the book. For discussion of this see Moore, *Judith*, 38–49. The details, however, do not easily map onto historical evidence. Better than assuming the author was describing historical realia, it is more likely that they used the convoluted historical-like details to tell a " universal meta-historical tale." Gera, *Judith*, 28.

[329] As with the geopolitical situation and rulers described in the book, early twentieth century biblical scholars made an effort to locate this Judean town. Charles Torrey argued that Bethulia should be identified with the city of Shechem. Charles C. Torrey, "The Site of Bethulia," *JAOS* 20 (1899): 160–72. Gera points out that the name of the town is profitably associated with the Hebrew בתולה, "virgin," to highlight and amplify the threat of foreign violation (*Judith*, 31 and 304).

then prays, adorns herself, and enters the Assyrian's camp where she uses her wit, beauty, and deception to undermine Assyrian leadership. Ultimately, Judith is invited into Holofernes' tent where she faces the threat of sexual assault at the hands of the drunk general. The text gives an insight into Holofernes' mental state saying that "he was extremely desirous to have intercourse with her [Judith]," (κατεπίθυμος σφόδρα τοῦ συγγενέσθαι μετ' αὐτῆς, Jdt 12:16). Holofernes, however, ends up drinking too much to act out on his desires. While he is passed out upon his couch, Judith decapitates him and absconds with his head back to Bethulia. As a result of Judith's success, Achior the Ammonite comes to believe (ἐπίστευσεν) in the God of Israel and circumcises himself. Bethulia succeeds in its offensive against the Assyrians, and Judith is honored and joins a procession to Jerusalem. Years after these events, the book tells the reader she dies at an old age.

The book of Judith likely relies on the LXX (or something very close to it) as it uses material only known in the LXX and not the MT.[330] LXX Gen 34 figures particularly prominently into the book. Prior to entering the Assyrian camp, Judith prays to God and invokes the Dinah story, drawing connections between it, her own situation, and the threat Bethulia as well as the center of Jewish cult activity in Jerusalem (Jdt 9:1-14).[331] The text indicates that at the same time Judith covers her head with ashes and strips off her sackcloth to pray, in Jerusalem

[330] Gera, *Judith*, 89-91. For examples of its use of LXX quotations see Jdt 9:2 and LXX Gen 34:7. See notes on LXX Gen 34:7 above. Thiessen also believes the author(s) of Judith had access to LXX Genesis but cautions against using the language of "rewritten Bible" for its anachronism in this context see Matthew Thiessen, "Protecting the Holy Race and Holy Space: Judith's Reenactment of the Slaughter of Shechem," *JSJ* 49 (2018): 165n1.

[331] Judith Newman notes the prayer also cites Exod 15 and Isa 36–39. Newman, "The Scripturalization of Prayer," 16.

the incense is brought into the temple paralleling Judith's body with the temple of God.[332] The reference to the Dinah story is found in Judith's prayer, which reads:[333]

> [9:2] O Lord, God of my father Simeon, in whose hand you gave a sword for vengeance upon foreigners, those who destroyed the womb virgin's womb[334] for defilement, stripped naked her thigh for shame, and desecrated her womb for disgrace.[335] For you said, "It shall not be so," but they did it. [3] Therefore, you handed over their rulers for slaughter, and their bed, having been deceived for blood, was ashamed by their deceit,[336] and you struck down the slaves in addition to rulers and rulers upon their thrones. [4] You handed over their wives for plunder, [their] daughters for captivity, and all of their spoils for distribution among the sons loved by you, those who were extremely zealous for you and loathed the defilement of their blood and called upon you for help.

Although Dinah and Shechem are not named in Judith's prayer, her prayer's connection to the Dinah story is forged by her mention of Simeon, a sword, vengeance upon foreigners, and a virgin, all of which relate to the Gen 34 narrative.[337] The prayer's use of a direct quotation from LXX Gen 34:7, "It shall not be so" (καὶ οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται), leaves little room for doubt that the writer is dependent on the Greek translation of Genesis.[338]

---

[332] Gera notes that the language used to describe Judith placing ashes on her head exactly mirrors that used in LXX 2 Sam 13:19 to describe Tamar putting ashes on her head after her brother raped her identifying Judith with another woman who was sexually assaulted. Gera, *Judith*, 301.

[333] The translation of Jdt 9:2–4 is my own.

[334] The particular phrase used here, ἔλυσαν μήτραν, is an odd phrase. Some commentators have suggested amending μήτραν to μίτραν and reading thus, "loosening a virgin's girdle" as a euphemism for intercourse.

[335] The Greek does not include "her" (αὐτοῦ) for the thigh and womb, but I have added it for greater clarity. Most certainly the writer is referring to the thigh and womb of the virgin (Gera, *Judith*, 306).

[336] The Greek in this section of the prayer (their bed...blood) is very unclear and further confused by variant readings. The source of the anthropomorphized bed's shame is unclear as is the reference to deceit. Gera, *Judith*, 308–9; Moore, *Judith*, 191.

[337] Newman notes that "the author's larger typological purpose" is served by leaving Shechem and Dinah unnamed. The two can stand for what the writer needs them to stand for. Newman, "The Scripturalization of Prayer," 18.

[338] It is noteworthy that LXX Gen 34:7 alters the sense of MT Gen 34:7. MT Gen 34:7 uses an imperfect form of עשה (do/make) and LXX Gen 34:7 uses a future indicative form of εἰμί (to be), the difference being "it shall not be done" and "it shall not be." This underscores Judith's use of the Greek text over a Hebrew version. See Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 560.

The primary literary device Judith uses to bring together the stories of Dinah and Judith is the prayer translated above. The prayer, put into the mouth of Judith, can be described as "typological."[339] Characters and elements from the Dinah narrative as presented in LXX Gen 34 prefigure those in the book of Judith. Judith's character, her and her town's precarious situation, as well as the enemies they face can be viewed through the prism of Dinah's story. In the prayer, Judith explicitly identifies herself with Simeon, her ancestor, asking God to give her a sword like the one given to her forebear (Jdt 9:2).[340] She also, though less explicitly, identifies with Dinah as a vulnerable woman going into foreign land knowing she might face a similar fate as Dinah.[341] Judith's prayer indicates that she knows she is in a vulnerable position and needs the divine intervention Dinah did not receive (Jdt 9:9–11).

After Judith prays, she "goes out" (ἐξῆλθεν, Jdt 10:10) toward the Assyrian encampment with language evocative of Dinah's own going out in LXX Gen 34:1.[342] Like Dinah, Judith captures the attention of the men of the city, and particularly one Shechem-like character, Holofernes. Like Simeon, however, she violently wields the sword against Holofernes (Jdt 13:6–

[339] Newman, "The Scripturalization of Prayer," 18; Thiessen, "Protecting the Holy Race and Holy Space," 183n44.

[340] Amy-Jill Levine, "Sacrifice and Salvation: Otherness and Domestication in the Book of Judith," in *Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna*, FCB, ed. Athalya Brenner-Idan (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 211. Judith's identification with Simeon and willingness to play the role of a community defender has raised questions about her gender performance. For comments on Judith's gender performance see Caryn Tamber-Rosenau, "Biblical Bathing Beauties and the Manipulation of the Male Gaze: What Judith Can Tell Us About Bathsheba and Susanna," *JFSR* 33.2 (2017): 55–72 and Levine, "Sacrifice and Salvation," 208–24.

[341] Some scholars have taken her explicit identification with Simeon to mean that she cannot also be identified with Dinah. For examples see Benedikt Eckhardt, "Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonean Politics," *JSP* 18.4 (2009): 254; Gera, *Judith*, 101 and 303. Also, Carey Moore's personal correspondence with D.N. Freedman contra Moore's own assessment, Moore, *Judith*, 191. These scholars' readings reflect the logic of a strict typology, a one-to-one correspondence between the Dinah story and the Judith novel. Judith's use of the Dinah story, howver, is more complex than a strict typology with overlapping correspondences. In her prayer, and in the novel as a whole, Judith seems to identify with *both* Dinah and Simeon.

[342] Standhartinger, "Um zu sehen die Töchter des Landes," 109.

9). In her prayer she valorizes Simeon and his brothers taking the Shechemite wives and daughters into captivity (Jdt 9:4).[343] Angela Standhartinger has argued, "Indem Judith sowohl die Rolle Simeons als auch die Rolle Dinas in Gen 34 einnimmt, kann sie Dina jedoch aus ihrer Passivität befreien, in die der größte Teil der Genesiserzählung Leas Tochter drängt."[344] Judith's dual identification with Simeon and Dinah ultimately "frees" Dinah.[345]

On a symbolic level Judith, like Dinah, is also identified with her land and her people. Judith's name suggests as much. *Ioudeith* (Ἰουδεὶθ), Judith, is the Graecized version of the Hebrew יהודית meaning Judean/Jew in the feminine form. While the name does not necessarily have to be symbolic of Judith's representation of her people, some narrative elements point to the fact that her name does in fact have symbolic value, including her genealogical association with Israel/Jacob (Jdt 8:1), traditional associations between Judah and widowhood (e.g. Lam 1:1), and her pious adherence to Judah's customs and knowledge of its history (Jdt 8:5–6, 8:11–27, 9:1–14).[346] Most compelling, however, is how Judith deploys the Dinah story, and particularly its sexual violence to forge the connection between Judith and her community. Like Judith is

[343] Levine, "Sacrifice and Salvation," 211. Amy-Jill Levine contrasts this with Dinah who went out to see the Shechemite women. Judith not standing in solidarity with other women in vulnerable positions seems like a betrayal of sorts, but Judith would not be the first woman to side with nation over gender. This line in the prayer is reminiscent of Judg 5:30 in which Sisera's mother valorizes the men seizing women.

[344] Standhartinger, "Um zu sehen die Töchter des Landes," 109.

[345] Levine argues that Judith ought not to be too closely identified with Dinah. In valorizing Jacob's sons taking the Shechemite women as plunder (Jdt 9:4), Judith 'rhetorically severs' the ties between her and Dinah as well as her and other (Gentile) women in her prayer. While Dinah goes out to look closely at or become acquainted with (καταμαθεῖν, LXX Gen 34:1) the women of the city, Judith praises Israel's men for taking them as plunder (Jdt 9:4). Levine's assessment assumes the Genesis text (MT or LXX) is clear on Dinah's thoughts about or intentions toward the women of Shechem. They are not, however. In her prayer, Judith takes the position of tribe over gender. Judith's comments on the Shechemite women does not create distance between her and Dinah, but it might provide insight as to how the author of Judith interpreted Dinah's rather ambiguous action at the beginning of the Genesis story. Levine, "Sacrifice and Salvation," 211.

[346] For the counter argument to Judith's name being symbolic see Moore, *Judith*, 179. For a review of the ways Judith, albeit imperfectly, functions as a symbol for Israel including her name, gender, widowhood, and piety see Levine, "Sacrifice and Salvation," 210–16. Levine ultimately argues that Judith "can only incompletely represent Israel." "Sacrifice and Salvation," 211.

identified with a community through her name, the author of Judith connects Dinah to the community by referring to her only as a virgin (παρθένος), the same Greek word used to describe Dinah in LXX Gen 34:3 (Jdt 9:2).[347] This Greek word is a typical translation for the Hebrew בתולה that is phonographically related to the name of the town Βετυλουὰ, Bethulia.[348]

In addition to identifying Judith with Simeon, Dinah, and the land, the prayer as well as other parts of the novel use the story of Dinah to reflect upon the threat foreign men pose to women within the community. In her prayer, Judith underscores both the violence Dinah endured as well as the Otherness of the perpetrators. In line with other interpretive traditions, Judith understands the sexual violence Dinah endured to have been undertaken by more than one perpetrator as marked by the plural relative pronoun οἳ and the plural verbs (Jdt 9:2). Like MT/LXX Gen 34, Judith uses a series of three verbs to describe the assault, but the series is decidedly more violent in tone (λύω, γυμνόω, βεβηλόω) than the series used in MT Gen 34:2 (לקח, שכב, ענה) and LXX Gen 34 (λαμβάνω, κοιμάω, ταπεινόω).[349] Moreover, it concisely expresses the detrimental results of the foreigners' (αλλογενείς) actions, including defilement, shame, and disgrace.[350] With reference to the language, Deborah Gera notes, "In recent years,

---

[347] Levine argues that referring to Dinah as "virgin" and not her name "[robs her] of her personhood" and ultimately works to sever the ties between Judith and Dinah. "Sacrifice and Salvation," 211. Newman argues that the exclusion of names serves the author's typological purpose. Newman, "The Scripturalization of Prayer," 18. Both the dehumanizing effect and the typological purpose can be held together in tension. The writer might have intended the nameless Dinah to serve a typological purpose, but the authorial decision also had a dehumanizing effect. I do not agree with Levine, however, that the move works to "sever the ties" between Dinah and Judith; rather, Judith is transforming the Dinah character through her identification with her.

[348] Gera, *Judith*, 304; Standhartinger, "Um zu sehen die Töchter des Landes," 108–9.

[349] Gera, *Judith*, 305–6.

[350] I have analyzed these as result clauses because LXX Gen 34 understands defilement (μίασμα in Jdt 9:2 connected to μιαίνω appearing in LXX Gen 34:5) and disgrace (ὄνειδος Jdt. 9:2 and LXX Gen 34:14) to be the result of Shechem's actions or the result of the proposed marriage respectively. On defilement (μίασμα, μιαίνω) see Gera, *Judith*, 306 and Thiessen, "Protecting the Holy Race and Holy Space," 167. One might also make a lexical case for shame (αἰσχύνην Jdt 9:2 and ἄσχημον LXX Gen 34:7) being the result of the rape in both texts; however,

several scholars have suggested that Dinah was not actually raped by Shechem, arguing that the verb ענה in Gen 34:2 refers to illicit sex, rather than rape…Judith's graphic description of defilement, pollution, and blood here makes it plain that she (and her author) understood that Dinah was violated against her will."[351] The verse recounting the violence Dinah faced leaves no doubt about how one is to morally assess the actions of the foreigners. The end of Jdt 9:2 takes the words Jacob's sons spoke, "It shall not be so" (οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται, LXX Gen 34:7) and places them in the mouth of the divine as last word on the outrage the foreigners had committed.

In addition to underscoring the violence and its consequences, Judith's prayer also highlights the assailants' foreign status (αλλογενείς, Jdt 9:2).[352] For Judith, foreigners are problematic because intercourse with them results in "the defilement of their [Jacob's sons'] blood" (μίασμα αἵματος αὐτῶν, Jdt 9:4). With respect to Judith's assessment on foreigners, Matthew Thiessen writes,

> Sexual intercourse with a foreigner, according to Judith, creates a pollution in the womb of Dinah, one that has potential consequences for the entire family of Jacob: were Dinah to conceive through Shechem, Jacob's family would have polluted blood—a mixture of foreign and Israelite blood that would threaten to dissolve the boundary separating Israel from the nations.[353]

Thiessen's assessment is in line with the broader arguments in this dissertation around the function of the telling—and retelling—of sexually violent stories in early Jewish literature, namely, to explore communal boundaries. In Judith's assessment, the problem with the sexual

---

the Greek words used to express shame in each text do not share a common root even if there is some overlap in their semantic ranges.

[351] Gera, *Judith*, 305–6.

[352] James Kugel lists and summarizes other Second Temple texts that discuss Shechem's/the Shechemites' foreignness. See James Kugel, *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 236–38. See also Gera, *Judith*, 305.

[353] Thiessen, "Protecting the Holy Race and Holy Space," 168.

violence is the larger threat it posed to the community and their own sense of purity.[354] Through her retelling of the Dinah story using provocative language around defilement and her specific reference to the Shechemites' foreignness, Judith more clearly articulates communal concerns around sexual violence and communal boundaries.

In addition to the direct reference to the Dinah story in Judith's prayer, Judith nods to the LXX Gen 34 story in its use of a relatively rare phrase concerning circumcision in a narrative context that describes permeable communal boundaries. After Judith returns triumphant to Bethulia with Holofernes' head, she asks Achior the Ammonite, Holofernes' former colleague, to verify she had in fact executed the general. Seeing what God accomplished through Judith, Achior believes in God and circumcises "the flesh of his foreskin" (καὶ περιετέμετο τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ, Jdt 14:10).[355] Judith's use of the phrase "the flesh of his foreskin" as the object of the verb "circumcise" περιτέμνω is relatively rare in early Jewish literature. In general, the verb does not demand the object, foreskin, be specified as "foreskin" can be assumed in most contexts. Although not demanded by the verb, the object phrase does appear a few times outside of Judith, four times in LXX Gen 17 when the circumcision rite is introduced to Abraham (17:11, 14, 24, 25), once in LXX Lev 12:3 to describe when boys shall be circumcised, and finally once in LXX Gen 34:24 in reference to the Shechemites, a group of foreigners,

---

[354] Thiessen demonstrates that concerns about communal purity extend beyond *Judith* and can be found in other Second Temple literature including Ezra 9, Neh 13, Sir 47, and Jub. 30. Thiessen, "Protecting the Holy Race and Holy Space," 168.

[355] A detailed examination of the character of Achior is outside the scope of this dissertation; however, there are focused studies on this topic including Pieter M. Venter, "The Function of the Ammonite Achior in the Book of Judith," *HvTSt* 67 (2011): 224–33; Friedrich V. Reiterer, "'Meines Bruders Licht:' Untersuchungen zur Rolle des Achior," in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits (Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 111–61; Catherine Vialle, "Achior L'Ammonite: Une Conversion Au Judaïsme Peu Banale Dans Le Livre De Judith," *BZ* 55.2 (2011): 257–64; Roger Gil and Eberhard Bons, "Judith 5:5–21 Ou Le Récit D'Akhior: Les Mémoires Dans La Construction De L'identité Narrative Du Peuple D'Israël," *VT* 64 4 (2014): 573–87.

attempting to join Jacob and his family to become "one people."[356] The use of the phrase in Judith, like its use in LXX Gen 34:24, is in reference to Achior, a foreigner, joining Judith's people. Given the other references to LXX Gen 34 in Judith as well as the similar contexts for the phrase's use in the two books, it is likely the repeated phrase is intentional and meant to invite the reader to read the stories together. This invitation to intertextual analysis is further solidified by Achior's passing reference to the fate of the Shechemites in Jdt 5:16 as he described the history of Israel and its God to Holofernes. In the larger context of references to LXX Gen 34, Achior's reference to Israel "driving out" the Shechemites invites the reader to see the two contrasting fates of the two. The Shechemites and Achior both circumcise "the flesh of their foreskin." While Achior is joined to the House of Israel after their circumcision, the Shechemites are slaughtered by the sword. Judith reverses the fate of the Shechemites through Achior.

Through the scene of the circumcision of Achior that alludes to LXX Gen 34 the novel of Judith explores the permeability of communal boundaries. In MT/LXX Gen 34, Jacob's sons held out the rite of circumcision as a way of joining their community; however, their offer was insincere. Although the Shechemite men performed the rite, they were still denied entry. Judith, in contrast to MT/LXX Gen 34, portrays Achior, an Ammonite mercenary general in Holofernes' army, receiving sanctuary among the Judeans prior to his circumcision and inclusion in the community through circumcision. Achior's presence within the story nuances its position on foreigners and creates a tension in its use of the LXX Gen 34 narrative.[357] On the one hand, it

[356] Catherine Vialle notes the lexical connection between Jdt 14:10 and LXX Gen 34:24 and contrasts the positive assessment of Achior's circumcision with that of the Shechemites. Vialle's observation is astute but demands further analysis. Vialle, "Achior L'Ammonite," 262.

[357] For more on how Achior's presence softens an otherwise harsh polemic against foreigners/Gentiles demonstrating that the righteous Other can join Israel see Adolfo Roitman, "Achior in the Book of Judith: His Role and Significance," in *"No One Spoke III of Her:" Essays on Judith*, ed. James Vanderkam (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 39.

affirms Simeon and his brother's use of violence against those on the outside of the community. It describes those on the outside as a vector of defilement in the bloodline. On the other hand, Judith subverts the LXX Gen 34 narrative by offering, in good faith, circumcision and inclusion in the community to a foreigner.

The novel's inclusion of a foreigner in the community should be qualified. Achior is no Shechem, and neither is he Holofernes. One might argue that Achior's personal qualities make him a good candidate for inclusion. He demonstrates knowledge of Israel's past in his speech to Holofernes (Jdt 5:5-21). Achior shows he is interested in helping Bethulia and its cause (Jdt 6:16-17) and is indeed welcomed into the community because of this (Jdt 6:20). Finally, he demonstrates belief in the God of Israel (Jdt 14:10) before he is circumcised. To further contrast him with other foreigner men in the book, Achior shows he is no threat by not putting up a fight against the sons of Israel who find him abandoned by Holofernes (Jdt 6:14) and even faints at the sight of the dead Holofernes' head Judith and her female servant brought back (Jdt 14:6–7).[358] Achior is unfazed by Judith's beauty showing no sexual interest in her.[359] Furthermore, Achior is a single person, not a group or representative of his group.[360] Nonetheless, his inclusion in Bethulia's community of Judeans is significant. The novel notes that Achior "was added to the house of Israel" (προσετέθη εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ).[361] Keeping in mind Judith is in conversation with LXX Gen 34, one can see the story of Achior serving as a reversal of sorts for the fate of the Shechemites. While Judith valorizes Jacob's sons for taking the Shechemite women captive (Jdt

[358] For observations on Achior's weakness see Gera, *Judith*, 414.

[359] Gera, *Judith*, 414. Gera notes that Achior is "oblivious to [Judith's] charms."

[360] Gera, *Judith*, 421.

[361] Προστίθημι is also used in LXX Est 9:27 to describe Gentiles who had been added to the community.

9:4), the novel raises questions about their duplicitous use of circumcision by demonstrating that the rite is a legitimate way for an ethnic outsider to join their ranks.

Judith's tension around communal boundaries reflects the political and social milieu of its time. Judith is comfortably dated between the mid-second and mid-first centuries BCE.[362] It was likely composed in Palestine while the region was under either Maccabean or later Hasmonean rule.[363] Scholars have been divided on whether the book presents a pro- or anti-Hasmonean perspective.[364] The fact that the political orientation of the novel vis-a-vis the leadership of Palestine is unclear might indicate that, with respect to the book's politics, its position on Hasmonean rule is indeed not its main point. Through the novel's polemical prayer and the character of Achior the novel appears to be engaging in a larger debate around "the sons of Israel's" relationships with "foreigners."[365]

The politics of the Hasmonean period raised several questions of boundaries as the kingdom navigated a relationship with the powerful Greek Seleucid empire as well as its own expansionist activities into border regions. Through a reexamination of a past episode of sexual violence in Israel's history identifying the characters of the past with actors in the imagined

---

[362] Moore, *Judith*, 67; Gera, *Judith*, 39–40. Wills argues for the earlier end of that timeline, *The Jewish Novel*, 142.

[363] On provenance see Gera, *Judith*, 95.

[364] Gera, *Judith*, 41.

[365] Concerning terminology in Judith, Jdt 6:1 uses ἀλλόφυλοι as a catch-all term for the foreign forces assembled by Holofernes. Jdt 9:2 uses ἀλλογενής in reference to the Shechemites, whom the prayer identifies with invading forces threatening Bethulia see Thiessen, "Protecting the Holy Race,"168–70. Echoing the LXX, *Judith* uses υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ to refer to the inhabitants of Palestine. Jdt 4:1, 8; 5:1, 23; 6:10, 14; 7:1, 4, 6, 10, 17, 19; 8:1; 10:8, 19; 15:3, 5, 7, 8; 16:25. See Gera, *Judith*, 95. It also uses γένος Ἰσραὴλ Jdt. 6:2; 9:14. For an overview of the questions around the relationship between Jews and others during the Hasmonean period see Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*, HCS 30 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, repr. 2019), 1–40, and Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, HCS 31 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 110–29.

present, Judith affirms a boundary between its community and the foreign empire the novel aligns with the historic Shechemites.[366] At the same time, Judith uses the Dinah story in a way to nuance its rather draconian posture toward foreigners presented in Judith's recapitulation of the story in her prayer. Achior the Ammonite is welcomed into the Bethulian fold. The use of the circumcision motif presented in LXX Gen 34 in Judith represents a striking departure from the exclusionary message of the former, but not an unsurprising departure given Judith's sociohistorical context. From 135–103 BCE, the Hasmonean dynasty incorporated Idumaeans and Ituraeans, some willingly and others by force and possibly through forced circumcision.[367] Scholars have taken different positions on whether Judith endorses the expansionist policies of the Hasmonean dynasty.[368] The novel's stance on policy, however, is likely not the main point. The more salient point is that the novel can imagine a world in which an Ammonite—albeit an exceptional one— can join a Jewish community through circumcision.[369] This represents a departure from the socio-historical setting of Genesis.

Like Judith reverses the fate of Dinah, challenges some themes found in LXX Gen 34, and depicts a permeable communal boundary, Joseph and Aseneth also reverses aspects of the

[366] Wills argues that the dynamic between an empire and a small Judean population explored in Judith is a narrative catalyst used to explore Jewish identity, a technique detectable across Jewish texts written between the second and first centuries BCE. Wills, "Jewish Novellas in a Greek and Roman Age," 154. For Wills' dating of Judith see "Jewish Novellas in a Greek and Roman Age," 160.

[367] On Hasmonean expansion generally see Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 24–26. On (forced) conversion see Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 136–37 and Steven Weitzman, "Forced Circumcision and the Shifting Role of Gentiles in Hasmonean Ideology," *HTR* 92 (1999): 37–59.

[368] Benedikt Eckhardt sees the text as anti-Hasmonean because it depicts willing as opposed to forced conversion, Eckhardt, "Reclaiming Tradition," 258. Steven Weitzman argues that the scene might reflect the pro-Hasmonean sentiments of the author writing, "Indeed, it is conceivable that the Achior scene was actually written in the days of Hyrcanuos or his immediate successors precisely to show that anti-Gentile violence was not incompatible with the conversion of locals." Weitzman, "Forced Circumcision," 57–58.

[369] Michael Venter also reflects on the meaning of Achior's conversion vis-a-vis Jewish identity in light of Judith's socio-historical setting. Venter, "The Function of the Ammonite Achior," 8.

Dinah story and portrays permeable communal boundaries. Joseph and Aseneth is a complicated story with a rich and variegated manuscript tradition.[370] The narrative of Joseph and Aseneth explores how Joseph, son of Jacob, comes to marry Aseneth, an Egyptian woman, as briefly mentioned in MT/LXX Genesis (Gen 41:45, 50 and 46:20). The story is divided into two parts. The first part (Jos. Asen. 1–21) is a story about Aseneth's "conversion" to the living God, and the second part (Jos. Asen. 22–29) describes Pharaoh's son's jealousy-motivated plot to take Aseneth from Joseph.[371] Joseph and Aseneth opens with an introduction to some of the main characters and setting. The characters include Pentephres, a priest of Heliopolis, advisor to Pharaoh (Jos. Asen. 1:3), his beautiful daughter Aseneth who shares more features in common with the Hebrews than the Egyptians but is devoted to Egyptian gods (Jos. Asen. 1:5, 2:3), Pharaoh, and his son. Pharaoh's son appeals to his father to marry Aseneth (Jos. Asen. 1:7), and Pharaoh denies his son's appeal (Jos. Asen. 1:8–9). Joseph, while visiting Egypt's territories on behalf of Pharaoh, comes to Pentephres' home (Jos. Asen. 1:1, 3:2). Pentephres knows Joseph's reputation; thus, he asks Aseneth to marry him, but Aseneth refuses citing Joseph's faults among them his status as a foreign man (ἀνδρὶ ἀλλογενεῖ) (Jos. Asen. 4:7–12). Aseneth, however, feels

[370] Several scholars have cogently argued that the story should be called Aseneth. I tend to agree with these scholars. However, the SBL Handbook of Style still maintains the story's title is Joseph and Aseneth; therefore, this study will use its traditional name. For more on the name see Patricia D. Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt: The Composition of a Jewish Narrative* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020), 1n1. Calling Joseph and Aseneth "a story" is somewhat misleading. It is a set of manuscripts existing in groups that recount more or less of a core narrative each with their own particular features. Ahearne-Kroll describes Joseph and Aseneth as a fabula by which she means "a story that consists of irreducible components…that are organized in particular, causal, and chronological ways." Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 134. This dissertation relies on Uta Barbara Fink's reconstruction of Joseph and Aseneth based upon Christoph Burchard's 2008 edition. Uta Barbara Fink, "Joseph und Aseneth," in *Joseph und Aseneth*, ed. Eckart Reinmuth (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 56–129. For a critique of Fink and Burchard's work see Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 77–116.

[371] While some scholars use the language of conversion to discuss Aseneth's experience in Jos. Asen. 1–21, Jill Hicks-Keeton argues transformation is a more appropriate word. See Jill Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth: Gentile Access to Israel's Living God in Jewish Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 9n15. Angela Standhartinger also explores the challenges with the language of conversion in "Recent Scholarship on Joseph and Aseneth (1988-2013)," *CBR* 12 (2014): 365. John J. Collins describes the bipartite division of *Joseph and Aseneth* in *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 108.

remorse when she sees Joseph for the first time (Jos. Asen. 6:1-8). During Joseph's visit, he and Aseneth meet, but Joseph rejects a kiss from her on the grounds that it is not fitting to worship the living God (τὸν θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα) and kiss a foreign woman (γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν) (Jos. Asen. 8:5). Joseph then blesses Aseneth in the name of the God of his father Israel and leaves (Jos. Asen. 8:9, 9:5).

After Joseph leaves, Aseneth goes into a period of self-abasement and mourning, crying out to God and confessing her sinfulness (Jos. Asen. 10:1–13:15). During her confession she is visited by an angel who instructs her to change out of her mourning clothes and informs her that her name has been written in the Book of Life (τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν ζώντων), that she will be given a new life (ἀναζωοποιηθήσῃ), and that she and Joseph will marry (Jos. Asen. 15:4–6). Aseneth is also given a new name, the City of Refuge (πόλις καταφυγῆς) that proves to be predictive of her future pacifistic actions and significant for the story's message (Jos. Asen. 15:7).[372] The angel spends time teaching Aseneth and performing signs for her before he is taken up by a fiery chariot (Jos. Asen. 17:8). When Joseph returns, he does marry Aseneth with Pharaoh as the officiant (Jos. Asen. 18:1–21:8). Aseneth bears Joseph two sons (Jos. Asen. 21:9) and sings a confessional song (Jos. Asen. 21:9–21).

In the second part, the narrative picks up with Pharaoh's son, his obsession with Aseneth, and his attempts to enlist Joseph's brothers into his plot to capture Aseneth. Forced to move to Egypt by famine, Jacob and his sons settle near Joseph where Aseneth meets them for the first time (Jos. Asen. 22:1–10). She forms a special bond with Levi (Jos. Asen. 22:11–13). When Pharaoh's son sees Joseph and Aseneth passing by, he is enraged and says to himself echoing the

[372] Aseneth's name change receives more attention at the end of this section.

words of LXX Gen 34:7, "it shall not be so" (οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται, Jos. Asen. 23:1).[373] At this point Pharaoh's son solicits the help of Simeon and Levi. He informs them that he knows about their slaughter of the Shechemites and invites them to help him fight Joseph in exchange for wealth (Jos. Asen. 23:2–5). They passionately deny his offer invoking the story of Dinah (Jos. Asen. 23:6–17). Pharaoh's son then turns to Joseph's brothers, Dan, Gad, Asher, and Naphtali, the sons of the maidservants, Billah and Zilpah. He informs them Joseph has spoken poorly of them, convinces them to join him, and they set out to ambush Aseneth (Jos. Asen. 24:1–20). When Aseneth comes by carriage, the brothers and the men given to them by Pharaoh's son ambush her, but she manages to flee (Jos. Asen. 26:5). Levi and his brothers with their swords in hand go after Aseneth (Jos. Asen. 26:6). Aseneth prays for help realizing that she is approaching Pharaoh's son (Jos. Asen. 26:8). Appearing unexpectedly, Benjamin leaps out of Aseneth's carriage and flings a stone at Pharaoh's son hitting him in the temple, injuring him severely (Jos. Asen. 27:2–3). Dan, Gad, Asher, and Naphtali proceed to go after Benjamin and Aseneth, but the two are miraculously rescued by God (Jos. Asen. 27:7–11). The sons of Leah, including Simeon and Levi, approach Dan, Gad, Asher, and Naphtali ready to harm them, but Aseneth intercedes on her attackers' behalf conceptually providing them refuge (Jos. Asen. 27:6–28:17). The story closes with an unsuccessful attempt by Levi to save Pharaoh's son (Jos. Asen. 29:1–9).

Like Judith, Joseph and Aseneth is originally composed in Greek and the language is "highly influenced" by the LXX/OG.[374] One of the stories that influenced the shape of the

[373] Some manuscripts do not include this phrase see *OTP* 2:239n23d.

[374] Standhartinger, "Recent Scholarship," 354. While many other facts about the novel's origins and composition draws controversy among scholars, its influence from LXX/OG has not. See Michael Kochenash, "Trojan Horses: The Counterintuitive Use of Dinah, Helen, and Goliath in Joseph and Aseneth," *JSJ* 52 (2021): 417–18; Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 24; Ross Shephard Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph a Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 22-42; Randall D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*, JSPSup 16, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 70. Manuel Vogel, "Einführung in die Schrift," in *Joseph und Aseneth*, ed. Eckart

narrative, and in particular the second part of the narrative, is LXX Gen 34.[375] From the Dinah story, Joseph and Aseneth is primarily and most explicitly concerned with Simeon and Levi's role in avenging their sister, but other less explicit allusions to the LXX Gen 34 story can be teased out. With respect to Simeon and Levi, Pharaoh's son recounts that Shechem "was overthrown by their right hands" (ἐν ταῖς δεξιαῖς ὑμῶν ταύταις κατέστραπται, Jos. Asen. 23:2) when he solicits their help to battle Joseph. Simeon and Levi respond to Pharaoh's son saying, "Behold! Have you seen these swords? With these two swords the Lord God avenged (ἐξεδίκησε) the damage (τὴν ὕβριν) of the Shechemites which they damaged (ὕβρισαν) the sons of Israel because of our sister Dinah whom Shechem the son of Hamor defiled (ἐμίανε) (Jos. Asen. 23:14)."[376] Simeon and Levi's statement is the most explicit reference to the narrative of LXX Gen 34 and mimicks the story's language of defilement. The most explicit linguistic parallel to LXX Gen 34 is the direct quote of LXX Gen 34:7 in Jos. Asen. 23:1, "it shall not be so" (οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται) uttered by Pharaoh's son upon seeing Joseph with Aseneth.

Joseph and Aseneth alludes to the Dinah story in less explicit ways as well. Michael Kochenash argues that both Aseneth and Dinah "enter into their [Pharaoh's son and Shechem's] sight in an incidental manner" and that seeing kicks off a series of violent events.[377] Kochenash further argues that "those who associate the actions of the son of Pharaoh in Jos. Asen. 23 with

---

Reinmuth (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 6. For a sustained defense of Joseph and Aseneth's origins in Hebrew see Paul Riessler, "Joseph und Asenath: Eine Altjüdische Erzählung," *TQ* 103 (1922): 1–3.

[375] Additional references and allusions to LXX/OG include Gen 41, 46-7, 1 Sam 17. For a full treatment of biblical allusions/potential allusions see Susan Docherty, "Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?" *JSJ* 35 (2004): 27–48. esp. 41–43.

[376] Translators typically do not use "damage" to render (ὕβρις/ὑβρίζω). Insult or insolence are more common translations. However, I have chosen to render it in this way because of the legal connotations associated with "damage" in English. Ahearne-Kroll convincingly argues Joseph and Aseneth's use of the term is drawing on its use in Ptolemaic legal petitions. Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 217–19.

[377] Kochenash, "Trojan Horses," 423.

Shechem's predatory relation to Dinah can thus accurately predict the violent end that the son of Pharaoh experiences."[378] In other words, the predacious Shechem serves as a pattern for Pharaoh's son.[379] As Pharaoh's son can be identified with Shechem, Aseneth can be identified with Dinah "as the woman pursued," but Dinah's character is transformed in Aseneth.[380] While Dinah is subjected to sexual violence at the hands of Shechem, Aseneth is rescued by the hand of God before Pharaoh's son is able to lay his hands on her.

Using the story of Dinah as a point of reference, Joseph and Aseneth makes several profound statements regarding communal boundaries, some of which reverse the messages implicit in LXX Gen 34. First, like Judith, Joseph and Aseneth demonstrates the permeability of boundaries through Aseneth's "conversion" and marriage to Joseph.[381] To be clear, the novel is not making a universalistic statement advocating for the inclusion of all ethnic others. Like Achior, Aseneth is exceptional. She shares the strict sexual mores of Joseph himself (Jos. Asen. 4:7, 8:1) and even bears a physical resemblance to "the daughters of the Hebrews" (ταῖς θυγατράσι τῶν Ἑβραίων, Jos. Asen. 1:5).[382] However, the message of the novel stands in stark contrast to that of LXX Gen 34, which did not in the end include those who took the step of altering their physical bodies to join Jacob's tribe. Aseneth's marriage to Joseph is defended by Levi, the progenitor of the priestly class and enforcer of the boundary between his family and

---

[378] Kochenash, "Trojan Horses," 423.

[379] As an aside, this underscores that early interpreters believed Shechem's actions in Gen 34 to be sexually violent.

[380] Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 126.

[381] Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 213; Standhartinger, "Intersections of Gender, Status, Ethnos, and Religion," 82.

[382] Matthew Thiessen, "Aseneth's Eight Day Transformation as Scriptural Justification for Conversion," *JSJ* 45 (2014): 231–32.

outsiders in Gen 34 (Jos. Asen. 23:14, 27:11).[383] The very one who bore the sword to prevent exogamy in Gen 34 wields it to defend Joseph's marriage to an Egyptian woman.

Joseph and Aseneth also complicates notions of who poses a sexual threat. The author subverts Joseph's expectation (and perhaps the audience's expectation too) that an Egyptian woman would lack control over her sexual desires by pointing to Aseneth as a paragon of sexual restraint (Jos. Asen. 7:1–8). At the same time, Aseneth is contrasted with other Egyptian women who sexually pursue Joseph (Jos. Asen. 7:3).[384] Pharaoh's son poses a clear sexual threat as he attempts to abduct Aseneth and take her for his wife as Shechem abducted Dinah and attempted to take her for his wife (Jos. Asen. 23:1–3). What is striking is that the threat Pharaoh's son poses to someone who, at least a few chapters earlier, was considered a part of his community, by ethnicity if not by social class.[385] Is this a case of inner-group sexual violence? Or is Aseneth so fully apart of her new community that Pharaoh's son is now the Other vis-a-vis Aseneth.[386] On this issue of Aseneth's inclusion, Thiessen writes, "To be sure, Aseneth, who is genealogically not Jewish, begins to worship Israel's God and becomes marriageable for Joseph. Marrying her is not, in the eyes of the author, intermarriage, after all."[387] Aseneth's acceptance into the Jewish community challenges the exclusionary message of the Dinah story. Simultaneously, casting Pharaoh's son as predacious confirms the story's message about

---

[383] Kochenash, "Trojan Horses," 432.

[384] Sunhee Jun, "Negotiation in the Contact Zone: Reading Joseph and Aseneth from a Postcolonial Perspective," *JSJ* 52 (2021): 5. Jun does not make the exact point made in this dissertation, but his comments on Aseneth and the other Egyptian women helped clarify the contrast between them concerning their sexual threat.

[385] Recall Pharaoh denied his son taking Aseneth for his wife due to her social station (Jos. Asen. 1:13).

[386] On the full and complete nature of Aseneth's incorporation into the family of Israel see Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth,* 62.

[387] Thiessen, "Aseneth's Eight Day Transformation," 247.

dangerous foreign men. Joseph and Aseneth presents a complicated about the permeability of boundaries and the dangers of interactions with outsiders.

Historically contextualizing Joseph and Aseneth's perspective on boundaries has its challenges. Proposals for Joseph and Aseneth's date have ranged from the mid-second century BCE to the fifth century CE.[388] The conversation on dating has been coupled with a debate on whether its origins are Jewish or Christian.[389] While these debates remain ongoing, several compelling facts point to the novel's origin in Hellenistic Egypt among a Jewish community.[390] Ahearne-Kroll convincingly situates the text in Ptolemaic Egypt based upon its resemblance to the narrative traditions among Greek-writing Egyptians, its imitation of Ptolemaic legal scribal formulae, descriptions of material culture, and allusions to distinctly Ptolemaic mythology and symbols.[391]

---

[388] Gideon Bohak has posited a mid-second century BCE date primarily based upon the perceived connections between the novel's content and the temple at Leontopolis. Bohak's early articulation of this thesis is found in "Asenath's Honeycomb and Onias' Temple: The Key to Joseph and Asenath," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 163–70. Early in his early work on the novel, Pierre Batiffol gave it a very late date of the fifth century CE which he later revised. For his early dating see *Le Livre de la Prière d'Aseneth*, StPatr (Paris: Leroux, 1889–90), 35. In more recent times Ross Shephard Kraemer has defended a fourth century CE date, see *When Aseneth Met Joseph*, 225–44. For a beautifully written and creative description of the challenges of dating and socially locating Joseph and Aseneth see Edith Humphrey, "On Bees and Best Guesses: The Problem of the Sitz Im Leben from Internal Evidence from Joseph and Aseneth," *CR:BS* 7 (1999): 223–36 esp. 232.

[389] On the debate on Jewish or Christian origins see John J. Collins, "Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?" in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*, JSJSup 100 (Boston: Brill, 2005), 112–27. On a critique of the "Jewish or Christian" question as it has been applied to Joseph and Aseneth and a reframing of the debate to Jewish or gentile authorship see Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 22–27.

[390] Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 187–241, and Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 24n31. Positing an Egyptian location and a Jewish community of origin suggests a *terminus ante quem* of 115–17 CE, the date of violent attacks against Jews in Alexandria during Trajan's reign, but it was likely written before 38 CE the date of the first pogrom in Alexandria, see Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 40n94. For more on the Jewish revolt against Trajan in Alexandria see Maria Pucci Ben Ze'ev, "Greek Attacks Against Alexandrian Jews During Emperor Trajan's Reign," *JSJ* 20.1 (1989): 31–48. For more on the first pogrom see John J. Collins, "Antisemitism in Antiquity?: The Case of Alexandria," in J*ewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*, JSJSup (Boston: Brill, 2005), 181–201.

[391] Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 187–241.

