

Macalester College

DigitalCommons@Macalester College

Classics Honors Projects

Classics Department

Spring 4-26-2022

From Handmaids to Princesses: How Identity and Politics Impact Definitions of Biblical Rape

Gabrielle R. Isaac-Herzog

Macalester College, gisaache@macalester.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/classics_honors



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Classics Commons](#), [History of Gender Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Jewish Studies Commons](#), [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#), [Legal Commons](#), [Reading and Language Commons](#), and the [Women's History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Isaac-Herzog, Gabrielle R., "From Handmaids to Princesses: How Identity and Politics Impact Definitions of Biblical Rape" (2022). *Classics Honors Projects*. 30.

https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/classics_honors/30

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics Department at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classics Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

**From Handmaids to Princesses:
How Identity and Politics Impact Definitions of Biblical Rape**

Gabrielle Isaac-Herzog
Nanette Goldman
Honors Thesis
Department of the Classical Mediterranean and Middle East
April 27, 2022

Abstract

The politics of sex in the Bible are complex. They are impacted and limited by the time of the stories, as well as the political landscape and laws of the region. However, since many modern religions have emerged from the text of the Hebrew Bible, it is important for scholars to continue the work of critically examining the texts in the contemporary context. This paper offers a textual analysis of several biblical stories through a feminist and decolonial lens. Through the generation of a taxonomy by which these stories can be categorized, this paper posits that the biblical definitions of rape serve to protect the ancient patriarchal power structures, instead of the victims of sexual violence.

Table of Contents:

1. Acknowledgements	4
2. Introduction	
2.1. Overview	5
2.2. The Existing Literature	6
2.3. Author Statement & Positionality	10
3. Context	11
4. Methodology	
4.1. Overview	13
4.2. Fallout	14
4.3. Diction	15
4.4. Taxonomy Introduction	17
5. Table 1: Taxonomy	18
6. Analysis	
6.1. The Rape of Tamar	19
6.2. The Rape of Dinah	25
6.3. The Rape of Bathsheba	28
6.4. The Rape of Hagar	32
6.5. The Meeting of Isaac and Rebekah	36
7. Conclusions & Further Research	39
8. Appendix	
8.1. Appendix A: Selection from <i>Deceit, Jealousy, and Slander: The Dual Narratives of Two Women's Mistakes</i>	42
8.2. Appendix B: Letters to the Women.	47
9. Bibliography	49

This project is dedicated to victim-survivors of sexual violence and those who have held space for them when they needed to speak and held their hearts when they grew too heavy for talk.

Acknowledgements

There are so many people who enabled and empowered me to complete this project. First and foremost, I must thank Nanette Goldman. Walking into the classroom for Beginning Hebrew on my first-ever day of classes at Macalester, I had no idea that I was going to be discovering an undying love of a language I had grown up hearing and reading, without ever knowing what it meant. With Professor Goldman's guidance, instruction, and care, I found immense joy in the meticulous and tedious act of translation. Sitting down to translate passages at the end of a long day felt refreshing instead of exhausting. I quickly realized that when I translated things myself, I could take new meaning from stories I'd heard dozens of times. Over the next four years, Professor Goldman continually encouraged me to keep digging and fostering that curiosity, recognizing the passion I had even before I, myself, did. I wouldn't be where I am now or headed where I'm going without your steadfast support. Thank you.

I must also thank all of my housemates, who have been there in the last year to push me when I needed a push, hug me when I needed a hug, and graciously listen to me rant about obscure biblical passages and translation minutiae with an astounding level of patience. You're the best.

And to all of my friends and family, particularly the incredibly strong Jewish women in my life: thank you for loving me, supporting me, and inspiring me. Most importantly, thank you for always encouraging me to follow my curiosities and passions.

Introduction

The politics of sex in the Bible are complex. They are impacted and limited by the time of the stories taking place, as well as the political landscape and laws of the region. However, since many modern religions have emerged from the text of the Hebrew Bible, it is important for modern scholars to continue critically examining the texts in the contemporary context. This is particularly important for cases of sexual violence in the Bible, of which there are many stories. Some of these such stories are canonically considered stories of rape, such as the Rape of Tamar or the Rape of Dinah, but others require deeper analysis to determine the specific dynamics of the sexual encounters before denoting them unequivocally as cases of rape. However, when one starts to examine stories canonically considered rape and compare them with other sexual encounters that appear to the modern eye as nonconsensual, the divisions created by the writers and redactors of the Hebrew Bible start to feel arbitrary.¹ It thus becomes clear that biblical definitions of rape serve to protect the ancient patriarchal power structures, instead of the victims of sexual violence.