Joseph and Aseneth's exploration of communal boundaries through use of the Dinah story connects well with the concerns of Jewish communities in Ptolemaic Egypt. As Stewart Moore describes, "there was a significant zone of interaction between Judeans and Egyptians" citing papyrological evidence from Hellenistic Egypt. [392] As Jews (or Judeans in Moore's terms) contemplated what shape contact with the Other should take, I argue that the author of Joseph and Aseneth explored those communal boundaries through Dinah's story. Dinah, a daughter of Jacob and a symbol of her people and her land, was violated by a Shechemite. This act demanded her brothers avenge her. Aseneth, an Egyptian woman is transformed into a daughter of Israel and is given a new name, City of Refuge, alluding to Zion, the beating heart of Judah.[393] As a woman she is identified with the land.[394] This connection between women and land is well understood. What is striking is that the author used the daughter of another land to represent Zion, and at her moment of physical and sexual vulnerability the divine steps in to defend daughter Zion.[395] The author turns the logic of the Dinah story on its head and develops a more inclusive and conciliatory story about the family of Jacob in a diasporic setting like that of the author.

---

[392] Stewart Allen Moore, *Jewish Ethnic Identity and Relations in Hellenistic Egypt: With Walls of Iron?* JSJSup 171 (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2015), 76. Stewart Moore argues for a high degree of contact between Judeans, Egyptians and Greeks in Hellenistic Egypt although he hesitates on seeing Joseph and Aseneth as a part of the evidence to support his claims which he primarily builds on administrative texts.

[393] Several scholars have identified Aseneth's name "the City of Refuge" with LXX/OG references to the city identifying it as a city where people seek refuge (καταφεύξονται). See the OG Zech 2:11(15), Jer 27:5 (MT Jer 50:5) and Is 54:15. Ahearne-Kroll adds to these traditional associations between "City of Refuge" and Zion another connection between her role in providing refuge in the story and the role of Ptolemaic administrators. See Ahearne-Kroll, *Aseneth of Egypt*, 212–20.

[394] Ahearne-Kroll notes that this identification of Aseneth with Zion is reminiscent of the "personification of Zion as female in biblical literature." "The Portrayal of Aseneth," 54.

[395] Hicks-Keeton, *Arguing with Aseneth*, 126.

Joseph and Aseneth and Judith both employ the LXX Gen 34 narrative to explore communal boundaries, but they do so in ways that challenge the strict boundary presented in the Pentateuchal story. Both stories present a female character who is aligned with Dinah, endangered like Dinah, but who ultimately escapes assault. Importantly, Judith and Aseneth are both given voices unlike their literary forebear and show a greater degree of power over their own fate than did Dinah. The stories also imagine more permeable boundaries. Using the language of LXX Gen 34 around circumcision, Judith shows how an Ammonite can join the ranks of the Judeans. In Joseph and Aseneth, Aseneth, the figure aligned with Dinah herself, demonstrates the permeability of the boundary between Jews and others and in the end is defended by Levi, the boundary enforcer from Genesis, as well as the God of Israel.

2.3.2 Establishing the Boundaries, Building the Walls

While the previous section examined stories that challenged the boundary setting message of the Dinah story, the next part of this chapter examines early Jewish literature that, in its overarching message, supports establishing strict boundaries through their allusions to Gen 34. The writings included in this section are diverse with respect to original language, genre, and socio-historical location for their production, but they share some common approaches to their interpretation of Gen 34. Using the story of Dinah as a template, the writers employ several strategies for establishing and reenforcing the boundaries between communities including highlighting Otherness, vilifying that Other, assuming a collective culpability for the violence, arguing for a divine license to enact revenge, and ultimately absolving insiders for any violence they commit.

Before addressing the specific content of these early Jewish works and their strategies for drawing boundaries, it is necessary to briefly introduce the works covered in this section.

Jubilees is a work composed in Hebrew from the second century BCE.[396] Fragments of the Hebrew text were discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, but not the work in its entirety.[397] Jubilees was translated into Greek, but no ancient copies remain of this translation. From Greek the work was translated into Latin (only one partial manuscript survives) and Ge'ez.[398] Jubilees roughly recounts the content of Gen 1–50 and Exod 1–24.[399] The contents, however, are framed through an introduction as a revelation from God, mediated by an angel to Moses on Mount Sinai (Jub. 1). This framing is critical for a story like the Dinah narrative which, in the MT, seems to be silent on the divine perspective. While several points could be made about the goals of Jubilees, its interest in establishing boundaries is of chief importance for this dissertation. With respect to boundaries, Jubilees' focus is intermarriage, but it is not an exaggeration to say

[396] James VanderKam, *Jubilees 2: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees 22–50*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018), 31–38. This dissertation makes use of VanderKam's translation (James VanderKam, *Jubilees*, The Hermeneia Translation [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2020].) with limited reference to the Latin text printed in Hermann Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis* (Leipzig: Fues, 1874). For a fair critique of VanderKam's translation and commentary see Michael Knibb, Review of James VanderKam, *Jubilees 1: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees, Chapters 1–21; Jubilees 2: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees, Chapters 22–50*, *Aethiopica* 23 (2020): 278–281. It is also worth noting that James Kugel argues that Jubilees is actually a work composed in two distinct stages, a base work heavily augmented by a figure he calls "the interpolator." Importantly he understands the chapter on Dinah to be an interpolation. See James L. Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation* (Boston: Brill, 2012), 11–16. I follow VanderKam in seeing the work as unified, VanderKam, *Jubilees 1: A Commentary*, 27–28.

[397] VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 1. The chapter recounting the Dinah story, Jub. 30, was not found among the DSS.

[398] VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 14–16. With respect to Ge'ez witness to *Jubilees*, the manuscripts range in date from the fourteenth to twentieth century. VanderKam indicates that there is a high degree of correspondence between the fragments found at Qumran and the Ge'ez—with the exception of some cave four fragments none of which relate to the Dinah story. Returning to a statement made earlier in the dissertation, however, it is important to recognize that we are examining snapshots of a text's life in this dissertation, looking for broad trends. We work with the evidence we have, not the evidence we wish we had.

[399] To be clear, the writer was not merely producing a summary of Genesis and Exodus; rather, they used the material in those texts to their own ends. The writer added, omitted, reframed, rearranged, and embellished material from the Torah. They offered interpretations of texts with reference to legal material. The author of the text was creative. Importantly, the writer does not seem to be writing a replacement for Genesis and Exodus. For more on Jubilees rewriting techniques and aims see Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The development of Mosaic discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 41–50.

its rhetoric borders on xenophobic.[400] As Christine Hayes puts it, "*Jubilees* supports an extreme form of genealogical purity for all Israelites."[401] Within the context of its larger boundary-setting aims, Jubilees enlists the Dinah narrative.

Like Jubilees, Theodotus also wrote during the second century BCE, but evidence of his writing is limited to a few fragments of Greek epic poetry preserved in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio evangelica* quoting Alexander Polyhistor, a first century BCE historian.[402] Eight fragments of the poem have been preserved, most relating to the Dinah story, but some more broadly to the family of Jacob. The socio-historical situation underlying Theodotus' epic poem has been the subject of debate. Early research suggested that Theodotus was Samaritan.[403] However, after studies by John Collins and Reinhard Pummer, the early claims of Samaritan origins were called into question.[404] Collins advanced the thesis that the epic contained an *anti-Samaritan polemic*. He further argues that the popularity of the Gen 34 narrative during the Second Temple period is rooted in a broader anti-Samaritan sentiment directed toward the Samaritan inhabitants of Shechem.[405] He assesses Theodotus as "a militant and exclusivist Jew."[406] While agreeing with Collins on Theodotus' exclusivist tendencies, Pummer argues that

---

[400] Ishay Zvi, "What if We Got Rid of the Goy? Rereading Ancient Jewish Distinctions," *JSJ* 47 (2016): 153.

[401] Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 78. Hayes notes that Jub. 22:16 also warns against "commensality and friendship (*Gentile Impurities*, 48). On this passage, see also Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 48.

[402] Overviews of these facts can be found in Ben Wacholder, "Theodotus," *EncJud* 19: 693–94; F. Fallon, "Theodotus," *OTP* 2:785–88; and Erich Gruen, "Hellenistic Judaism," in *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History*, DCLS 29 (Boston: De Gruyter, 2016), 26–28.

[403] Michael Daise, "Samaritans, Seleucids, and the Epic of Theodotus," *JSP* 17 (1998): 25.

[404] Collins, "The Epic of Theodotus," 91–104. Reinhard Pummer, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *HTR* (1982): 177–88. Michael Daise defends the claim the epic's author is Samaritan in "Samaritans, Seleucids, and the Epic," 25–52, esp. 27.

[405] Collins, "The Epic of Theodotus," 92; *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 101–2.

Theodotus does not use the Gen 34 narrative to express anti-Samaritan views. Rather, like Jubilees, Theodotus uses the story to further an argument against mixed marriages.[407] He goes even further to argue "none of the works that were included in this investigation, i.e., Testament of Levi, Jubilees, Judith, Theodotus, Josephus, Philo, and Pseudo- Philo, show any anti-Samaritan Tendenz." [408] Pummer's argument is in line with broader research suggesting that earlier theses regarding the conflictual nature of Judean-Samaritan relations during the Second Temple period were overstated.[409]

The Testament of Levi is part of a larger compilation of testamentary literature called The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.[410] Though the extant form of the Testament of Levi shows clear signs of Christian editing, it was most likely composed by a Jewish author sometime during the Hellenistic period.[411] Kugel demonstrates that themes in the Testament of Levi, particularly

---

[406] Collins, "The Epic of Theodotus," 92.

[407] Pummer, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings," 187.

[408] Pummer, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings," 188. He notes, however, that it is "conceivable" that works might be enlisted in the service of anti-Samaritan polemics.

[409] For example, see Benedikt Hensel, "On the relationship of Judah and Samaria in Post-exilic Times: A Farewell to the Conflict Paradigm," *JSOT* 44 (2019): 19–42, esp. 28–29.

[410] This dissertation relies upon the Greek text of the Testament as published in Marinus DeJonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Boston: Brill, 1978). It also makes use of the notes on the text compiled in H. W. Hollander and Marinus DeJonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Boston: Brill, 1985).

[411] Some of those indicators include the ethics of the *Testaments* aligning well with those presented in other Hellenistic writings produced by diasporic communities, pre-Roman historical references, and parallels in literature from Qumran. For more on the Jewish Hellenistic background of the Testament of Levi see Robert Kugler, "Testaments," in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*, eds. Matthias Henze and Rodney A. Werline (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020), 339, and Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 174–85. Collins cautions, however, "the provenance of the *Testaments* is notoriously problematic" (*Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 174). The most convincing piece of evidence for a Jewish background and origin for the Greek *Testament of Levi* in particular are its affinities, including some shared content, with the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD), fragments of which were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls almost certainly dated to a time prior to the advent of Christianity. There is little doubt that ALD was a source for the Testament of Levi. For the relationship between ALD and the Testament of Levi see Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation and Commentary*, SVTP 19 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 1–32. Still, highlighting the conscientiousness of the issue of the *Testament of Levi* and its origins, Henryk Drawnel argues that the Greek Testament is "of little value" for

with respect to the Dinah story, are consistent with the themes found in other Second Temple, Jewish texts.[412] Unfortunately, the Testament of Levi resists any more precise conjectures on its dating and provenance, and the editing process it underwent as it traveled from pre-Roman, Jewish communities to Christian communities is opaque.[413] Still, situating the text broadly in Second Temple Judaism and identifying its affinities with other Jewish texts' use of stories of sexual violence for exploring communal boundaries is valuable. Even without locating the text socially and historically, one can see the Testament of Levi uses similar strategies as other early Jewish texts to explore communal boundaries through the Dinah story.

In contrast to the Testament of Levi, the writings of Philo can be much more securely dated as Philo was both prolific, leaving a lengthy written record, and highly influential, making a mark on roughly contemporaneous secondary sources. Politically, Philo is best known for his role representing the Jewish community in Alexandria to the Roman Emperor Caligula and his documented ability to interface with others outside of his community.[414] In addition to his political role as ambassador, Philo played an important role in articulating a particular and philosophical perspective on Judaism in the Egyptian diaspora, writing multiple texts commenting on the Pentateuch.[415] This chapter focuses on two pericopes that address the Dinah

---

understanding *ALD*, calling into question the closeness of the two works. See Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*, JSJSup 86 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 4.

[412] Kugel, "The Story of Dinah," 32–35.

[413] Collins' statement on this issue is worth quoting, "The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are the ultimate monument to the failure of scholarship to pin down the literature of this period to definite historical settings (*Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 17)."

[414] For more on Philo's role as ambassador see Maren Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 23–90. See also Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 131.

[415] Within Philonic scholarship, which Pentateuch Philo used and what techniques he used have been a source of debate. For a thorough overview of Philo and his use of the Pentateuch, particularly which version of the text see Gregory E. Sterling, "Which Version of the Greek Bible Did Philo Read?" in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the*

story within Philo's *Allegorical Commentary*.[416] Philo produced his *Allegorical Commentary* for Jews in Alexandria and prior to serving as an ambassador to Rome.[417] In this commentary Philo focuses on "allegorical interpretations which are expanded through the introduction of secondary, or even tertiary, biblical texts (lemmata)."[418] His comments on the Dinah story are among those comments introduced through secondary biblical texts. While different parts of Philo's writings suggest a certain openness to a porous boundary with Gentiles through a process of conversion, the pericopes under investigation in this chapter suggest a less open attitude toward the Other, particularly in Philo's omission of the circumcision plot from Genesis.[419]

Finally, this section addresses Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and his recounting of the Dinah story. Like Philo, Josephus' historical and social location as well as the context in which he produced *Jewish Antiquities* is relatively clear, not least for the fact he left an autobiography and provided lines on the occasion and purpose of his writing.[420] About a generation after Philo,

---

Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007, eds. Akio Moriya and Gohei Hata (Boston: Brill, 2012), 89–128. For a less technical overview of the issues surrounding which version of the text Philo used see Rajak, *Translation and Survival*, 149–50.

[416] This dissertation relies on the Greek text of the works of Philo recorded in Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Su-persunt* (Berlin: Typis et Impensis Georgii Reimeri, 1886–1930). For general information on the use of Genesis in the Philo's *Allegorical Commentary* see Gregory E. Sterling, "When the Beginning is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup., eds. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Boston: Brill, 2012), 427–46, esp. 431–32. For a brilliant analysis of where the *Allegorical Commentary* fits into the development of Philo's thought, see Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria*, 179–91.

[417] Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria*, 179.

[418] Albert Geljon and D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Boston: Brill, 2013), xiii.

[419] For Philo on conversion see Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 58. For Philo's omission of the circumcision plot see Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 260–61.

[420] Steve Mason has produced a volume translating and contextualizing Josephus' biography—*The Life*. Importantly for this dissertation he examines the bond between *The Life* and *Jewish Antiquities.* See *Flavius Josephus: The Life of Josephus* (Boston: Brill, 2003), xiii–xv.

Josephus, writing as a Jewish historian, lived and worked in Rome and as a Roman citizen.[421] While Josephus produced many works, *Jewish Antiquities*, a history of the Jewish people recounting many of the stories in Genesis, is the text under examination in this work.[422] Josephus, like Philo, is not an insular community, but interacts with people from different backgrounds. Moreover, Josephus, like Philo, imagines the boundary between Jews and others to be permeable through the process of conversion.[423] Yet, like Philo, he uses the Dinah story as one that justifies setting tight boundaries around the community.

What is striking about this diverse group of works composed in a variety of socio-historical settings is that each of them uses the Dinah story as a way to engage in boundary-setting discourse.[424] In the following sections, I will explore the strategies each of these works use to establish or reinscribe boundaries.[425]

---

[421] Steve Mason examines Josephus' role as a Judean historian (note Mason does not say Jewish) and, more importantly, as an active member of a Roman literary community. See "Josephus as a Roman Historian," in *A Companion to Josephus*, eds. Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (New York: Wiley & Sons, 2016), 89–108.

[422] *Jewish Antiquities* covers a much broader scope of literature beyond the book of Genesis. For an overview of the sources Josephus used and the broader project see Daniel Schwartz, "Many Sources but a Single Author: Josephus's Jewish Antiquities," in *A Companion to Josephus*, eds. Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers (New York: Wiley & Sons, 2016), 36–58. Christopher Begg indicates that "Josephus appears to have had a variety of sources, biblical and extra-biblical, written and unwritten, available to him for his rewriting of Genesis ("Genesis in Josephus," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup., eds. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Boston: Brill, 2012), 308.)."

[423] Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 58 and 68.

[424] Kugel argues for a different division between early Jewish works and their attitude towards boundaries after examining their use of the Dinah story. Kugel places Jubilees and Judith in the same group noting their "more bloodthirsty quality and a certain xenophobia withal" and Theodotus and the Testament of Levi in another. See Kugel, "The Story of Dinah," 33.

[425] While each of the strategies receive their own heading, the division between them is somewhat arbitrary. Most of the texts herein analyzed use some sort of combination of these strategies to reinscribe the boundaries between the communities.

2.3.2.1 Highlighting Otherness and Vilifying the Other

One of the primary ways early Jewish authors engage in boundary-setting discourse in their recounting of the Dinah narrative is by highlighting Shechem and his people's Otherness.[426] For example, the author of Jubilees recounts the incident described in Gen 34 (Jub. 30:1-4, 24–26) on either side of a much longer interpretation of the story written in a tone that vacillates between legal and didactic.[427] While the writer's recounting of the Dinah narrative is terse, the author is clear in his interpretation that Shechem's roots outside of the people of Israel is problematic. The writer uses the Dinah narrative as an opportunity to provide a justification for the prohibition of marriage—and sexual relations—with foreigners (Jub. 30:5–16).[428] The passage reads, "If there is a man in Israel who wishes to give his daughter or his sister to any foreigner, he is to die (Jub. 30:7)."[429] Not wanting their concern with foreignness to be obscured in any way, the writer follows their comments up with divine instruction. The angelic messenger says to Moses, "order the Israelites and testify to them that they are not to give any of their daughters to foreigners and that they are not to marry any foreign women because it is despicable before the

[426] In the previous section I highlighted that Judith and Joseph and Aseneth specifically used LXX Gen 34. Here, with respect to the group of texts I address, I intentionally use the generic "Dinah narrative" as the textual relationship might vary. For example, Jubilees seems to have had access to a text directly related to or similar to MT Genesis while the Greek writers Philo and Josephus were likely working with LXX Genesis.

[427] VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 818. With respect to the legal tone, the writer relies on material from what seems to be MT (or something like the MT) Ex. 34:16, Lev. 18:21, 20: –5, Deut. 7:3–4a, and others. VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 82–34.

[428] While Jubilees takes a strong stance regarding those outside of Israel, it is questionable whether a strict binary of Jew and Gentile, as a unified category, exists prior to the turn of the era. Rosen-Zvi, "What if We Got Rid of the Goy? 153–54.

[429] VanderKam's translation in *Jubilees 22–50*, 813. Cana Werman argues this verse in Jubilees mimics the wording and is based upon the law prohibiting a priest's daughter from engaging in illicit sexual activity (זנות) in Lev 21:9. Jubilees thus expands the scope of the law to include all of Israel. Werman, "'Jubilees 30': Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 11–13.

Lord (Jub. 30:11)."[430] Impurity within Israel results from "anyone has given one of his daughters to any foreign man (Jub. 30:14)."[431] Leaving out the circumcision plot of the brothers from Gen 34, Jubilees does not entertain the idea of a permeable boundary and understands the stakes of sexual involvement to be so high that it affects the entire community.[432]

In addition to highlighting the Otherness of Shechem and making his foreign status core to the interpretation of the Dinah narrative, Jubilees also adds details to the narrative that vilified Shechem. It states that Dinah was "a small girl" (*nestit* in Ge'ez) of twelve years and that in laying with her, he defiled her (Jub. 30:2). By highlighting Dinah's age, the text emphasizes Shechem violated a child.[433] Different from Gen 34, Jubilees foregrounds the consequence of the action, namely defilement, right after describing that Shechem lay with Dinah. This interpretation of the act as a defiling one stands contrast to Gen 34. After Genesis describes the

[430] VanderKam's translation in *Jubilees 22–50*, 813. "Despicable" is *mennun* and *ambominatio* in Ge'ez and Latin respectively.

[431] Notions of impurity in Jubilees and the concerns with intermarriage build upon the concerns raised in Ezra-Nehemiah. Hayes demonstrates that Jubilees (as well as 4QMMT) adopt "a concern for the preservation of the genealogical purity and sanctity of Israel (*Gentile Impurities*, 69)."

[432] VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 833. Hicks-Keeton contrasts Jubilees' and Joseph and Aseneth's understanding of boundaries. *Arguing with Aseneth*, 120–26. Collins describes the line between Jew and Gentile as being "sharply drawn" in Jub. 30. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 101–2. On the exclusion of the circumcision plot point from Gen 34, Estzer Balassa offers an interesting take writing "We may gather, that in Jubilees, the reason of this is that circumcision is so important and sacred, that also the angels are circumcised (Jub. 15:27). So, it cannot be used as a weapon against anybody." See "The Consequences of Dinah's Rape," in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits (Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 191.

[433] VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 821. Demetrius the Chronographer specifically notes that Dinah was sixteen years and four months old when she was defiled by Shechem. *PrEv* 9.21.6. For more on Demetrius see the excursus below. One might question whether the same taboo existed regarding violence against children. This text, with its emphasis on Dinah's age, might be appealed to in support of the idea that the taboo existed. Still, even if one does not believe any type of taboo on sexual violence against children existed, there was certainly a taboo on young daughters losing their virginity, forcibly or by consent, and that loss impacting a family's ability to profit from their union. See Samuel L. Adams, *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 67–70.

rape (Gen 34:2), it immediately describes Shechem's infatuation with Dinah (Gen 34:3). Only later Jacob hears about the incident is the sexual act described as defiling (Gen 34:5).

Like Jubilees, Theodotus also engages in language that highlights the Otherness of Shechem and further vilifies him. Theodotus writes that before considering a union between his daughter and Shechem, all the Shechemites must "become like Jews" (Ἰουδαΐσαι from ἰουδαΐζω) (*Praep. ev.* 9.22.5). This verb is a relatively uncommon but is always directed at those who are not Jewish or whose belonging to the group is in some way in question, underscoring the difference.[434] Theodotus notes that it is not lawful (Οὐ θεμιτός) for Hebrews to bring sons-in-law in from elsewhere (ἄλλοθεν), rather they ought to be of a like people or perhaps colloquially "of the same stock" (γενεῆς ὁμοίης) (*Praep. ev*. 9.22.6). Bringing someone from "elsewhere" denotes a crossing of boundaries, bringing in someone from outside the community to take the place of someone inside the community. Like Jubilees, Theodotus indicates that Shechem corrupted (φθείρω) Dinah in describing the sexual violence, but he does not direct the brunt of his critique toward Shechem alone opting instead to highlight the wickedness of his people (*Praep. ev.* 9.22.6). The critique of his people is addressed in the following section of this chapter.

Unlike Theodotus and some of the other texts addressed in this section, the Testament of Levi is less overt in how it identifies Shechem's foreignness. Contrasting the Testament of Levi with Judith, Jubilees, and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, James Kugel writes,

> Against such a background, it is striking that the Testament of Levi makes nothing of Shechem's foreignness. Indeed, neither Shechem nor his father is ever described as a 'foreigner,' 'gentile,' or 'stranger,' as in the texts cited above.[435]

[434] The verb is used in OG Est 8:17, Gal 2:14; *J.W.* 2:454, 463. For more on the verb's usage see Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism," 464.

[435] Kugel, "The Story of Dinah," 18. Hayes concurs with Kugel, *Gentile Impurities*, 78–79.

Kugel then argues,

> The Testament of Levi does not mention Shechem's 'foreignness' as the reason for his crime being an abomination, because foreignness, as such, is irrelevant. What matters is that, because of the sinfulness evident in crimes like the rape of Dinah or the 'abduction' of Sarah at Gerar (Genesis 20), the Canaanite tribes as a whole had been sentenced to death.[436]

In other words, in the Testament of Levi, the Canaanites are sentenced to death because they do bad things, not because they are foreign.

While Kugel is right that the overt othering language found in Jubilees and other texts is absent from the Testament of Levi, it is difficult to maintain that Shechem and his people's status as Canaanite Other was immaterial to the writer. For example, an angel comes to visit Levi and give him instructions to enact vengeance on Shechem and identifies itself as "the angel who pleads for the offspring of Israel" (ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ παραιτούμενος τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ) seemingly setting Israel apart from others in their midst (T. Levi 5:6).[437] By logical extension, Shechem and his people are not a part of the offspring of Israel (γένος Ἰσραήλ).[438] Furthermore, in describing why Shechem deserved retribution, the text notes that the Canaanites (whom the text equates with Shechemites) persecuted Abraham when he was a foreigner (ξένος) in their land (T. Levi 6:9).[439] Again, by logical extension, like Shechem and his people are not part of the γένος Ἰσραήλ neither is Abraham a part of them. The Testament of Levi may be less overt in its anti-

[436] Kugel, "The Story of Dinah," 19. The Testament of Levi's reference to Sara is discussed more fully in the next section.

[437] It should be noted, upon waking from the vision, Levi identifies the angel as the one who pleads for the offspring of Israel "and for all the righteous" (καὶ πάντων τῶν δικαίων) (T. Levi 5:7); however, The Testament of Levi seems to not identify any other than Israel who are righteous.

[438] Testament of Levi 9:10 warns against marrying foreign offspring (γένος ἀλλόφυλος).

[439] For The Testament of Levi's conflation of Shechemites and Canaanites see Hollander and DeJonge, *The Testaments*, 148. The conflation is addressed more fully in the next subsection.

Other sentiment, but the reader certainly understands Shechem and his people are Other vis-a-vis Dinah, Levi, and the rest of the family of Jacob. The logical extensions presented above are justified by looking at other parts of the Testament that are more explicit in their vilification of the Shechemites, or Canaanites. This motif which is explored fully in the next section.

While the Testament of Levi addresses Shechem's otherness in an indirect manner, Philo centers Shechem's difference. Philo addresses the Gen 34 narrative in two treatises—*On the Changes of Names* and *Migration of Abraham*—of his *Allegorical Commentary*.[440] Although it is clear Philo is familiar with the LXX, in his interpretation of the Dinah story, he does not recount the narrative from Genesis.[441] Rather, Philo offers an allegorical interpretation of the text consistent with the style of his commentary. Shechem receives a fair amount of interpretation in each of Philo's recollections of the Gen 34 story. In both treatises, Philo describes Shechem as an offspring of "irrational nature" (ἀλόγου φύσεως) and "folly" (ἀνοίας) (*Migration* 39:224, *Names* 36:193). He derides Shechem by describing him has hypocritical and deceitful. Playing with Hebrew etymology, Philo relates these qualities to the fact that Shechem's father's name, Hamor, means donkey (ὄνος) in Hebrew (*Migration* 39:224, *Names* 36:193). Philo's attention to Shechem's supposed donkey-like characteristics brings his Othering rhetoric into sharp relief.[442] To animalize another is to take one step toward denying their humanity. In her analysis of ancient West Asian, Egyptian, and Israelite materials, the last pertaining to Philo's commentary on the LXX, T. M. Lemos finds that "non-native individuals are…frequently compared to

[440] Names 36.193–200 and Migration 39.223–225. Philo's treatises are often referred to by their Latin names in scholarship *De mutatione nominum* (*Mut.*) and *De migratione Abrahami* (*Migr.*).

[441] Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 255.

[442] In *Migration* 39.223–224, Philo levels accusations of Shechem being a plotter against wisdom (τοῦ φρονήσεως ἐπιβούλου) as well as thoughtlessness (ἀφροσύνη), shamelessness (ἀναισχυντία), and audacity (θράσος). He relates Shechem to the type of men who wear beautiful masks to cover up ugly faces (*Names* 36.198).

animals." [443] To be clear, animalizing language in and of itself does not necessarily indicate dehumanization, but animalizing language in the context of an otherwise derisive passage, like that of Philo, does work toward dehumanizing.[444] Shechem and Hamor, leaders of their city according to Genesis, are brought down to the level of domesticated animals subject to their human handlers. The process of dehumanization is completed in Philo's justification of Simeon and Levi's deadly violence directed toward the donkey, his son, and their people (discussed further in a following section).[445] They were just donkeys anyways.

Like other Jewish writers who came before him, Josephus highlights Shechem's alteriarity and heightens the severity of his offense. In contrast to the ambiguous term MT Genesis uses to describe Shechem's seizure of Dinah (לקח), Josephus writes that Shechem corrupted (φθείρω) Dinah through abduction (ἁρπαγή) (*Ant.* 1:337).[446] Josephus also describes Jacob's concerns regarding the legality about giving his daughter to a foreigner (ἀλλόφυλος) in marriage, highlighting the fundamental problem of Shechem's difference (*Ant.* 1:338). Some have observed that Josephus does omit the circumcision plot in his recounting of the story, possibly in part due to his position that individuals who joined Israel through circumcision were

[443] Lemos, *Violence and Personhood in Ancient Israel*, 26.

[444] Lemos, *Violence and Personhood in Ancient Israel*, 29–61. Lemos gives the example of Assyrian kings referring to themselves as lions not functioning in a dehumanizing way, but animalization leading to violence against the other does dehumanize.

[445] One might recall the dismissiveness with which Jeremiah treats the death of Jehoiakin in Jer 22:18–19. No one shall mourn his death and he shall be buried with the burial of a donkey (קבורת חמור). Saul Olyan addresses the "reclassification" of Jehoiakim as an animal that occurred through this type of burial. The comparison is apt as like Jehoiakim, Hamor and his sons are leaders, and in a class-stratified society, brought low through the association with domestic animals. See "Jehoiakim's Dehumanizing Interment as a Ritual Act of Reclassification," *JBL* 133 (2014): 271–79.

[446] Feldman offers "seduce" as a translation for φθείρω; however, given its usage in *Jewish Antiquities*, this dissertation has opted to translate it as corrupt.

lawfully able to marry within the group.[447] Feldman suggests that Josephus' views on intermarriage expressed in writing were in part motivated by his concerns about accusations of misanthropy directed toward Jews.[448] Recounting the brothers' duplicity against the Shechemites concerning a marriage negotiation might undermine the nuanced position on marriage he advances. His omission of the plot could also be a reflex of his tendency to omit stories that reflect poorly on the ancestors as he did with the stories of Bilah and Reuben (Gen 35) and Tamar in Judah (Gen 38).[449] Still, Josephus' choice to recount the story of Dinah and Shechem, highlighting Shechem's foreignness, indicates that at least a certain level of confidence his story would be comprehensible and maybe even relatable to his Roman audience. The idea that a people might respond with unbridled violence to an instance of boundary-crossing sexual violence might very well resonate amongst the recipients of Lucretia's story described in the previous chapter.[450]

2.3.2.2 Collective Culpability

The issue of collective culpability in recounting the Dinah narrative is somewhat challenging to address in the context of the strategies in which early Jewish writers draw stricter boundaries because the Genesis narrative itself is opaque on the issue of culpability. In the first half of Gen 34, Shechem is clearly the party guilty of offense. It is he, in the grammatical singular, who takes (ויקח), lays (וישכב), and rapes her (ויענה) (Gen 34:2). He, singularly, defiled

[447] On Josephus' sensitivity toward the topic of intermarriage see Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation*, 137–38. On Josephus' nuanced views on intermarriage see Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 71–72.

[448] Louis Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob," *JQR* 79 2/3 (1988–89): 127n62.

[449] Begg, "Genesis in Josephus," 314.

[450] For more on Lucretia and her story see the "case studies" in the methodology chapter. Feldman makes a similar point in Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 270.

(טמא) Dinah and commits (עשה) an outrage in Israel (Gen 34: 5, 7). The next several verses turn on Shechem's actions and speech, but in the end, Genesis introduces a confounding element. It states Shechem was plundered by Jacob's sons because *they defiled* (טמאו) their sister (Gen 34:27). One might argue that any subsequent interpretation of the text implicating all of the Shechemites is merely responding to the grammatical challenge or the ethical challenge produced by the text, namely the wholesale slaughter for the sins of one man.[451] While interpreters might be motivated to resolve these interpretive issues, there might be an additional motivation underlying their appeal to collective culpability. It is possible that appealing to the collective culpability of the Shechemites might allow them to use the Dinah story in boundary-setting discourse.

At the outset of its retelling of the Dinah story, Jubilees implicates, or at least potentially implicates, all the Shechemites, reading "literally 'they seized Dinah violently [*masaṭewwā la-dinā/rapuerunt dinam*]'" (Jub. 30:2).[452]Like the Genesis narrative, Jub. 30:2 indicates that Shechem, alone, lay with her and defiled her.[453] Almost immediately after this description of the event in its terse retelling, the author implicates all the Shechemites once more writing that *they* defiled Dinah (Jub. 30:3). Within the context of Jubilees*,* it is important that all the Shechemites are implicated not only because it helps to justify the incredible violence used against the Shechemites, but also because it helps to justify the impermeable boundary the text is intent on drawing. Contextually, the primary subject of Jub. 30 is intermarriage. Dinah's story works in

[451] Kugel notes that some interpreters were responding to this grammatical issue also noting the problem with this interpretation. Kugel, *The Bible As It Was*, 239–41.

[452] VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 820.

[453] VanderKam indicates that while the Ge'ez uses a simple conjunction between the verbs, the Latin manuscript reverses the order of the verbs and adds quia—"he defiled her since he lay with her." *Jubilees 22–50*, 814.

service of the writer's primary concern. Implicating all of the Shechemites bolsters the case for endogamy.

The Testament of Levi, like Jubilees, through first-person speech attributed to Levi underscores that all of Shechem's people are pronounced "guilty" because *they* did (ἐποίησαν) to Dinah what they had sought to do to Sarah, Israel's matriarch, while Abraham was a sojourning stranger (T. Levi 6:8).[454] By harkening back to the story of Sarah and Abraham's, the Testament argues that Shechem's people have a pattern of seeking to violate Israel's women. This behavior is part-and parcel of the Shechemite's broader hostility toward "all strangers" (πάντας τοὺς ξένους, T. Levi 6:10). The Testament points to an Eblaen (Ἰεβλαήν), someone born in Abraham's household, as having been harmed (αἰκίσαντο) by them (T. Levi 6:9).[455] According to the Testament, other unspecified strangers were also treated hostilely by the Shechemites who "seized their wives by force" (ἐν δυναστείᾳ ἁρπάζοντες τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν) (T. Levi 6:10).[456] Levi concludes his indictment of the inhabitants of Shechem stating that they are "a city without understanding," and Levi and his people jeer them "because they did foolishness in Israel by defiling our sister" (ὅτι καίγε ἀφροσύνην ἔπραξαν ἐν Ἰσραήλ, μιᾶναι τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν) (T. Levi 7:2–3).[457] The Testament of Levi does the most to contextualize Shechem's violence in a history of egregious behavior and to demonstrate the collective nature of the crime.

---

[454] Four manuscripts–three from St. Catherine's monastery– indicate that it was Sarah *and* Rebecca who were targeted by the Shechemites. DeJonge, *The Testaments*, 31.

[455] The identity of Eblaen is unknown. He is not known from other stories of Abraham. See Kugel, "The Story of Dinah," 22 and Hollander and DeJonge, *The Testaments*, 148.

[456] Some manuscripts emphasize the women were strangers adding the adjective ξένας.

[457] Interestingly, the Testament of Levi uses ἀφροσύνην (foolishness) to describe what Shechem did which is the same word OG Judg 19:23–24 (A and B versions) uses to describe the foolish thing the Benjaminite men threaten to do to the Levite. The Greek word ἀφροσύνη is parallel to the Hebrew נבלה which occurs in MT Gen 34 and Judg 19-20 to describe the sexually violent acts. LXX Genesis 34, however, does not use ἀφροσύνη, opting instead for ἄσχημων.

In addition to its contextualization of the crime, the Testament also seems to expand the group it deems culpable for the offense. After describing the collective sins, Levi counsels his father not to be angry because the Canaanites (Χαναναίους) will be scorned (ἐξουδενώσει) (T. Levi 7:1). Hollander and DeJonge argue that the Testament writer equates the inhabitants of Shechem with the Canaanites.[458] Even if this is so, the writer's use of a broader category supports a case for stronger boundaries between Israel and a larger category of people constructed by the text as Others. The story of Dinah is subsumed into a larger narrative about the dangers of the people of the land. The Testament of Levi's framing of the event not only serves to justify Levi's violence, but it equally serves the interest of creating and reinforcing the boundary between Israel and others by appealing to the collective culpability of a large group of others.

The collective culpability motif continues in Philo. In both treatises he recognizes multiple perpetrators. In one passage, he notes that "the foolish ones attempt to corrupt this one" (ταύτην οἱ ἐπιχειροῦντες ἄφρονες διαφθείρειν) indicating that there are multiple offenders corrupting Dinah, allegorized as judgment (*Names* 36.195). In the second passage he notes that "these ones" (οὗτοι) hoped to snatch away the virgin soul (*Migration* 39.224).[459] At the moment when Simeon and Levi entered the city to take revenge, Philo states that they were in the midst of "pleasure-loving, passion-loving, and uncircumcised labor" (φιληδόνῳ καὶ φιλοπαθεῖ καὶ ἀπεριτμήτῳ πόνῳ), which, for Philo, is behavior emblematic of their uncouth, animalistic nature. In addition to the degradation of all the inhabitants of the city, Philo's statement is noteworthy

[458] For the idea that the writer is operating on a simple equation of Shechemites and Canaanites see Hollander and DeJonge, *The Testaments*, 148.

[459] Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 256.

here due to his use of the adjective "uncircumcised."[460] At the same time he derides the whole of Shechem's community, he also notes that they do not bear the mark of circumcision, the chief bodily marker that separates Israel from others. Philo's degradation of the city's inhabitants is bound to their fundamental bodily difference. The two are brought together to solidify the boundary between the communities.

2.3.2.3 Divine License for Revenge and Absolving Violence against the Other

Finally, interpreters of the Dinah story sought to absolve their forebearers' retributive violence, some by appealing to a divine license to seek revenge. The sexual violence, the violent response, and the ex post facto justification of the violent response work together to both inscribe and validate the boundary the interpreter aims to set.

Jubilees is unambiguous with respect to its position on the Shechemites and with respect to heaven's position on the Shechemites. The brothers' violence against them was decreed by God.[461] The divine ordination of violence against the Other from heaven suggests there is little room for questioning the boundary reified by the retributive violence. God's decree against the Shechemites, however, was not without reason. *They* had done something shameful in Israel echoing the words of Gen 34:7 that are also redeployed in both Judith and Joseph and Aseneth.[462] Jubilees implicates all of Shechem where Genesis most consistently implicates the

---

[460] Feldman notes that Philo "adds 'of the uncircumcised,' despite the fact that (according to the Bible) they had just undergone the operation of circumcision." While not directly pertinent to the argument of this section, Feldman's observation is worth mentioning. Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 257.

[461] VanderKam notes that Latin versions of the text Jub. 30:5 use *iudicum* and suggests a reading of *iudicatum*. VanderKam, *Jubilees 22–50*, 814.

[462] VanderKam notes that the Ge'ez text uses *ḫafrata* for "shameful," the same word Ge'ez Genesis uses to translate נבלה in Gen 34:7. *Jubilees 22–50*, 825.

one. Divine license to punish Shechem for its collective crime is one more way the text supports and builds upon the boundaries explored in the biblical Dinah story.

The motif of appealing to a divine licensure for retributive violence seen in Jubilees is also found in Theodotus. Theodotus imagines God as having a more direct role in Simeon and Levi's violence. According to *Praep. Ev*. 9.22.9, "God struck the inhabitants of Shechem (Βλάπτε θεὸς Σικίμων οἰκήτορας)." Theodotus continues to describe this violence in graphic detail (*Praep. ev.* 9.22.9). This violence, however, is not without merit, and Theodotus supplies reasons for the divine aggression against the Shechemites. In addition to the crime against Dinah, Theodotus indicates that the people "do not honor" (οὐ ἔτιον) others who come in (to the city presumably). Moreover, they do not judge (δικάζω) lawfully within the city and incited people toward deadly works (ἔργα λοίγια) (*Praep. ev.* 9.22.9).[463] The boundary is justified, and its justification extends beyond a discrete incident with Dinah. God supports the enforcement of the boundary, and, even if God did not support it, the Shechemites have provided several reasons themselves for a boundary to be enforced with such extreme violence.

Consistent with Jubilees and Theodotus' epic, the Testament of Levi also provides a divine justification for the violence taken against the Shechemites, and particularly that of Levi. The justification is delivered in the context of Levi's vision of heaven where an angel meets him. After giving Levi the blessing of priesthood (τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς ἱερατείας), the angel provides Levi with a shield and sword to enact vengeance (ποίησον ἐκδίκησιν) on account of Dinah (T. Levi 5:2–3).[464] Levi's authority to oversee the religious rites of his community are paired with

[463] The claims of ungodliness and inhospitality Theodotus levels at Shechem are reminiscent of that leveled against Sodom in Wis. 10:6 and 19:13-17.

[464] Some manuscripts do not include "blessed." DeJonge, *The Testaments*, 30.

his right to respond with violence toward the Other, the one who perpetrated the violence and those associated with him. The text reinforces the fate of the "sons of Hamor" stating that Levi finished them off "just as it is written in the tablets of heaven" (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν) (T. Levi 5:4).[465] In the previous section I showed that the Testament of Levi painted a picture of the inhabitants of Shechem—possibly the Canaanites as well—as loathsome people with a propensity to violence. What further justification for retributive, boundary-enforcing violence might one need once a divine emissary has hand delivered weapons along with clear instructions to destroy a people?

Although he differs from his counterparts in his strategy for justifying retributive violence, Philo also ultimately seeks to make a case for the brothers' violence. While some of the other authors appeal to a divine licensure for violence to justify the brothers' actions, Philo focuses on their upstanding qualities. Feldman notes that "Simeon and Levi are praised in terms that a philosopher would especially appreciate, namely as hearers (ἀκουσταί) and pupils (γνώριμοι) of sound sense (φρονήσεως)...the opposite of the unintelligence (ἄνοια) epitomized by Shechem" (*Migration* 39.224).[466] Philo indicates Simeon and Levi are prepared to defend against "profane and impure manners" (βεβήλων καὶ ἀκαθάρτων τρόπων), like those undertaken by Shechem and his people (*Names* 36.200).[467] In addition to extolling the virtues of Simeon and Levi, Philo also appeals to a Deuteronomic dictum Shechem and his men were violating as they

[465] Schniedewind writes about the "numinous power of writing." It is transmundane and powerful. Biblical literature points to the notion that "God keeps a heavenly book, inscribed with people's names, which God adds to and erases thereby inscribing the eternal fate of those named" (Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 24). This notion seems to lie behind this line in T. Levi.

[466] Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 259. It is important to note that 4 Macc 2:19 uses Simeon and Levi as an example of what not to do—they did not have a temperate mind (σώφρων νοῦς); their passions (παθῶν) ruled; they did not act with reason (μὴ λογισμῷ). This note is important because it evidences the diversity of Jewish thought, and in particular, thought concerning Simeon and Levi.

[467] Feldman, "Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus," 259.

were engaged in pleasure-loving (φιληδόνῳ) to support his case for revenge. Philo writes that even though there was a divine decree (χρησμός) saying, "Not ever shall one become a prostitute among the daughters of the Seer, Israel" (οὐκ ἂν γένοιτό ποτε πόρνη τῶν τοῦ βλέποντος, Ἰσραήλ, θυγατέρων), the men who assaulted the "virgin soul" (παρθένον ψυχὴν) hoped to go unnoticed (*Migration* 39.224).[468] While the divine did not directly sanction the violence, the divine decree was invoked to demonstrate how the Shechemites had participated in the violation of divine law. Even though Philo differs greatly from the other texts in terms of his rhetorical strategy and his allegorical interpretation of Genesis, he still employs many of the same strategies other early Jewish authors use to draw and reinforce boundaries between themselves and others using this narrative of sexual violence.

2.4 Conclusion

The Dinah story, as presented in the MT, reflects on boundaries important in the Iron Age context. I have argued that the story's sexual violence serves the political purposes of the writer and their royal patron: it demonstrates that Shechem and his people are violent, sexually deviant Others and thereby justifies the seizure of land. Early interpreters of the Dinah story continued this trend and used the story to reflect on issues of boundaries in their own time, each in their own way. I have argued Joseph and Aseneth uses the Dinah story to explore the permeability of communal boundaries. I have also argued that even in Judith, a story traditionally understood as advocating for strict boundaries, the writer uses the circumcision motif in the Dinah narrative to consider acceptable ways for others to join the community. I have showed that several other

[468] Philo's quote is similar to LXX Deut 23:17, but it does not reflect the extant text perfectly. This might indicate Philo took editorial license with the text. It could also indicate that he was working from a source text not currently extant. This underscores the point discussed in the previous chapter that there was a certain amount of textual fluidity with regards to the biblical texts.

writers employ the Dinah story to advocate for a stricter interpretation of boundaries using various strategies including highlighting the Otherness of Shechem, emphasizing the collective culpability of the Shechemites (or Canaanites for the Testament of Levi), and citing a divine license (or other justification) for the revenge enacted upon the Shechemites. To be clear, not all of the writers employ these strategies to advocate for the *same* boundary. For example, there are real differences in the way that writers of Jubilees and Josephus imagine boundaries with others for their Jewish communities, but they both understand the Dinah story to be a site for exploring those boundaries. In the following chapter I explore the ways the Sodom story in Gen 19 was used for similar boundary exploration purposes among early Jewish interpreters.

2.5 Excursus: Dinah in The Aramaic Levi Document?

The story of Dinah is tangled up with traditions about Levi. Levi features prominently in three early Jewish works: Jubilees, Testament of Levi and the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD).[469] The fragmentary nature of ALD makes Dinah's place in the work unclear. No fragment contains Dinah's name.[470] Shechem's name is also absent from ALD.[471] Some lines can

[469] Robert Kugler describes these three documents as the "Levite-Priestly Tradition." *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, SBLEJL 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 2-4. In the work he presented this idea of the Levite-Priestly tradition, he also articulated a view of textual dependence between the three which he has since retracted. See Kugler, "Testaments," 340.

[470] Drawnel suggests that Dinah is named in 4QLevi^{d} frg. 3; however, the evidence for his reading is thin. Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*, JSJSup 86 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 37 and 171. Jonas Greenfield, Michael Stone, and Esther Eshel do not find Dinah's name in 4QLevi^{d} frg. 3 and make no attempt to place it within ALD noting it does not parallel content in the other fragments or T. Levi, Greenfield, Stone and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation and Commentary*, SVTP 19 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 223.

[471] Although Shechem's name is absent from the document, one fragment (P 1185) seems to relate to the Shechemites. For more on the initial publication of this fragment see Gideon Bohak, "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document," *From Cairo to Manchester: Studies in the Rylands Genizah Fragments*, eds. Renate Smithuis and Philip S. Alexander, JSSSup 31 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 101–13. For analysis on how it relates to Shechem see Dorothy Peters and Esther Eshel, "Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem: Levi and His Sword in the Rylands Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document," in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Kipp Davis, Dorothy Peters, Kyung Baek, and Peter Flint (Boston: Brill, 2016), 237–59.

be interpreted as relating to her story, but the fragmentary nature of the content makes it difficult to determine how the writer is framing the story. A few of these lines are tantalizing, but caution must be exercised in relating them to the Dinah story. For example, Cam. col. A, II reads,[472]

She/you defiled the son[s]	..ט̇מאת לבנ̇[ ] (על?)	15
In order that all people	דברת די כל אנ̇ש̇[ ]	16
To do according to the law in all	למעבד כדין בכל̇ [ ]	17
Jacob my father and Re[uben]	יעקב אבי ורא[ ]	18
And we said to them in [...] of	ואמרנן להון ב[ ] ..נה די ה̇[ ]	18
They desired our daughters that we all would be	צביין אינון בברתן ונהוי כולן א[ ]	19
and friends. Cut your foreskins of flesh	וחברין גזורו .. עורלת בשרכון	20
And look like [...] and you will be sealed	והתחמיון כ[....]ותה/חון חתימין	21
Like us with the circumcision of [...]? And we will be for y[ou]	כואתן במילת [..]ו̇ט ונהוי לכ[..]	22
?	א	23

The bottom half of the fragment addressing circumcision seems as if it might relate to the proposal made by Jacob's sons to the Shechemites to circumcise the men of the city. However, and scholars debate its reading.[473] The debate centers on what subject to infer from טמא in the *piel* stem (defile), a third-person feminine (she) or second-person masculine or feminine (you). If the former reading is preferred, is Dinah the subject? What would it mean for the victim of sexual violence to be responsible for defiling? If Dinah is the intended subject of the verb, the writer would be making quite a statement on how they understand its sexual politics.

[472] All transcriptions in this paper are original to the author and based on images made publicly available by University of Cambridge Digital Library. Uncertain letters have been marked by a small dot above them; brackets mark where the line has been damaged. Dots on the line indicate that there is damage within a word. No attempt has been made in this transcription to show, through spaces, how many letters are believed to be missing in the bracketed areas. Words for which there is no physical evidence, but strong contextual evidence are put in parentheses and marked with a question mark. For the readers' knowledge, each line in this manuscript averages 19–22 letters, and the scribe's hand is very consistent.

[473] Drawnel reads and reconstructs the line as דטמאת לבני יעקב בזנותה על and translates that as "since she defiled the sons of Jacob with her harlotry." Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 105–6. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel more cautiously read and reconstruct טמאת לבני...על and translate "you/she defiled the sons...according to." Greenfield, Stone and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 110–111.

Understanding the subject to be a second person masculine subject makes less sense. Both readings are unsatisfactory, and there is too little context to construct a clear meaning.

Another line that is somewhat provocative and may suggest a relationship to the Dinah story is found in 4Q213[a] frgs. 3 and 4.[474]

He made us swear [ ] . [ ] . men	]אשבען [ ]מ [ ]ר גבריא	2
A woman and she desecrated her name and the name of her father	]אנתה ותח[]ל שמה ושם אבוה	3
. . [ ] . [ ] . . [ ] shame and all	]ר֯ה [ ]מ[ ]בה[ ] בֿהתא	4
. . who profaned her name and the name of her ancestors and shamed all her brothers	וכל]לה זי חבלת שמה ושם אבהתה ואבהתת לכל	5
Her father and the name of the holy one will not be erased from her people forever	אחיה]אבוה ולא מתמתא שם חסיה מן כול עמהא	6
. . for all generations of eternity and ...the holy ones from the people	לעלם] לש לכל דרי עלמא ומ[ ]קדישין	7
. [ ] holy tithe, an offering for ..	מן עמא]ל[ ]מעשר קודש קרבן לאל[]ן	8

Henryk Drawnel argues that this fragment parallels Jub. 30:5–7 as well as Cam. col. A 15 reading, "she defiles the sons of Jacob with her harlotry."[475] In Drawnel's analysis of this fragment, he does not understand Dinah to be the woman referenced and the subject of תחלל (desecrated) or חבלת (profaned), but the whole line to be a "halakhic commentary" on the Dinah story. Drawnel notes a similarity with Jub. 30:7 that comments on the Dinah narrative but discusses another woman who has dishonored her father's name. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel approach the fragment differently from Drawnel. The three note, "Nothing we know about Dinah helps us to contextualize this material, nor does it have any sort of parallel or echo in TPL [T. Levi]. Therefore, we are not persuaded that it relates to Dinah, and we have left it among the

[474] Images of this fragment are made available by the Leon Levy digital library.

[475] Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 235.

unplaced fragments."[476] Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel are right to exercise caution in interpreting this fragment. Scholars assume that ALD contains a story about Dinah that precedes Levi's violent intervention, and for good reason. Given the diversity of responses in early Jewish literature to the Dinah story, however, it is important to exercise caution in reading between the lines on ALD's fragments.

2.6 Excursus: Just the Facts

One of the earliest Greek accounts of Israel's history, including a reference to the Dinah story, was composed by one called Demetrius the Chronographer in the third century BCE and includes a reference to the Dinah story. [477] The account is sparse but adds some details absent from Genesis. For example, Demetrius notes that Jacob and his family lived beside Hamor and his tribe, presumably peacefully, for ten years before the attack.[478] Demetrius also provides the ages of many of the story's characters. For example, Dinah was sixteen years and four months old at the time of the attack (*Praep. ev*. 9.29.9). For Demetrius, the event functioned as an anchor point for other parts of the Genesis narrative, and particularly Jacob's movements around Palestine. His primary objective, based on the extant fragments of his work, was to produce an account of the Torah based upon "Hellenistic critical standards," primarily solving chronological questions and inconsistencies.[479] While Demetrius does not seem to be making any type of argument or engaging in any type of polemic in his recounting of the Dinah story, it is striking he

[476] Greenfield, Stone and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Documen*t, 18.

[477] Fragments of Demetrius' work are preserved in Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* and Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata*. J. Hanson, *OTP* 2:843.

[478] Magnar Kartveit suggests that Demetrius was trying to communicate that there was a peaceful coexistence before the attack even though he does not explicitly state it was peaceful. Magnar Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans*, VTSup (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 121.

[479] Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 35.

chooses it as one of the historical anchor points of his chronology. It signals that the story was important in Jewish historiography even as early as the third century BCE.

2.7 Excursus: What Happened Afterward?

What happened to Dinah after her abduction and assault at Shechem? Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*) and the Testament of Job both write that Dinah became Job's wife.[480] Both writings are dated to sometime between the first century BCE and the first century CE, but they likely originate in different languages and different communities.[481] Still, they reflect a common tradition about Dinah's life after Shechem.[482] After a few terse lines recounting the rape and her brothers' revenge, Pseudo-Philo notes that "afterwards, Job took her as a wife and begot from her fourteen sons and six daughters (*LAB* 8:8)." Legaspi argues that Pseudo-Philo "addresses two concerns: the marital prospects of a defiled Dinah (have her marry exogamously) and the need to locate the figure of Job in Israelite history."[483] The first concern is worth drawing out. The issue of communal boundaries in this sexually violent story was clear to Pseudo-Philo, and he took on the interpretive challenge of working through it. Having been

---

[480] With respect to *LAB*, this dissertation uses the translation produced by Jacobson with reference to DJ Harrington's Latin text reproduced in Jacobson's translation and commentary. Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, AGJU 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1996). Harrington's translations in *OTP* 2:297–377 has also served as a reference. With respect to T. Job, this dissertation uses the Greek text edited by Sebastian Brock in *Testamentum Iobi* (Leiden: Brill, 1967). Other rabbinic traditions suggest that Dinah became Simeon's wife while others indicate that she became Asenath's mother. See Michael Legaspi, "Job's Wives in the 'Testament of Job': A Note on the Synthesis of Two Traditions," *JBL* 127 (2008): 72.

[481] The debate surrounding Pseudo-Philo's date is addressed more fully in the final chapter. For an overview of the scholarship on the issue of dating for each text see D.J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," *OTP* 2:299 and R.P. Spittler, "Testament of Job," *OTP* 1:833. On the dating of T. Job see also Kugler, "Testaments," 335. The Hebrew origin of *LAB* is discussed in the final chapter. The Greek origins of T. Job are addressed in Spittler, *OTP* 1:830.

[482] For the purposes of this tradition, it is unimportant to determine the direction of dependency or a vector of transmission between the two writings. The note about Job and Dinah's union in both of them is not critical to the flow of either narrative, yet both chose to include the detail. It must have resonated with both writers.

[483] Legaspi, "Job's Wives," 73.

raped by a foreigner, endogamy is a route cut off for Dinah. He develops a "next best" solution by partnering Dinah with a "good outsider" and provide a familial tie for Job to Jacob's family.

The familial tie is of the utmost importance within Testament of Job. At the beginning of his testamentary speech, Job tells his children that they are part of an "elected" (ἐκλεκτός) and "honorable" (ἔντιμος) people through Jacob, their mother's father (T. Job 1:5–6). Dinah's role is minor, but critical. She is the link by which Job and his children are connected to Israel. The defiled daughter of Jacob is married out to bring in the most righteous of the foreigners. While Dinah's role in both of these writings approaches the insignificant, the writers recognize her body, after Shechem's violation of her, exists at the boundary of the community. They use her to bring another liminal figure closer to the center of the fold.

3. The Sodom Story and Its Reception

The story of Sodom as presented in Gen 19:1–29, unlike the stories of Dinah in Gen 34 and the Levite's concubine in Judg 19–20, is alive in popular Western imagination. Its continued relevance is in part due to its connection to terms like "sodomy" and "sodomite" that have been adopted even into administrative and legal language.[484] The story also loomed large in the collective imagination of ancient writers and interpreters, even as early as the Iron Age. For these ancient interpreters, the issue of same-sex sexual relations hardly registered as a concern. The Sodom story did, however, figure into the ancient discussions of the boundaries between Jews and others, quite similar to what we found in the last chapter in the early interpretations of the Dinah story. The story of Sodom also raised an additional and unique boundary issue, specifically one centered around the nature of the messengers sent to deliver God's message of judgment. What type of being are the messengers? How should one understand the sexual violence directed at them? And what does the story mean for boundaries with transmundane creatures? The issue of boundaries—be they with other human communities or other types of beings—is central to early Jewish interpretation of this story.

Following the same general outline of the previous chapter, in this chapter, I first examine the story of Sodom in its MT Genesis context. I then argue that Gen 19, different from the way most modern interpretations treat it, ought to be read as a story of sexual violence. While reading the story of Dinah as a story of sexual violence is sometimes criticized on lexical-legal grounds, the story of Sodom is not often read as a story of sexual violence at all. This chapter offers a corrective to the framing of Gen 19 as anything other than a sexually violent text. I

[484] In this chapter, I use "Gen 19" and "Sodom story" as a shorthand for the Sodom and Gomorrah story contained within verses 1–29 of the chapter not inclusive of 30–38. With respect to administrative/legal language, one can look to the example of the 1986 United States supreme court case Bowers v. Hardwick which posed the question of whether the constitution protects individuals' rights to consensual "sodomy."

conclude my discussion of MT Gen 19 by examining the politics of sexual violence at play in the story and pay particular attention to questions of gender, as well as communal relations and boundaries. In this section, I argue that Gen 19 works in concert with Judg 19–20 as part of anti-Saul polemic constructed by southern political leadership. After examining the story in the MT, I analyze its Greek translation and focus on key words and phrases that appear in early Jewish writings to help the reader understand the interpretive moves of other early Jewish writers. Finally, I turn to the story's reception in early Jewish literature. I argue that early Jewish writers use the story of Sodom to create, extend and reify boundaries with Others. They do this by aligning contemporary groups with the Sodomites to create and justify those boundaries. Early Jewish writers also interpret the story of Sodom to create a boundary between humanity and the semi-divine realm. They advocate for this boundary by reading the story of Sodom alongside the stories of Gen 6 and works that interpret it. Finally, I show how at least some early Jewish writers explored the stories of Gen 19 and Judg 19–20 together.

3.1 MT Genesis 19 and The Sodom Tradition

3.1.1 Dating and Context

As dating for the textualization of Genesis was addressed in the previous chapter, it is not rehearsed here. There are some important points to make, however, about the early history of Gen 19 and its context within the Abraham cycle in Genesis.[485] In a similar vein to how scholars interested in the history of the composition of the Pentateuch dissected the Jacob cycle to

[485] For an overview of recent literature on the Abraham cycle see Kris Sonek, "The Abraham Narratives in Genesis 12–25," *CBR* 17 (2019): 158–83. This dissertation treats Gen 19:1–29 as a literary unity; however, scholars, particularly twentieth century European scholars, have teased out various narrative strands within the text. Examples of these approaches include Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary, Revised Edition*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), 215–22; Gunkel, *Genesis*, 205–12; Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 297–309. In his comments on Gen 19:17–22, Von Rad perceptively notes "now the passage belongs inalienably to the story" (*Genesis*, 220). His observation might well be true for all of Gen 19:1–29.

determine the relative antiquity of individual stories within the cycle, scholars have likewise examined the Abraham cycle to develop theories of its layers and the Sodom story's place in those layers.[486] Several scholars have affirmed the antiquity of the Sodom and Gomorrah tale in Gen 19 relative to its counterparts in the rest of the Abraham cycle.[487]

While several scholars affirm the antiquity of both the Abraham cycle and Gen 19 within that cycle, still some see the cycle and story as late inventions. Nadav Na'aman argues that "none of the three patriarchs," including Abraham, belong to the time of a divided kingdom; rather, they belong to the mid-sixth century BCE. Of the story of Sodom, Na'aman writes, "Since scholars dated the Sodom story to the pre-exilic period, they missed the obvious explanation for its message; namely, that it was written as a theological explanation for God's justice in the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem." Na'aman's conclusions, however, have not been obvious to other scholars.

Other scholars have argued for an earlier date. Claus Westermann notes that the story of Sodom in Gen 19 has more in common with the primeval history (such as the flood narrative) with respect to its portrayal of God's judgment and proclamation of salvation for one individual.[488] Westermann's conclusions are rooted in a particular conception of the development

---

[486] For a review of some of the major theories on the literary strata of the Abraham cycle see Nadav Na'aman, "The Pre-Priestly Abraham Story as a Unified Exilic Work," *SJOT* 29 (2015): 157–61.

[487] For example, see Irmtraud Fischer, *Die Erzeltern Israels: Feministisch-theologische Studien zu Genesis 12–36*, BZAW 222 (New York: de Gruyter, 1994), 339; Thomas Römer, "Recherches actuelles sur le cycle d'Abraham," in *Studies in the Book of Genesis, Literature, Redaction and History*, BETL 155, ed. A. Wénin (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 193; Reinhard Kratz makes Gen 19 the centerpiece of the Abraham cycle to which other Abraham narratives were attached. See Kratz, *Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 270–71.

[488] Westermann's methodology for determining the antiquity of the story is particularly interesting for this dissertation. He compares Gen 19 with Judg 19–20 parsing the differences in the messages about God's judgment and locating those messages historically in his broader conception of the development of Israelite religion. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 298.

of Israelite religion that understands God's judgment to be vast and his loyalty to individuals unwavering (as in the case of Noah and Lot). Even if one does not follow Westermann in his theological presuppositions, the connections between the flood narrative and Sodom are compelling. Like Westermann, Hermann Gunkel also affirms the antiquity of the Sodom account in Gen 19. Gunkel points to the imitation of various motifs from Gen 19 in Judg 19–20 stating that the imitation "demonstrates the advanced age of the Sodom account."[489] Of course, Gunkel's evidence only points to a relative dating of the account dependent on whatever one's view is of the dating of Judges. Neither the logic or evidence of Westermann or Gunkel might be sufficient to move Na'aman from his position, but their positions regarding the antiquity of Gen 19 alongside that of several other scholars does demonstrate that it is anything but obvious this story is a mid-sixth century story reflecting on the fate of Jerusalem.

Outside of questions about dating, the placement of the Gen 19 story within the broader Abraham cycle is important for establishing the text's context. Some scholars note that the story of Sodom in Gomorrah in Gen 19:1–29, like that of Dinah in Gen 34, is somewhat disconnected from the text on either side of it and was likely "originally an independent saga."[490] Despite it bearing the marks of an independent unit, the story has been woven into a broader literary context.[491] This broader literary context is important to bear in mind when evaluating the reception history around the cities and their destruction as some early Jewish texts addressing

[489] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 215. Gunkel assumes the direction of influence from Genesis to Judges, but Marc Brettler demonstrates the direction of influence from Genesis to Judges through an effective methodology of looking for "blind motifs" in the text. See Marc Z. Brettler, "The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics," *JBL* 108 (1989): 411–12.

[490] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 216.

[491] Within the book of Genesis, Sodom and Gomorrah are mentioned in 10:19; 13:10, 14; 14:2–11; 18:20; 19:24, 28. Sodom receives individual note in 13:12–13, 14:12, 17–24, 18:26, 19:1–22. The independent traditions of Sodom might indicate that its Gomorrah counterpart was a later addition.

Sodom and Gomorrah are often more interested in the theological material preceding the narrative (Gen 18: 20–33) than the narrative itself.

Within Genesis, the first mention of Sodom and Gomorrah occurs in the context of the Table of Nations text (Gen 10:19), in which the cities are described as at the border of the territory the Canaanites settled. Sodom and Gomorrah are again mentioned in Gen 13:10–13 in a story about Lot's settlement among the cities of the Plain "as far as Sodom" (עד סדם, Gen 13:12). It also mentions the cities in this chapter to anchor Lot's settlement historically, "before YHWH destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah" (לפני שחת יהוה את סדם ואת עמרה, Gen 13:10), assuming the audience knows about the destruction described in Gen 18–19. Finally, a disjunctive clause in Gen 13:13 offering additional information on where Lot has settled reports, "Now, the men of Sodom were evil and very sinful before YHWH" (ואנשי סדם רעים וחטאים ליהוה מאד). It is worth noting that Sodom is sometimes mentioned independently of Gomorrah leading some scholars to believe that "and Gomorrah" phrases might have been retroactively added to some Sodom traditions.[492]

In the chapter immediately following Lot's settlement among the five cities of the plain, Genesis offers (a rather confusing) report on a battle between the kings of the cities of the plain, including the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, and a collection of other kings including that of Elam (Gen 14:1–16). The King of Elam and his counterparts subdued the five cities and much of the surrounding area. During a battle with Sodom and Gomorrah, the King of Elam and his counterparts seized Lot, his household as well as other goods of Sodom (Gen 14:11–12). After receiving word of Lot's fate, Abraham acts, deftly battles the foreign forces, defeats them, and

[492] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 201; Von Rad, *Genesis*, 221.

returns Lot and his household to their place (Gen 14:13–16). Hearing of Abraham's defeat of these kings, the King of Sodom as well as King Melchizedek of Salem go out to meet Abraham. While Melchizedek gives an offering to Abraham, the King of Sodom informs Abraham that he can keep the goods he rescued.[493] Abraham declines the offer telling the king that he swore to the God Most High that "he will not take a thread, a sandal strap nor anything else belonging to you, so that you will not say I made Abram rich" (אם-מחוט עד שרוך-נעל ואם-אקח מכל-אשר-לך ולא תאמר אני העשרתי את אברם Gen 14:23). In an astute analysis of the story, Robert Wabyanga suggests Abraham's refusal might be indicative of the authors' interest in delineating Abraham's wealth from foreign wealth.[494]

Of particular importance is the pericope in Gen 18:17–33, which includes a debate between YHWH and Abraham regarding the destruction of Sodom. These verses reflect on theological themes related to the destruction of the cities like YHWH's justice, whether the righteous of Sodom should suffer for the sins of the wicked in the city, and the nature of the relationship between YHWH and his chosen ones. It might be argued that it offers interpreters a lens for thinking about the material that comes after it although one could derive their own interpretation of the Gen 19 narrative without the content in Gen 18:17–33.[495] The pericope

[493] Robert Kuloba Wabyanga clearly draws out the differences between the King of Salem and the King of Sodom in "The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah Revisited: Military and Political reflections," *OTE* 28/3 (2015): 854–57.

[494] Wabyanga, "The Destruction of Sodom," 856.

[495] The explanation for a catastrophe coming in the form of a story about sexual violence is also seen in the relationship between Judg 19 and Judg 20 explored in the next chapter. Von Rad suggests Gen 18:17–33 is an "insertion" into the Abraham-Lot story. Von Rad, *Genesis*, 214–5. Gunkel suggests that this dialogue in Gen 18 (specifically Gen 18:16aβ, b, 20–22a, 33b) was not an independent narrative but a constructed "interlude"–albeit in two distinct parts–between the first part of Gen 18 and the first part of Gen 19. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 200. Westermann also explores the idea that some portion of the Sodom material in Gen 18 functioned as a theological explanation for Gen 19. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 286–7. Ed Noort refers to Gen 18:16–33 as a "prologue" in "For the Sake of Righteousness: Abraham's Negotiations with YHWH as Prologue to the Sodom Narrative: Genesis 18:16–33," in *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and Its Interpreters*, TBN 7, eds. Edward Noort and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (Boston: Brill, 2004), 3–15.

begins with men who had been visiting Abraham turning toward Sodom, and YHWH posing a rhetorical question on whether to share with Abraham that which YHWH was going to do, presumably referring to his intent to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:16–19). YHWH indicates that he must go down to see what they have done—"the great outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah" and a "great sin" (זעקת סדם ועמרה כי-רבה וחטאתם כי כבדה מאד Gen 18:20).[496] YHWH intends to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, but the reason is opaque. Abraham is perplexed by YHWH's response and asks if he intends to sweep away the righteous along with the evil (Gen 18:23). Abraham's question provokes a dialogue between Abraham and YHWH on the number of righteous individuals required to save the city (Gen 18:23–33). At the end of the dialogue, Abraham negotiated with YHWH that if ten righteous individuals are found in Sodom (and Gomorrah?), he will not destroy it. The pericope ends with YHWH and Abraham returning to their places, a literary equivalent of the closing of the curtain in a stage production. The debate between Abraham and YHWH serves as a distant backdrop for the scene that unfolds in Gen 19.

3.1.2 Overview of MT Genesis 19

Like Gen 18 began with three mysterious visitors arriving at Abraham's tent, Gen 19 begins with two mysterious visitors arriving at the gate of Sodom (Gen 18:2, 19:1). Unlike their counterparts in Gen 18, the visitors arrive in the evening and meet Lot who bows before them (וישתחו אפים ארצה) (Gen 19:1). The MT describes these two visitors as המלאכים which, in a mundane sense, means messengers.[497] However, throughout the MT it is also used in construct

---

[496] Wabyanga juxtaposes the outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah which seems to demand YHWH's destructive hand and that of the outcry of the sons of Israel in Exod 3 or Judg 6 which moved YHWH's saving hand. "The Destruction of Sodom," 856.

[497] For example, Gen 32:4, Deut 2:26, Judg 6:35, etc. Throughout the current discussion on Gen 19, "angels" does not appear as a translation for המלאכים as it does in many English translations of the text. My intention behind using "messengers" is to break the readers' association between the concept of 'angel' as it exists in post-exilic (and later) writings and its underdetermined counterpart in pre-exilic texts. Pre-exilic writings, like Gen 19,

with YHWH or a pronoun referring to YHWH suggesting the messenger's proximity to the divine, possibly conferring a divine or semi-divine status on the messenger.[498] The outcome of the visit certainly suggests these messengers possess some otherworldly power.

Lot offers the messengers a place to wash up and stay for the night, but they initially refuse his offer opting to stay the night in the open space (רחב) in the city (Gen 19:2). Lot presses them (ויפצר בם), however, and they agree to stay with Lot who provides his visitors a feast (Gen 19:3). At the end of the evening, the men of Sodom, the text emphasizing all of the men of Sodom, young and old, surround Lot's home and call out for him to send out the men (האנשים) who are staying with him that they might "know" (ידע) them in the euphemistic way that the MT uses the verb (Gen 19:4–5).[499] It is worth returning at this point to the definition of sexual violence operative in this dissertation which includes any "attempt to obtain a sexual act" and "unwanted sexual comments or advances" both of which describe this gang's behavior as they surround Lot's house.

---

are uninterested in explaining divine messengers, whence they came, their relationship to YHWH, their status, or supernatural abilities. The message they bring is their priority. Carol Newsom and Duane Watson, "Angels" *ABD* 1:248–54. It is worth briefly noting the BHS textual apparatus issue of apparatus suggests amending שני המלאכים in Gen 19:1 to האנשים. It offers no manuscript evidence for that amendment; thus, the text as written should stand. For a detailed discussion on the relationship of these messengers to YHWH and the "angel of the Lord" מלאך יהוה see Camilla Hélena von Heijne, *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis*, BZAW 412 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 58–62.

[498] For example, Gen 16:7, Gen 24:7, Ex 23:23, etc. It is noteworthy that when human characters learn that the messenger is an emissary from the divine, their reactions vary from reverence on the one end to ambivalence as is seen in Gen 19. See Newsom and Watson, "Angels" *ABD* 1:249.

[499] Some commentators have addressed the verb ידע in this context arguing for an interpretation different from the one offered above. Ron Pirson says that the verb does not have a sexual meaning in Gen 19:5. Ron Pirson, "Does Lot Know About Yada'?" in *Universalism and Particularism at Sodom and Gomorrah: Essays in Memory of Ron Pirson*, AIL, eds. Diana Lipton and Ron Pirson (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012), 212. Brian Doyle says, "there is support for a non-sexual interpretation of the focal verses of Genesis 19." Brian Doyle, "The Sin of Sodom: yāḏa' yāḏa' yāḏa'? Reading of the Mamre-Sodom Narrative in Genesis 18–19," *Theology and Sexuality* 9 (1998): 86. Wabyanga suggests that the men of Sodom "had the duty to know the strangers who have infiltrated their territory" suggesting visitors are spies and relying on the most straightforward translation of the verb, "to know." "The Destruction of Sodom," 869. Given Lot's offer of his virgin daughters to the men and the textual connections with other stories of sexual violence including Gen 34 and Judg 19, a non-sexual interpretation of ידע is untenable.

Undoubtedly troubled by the men's behavior, Lot emerges from the house, shutting the door behind him, and pleads with the men to not be wicked (אל-נה…תרעו) (Gen 19:6–7). In an attempt to appease the men of Sodom and protect the men (or semi-divine beings presenting as men?) visiting him, Lot offers his two virgin daughters for the men to do with whatever is good in their own eyes (Gen 19:8). The men responded to Lot with verbal and physical aggression, questioning how "this one" who came as a non-native to dwell among them (האחד בא-לגור) now fancies himself a judge.[500] The men of Sodom threaten that they will deal more wickedly with him than his guests and begin to draw near to break down the door (Gen 19:9). At that moment, the visitors sent by God reach outside of the door, draw Lot inside, and strike (הכו) the would-be assailants with blindness (הסנורים) causing them to search in vain for the door (Gen 19:10–11).[501]

At this point the narrative shifts, and the male messengers take a more active role. They instruct Lot to gather the members of his household and leave because they soon will destroy this place (המקום הזה) (Gen 19:12–13). They inform Lot that their outcry (צעקתם) has gone up before YHWH, and YHWH sent them to decimate the city (לשתחה) (Gen 19:13).[502] Lot heeds the

---

[500] In Gen 19:9, the mob of men command Lot to גש-הלאה before insulting him. The Hebrew phrase is peculiar as the verb suggests they're asking Lot to draw near, but the adverb carries the usual sense of "yonder." Both "get out of the way" and "come closer" can make sense contextually. For a detailed analysis of the Hebrew syntax see Christopher Heard, "What Does the Mob Want Lot To Do in Gen 19:9?" *HS* 51 (2010): 95–105.

[501] Others who afflict YHWH's chosen are struck with blindness in the HB. See 2 Kgs 6:18–20 and Zech 12:4. See Wabyanga who makes this observation "The Destruction of Sodom," 860.

[502] Many translators have chosen to translate צעקתם as "the outcry against them." However, this translation of "against them" as opposed to "their outcry" is only offered in reference to two verses (Gen 18:21 and 19:13) both dealing with Sodom. Every other time this construct phrase is used in the MT, mostly in reference to Israel, God's chosen people, it is translated "their outcry" and often results in divine intervention or rescue (e.g., Exod 3:7–9). It is worth maintaining a consistent translation of "their outcry." When the cry of non-Israelites disturbs the divine presence, the result is swift, violent intervention, just directed at the ones who disturbed the divine. Ellen J. van Wolde, who also indicates that "outcry against them" is an improper translation of Gen 19:13, offers a thorough analysis and thoughtful comments on how צ/זעקה is used in the MT. While I disagree with her overall interpretation of Gen 18–19, her lexical analysis is unmatched in scholarship on this passage. See Ellen J. van Wolde, "Outcry, Knowledge, and Judgment in Genesis 18–19," in *Universalism and Particularism at Sodom and Gomorrah: Essays in Memory of Ron Pirson*, AIL, eds. Diana Lipton and Ron Pirson (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012), 71–101.

messengers' warning and informs the men to whom his daughters were betrothed to leave with him lest they be lost in the destruction, but they do not take Lot seriously (Gen 19:14). The messengers repeat their warning to Lot, but Lot lingers until finally the messengers take him by force out of the city and command him to leave the plain, never looking back (Gen 19:15–17). Lot is paralyzed by fear of the impending doom and tells the messengers that he cannot flee to the hills lest destruction kills him (Lot's logic is not unimpeachable) (Gen 19:18–19). He negotiates with the men to stay on the plain and escape to a small city which they agree not to destroy (Gen 19:20–21).

When Lot arrives at the small city, which the text indicates was henceforth called Zoar likely due to its size, YHWH rains down sulfur and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:22–24). The writer specifies that YHWH overturned the cities, the whole plain, all its inhabitants and the vegetation of the land (Gen 19:25).

The narrative takes one more decisive turn after the destruction of the cities. The narrator informs the audience that Lot's wife looks back and becomes a pillar of salt (Gen 19:26). Without comment or analysis on the wife-turned-pillar, the narrative turns its attention to Abraham who stands out at an overlook where he can see the smoldering cities (Gen 19:27–28). The pericope ends with an affirmation of God's loyalty to Abraham noting that he intervened for Lot by removing him from the cities before they were destroyed (Gen 19:29).

3.1.3 MT Sodom & Gomorrah Tradition Outside of Genesis

Having reviewed mentions of Sodom in Gomorrah in Genesis prior to Gen 19, and the story of Gen 19 itself, it is important to briefly review Sodom and Gomorrah's presence in other parts of the MT before turning to the memory of Sodom in early Jewish texts. Outside of

Genesis, the memory of Sodom and Gomorrah is evoked in Deuteronomy and the prophets.[503] In Deut 29:22, Sodom and Gomorrah are used as examples of land afflicted by YHWH unable to produce vegetation. Deuteronomy 32:32 continues with the theme of vegetation, stating that the vineyards of Sodom and Gomorrah are poisonous and bitter. The writer of the song in Deut 32 seems unaware that the cities have been razed. Amos and Isaiah both incorporate Sodom and Gomorrah into comparisons—the most frequent way for the cities to be used in the prophets. Through Amos, YHWH indicates that he overthrew some of Israel like Sodom and Gomorrah (Amos 4:11). Isaiah indicates that except for YHWH leaving some survivors they would be like Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa 1:9–10). He then says Jerusalem proclaims their sin like those of Sodom (Isa 3:9).[504] In a different part of Isaiah, the writer compares the pending destruction of Babylon to that of Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa 13:19). Jeremiah also invokes the memory of Sodom and Gomorrah, stating that the inhabitants of Jerusalem have become like the two cities (Jer 23:14). Jeremiah threatens that Edom and Babylon shall become uninhabitable like Sodom and Gomorrah (Jer 49:18 and 50:40). Similarly, Zephaniah writes Moab and the Ammonites will become like Sodom and Gomorrah, respectively (Zeph 2:9). The writer of Lamentations says the iniquity (עון) of his people has been like that of Sodom's people (Lam 4:9).

While many of the above-mentioned references to Sodom and Gomorrah are relatively vague and generally reference a great destruction, Ezekiel's references to Sodom, alone, stand out for their specificity and uniqueness among the traditions. Ezekiel states plainly that the guilt

[503] While not specifically addressing Gen 19, Thomas Römer does address the Abraham cycle broadly outside of the book of Genesis in "Abraham Traditions in the Hebrew Bible Outside the Book of Genesis," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup, eds. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen (Boston: Brill, 2012), 159–80.

[504] David Carr takes the references to Sodom and Gomorrah in Amos and Isaiah to link them together and serve as evidence of their southern (Judean) background. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 339.

(עון) of Sodom was their pride (גאון), excess of food (שבעת-לחם), prosperous ease (שלות השקט), and that they did not help the poor and needy (ויד-עני ואביון לא החזיקה) (Ezek 16:49). He goes on to say that Sodom was self-important (תגבהינה) and did abominable things (תעשינה תועבה) (Ezek 16:50).[505] The prophet then changes his message stating that YHWH promises to restore this city and its fortunes alongside his restoration of Samaria and Judah. Ezekiel's rhetorical aim in promising restoration to the ancient city is unclear. Is this an attempt to shame Judah, placing it on the level of infamous Sodom, and elevate YHWH, showing he can restore even long-ago-ruined cities? Whatever the case, Ezekiel's writings of the city stand out against the backdrop of the broader tradition.[506]

3.1.4 Framing Genesis 19

Before exploring the politics of sexual violence at work in the Gen 19 narrative, it is worth commenting briefly upon the presence of this passage in a dissertation about sexual violence. In the recent history biblical scholarship on Gen 19, and in particular "the sin of Sodom," has focused on hospitality/inhospitality or "male-male genital expression."[507] Reading

[505] The feminine verbal forms are the result of Ezekiel's personification of cities as women, a rhetorical move which should not surprise readers of this dissertation.

[506] Concerning Abraham and Ezekiel's use of the figure in Ezek 33, Römer notes that Ezekiel does not seem to have access to Gen 12–26, "Abraham Traditions," 169. Römer's observation about Ezek 33 is relevant for Ezekiel offering a unique take on Sodom and Gomorrah.

[507] Doyle, "The Sin of Sodom," 84–5. Doyle argues "shaming" is another prominent theme that comes out in the literature on the story. Discussions of shame tend to be often intertwined with those of inhospitality. Unique in scholarly approaches, Jay Emerson Johnson presents the text as one of idolatry in "Sodomy and Gendered Love: Reading Genesis 19 in the Anglican Communion," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception History of the Bible*, eds. Michael Lieb, Emma Mason, Jonathan Roberts, and Christopher Rowland (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 431. Sonia E. Waters sees the dichotomy of "men desiring sex with other men" and "a breach of ancient hospitality" at work in discourse around this text, see "Reading Sodom through Sexual Violence Against Women," *Int* 71.3 (2017): 278. An example of a study addressing the hospitality/inhospitality issue is Stuart Lasine, "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World," *JSOT* 29 (1984): 37–59. With respect to "male-male genital expression" as Doyle terms it, Johanna Stiebert and Jerome T. Walsh address popular, religious interpretations of the text focusing on what they term as "sexual relationality" arguing that sexual relationality (as well as sexual orientation) is not a concern of the text. Their position is widely accepted among biblical scholars in the twenty-first century. See Johanna Stiebert and Jerome T. Walsh, "Does the Hebrew Bible Have Anything to Say About Homosexuality?" *OTE* 14 (2001): 119–52. For a similar finding on when the interpretive approach changed

the story within the frame of hospitality/inhospitality accords with the broader theme of the Gen 18–19 sequence. Interpreting the men of Sodom's demands and Lot's offer of his daughters only through the lens of hospitality or the permissibility of male-male sexual relationships, however, obscures and dilutes the story's sexual violence. The sex sought in Gen 19 is not rooted in desire. It is rooted in violence.[508] The sex is not an expression of sexual orientation. It is an expression of violent domination. Gen 19 is a story about sexual violence, textually connected to other biblical stories of sexual violence and is best understood as such.[509]

3.1.5 The Politics of Sexual Violence

Having argued that Gen 19 is a story about sexual violence, the politics of sexual violence can be analyzed through the tripartite model for analysis laid out in the methodology. First, let us turn to the gender politics at play in the story. The issue of gender as it relates to the messengers to the town of Sodom warrants more scrutiny than is often given. While it is clear that the residents of Sodom perceive the messengers as men (אנשים Gen 19:5), traditional interpretations of the text assume that the messengers are some sort of otherworldly or angelic emissaries.[510] Does their semi-divine status impact how one should understand their gender? Or

---

in scholarship see Michael Carden, *Sodomy: A History of a Christian Biblical Myth*, (New York: Routledge, 2014), 7. Representing a previous generation of biblical scholarship, Westermann argues that the text addresses both "unnatural lust" and "the violation of the right of guest to protection" *Genesis 12–36*, 301. Still, there are some maintaining that "homosexuality" is Sodom's sin and recognizing that is the key to interpreting the text, see Cephas Tushima, "Homosexuality and Liminality in Sodom: The Quests for Home, Fun and Justice (Gen 19:1–29)," *OTE* 34 (2021): 78–9.

[508] Waters eloquently describes the role of rape myths in arriving at this poor interpretation "First, rape myths equate rape with sexual desire, supporting the assumption that Sodom is a story about gay sexual attraction and queer identity ("Reading Sodom, 274)."

[509] For a full discussion of the textual connections between Gen 19 and other stories of sexual violence turn to the next chapter under the heading "The Tie That Binds." Others have rightly framed Gen 19 as a story of sexual violence. See Waters, "Reading Sodom," 274–83.

[510] In Hebrew as well as in Greek the words for divine and human messengers are the same (מלאך and ἄγγελος). The Vulgate was the first text to distinguish between the angelic and human messengers, *angelus* and *nuntius* respectively (Newsom and Watson, "Angels," 248). The Vulgate identifies the messengers in Gen 19:1 as *angeli*.

how early audiences understood their gender?[511] Biblical presentations of the beings that stand between the divine and human realm are underdetermined in many respects, particularly in terms of sex and gender.[512] Within Gen 19, these beings possess supra-human abilities found for example in their ability to blind the men of Sodom. While the men of Sodom recognize the messengers as men, it remains an open question as to whether the writer(s) or any Iron Age audience recognize them as men given the opacity of their conceptions of gender in the semi-divine realm. In threatening the messengers' bodily integrity, the men of Sodom attempt to subordinate the beings that they read as men. In the end, the messengers subordinate the men of Sodom by blinding them. By using power that exceeds that of men, the messengers set themselves above the hierarchy being worked out among the rest of the characters.