Through the translation and textual analysis of five stories centering sexual or romantic encounters between a woman and man from the Tanakh (Hebrew Bible),² I will create a new taxonomy that can be used to classify different stories that involve sex, in order to better understand what was considered sexual violence at the time of the Bible being written and why. As a result, I will also raise additional questions about how

¹ Though there is no concrete evidence of who the specific redactors were, there is an entire field of biblical analysis and interpretation dedicated to analyzing the people who wrote, compiled, and edited the stories we now find in the bible, known as redaction criticism.

² Genesis 16:1-6, Genesis 24:56-67, Genesis 34, 2 Samuel 11, 2 Samuel 13.

contemporary biblical scholars can and should be critically examining sexual politics and cases of sexual violence and the resultant justice—or lack thereof—in the Hebrew Bible.

The Existing Literature

This is by no stretch of the imagination the first scholarship on the topic of sexual violence and violence against women in the Hebrew Bible. I have attempted to distill the breadth of scholarship to that which applies most significantly to the work conducted for this project. Thus, I will focus in this section on scholarship around the specific stories mentioned, reading the Hebrew Bible through a trauma lens, and terminology that frequently surrounds instances of sexual violence and sexual acts more generally in the Hebrew Bible.

In *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible*, Eve Levavi Feinstein uses the readings of Lyn M. Bechtel and Tikva Frymer-Kensky to suggest that based on word order, Dinah may not have actually been raped by Shechem.³ The argument made by Bechtel is that “in descriptions of rape, ‘violate’ precedes ‘lie with,’ while in cases of consensual sex, ‘violate’ follows ‘lie with.’”⁴ In her book, *Reading the Women of the Bible*, Frymer-Kensky provides a reading that compares the stories of Dinah and Tamar.⁵ She argues that ה.נ.ע (*innah* – ‘to humble’) refers more generally to an act of humbling or degrading of a person, and in cases when כ.כ.ש (*shachav* – ‘to lie down’) precedes ה.נ.ע (*innah*), the humbling of a woman is a causal result of the illicit sex act of any kind—not necessarily rape. Contrasting this, ה.נ.ע (*innah*) preceding כ.כ.ש (*shachav*) is illustrative of the fact

² Eve Levavi Feinstein, *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 72-73.

⁴ Feinstein, 73.

⁵ The Rape of Dinah (Genesis 34) tells the story of a local Hivite prince raping Dinah, the only daughter of Jacob. The Rape of Tamar (2 Samuel 13) tells the story of Amnon, one of King David’s sons, raping King David’s daughter, Tamar. Both stories are traditionally interpreted as stories of rape.

that the violence of raping a woman starts before the physical act of penetration. Thus, according to Frymer-Kensky, *ה.ג.ע* (*innah*) preceding *ג.כ.ש* (*shachav*), as it does in the story of Tamar, but does not in the story of Dinah, would insinuate an instance of rape.⁶ Following this line of logic, certain translators and biblical commentators would argue that “The Rape of Dinah” is a misnomer for a story that could perhaps better be described as a tragedy of star-crossed lovers. Frymer-Kensky is also careful to emphasize that *ה.ג.ע* (*innah*) “usually has nothing to do with sex.”⁷

This is directly contradicted by L. Juliana M. Claassens’ trauma-informed examination of Tamar’s story, in which she writes that Tamar, “uses the technical term for rape (*‘al te’annēnī*)⁸ in order to describe her impending violation.”⁹ As will be touched upon later in this paper, *ה.ג.ע* (*innah*) is a term fraught with disagreement among scholars and translators. In her paper, Claassens further argues that by examining Tamar’s story through a lens of trauma, some of the agency that Tamar has lost can be returned to her. She makes the compelling point that to “retell Tamar’s story from the victim’s perspective with a focus on survival and recovery is an act of resistance in itself.”¹⁰ Focusing on the victim-survivor’s story, as opposed to the act of the perpetrator, is certainly a subversive approach to Tamar’s story. As such, her article is an important step in enriching biblical scholarship with the inclusion of trauma-informed analysis and translation. While I agree with and appreciate the intention and argument of Claassens, I fear we cannot ignore the reality of the text from which we are interpreting and retelling

⁶ Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *Reading the Women of the Bible* (New York: Schocken Books, 2002), 183.