The issue of the angels' gender and where they fit into the divine-human hierarchy also matters for how vengeance is enacted in the text. In other texts of sexual violence vengeance is sought by male relatives. Dinah is avenged by her brothers. The concubine of Judg 19 is avenged by her husband. Tamar, the daughter of David, is avenged by her brother (2 Sam 13). Here, in Gen 19, the messengers are avenged by God. Could this divine intervention be a result of the gender dynamics? What might it mean to have men threatened by sexual violence avenged by other men? Does the divine stepping in to avenge the messengers and Lot help to preserve their masculinity within the narrative?

---

[511]Mika Ahuvia describes the differences between biblical and Second Temple literature as it relates to the gender of "subordinate divine" beings. Biblical and other Second Temple writings portray these beings in various forms, sometimes explicitly marked as masculine. Mika Ahuvia discusses the "unmarked" divine and subordinate divine in biblical sources in "Gender and the Angels in Late Antique Judaism," *JSQ* 29 (2022): 2–10, esp. 7–8.

[512] Mika Ahuvia discusses the "unmarked" divine and subordinate divine in biblical sources in "Gender and the Angels in Late Antique Judaism," *JSQ* 29 (2022): 2–3.

Different from the angels, Lot both is and presents as a man, but throughout the story his masculinity is challenged. According to the hegemonic ideal of masculinity, Lot is expected to be able to defend himself and his household.[513] Lot does not live up to the hegemonic ideal. Although he attempts to confront the men of Sodom, he is clearly outnumbered, and the safety of his guests is compromised. Possibly more telling of Lot's subordinated position vis-a-vis the men of Sodom is his offer of his daughters to the men. He cannot protect them or preserve his household's honor by controlling their sexual interactions. Lot has been backed into a corner by the men of Sodom, and now he is bargaining for his guests' safety with his daughters. Lot's daughters, in this portion of the Lot cycle, occupy a minor role. Lot understands them as having some value in that he can exchange them for safety. The messengers also find Lot's daughters as people worth saving, taking them by the hand and leading them out of the city. There is little in the story to indicate that they have value as a participant in social relations.

The communal politics operative in the story are multilayered and can be examined from the vantage point of different characters in the story. Who is an "insider" and who is an "outsider" changes if one considers the perspective of the men of Sodom, Lot, or the text. From the vantage point of the men of Sodom, the messengers are strangers, and clearly unwelcomed based on the response they received upon entrance to the city.[514] Although years of tradition have focused on the same-sex aspects of the threat of violence, Michael Carden perceptively argues that the violence directed against the messengers is an instance of violence rooted in xenophobia as opposed to gender. He posits that if the messengers were traveling with women as the Levite

[513] See key features of hegemonic masculinity under masculinity heading in the methodology section.

[514] Carden, *Sodomy*, 21. Some interpreters have suggested that the men of Sodom believed the messengers to be spies and read the threatened violence as a rational response to intruders. Van Wolde, "Outcry, Knowledge, and Judgment," 92.

was traveling with his concubine in Judg 19, that those female companions would have been an acceptable sacrifice to the crowd.[515] Evidently, Lot's resident daughters were not as appealing as the strangers. Carden's intertextual reading between Gen 19 and Judg 19 is compelling. Still, the fact that they are perceived as men matters for the interpretation of the story. Carden writes, "By being marked as queer, feminized, outsider, males are marked as not fully human and, appropriately, subordinate to the insider males."[516] The messengers' outsider and male status draws violence against them which, if enacted, demonstrates that they are subordinate to the men of Sodom.

Like the messengers, Lot is also considered an outsider in the eyes of the men of Sodom.[517] The men of Sodom draw attention to his non-native status, jeering that this man who came as a migrant now fancies himself a judge (Gen 19:9)?[518] Lot's status as a migrant and thus an outsider is not incidental to his interaction with the men of Sodom. It is central. The men of Sodom's jeers suggest the violence they direct toward Lot and his guests. Sexual and otherwise physical violence directed at outsiders is at some level permissible and expected. In putting this anti-migrant jeer in the mouths of the men of Sodom, the writer(s) of Gen 19 provide a window into the perspective of the text.

---

[515] Carden, *Sodomy*, 36.

[516] Carden, *Sodomy*, 38.

[517] Carden argues that the men of Sodom consider Lot an insider citing their "rejection" of Lot's daughters (*Sodomy*, 35). Carden also interprets the insider/outsider dynamic as fundamental to understanding certain sexually violent texts; however, this dissertation interprets those dynamics in the Lot episode differently. Carden's assertion that the men of Sodom rejected Lot's offer of his daughters at all, much less on the basis of the men's perceived shared citizenship with them or Lot unsupported by the text. The men never reject Lot's offer outright and only become more violent after interacting with Lot.

[518] Other interpreters have highlighted this insider/outsider dynamic including Van Wolde, "Outcry, Knowledge, and Judgment," 98 and Weston W. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), 120.

While the men of Sodom perceive Lot as the outsider, Genesis and its story of the family of Abraham in the land clearly understand the men of Sodom as outsiders or foreigners, distinct from Abraham and his family. There are no individuals among the group. All of the men are implicated in the offense, and all are held responsible.[519] The Sodomites' death by fire from heaven is clear evidence of how the writer understands them. Ronald Hendel describes characteristics of outsiders in Genesis stating that "in the processes of genealogical self-definition expressed in these stories, the foreign Other is generally described as, to varying degrees, uncivilized or immoral."[520] The Gen 19 story presents them as both. Lot's position vis-a-vis the writers is more ambiguous. On the one hand, Lot, Abraham's nephew, can be contrasted with the men of Sodom who are depicted as entirely depraved. On the other hand, Lot himself is deeply flawed. Hendel addresses the portrayal of Lot in Gen 19,

> In the patriarchal narratives of Genesis 12–50, the genealogical contrast of wild foreigners with the civilized precursors of Israel is both heightened and complicated. The three generations of the patriarchs— Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob— each portray a different set of genealogical oppositions. In the first, Abraham's righteousness is contrasted with his nephew Lot's flaws. Lot's most egregious fault occurs in Genesis 19, when he offers his daughters to the lustful townsmen of Sodom in an attempt to protect his guests.[521]

Lot is no Canaanite, but he is also no Abraham.[522] Lot is certainly a flawed character as Hendel rightly notes, and I would add his portrayal even in this story is not on the whole negative. In the *Dynamics of Diselection: Ambiguity in Genesis 12–36 and Ethnic Boundaries in Post-exilic*

---

[519] Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, 120.

[520] Ronald Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford University Press, 2005), 12.

[521] Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 11.

[522] Although a skeptical reading of Abraham might note Lot's willingness to sacrifice his daughters and Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac are not entirely different. In both cases, divine activity saves the men's' children.

Judah R. Christopher Heard notes, "At many significant points in the narrator's presentation, crucial elements of the portrait redound either to Lot's blame or to his credit, depending on how readers evaluate the facts of the story the narrator tells."[523] Lot's liminal moral position allows readers to both sympathize with the figure as he comes under attack by the lascivious and rapacious mob and condemn him for offering his daughters.

Lot's morally liminal space, however, opens up another interpretive issue, that of Lot's daughters. Does the text portray them as victims of their father's flexible sense of moral behavior or as reasonable sacrifices to protect the messengers sent to Lot? They are under threat from the mob and their father. Their dual threat, however, is not carried out to its logical end in Gen 19. The divine brings vengeance to the men of Sodom and salvation for the messengers, Lot, and his daughters before the moral implications of Lot's offer can be worked out in the narrative. The questions surrounding Lot's daughters, their fate at the hands of Sodom's mob, and the moral culpability of the male guardian who offers them are picked up and worked out by the writer of the final chapters of Judges who creates a character parallel to them. This character, the concubine, in Judges and the aforementioned questions are explored in the next chapter, but not here. Lot's daughters, at least in this discrete section of Gen 19, are underdetermined.

Examining the communal politics of sexual violence in Gen 19 helps both to explain some aspects of the stories as well as to allow readers reflect on the story in a deeper way. Within the narrative frame, the men of Sodom's threats directed at the messengers and Lot make a certain amount of sense. Of course, violence, and especially sexual violence, is directed first and foremost towards those perceived as outsiders. From the perspective of the writers, this

---

[523] R. Christopher Heard, *Dynamics of Diselection: Ambiguity in Genesis 12–36 and Ethnic Boundaries in Post-exilic Judah,* SemeiaSt 39 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001), 61.

sexually violent activity is most characteristic of those people of the land—like Shechem and the men of Sodom—who are not members of the family of Jacob. It is their activity that demands retribution by man or by God. Lot occupies a moral middle ground; he is victimized and victimizes. The ambiguities surrounding his character and his daughters as it relates to the communal aspects of the politics of sexual violence invites further reflection. Indeed, the reception of this text in Judg 19–20 explores those ambiguities.

The politics of sexual violence are also evident in how Gen 19 is worked into the broader narrative. The story of Sodom is certainly an old story. It is older than its moment of textualization within the larger Genesis story. Given the number of times Sodom is mentioned in the Hebrew Bible outside of Genesis, not all of which reflect the city's story in Gen 19, it is likely the story of Sodom's destruction existed in multiple forms. Why was this particular articulation of the city's destruction preserved in the larger story of Genesis during Hezekiah's reign? How does the story reflect the eighth century cultural milieu and advance the aims of its royal patron? The eighth century saw an explosion of migrants from Israel to Judah resulting from Assyrian incursions. There is evidence to suggest that scribes trained in and employed by Israel were incorporated into the Judean scribal apparatus bringing with them their experiences of Assyrian brutality and the challenges of being a migrant. Lot's story of being a migrant acting within the administration of a new city and the sexually violence he faced may well be a story an Israelian migrant working as a scribe would find compelling.

Still, this explanation for how the story might reflect an eighth century cultural milieu does not explain how the story serves Hezekiah or the Judean state's interests. Considering the story's lack of overt geographical and historical reference points, any answers to this question are even more speculative than other stories like Gen 34 with a place like Shechem as a

geographic anchor. That caveat in place, I suggest the key to understanding the historiographic significance of Gen 19 can be found in its connection to Judg 19–20, a story explored more fully in the next chapter. Several interpreters have noted the thematic and lexical connections between these chapters in Genesis and Judges, demonstrating that the former served as a template for the latter.[524] Unlike Gen 19, Judg 19–20 has a few key historical and geographic anchors that allow for interpreters to posit cogent explanations of the story's political and historiographical significance.[525] I proffer my own explanation of that significance in the following chapter. For now, it is sufficient to argue that Gen 19 exists in its current form as a part of the anti-Saul, pro-David argument Hezekiah is putting forth in the texts penned by his scribes.[526] The sexual violence in Judg 19–20, fashioned on the sexual violence in Gen 19, done by members of Saul's tribe in his home city demonstrates why Saul and his line are unfit for the throne. The stories, in tandem, form a part of Hezekiah's written argument for David's legitimacy and thus his own legitimacy as king of a united Israel and Judah.

3.2 LXX Genesis 19

The story of Sodom is referenced in a wide range of early Jewish works written in and outside of Palestine. Many of these works are originally composed in Greek and their writers demonstrate familiarity with the LXX. As such, any study on the story's reception must examine

[524] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 215 and Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 298. Marc Brettler demonstrates the direction of influence from Genesis to Judges through an effective methodology of looking for "blind motifs" in the text, Brettler, "The Book of Judges, 411–2.

[525] See the next chapter for a thorough discussion of the political implications of Judg 19–20.

[526] For a discussion on Hezekiah's interest in the legitimacy of the Davidic line, see Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 77–80. Raymond de Hoop argues that the historiographic significance of Gen 19 is wrapped up with that of Judg 19-21 and 1 Sam 11. He uses the metaphor of a triptych. Each of the three panels is a snapshot in a story that when lined up form a narrative polemic against Saul. See Raymond de Hoop, "Saul the Sodomite: Genesis 18–19 as the Opening Panel of a Polemic Triptych on King Saul," in *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and Its Interpreters*, TBN 7, eds. Edward Noort and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (Boston: Brill, 2004), 17–26.

how it is presented in the LXX. Additionally, the LXX Gen 19 is important for understanding the Greek composition of Judges. Given the intertextuality between MT Gen 19 and Judg 19–20, examining LXX Gen 19 helps in understanding how OG Judges was composed and if those writers used LXX Gen 19 in that translation effort.[527] The purpose of this section is to highlight key words and phrases in LXX Gen 19 that appear in or inform other early Jewish literature and OG Judges.

One of the key terms that hints at the intertextual relationship between MT Gen 19 and Judg 19 is the verb פצר used in MT Gen 19:3. Most Greek manuscripts use καταβιάζω to describe Lot's "urging" his guests to stay with him. One manuscript (codex Alexandrinus) uses παραβιάζω.[528] Both of these differ only slightly from Judg 19:7 which uses βιάζω.[529] In this verse, OG Judges does not demonstrate a clear dependence on any of the LXX Genesis manuscript traditions.

The meanings of ידע in MT Gen 19:5 and 19:8 are debated in modern scholarship on the passage. The LXX seems to maintain a clear distinction between these two usages of the verb ידע in the two verses. The first use of ידע is translated as συγγίνομαι, typically meaning "to get to know/get acquainted," but it can also carry sexual connotations (ἵνα συγγενώμεθα αὐτοῖς, LXX Gen 19:5).[530] The second ידע in Gen 19:8 is translated as γινώσκω (αἳ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἄνδρα, LXX Gen 19:8).[531] Brayford suggests that "the former [συγγίνομαι] is used in reference to an act that

[527] An example of a study addressing this relationship is William Ross, "Style and Familiarity in Judges 19,7 (Old Greek): Establishing Dependence Within the Septuagint," *Biblica* 98 (2017): 25–36.

[528] Brayford suggests that παραβιάζω connotes greater force, *Genesis*, 317. Wevers argues there is no difference between the two words *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 270.

[529] Unfortunately, at this time there is not yet a critical edition for OG Judges, so this statement is limited by the evidence currently available.

[530] Brayford, *Genesis*, 318.

is characterized as wicked; the latter [γινώσκω] to an act that is presumably not so."[532] Whether Brayford is right in her assessment is difficult to determine, but the difference does beg some sort of explanation. Interestingly, MT Judg 19 also uses ידע twice in its sexual sense. OG Judges translates both instances with γινώσκω and does not differentiate between the two uses.

Finally, the manner of discussing the environs of Sodom is important for establishing connections with early Jewish texts. The Hebrew word ככר used in MT Gen 19 is translated as both περίχωρος (19:17, 28) and περίοικος (19:25, 29). The two words have slightly different connotations, the former surrounding region and the latter neighboring towns.

3.3 Early Reception

The legacy of Sodom looms large in early Jewish literature and its presentation in this literature is varied like its presentation in various biblical books. References to the city and its destruction are scattered throughout early Jewish literature. Many of those references do no more than nod to the depths of the city's supposed wickedness.[533] Some references, however, offer more substantial descriptions of the city, either through direct reference to Gen 19 or by telling of the sexual activity of Sodom. While each of these writings deploy the Sodom story for its own purposes, some common themes still emerge among them.

The majority of the writings, with one notable exception, appeal to the Sodom story to justify the writers' stance on inter-communal boundaries. Whereas the Dinah story was used to *explore* communal boundaries, including the permeability of those boundaries, the Sodom story

[531] Doyle, "The Sin of Sodom," 92.

[532] Brayford, *Genesis*, 318–19.

[533] J.A. Loader cataloged and analyzed references and allusions to Sodom and Gomorrah in early Jewish literature. This dissertation has certainly benefited from the painstaking work Loader undertook cataloging the references. J.A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish, and Early Christian Traditions* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1990).

was used to *reinforce* the boundaries. Part of the differences in the way the story is interpreted might be attributed to the seeming same-sex nature of the encounter (and indeed Philo seems to focus on this aspect). Even modern interpreters can imagine a world in which Dinah ends up in a "legitimate" marital bond with her assailant. It is hard to imagine this logic applied to a man sexually assaulted by another man. However, it is more likely that early interpreters understood the boundary being crossed in Sodom as a fundamentally different type of boundary, namely a boundary between human and semi-divine beings. Several writings examine this boundary in their interpretation of Gen 19. Other writings offer a polemical take on the Sodomites, highlight a variety of their misdeeds, and sometimes connect their misdeeds to those of contemporary groups. Finally, two writings explicitly connect their interpretation of Gen 19 with Judg 19–20. These writings highlight the shared concern around communal boundaries in sexual violence narratives.

3.3.1 Those Inhospitable Foreigner-Haters: Wisdom of Solomon and Josephus

The Wisdom of Solomon (Wisdom) belongs to the diaspora community in Egypt and has been dated as early as the second – first centuries BCE.[534] Some modern interpreters have begun to coalesce around an early Roman period date. Assuming a mid-to-late first century BCE Egyptian context, the Jewish writer would have likely experienced a shift in their social and political status. On this issue Sarah Tanzer writes that the "[Alexandrian diaspora] community, which had been moving toward greater social and cultural standing among the Greeks of Alexandria, found themselves reduced to the status of aliens and foreigners in the late first century BCE, demoted from their previous status as resident aliens."[535] Their historical

[534] Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 195. David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 43 (New York: Doubleday, 1979), 20. This dissertation makes use of the Greek text of the Wisdom of Solomon printed in Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*.

circumstances made the issue of communal boundaries salient as they experienced exclusion in the place that had become their home.[536]

Wisdom references the story of Gen 19 twice in the third section of the work that addresses God's intervention in history and judgment on the ungodly (Wis 10:6–9, 19:13–17).[537] The first indirect mention of Sodom occurs in Wisdom 10:6–9 where the author identifies the inhabitants as ungodly (ἀσεβής, Wis 10:6). The writer continues by describing how the smoldering remains of Sodom bear witness to their evil (πονηρία) and folly (ἀφροσύνη).[538] At the end of the third section, Sodom is referenced once again. Comments on Sodom are intertwined with comments on the Egyptians of the Exodus story, a race (σπέρμα) whom the writer says is "cursed from the beginning" (Wis 12:11). The writer states that the Egyptians' suffering was deserved as they "practiced a more fierce hatred of strangers" (γὰρ χαλεπωτέραν μισοξενίαν ἐπετήδευσαν, Wis 19:13). The foreigner-hating motif is again invoked as the writer describes how the Sodomites refused outsiders, and the Egyptians enslaved strangers (ξενοί) and received foreigners (ἀλλότριοι) hatefully (Wis 19:14–15). The legacy of Sodom is tied to the legacy of the Egyptians, the people who, at the time of the author, are still identified as hostile toward the diaspora community. The writer of Wisdom addresses the story of Sodom from the

[535] Sarah J. Tanzer, "The Wisdom of Solomon," in *Women's Bible Commentary*, eds. Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 405.

[536] Tanzer notes that the book expresses nuanced views on other ethnic groups present in Egypt. On the one hand native Egyptians were painted as the "historical enemy" of Jews. On the other hand, Alexandrian Greeks occupied a different status as they were the group from whom the Jewish community "[sought] acceptance (Tanzer, "The Wisdom of Solomon, 405")."

[537] Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities*, 78 and Tanzer, "The Wisdom of Solomon," 404.

[538] The term for folly is one that occurs in discussions of sexual violence, notably OG Judg 19:23–24 and OG 2 Sam 13:12.

perspective of their own historical setting. The sexually violent Sodomites were foreigner-haters like the Egyptians who antagonize the author's community.

The notion that the Sodomites' sexually violent acts identify them as hostile to foreigners also is found in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*.[539] Josephus frames his retelling of Abraham's negotiations with God over the fate of Sodom presented at the end of Gen 18 with his interpretation of Gen 19 (*Ant.* 1:194).[540] Similar to the charges laid against the Sodomites in Wisdom, Josephus states that they were hostile to outsiders (μισόξενοι) in addition to being proud (ὑβρισταὶ) and ungodly (ἀσεβεῖς, *Ant.* 1:194). Regarding their sexual practices, Josephus makes an ambiguous statement "καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἄλλους ὁμιλίας ἐκτρέπεσθαι" which has been understood variously as referring to same-sex sexual practices or avoiding intercourse altogether.[541] The interpretation turns on the translation of ἐκτρέπω, often translated as "turning aside from" or in the passive voice, "to be diverted."[542] Carden offers the translation "they avoided intercourse with each other." Based upon the story Josephus tells from Gen 19, however, it might be more reasonable to translate the verb as something like "pervert," not necessarily with a sense of specific condemnation toward same-sex sexual activity. However one understands this passage, Josephus' interpretation of the Sodomite attitude toward strangers is clear, and their sexual practices are understood in tandem with their inhospitality and hatred of foreigners. Like Wisdom, Josephus uses the story to reflect on communal boundaries which, as

[539] This dissertation focuses on Josephus' remarks on Sodom connected with his retelling of the Gen 19 story in *Ant*. 1:194–200, but he mentions Sodom a few times in his writing including in *JW* 4:453, 4:483–85, and 5:556 as well as in *Ant.* 1:169–85 and 5:81.

[540] Schwartz, "Many Sources but a Single Author," 38.

[541] Carden addresses the translation issue in *Sodomy*, 73n7. William Whiston in his translation of *Jewish Antiquities* translates the phrase as "they…abused themselves with Sodomitical practices." This translation is difficult to defend.

[542] LSJ s.v. "ἐκτρέπω".

described in the previous chapter, were of central importance to him. In this case, Josephus is able to condemn the xenophobia of a foreign group in line with the openness he is projecting for his Roman audience.

3.3.2 Judgment for the Proud: 3 Maccabees 2:5 & Sirach 16:7–10

3 Maccabees is a book at once steeped in Jewish literary history and concerned with matters concerning diasporic Jewish communities during the Hellenistic period.[543] The writer of 3 Maccabees combines their familiarity with the story of Sodom's destruction from Genesis with the language similar to that which Sirach uses to describe Sodom. Like other early Jewish writings, 3 Maccabees makes use of the familiar story of sexual violence in Sodom to articulate its own position on communal boundaries, a topic of particular concern to diaspora communities.

The allusion to the story of Sodom comes in the context of a prayer, much like Judith's allusion to the story of Dinah. The prayer is precipitated by Ptolemy IV Philopator's attempt to enter into the Jerusalem temple (3 Macc 1:10). After explaining to the king that he is unable to enter because it is unlawful for him to do so, he pressed the issue (3 Macc 1:11–15). Philopator's response prompted the prayer attributed to Simon II, the high priest.[544] In his prayer, Simon

---

[543] Some scholars date the composition of 3 Maccabees to the late Hellenistic period, Sara R. Johnson, "3 Maccabees," in *Women's Bible Commentary*, eds. Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 450, and Noah Hacham, "3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity," *JBL* 126 (2007): 785n74. Others date it to the early Roman period, see Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 122 and Jonathan Trotter, "The Homeland and the Legitimation of the Diaspora: Egyptian Jewish Origin Stories in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *JSP* 28 (2018): 111. This dissertation prefers a late Hellenistic dating; however, a later dating does not substantially impact its argument on how 3 Maccabees deploys Gen 19 in its narrative. For a discussion of the diasporic nature of 3 Maccabees see Trotter, "The Homeland and the Legitimation of the Diaspora," 111–19.

[544] The attribution of the prayer to Simon II is a matter of contention in scholarship based on the manuscript history of the book. Not all manuscripts include 3 Macc 2:1 which attributes the prayer to Simon. See Cameron Boyd-Taylor, Introduction to 3 Makkabees in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, eds. A. Pietersma and B. Wright, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 521 and N. Clayton Croy, *3 Maccabees*, SCS (Boston: Brill, 2006), 51.

states that he and his people are being oppressed by an unholy (ἀνόσιος) man (3 Macc 2:2). Simon recounts the ways in which God has judged pride and arrogance (ὕβρις καὶ ἀγερωχία, 3 Macc 2:3). His first example of God's judgment is recalling the giants (γίγαντες) brought down by the flood, a story presented in Gen 6:1–17 and reworked in other early Jewish works (3 Macc 2:4).[545] Having recounted God's judgment on the giants, Simon turns to the story at hand praying, "With fire and brimstone you consumed the Sodomites who practiced pride and were secretive in evil deeds, being made an example for generations (3 Macc 2:5)."[546] The writer of 3 Maccabees here adopts the language of "fire and brimstone" (πῦρὶ καὶ θείῳ) from LXX Gen 19.[547] Although this one line of Simon's prayer does not fully articulate the points of correspondence between Gen 19 and the narrative in which the prayer is embedded, there is at least one clear point of connection. God brought judgment on the proud (ὑπερηφανία, 3 Macc 2:5) Sodomites (non-Israelites) who sought to violate God's messengers, like Simon is asking God to judge the proud foreign ruler seeking to violate God's temple.[548] Simon's use of Gen 19 in his prayer mirrors Judith's use of Gen 34 in her prayer. They both appeal to stories of sexual violence perpetrated by foreigners against those connected to the God of Israel, Dinah and the messengers.

---

[545] "Γίγαντες" or "giants" is the word LXX Gen 6:4 uses to translate הנפלים, the meaning of which is unclear in its MT Gen 6:4 context. The issue of giants is discussed under the next subheading "Crossing Boundaries: Watchers, Giants, and Sodom."

[546] What is meant by the phrase "[they] were secretive in evil deeds" is somewhat obscure. One Greek manuscript exchanges "notorious" (διάδηλος) for "secretive" (ἄδηλος) which might make better sense if read in light of Gen 19.

[547] These two nouns are inverted in some manuscripts of LXX Genesis.

[548] Loader also sees an anti-foreigner polemic underlying the author's use of Gen 19. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities*, 76.

3 Maccabees parallels Sirach's use of the Gen 19 tradition to discuss God's judgment of the proud foreigners (Sir 16:7–8).[549] Sirach or Ben Sira is a wisdom work originating in Palestine at the beginning of the second century BCE.[550] Like 3 Maccabees 2:5, Sirarch 16:8 is lexically connected to LXX Gen 19:25, 29 using περίοικος in order to describe Lot's larger environment, beyond Sodom or the "plain" (ככר, MT Gen 19:25, 29).[551] The writers of the two works both identify the Sodomites as being proud (ὑπερηφανία, Sir 16:8) in the tradition of the prophet Ezekiel.[552] They are echoed by Josephus in this assessment of the Sodomites who also identifies pride (*Ant.* 1.194). All three writers highlight how traditions of Sodom in Genesis and Ezekiel are drawn together in early Jewish writings. How these writers address boundary crossing by pulling together different narrative traditions rooted in Genesis is addressed in the following section.

[549] Loader observes that these stories are connected in other early Jewish and Christian texts as well including Jub. 20:5–6, Lk 17:26–29, 2 Pet 2:4–8, Jud 6–7. For these references see Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities*, 76.

[550] There is broad consensus around the dating and provenance of the work, see Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*, 1st ed., AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 9; Richard Coggins, *Sirach*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 18–19; Jeremy Corley, *Sirach*, New Collegeville Bible Commentary Old Testament (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013), 1–2. The work was composed in Hebrew before it was translated into Greek a generation after its composition (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 51–56). This dissertation makes use of both the Hebrew and Greek versions of the text recognizing the importance of both in antiquity (for more on this issue see Mroczek, *Literary Imagination*, 86–114). The verses addressed in this dissertation are best preserved in MS A, digital images of which are found in the University of Cambridge's Digital library, classmark T-S 12.863. Another less well-preserved manuscript contains one of the verses used in this dissertation and it can also be found in the University of Cambridge's Digital library, classmark T-S NS38a.1. This dissertation also makes use of the Greek text found in Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, SVTG 12.2 (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).

[551] The Hebrew manuscript tradition does not use ככר like the MT, but rather refers to Lot's neighbors, מגורי לוט.

[552] Again, it is important to note that the Hebrew manuscript tradition does not follow the MT. In MT Ezek. 16:49, pride is גאון, and in the Hebrew manuscript it is גאות.

3.3.3 Crossing Boundaries: Watchers, Giants, and Sodom

One of the persistent themes in the early reception of the story of Sodom's destruction is how it is woven together with stories of the sons of the gods/Watchers, their nephilim/ giant offspring, and the flood known from texts like MT Gen 6, LXX Gen 6, and the Enochic Book of Watchers (BW).[553] The stories are brought together in Sir 16:7–8, Jub. 20:5–6, T. Naph. 3:4–4:1, 3 Macc 2:4, and possibly even in Josephus' *Ant.* 1:194.[554] The two traditions share themes of sexual boundary crossing between semi-divine and human beings and its resultant divine judgement. By placing these two traditions in conversation with one another, these early Jewish works suggest the messengers' nature was the central concern about the Sodomites sexually violent actions in Gen 19, not necessarily the violence itself.

Jubilees retells the narratives found in Gen 18–19, reducing their size substantially. Gen 18 receives a few lines in Jub. 16:1–4 focusing mainly on Sarah's laughter and the birth announcement; Gen 19 receives a few more lines in Jub. 16:5–9 focusing on God's judgment of

[553] Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities*, 76 and Carden, *Sodomy*, 47–8. Annette Yoshiko Reed has demonstrated the early Enochic literature and specifically the BW was well known and oft cited among early Jewish writers. Often determining whether a text is specifically referencing the BW or its antecedent, Gen 6, is impossible, and indeed, this task is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Throughout this section, Reed's discussion on the influence of BW on individual early Jewish writings are referenced in the footnotes. Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Regarding the terms for the characters, the sons of the gods (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ/בני האלהים) from MT/LXX Gen 6 are identified with Watchers (עירים/ין Hebrew/Aramaic, ἄγγελοι [angels] and ἐγρήγοροι [Watchers] in Greek with some Greek manuscripts of LXX Gen 6:2 referring to ἄγγελοι instead of οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ). This dissertation refers to "angels/Watchers" as a shorthand for this group. "Giants" is often the English translation for the Hebrew/Aramaic terms גברים/ין and sometimes also נפלים/ין. In early Jewish literature גברים/ין are often closely identified with נפלים/ין. In LXX Gen 6:1–4, both גברים and נפלים is translated as οἱ γίγαντες. For a thorough treatment of these categories in early Jewish literature see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The "Angels" and "Giants" of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions," *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–77.

[554] The New Testament, which falls just outside of the purview of this dissertation, also associates the stories of the Watchers and Sodom in 2 Pet 2:4–5 and Jude 6–7. See Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 102–6, and Carden, *Sodomy*, 50 and 59–60.

Sodom, Gomorrah, Zeboim, and their environs.[555] Despite Jubilees' short recapitulation of the story, the writer incorporates the lessons of Sodom elsewhere in the work, namely in Abraham's testamentary address to his sons and grandsons (Jub. 20:2–6). After a warning about the dangers of marrying Canaanite women (Jub. 20:4), the writer invokes Sodom alongside of the giants from the Gen 6 and BW traditions.[556] Jubilees 20:5 states, "He told them about the punishment of the giants and the punishment of Sodom—how they were condemned because of their wickedness; because of the sexual impurity, uncleanness, and corruption among themselves they died in (their) sexual impurity."[557] The connection between the giants, Sodom, and the list of reasons for their condemnation is ambiguous; it is unclear if every element of the list applies to both the giants and Sodom. James VanderKam notes that the list "does not correspond well with what Jubilees and 1 Enoch report about the deeds of the giants" and suggests reading it as applying to only Sodom.[558] VanderKam is certainly well-reasoned in his analysis; however, there is an alternative way to understand the passage. In the context of the broader early Jewish and early Christian traditions that associate *both* the giants and angels/Watchers with Sodom, the term "giants" plausibly functions as a short-hand reference to the tradition of the Watchers here in Jubilees and elsewhere in the interpretive tradition.

[555] The content of Jub. 16:5–9 is addressed fully in the following section "Sexual Sin and Boundary Crossing."

[556] For more information on the prohibition against marrying Canaanite women and Jubilees' "fixation" on Canaanite women see Jacques T.A.G.M. Van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8*, JSJSup 161 (Boston: Brill, 2012), 171–72.

[557] The Latin records "because they commingled with prostitutes, engaged in unclean acts, did every (kind of) abominable act." Vanderkam, *Jubilees 1–21*, 605n5b.

[558] Vanderkam, *Jubilees 1–21*, 613–14. Jub. 7:22–23 and BW 7:2–5.

The tradition of the giants, angels/Watchers contains certain narrative features that are similar to the Sodom story. A reference to either "giants" or "angels/Watchers" evokes a memory of the broad outline of the tradition which includes angels/Watchers entering the human world, those beings entering into a sexual relationship with human beings, producing progeny, chaos and violence gripping the world, and the divine judgment that followed.[559] With respect to the sexual encounter between the angels/Watchers and human beings, Jubilees indicates that wickedness and corruption increased on earth as a result of it (Jub. 5:2–3), and it was illicit and impure (Jub. 7:21).[560] The charges laid against the angels/Watchers in Jub. 5 and 7 mirror those in the list of charges against the giants and Sodom in Jub. 20.[561] Moreover, thematic parallels exist between the tradition of the angels/Watchers and the story of Sodom. Both stories involve a boundary-crossing encounter between semi-divine beings and humans, one that is sexual and one nearly sexual. Both encounters lead to violence and result in divine judgment. The manner in which Jubilees describes the angels/Watchers and the parallels between the storylines of the angels/Watchers and Sodom suggests that the references are intentional.

That the reference to the giants and Sodom directly follows a reference to intermarriage with Canaanites confirms that these stories are also evocative of the idea of sexual boundaries. While it is possible that the list of charges including sexual impurity in Jub. 20:5 only applies to Sodom, it is more likely that the writer is using "giants" as a shorthand for the story of illicit and

[559] This summary is not meant to flatten the relevant differences between Gen 6, BW 6–11, Anim. Apoc. 86–89, and other traditions flowing from Gen 6, but to highlight the broad similarities which hold them together as a variegated but still unified tradition.

[560] Other early Jewish literature, outside of Enochic literature, alludes to the sexual impurity of the Watchers/angels interaction with women. Reed and other suggest that concern about the angels sexual activity is reflected in 1 Cor 11:10. See Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 178.

[561] VanderKam notes that there are parallels in language around conceptions like "sexual impurity/fornication" and "uncleanness/impurity" in Jub. 7 and Jub. 20. Vanderkam, *Jubilees 1–21*, 611.

boundary-crossing sexual activity of the angels/Watchers which connects it to the story of Sodom. By referencing these two stories of divine judgment resulting from these groups seeking to cross sexual boundaries, the writer underscores the danger in inherent to boundary crossing. If one does not heed the call to endogamy, they might face the consequences of Sodom and the Watchers.

Other early Jewish works like Sirach and 3 Maccabees discussed above also associate Sodom and the giants.[562] Sirach 16:7 seems to allude to the Watcher tradition stating that "he did not atone for (ἐξιλάσκομαι) the ancient giants who revolted in their strength (ἰσχύς)" in the same way he did not spare (φείδομαι) Lot's environs.[563] Annette Yoshiko Reed following Randal Argall suggests this reference to God not forgiving the giants might be a reference to the Watchers' failure to earn divine forgiveness in BW.[564] This theme of failing to earn divine forgiveness and ward off divine retribution is similar to what is found in the Gen 18–19 tradition in which Abraham pleads on behalf of Sodom like Enoch pleads on behalf of the Watchers.

3 Maccabees 2:4 echoes some of the sentiment expressed in Sirach stating that God destroyed the giants "who trusted in their strength (ῥώμη) and confidence (θράσος)." The interpretation of the giants' actions in 3 Macc 2:4 is vague enough that they could be easily applied to the Watchers or the giants. Sirach's description leans toward the Watchers, but it too

---

[562] Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities*, 76 and Carden, *Sodomy*, 47.

[563] It is often asserted unequivocally that Sir 16:7 refers to the tradition found in Gen 6; however, as Matthew Goff argues the Hebrew manuscripts of Sirach "complicate the issue" as they refer to the נסיכי קדם "chieftains of old" where the Greek tradition refers to the γίγαντες. As might be noted, נסיכי קדם is not a usual Hebrew term for בני האלהים (see footnote 549 in this chapter). Goff argues that the primary reference is to Canaanite leaders of old, but that the traditions of leaders of Canaan in the Hebrew Bible are deeply intertwined with the Gen 6 tradition. Matthew Goff, "Ben Sira and the Giants of the Land: A Note on Ben Sira 16:7," *JBL* 129 (2010): 645–655. Still, the Greek translation does seem to allude to LXX Gen 6:4. The Greek translation of Sirach takes on an interpretive life of its own in the early Jewish literary tradition and is important in any discussion of reception history.

[564] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 70.

might represent a blending of traditions in which the sins of the Watchers and giants in the interpretive tradition were not easily distinguished from one another. In any case, both the story of Sodom and the giants/Watchers are used in service of the prayer's message more particular to his context about God intervening on behalf of those who cross boundaries to harm God's people.

While Jub. 20:5, Sir 16:7–8, and 3 Macc 2:4–5 all reference the "giants" alongside Sodom, T. Naph. 3:4–4:1 addresses the Watchers (ἐγρήγοροι) alongside Sodom.[565] The work connects the Watchers and Sodom as they both "changed the order of their nature" (ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν) (T. Naph. 3:5). Some have understood this reference to Sodom changing the order of its nature to the men of Sodom seeking some sort of sexual relation with the angels presenting as men. For example, Loader argues, "In this context the changing of its order by Sodom can only refer to the homosexual aspirations of the Sodomites mentioned in Gen 19:5."[566] The contextual clues, however, do not support Loader's conclusion. In the context of these two stories being associated in this passage, it would seem that the "changing of the order of nature" that they share is their "crossing the boundaries of the human and the angelic or semi/divine."[567] The BW itself signals a violation of the order of nature is the issue. In his analysis of the BW, Loren Stuckenbruck writes, "The reason for singling out this pre-diluvian activity as loathsome is most clearly expressed in 15:3–7: the union between essentially spiritual, heavenly beings and earthly humans of flesh and blood by definition violates the order of nature (15:4, 9–10)."[568] The

[565] Reed addresses the use of BW in T. Naph. in *Fallen Angel*s, 112.

[566] Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities*, 82.

[567] Carden, Sodomy, 56.

[568] Stuckenbruck, "The "Angels" and "Giants," 364.

Testament of Naphtali represents the clearest statement in early Jewish literature connecting the actions of the Watchers to those of the residents of Sodom.[569]

In addition to making the connection between the Watchers and the Sodomites, the Testament of Naphtali contextualizes its remarks on Sodom in a discussion on the "nations" (ἔθνη) that "wander" (πλανάω, T. Naph. 3:3). Naphtali's testamentary statement expresses concern that his descendants will walk "according to all of the wickedness of the nations" (κατὰ πᾶσαν πονηρίαν ἐθνῶν) and do "according to the lawlessness of Sodom" (κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν Σοδόμων, T. Naph. 4:1). Although the Testament on the one hand draws attention to the sexual boundary that is crossed between types of beings, it connects that illicit behavior with the wickedness of other human communities. This is not unsimilar to Jubilees contextualizing its comments on the Watchers tradition and Sodom in a broader conversation about exogamy. The story of Sodom is pertinent to the writer's understanding of other human communities.

Finally, Josephus might allude to a connection between the Watchers tradition and the Sodom tradition. At the beginning of his account of the story of Sodom in *Jewish Antiquities*, he writes that Sodom became proud, "insolent (ὑβριστής) in relation to humans and ungodly toward God" (*Ant.* 1.194). The word Josephus uses for "insolent" in his description of the men of Sodom is only used three other times in the entirety of *Jewish Antiquities*, one of which is to describe the offspring of the angels/Watchers, or the giants (*Ant.* 1.73).[570]

The impulse to associate the giants/angels/Watchers tradition with the tradition of Sodom is natural. Both stories describe an incident of sexually explicit, boundary-crossing encounter

---

[569] The New Testament also brings together the angels/Watchers (ἄγγελοι) with the residents of Sodom, see 2 Pet 2:4–6 and Jude 6–7.

[570] The other two references describe the sons of Eli and Jeroboam (*Ant.* 5.339 and 9.205).

between semi-divine beings and humans that lead to violence and divine judgment. Moreover, the BW and Gen 18 describe attempts to appeal to the divine to relent from judgment. The boundary crossing in the sexual realm present in both stories has possibly been overlooked because the focus on the sexual activity in the Sodom story has centered on its same-sex nature. The Testament of Naphtali makes it clear, however, that the semi-divine-human boundary is the primary issue at hand. The angels/Watchers and the men of Sodom defy the order of nature by pursuing sexual relations with those outside of their kind. Their folly, although it occurs with and among transmundane beings, is not irrelevant for humans in the mundane realm.[571] Writers can use the incident to offer warnings and advice on communal boundaries in the mundane realm.

3.3.4 Sexual Sin and Boundary Crossing

One of the clear lines of interpretation in early Jewish literature concerning the story of Sodom is its connection to sexual sin and the resultant sexual impurity. Jubilees' terse retelling of the story of Sodom states in clear and simple terms that the Lord executed judgment on the city and its environs because, "they were depraved and very sinful, (that) they would defile themselves, commit sexual sins in their flesh and do what was impure upon the earth" (Jub. 16:5). Sexual sin served as a boundary marker for many early Jewish writers.[572] In this passage, Sodom and its sister cities serve as a cautionary tale (Jub. 16:6). It is a warning to adhere to the boundaries that Jubilees constructs for sexual behavior. The terse retelling, however, does not give details on those boundaries and how they were crossed in Sodom. The writer assumes "we

[571] My use of transmundane follows Reed's use of the term in Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 1–5, esp 3n9.

[572] Martha Himmelfarb notes that זנות is often the term that signaled the boundary marker. It is used to describe "whatever sexual practices the writer deemed impermissible." Martha Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt," *JSQ* 6 (1999): 5. Hayes builds upon this by noting that Jubilees' manner of discussing Sodom and its sister cities employs language in Latin and Ethiopic that reflect the concept of זנות in Hebrew. See Hayes, Gentile Impurities, 77.

all know" the content of Sodom's sexual sins. As I demonstrated in the previous section, that boundary Jubilees imagined was the one between the human and semi-divine realms.

Like Jubilees, the Testament of Levi appeals to Sodom during a broader conversation about boundaries. The Testament of Levi incorporates its reference to Sodom and Gomorrah into a hortatory passage delivered by Levi, progenitor of the priestly line, to his sons. The aim of his message was to warn his sons against deviating from the law of the priesthood (T. Levi 14:4), part of which concerns sexual behavior. In the passage, Levi predicts that his sons will "desecrate married women" (τὰς ὑπάνδρους βεβηλώσετε) and "defile the virgins of Jerusalem" (παρθένους Ἰερουσαλὴμ μιανεῖτε) and join with "prostitutes and adulteresses" (πορναί, μοιχαλίδες) (T. Levi 14:6).[573] He then warns about marital union with the daughters of the nations (θυγατέρας ἐθνῶν) in language reminiscent of Ezra's concern in about Israel mixing with foreign women (1 Esd 8:67). Finally, he says "your intercourse will become (like) Sodom and Gomorrah in ungodliness" (γενήσεται ἡ μεῖξις ὑμῶν Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ), presumably referring to the sons' intercourse resulting from the marital union with the foreign women (T. Levi 14:6).[574] It is possible that the author is aware that "Sodom and Gomorrah" are connected to sexual deviance generally, and it is that general deviance they are referencing in the comparison. It is also possible, and maybe more likely, that the author is making a stronger comparison between the boundary crossing inherent in taking foreign wives and the boundary

[573] The language of desecration (βεβηλόω) and defilement (μιαίνω) should be familiar from the discussion of Dinah in Judith's prayer.

[574] Ungodliness (ἀσέβεια/ ἀσεβής) is a charge other early Jewish writers lay against Sodom. For example, see Josephus, *Ant.* 1:194; Josephus, *JW*, 4:484; and Philo, *Flight*, 144.

crossing the men of Sodom attempted in their attempt to sexually violate beings from another realm.[575]

3.3.4.1 A Turn in the Conversation on Sexual Sin: Philo

Like many of the early Jewish writers already discussed in this chapter, Philo uses Sodom as an example of a place and people mired in sexual sin. Philo's interpretation of that sin, however, is unique. Philo earns the designation of "first" in interpreting the sexual sin of Sodom as male-male sex.[576] Philo addresses the story of Sodom a number of times in his writings, but the most robust interpretations of the Sodom story are found in *Questions and Answers on Genesis* (*QG*) and the treatise *On the Life of Abraham* (*Abraham*) in his Exposition of the Law.[577] Philo wrote *QG* at an early stage in his life and for pedagogical purposes.[578] Although it is a commentary like *Allegorical Commentary*, its style is less esoteric, contains fewer intertextual references, and it is more direct in its messaging.[579] In contrast to *QG*, the treatise on Abraham reflects the philosophical and literary influences he encountered at a later stage in his career.[580] The treatise shows a great concern for the "moral improvement" of its readers and focuses on "abstract virtues" by reflecting on the life of Abraham.[581] In both works, Philo is

[575] Hayes, *Gentile Impurities,* 77fn37.

[576] D'Angelo, "Sexuality in Jewish Writings," 552; Eoghan Ahern, "The Sin of Sodom in Late Antiquity," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 27 (2018): 215. Carden has given Philo the designation of being "the inventor of the homophobic reading of Genesis 19 (*Sodomy*, 61)."

[577] Those references include *Abraham* 133–166; *QG* 4; *Names* 228; *Sacrifices* 122; *Prelim. Studies* 109; *Confusion* 27–28; *Flight* 144; *Drunkenness* 222–224; *Alleg. Interp.* 3:24, 197, 213; *Dreams* 1:85, 2:191–192. Each reference to Sodom does not receive equal treatment. This dissertation only focuses on a handful of references in Philo's work relating to his interpretation of the story of Sodom in Gen 19. Only fragments of the Greek text of *QG* are accessible. The whole work is preserved in Armenian. This dissertation makes use of Philo, *Questions and Answers on Genesis,* Supplement 1, trans. Ralph Marcus, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

[578] Niehoff, *Philo*, 173–91, esp 185.

[579] Niehoff, *Philo*, 185–88.

[580] Niehoff, *Philo*, 7–8.

concerned with the Sodomites' licentiousness; however, his later work attempts to detail his concerns with the sexual behavior of Sodom, particularly at it relates to gender.

In *QG*, Philo poses questions which he answers with two levels of meaning, the literal and the "deeper" or allegorical. With respect to Gen 19, Philo asks about the meaning of the command to "bring them out that we may know them" (Gen 19:5, *QG* 4.37). He determines that on its face, the question indicates "pederasty," but at a deeper level it indicates the men are "lascivious" and threaten the population that is "self-controlled" (*QG* 4.37).[582] Philo then questions why Lot offers his two daughters for the Sodomites to do as they wish (*QG* 4.38). Again, he concludes that the literal meaning is because the Sodomites are pederasts. Their pederast ways are not confined to one gender; they are an outflowing of their general lasciviousness. Philo indicates that the deeper meaning of this verse gives a window into one's thought life. There are thoughts that are masculine, those pertaining to wisdom and virtue, and thoughts that are feminine, those pertaining to bodily needs and the passions (*QG* 4.38). While one might want to save both, sometimes it is necessary to sacrifice one. Feminine thoughts, or the passions, must be surrendered in order to save the masculine (*QG* 4.38). Philo's analysis gives a window into how he understands gender and the value of each gender. Philo is interested in preserving a strict gender binary and the superiority of masculine men. These themes can be traced in his later commentary on Gen 19.

In Philo's treatise on Abraham, while he is generally concerned with various forms of sexual impropriety in Sodom, he focuses on same-sex sexual relations.[583] He writes that in

[581] Niehoff, *Philo*, 125–26.

[582] Mary D'Angelo argues that Josephus also depicts the Sodomites as pederasts because he notes that "youths (νεανίσκοι) of extraordinary beauty" (*Ant.* 1.200); however, without labeling the Sodomites as such it is hard to be sure. D'Angelo, "Sexuality in Jewish Writings," 554.

[583] Ahern, "The Sin of Sodom," 220.

addition to adulterous relationships, "men had intercourse with males" (ἄνδρες ὄντες ἄρρεσιν ἐπιβαίνοντες) (*Abraham* 135).[584] He intonates that he takes issue with one of the men fulfilling the role as a passive sexual partner (πάσχων).[585] In other words, he is more concerned with the gender performance of the men of Sodom than he is about their attempt to have intercourse with beings outside of their kind. Underscoring his concern with the Sodom's seeming proclivity for same-sex sexual encounters, he also takes issue with the fact that these sexual unions do not produce children (*Abraham* 135). This concern might have led to him equating Sodom with "barrenness" (στείρωσις, *Drunkenness* 222 and *QG* 4.23).[586] Through their sexual relations, Philo writes that they created for themselves a "female disease" (νοσος θῆλεια) and that the feminization (γυναικόω) of their bodies had a corrupting effect on their soul and society (*Abraham* 136). According to Philo, the divine destroyed Sodom out of indignation with the sexual unions that did not produce children (*Abraham* 137).[587]

Philo's articulation of the sexual sin of Sodom in his treatise on Abraham is more nuanced than his earlier writing in *QG* which focused primarily on Sodom's licentiousness. While both writings used the story to articulate a hierarchy of sexes in which men were on top (literally and figuratively), in Abraham he explored what he saw as the problems with same-sex

---

[584] I have used Birnbaum and Dillon's translation which clarifies the euphemistic use of ἐπιβαίνω in Philo, *On the Life of Abraham*, trans. Ellen Birnbaum and John M Dillon, PACS 6 (Boston: Brill, 2021), 115. For a brief summary of important points in this passage see D'Angelo, "Sexuality in Jewish Writings," 552.

[585] Philo's concern with "active" and "passive" roles might be rooted in Stoicism, the influence of which is found in his later works, Niehoff, *Philo*, 97. Ahern finds other influences of Stoicism in Philo's recounting of Gen 19, see Ahern, "The Sin of Sodom," 214–15.

[586] D'Angelo, "Sexuality in Jewish Writings," 552.

[587] It is worth noting that Philo discusses the destruction of Sodom using both flood and fire terms (*Abraham* 138) suggesting he was familiar with literature that combined the Watcher/flood tradition with the Sodom story.

sexual relations. In so doing, Philo set his work apart from the broader interpretive tradition that did not remark on same-sex sexual relations.

3.3.5 Connecting Genesis 19 and Judges 19–20: Pseudo-Philo and Testament of Benjamin

This final section of the early Jewish reception of Gen 19 considers two works, Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*) and the Testament of Benjamin. Both writings address the relationship between the stories of Gen 19 and Judg 19–20, the latter addressed in the next chapter, and use those stories to address boundaries. Of the two works, *LAB* most clearly associates Gen 19 and Judg 19–20 with one another.[588] Pseudo-Philo's work was originally written in Hebrew in Palestine around the mid-first century CE.[589] It retells the story of Israel's history from its beginnings to the time of David. Some of that story parallels material found in Genesis–Samuel, and some does not. One of the stories it does not retell is the story of Sodom from Gen 19. *LAB* does allude to Gen 19, however, in its retelling of the story of the concubine from Judg 19–20 (*LAB* 45:1–6) and "casually" integrates details from Gen 19 into that retelling.[590] The story in *LAB* describes the arrival of a Levite (there is no mention of his concubine until later in the retelling) in the town of Nob (not Gibeah) (*LAB* 45:1). Another Levite, Bethac, meets him and encourages the first Levite to stay with him since the people of the town are wicked (*LAB* 45:2). In his description of his fellow townspeople in Nob, he explicitly references Sodom saying that "the Lord will shut up their mind (Dominus concluded

[588] The Latin text as well as the English translation in Howard Jacobson's text and translation of Pseudo-Philo are utilized in this dissertation. Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

[589] Scholars debate whether the work was written before or after the destruction of the Second Temple. The evidence is entirely unclear. For summaries of the date debate see D.J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," *OTP* 2:299 and Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo*, 199–210.

[590] Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo*, 1031.

cor eorum)...as he shut up the Sodomites before Lot."[591] The men of Nob, like the men in both Gen 19 and Judg 19–20, gather at the house ready for violence. At this juncture, the writer references the Genesis story again by having the men say, "It has never happened that strangers (advene) give orders to local inhabitants (*LAB* 45:3, cf. Gen 19:9)." The issue of boundaries is made explicit, but the boundary is not related to sexual intercourse. The writer of *LAB* recognizes that the old man from Judg 19 and Lot share an outsider status. For the writer of *LAB*, the words the men of Sodom hurl at Lot could have just as easily been hurled at the old man in Judges.

The Testament of Benjamin also seems to associate the story of Sodom to the story of the concubine in Judg 19–20. In Benjamin's testamentary speech to his descendants, he says that they will fornicate (πορνεύω) with the fornication (πορνεία) of Sodom, associating Sodom with sexual misdeeds. After they fornicate, many will perish, and others will commit more salacious acts with women. Following these sexual misdeeds, the writer says, "the kingdom of the Lord will not be among you" (βασιλεία κυρίου οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, T. Ben. 9:1). The Lord will remove it from them (T. Benj. 9:1). Bearing in mind this is directed toward the tribe of Benjamin, Saul's tribe, the reference to taking away the kingdom might refer to his loss of the kingdom. But what about the note about sexual misdeeds with women following on the reference to Sodom? Following Carden and others, it seems that this is a reference to the rape and murder of the concubine, the outrage at Gibeah, Saul's hometown.[592] In the following chapter, the ways the story of Sodom and the story of the concubine are deeply intertwined and connected to the politics of Saul.

---

[591] Jacobson suggests that the writer could be referencing a sort of mental blindness harkening to the physical blindness in Gen 19:11, *Pseudo-Philo*, 1031.

[592] Carden, *Sodomy*, 58.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that the story of Sodom in MT Gen 19 is best understood as a story of sexual violence. The story's use of sexual violence is consistent with other biblical stories of sexual violence in that the issue of communal boundaries sits at the heart of the narrative. I alluded to how this story together with Judg 19–20 supports an anti-Saul polemic and are a part of Hezekiah's written argument for David's legitimacy, and his own, as king of a united Israel and Judah. The story participates in the creation of an Other, namely Saul and his people, and erects a boundary with them.

As the story was interpreted in early Jewish literature, boundaries are a consistent theme. I argue that one of the most important boundaries explored in the interpretation of Gen 19 is that between humans and semi-divine beings. Interpreters found Gen 6 and other later traditions of the Watchers relevant for interpreting the story of Sodom. To cross the sexual boundary with semi-divine beings is to transgress the order of nature for some early interpreters. Even though some interpretations of the story focused on the boundary that was crossed between humans and semi-divine beings in Gen 19, I have shown that interpreters were able to translate relevant lessons from it to a strictly mundane, human realm. Other interpreters found more straightforward lessons in the story concerning the sexual sin of Sodom, their inhospitality, and the divine judgement they received. The majority of these interpretations still connected these lessons to broader messages around boundaries. With the exception of Philo, early Jewish interpreters did not use the story of Sodom to comment on same-sex sexual relations. That said, gender might well operate in the background of how this story was interpreted. Unlike the story of Dinah which was used to explore both the permeability and impermeability of communal boundaries, the story of Sodom is used strictly to reinforce boundaries.

3.5 Excursus: Qumran

The Sodom and Gomorrah traditions were known at Qumran as evidenced by a handful of Dead Sea Scrolls.[593] Two highly fragmentary Scrolls reflect the traditions of MT Gen 18–19.[594] Six other Scrolls also reflect knowledge of the Sodom and/or Gomorrah. Each Scroll is analyzed below; however, due to the fragmentary nature of the Scrolls and overall lack of context for the mentions of the tradition, few conclusions can be drawn.

3.5.1 4Q172 (4QCommentaries on Unidentified Texts)

4Q172 is a collection of fourteen fragments classified as "commentaries on unidentified texts" in their original publication.[595] 4Q172 4, 3 addresses Gomorrah.[596] In its complete state it likely also addressed Sodom.[597] The text is highly fragmentary, but of primary interest are the words in line three, "the lewdness of Gomorrah" (פחז עמרה). "Lewdness" (פחז) is not used in the

[593] The analysis does not address mentions of Sodom and Gomorrah in 1QIsa[a] as the scroll is largely the same as MT Isaiah addressed above.

[594] 2Q1 attests Gen 19:27–18. 8Q1 attests Gen 18:20–25. The latter contains a short supralinear addition. Both manuscripts are transcribed in Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variant*s, VTSup 134 (Boston: Brill, 2010), 9. As the name of the previous title suggests, some scholars, when classifying these scrolls, refer to them as 'biblical,' an anachronistic term for Second Temple Judaism. Sidnie White Crawford has recently suggested reclassifying these and other scrolls at Qumran as "classic literature of ancient Judaism," classical meaning composed by the early Hellenistic period, to both avoid anachronisms and more accurately classify the material found at Qumran. White Crawford's categories are a helpful corrective to previous classification systems. Her other categories include "nonsectarian texts composed in the Hellenistic-Roman period," "sectarian texts," and "affiliated texts" which are texts containing ideas "congenial" to the sect but do not contain explicit markers. See Sidnie White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2019), 11–16.

[595] John M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.1(4Q158–4Q186)*, DJD V (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 50–53. Trine B. Hasselback offers a helpful overview of how the fragments have been approached in scholarship as well as new ways to analyze the collection in "Two Approaches to the Study of Genre in 4Q172," in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays From the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts From Cave Four*, eds. George Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven (Boston: Brill, 2011), 109–18.

[596] Digital images of this fragment are accessible through The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library online.

[597] This is an inference. Gomorrah does not stand alone in early Jewish texts. Roman Vielhauer also suggests Sodom likely appeared in the original form of this text in "Sodom and Gomorrah: From the Bible to Qumran," in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz (New York: De Gruyter, 2013), 149.

MT in any book to describe Gomorrah, or Sodom for that matter. The content of the surrounding text is rather opaque. The first line might contain כן ויזנו...מם, which could be read, "thus they prostituted themselves…[against him]" as suggested by Vielhauer or "they will feed with him," as suggested by Martínez and Tigchelaar.[598] The fragment offers little in the way of evidence to clarify the reading. The second line contains the phrase העול ברחו, which reads "the/of iniquity they fled." Both Vielhauer and Martínez and Tigchelaar offer interpretations of the line that require reconstructions that are speculative, even if based on evidence from the MT or other Scrolls.[599] In the fourth line after the mention of "the lewdness of Gomorrah" in line three, the text states בוערת וגם, "burning and also." This, of course, is consistent with the mode of destruction for Gomorrah in Gen 19, but the text still lacks essential context to determine whether that interpretation of the line is correct. The final legible line reads לבבם, "their heart."[600] From the above evidence, one can suggest that the author of this fragment likely was familiar with the MT Gen 19, but there is not enough of the fragment to offer any indication of how they interpreted it.

3.5.2 4Q177 (4QCatena A, 4QMidrash on Eschatology^{b} or 4QEschatological Commentary B)

4Q177 is a text with a complicated history, and, as such, is known under a variety of different names in academic literature including 4QCatena A, 4QMidrash on Eschatology^{b}, and

---

[598] Vielhauer suggests the final two *mems* be read as ממנו in "Sodom and Gomorrah: From the Bible to Qumran," 149; Martínez and Tigchelaar reads the two *mems* as part of עמם in Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *DSSSE*, 2nd ed., vol 1 (Boston: Brill, 1999), 349. In the 1968 *DJD* publication, John M. Allegro reads בהיותו עמם "when he was with them" where the other two find verbal forms from זנה and זון, respectively. See Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.1*, 50–51. With respect to the preposition, having looked at images of the fragment, I find Allegro, Martínez and Tigchelaar's reading more consistent with the ink on the fragment itself.

[599] Vielhauer suggests "of deceit in the squares" adding -בות to the end of the second word. Vielhauer, "Sodom and Gomorrah," 149. Martínez and Tigchelaar suggest "all of the men of iniquity have fled" adding כול אנשי before העול. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 349.

[600] There is one visible line below this line, but its reading is unclear.

4QEschatological Commentary B.[601] While the genre and aim of the text is a matter of debate, the content is generally eschatological in nature as some of its names suggest.[602] Within a section relating to Ps 6 and the "last days" (לאחרית הימים) (4Q177 12-13 IV, 7), there is an allusion to Gen 18.[603] Neither Sodom nor Gomorrah are mentioned by name, but the text references "ten righteous ones in the city" (עשרה צדיקים בעיר) (4Q177 12-13 IV 10), which is similar to both Gen 18:32 and 4Q252 below. Eibert Tigchelaar and Roman Vielhauer argue the fragment is also connected to Gen 19 through a reference to בני בליעל in line 9.[604] Tigchelaar and Vielhauer rightly associate the stories of Gen 19 and Judg 19 through each story's use of "the men of the city" (אנשי העיר) with reference to the mobs surrounding Lot and the Benjaminite man's homes respectively (Gen 19:4 and Judg 19:22).[605]

Gen 19:4 טרם ישכבו ואנשי העיר אנשי סדם נסבו על-הבית מנער ועד-זקן כל-העם מקצה
But before they laid down, **the men of the city, the men of Sodom**, from young to old, all of the men to the very last, **surrounded the house**…

---

[601] Digital images of a portion of this fragment are accessible through The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library online. An edition of the text, and the one used here, along with an introduction and notes is printed in Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschata.b): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*, StTDJ 13 (Boston: Brill, 1994), 57–126, esp 71–76. See also John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'," RevQ 7.2 (1970): 236–48, esp. 245–6 and Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 362–7.

[602] On the issue of content and its relationship to name in 4Q174 and 4Q177 see George Brooke, "From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Re-naming an Adopted Manuscript," in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays From the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts From Cave Four*, eds. George Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven (Boston: Brill, 2011), 129–50, esp. 150. An overview of the text and its genre as well as a challenge to the Brooke's idea for naming is presented in Mark Laughlin and Shani Tzoref, "Theme and Genre in *4Q177 and Its Scriptural Selections," in The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays From the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts From Cave Four*, eds. George Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven (Boston: Brill, 2011), 169–91.

[603] Following Martínez and Tigchelaar's arrangement of the fragments.

[604] Eibert Tigchelaar, "Sodom and Gomorrah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and Its Interpretations*, TBN 7, eds. Edward Noort and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (Boston: Brill, 2004), 60–61, and Vielhauer, "Sodom and Gomorrah," 156–8.

[605] The textual parallels between Gen 19 and Judg 19 are addressed in the next chapter.

Judg 19:22a המה מיטיבים את-לבם והנה אנשי העיר אנשי בני-בליעל נסבו את-הבית מתדפקים על-הדלת
While they were in good spirits, suddenly **the men of the city, the sons of wickedness (Belial), surrounded the house** banging on the door…

While the potential of 4Q177 having a connection with Gen 19 through an intertextual reference with Judg 19 is a compelling reading of the text (and particularly for a dissertation predicated on the connection between the reception histories of texts dealing with sexual violence, especially Gen 19 and Judg 19), a word of caution is in order. The phrase בני בליעל does not occur in this section of the text; בני is reconstructed. Although the reconstruction has merit in the context, especially given the occurrence of the corollary "children of light" (בני האור) in the surrounding text, an involved intertextual reading should be approached with caution. Moreover, drawing conclusions about how ancient authors approached the interplay between Gen 19 and Judg 19 is inadvisable on such little evidence.

3.5.3 4Q180 (4QAges of Creation A or 4QPesher on the Periods)

4Q180 is a fragmentary document that discusses the division of time into preordained periods similar to sectarian documents found at Qumran.[606] The preserved portion of the document addresses figures and stories known from Genesis, Jubilees and 1 Enoch.[607]

---

[606] For the original publishing of this text see Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.1*, 77–80, and follow up notes in John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V'," 254–5.The text is also reproduced in Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE, 372–3. Digital images of this fragment are accessible through The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library online; however, the viewer should note that the fragments are in poor condition, and, as a result, the images are unclear. Regarding the subject matter of the document see Divorah Dimant, "Ages of Creation," *EDSS* 1: 11–13. For Dimant's classification of the text as "sectarian" see Devorah Dimant, "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181," in History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies, FAT 90, ed. Divorah Dimant (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 385–404. For a thoughtful discussion on what makes a text "sectarian" see Carol Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, Biblical and Judaic Studies, eds. William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87. An application of Newsom's rubric (the text's use, authorship, and rhetorical function) for declaring a text "sectarian" might call into question Dimant's use of the term for this text.

[607] Divorah Dimant, "Ages of Creation," *EDSS* 1: 11–13.

Concerning the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, one fragment of the text addresses the cities after discussing Abraham's visit at Mamre (Gen 17). It quotes Gen 18:20–21,

4Q180 2-4 II, 5-6[608]

the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah (is) great and their sin	זע]קת סדום ועמורה כי ר[בה] וחטאתמה
is very serious. Let me go down and see their cry which has come	כבדה מאדה ארדה נא ואראה הזעקתמה הבא֯ה

The following lines are broken and only offer hints of what the author's interpretation of these lines known from Genesis are and how they fit into the greater aims of the document.[609] As with the previously mentioned texts from Qumran, there are more questions than answers with respect to how the story of Sodom and Gomorrah was interpreted by these writers.

3.5.3 4Q252 (4QCommentary on Genesis A)

The Sodom and Gomorrah tradition is also encountered in 4Q252.[610] The genre of 4Q252 is a matter of debate with some classifying it as a commentary, rewritten scripture, or *pesher* on Genesis.[611] The text consists of several statements related to content known from Genesis. The goal of the text is unclear as is whether there is a unifying theme or principle to the selection of

[608] Following Martínez and Tigchelaar's arrangement of the fragments.

[609] Vielhauer demonstrates the ambiguity of this section of the scroll by describing the various interpretive possibilities that have been advanced by scholars. Vielhauer, "Sodom and Gomorrah," 160–1.

[610] 4Q252 was first published by George J. Brooke in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts*, Part 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 185–207. The text is also reproduced in Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 500–05 and Émile Puech, "4Q252: 'Commentaire de la Genèse A' ou 'Bénédictions Patriarcales'?" *RevQ* 26.2 (2013): 227–51. Readers should note Puech offers a heavily reconstructed reading of the text but does indicate where he is reconstructing. Digital images of this fragment are accessible through The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library online.

[611] Puech, "4Q252," 228. For a defense of commentary see George J. Brooke, "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry To Pesher," *DSS* 1.2 (1994): 160–79. Moshe J. Bernstein argues that the text is some sort of "new" genre on a spectrum of interpretive literature in "4Q252: From Rewritten Bible to Biblical Commentary," in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, vol. 1, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein (Boston: Brill, 2013), 124. Also, on the genre of 4Q252, Bernstein, "4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke, 'The Thematic Content of 4Q252,'" in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, vol. 1, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein (Boston: Brill, 2013), 133–50. Sidnie White Crawford classifies this text as a "sectarian text" *Scribes and Scrolls,* 229n31.

stories the text comments on. One of the traditions to which the text devotes four lines is that of Sodom and Gomorrah as found in MT Gen 18–19 (4Q252 III, 2–6). On either side of the Sodom and Gomorrah section are treatments of other parts of the Abraham cycle, both the covenant with Abraham (Gen 15) and the Akedah (Gen 22). The four fragmentary lines on Sodom and Gomorrah do not offer much in the way of context. In fact, one might question whether they address Sodom and Gomorrah at all given that "Sodom" does not show up at all in the text, and only two letters indicate a reading of the city Gomorrah (רה…). The reconstruction of the city name as well as other parts of the text is based upon assumptions on the relationship between 4Q252 and MT Genesis—well-founded and defensible assumptions, but assumptions nonetheless. In the end, a handful of words can be securely identified. They are presented in the table below.

4Q252 III, 2-6

Ten men […] Gomorrah, and also	(2) עשר אנשים[עמ]רה וגם
This city [….] the righteous ones	(3) העיר הזאת[ ] צדיקים
I will not [….]-s alone shall be destroyed	(4) אנוכי לוא [ ] ים לבדם יחרמו
If one is not found there […] that which is found in it and its plunder	(5) ואם לוא ימצא שם[ ] הנמצא בה ושללה
And its children and the remnant [….] forever and he stretched out	(6) וטפיה ושאר[ ] עולם וישלח

If one views the text through the lens of the MT, there are a few hints that the author is referring to Gen 18, and possibly Gen 19. In the first line, ten men might refer to Abraham's negotiation with YHWH regarding the number of righteous ones (צדיקים) reflected in the third line (Gen 18:23–33). Some scholars have found affinities between lines 4–6 and Deut 13:13–19,

the law of the idolatrous city.[612] The potential combination of these two texts, Gen 18–19 and Deut 13, are indeed tantalizing in terms of what insight can be gained on how this ancient author conceived of the tale of Sodom and Gomorrah. Unfortunately, however, due to an essential lack of content, there is little that can be responsibly posited on the author's interpretation of the story or their intent in retelling it.[613]

3.5.4 3Q14 (3QUnclassified Frgs. ar)

3Q14 is a highly fragmentary.[614] Hebrew and Aramaic fragments are associated with the Scroll; Sodom is mentioned in the Aramaic fragments. It is difficult to determine if there was a unifying subject for the Aramaic fragments. One fragment (frg. 6) mentions "secrets" (סתרין).[615] The following fragment mentions the number "fifty" (חמשין). Fragment eight states "of Sodom" (די סדום). What little is present might be understood as relating to the dialogue between Abraham and God in Gen 18, with the "secrets" referring to God hiding what he was going to do from Abraham (Gen 18:17). This suggestion, however, is only speculative.[616] It is, however, worthwhile to observe that the city's fame at one point made it into the Jewish Aramaic literary tradition at Qumran.

---

[612] Vielhauer, "Sodom and Gomorrah," 153; Bernstein, "4Q252: From Rewritten Bible," 109n46.

[613] Moshe Bernstein captures the sentiment in interpreting column 3 reflected in this dissertation stating, "I am even less sanguine about extrapolating meaning-ful conclusions from column 3 than from column 2 ("4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources," 140)." No meaningful conclusions are herein offered.

[614] Originally published in Maurice Baillet, J.T. Milik, Roland De Vaux, and H.W. Baker, *Les "petites Grottes" De Qumran: Exploration De La Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q À 10Q, Le Rouleau De Cuivre*, DJD 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 103.

[615] The editors of the fragment's original publication suggested that this might signal the document was an apocalypse.

[616] It could also be rightly critiqued for reading too much of what we know of the Hebrew Bible into the Scrolls.

3.5.6 1Q20/1QapGen (Genesis Apocryphon)

1QapGen (1Q20) mentions Sodom and Gomorrah, but, at least in the extant portion, does not seem to draw on the narrative in Gen 19 (or even Gen 18) to discuss the cities.[617] The well-preserved column 21 mentions Lot parting from Abraham and settling in Sodom. The end of the column describes the war between the King of Elam with his allies and the kings of the cities of the plain, including Sodom and Gomorrah, familiar from MT Gen 14. The text relates that Sodom was plundered by the King of Elam. Column 22 describes Abraham's interaction with the King of Sodom after reclaiming what the King of Elam captured. The text does not cover the destruction of the city nor any discussion regarding their destruction.

As stated at the outset of this discussion on Sodom and Gomorrah in the Dead Sea Scrolls, few conclusions can be drawn about how the tradition of the cities was interpreted at Qumran. Still, one can make a few observations about the extant material on the tradition of the cities. First, the majority of the material at Qumran concerning the cities addressed the end of Gen 18 and Abraham's negotiations with YHWH as opposed to the actions of the Sodomites in Gen 19. This might merely be an accident of what manuscript evidence is preserved, but the tilt toward Gen 18 over Gen 19 is worth noting.[618] Second, sexual violence does not seem to figure prominently into the interpretation of the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah. With the exception of the mention of "lewdness" (פחז) seemingly in construct with Gomorrah in 4Q172, any hint of sexual violence or illicit sexual behavior is missing from the manuscripts dealing with Sodom and Gomorrah at Qumran.

---

[617] An excellent edition of the Aramaic text along with translation and commentary is Daniel Machiela's *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon a New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Boston: Brill, 2009). See also *DSSSE*, 2nd ed., vol 1, eds. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (Boston: Brill, 1999), 28–49.

[618] Vielhaur, "Sodom and Gomorrah," 163.

3.6 Excursus: 2 Enoch

2 Enoch is a series of vignettes related to the figure of Enoch primarily consisting of his visionary tours of the heavens. These vignettes are contained in a series of manuscripts preserved in Old Slavonic.[619] The manuscripts are generally grouped into a short and long recension, but bear witness to multiple traditions.[620] The work resists being pinned to a date and place of production. It is almost certainly older than the medieval manuscripts preserving it, but it is unclear how much older it is.[621] Andersen suggests a late first century CE date for the work and a Palestinian provenance, but his conclusions are couched in conditional language.[622] The interpretation of the Sodom story in the longer recension of 2 Enoch certainly stands out among interpretation of the story in other early Jewish texts. It explicitly identifies same-sex pederasty as being Sodom's offense worthy of a fiery judgment in the afterlife (2 En. J 10.4).[623] The assessment of Sodom in this longer recension does not reflect the *broader* interpretive tradition of early Judaism which does not connect Sodom's sin to same-sex relations or pederasty.[624] It does, however, relate to Philo's interpretation of the sins committed at Sodom. This fact might suggest that this work of dubious origins does in fact belong to the first century CE, and maybe possibly the Alexandrian Jewish community.[625]

---

[619] F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:92.

[620] Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:93.

[621] Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:94–97.

[622] Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:94–95.

[623] I am working with Andersen's translation in "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:118.

[624] Carden, *Sodomy*, 44–5.

[625] At the end of the nineteenth century, RH Charles suggested first century Egypt as the book's provenance. See *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), xii.

4. The Story of The Concubine and Its Reception

The story of the concubine in Judg 19:1–20:13 harnesses shock and horror for its polemical purposes in a way that few other passages in the Hebrew Bible do.[626] Unlike the stories of Dinah and Sodom (Gen 34 and Gen 19), the story of the concubine is hardly mentioned in early Jewish sources. Even though the story shares phrases and narrative progression with the story of Sodom, it does not live in popular memory like its counterparts in Genesis.[627] Still, it is this story in Judges that acts as the tie that binds these stories of sexual violence together.

Although the story brings the three stories analyzed in this dissertation together, it is set apart from the other two stories in that the perpetrators of violence and the victim are all a part of "Israel" in the broadest sense, setting aside the complicated politics of inclusion and exclusion among the tribes. The insider-outsider dynamics the Judges story is trying to communicate are complex and their nuance obscured by time. For an early Jewish audience, the story required reworking in order to make sense of the sexual violence perpetrated by men of Israel against a woman of Israel. The two writers who address the story of the concubine substantively work to address the complicated boundary issues raised in the MT Judg 19–20 for their early Jewish audiences.

The following chapter is organized much like the previous two chapters. I begin with an overview of Judg 19–20 and situate the chapters in their broader context in Judges and in history. I then offer an innerbiblical reading of Gen 34, Gen 19 and Judg 19–20 and highlight shared

---

[626] Close other contenders for harnessing shock and horror might include 2 Sam 13, Ezek 16, 23, and Hos 2. In this chapter, I use "the story of the concubine" to refer to Judg 19:1–20:13. I also use the shorthand of Judg 19–20 to refer to this story without specifying the break at 20:13. The reasons for breaking the story at Judg 20:13 are discussed in detail below. My translation of "concubine" for the Hebrew פילגש is also discussed below under section 4.1.2.

[627] Sonia Waters writes, "While 'Sodomite' has become a catchphrase in modern culture for men who engage in sexual relations with men, there is no word in Western culture that references the gang rape of a woman in Judg 19. There is no term 'Gibeahite' that plays its part in the lexicon of straight sexual relations to evoke disgust or fear, condemnation or prohibition ("Reading Sodom, 281)."

words and phrases. The discussion on the interconnectedness of the three texts elucidates the method used for delimiting the corpus in this dissertation. Following that, I explore the politics of sexual violence at play in the text by asking critical questions around gender, communal boundaries and the historiographic project underlying the story. I argue that the story of the concubine served a political purpose of undermining Saul's legacy as a part of Hezekiah's broader agenda for expanding his kingdom. I then turn to the story's Greek translations. The discussion focuses on the Greek translations in their own right as opposed to analyzing them for how they inform other early Jewish writings as in the previous two chapters. Finally, I conclude the chapter with a discussion of the limited corpus of early Jewish writings that reference the story of the concubine. I argue that the boundary project of MT Judg 19–20 is lost in the story's early reception. Josephus minimizes the issue of boundaries in his retelling, and Pseudo-Philo introduces the Amalekites as a representative Other to explore the issue of boundaries.

4.1 MT Judges 19–20

4.1.1 Dating and Context

Historically locating Judges must begin with a conversation about its place in the Deuteronomistic History. The Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) is a theory proposing that Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings formed a single historical work unified by language, style, and various motifs. The theory was advanced by Martin Noth in the mid-twentieth century and has been developed in several different, sometimes competing, directions.[628] Many of the adaptations of Noth's theory concern the number of significant

[628] Noth's seminal work advancing his theory is *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1943). A helpful summary of Noth's work and scholarship that builds upon it can be found in Gary N. Knoppers, Introduction to *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, eds. Gary N. Knoppers, and J. Gordon McConville (Collegeville: Penn State University Press, 2000), 1–18.

moments in the growth of the work. Noth conceived of a single author pulling together disparate sources in weaving them into a unified history. Developments of Noth's theory, however, understand the DtrH to have grown over time and undergone a series of redactions.[629] Some have argued the work began to come together during the reign of Hezekiah.[630] Others argue for later periods including under Josiah's kingship and/or after the Babylonian exile.

Establishing Judges place in this development is challenging.[631] One finds evidence of different strata in the very language of Judges. For example, Deborah's song in Judg 5 bears the hallmarks of an archaic form of the language while the rest appears classical in nature.[632] The subject matter is clearly about a time before the work could have been written, but its political and theological concerns have been read as resonate with later periods.[633] Further complicating a

---

[629] Although one footnote can hardly do justice to the number of significant contributions made by scholars to the study of the DtrH, a few highlights are summarized here. Frank Moore Cross argued for a dual redaction to the DtrH, the first and primary of which occurred under Josiah and the second of which occurred in the exile. The most recent articulation of Cross's theory (as far as I know) is published in "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, eds. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville (Collegeville: Penn State University Press, 2000), 79–94. Others have argued for multiple pre-exilic editions of the DtrH. An example of this approach can be found in André Lemaire, "Toward a Redactional History of the Book of Kings," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*, eds. Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville (Collegeville: Penn State University Press, 2000), 446–61. The idea of multiple redactions over time is supported by the work of Moshe Weinfeld who posited the existence of a Deuteronomic school responsible for shepherding the work through its phases starting with Deuteronomy in the seventh century BCE. See *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (New York: Oxford, 1972). A full summary of work related to the DtrH is found in Steven L. McKenzie, "Deuteronomistic History," *ABD* 2:160–68.

[630] See previous footnote in addition to the summary of various scholars takes on multiple redactions in William Schniedewind, "The Problem with Kings: Recent Study of the Deuteronomistic History," *RSR* 22 (1996): 22–27.

[631] Baruch Halpern writes, "Yet its [Judges] literary history is as complex as that of any other work in the DtrH (*The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*, 1st ed. [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988], 121)."

[632] With respect to the archaic nature of Judg 5 see Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew*, 53. In contradistinction to the arguments here, Cynthia Edenburg argues that Judg 19–21 contains features characteristic of late biblical Hebrew in *Dismembering the Whole: Composition and Purpose of Judges 19-21* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 115–59.

[633] For example, see Gale A. Yee, "Ideological Criticism: Judges 17–21 and the Dismembered Body," in *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*, ed. Gale A. Yee (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 138–60.

discussion on the dating of Judges is its structure with clear divisions at the beginning and end.[634] The end is of particular interest here.

Students of Judges have long recognized its ending in chapters 17–21 is different in form and content from the preceding chapters.[635] Judges 17–21 does not follow the cyclical pattern of unfaithfulness to YHWH, disaster, and repentance recognizable in the preceding chapters. The section also does not discuss Israel's judges.[636] This disunity suggests that the final chapters were appended to the preceding chapters.[637] Scholars have offered several proposals for when these latter chapters were composed. For example, Patrick Arnold attempts to "peel off" priestly and deuteronomistic layers until arriving at its eighth century "core."[638] He parses out the layers by identifying passages within the narrative that show an affinity to other passages in other writings (i.e., Gen 19, 1 Sam 11, Josh 8, etc.). Arnold argues that the core narrative comes from the northern kingdom of Israel prior to its 722 BCE fall.[639] Different from Arnold's assessment of deuteronomistic editorial "interference" in Judg 19–21, Gale Yee argues the story as a whole is best understood as being a product of the Deuteronomist.[640] She argues that the chapters' attitude toward the kingship betray its seventh century location, stemming from the period of or just after

---

[634] Mark S. Smith and Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, *Judges 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2021), 12–14.

[635] Scholars also recognize chapters 1–2:11 as different from the following chapters in fundamental ways. For an articulation of this perspective see Smith and Bloch-Smith, *Judges 1*, 13–14.

[636] Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 148.

[637] Smith and Bloch Smith, *Judges 1*, 15. A notable departure from this appendix theory is articulated by Yairah Amit who argues that chapters 17–18 are the "true ending" and 19–21 are the appendix, see *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*, trans. Jonathan Chipman (Boston: Brill, 1999), 310.

[638] Patrick M. Arnold, *Gibeah: The Search for a Biblical City* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009) 61–86, esp. 62.

[639] Arnold, *Gibeah*, 81.

[640] Arnold, *Gibeah*, 63–65; Yee, "Ideological Criticism,"143–47.

the Josianic reforms.[641] Mark Smith and Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, however, find the final chapters (as well as the prologue) "to be postexilic and perhaps post-deuteronomistic as well, given their general lack of deuteronomistic idiom."[642] They argue the final chapters were composed between the seventh and fifth centuries.[643]

Other scholars argue for a date even later than the period of Josiah's kingship. Robert Boling suggests that the story was "probably appended during the Babylonian exile, when Judah and Benjamin had been, until recently, all that remained of the old federation."[644] Joseph Blenkinsopp extends Boling's window for the chapters' composition to include the Persian period.[645] Similar to Arnold, Blenkinsopp finds evidence for a later date in the textual overlaps between Judg 19–21 and other passages (Gen 19, 1 Sam 11, Josh 8, Num 31, and Judg 3). He reaches this conclusion in part because he believes at least one of these passages (Num 31) to come from P.[646]

---

[641] Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 144. While I ultimately disagree with Yee's dating and instead follow Sara Milstien (her position described below), Yee's economic analysis on the "modes of production" prior to and after the Josianic reforms and how that economic dynamic is reflected in the composition of the chapters is quite convincing. Examining Judg 19–21 herself, Cynthia Edenburg offers a challenge to Yee's methodology for identifying Deuteronomistic writings. Specifically, she challenges the notion that Deuteronomistic texts can be identified by "theme and ideology." See Edenburg, *Dismembering the Whole*, 5.

[642] Smith and Bloch Smith, *Judges 1*, 34.

[643] Smith and Bloch Smith, *Judges 1*, 26.

[644] Robert G. Boling, *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB6A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 278.

[645] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Benjamin Traditions Read in the Early Persian Period," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, eds. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 642. Part of Blenkinsopp's argument for this dating is built upon the assumption that Bethel, which features numerous times in Judg 19–21, was active as a cultic center during the neo-Babylonian and early Persian periods (Blenkinsopp, "Benjamin Traditions," 642–43). Based on a reevaluation of archaeological reports from the site, Israel Finkelstein and Lily Singer-Avitz argue there is "a lack of evidence for meaningful activity during the 6th century and early Persian period (Israel Finkelstein and Lily Singer-Avitz, "Reevaluating Bethel," *ZDPV* 125.1 [2009]: 43)."

[646] Unfortunately, Blenkinsopp does not demonstrate that the direction of influence is Num 31 → Judg 20–21. Blenkinsopp, "Benjamin Tradition," 641. Moreover, Blenkinsopp seems to assume the rich tapestry of textual

Some scholars argue for a "quite late" date for the text. Edenburg sees the text as having undergone a series of redactions and concludes that "while the authors of the primary narrative and the later revision seem to be familiar with the Deuteronomistic History (N1 and R2) and Priestly literature (only R2), their innovative use of Deuteronomistic and Priestly idiom places them at a distance from the mainstream Deuteronomistic and Priestly circles."[647] That distant period is the Persian period. Without assigning Judg 19–21 to a particular century, David Carr argues that Judges was influx "quite late in the post-exilic period" based on the evidence from the final chapters.[648] Klaas Spronk, also looking at the final chapters and seemingly following Carr, argues that "this final edition of the text [Judges] probably took place in the Hellenistic age."[649]

Different from the proposals above, Sara Milstein argues for both a multi-stage development in the Judg 19–21 passage and an early dating, at least for the latter half of the chapters (Judg 20:14–21:24). Milstein proposes "that an old Saul complex once circulated that included early versions of the Benjaminite war (Judg 20–21), its resolution with regard to the women of Shiloh (Judg 21:15–24), an old Saul birth story (1 Sam 1), and an account of Saul's victory over the Ammonites (1 Sam 11). This complex was then fronted by Judg 19:1–20:13 in order to recast the complex in anti-Saul terms."[650] Milstein argues that the Benjamin tradition (this Saul complex that circulated without Judg 19:1–20:13) as being developed and circulated

---

allusions on display in Judg 19–21 requires years (hundreds?) of development. I am not sure that this assumption is warranted.