⁷ Frymer-Kensky, 183.

⁸ Translated: “do not rape me.”

⁹ L. Juliana M. Claassens. “Trauma and Recovery: A New Hermeneutical Framework for the Rape of Tamar (2 Samuel 13)” in *Bible through the Lens of Trauma*, ed. Elizabeth Boase and Christopher G. Frechette (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 185.

¹⁰ Claassens, ed. Boase and Frechette, 191.

stories. There is certainly a place for the liberative work that Claassens proposes, but in this paper, I will seek to take meaning from the fact that readers of the text do not have the privilege of knowing if and how Tamar recovers and transforms from victim to survivor.

In her book, *Rape Plots: A Feminist Cultural Study of Genesis 34*, Susanne Scholz offers an extensive and comprehensive commentary on the story of Dinah, including a summary and critical analysis of the vast history of commentaries on the story that have developed over time.¹¹ It is certainly a foundational piece of scholarship for biblical scholars seeking to analyze Genesis 34 through a feminist and liberation lens. However, I'd like to highlight two aspects of her work that are particularly pertinent to this paper. The first is that, as she writes in the conclusion, one of the central assumptions upon which the paper operates is that Dinah was raped, and that this is the heart of the story, something that, as has been explained above, is certainly not necessarily a given in all interpretations.¹² I, myself, argue that though a feminist perspective certainly must highlight the violence against Dinah as the central action, the text itself doesn't lend itself easily to that due to its focus on the men's actions after the fact. The second section I'd like to highlight is her discussion of rape, not as an isolated form of violence committed by all men against all women, but as one branch of systemic violence that disproportionately affects people who hold multiple marginalized identities. She references other seminal scholars of intersectional liberation, including the following quote from bell hooks: "feminist efforts to end male violence against women must be

¹¹ Susanne Scholz, *Rape Plots: A Feminist cultural Study of Genesis 34* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2000).

¹² Scholz, 167.

expanded into a movement to end all forms of violence.”¹³ Scholz’s interpretation of this is that, “[bell] hooks is tired of feminists who see women as innocent victims of violence.”¹⁴ I would amend this to say that bell hooks was tired of feminists who see *white* women as innocent victims of violence. Furthermore, in the context of this paper, I would implicate any free woman who holds a certain level of social, financial, or ethnic and racial privilege as a harmful enabler and actor in the patriarchy.

It is not enough to simply acknowledge that gendered violence disproportionately impacts women who hold marginalized racial, socioeconomic, religious, or national identities. Speaking as a white woman, it is our responsibility to recognize the ways in which we are complicit in violence against *all* women, particularly those who have less privilege than we ourselves do. Complicity can range from simply staying silent when we see daily instances of misogynoir to not standing in solidarity with women of color when they tell us that they are being disproportionately marginalized by medical, judicial, educational, carceral, and other systems in the United States. In the course of analyzing the stories presented in this paper, we will see instances of both a woman not using her position of power to be an ally for those who don’t hold her status, as well as a woman actively putting a woman of a lesser status directly in harm’s way.

Through the course of this paper, I will lean on, modify, and sometimes outright contradict aspects of the feminist scholarly work discussed in this section. While they provided a foundation to understanding the ongoing scholarly conversations around the topic of sexual violence in the Hebrew Bible, I address similar themes through my own

¹³ bell hooks, “Feminist Movement to End Violence,” chap. In *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Boston: South End, 1984), 130.

¹⁴ Scholz, 35.

interpretations that are firmly rooted in the text, aiming to answer questions of why the biblical redactors chose to tell stories in a certain way, and hoping to illuminate ways in which other contemporary interpretations can use such understandings to examine a variety of violence in biblical stories productively.