[647] Edenburg, *Dismembering the Whole*, 323.

[648] Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 285.

[649] Klaas Spronk, *Judges*, HCOT (Bristol: Peeters, 2019), 25.

[650] Sara J. Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 201–2.

"when Benjamin was still calculating its relationship to Israel, not Judah" and during "the period prior to or shortly following Benjamin's alliance with Judah [1 Kgs 12:17-21], at a time when the Benjaminites were still capable of producing their own literature."[651] Building on Milstein's argument, this dissertation argues that the late eighth century represents a reasonable period for the anti-Saul "introduction" in Judg 19:1–20:13 to be composed and added onto the pro-Saul, Benjaminite material.[652]

The Hezekian period was a time of looking back to the golden age of unification under a southern, Judahite king, David. As part of an argument of the legitimacy of this Davidic, unified kingdom there was a concomitant disparagement of a Saulide kingdom.[653] Yairah Amit assesses the political impact of Judg 19–21 in its narrative context in this way,

> It appears that the role of Judges 19–21, immediately preceding the book of Samuel, is to reinforce the negative aspect of all that is connected with Saul, to blur the tragic effect, and thus to make it easier for readers to understand the reasons for the change in regime and the preference for David.[654]

---

[651] Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe*, 205.

[652] Milstein is somewhat agnostic on dating the "introduction" (Judg 19–20:13) holding open the possibility that it could have been incorporated during a late (Persian period) redaction Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe*, 204.

[653] With respect to the north-south dynamics at play in the Saul narratives, Na'aman -argues in a two-part series about the origins of Israel, how neither the tribe of Benjamin, the city of Gibeah or the person of Saul can be categorized as coming from the north. Nadav Na'aman, "Saul, Benjamin, and the Emergence of 'Biblical Israel' (Part 1)," ZAW 121.2 (2009): 211–24 and "Saul, Benjamin, and the Emergence of 'Biblical Israel' (Part 2)," ZAW 121.3 (2009): 335–49, esp. 345. Israel Finkelstein challenges Na'aman's conclusions in Israel Finkelstein, "Saul, Benjamin and the Emergence of 'Biblical Israel:' An Alternative View," *ZAW 123* (2011): 348–67.

[654] Yairah Amit, "Literature in the Service of Politics: Studies in Judges 19–21," in *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*, JSOTSup 171, eds. Yair Hoffman, Henning Graf Reventlow, and Benjamin Uffenheimer (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1994), 39. To be clear, Amit does not use her assessment in support of an eighth century date as this dissertation does.

David is a central figure in the DtrH.[655] Appeals to the politics of David within parts of the DtrH are often read as being in line with Josiah and his rule.[656] Reading the politics of David in the DtrH is complicated as both Hezekiah and Josiah aligned themselves with David and "reasserted Davidic sovereignty" particularly in regard to the north.[657] While parts of the DtrH highlighting a preference for David clearly must be dated to the time of Josiah or thereafter, there is nothing in these last chapters of Judges that demand a Josianic or post-Josianic date. The politics of the narrative can be read cogently for either a late eighth century/ early seventh century date or a sixth century date. This dissertation prefers the former. Others have argued this to be the period for an early version of Judges as a whole.[658] The final chapters have often been left out of the frame for an early version of Judges, but, as far as I can see, there is nothing in the final chapters that would preclude an early date. Still, there is reason to not hold too firmly to this early date as our understanding of Judges, its composition, and its place in the DtrH is still very much influx.

4.1.2 Overview of MT Judges 19–20

Many studies on Judges treat Judg 19–21 as a textual unit, and indeed it is. It has been edited in a way to fit together, but, following Sara Milstein, this dissertation understands Judg 19:1–20:13 to be a discrete unit within the three chapters.[659] This section recounts the story as it appears in MT Judges to provide context for the discussion in this chapter.

---

[655] Cross, "The Book of Kings," 84–89.

[656] An example of a work that does this is Alison Joseph, *Portrait of the Kings: The Davidic Prototype in Deuteronomistic Poetics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015) 147–86.

[657] Halpern, *The First Historians*, 168.

[658] Amit, *The Book of Judges*, 367–69.

[659] Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe*, 175–207. For a critique of some scholars' tendency to separate the story of the concubine from the abduction in Judg 21 see James Harding, "Homophobia and Masculine Domination in Judges 19-21," *The Bible & Critical Theory* 12 (2016): 54. In principle, I agree with Harding's critique but still believe there are literary and historical reasons to analyze Judg 19:1–20:13 as a separate textual unit.

With the ominous refrain "in those days when there was no king in Israel" the story of the concubine opens.[660] The narrator introduces the audience to a certain Levite man (איש לוי) who resides in the outskirts of the hill country of Ephraim.[661] The man married (ויקח-לו) a concubine (פילגש) from Bethlehem in Judah (Judg 19:1).[662] The concubine's home city is in the southern territory of Judah and associated with David. Saul's home territory in Benjamin is situated between Bethlehem and the hill country of Ephraim. The setting of the story is key for understanding its political import.

The MT reports that the concubine had illicit sexual relations (ותזנה עליו) against the man and left for her father's house (Judg 19:2).[663] The construction of זנה with על is unconventional, and as such the meaning is unclear.[664] The Greek recensions report that she was angry (ὠργίσθη) with the Levite. The editors of the BHS apparatus suggest that זנה should be emended to זנח

---

[660] This phrase is repeated in Judg 17–21 (Judg 17:6, 18:1, 19:1, 21:25) and is cited as evidence of the unity or coherence of those chapters.

[661] For an in-depth study on the unnamed Levite's character, see David Z. Moster, "The Levite of Judges 19–21," *JBL* 134 (2015): 721–730. He argues that the unnamed man is a "type-character" representing Levites as a whole. His actions as "shocking and calculated killer" is typical for other Levites in the Hebrew Bible.

[662] The meaning of פילגש is debated in biblical scholarship. Susan Ackerman demonstrates that פילגש can either be used to indicate "a woman who is part of a man's harem but is not one of his actual wives or it can mean a woman who is married to a man as a secondary wife (*Warrior, Dancer, Seductress, Queen*, ABRL [New York: Doubleday, 1998], 236)." The former has more "autonomy and authority" than the latter. The woman in Judg 19 seems to be part of the latter group; however, it is not entirely clear. The challenge of this understanding posed by Judg 19 is the absence of a primary wife. Admittedly, "concubine" is not an entirely accurate term, but the term has historically been used in English translations for פילגש. Leaving פילגש untranslated as some studies do does not bring more clarity to the woman's identity. Recognizing the imperfections of "concubine" as a translation, this dissertation uses it because of its long history in biblical translation, the connotation of a compromised position of power vis-a-vis men contained in the word, and the lack of better translation options.

[663] Jason Bembry effectively argues that this description of the concubine engaging in an illicit sexual act is part of a trend in the Hebrew Bible for "later tradents" to "sexually slander" those who are killed by Israelites. This slander is meant to justify the act of murder. His argument is in part built upon a comparison of MT Judg 19:2 with parallel passages in the story's early reception. This phenomenon is also explored in this dissertation. Jason Bembry, "The Levite's Concubine (Judg 19:2) and the Tradition of Sexual Slander in the Hebrew Bible: How the Nature of Her Departure Illustrates a Tradition's Tendency," *VT* 68 (2018): 519–39.

[664] On this verb see Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 152, and Boling, *Judges*, 273–74.

meaning "to spurn." This emendment would bring the Hebrew into better alignment with the Greek, but there is no Hebrew manuscript evidence to support the emendment. From a narrative perspective, it is surprising that her father took her in if she was in fact unfaithful to her husband. It is possible that זנה might better be understood as some sort of breach in the relationship, not necessarily as an illicit sexual act.[665] The ambiguity in this verse plays out in the story's early reception.

The concubine stayed in her family home for four months before the Levite came for her with a servant and a pair of donkeys. Like Shechem spoke to Dinah, the Levite went to "speak to her heart" (לדבר על לבה) and to return her.[666] The concubine's father welcomed the Levite, showed him hospitality, and forced him to stay (ויחזק). After three days the father pressed (ויפצר) the Levite to stay another night after pushing a meal on him. On the fifth day, the Levite's father-in-law showed hospitality once more and as the day wore on again urged the Levite to stay, but the Levite refused and set out late for his home. As evening approached the Levite's servant suggested that they stay for the evening in Jebus, the Canaanite name for Jerusalem. The Levite rejects the suggestion saying that they will not stay in a city of foreigners (עיר נכר) but will instead travel to Gibeah or Ramah since they belong to the people of Israel (בני ישראל) (Judg 19:3–11).

---

[665] Madipoane Masenya explores alternatives for understanding this verb that might fit the narrative context better in "Without a Voice, With a Violated Body: Re-reading Judges 19 to Challenge Gender Violence in Sacred Texts," *Missionalia* 40 (2012): 208–9.

[666] On this phrase Blyth writes "Instead, one may posit that, within this particular context, this Hebrew idiom may represent rather a sense of egocentric self-interest and expediency on behalf of the speaker. The Levite was less concerned about offering comfort or reassurance to his wife than simply being intent on retrieving her, by whatever means necessary ("Redeemed By His Love?" 12)." Will Briggs offers a different interpretation saying that the Levite's actions represent an "effort at social cohesion through grace ("'A Man's Gotta Do What a Man's Gotta Do?: The Criticism of Hegemonic Masculinity in Judges 19.1–20.7," *JSOT* 54 [2017]: 63)."

The travelers arrive in Gibeah by the evening. As they wait in the square for a local to care for them, an older sojourner from the hill country of Ephraim who was living in Gibeah approaches them. He enquires about their travels and agrees to house them for the evening.[667] The Levite ensures the man that they have enough provisions to not be a burden on him. The old man cautions them against staying in the square (Judg 19:12–20).

After the travelers wash and settle in at the Ephraimite man's home, the men of Gibeah, a worthless lot (בני בליעל) surround the home and demand for the old man to expel the man (presumably the Levite and not his servant) so that they might know him (נדענו). The old man exits his home and attempts to reason with the crowd. He asks them not to do this outrageous thing (הנבלה הזאת). The old man offers his virgin daughter (בתי הבתולה) and the Levite's concubine to the men and tells them to rape the women (ענו אותם) or whatever they want to do to them. He pleads that the men just not do this outrageous thing to his male guest (Judg 19:22–24).

The men would not listen to the old man, so the Levite threw his concubine out to the mob. The men raped and abused the concubine all night until the morning. At dawn they let her go. She returned to the old man's home where she collapsed at the gate, her hands extended onto the threshold. When the Levite woke and started on his way, he discovered the concubine. He commanded her to rise so that they could leave. Without hearing a response, he picked her up, threw her on the donkey and rode home. At home, he took a knife, divided her body into twelve pieces and sent the pieces out to all the territory of Israel with a message asking whether such a thing had been seen in Israel since they arrived from Egypt. He implored the men to pay attention to the matter (Judg 19:25–30).

[667] Curiously, the MT writes that the Levite told this old Ephraimite that he was en route to the house of the Lord (בית יהוה) (Judg 19:18). This is one of the textual conundrums of the passage.

Having received the message, the men of Israel gathered at Mizpah in the capacity of a military force. Benjamin heard that the tribes had gathered but seemingly did not attend. The Levite explained to the assembly that he and his concubine were spending the night in Gibeah when the lords of Gibeah (בעלי גבעה) rose up against him with the intention of killing him. Instead, these men of Gibeah raped his concubine until she died. Therefore, he cut up and distributed the pieces of his concubine's body "because they committed an abomination and an outrage in Israel" (כי עשו זמה ונבלה בישראל). The Levite solicits the assembly's response and speaking as one they commit to battle Gibeah, and the battle commences (Judg 20:1–13).

4.1.3 Excursus: A Gibeah Tradition

Just like the city of Sodom has a tradition in the Hebrew Bible, Gibeah also has a tradition.[668] With respect to the study of the story of the concubine and Gibeah, the references to the city in Hosea are most relevant. Hos 5:8–9 reads,

תקעו שופר בגבעה חצצרה ברמה הריעו בית און אחריך בנימין אפרים לשמה תהיה ביום תוכחה בשבטי ישראל הודעתי נאמנה

Blow the horn in Gibeah, the trumpet in Ramah. Shout in Beth-aven, behind you Benjamin. Ephraim will be a desolation in the day of rebuke, among the tribes of Israel I make known what is sure.

The war imagery in northern sites is clear, but which war the passage is reference is a matter of debate. Some commentators read the verses as related to the Syro-Ephraimite while others suggest they correspond to the events in Judg 19–20.[669] Examining the verses within their

[668] For Gibeah's archaeological history and its identification with Tel el-Fûl as well as the challenge of locating Gibeah in the Hebrew Bible due to the etymology of its name see William Schniedewind, "The Search for Gibeah: Notes on the Historical Geography of Central Benjamin," in *"I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times:" Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. Amihay Mazar, Pierre de Miroschedji, and Aren M. Maeir (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 711–22.

[669] For scholars who relate the verses to the Syro-Ephraimite war see Arnold, *Gibeah*, 112–17. Albrecht Alt pioneered this thesis in "Hosea 5:8-6:6. Ein Krieg und seine Folgen in prophetische Beleuchtung," in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Munich: Beck, 1953), 163–87. For its relation to Judg 19–20 see Schniedewind, "The Search for Gibeah," 722. To avoid setting up a false binary, for an example of a scholar who

broader context, Frances Andersen and David Noel Freedman write of them, "[they] do not seem to be as coherent as the rest, and their analysis is correspondingly difficult."[670] I tend to agree with Andersen and Freedman's assessment. Although viewing the passage in Hosea as relating to Judg 19–20 might help to establish the relative antiquity of the latter, it is unclear the relationship between the two passages exists.

In addition to the reference to Gibeah in Hos 5:8, Hos 9:9 and 10:9 discusses Israel's corruption as being as bad as "in the days of Gibeah." In Hos 10:9, the prophet suggests a war might overtake Gibeah. Sarah Milstein argues the references are vague enough that they do not necessarily refer to Judg 19.[671] Carden also questions any association saying, "Despite this clear odium, neither passage gives details of the specific evil associated with Gibeah or refers to the events in Judg 19–21. For readers unfamiliar with those events, these verses in Hosea provide no clues."[672] David Noel Freedman, however, argues that the references to Gibeah in Hosea point to the incident described in Judg 19–20.[673] While Milstein and Carden's caution in associating the story in Judges with Hos 9:9 and 10:9, the possibility of their association should not be ruled out.

Other references to Gibeah are scattered throughout the Hebrew Bible. What makes these references important for this study is that they confirm the city's association with both Benjamin the tribe and Saul the individual. The city's association with the tribe of Benjamin, Saul's tribe, is confirmed by Josh 18:28, 2 Sam 23:29, and 1 Chron 11:31.[674] Its association as Saul's home is

---

does not see it relating to either of those conflicts see Edwin M. Good, "Hosea 5:8-6:6: An Alternative to Alt," JBL 85.3 (1966): 273–86.

[670] Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed., AB 24 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980), 400.

[671] Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe*, 182–3.

[672] Carden, *Sodomy,* 44.

[673] Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 535.

confirmed by 1 Sam 13:2, 15:34, and Isa 10:29.[675] Other references to the city occur in the context of Saul's narrative (1 Sam 22:6, 23:19, 26:1).

4.1.4 The Tie That Binds[676]

The sexual violence motif ties together the stories of Gen 19, 34 and Judg 19–20, but their relationship is even more elemental than a single shared motif. Several commentators have demonstrated that the stories share words, phrases, and a certain narrative progression that suggests a level of intentionality in relating the stories to one another on the part of scribes who penned them.[677] This section explores those parallels and argues that Judg 19–20 is the tie that binds the three stories together.

The most salient textual parallels are found between Gen 19 and Judg 19. Westermann and others have noted the structural connections in the narratives' progression (guests' arrival, warm reception, the mob's demands, counteroffer by host, threats, and repulse of the mob).[678] Interpreters have also noted the striking parallels in the language of the two stories. The chart below shows some of those parallels.[679]

---

[674] Carden notes the city's reference in Josh 15:57 lists it among the cities of Judah, Carden, *Sodomy,* 43. This might reflect its status as a border city and Benjamin's status as a border territory.

[675] The reference to Gibeah in Isaiah occurs in a confusing oracle, both in terms of the language and the content. For more on the content of the reference including the unusual order of the cities and locating the oracle historically see Duane Christensen "The March of Conquest in Isaiah X 27c-34," *VT* 26 (1976): 385–99. For more on the language see Takamitsu Muraoka, "Short Note Who Lodged at Geba (Isaiah 10:29)?" *VT* 61 (2011): 148-49.

[676] The title of this section alludes to the title of Patricia Hill Collins article cited in the methodology chapter "The Tie That Binds: Race, Gender and US Violence."

[677] For an example of scholarship that explores the "rape motif" in these stories see Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, 118–27. Katherine Southwood finds the stories share the theme of hospitality and migration in addition to sexual violence in "'This Man Has Come Into My House': Hospitality in Genesis 19; 34; and Judges 19," *BibInt* 26 (2018): 469–84. Susan Niditch also sees the hospitality theme unifying Gen 19 and Judg 19–20 in "The Sodomite Theme in Judges 19–20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 365.

[678] Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 297. Other interpreters who have noted similarities include Blenkinsopp, "Benjamin Traditions," 640; Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, 11; Waters, "Reading Sodom," 274–83; Hoop, "Saul the Sodomite," 18; Johnson, "Sodomy and Gendered Love," 419; and Carden, Sodomy, 7–8.

Genesis 19	Judges 19
19:4 ואנשי העיר…נסבו על-הבית The men of the city…surrounded the house	19:22 אנשי העיר…נסבו את-הבית The men of the city…surrounded the house
19:5 איה האנשים אשר-באו אליך הלילה הוציאם אלינו ונדעה אתם Where are the men who came to you tonight? Send them out to us so that we may know them.	19:22 הוצא את האיש אשר-בא אל-ביתך ונדענו Send out the man who came to your house so that we may know him.
19:6 ויצא אלהם לוט הפתחה Lot went out the entrance toward them.	19:23 ויצא אליהם האיש בעל הבית The man, the homeowner, went out toward them.
19:7 אל-נא אחי תרעו Please my brothers do not do evil.	19:23 אל-אחי אל-תרעו נא No my brother, please do not do evil.
19:8 הנה-נא לי שתי בנות אשר לא-ידעו איש אוציאה-נא אתהן אליכם See here, I have two daughters who have not known a man. Let me bring them out to you.	19:24 הנה בתי הבתולה ופילגשהו אוציאה-נא אותם Here, my virgin daughter and his concubine. Let me bring them out.

As is evident from the parallels both in phrases and narrative progression above, the two stories show a significant amount of borrowing from one another.[680] The direction of this influence has been debated, but Marc Brettler demonstrates that Gen 19 influenced Judg 19 through identifying a "blind motif" or "a story element that…leads to nowhere."[681] Brettler shows that the old man's offer of his virgin daughter along with the concubine is one of those elements. It is necessary to

[679] The aim of this chart is to give a sense for some of the parallels between the two stories. Raymond de Hoop produced a much more comprehensive chart in his chapter on the two stories. See Hoop, "Saul the Sodomite," 21–22 as did Patrick Arnold, *Gibeah*, 73.

[680] Contrary to the suggestion that one story copies words and phrases from another, Patrick Arnold views the same parallels and determines that these similarities were not produced from copying, but rather the parallels arise from both of their reliance on an oral type scene. Arnold, *Gibeah*, 72–74.

[681] Brettler, "The Book of Judges," 411. Stuart Lasine also finds the direction of influence to be Gen 19 → Judg 19 in "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World," *JSOT* 29 (1984): 37 as does Edenburg, *Dismembering the Whole*, 186. An alternative view on the direction of influence is proffered by Susan Niditch who writes, "While we cannot ascertain the date of the Genesis 19 version…, in terms of relative chronology the narrative in Judges 19-20 might well be suggested to have primacy ("The Sodomite Theme," 376)."

parallel the offer of two virgin daughters to the mob in Gen 19, but the old man's own daughter does not show up before or after the moment in which she is offered. Moreover, Brettler notes that the writer of Judg 19 adds elements to increase the severity of the story's tone. He notes that it seems more likely a writer would add elements rather than remove them. For example, the writer of Judges inserts "rape them" (וענו אותם) in the middle of a dialogue that closely parallels Gen 19 (Judg 19:24). Brettler also notes that the writer exchanged the innocuous "anything" (דבר) in Lot's plea for the men not to do anything to his guests (Gen 19:8) with "this outrageous thing" (הנבלה הזאת) in the old man's plea for his guests' safety (Judg 19:23).[682]

When the writers of Judg 19–20 composed the story of the concubine, they had the stories of Genesis at their disposal.[683] While the most striking parallels are between Judg 19–20 and Gen 19, Judg 19–20 also shares content with Gen 34 beyond their shared sexual violence motif. One aspect of this shared content relates to Brettler's observation that Judg 19–20 uses הנבלה where Gen 19 uses דבר. Judges 19–20 uses this word four times. It uses it twice in verses that parallel content in Gen 19, once exchanging הנבלה for דבר and once using the word in construct with דבר (Judg 19:23 and 24).[684] It uses it another two times in a way that parallels the word's usage in Gen 34 shown below.[685]

Gen 34:7

כשמעם ויתעצבו האנשים ויחר להם מאד כי נבלה עשה בישראל לשכב את-בת-יעקב וכן לא יעשה

---

[682] Brettler, "The Book of Judges," 411. See also Edenburg, *Dismembering the Whole*, 182–83.

[683] I imagine that these stories circulated in written form among scribal communities, but the possibility of oral transmission should not be precluded.

[684] This use of the word נבלה in these two verses (Judg 19:23–24) parallels the use of נבלה in another sexually violent story about Tamar, daughter of David (2 Sam 13:12). On the parallel use of the word נבלה in these two stories Edenburg, *Dismembering the Whole*, 183–84.

[685] Fields notes the parallel in usage of הנבלה between Gen 34 and Judg 19–20. Fields, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, 119.

When they heard, the men [the sons of Jacob] grieved and became infuriated **because of the outrageous thing he did in Israel** by laying with the daughter of Jacob. And thus, it shall not be done.

Judg 20:6

ואחז בפילגשי ואנתחה ואשלחה בכל-שדה נחלת ישראל כי עשו זמה ונבלה בישראל

I took my concubine, cut her up, and sent her out to all of the territory of Israel **because they did an abomination and outrageous thing in Israel**.

Judg 20:10

ולקחנו עשרה אנשים למאה לכל שבטי ישראל ומאה לאלף ואלף לרבבה לקחת צדה לעם לעשות לבואם לגבע בנימן ככל-הנבלה אשר עשה בישראל[686]

We will take ten men of one hundred from all the tribes of Israel, and one hundred of a thousand and a thousand of ten thousand to take provisions to the people to be prepared for their coming, for Gibeah of Benjamin **according to all the outrage which it committed in Israel**.

The repetition of the phrase draws attention to it and underscores the intentionality behind its use. Like Gen 34, the phrase is used to reference the sexual violation of a woman who is avenged by those who recognize the violation as outrageous.[687]

Additionally, other commentators have noted that both stories use the phrase "spoke to the heart."[688] Genesis 34:3 indicates that Shechem "spoke to the heart of the girl" (וידבר על-לב הנער) after violating her. In Judg 19:3, the Levite goes to Bethlehem "to speak to her [the concubine's] heart" (לדבר על לבה) and to bring her home. While the phrase is not uncommon in

[686] The BHS editor recommends emending גבע to גבעת as well as עשה to עשו, the latter based on manuscript evidence. Both emendments make good sense.

[687] As previously mentioned in footnote 228 in the chapter on Gen 34, similar instances of the phrase appear in Deut 22:21 and 2 Sam 13:12 both of which address sexual violence. It is likely textual allusions between Judg 20 and those two exist as well although determining the direction of influence is outside the scope of this dissertation. Jeremiah 29:23 uses it in reference to illicit sex although there is nothing in the context of the verse that suggests it should be read in parallel with Judg 20. Joshua 7:15 uses the phrase in reference to the taking of sacred items. Other interpreters have drawn parallels between Josh 8 and Judg 19–20, but not Josh 7 and Judg 19–20. The phrase's usage in Jeremiah and Joshua is likely coincidental.

[688] Naomi Graetz, "The Concubine of Gibeah: The Case for Reading Intertextually," in *In the Arms of Biblical Women*, Biblical Intersections 13, eds. John T Greene and Mishael Caspi (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2013), 121–43; Susan Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary,* OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 192; Southwood, "This Man Has Come," 482n48; Spronk, *Judges*, 507.

the Hebrew Bible, several modern interpreters have noted its use in three sexually violent texts and have suggested an intertextual approach to understanding the phrase.[689] On its own, the common phrase does not necessarily suggest one passage's influence on the other. However, if one is convinced that Gen 19 and 34 were brought together in a Genesis text during the eighth century and circulated among the scribes who compiled and composed Judges, it helps explain the common use of הנבלה and דבר על לב in two stories that share the sexual violence motif.

4.1.5 The Politics of Sexual Violence

The shocking and gruesome nature of the gender-based violence in this story has drawn analysis from various perspectives (gender, class, postcolonial, etc.). This section attempts to synthesize those insights from those studies as they relate to the politics of sexual violence at play in Judg 19–20.[690]

The gender politics at play in Judg 19–20 are one aspect of the politics of sexual violence. Scholars highlight the "inferior" status of the woman in the story accorded to her by her place as concubine (פילגש).[691] Even among women, her status is diminished.[692] Prior to her fleeing to her father's home, the woman without voice in the story was evidently removed from her own familial and tribal support structure in Bethlehem. The concubine's father was willing to

---

[689] The phrase is used eleven times (factoring in uses of על and אל prepositions) in the Hebrew Bible, three times directed at women who are abused (Gen 34:3, Judg 19:3, and Hos 2:16; the other references include Gen 24:25, 50:21, 1 Sam 1:13, 2 Sam 19:8, Is 40:8, Ruth 2:13, 2 Chron 30:22, 32:6). Scholars who have read Judg 19:3 intertextually with Gen 34 and Hos 2 include Trible, *Texts of Terror*, 67; Graetz, "The Concubine of Gibeah," 121–43.

[690] It is worth noting that some scholars view this narrative through the lens of trauma such as Janelle Stanley, "Judges 19: Text of Trauma," in *Joshua and Judges*, Texts @ Contexts, eds. Athalya Brenner and Gale Yee (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013) 275–89. Unfortunately, due to the limits of this analysis this aspect of scholarship is not addressed here.

[691] Trible, *Texts of Terror*, 66. Also, Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 152.

[692] Trible, *Texts of Terror*, 66 and Ackerman, *Warrior, Dancer*, 236,

support her for four months until her husband, the Levite, came for her, but was ultimately willing to let her return to that husband of questionable character.[693] It is in the husband's care that she is exposed to obscene violence. When the mob surrounds the house and asks to sexually assault the Levite, the Ephraimite host offers his daughter and the concubine. He assumes the assault of two women would be preferable to an assault of one man.[694] In contrast to the story of Sodom, when the concubine is thrown out to the rapacious mob, there is no miraculous or divine intervention to save her life.[695] The concubine's disadvantaged position is clear.

While the concubine has been analyzed from a gender perspective, the Levite has received less gender analysis.[696] The Levite in many ways does not fit the "ideal" hegemonic masculine type in ancient Israel. He shows a lack of control over his household by being unable to keep the concubine under his roof.[697] When he finally, after four months, goes to retrieve her, he is unable to carry out his will to return home in the subordinated position in the guest-host relationship and as a migrant to another city.[698] Although he is able to assert his will to stop in

---

[693] Koala Warsaw-Jones offers a different but valuable perspective on the father's actions. She argues that the father-in-law "[resorts] to manipulative speech tactics" in the form of hospitality "in order to try to redirect the actions of the son-in-law" since he does not have the power to keep his daughter. See "Toward a Womanist Hermeneutic: A Reading of Judges 19–21," in *A Feminist Companion to Judges*, FCB 4, ed. Athalya Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 183.

[694] Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 154. Mansenya makes a similar point in "Without a Voice," 210 as does Niditch in *Judges*, 193. Trible suggests that the concubine might have already been offered sexually to the old Ephraimite man as the Levite refers to his concubine as "your [the old man's] maid" (אמתך) in Judg 19:19 (*Texts of Terror*, 72).

[695] Johnson, "Sodomy and Gendered Love," 419; Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 54.

[696] A notable study on the Levite's masculinity is Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 51–71. He argues that the story "puts forward another critique of hegemonic masculinity within the HB ("A Man's Gotta Do," 60)."

[697] Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 43.

[698] On the migrant/guest aspect of this subordination see Southwood, "This Man Has Come," 470–3. On the gendered aspects of this subordination see Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 64–65. Several studies have examined the ambiguous relationship of the Levites to the remainder of the tribes during their early history as well as their opaque origins. See for example, Harald Samuel, *Von Priestern Zum Patriarchen: Levi Und Die Leviten Im Alten*

Gibeah with his servant (הנער) who suggests stopping in Jebus, he is once again subordinated to the position of a guest with the old Ephraimite man (Judg 19:11–19). In the latter half of Judg 19, the Levite's inability to achieve the standard of hegemonic masculinity is underscored as he is unable to control the sexual interactions of his concubine (and just barely able to preserve his own bodily autonomy).[699] It is possibly this sense of having his masculinity so damaged that contributes to him picking up the knife and dismembering the woman who was now a symbol of his subordinated masculinity. His call to arms is a performance of hegemonic masculinity that values the military prowess of a male leader, but the audience knows this call to violence covers up the myriad of ways his masculinity has been challenged.[700] Ultimately, his call to arms is a success by some measure. Vengeance is achieved. The men of Gibeah and the tribe of Benjamin are brought down in the campaign the Levite instigated.

The other males involved in the brutal assault of the concubine are also not exemplars of the hegemonic masculine ideal. In a move similar to Lot's in Gen 19, the old man offers his own daughter to the mob. He is unwilling to protect his family's honor by controlling the sexual encounters of the women in his family. The men of Gibeah are also not described as men of honor. They are explicitly called worthless men (בני-בליעל, Judg 19:22). In the Hebrew Bible, the phrase used for these worthless men, בני-בליעל, appears in connection to people who deviate from

---

Testament, BZAW 448 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014); Mark Leuchter, *The Levites and the Boundaries of Israelite Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017); Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Exodus: How It Happened and Why It Matters* (New York: HarperOne, 2017); and a collection of essays in Mark Leuchter and Jeremy Michael Hutton, eds., *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, AIL (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011). It is possible that the writer imagined the Levite as inhabiting a compromised position vis-à-vis other tribes in the story's spatiotemporal setting.

[699] For more on how allowing another man to gain sexual access to a woman under a man's control diminishes the mans' masculinity in the HB, see Susan Haddox, "Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities," in *Men and Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*, The Bible in the Modern World 33, ed. Ovidiu Creangă (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010), 6. On the threat to the Levite's body from a gendered perspective see Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 154. See also Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 66.

[700] Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 69–70.

right worship of YHWH (Deut 13:14), the sons of Eli (1 Sam 2:12), and men who oppose the sanctioned army (1 Sam 10:25–26). The term is pejorative and certainly does not describe an ideal man as defined by any terms. Additionally, the mob-like behavior of these men does not signal that they are in control of their bodies or sexual urges.

Despite the valorous ending in which the confederated tribes subordinate the tribe that went rogue at the end of Judg 20, one must ask the question: why tell a story about sexual violence in which no man achieves the ideal form of masculinity? It is possible that stories like these work to uphold the culturally dominant form of masculinity, or hegemonic masculinity.[701] The story demonstrates the adverse consequences of not having any man who can live up to the standards of the ideal man. This theme, as this dissertation demonstrates, is repeated in biblical narratives. When men fail to be "real men," everyone, and especially women, are harmed.

Turning from the gender politics to those of the various communities, the writer of Judg 19–20 certainly uses the story of sexual violence against the concubine to make broader points about communities and their dynamics. From the perspective of the narrator and within the context of this three-chapter epilogue to the book, the story of sexual violence is meant to explain and justify violence against the Benjaminites at the hands of the remainder of Israel's tribes.[702] One might make the argument that the sexually violent acts committed by the Gibeahite men of Benjamin underscores their difference or Othered status among Israel's tribes. Certainly, it seems from the perspective of the mob of Gibeahite men, the Levite, the old man, and the

---

[701] This argument challenges Briggs' argument that Judg 19–20 critiques hegemonic masculinity. Briggs, "A Man's Gotta Do," 51–71.

[702] This is not to suggest that the story is a total fabrication for polemical purposes, but it is used here for polemeical purposes. One might argue the justification is inelegant. As Milstein identifies, there is a clear seam in the three-chapter epilogue. The war with the Benjaminites at the end of Judg 20 and in Judg 21 is discontinuous in certain ways from the polemical concubine account. For more on the discontinuities see Milstein, *Master Scribe*, 175–83.

concubine are all outsiders.[703] Like the men of Sodom did with the migrant Lot, the men of Gibeah did with the migrant old man. They surrounded the house of the migrant to gain access to his out-of-town guests.

The challenge, however, is that from the narrative perspective, the men of Gibeah are not *completely* Other.[704] The Levite chose to stay in Gibeah over Jebus because of their shared Israelite heritage (Judg 19:12).[705] These Benjaminite men only treat members of other tribes (Levi, Ephraim, and possibly Judah if the concubine's home in Bethlehem is indicative of her tribe) as if they were not of the same people. Carden makes the point well stating,

> Hubris catches up with Gibeah in that their intended victim is a fellow Israelite. I believe it is this fact that inspires the angry reaction of the assembly of Israel. If a Jebusite or other non-Israelite had reported the same events, I doubt that there would have been the same outrage. In other words, the men of Gibeah are treating fellow Israelites like foreigners. Rape here signifies a breach of ethnic solidarity.[706]

Benjaminite men are not like the rest of the tribes. They do not follow the rules of tribal solidarity. For all intents and purposes, in terms of their actions, they are no different than the Shechemites and the Sodomites.[707] The dismembered female body is evidence of the violation

---

[703] Carden argues that the concubine gains outsider status due to her connection to the Levite. He argues that the old man's daughter does not have outsider status and that is why she is not a "suitable substitute" for the Levite while the concubine is suitable. If one agrees to Carden's logic that women's status as insider or outsider is conferred by their relationships with men, then the old man's daughter would also be an outsider as her father is from Ephraim, but only residing (גר) in Gibeah (Judg 19:16, Carden, *Sodomy*, 37). Following Brettler's notion of a "blind motif" the old man's daughter exists in the narrative only to provide a parallel to the offer of two women to the mob in Gen 19. Brettler, "The Book of Judges," 411.

[704] It should be noted of course that the manner in which the men of Gibeah are received changes with the audience's horizon of expectation. The internal clues in the narrative, however, point to the fact the men of Gibeah were not seen as completely other by the writers.

[705] Niditch, *Judges*, 192.

[706] Carden, *Sodomy*, 37.

[707] Amit makes a similar point about the Benjaminites paralleling the Sodomites as well as the Shechemites. She writes that through a comparison of Judg 19 with other biblical rape stories, Judg 19 "indicates an explicit tendency in our story to shock the reader and to incite him against those who performed the rape, and by the nature of things also against those who supported them (*The Book of Judges*, 343)."

they committed in the land, and in some way symbolizes a 'national' unity the other tribes have.[708]

The politics of sexual violence as they relate to the communities informs an understanding of the politics of sexual violence within Judges' historiography. The story of sexual violence in Judg 19–20 explains Benjamin's difference from the rest of the tribes and justifies the rest of the tribes' violence against them. The story makes the Benjaminites Others. The emphasis on Gibeah within the tribe is telling. Gibeah is first and foremost known for its association with Saul. The fact that none of the characters are named makes the name of the town standout all the more.[709] This is a story about Saul's hometown, and the audience learns that the people of that town are just like the infamous Sodomites.[710] They behave like the non-Israelites about whom the Levite expressed concern as they passed by Jebus to stay in Gibeah. The counterfactual is implied as they pass by old Jerusalem. Jerusalem, David's city, is safer occupied by Canaanites than Gibeah by Benjaminites. The anti-Saul polemic underlying the story serves a pro-David description of history and a pro-Hezekiah agenda.[711] Hezekiah politically positioned himself as the rightful heir of David's throne leading his kingdom back to its golden age.[712] Part of this project necessarily included defaming King Saul from whom David

---

[708] Recall the discussion of women's bodies symbolizing the nation from the methodology chapter under the subheading "The Politics of Sexual Violence."

[709] Amit, *The Book of Judges*, 348.

[710] Raymond de Hoop argues that Gen 19 is the first "panel" in an anti-Saul triptych with the Judg 19–20 story as the central panel and Saul's rescue of Jabesh-Gilead and the dividing of the ox as the end panel (Hoop, "Saul the Sodomite," 26). While I believe the anti-Saul motif is more widespread than these three stories, the image of the triptych is helpful for thinking about how this set of stories works together to defame Saul.

[711] Amit recognizes the anti-Saul and pro-David aspect of this assessment but not the pro-Hezekiah aspect, see Amit, *The Book of Judges*, 342.

[712] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became A Book*, 80. See also Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise*, 70–71.

usurped the throne. Saul, his line, and his tribe are not the legitimate heirs of a united kingdom and moreso, according to Judg 19, the town of Gibeah and its residents are so bad that they threaten a Levite with sexual violence and actually rape his concubine.[713]

4.2 LXX Judges 19–20

In the previous two chapters, the discussion of the early Greek translations of the two stories focused on how those translations impacted the stories' early Jewish reception outside of the translations themselves. Because there is so little in terms of early Jewish reception of the story of the concubine, this section on its Greek translation(s) focuses on some of the more significant differences between the Greek translations and MT Judges.[714] Prior to turning to some observations on various aspects of the Greek translations of Judges, it is necessary to lay some groundwork for those observations.[715]

To frame the discussion on the ancient Greek versions of Judges, Mark Smith and Elizabeth Bloch-Smith's succinct summary seems particularly appropriate for the task: "The

---

[713] It is worth noting that there are other interpretations of the historiographic significance of this story. One particularly worth noting is Gale Yee's assessment that the story was written during the Josianic period to undermine "popular cult centers" and "their clergy, the Levites." While ultimately, this dissertation locates Judg 19 differently, Yee's interpretation is worth considering. Yee's assessment does not properly account for the significance of Benjamin and Gibeah in the story, but cogent, compelling, alternative explanations of the significance of the story, like Yee's, are worth noting. Yee, "Ideological Criticism," 157.

[714] Recognizing there was no "MT" Judges proper at the moment the first Greek translation of Judges appeared, there is compelling evidence for the stability of the tradition both in the earliest Hebrew manuscripts as well as other early translations. This stability is particularly true if one sets Judg 5 aside. For more on this topic see Natalio Fernández Marcos, Introduction to *Judges*, Gesamtwerk Zur Fortsetzung, 7, BHQ, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 5–13.

[715] Because no critical edition of OG Judges yet exists, this dissertation makes use of a range of materials to gain as full of a perspective as possible on the Greek manuscript tradition for Judges. Greek editions of Judges consulted include Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart eds., *Septuaginta Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes* (Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006) and Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*. Of critical importance for this dissertation was the work of Josef Schreiner. Schreiner compiled and categorized the differences between the MT and various Greek manuscripts (haplography, dittography, singular-plural interchange, etc.) in *Septuaginta-Massora Des Buches Der Richter: Eine Textkritische Studie*, AnBib 7 (Roma: Pontificio istituto biblico, 1957).

Greek manuscript evidence for Judges is complex."[716] Despite the overall complexity of the evidence surrounding Judges translation into Greek, the complexity should not be seen as indicative of early textual instability.[717] Noting the stability in Hebrew manuscripts, including those from Qumran, as well as other ancient translations, William Ross writes, "the textual history of Greek Judges is far more complex. This complexity is itself striking in view of the apparent stability of the Hebrew textual tradition."[718] In other words, the Greek tradition stands in contrast to an otherwise stable textual tradtion.

The complexity of the Greek tradition of Judges is reflected in one of its early print editions in the modern era. The producer of the edition, Alfred Rahlfs, believed that there were two groups of manuscripts for Greek Judges with different origins that he called A and B.[719] This conviction led him to produce a Greek version of Judges with both an A and B text. Since Rahlfs produced this edition, most scholars have rejected the view that there were two, independent Greek translations, and instead defend the view that the various versions of Greek Judges stem from one OG Judges.[720] Furthermore, as a corrective to "traditional research" on Greek Judges,

---

[716] Smith and Bloch-Smith, *Judges 1*, 9.

[717] William A. Ross, *Postclassical Greek and Septuagint Lexicography*, SCS 75 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2022), 4–6. Smith and Bloch-Smith review the Judges evidence from Qumran and conclude the four manuscripts are very close to MT Judges (Smith and Bloch-Smith, *Judges*, 8–9). The most notable of these four is 4Q49 which contains eight verses, Judg 6:2–6 followed by Judg 6:11–13. Judges 6:7–10, based on literary-critical grounds and prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, had been thought to be a later insertion (Ross, *Postclassical Greek*, 4–5).

[718] William A. Ross, *Postclassical Greek and Septuagint Lexicography*, SCS 75 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2022), 6.

[719] José Manuel Cañas Reíllo, "LXX-Judges: The Value of Secondary Translations for Its Textual History," in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz. 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.-24. Juli 2016*, WUNT 405, eds. M. Meiser, M. Geiger, S. Kreuzer, and M. Sigismund (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 230.

[720] Ross, *Postclassical Greek*, 7; José Manuel Cañas Reíllo,"Manuscripts and Recensions in LXX-Judges," in *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen. 7. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2018*, WUNT 444, eds. E. Bons, M. Geiger, F. Ueberschaer, M.

José Manuel Cañas Reíllo makes the point that "the traditional research emphasized the differences between Judg^{A} and Judg^{B}; but, what happens when similarities are taken into account? The answer: there are more similarities than differences."[721] At the risk of oversimplifying the differences Cañas Reíllo acknowledges between these two diverse groups of manuscripts,[722] it is worth noting the general trend in Greek translation over the first few centuries of the common era was to bring the translation "closer to a Hebrew exemplar."[723]

What is known about the earliest Greek translation of Judges? Although no manuscript evidence from that early stage exists, the working hypothesis is that a Greek translation of Judges was produced during the second century BCE in Egypt, about a century after the translation of the Torah into Greek.[724] This timeline for production is important given the literary dependence of MT Judg 19 on MT Gen 19. In an assessment of the Greek translations of these two passages, William Ross writes that "the inclination of the Judges translator towards imitation may have derived from his familiarity with OG Genesis, in particular, and the authority of the Greek

---

Sigismund, and M. Meiser (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020) 546; and José Manuel Cañas Reíllo, "Recensions, Textual Groups, and Vocabulary Differentiations in LXX-Judges," in *The Legacy of Soisalon-Soininen: Towards a Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, DSI 13, eds. T. Kauhanen and H. Vanonen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020) 175–188.

[721] Cañas Reíllo,"Manuscripts," 547.

[722] The idea of two groups is also questioned. Neither group is homogenous, and both contain distinct subgroups. See Philip E. Satterthwaite, Introduction to Judges in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, eds. A. Pietersma and B. Wright (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 195.

[723] Ross, *Postclassical Greek*, 7. This observation was articulated by Soisalon-Soininen and recounted in a review of his work by Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Recensions: A Late Review of Soisalon-Soininen's Doctoral Thesis on the Text-forms of Judges," in *The Legacy of Soisalon-Soininen: Towards a Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, eds. Tuukka Kauhanen and Hanna Vanonen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020), 159–74. See also José Manuel Cañas Reíllo, "LXX-Judges: The Value of Secondary Translations for Its Textual History," in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz. 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.-24. Juli 2016*, WUNT 405, eds. M. Meiser, M. Geiger, S. Kreuzer, and M. Sigismund (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 230.

[724] Rejak, *Translation and Survival*, 97–98; Smith and Bloch-Smith, *Judges 1*, 9–10; and Julio C. Trebolle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible an Introduction to the History of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson (Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Pentateuch within his community, in general."[725] In other words, the relationship between the Hebrew passages follows them into translation. Their reception history remains intertwined.

Having provided some preliminary remarks on OG Judges, the following paragraphs consider particular features of the translation relevant to the story of the concubine's reception as well those interesting in their own right.[726] The first significant feature of the Greek translations comes in Judg 19:2. The A group, thought to be earlier, states that the concubine became angry (ὠργίσθη) with the Levite.[727] It has been suggested that the translator might have read the verb זנח; however, ὀργίζω is not a standard translation for זנח in the LXX/OG.[728] The B group states that the concubine left (ἐπορεύθη) the Levite.[729] The reason for these differences with the MT might either suggest the translators used a Hebrew Vorlage that diverged from the MT on this verse, or that the translators could not make sense of the story with a conventional interpretation of זנה.[730]

In the following verse (19:3), the A group adds an additional phrase indicating that not only did he go to Bethlehem to speak tenderly to the concubine but his intent in doing so was to reconcile her to himself (τοῦ διαλλάξαι αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ) and bring her home.[731] Upon the Levite's arrival in Bethlehem, the MT and B group indicates that the concubine brought him in (תביאהו,

---

[725] William Ross, "Style and Familiarity," 25–36.

[726] Here OG Judges refers to the whole of the Greek Judges manuscript tradition that reflects in some way one early Greek translation of Judges.

[727] One might note here that the NRSV follows this group of texts for its English translation of Judg 19:2.

[728] For more comments on the Greek translation of this verse, see Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 42–43.

[729] Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 132.

[730] One might be able to generate other potential reasons to account for the differences between the Hebrew and Greek, but these seem like the most likely reasons. I would welcome other, innovative alternatives.

[731] Spronk, *Judges*, 507; Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 52.

ἦδε εἰσήνεγκεν), the A group states simply that the Levite arrived (ἐπορεύθη).[732] The A group also tempers the tone with which the father met the Levite. While the MT and B group state that the father was delighted (וישמח, ηὐφράνθη) to meet the Levite, Judg^{A} 19:3 simply state that the father was there to meet him (καὶ παρῆν εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ).[733] In a similar vein, while MT and Judg^{B} 19:4 state that the father kept the Levite by force (ויחזק, κατέσχεν), Judg^{A} 19:4 states that the father brought him in (εἰσήγαγεν).[734] In some ways, the A group makes sense of the story line by showing the Levite as cognizant of the need for reconciliation and tempering the response of both the concubine and her father. The later B group, however, more accurately reflects the MT.

With respect to "accurately reflecting" a prior text, Ross argues that Judg^{A} 19:23 reflects the wording of LXX Gen 19:7. In a previous section, the parallel wording between these two verses in the Hebrew was demonstrated. While the syntax is not identical between the two, the content is the same.

Genesis 19:7	Judges 19:23
אל-נא אחי תרעו Please my brothers do not do evil.	אל-אחי אל-תרעו נא No my brother, please do not do evil.

Ross demonstrates that the wording is likewise parallel in the LXX Gen 19:7 and Judg^{A} 19:23, and different from their Hebrew counterparts, their syntax is the same. Both verses state,

[732] Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 60.

[733] Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 121.

[734] Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 60.

Μηδαμῶς, ἀδελφοί, μὴ πονηρεύσησθε/πονηρεύσθε.[735] Both deviate from the syntax of their Hebrew counterparts but mirror one another, suggesting that the translator of Judges may have been dependent on LXX Gen 19:7 for their translation of Judg 19:23.

One of the questions that is left unanswered by the MT Judg 19 is whether the concubine is dead before the Levite begins to dismember her. Both the A and B groups of Judg 19:28 clarify that she was dead by the time the Levite told her to get up.[736] After the Levite dismembers the concubine (Judg 19:29), the MT and the A Group diverge significantly in how they describe what happened next.[737]

MT Judges 19:30	Judges^{A} 19:30
והיה כל-הראה ואמר לא-נהיתה ולא-נראתה כזאת למיום עלות בני-ישראל מארץ מצרים עד היום הזה שימו-לכם עליה עצו ודברו	καὶ ἐγένετο πᾶς ὁ ὁρῶν ἔλεγεν Οὔτε ἐγενήθη οὔτε ὤφθη οὕτως ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀναβάσεως υἱῶν Ισραηλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. **καὶ ἐνετείλατο τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, οἷς ἐξαπέστειλεν, λέγων Τάδε ἐρεῖτε πρὸς πάντα ἄνδρα Ισραηλ Εἰ γέγονεν κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀναβάσεως υἱῶν Ισραηλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης;** θέσθε δὴ ἑαυτοῖς βουλὴν περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ λαλήσατε.
And it happened that all who saw said, "Something like this has never happened and never been seen since the day the children of Israel came up from the land of Egypt until this very day. Set yourselves upon it. Take counsel and speak out.	And it happened that all who saw said, "It has not happened, and it has not been seen thus from the day the children of Israel came up from Egypt[738] until this day. **And he commanded the men whom he sent saying, "This you shall say to every man of Israel: 'Has it happened according to this thing**

[735] Ross constructs his own 'critical edition' for these two verses and determines the likely verb used in the original Greek translation of Judg 19:23 was in the present imperative as opposed to the aorist subjunctive in Genesis.

[736] Judg^{A} 19:28- ἀλλὰ τεθνήκει; Judg^{B} 19:28- ὅτι ἦν νεκρά. Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 69.

[737] Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 38.

[738] Simplified from "land of Egypt." Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 79.

	from the day the children of Israel came up from Egypt until this day? Therefore, take counsel[739] for yourselves concerning her and speak out.

The insertion of a speech to the messengers fills out the narrative, but it is not entirely necessary. The length of the insertion is striking, causing some to suggest that the A group must be working with a different Hebrew Vorlage.[740] Whether or not a different Hebrew Vorlage existed with the Levite's command, the idea that the Levite gave some sort of instruction to the messengers is echoed in early Jewish tradition.[741]

The final feature of the Greek translation of Judges worth noting is found in Judg^{A} 20:5. When the Levite reports the brutality of the mob, in the MT and B Group, he states that the men of Gibeah raped his concubine until she died. The A Group writes that they violated her (ταπεινω) and mocked her (εμπαιζω). Schreiner rightly assesses the reason for including this statement: "um das ungeheuerliche der schandtat herauzustellen" (in order to bring out the outrageousness of the outrage).[742] In the following section, some of the features of the Greek translations resurface as they are addressed by other early Jewish interpreters.

4.3 Early Jewish Literature

The story of the concubine and the politics that underlie its composition are challenging for early Jewish audiences. Unlike Gen 19 and 34, the foreign status of the perpetrators of sexual

---

[739] The A group seems to take the verbal עצו as a nominal עצה. Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 41.

[740] Satterthwaite, Introduction to Judges, 196; Boling, *Judges*, 277.

[741] Schreiner writes, correctly in my opinion, that Josephus seems to presume the Greek text (*Ant.* 5.149) based upon his statement that the pieces of the concubine were sent along with a message. Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 38.

[742] Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, 57.

violence in Judg 19–20 is ambiguous. From a southern perspective, the status of Gibeahites, Benjaminites, or folks from the north in general changes with different historical circumstances. Judg 19–20 is not easily turned into a cautionary tale about erecting proper boundaries with those on the outside of the community. The "they" of Judg 19–20 at different times and for different communities might look more or less like "us." It is possible that these complicated dynamics made it less inviting for early interpreters to use in their own writings. Its location outside of the Torah probably also contributed to the lack of engagement.

The story of the concubine is only clearly referenced in two early Jewish works, Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. It is possible the Testament of Benjamin contains a veiled reference to the story as well. Despite the challenging politics around the story of the concubine, the writers of these works draw out the issue of boundaries in the story, each in their own way. The boundaries, however, are not explored or explained through an anti-Saul/Gibeah/Benjamin prism. Instead, the narratives explore communal boundaries in a different sense and reveal the normalization of sexual violence directed at outsiders or those who have placed themselves on the outside of their communities by their choices.

4.3.1 Josephus: It Was Bad, But Not That Bad

Josephus' retelling of the story of the concubine draws builds upon the account of the same story in OG Judges^{A}. His retelling, however, alters the politics of sexual violence. Instead of casting the Gibeahites as the sexually violent Other on par with the men of Sodom, he recasts the story as one about a few bad apples. In so doing, he extracts the story from an anti-Saul polemic.

Before examining how Josephus alters the politics of sexual violence of the story of the concubine, it is worth establishing which Judges story he is altering. While Josephus' version is innovative in many ways, it does show signs of being anchored to OG Judges^{A} as opposed to MT Judges or OG Judges^{B}. The primary indicator of this relationship to OG Judges^{A} is how Josephus addresses the relationship between the Levite and his wife (not concubine, in Josephus).[743] Prior to the wife leaving, she was aloof with her husband and when they did interact, they hurled grievances at one another (*Ant.* 5:137). This description of events appears to be an embellishment of OG Judg^{A} 19:2 that described the concubine as leaving out of anger.[744] Additionally, in line with the Greek versions of Judg 19–20, Josephus gives a notice of the woman's death after her violent encounter with the men of the town (*Ant.* 5:147). Finally, like OG Judges^{A}, Josephus indicates that the Levite sent the pieces of the woman with a specific message out among the tribes (*Ant*. 5:149).[745]

Although traces of OG Judges^{A} are evident in Josephus' retelling of the story of the concubine, there are still significant differences between the two accounts that warrant close examination. These differences impact the politics of sexual violence at play in the story Josephus weaves. First, Josephus frames the story differently than Judges. While Judges places

[743] *Jewish Antiquities* 5:136 states the Levite "married a wife" (ἄγεται γύναιον) as opposed to concubine (γυναῖκα παλλακὴν) in OG Judg$^{A \text{ and } B}$ 19:1. On her designation in Josephus see Sprock, *Judges*, 498; Christopher T. Begg, "The Retellings of the Story of Judges 19 by Pseudo-Philo and Josephus: A Comparison," *EstBib* 58 (2000): 42–43.

[744] Christopher Begg understands Josephus as "developing" the A Group description of the concubine leaving, while Feldman states that Josephus "departs" from both. Feldman does not indicate if he sees some type of relationship between OG Judg^{A} 19:2 and *Ant.* 5:137. Begg, "The Retellings," 43; Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal (*Ant.* 5.136–74) of the Benjaminite Affair of the Concubine and Its Repercussions (Judg 19–21)," in *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 653.

[745] The language of tribes (φυλή) in Josephus also mimics OG Judg^{A} 19:29 as opposed to borders (גבול; ὅριον) in the MT and OG Judg^{b} respectively. Begg offers a few small additional ways in which he understands Josephus to follow the A Group of Greek Judges, Begg, "The Retellings," 36.

the story at the end of the work, Josephus places it at the beginning of his retelling of the events of Judges.[746] He places it after a reworking of material from Judg 1–2 along with his own editorial comments on the state of society and governance in Israel at the time (*Ant.* 5:132–135).[747] Judges frames the story by stating at that time "there was no king in Israel" (Judg 19:1). In contrast, Josephus draws attention to the role of avarice in creating conditions ripe for civil strife (*Ant.* 5.135).[748] By omitting the line about kingship, Josephus moves the story further away from the politics of kingship present in the Judges account. For Josephus, the purpose of telling a sexually violent story is not to engage in an anti-Saul polemic.

In addition to altering the framing of the story, Josephus changes the depiction of the story's characters which in turn impacts its politics of sexual violence. Josephus balances out some of the unevenness in the relationship between the Levite and his wife. First, he gives the concubine of Judges the status of wife. Second, he lowers the Levite's status of being a man of common origins (δημοτικωτέρων, *Ant.* 5.136).[749] In addition to making a slight adjustment to the balance of power in their relationship, Josephus turns their relationship into a story of unrequited love.[750] The Levite is enamored (ἐράω) with his beautiful wife, but she is unfavorably disposed

[746] Amit notes the difference in chronology between Judges and Josephus' retelling of Judges. Amit, *The Book of Judges*, 312fn4

[747] Feldman treats this subject at length. See Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 640–48.

[748] Christopher Begg, ed. and trans., *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, Vol. 4, Jewish Antiquities Books 5–7 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 33n356. Feldman argues that Josephus believed the period of the Judges

[749] Feldman posits that Josephus lowers the Levite's status due to a rivalry between priests and Levites and Josephus' identification with priests. His argument, however, is difficult to follow given the ways in which Josephus seems to rehabilitate the Levite's character. By just adhering to the details of Judges, the Levite would have appeared much worse than the way Josephus portrays him. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 649–50.

[750] Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 651–54.

(ἀλλοτρίως) toward him (*Ant.* 5.136–137).[751] It is out of his love (ἐπὶ τῷ ἔρωτι) for his wife that he chases her down to her parent's home.

While Judges focuses on the hospitality the Levite receives at the concubine's father's house in Bethlehem (a Judahite city), Josephus spends no time describing the hospitality. Thus, there is nothing with which to compare the inhospitality of the Gibeahites of Benjamin. Like Judges, Josephus has the couple and their servant pass Jerusalem because it was controlled by the Canaanites and press on to Gibeah (*Ant.* 5.139–140). In Gibeah, they are met by an Ephraimite who took them in on account of their shared connection to Ephraimite territory (*Ant.* 5.142).

The incident, as it unfolds at the Ephraimite's home, is one of the scenes Josephus altered in fundamental ways to change the politics of sexual violence in the story. Josephus specifies that the *young* men of Gibeah (νεανίαι τινες τῶν Γαβαηνῶν) had seen the woman at the market and marveled at her comeliness (εὐπρέπεια, *Ant.* 5.143). Recognizing her status as an outsider to the community (ξένη) and vulnerability staying at the old man's home, the young men go to the host's door and ask for *her, the outsider woman* (ξένη, *Ant.* 5.143).[752] Josephus' account of this story puts the woman's beauty at the heart of the violence directed against her (similar to his characterization of the messengers in Gen 19: τοὺς νεανίσκους εὐπρεπεστάτους τῇ ὄψει [*Ant.* 1.200]). In Judg 19:22, the men of the city (אנשי העיר) perpetrated the crime. In Josephus, young men (νεανίαι) perpetrate the crime (*Ant.* 5.143). The men (ἄνδρες) of the city would be marked by a certain self-control, a defining feature of masculinity in ancient Greek and Roman

[751] For more on the passage regarding her leaving in Josephus, see Begg, "The Retellings," 43.

[752] In some translations of Josephus' writings, ξένη is translated as "guest." The word also has the valence of "foreigner." Contextually, both translations could be plausible here. I have chosen to translate the word as "outsider" because the young men perceive the woman as an outsider to the community whether she is a "guest" or "foreigner" in their eyes.

societies.[753] Finally, the young men of the city only seek the beautiful wife of the Levite in Josephus' retelling and do not seem interested in her husband as Judg 19:22 describes. This omission is striking. Feldman suggests that the omission of "homosexuality" is to shield Gibeahite Jews from such an offense, but it is unclear whether this is Josephus' motivation.[754] In Josephus' account of the story, the old man offers his daughter (and not the Levite's wife) since it was "more legitimate" (νομιμώτερον) for them to satisfy their lusts on her than his guests (*Ant.* 5.145). One might speculate that he understood the assault of a female guest as a lesser offense than a male guest.

The male guest or Levite, for his part, is somewhat rehabilitated in Josephus' recounting of the story.[755] In Judg 19:25, the Levite puts his own concubine out for the men of the city to ravish her. Instead, Josephus has the mob of young men seize the woman (ἁρπασάμενοι, *Ant.* 5.146). When she returns in the morning, under deep grief (ὑπὸ λύπης) and out of shame (ὑπ' αἰσχύνης), she does not approach her husband reasoning he would be too hurt by what had happened (*Ant.* 5.147). Before he finds her, she dies (*Ant.* 5.147). When he does find her lifeless body, he seeks to comfort her. He reminds her that she did not go with the young men voluntarily (ἐξ ἑκουσίου) but was forced (*Ant.* 5.148). The Levite is transformed into a loving husband distraught by the violence done to his wife. He enters the next scene in a more justified state of anger and acts prudently (σωφρόνως) given what has happened (*Ant.* 5.149).

---

[753] Mark Materson, "Studies of Ancient Masculinity," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*, ed. Thomas K. Hubbard (Malden: Blackwell, 2014), 22 and 25. See also Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson, "Taking It Like A Man: Masculinity in 4 Maccabees," *JBL* 117 (1998): 249–50.

[754] Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 655–56. For an apt critique of the use of "homosexuality" in secondary writings on Judg 19–20 (and I would add their retellings in ancient literature), see Harding, "Homophobia and Masculine Domination," 58.

[755] Contra Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 650.

In the scene calling the men of Israel to arms, Josephus does not mention Benjamin compared to four mentions of Gibeah's affiliation with Benjamin in Judges (*Ant.* 5.149–154; Judg 20:4, 10, 12, and 14). Josephus includes an addition in which the allies against Gibeah request the town deliver the young men who perpetrated the offense up to justice (*Ant.* 152–154).[756] The town refuses the reasonable request, thus prompting a war. It is at this point the tribe of Benjamin is finally invoked. Further distancing his story from Benjamin and Saul, Josephus indicates the tribes met at Shiloh to oppose Gibeah, not Mizpah where Saul was announced as king (1 Sam 10:17–24). Feldman writes that Josephus is "eager to dissociate the Benjaminites of Saul's day from the Benjaminites involved with the incident of the concubine."[757] Feldman's assessment primarily is based on Josephus' praise of Saul in his encomium of the king (*Ant.* 6.343–350).[758] Josephus valorizes Saul, and in his retelling of Judges he seizes on opportunities to distance Saul's tribe from the event with the concubine.

In Josephus's retelling of the story of the concubine, he enters into the debate concerning boundaries. While Judg 19–20 uses the story of sexual violence to emphasize the Otherness of Saul's tribe and hometown aligning them with the Sodomites, Josephus deemphasizes the anti-Benjamin polemic.[759] The story of the concubine becomes a story about marauding youths who spotted a beautiful married woman from outside of their community (possibly foreign) in the

[756] Feldman notes that Josephus is attempting to bring the Israelites' actions in line with statutes around grievances in Deut 20:10–12. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 658–59.

[757] Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 672.

[758] Michael Avioz suggests that Josephus is praising Saul in a tongue-in-cheek manner in the encomium based on the morally ambiguous portrait Josephus paints of Saul's life prior to the encomium. He raises the possibility that Josephus might in some ways be bound by the material Samuel offers him. Samuel presents a complicated image of Saul. I suggest that Josephus' encomium is countering the material the writer of Samuel offered him. Michael Avioz, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Books of Samuel*, LSTS 86 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), 54.

[759] Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 658.

market. Without the consent of her husband and host, they seized and assaulted her. Her grieving husband, acting in sober judgment seeks justice on her behalf. While still adhering to the basic structure of Judg 19–20, Josephus recasts the story fundamentally altering the politics of sexual violence. The Gibeahites are not like the Sodomites. It was just a few bad apples.

4.3.2 Pseudo-Philo and Exogamy

Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*) is an early Jewish work preserved in Latin but most likely written in Hebrew.[760] Scholars have dated the text between the first century BCE and the first century CE.[761] The writer selectively weaves stories together from Genesis to Samuel, roughly chronologically. The writer alludes to Dinah's story and skips over the story of Sodom, but substantively engages Judg 19–20.[762] Like Josephus, Pseudo-Philo does not adopt an anti-Saul or anti-Benjamin polemic with his retelling of the narrative of the concubine. Instead, in a darkly creative and disturbing retelling, the author makes the story about sexual and communal boundary crossing.

One of the keys to understanding the message of Pseudo-Philo's story of the concubine is noting not only the alterations, but omissions as well. One way Pseudo-Philo recasts the story of the concubine is by eliminating the story of her departure from the Levite to her father's home and the scene of the father's overbearing hospitality in Bethlehem. The story begins with the

[760] This dissertation makes use of the translation of *LAB* produced by Jacobson with reference to DJ Harrington's Latin text reproduced in Jacobson's translation and commentary. Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*, AGJU 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1996). Harrington's translations in "Pseudo-Philo," *OTP* 2:297–377 has also served as a reference.

[761] The debate around dating the text centers on the issue of the destruction of the temple in 70 CE and whether the writer was aware of the event. Harrington dates the text prior to the destruction in the early first century CE but suggests it could have been written as early as 135 BCE, *OTP* 2:299. Jacobson favors a date after 70 CE, *Pseudo-Philo*, 199–209. Mary Therese DesCamp follows Jacobson's dating, *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods Through a Cognitive Lens*, BibInt 87 (Boston: Brill, 2007), 3n3.

[762] Carden, *Sodomy*, 42.

Levite on a journey with his servant, *without* mention of his concubine (*LAB* 45.1). He arrives in Gibeah, but the citizens of the city reject his entry. Jebus is never mentioned,[763] suggesting a pro-David, anti-Saul message is not important to the writer. From Gibeah, the Levite and his servant carry onto Nob. Nob is where the primary action in the story takes place.[764]

In Nob, the Levite, named Beel, is recognized by another Levite, not Ephraimite, named Bethac (*LAB* 45.2). Bethac calls the Levite by his name, warns Beel about the wickedness of the city's inhabitants, and invites him into his home. [765] Bethac makes an ambiguous statement about the Lord closing the minds of the people of the city like he did the Sodomites before Lot.[766] Pseudo-Philo begins to weave the details of the story of Sodom in Gen 19 with the story of the concubine. Like in Gen 19, "all" (omnes) of the inhabitants of the city came to demand of Bethac "those who came" (qui venerut) to him for some unstated purpose (*LAB* 45.3).[767] The crowd threatens to burn them if he does not comply by offering them up. In speech reminiscent of Lot's in Gen 19, Bethac appeals to the crowd reminding them that Beel and his traveling companions are their brothers. The crowd replies with speech reminiscent of the Sodomites, arguing that

---

[763] Begg, "The Retellings," 37–38.

[764] It is unclear why the writer chose to locate the story in Nob. Eyal Regev has examined this question closely and suggests several possible reasons for the use of Nob. Regev argues that the most probable explanation is a geographic error not a literary tactic. Nob could have been known as a hill, גבעה, and it was in the territory of Benjamin. See Eyal Regev, "The Two Sins of Nob: Biblical Interpretation, an Anti-Priestly Polemic and a Geographical Error in Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum." *JSP* 12 (2001): 85–104, esp. 100-101. Jacobson addresses a lack of clarity in the Nob reading due to a b/v interchange in Latin, Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo*, 1029.

[765] Jacobson states that the meaning of the names as well as the Hebrew underlying the names is ambiguous. Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo*, 1030.

[766] Jacobson discusses the ambiguity of this phrase and potential connections with Gen 19:11 and the word סנורים; Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo*, 1031. Harrington also addresses this briefly in *OTP* 2:359nc. See also Begg, "Retellings," 38. Pseudo-Philo uses a narrative technique of "flashback" whereby he references a prior story in the context of the current story. What makes this flashback to Sodom interesting is that he never described the event in an early part of the writing. On flashbacks see, Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo*, 240.

[767] Begg, "The Retellings," 38.

"strangers" (advene) do not order locals (*LAB* 45.3). At that, they seized Beel and the concubine (mentioned for the first time), released Beel, and "abused" (usi sunt trupiter) the concubine until she died.[768] The narrator reports that this occurred because the concubine had left her man and "committed sin with the Amalekites, and on account of this the Lord God delivered her into the hands of sinners (*LAB* 45.3)."[769]

After this notice of the concubine's sexual indiscretion, Beel takes his dead concubine to Kedesh, cuts her up and distributes her remains to the twelve tribes. He incites them to take up arms against Nob at Shiloh. The tribes agree that they cannot be silent about the depravity of the inhabitants of Nob. The narrator closes out the account of the Levite and his concubine by referring back to his own account of Judg 18–19. The moral lesson the narrator conveys through a statement from the Lord is that they should have been on guard against the crafty plans of Micah the Levite leading them to idolatrous worship (*LAB* 45.6). In a speech later in the work chastising Israel for not acting zealously against idolatry, the Lord states, "But now, on seeing how this man's concubine, who had done wicked deeds, died, you were all disturbed and came to me saying, 'Will you deliver the children of Benjamin into our hands?' Therefore I deceived you and said, 'I will deliver them to you (*LAB* 47.8).'" The language is vague, but the intent seems clear that the writer is addressing a sexual sin.

As a feature of his work, Pseudo-Philo often names characters who were left unnamed in the Hebrew Bible, including the Levite and his host, named Beel and Bethac, respectively.[770]

---

[768] The Latin literally reads "used her shamefully."

[769] Cum peccasset cum Amalechitis, et propterea tradidit eam Dominus Deus in manus peccatorum. Begg describes this line as "moralizing explanation" for her death, "The Retellings," 39.

[770] On naming female characters, see Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "Portraits of Women In Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities," in *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 94.

Significantly, however, the writer leaves the concubine unnamed. Moreover, the audience learns nothing about her prior to her abuse, neither her relationship with her husband nor with her family. Indeed, the concubine remains unmentioned until the moment she is seized and raped by the mob. This violence to the concubine is justified by Pseudo-Philo with a curt note about her sexual past. She sinned with the Amalekites (cum peccasset cum Amalechitis); thus, she deserves what she got. One can certainly analyze this justification from a gender perspective.[771] The victim is known not by her name nor her family, but by her sin in contrast to the men in the story. This rhetorical strategy is meant to make the violence directed toward her justified and righteous.

Not only is the statement about her sin meant to justify the violence done to her, but it also functions as a statement about boundaries. The reference to the concubine "sinning with Amalekites" in some ways is out of place. MT Judges 19:2 suggests that the concubine acted sexually unfaithful in some way, but there is no indication of that activity being with the Amalekites.[772] The Amalekites, however, occupy a certain place in early Jewish imagination and in *LAB*. In 1 Sam 15, God commands Saul to destroy the Amalekites completely. Pseudo-Philo unequivocally endorses this position, and Saul is condemned for not following God's commands to destroy the Amalekites.[773] The writer's choice of the Amalekites serves to further justify the violence done against her. The Amalekites deserve nothing but destruction; they are the Other par excellence. The concubine crossed a boundary by engaging them sexually; thus, the violence

[771] In her gender analysis of Pseudo-Philo, Betsy Halpern-Amaru writes that there is a focus on reward for obedience to God and punishment for disobedience. In relation to this, Women are sometimes cast as "the objects of divine punishment" as in this story. Halpern-Amaru, "Portraits of Women," 100.

[772] Begg, "The Retellings," 37; Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 657.

[773] Louis Feldman, "Josephus' View of the Amalekites" in Israel in the Wilderness, TBN 10 (Boston: Brill, 2008), 105–6.

done to her is defensible. As part of this rereading, the writer also omits other details from Judges: the men of the town do not threaten the Levite with sexual violence, and the host's daughter is never jeopardized.[774] All focus is on the concubine, the violence she endured, and the justification for that violence. The story of sexual assault against the concubine is reworked to fit the writer's own views–different than those of Judg 19–20–about exogamous relationships.[775]

The use of the story of the concubine as a story to address the problems of exogamy in Pseudo-Philo mirrors the use of the Dinah story in other early Jewish works. The writer finds themselves in good company among early Jewish writers concerned about Jews engaging in sexual relationships with those outside of the community. There is a discernable pattern in early Jewish literature to use stories of sexual violence to reflect on the problems of sexual relationships with others.

4.4 Conclusion

The politics of sexual violence in the story of the concubine in Judg 19:1-20:13 are complex. I argue that the MT's hyper-local story of a woman abused by the men of Gibeah was harnessed to undermine the legitimacy and legacy of Saul, the famous king from Gibeah as part of the authorization of the reign of Hezekiah. The audience learns that the people of that king's town behave like the Sodomites and treat members of their own nation like foreigners. Such an anti-Saul polemic however was not as relevant to the early Jewish authors that later interpreted the story of the concubine. These later writers were thus left to reinterpret this story of heinous violence carried out between members of Israel. Josephus downplayed the story's tribal elements and minimized the culpability of the whole tribe of Benjamin by telling a story about marauding

---

[774] Begg, "The Retellings," 39; Feldman, "Josephus' Portrayal," 656.

[775] On Pseudo-Philo's views on exogamy, see Halpern-Amaru, "Portraits of Women," 91n32, 92.

youths and thus obscured the issue of boundaries, creating a sort of tragic romance. Pseudo-Philo, on the other hand, retold the story in order to denigrate the Amalekites, representative of the Other and to justify violence against those (namely women) who associate with such Others.

4.5 Excursus: Testament of Benjamin, Sodom and Gibeah

While the references to the story of the concubine are few in early Jewish literature, Michael Carden believes that the T. Benj. 9:1 might contain a veiled reference to the atrocity that occurred in Gibeah.[776] The previous chapter reviewed the evidence for Carden's claim, particularly the statement regarding the descendants of Benjamin fornicating like Sodom, they will commit salacious acts with women, and as a result the kingdom of the Lord will be removed from them. The salacious acts with women might reference the crime at Gibeah, and the removal of the kingdom might be in reference to Saul losing the kingdom to David.[777] In light of the discussion of the politics underlying Judg 19–20, it is worth returning to this argument. In a testament focused on Benjamin and his descendants, it is reasonable that the writer would be attuned to the anti-Saul polemic in parts of the Hebrew Bible including in Judg 19–20. If the writer is indeed referencing the story of Gibeah as well as Saul's loss of the kingdom, he would be the only known early Jewish writer to address the Saul-David dynamic at play in Judg 19–20.

[776] Carden, *Sodomy*, 58.

[777] Carden argues for the reference to the atrocity at Gibeah, *Sodomy*, 58. R.H. Charles argues for the reference to Saul losing the kingdom to David, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1908), 210.

5. Conclusion

The presence of stories of sexual violence in the Hebrew Bible is unsettling. Some stories, like that of the concubine, are chilling in their detail. Others, like the story of Dinah, are full of gaps causing some to write them off as too ambiguous to consider alongside the story of the concubine. The story of Sodom because of its gender dynamics is rarely considered in the same frame as other stories of sexual violence. One gets the impression from reading the stories that the violence itself nor the impact on the victim was the point. These stories are not explorations of character or personal trauma. From our modern vantage point, it can be difficult to imagine what purpose they served for ancient audiences. If one considers how other stories of sexual violence (be they more or less rooted in "historical fact") function in different societies, including modern ones, the purpose becomes a little clearer. Stories of sexual violence are often used to create and reify community boundaries. Reading through a feminist lens informed by intersectional approaches helps to reveal the stories' underlying purpose. As this dissertation has argueed, each of the biblical stories of sexual violence (Gen 34, Gen 19, and Judg 19–20) exhibit such boundary concerns and correspond to other political issues at the time of their composition.

Early Jewish writers recognized these stories' value for exploring boundaries. Predictably, some writers harnessed these stories to reinforce their vision of strict communal boundaries. For example, the writer of Jubilees pulled the Dinah story into their own discussion on the dangers of exogamy. Likewise, 3 Maccabees alluded to the story of Sodom in his prayer regarding the arrogance of a foreign power. The writer of *LAB*, for their part, used the story of the concubine in service of an argument for endogamy threatening sexual violence as a punishment for engaging in sexual relations outside of the community. Judith and Joseph and Aseneth, however, used the Dinah story to explore the permeability of communal boundaries. Although neither should be viewed as advocating for some type of universal acceptance of

others, both redeployed the Dinah story in certain ways to raise the possibility of porous boundaries.

One of the more interesting conversations I have charted in the early Jewish literature in regard to boundaries is that with semi-divine beings. With some consistency early Jewish (as well as Christian) writers considered the story of Sodom alongside the story of the sons of God/Watchers known from Gen 6 and early Enochic literature. The relationship between these two stories in early Jewish and Christian literature, particularly concerning the issue of boundaries, requires further research and possibly could benefit from animal studies which addresses the existence of different types of non-human beings.

The gendered aspects of Gen 19 raise another set of questions as well around men as victims of sexual violence in the Hebrew Bible. The boundaries explored in early Jewish literature treating Gen 19 were in some ways quite different from the boundaries explored in Gen 34 and Judg 19–20. Unsurprisingly, exogamy was not a main concern in the early reception of Gen 19. It would be worth examining the early reception of other stories where men are or are almost victims such as the end of Gen 19:30–38 (Lot and his daughters) or Gen 39 (Joseph and Potiphar's wife). Admittedly, this corpus is smaller, but it is still worth exploring through the lens of masculinity studies.

One final avenue for potential research is to expand the set of stories. This dissertation explored a set of stories based upon the literary dependence of Judg 19–20 on Gen 19 and 34. There are other stories, however, that fit well into the conversation. 2 Samuel 13 has long been recognized as sharing thematic and lexical features with Gen 34 and Judg 19–20. Hagar's story in Gen 16 and 21 would also be a story to consider for expanding this set. Hagar is often overlooked as a victim of sexual violence. It is also clear she is denied agency as a slave to

Abraham and Sarah's family. Her surrogacy is forced. In the words of Wil Gafney, she is a "sex-slave."[778] Her status as Other is plain. She is an Egyptian woman living among the family of Abraham. Boundaries are called into question throughout her narrative. The story of Hagar is an important story for expanding the conversation on biblical stories of sexual violence and boundaries.

[778] Wil Gafney, *Womanist Midrash: A Reintroduction to the Women of the Torah and the Throne* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017), 41.

Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, Lila. *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Ackerman, Susan. *Warrior, Dancer, Seductress, Queen.* ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Adams, Samuel L. *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Translation Technique and the Recensions: A Late Review of Soisalon-Soininen's Doctoral Thesis on the Text-forms of Judges." Pages 159–74 in *The Legacy of Soisalon-Soininen: Towards a Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Edited by Tuukka Kauhanen and Hanna Vanonen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020.

Ahearne-Kroll, Patricia D. "The Portrayal of Aseneth in Joseph and Aseneth: Women's Religious Experience in Antiquity and the Limitations of Ancient Narratives." Page 39–58 in *Women and Gender in Ancient Religions: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. WUNT 263. Edited by S. P. Ahearne-Kroll, P.A. Holloway, and J.A. Kelhoffer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

———. *Aseneth of Egypt: The Composition of a Jewish Narrative*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020.

Ahern, Eoghan. "The Sin of Sodom in Late Antiquity." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 27 (2018): 209–33.

Ahuvia, Mika. "Gender and the Angels in Late Antique Judaism." *JSQ* 29 (2022): 1–21.

Allegro, John M. *Qumrân Cave 4.1(4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Alt, Albrecht. "Hosea 5:8-6:6. Ein Krieg und seine Folgen in prophetische Beleuchtung." Pages 163–87 in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* Munich: Beck, 1953.

Amit, Yairah. "Literature in the Service of Politics: Studies in Judges 19–21." Pages 28–40 in *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*. JSOTSup 171. Edited by Yair Hoffman, Henning Graf Reventlow, and Benjamin Uffenheimer. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1994.

———. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Boston: Brill, 1999.

———. *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Boston: Brill, 2000.

———. "How to Slander the Memory of Shechem." Pages 231–244 in *Memory and the City in Ancient Israel*. Eds. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014.

Andersen, Francis I. “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch.” *OTP* 1:91–221.

Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. AB 24. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.

Anderson, David M. “Sexual Threat and Settler Society: ‘Black Perils’ in Kenya, c. 1907–30.” *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 37 (2010): 47–74.

Antela Bernárdez, Borja. “Philip and Pausanias: A Deadly Love in Macedonian Politics.” *ClQ* 62 (2012): 859–61

Arnold, Patrick M. *Gibeah: The Search for a Biblical City*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009.

Asikainen, Susanna. *Jesus and Other Men: Ideal Masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels*. Boston: Brill, 2018.

Avioz, Michael. *Josephus’ Interpretation of the Books of Samuel*, LSTS 86. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Auerbach, Erich. “Odysseus’ Scar.” Pages 1–23 in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature- New and Expanded Edition*. Translated by Willard R. Task. Princeton University Press, 2003.

Baden, Joel. Introduction to “The Integration of Preexisting Literary Material in the Pentateuch and the Impact upon Its Final Shape” Pages 607–8 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*. FAT 111. Edited by Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Bailey, Randall C. “They’re Nothing But Incestuous Bastards: The Polemical Use of Sex and Sexuality in Hebrew Canon Narratives.” Pages 121–38 in *Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. Vol. 1. Edited by Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Baillet, Maurice, Milik, J.T., De Vaux, Roland, and H.W. Baker. *Les “petites Grottes” De Qumran: Exploration De La Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q À 10Q, Le Rouleau De Cuivre*. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Baker, Cynthia M. “A Jew By Any Other Name?” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011): 151–78

Balassa, Eszter. “The Consequences of Dinah's Rape.” Pages 188–97 in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*. Ed. Géza G. Xeravits. Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Studies*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Batiffol, Pierre. *Le Livre de la Prière d'Aseneth*. StPatr. Paris: Leroux, 1889–90.

Bechtel, Lyn M. "What if Dinah is not raped? (Genesis 34)." *JSOT* 62 (1994): 19–36.

Begg, Christopher T. "The Retellings of the Story of Judges 19 by Pseudo-Philo and Josephus: A Comparison." *EstBib* 58 (2000): 33–49.

———. "Genesis in Josephus." Pages 303–30 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Bembry, Jason. "The Levite's Concubine (Judg 19:2) and the Tradition of Sexual Slander in the Hebrew Bible: How the Nature of Her Departure Illustrates a Tradition's Tendency." *VT* 68 (2018): 519–39.

Ben Ze'ev, Maria Pucci. "Greek Attacks Against Alexandrian Jews During Emperor Trajan's Reign." *JSJ* 20.1 (1989): 31–48.

Berlin, Adele. "Literary Approaches to Biblical Literature: General Observations and a Case Study of Genesis 34." Pages 45–75 in *Hebrew Bible: New Insights and Scholarship*. Edited by Frederick E. Greenspahn. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "4Q252: From Rewritten Bible to Biblical Commentary." Pages 92–125 in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. Vol. 1. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein. Boston: Brill, 2013.

———. "4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke, 'The Thematic Content of 4Q252.'" Pages 133–50 in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. Vol. 1. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Bird, Phyllis. ""'To Play the Harlot': An Inquiry into an Old Testament Metaphor." Pages 75–94 in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Peggy L. Day. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Benjamin Traditions Read in the Early Persian Period" Pages 629–45 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. Edited by Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Blum, Erhard. "The Jacob Tradition." Pages 181–211 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup. Eds. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen. Boston: Brill, 2012.

———. "Institutionelle und kulturelle Voraussetzungen der israelitischen Traditionsliteratur." Pages 3–44 in *Tradition(en) im alten Israel Konstruktion, Transmission und*

Transformation Herausgegeben. Edited by Ruth Ebach und Martin Leuenberger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Blyth, Caroline. "Redeemed by His Love? The Characterization of Shechem in Genesis 34." *JSOT* 33 (2008): 3–18.

Bohak, Gideon. "Asenath's Honeycomb and Onias' Temple: The Key to Joseph and Asenath." Pages 163–70 in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A.* Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994.

———. "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document." Pages 101–13 in *From Cairo to Manchester: Studies in the Rylands Genizah Fragments.* Edited by Renate Smithuis and Philip S. Alexander. JSSSup 31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Boling, Robert G. *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB6A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Bourke, Joanna. *Rape: A History from 1860 to Present Day*. London: Virago, 2007.

———. Forward to *Theorizing Sexual Violence*. Edited by Renée J. Heberle and Victoria Grace. London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.

Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. Introduction to 3 Makkabees in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. Pietersma and B. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Breed, Brennan. *Nomadic Text: A Theory of Biblical Reception History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014.

Brettler, Marc Z. "The Book of Judges: Literature as Politics." *JBL* 108 (1989): 395–418.

——— "Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism." *CBQ* 61 (1999): 429–47.

———. "The New Biblical Historiography." Pages 43–50 in I*srael's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*. Edited by V. Philip Long. Winona: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Briggs, Will. "'A Man's Gotta Do What a Man's Gotta Do?: The Criticism of Hegemonic Masculinity in Judges 19.1–20.7." *JSOT* 54 (2017): 51–71.

Brooke, George. "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry To Pesher." *DSS* 1.2 (1994): 160–79.

———. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

———. “From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Re-naming an Adopted Manuscript.” Pages 129–50 in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays From the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts From Cave Four*. Edited by George Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven. Boston: Brill, 2011.

Burke, Aaron A. “Coping with the Effects of War: Refugees in the Levant in during the Bronze and Iron Ages.” Pages 263–87 in *Disaster and Relief Management: Katastrophen Und Ihre Bewaltigung*. FAT 81. Edited by Angelika Berlejung. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Repr. of New York: Routledge, 1990.

Byron, Gay L. “Black Collectors and Keepers of Tradition: Resources for a Womanist Biblical Ethic of (Re)Interpretation.” Pages 187–208 in *Womanist Interpretations of the Bible: Expanding the Discourse*. SemeiaSt 85. Edited by Gay Byron and Vanessa Lovelace. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Byron, Gay, and Vanessa Lovelace, “Introduction: Methods and the Making of Womanist Biblical Hermeneutics.” Pages 1–18 in *Womanist Interpretations of the Bible: Expanding the Discourse*. SemeiaSt 85. Edited by Gay Byron and Vanessa Lovelace. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Cañas Reíllo, José Manuel. “LXX-Judges: The Value of Secondary Translations for Its Textual History.” Pages 230–43 in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz. 6. Internationale Fachtagung Veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.-24. Juli 2016*. WUNT 405. Edited by M. Meiser, M. Geiger, S. Kreuzer, and M. Sigismund. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

———. “Manuscripts and Recensions in LXX-Judges.” Pages 544–60 in *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen. 7. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2018*. WUNT 444. Edited by E. Bons, M. Geiger, F. Ueberschaer, M. Sigismund, and M. Meiser. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

———. “Recensions, Textual Groups, and Vocabulary Differentiations in LXX-Judges.” Pages 175–88 in *The Legacy of Soisalon-Soininen: Towards a Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. DSI 13. Edited by T. Kauhanen and H. Vanonen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020.

Carden, Michael. *Sodomy: A History of a Christian Biblical Myth*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Carrigan, Tim, Raewyn Connell, and John Lee. “Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity.” *Theory and Society* 14 (1985): 551–604.

Carr, David. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Charles, R.H. *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.

———. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

Chavez, Alex E. "Gender, Ethno-Nationalism, and the Anti-Mexicanist Trope." *The Journal of American Folklore* 134 (2021): 3–24.

Chesnutt, Randall D. *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*. JSPSup 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Christensen, Duane. "The March of Conquest in Isaiah X 27c-34." *VT* 26 (1976): 385–99.

Clines, David J.A. "David the Man: The Construction of Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 212–43 in *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible*. JSOTSup 205. GCT 1. Edited by David J.A. Clines. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Coggins, Richard. *Sirach*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. HCS 31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Cohn, Leopold, and Paul Wendland. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Su-persunt*. Berlin: Typis et Impensis Georgii Reimeri, 1886–1930.

Cole, Susan Guettel. "Greek Sanctions Against Sexual Assault." *CP* 79 (1984): 97–113.

Coleman, Nancy. "Why We're Capitalizing Black." *New York Times*, July 5, 2020. Accessed June 22, 2022.

Collins, John J. "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans." *HTR* 73 (1980): 91–104.

———. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. "Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?" Pages 112-27 in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*. Ed. John J. Collins. JSJSup 100. Boston: Brill, 2005.

———. "Antisemitism in Antiquity?: The Case of Alexandria." Pages 181-201 in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*. Ed. John J. Collins. JSJSup. Boston: Brill, 2005.

———. *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible and Deuterocanonical Books*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2018.

Connell, Raewyn. *Masculinities*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1995.

Connell, Raewyn, and James Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* (2005): 829–59.

Corley, Jeremy. "Septuagintalisms, Semitic Interference, and the Original Language of the Book of Judith." Pages 65–96 in *Studies in the Greek Bible: Essays in Honor of Francis T. Gignac, S.J.* CBQMS 44. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008.

———. *Sirach*. New Collegeville Bible Commentary Old Testament. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2013.

Craven, Toni. "The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth-Century Studies of the Apocryphal/ Deuterocanonical Books." *CBR* 1.2 (2003): 187–229.

Crawford, Sidnie White. *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2019.

Cross, Frank Moore. "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 79–94 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville. Collegeville: Penn State University Press, 2000.

Croy, N. Clayton. *3 Maccabees*. SCS. Boston: Brill, 2006.

Daise, Michael. "Samaritans, Seleucids, and the Epic of Theodotus." *JSP* 17 (1998): 25–51.

Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

DeJonge, Marinus. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* Boston: Brill, 1978.

Descamp, Mary Therese. *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods Through a Cognitive Lens*. BibInt 87. Boston: Brill, 2007.

Dimant, Divorah. "Ages of Creation." EDSS. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181." Pages 385–404 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Edited by Divorah Dimant. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Diodorus Siculus. *The Library of History*. Translated by C.H. Oldfather. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Docherty, Susan. "Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?" *JSJ* 35 (2004): 27–48.

Donaldson, Laura E. *Decolonizing Feminisms: Race, Gender & Empire Building.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Doyle, Brian. "The Sin of Sodom: yāḏa' yāḏa' yāḏa'? Reading of the Mamre-Sodom Narrative in Genesis 18-19." *Theology and Sexuality* 9 (1998): 84–100.

Drawnel, Henryk. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. JSJSup 86. Boston: Brill, 2004.

Driver, S.R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Meridian, 1956.

Dube, Musa W. *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000.

———. "Dinah (Genesis 34) At the Contact Zone: 'Shall Our Sister Become a Whore?'" Pages 39–58 in *Feminist Frameworks and The Bible: Power, Ambiguity, and Intersectionality*. Edited by L. Juliana Claassens and Carolyn J. Sharp. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.

Eckhardt, Benedikt. "Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonean Politics." *JSP* 18.4 (2009): 243–63.

Edenburg, Cynthia. *Dismembering the Whole: Composition and Purpose of Judges 19–21*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Eisen, Ute, Christine Gerber, and Angela Standhartinger, eds. *Doing Gender - Doing Religion: Fallstudien Zur Intersektionalität Im Frühen Judentum, Christentum Und Islam*. WUNT 302. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Evans, Robert. *Reception History, Tradition and Biblical Interpretation: Gadamer and Jauss in Current Practice*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2014.

Exum, Cheryl. “Feminist Criticism: Whose Interests Are Being Served?” Pages 65–90 in *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Gale Yee. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Fallon, F. “Theodotus.” *OTP* 2:785–93.

Feimster, Crystal N. *Southern Horrors: Women and the Politics of Rape and Lynching*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Feldman, Liane. “Sanitized Sacrifice in Aramaic Levi’s Law of the Priesthood.” *JAJ* 11 (2020): 343–68.

Feldman, Louis. “Josephus’ Portrait of Jacob.” *JQR* 79 2/3 (1988–89): 101–51.

———. *Josephus’ Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

———. “Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus on the Rape of Dinah.” *JQR* 94 (2004): 253–77.

———. “Josephus’ Portrayal (Ant. 5.136–74) of the Benjaminite Affair of the Concubine and Its Repercussions (Judg 19–21).” Pages 637–74 in *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. JSJSup 107. Boston: Brill, 2006.

———. “Josephus’ View of the Amalekites.” Pages 89–115 in *Israel in the Wilderness*. TBN 10. Edited by Kenneth E. Pomykala. Boston: Brill, 2008.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *Introduction to Judges*. Gesamtwerk Zur Fortsetzung 7. BHQ. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

Fewell, Danna Nolan, and David M. Gunn. “Sternberg’s Reader and The Rape of Dinah.” *JBL* 110 (1991): 193–211.

Fields, Weston W. *Sodom and Gomorrah: History and Motif in Biblical Narrative*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.

Fink, Uta Barbara. “Joseph und Aseneth.” Pages 56–129 in *Joseph und Aseneth*. Edited by Eckart Reinmuth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Finkelstein, Israel. “The Settlement History of Jerusalem in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC.” *RB* 115.4 (2008): 499–515.

———. “Saul, Benjamin and the Emergence of ‘Biblical Israel:’ An Alternative View.” *ZAW 123* (2011): 348–367.

Finkelstein, Israel, and Lily Singer-Avitz. “Reevaluating Bethel.” *ZDPV* 125.1 (2009): 33–48

Fishbane, Michael. “Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Gen 25:19–35:22).” *JJS* 26 (1975): 15–38.

Fischer, Irmtraud. *Die Erzeltern Israels: Feministisch-theologische Studien zu Genesis 12–36*. BZAW 222. New York: de Gruyter, 1994.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Fleishman, Joseph. “Shechem and Dinah, in Light of Non Biblical and Biblical Sources.” *ZAW* 116 (2004): 12–32.

Foskett, Mary F. *A Virgin Conceived: Mary and Classical Representations of Virginity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.

Friedman, Richard Elliot. *Bible With the Sources Revealed: A New View Into the Five Books of Moses*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2003.

———. *The Exodus: How It Happened and Why It Matters.* New York: HarperOne, 2017.

Frymer-Kensky, Tikva Simone. “Virginity in the Bible.” Pages 79–96 in *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. JSOTSup 262. Edited by Victor Harold Matthews, Bernard M. Levinson, and Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. New York: Continuum, 1995.

Gafney, Wil. “A Black Feminist Approach to Biblical Studies.” *Encounter* 67 (2006): 391–403.

———. *Womanist Midrash: A Reintroduction to the Women of the Torah and the Throne*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Geljon, Albert, and D.T. Runia. *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Geller, Stephen A. “The Sack of Shechem: The Use of Typology in Biblical Covenant Religion.” *Proof* 10 (1990): 1–15.

Gera, Deborah Levine. *Judith*. CEJL. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Gil, Roger, and Eberhard Bons. “Judith 5:5–21 Ou Le Récit D’Akhior: Les Mémoires Dans La Construction De L’identité Narrative Du Peuple D’Israël.” *VT* 64.4 (2014): 573–87.

Glendinning, Eleanor. “Reinventing Lucretia: Rape, Suicide and Redemption from Classical Antiquity to the Medieval Era.” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 20 (2013): 61–82.

Good, Edwin M. “Hosea 5:8-6:6: An Alternative to Alt.” *JBL* 85.3 (1966): 273–86.

Goff, Matthew. “Ben Sira and the Giants of the Land: A Note on Ben Sira 16:7.” *JBL* 129 (2010): 645–655.

Graetz, Naomi. “The Concubine of Gibeah: The Case for Reading Intertextually.” Pages 121–43 in *In the Arms of Biblical Women*. Biblical Intersections 13. Edited by John T. Greene and Mishael Caspi. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2013.

Gravett, Sandie. “Reading ‘Rape’ in the Hebrew Bible: A Consideration of Language.” *JSOT* 28 (2004): 279–99.

Graybill, Rhiannon. *Are We Not Men?:Unstable Masculinity in the Hebrew Prophets.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

———. *Texts After Terror: Rape, Sexual Violence, and the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation and Commentary*. SVTP 19. Boston: Brill, 2004.

Gruber, Mayer I. “דיון חוזר — ההאשמות כלפי שכם בן חמור.” *Beit Mikra* 44 (1999): 119–27.

Gruen, Erich S. “Hellenistic Judaism.” Pages 21–76 in *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History*. DCLS 29. Boston: De Gruyter, 2016.

———. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. HCS 30. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. Repr. 2019.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Haddox, Susan. “Favoured Sons and Subordinate Masculinities” Pages 2–19 in *Men and Masculinity in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*. The Bible in the Modern World 33. Edited by Ovidiu Creangă. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010.

———. “Masculinity Studies of the Hebrew Bible: The First Two Decades.” *CBR* 14 (2016): 176–206.

Hacham, Noah. “3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity.” *JBL* 126 (2007): 765–85.

Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. “Portraits of Women In Pseudo-Philo’s Biblical Antiquities.” Pages 83–106 in *Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Hanson, J. “Demetrius the Chronographer.” *OTP* 2:843–54.

Harding, James. “Homophobia and Masculine Domination in Judges 19-21.” *The Bible & Critical Theory* 12 (2016): 41–74.

Harrington, D.J. “Pseudo-Philo.” *OTP* 2:297–377.

Hasselback, Trine B. “Two Approaches to the Study of Genre in 4Q172” Pages 109–118 in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays From the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts From Cave Four*. Edited by George Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven. Boston: Brill, 2011.

Hawkesworth, Mary. “Sex, Gender, and Sexuality: From Naturalized Presumption to Analytical Categories.” Pages 31–56 in *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*. Edited by Georgina Waylen, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and S. Laurel Weldon. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Hayes, Christine. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Heard, Christopher. *Dynamics of Diselection: Ambiguity in Genesis 12-36 and Ethnic Boundaries in Post-exilic Judah*. SemeiaSt 39. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2001.

———. “What Does the Mob Want Lot To Do in Gen 19:9?” *HS* 51 (2010): 95–105.

Heijne, Camilla Hélena von. *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis*. BZAW 412. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Hendel, Ronald. Review of *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* by John William Wevers. *JR* 75 (1995): 103–4.

———. *The Text of Genesis 1–11*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

———. *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hensel, Benedikt. "On the relationship of Judah and Samaria in Post-exilic Times: A Farewell to the Conflict Paradigm." *JSOT* 44 (2019): 19-42.

Heberle, Renée J., and Victoria Grace, eds. *Theorizing Sexual Violence*. Edited by London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.

Heckel, Waldemar, Timothy Howe, and Sabine Müller. "'The Giver of the Bride, the Bridegroom, and the Bride': A Study of the Murder of Philip II and Its Aftermath." Pages 92–124 in *Ancient Historiography on War and Empire*. Edited by Timothy Howe, Sabine Müller, and Richard Stonemaker. Philadelphia: Oxbow, 2017.

Hezser, Catherine. "'Joseph and Aseneth' in the Context of Ancient Greek Erotic Novels." *FJB* 24 (1997): 1–40.

Hicks-Keeton, Jill. *Arguing with Aseneth: Gentile Access to Israel's Living God in Jewish Antiquity.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Hill Collins, Patricia. "The Tie that Binds: Race, Gender and US Violence." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21.5 (1998): 917–38.

———. "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas." *Annual Review of Sociology* 41 (2015): 1–20.

———. "On Violence, Intersectionality and Transversal Politics." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40 (2017): 1460–73.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt." *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1–24.

Hollander, H, W., and Marinus DeJonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary,* Boston: Brill, 1985.

hooks, bell. "Reflections on Race and Sex." Pages 57–64 in *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Hoop, Raymond de. "Saul the Sodomite: Genesis 18–19 as the Opening Panel of a Polemic Triptych on King Saul." Pages 17–26 in *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and Its Interpreters*. TBN 7. Edited by Edward Noort and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. Boston: Brill, 2004.

Horeck, Tanya. *Public Rape: Representing Violation in Fiction and Film*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Humphrey, Edith. “On Bees and Best Guesses: The Problem of the Sitz Im Leben from Internal Evidence from Joseph and Aseneth.” *CR:BS* 7 (1999): 223–36.

Hunter, Virginia J. *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Hurvitz, Avi. “Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew.” *VTSup* 80 (2000): 143–60.

———. *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew*. Boston: Brill, 2014.

Hyman, Ronald T. “Final Judgment: The Ambiguous Moral Question that Culminates Genesis 34.” *JBQ* 28 (2000): 93–101.

Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. AGJU 31. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

James, Jonathan, and Jean Proulx. “Theories That Explain Sexual Aggression Against Women.” Pages 3–22 in *The Wiley Handbook of What Works with Sexual Offenders: Contemporary Perspectives in Theory, Assessment, Treatment, and Prevention*. Edited by Jean Proulx, Franca Cortoni, Leam A. Craig, and Elizabeth J. Letourneau. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2020.

Jauss, Hans Robert. “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory.” *New Literary History* 2 (1970): 7–37.

———. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Jean-Charles, Régine Michelle. *Conflict Bodies: The Politics of Rape Representation in the Francophone Imaginary*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2014.

Jobes, Karen and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Publishing, 2015.

Johnson, Jay Emerson. “Sodomy and Gendered Love: Reading Genesis 19 in the Anglican Communion.” Pages 414–32 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception History of the Bible*. Edited by Michael Lieb, Emma Mason, Jonathan Roberts, and Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Johnson, Sara R. “3 Maccabees.” Pages 450–55 in *Women’s Bible Commentary*. Edited by Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley. 3rd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Johnson-DeBaufre, Melanie. “Texts and Readers, Rhetorics and Ethics.” Pages 217–31 in *Feminist Biblical Studies in the Twentieth Century: Scholarship and Movement*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Joseph, Alison. *Portrait of the Kings: The Davidic Prototype in Deuteronomistic Poetics*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.

———. “Understanding Genesis 34:2: ‘Innâ.” *VT* 66 (2016): 663–68.

———. “Why ‘Is Dinah Raped?’ Isn’t the Right Question: Genesis 34 and Feminist Historiography.” *JHebS* 19.4 Gendered Historiography: Theoretical Considerations and Case Studies (2019): 27–37.

Joshel, S.R. “The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy’s Lucretia and Verginia.” Pages 163–190. *Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World: Readings and Sources*. Edited by Laura K. McClure. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

Jun, Sunhee. “Negotiation in the Contact Zone: Reading Joseph and Aseneth from a Postcolonial Perspective.” *JSJ* 52 (2021): 1–19.

Junior, Nyasha. “Womanist Biblical Interpretation.” Pages 37–46 in *Engaging the Bible in a Gendered World: An Introduction to Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Honor of Katherine Doob Sakenfeld*. Edited by Linda Day and Carolyn Pressler. Louisville: John Knox Press.

———. *An Introduction to Womanist Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: John Knox Press.

Kartveit, Magnar. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. VTSup. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Keady, Jessica M. “Rape Culture Discourse and Female Impurity: Genesis 34 as a Case Study” Pages 67–82 in *Rape Culture, Gender Violence and Religion*. Eds. Caroline Blyth, Emily Colgan, Katie B. Edwards. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018.

Keskinen, Suvi. “Borders of the Finnish Nation: Media Politics and Rape by ‘Foreign’ Perpetrators.” Pages 107–24 in *Media in Motion: Cultural Complexity and Migration in the Nordic Region*. Edited by Elisabeth Eide and Kaarina Nikunen. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Knapp, Andrew. “The Succession Narrative in Twenty-first-century Research.” *CBR* 19 (2021): 211–34.

Knibb, Michael. Review of James VanderKam *Jubilees 1: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees, Chapters 1–21; Jubilees 2: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees, Chapters 22–50*. *Aethiopica* 23 (2020): 278–281.

Knoppers, Gary N. Introduction to *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Pages 1–18. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers, and J. Gordon McConville. Collegeville: Penn State University Press, 2000.

———. *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Kochenash, Michael. "Trojan Horses: The Counterintuitive Use of Dinah, Helen, and Goliath in Joseph and Aseneth." *JSJ* 52 (2021): 417–41.

Kraemer, Ross Shephard. *When Aseneth Met Joseph a Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Kraft, Robert A. "Introductions to the LXX Pentateuch: Keeping Things Updated." Pages 443–48 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. JSJSup. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Boston: Brill, 2008.

———. "Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies." *JBL* 126 (2007): 5–27.

Kratz, Reinhard. *Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.

Kugel, James A. "The Story of Dinah in the 'Testament of Levi.'" *HTR* 85 (1992): 1–34.

———. *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretative Life of a Biblical Text*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

———. *The Bible As It Was.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

———. *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Kugler, Robert. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. SBLEJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

———. "Testaments." Pages 329–52 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters.* Edited by Matthias Henze and Rodney A. Werline. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020.

Kulig, Teresa C, Amanda Graham, Francis T. Cullen, Alex R. Piquero, and Murat Haner. "'Bad Hombres' at the Southern US Border? White Nationalism and the Perceived Dangerousness of Immigrants." *Journal of Criminology* 54.3 (2021): 283–304.

Lamont, Michèle. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Lamont, Michèle and Virág Molnár. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (2002): 167–195.

Lasine, Stuart. "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World." *JSOT* 29 (1984): 37–59.

Laughlin, Mark, and Shani Tzoref. "Theme and Genre in 4Q177 and Its Scriptural Selections." Pages 169–91 in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays From the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts From Cave Four*. Edited by George Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven. Boston: Brill, 2011.

Lazarewicz-Wyrzykowska, Ela. "Samson: Masculinity Lost (and Regained?)" Pages 171–88 in *Men and Masculinities in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond*. The Bible in the Modern World 33. Edited by Ovidiu Creangă. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010.

Lear, Andrew. "Ancient Pederasty: An Introduction." Pages 106–131 in *Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Edited by Thomas K. Hubbard. Malden: Wiley- Blackwell, 2014.

Leuchter, Mark. *The Levites and the Boundaries of Israelite Identity.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Leuchter, Mark, and Jeremy Michael Hutton, eds., *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, AIL. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. "Did Ancient Women Write Novels?" Pages 199–219 in *'Women Like This: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. EJL 1. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1991.

Legaspi, Michael. "Job's Wives in the 'Testament of Job': A Note on the Synthesis of Two Traditions." *JBL* 127 (2008): 71–79.

Lemaire, André. "Toward a Redactional History of the Book of Kings" Pages 446–61 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and J. Gordon McConville. Collegeville: Penn State University Press, 2000.

Lemche, Niels Peter. *The Canaanites and Their Land: The Tradition of the Canaanites*. JSOT Sup 110. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Lemos, T.M. *Violence and Personhood in Ancient Israel and Comparative Contexts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Levine, Amy-Jill, ed. *"Women like This:" New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. EJL. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

———. "Sacrifice and Salvation: Otherness and Domestication in the Book of Judith." Pages 208–24 in *Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna*. FCB. Edited by Athalya Brenner-Idan. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

———. "Hemmed in on Every Side: Jews and Women in the Book of Susanna." Pages 175–190 in *Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. Vol. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Levine, Étan. *Marital Relations in Ancient Judaism*. BZAR 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009.

Lieu, Judith. "'Impregnable Ramparts and Walls Of Iron': Boundary and Identity in Early 'Judaism' and 'Christianity.'" *NTS* 48 (2002): 297–313.

Livy. *The History of Rome*. Translated by B.O. Foster. 16 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.

Loader, J.A. *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish, and Early Christian Traditions*. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1990.

Long, V. Philip, ed. *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*. Winona: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

———. "History and Fiction: What Is History?" Pages 232–54 in *Israel's Past in Present Research: Essays on Ancient Israelite Historiography*. Edited by V. Philip Long. Winona: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Longacre, Drew. "Paleographic Style and the Forms and Functions of the Dead Sea Psalm Scrolls: A Hand Fitting for the Occasion?" *VT* 72 (2022): 67–92.

Lorde, Audre. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." Pages 25–28 in *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Edited by Reina Lewis and Sara Mills. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.

Machiela, Daniel. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon a New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. STDJ 79. Boston: Brill, 2009.

Masenya, Madipoane. "Without a Voice, With a Violated Body: Re-reading Judges 19 to Challenge Gender Violence in Sacred Texts." *Missionalia* 40 (2012): 205–16.

Mason, Steve. *Flavius Josephus: The Life of Josephus*. Boston: Brill, 2003.

———. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.

———. "Josephus as a Roman Historian" Pages 89–108 in *A Companion to Josephus*. Edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers. New York: Wiley & Sons, 2016.

Materson, Mark. "Studies of Ancient Masculinity." Pages 19–32 in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Edited by Thomas K. Hubbard. Malden: Blackwell, 2014.

Matthes, Melissa M. *The Rape of Lucretia and the Founding of Republics: Readings in Livy, Machiavelli, and Rousseau*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.

McKenzie, Steven L. "Deuteronomistic History." *ABD* 2:160–68.

McPhail, Beverly A. "Feminist Framework Plus: Knitting Feminist Theories of Rape Etiology Into a Comprehensive Model." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 17 (2016): 314–29.

Mermelstein, Ari. "Emotion, Gender, and Greco-Roman Virtue in Joseph and Aseneth." *JSJ* 48 (2017): 331–62.

Milnor, Kristina. "Women in Roman Historiography." Pages 276–287 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*. Edited by Andrew Feldherr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Milstein, Sara J. *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Monroe, Laura. *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israel Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Moore, Carey A. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.

Moore, Stephen D., and Janice Capel Anderson. "Taking It Like A Man: Masculinity in 4 Maccabees." *JBL* 117 (1998): 249–73.

Moore, Stewart Allen. *Jewish Ethnic Identity and Relations in Hellenistic Egypt: With Walls of Iron?* JSJSup 171. Boston: Brill, 2015.

Morrell, Robert, and Sandra Swart. "Men in the Third World: Postcolonial Perspectives on Masculinity." Pages 90–113 in *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Edited by

Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn, and Raewyn Connell. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2005.

Moster, David Z. “The Levite of Judges 19–21.” *JBL* 134 (2015): 721–730.

Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. “Short Note Who Lodged at Geba (Isaiah 10:29)?” *VT* 61 (2011): 148–49.

Murphey, Kelly J. *Rewriting Masculinity: Gideon, Men, and Might*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Na’aman, Nadav. “Saul, Benjamin, and the Emergence of ‘Biblical Israel’ (Part 1).” *ZAW* 121.2 (2009): 211–24.

———. “Saul, Benjamin, and the Emergence of ‘Biblical Israel’ (Part 2.” *ZAW* 121.3 (2009): 335–49.

———. “The Growth and Development of Judah and Jerusalem in the Eighth Century BCE: A Rejoinder.” *RB* 116.3 (2009): 321–35.

———. “The Jacob Story and the Formation of Biblical Israel.” *TA* 41 (2014): 95–125.

———. “The Pre-Priestly Abraham Story as a Unified Exilic Work.” *SJOT* 29 (2015): 157–81.

Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism.* Boston: Brill, 2003.

Nelson, Robin. “The Sex in Your Violence: Patriarchy and Power in Anthropological World Building and Everyday Life.” *Current Anthropology* 62 Sup. 23 (2021): S92–102.

Newman, Judith. “The Scripturalization of Prayer in Exilic and Second Temple Judaism.” Pages 7–24 in *Prayers That Cite Scripture*. Ed. James L. Kugel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Newsom, Carol A. “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran” Pages 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters.* Biblical and Judaic Studies. Edited by William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Newsom, Carol A., and Brennan W. Breed. *Daniel: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

Newsom, Carol A., and Duane Watson. “Angels.” *ABD* 1:248–55.

Niditch, Susan. “The Sodomite Theme in Judges 19–20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration.” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 365–78.

———. *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*. LAI. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

———. *Judges: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Niehoff, Maren. *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Noort, Ed. “For the Sake of Righteousness: Abraham’s Negotiations with YHWH as Prologue to the Sodom Narrative: Genesis 18:16-33.” Pages 3–15 in *Sodom’s Sin: Genesis 18–19 and Its Interpreters*. TBN 7. Edited by Edward Noort and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. Boston: Brill, 2004.

Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1943).

Olson, Dennis T. “Literary and Rhetorical Criticism.” Pages 13–54 in *Methods for Exodus*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Olyan, Saul. “Jehoiakim’s Dehumanizing Interment as a Ritual Act of Reclassification.” *JBL* 133 (2014): 271–79.

Pape, John. “Black and White: The ‘Perils of Sex’ in Colonial Zimbabwe.” *Journal of South African Studies* 16 (1990): 699–720.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Pawlak, Matthew C. “A Desperate Romantic Gesture: Sexuality and Slavery in Joseph and Aseneth.” *JJS* 69 (2018): 248–55.

Peters, Dorothy, and Esther Eshel. “Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem: Levi and His Sword in the Rylands Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document.” Pages 237–59 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Kipp Davis, Dorothy Peters, Kyung Baek, and Peter Flint. Boston: Brill, 2016.

Peterson, V. Spike. “Sexing Political Identities/ Nationalism as Heterosexism.” *International Journal of Feminist Politics* 1 (1999): 34–65.

Philipose, Elizabeth. “Feminism, International Law, and the Spectacular Violence of the ‘Other’ Decolonizing the Laws of War.” Pages 176–204 in *Theorizing Sexual Violence*. Edited by Renée J. Heberle and Victoria Grace. London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.

Philo. *Questions and Answers on Genesis*. Supplement 1. Translated by Ralph Marcus. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

———. *On the Life of Abraham*. Translated by Ellen Birnbaum and John M Dillon. PACS 6. Boston: Brill, 2021.

Pirson, Ron. "Does Lot Know About Yada'?" Pages 203–13 in *Universalism and Particularism at Sodom and Gomorrah: Essays in Memory of Ron Pirson*. AIL. Edited by Diana Lipton and Ron Pirson. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012.

Plaskow, Judith. "Feminist Anti-Judaism and the Christian God." *JFSR* 7 (1991): 99–108.

———. "Anti-Judaism in Feminist Christian Interpretation." Pages 83–95 in *Judith Plaskow: Feminism, Theology, and Justice*. Edited by Hava Tirosh-Samuelson and Aaron W. Hughes. Boston: Brill, 2014.

Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*. Translated by H. Rackham. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Puech, Émile. "4Q252: 'Commentaire de la Genèse A' ou 'Bénédictions Patriarcales'?" *RevQ* 26.2 (2013): 227–51.

Pui-lan, Kwok. "Sexual Morality and National Politics: Reading Biblical "Loose Women." Pages 21–46 in *Engaging the Bible: Critical Readings from Contemporary Women*. Edited by Choi Hee An and Katheryn Pfisterer Darr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.

Pummer, Reinhard. "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." *HTR* (1982): 177–88.

Pury, Albert de. "The Jacob Story and the Beginning of the Formation of the Pentateuch." Pages 51–72 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist?: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Rajak, Tessa. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Randall, Melanie, and Vasanthi Venkatesh. "Introduction to 'The Right to No: The Crime of Marital Rape, Women's Human Rights, and International Law.'" *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* 41 (2015): 154–7.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Reiterer, Friedrich V. "'Meines Bruders Licht:' Untersuchungen zur Rolle des Achior." Pages 111–61 in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits. Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.

Rendsburg, Gary A. *The Redaction of Genesis*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1986.

Riessler, Paul. "Joseph und Asenath: Eine Altjüdische Erzählung." *TQ* 103 (1922): 1–22, 145–83.

Robert, John. Introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception History of the Bible*. Edited by Michael Leib, Jonathan Roberts, and Emma Mason. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Robertson, Elizabeth and Christine M. Rose, eds. *Representing Rape in Medieval and Early Modern Literature*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Roitman, Adolfo. "Achior in the Book of Judith: His Role and Significance." Pages 31–45 in *"No One Spoke III of Her:" Essays on Judith*. Ed. James Vanderkam. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Römer, Thomas. "Recherches actuelles sur le cycle d'Abraham." Pages 179–212 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis, Literature, Redaction and History*. BETL 155. Edited by A. Wénin. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

———. "Abraham Traditions in the Hebrew Bible Outside the Book of Genesis." Pages 159–80 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Rönsch, Hermann. *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die Kleine Genesis*. Leipzig: Fues, 1874.

Rösel, Martin. "The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis." *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 62–70.

Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. "What if We Got Rid of the Goy? Rereading Ancient Jewish Distinctions." *JSJ* 47 (2016): 149–82.

Ross, William A. *Postclassical Greek and Septuagint Lexicography*. SCS 75. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2022.

———. "Style and Familiarity in Judges 19,7 (Old Greek): Establishing Dependence Within the Septuagint." *Biblica* 98 (2017): 25–36.

Rubarth, Scott. “Competing Constructions of Masculinity in Ancient Greece.” *Athens Journal of Humanities and Arts* 1 (2014): 21–32.

Russaw, Kimberly D. *Daughters in the Hebrew Bible*. Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic, 2018.

Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Translated by John Elwolde. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1993.

Samuel, Harald. *Von Priestern Zum Patriarchen: Levi Und Die Leviten Im Alten Testament*. BZAW 448. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Sanders, Seth L. *The Invention of Hebrew*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009.

Satterthwaite, Philip E. Introduction to Judges in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. Pietersma and B. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Schneider, Tammi J. *Mothers of Promise*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2008.

Schniedewind, William M. “The Problem with Kings: Recent Study of the Deuteronomistic History.” *RSR* 22 (1996): 22–27.

———. *Society and the Promise to David: The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1–17*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

———. *How the Bible Became A Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

———. “The Search for Gibeah: Notes on the Historical Geography of Central Benjamin.” Pages 711–22 in *“I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times:” Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by Amihay Mazar, Pierre de Miroschedji, and Aren M. Maeir. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

———. *A Social History of Hebrew: Its Origins through the Rabbinic Period*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Scholz, Susanne. *Rape Plots: A Feminist Cultural Study of Genesis 34*. StBibLit 13. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

———. “‘Back Then It Was Legal’: The Epistemological Imbalance in Readings of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Rape Legislation.” *The Bible and Critical Theory* 1.4 (2005): 36.1–36.2

———. “Second-Wave Feminism.” Pages 242–51 in *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Julia M. O’Brian. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Schreiner, Josef. *Septuaginta-Massora Des Buches Der Richter: Eine Textkritische Studie*. AnBib 7. Roma: Pontificio istituto biblico, 1957.

Schuller, Eileen, and Marie-Theres Wacker, eds. *Early Jewish Writings*. The Bible and Women. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Schulte, Leah Rediger. *The Absence of God in Biblical Rape Narratives*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.

Schwartz, Daniel. “Many Sources but a Single Author: Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities.” Pages 36–58 in *A Companion to Josephus*. Eds. Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers. New York: Wiley & Sons, 2016.

Scott, Joan W. “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis.” *The American Historical Review* 91.5 (1986): 1053–75.

Segovia, Fernando and Mary Ann Tolbert, eds. *Reading From This Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. Vol. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Seow, C. L. *Job 1–21: Interpretation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Setzer, Claudia. “Feminist Interpretation of the Bible.” Pages 165–83 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in America*. Edited by Paul C. Gutjahr. New York: Oxford, 2018.

Shamesh, Yael. “Rape is Rape is Rape: The Story of Dinah and Shechem (Genesis 34).” *ZAW* 119 (2007): 2–21.

Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in Colonial Texts*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Shuger, Debora. “Castigating Livy: The Rape of Lucretia and *The Old Arcadia*.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998): 526–48.

Shectman, Sarah. *Women in the Pentateuch: A Feminist and Source Critical Analysis*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 23. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. 1st ed. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Sonek, Kris. “The Abraham Narratives in Genesis 12–25.” *CBR* 17 (2019): 158–83.

Smith, Mark S., and Elizabeth Bloch-Smith. *Judges 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2021.

Smoak, Jeremy D. “Building Houses and Planting Vineyards: The Early Inner-Biblical Discourse on an Ancient Israelite Wartime Curse.” *JBL* 127 (2008): 19–35.

Southwood, Katherine. ‘“This Man Has Come Into My House’: Hospitality in Genesis 19; 34; and Judges 19.” *BibInt* 26 (2018): 469–84.

Spittler, R.P. “Testament of Job.” *OTP* 1:833.

Spronk, Klaas. *Judges*. HCOT. Bristol: Peeters, 2019.

Standhartinger, Angela. “Um zu sehen die Töchter des Landes: Die Perspektive Dinas in der Jüdischhellenistischen Diskussion um Gen 34.” Pages 89–116 in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. NovTSup 74. Edited by Dieter Georgi, Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger. Boston: Brill, 1994.

———. *Das Frauenbild Im Judentum Der Hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag Anhand Von ‘Joseph Und Aseneth*.’ AGJU 26. Boston: Brill, 1995.

———. “Joseph and Aseneth: Perfect Bride or Heavenly Prophetess.” Pages 578–85 in *Feminist Biblical Interpretation: A Compendium of Critical Commentary on the Books of the Bible and Related Literature*. Edited by Luise Schottroff and Marie-Theres Wacker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

———. “Recent Scholarship on Joseph and Aseneth (1988-2013).” *CBR* 12 (2014): 353–406.

———. “Intersections of Gender, Status, Ethnos, and Religion in Joseph and Aseneth.” Pages 69–90 in *Early Jewish Writings,* The Bible and Women 3.1. Edited by Eileen M. Schuller and Marie-Theres Wacker. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Stanley, Janelle. “Judges 19: Text of Trauma.” Pages 275–89 in *Joshua and Judges*. Texts @ Contexts. Edited by Athalya Brenner and Gale Yee. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

Sterling, Gregory E. “When the Beginning is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo.” Pages 427–46 in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. VTSup. Edited by Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen. Boston: Brill, 2012.

———. “Which Version of the Greek Bible Did Philo Read?” Pages 89–128 in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop*

in Tokyo August 28–31 2007. Edited by Akio Moriya and Gohei Hata. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. ISBL. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1985.

Steudel, Annette. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschata.b): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. StTDJ 13. Boston: Brill, 1994.

Stiebert, Joanna. *Fathers and Daughters in the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Stiebert, Johanna and Jerome T. Walsh. "Does the Hebrew Bible Have Anything to Say About Homosexuality?" *OTE* 14 (2001): 119–52.

Stone, Ken. *Sex, Honor, and Power in the Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Strugnell, John. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan.'" *RevQ* 7.2 (1970): 236–48.

Strunk, Thomas E. "Rape and Revolution: Livia and Augustus in Tacitus' "Annales."" *Latomus* 73 (2014): 126–148.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The "Angels" and "Giants" of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions." *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–77.

Sweeney, Marvin. "Hosea's Readings of the Pentateuchal Narrative." Pages 851–72 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*. FAT 111. Edited by Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Old Testament in Greek, According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: University Press, 1909.

Tamber-Rosenau, Caryn. "Biblical Bathing Beauties and the Manipulation of the Male Gaze: What Judith Can Tell Us About Bathsheba and Susanna." *JFSR* 33.2 (2017): 55–72.

Tanzer, Sarah J. "The Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 404–09 in *Women's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley. 3rd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Teeter, Andrew. "The Hebrew Bible and/as Second Temple Literature: Methodological Reflections." *DSD* 20 (2013): 349–77.

Thiessen, Matthew. “Protecting the Holy Race and Holy Space: Judith’s Reenactment of the Slaughter of Shechem.” *JSJ* 49 (2018): 165–88.

———. “Aseneth’s Eight Day Transformation as Scriptural Justification for Conversion.” *JSJ* 45 (2014): 229–49.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2009.

Ticktin, Mary. “Sexual Violence as the Language of Border Control: Where French Feminist and Anti-immigrant Rhetoric Meet.” *Signs* 33 (2008): 863–89.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. “Sodom and Gomorrah in the Dead Sea Scrolls” Pages 47–62 in *Sodom’s Sin: Genesis 18-19 and Its Interpretations*. TBN 7. Edited by Edward Noort and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. Boston: Brill, 2004.

Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. Fourth edition. Boulder: Westview Press, 2014.

Torrey, Charles C. “The Site of Bethulia.” *JAOS* 20 (1899): 160–72.

Tov, Emmanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Trebolle Barrera, Julio C. *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible an Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Trible, Phyllis. “Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation.” *JAAR* 41 (1973): 30–48.

———. “The Effects of Women’s Studies on Biblical Studies: An Introduction.” *JSOT* 22 (1982): 2–5.

———. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. OBT. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Trotter, Jonathan. “The Homeland and the Legitimation of the Diaspora: Egyptian Jewish Origin Stories in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.” *JSP* 28 (2018): 91–122.

Tushima, Cephas. “Homosexuality and Liminality in Sodom: The Quests for Home, Fun and Justice (Gen 19:1–29).” *OTE* 34 (2021): 68–88.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. VTSup 134. Boston: Brill, 2010.

U.S. Congress. Congressional Globe. *Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States*. 42d Cong., 2d sess., 1872. 13 vols. S. Rept. 41, pt. 1.

Van Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M. *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8*. JSJSup 161. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Van Wolde, Ellen J. "Does 'innâ denote rape? A Semantic Analysis of a Controversial Word." *VT* 52 (2002): 528–44.

———. "Outcry, Knowledge, and Judgment in Genesis 18–19" Pages 71–101 in *Universalism and Particularism at Sodom and Gomorrah: Essays in Memory of Ron Pirson*. AIL. Edited by Diana Lipton and Ron Pirson. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012.

VanderKam, James. *Book of Jubilees.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2001.

———. *Jubilees 22–50*. Hermenia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018.

———. *Jubilees*. The Hermeneia Translation. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2020.

Venter, Pieter M. "The Function of the Ammonite Achior in the Book of Judith." *HvTSt* 67 (2011): 224–33.

Vialle, Catherine. "Achior L'Ammonite: Une Conversion Au Judaïsme Peu Banale Dans Le Livre De Judith." *BZ* 55.2 (2011): 257–64.

Vielhauer, Roman. "Sodom and Gomorrah: From the Bible to Qumran" Pages 147–169 in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. New York: De Gruyter, 2013.

Vogel, Manuel. "Einführung in die Schrift." Pages 3–32 in *Joseph und Aseneth*. Edited by Eckart Reinmuth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary, Revised Edition*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.

Wabyanga, Robert Kuloba. "The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah Revisited: Military and Political Reflections." *OTE* 28/3 (2015): 847–73.

Wacholder, Ben. "Theodotus." *EncJud* 19: 693–94.

Warsaw-Jones, Koala. "Toward a Womanist Hermeneutic: A Reading of Judges 19–21." Pages 172–86 in *A Feminist Companion to Judges*. FCB 4. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Waters, Sonia E. “Reading Sodom through Sexual Violence Against Women.” *Int* 71.3 (2017): 274–83.

Weems, Renita. “Re-reading for Liberation: African American Women and the Bible.” Pages 42–55 in *I Found God in Me: A Womanist Biblical Hermeneutics Reader*. Edited by Mitzi J. Smith. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2015.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School.* New York: Oxford, 1972.

Weitzman, Steven. “Forced Circumcision and the Shifting Role of Gentiles in Hasmonean Ideology.” *HTR* 92 (1999): 37–59.

Werman, Cana. “‘Jubilees 30’: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage.” *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 12–36: A Commentary*. CC. Translated by John J Scullion. Minneapolis: Ausburg Publishing House, 1985.

Wevers, John William. *Genesis LXXG-GEN*. SVTG 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

———. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Wills, Lawrence M. “Jewish Novellas in a Greek and Roman Age: Fiction and Identity,” *JSJ* 42 (2011): 141–65.

———. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015.

Wilson, Stephen M. *Making Men: The Male Coming-of-Age Theme in the Hebrew Bible*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2015.

Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

Winter, Yves. “Machiavelli and the Rape of Lucretia.” *History of Political Thought* 40 (2019): 405–432.

Wöhrle, Jakob. “There’s No Master Key! The Literary Character of the Priestly Stratum and the Formation of the Pentateuch” Pages 391–403 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*. FAT 111. Edited by Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

World Report on Violence and Health. Edited by Etienne G. Krug, Linda L. Dahlberg, James A. Mercy, Anthony B. Zwi, and Rafael Lozano. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2002.

Worthington, Ian. *By the Spear: Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Rise and Fall of the Macedonian Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Wyatt, Nick. "The Story of Dinah and Shechem." Pages 16–38 in *The Archaeology of a Myth: Papers on Old Testament Tradition*. New York: Routledge, 2014. Repr. *UF* 22 (1990): 433–58.

Yamada, Frank. *Configurations of Rape in the Hebrew Bible: A Literary Analysis of Three Rape Narratives*. StBibLit 109. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

Yee, Gale A. "Ideological Criticism: Judges 17–21 and the Dismembered Body." Pages 138–60 in *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Gale A. Yee. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

———. "Introduction: Definitions, Explorations, and Intersections" Pages 1–40 in *The Hebrew Bible: Feminist and Intersectional Perspectives*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018.

———. "Thinking Intersectionally: Gender, Race, Class, and the Etceteras of Our Discipline." *JBL* 139 (2020): 7–26.

Zahn, Molly. *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Zakowitch, Yair. "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives." Pages 175–96 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Ed. Jeffrey Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. SVTG 12.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

Zlotnick, Helena. *Dinah's Daughters: Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.