Author Statement & Positionality

Before delving further into my own translations and interpretations of these violent biblical stories, it is important to acknowledge my own positionality. At the time of writing, I am a 23-year-old Jewish woman who was raised hearing stories of, and sometimes revering, many of the same biblical figures whose moral characters I strive to complicate in this paper. I am also a survivor of sexual abuse, and one who did not receive justice, either legally or otherwise. I include these identities not because I think any of them impact or detract from my ability to tackle this subject as a skilled translator and experienced textual analyst of the Hebrew Bible. Rather, I have chosen to disclose these particular identities because they are not parts of myself that I put aside during this work. They are the very identities that have driven me to answer these questions in an effort to re-enfranchise those who have also felt disenfranchised by the existing one-dimensional and patriarchal translations and analyses of these Hebrew Bible stories.

Edited To Add in March 2022: In the course of my writing this paper, I was the victim of another sexual assault. This event shifted my mindset and experience embarking on the latter portion of this project.¹⁵ This time around, I am seeking a path of

¹⁵ See Appendix B. After the assault, I took some time away from the research side of this project in order to reflect and conduct some creative writing about what I had experienced, and how it changed how I felt about this endeavor. One of my goals at the outset of writing this thesis was to push back against the way in which scholarship is frequently siloed as separate from the emotional positionality of its author. As a result, I decided to include my identity as a survivor in my positionality statement, as well as the letters that I wrote to the women whose stories of trauma I was using in my academic pursuits.

justice that feels restorative and healing to me. This was a decision that I feel privileged to have been able to make, and I am acutely aware that many of the women described in the stories I've been translating and analyzing did not have the privilege of agency when navigating the resolution processes in the aftermath of their violent experiences.

Context

Several questions arose throughout the course of this research that warrant addressing before continuing. The first is that of the difference between legal definitions of rape and societal understandings of sexual violence. For the purposes of this project, I conceive of legal definitions of rape as acts that have a specific recourse through some form of legal system, such as a trial, or an execution. I conceive of societal definitions of rape as how people, as members of a society and community, define sexual violence and choose when and how to take more informal steps toward justice. Obviously, the latter is extremely subjective and changes based on who you ask, what their relationship to their community is, and where in the world they are located. Even though the legal definitions are less subjective, they do vary widely throughout the world even in our modern context. In this section of the paper, I will provide some background on different legal systems described in the Tanakh and how they define different forbidden sex acts (which includes adultery, rape, bestiality, and incest, among other things).

However, I am primarily analyzing these stories through the lens of a modern American conception of sexual violence, which I define as: harassment or physical contact of a sexual nature perpetrated by one person against (an)other(s) who has not given consent. By this definition, any example of a slave, handmaid, or concubine having

sex with someone of higher status will be considered rape because there is a power differential that deems the person of lower status unable to consent without coercion or threat of violence against them if they do not obey. It is important to note that this categorization is not congruent with what would have been considered rape according to biblical law.

The section of biblical law relevant to this paper is that of the Holiness Code, Leviticus 17 through Leviticus 26, which lays out a number of ways in which people are to act in accordance with purity laws. I will also reference Deuteronomy 22 due to its mention of additional laws around purity and rape,¹⁶ but it is not included in the Holiness Code. According to David Tabb Stewart's interpretation of biblical laws, "slaves are sexually subject to their masters, except for the promised slave woman."¹⁷ In other words, unless a slave is promised as a wife to someone, there is legally no way for a slave to be considered raped by her master. However, if she comes into sexual contact other than her "owner or promised husband," she will be excused from punishment, but her rapist will only receive the second-degree punishment of sacrificing a ram.¹⁸

The case of incest is an interesting one. The Holiness Code forbids any sexual relations between "near-kin."¹⁹ Two additional verses specifically condemn a son for engaging in sexual relations with a father/mother, or stepmother, respectively.²⁰

Additionally, the biblical redactors are sure to include the story of Reuben having sex

¹⁶ Deuteronomy 22:28-29 translation: "If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, that is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found; then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife, because he hath humbled her; he may not put her away all his days." (Translation provided by Jewish Publication Society Bible via biblehub.com).

¹⁷ David Tabb Stewart, "Categories of Sexuality Indigenous to Biblical Legal Materials" in *Sexuality and Law in the Torah* ed. Hilary Lipka and Bruce Wells (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020), 43.

¹⁸ Stewart, 40.

¹⁹ Leviticus 18:6.

²⁰ Leviticus 18:7-8.

with one of Jacob's wives, Bilhah, who is not Reuben's mother,²¹ and to specifically condemn him in Jacob's song of tribal inheritance in Genesis 49:4.²² Overall, while all forms of incest are forbidden, the majority of the examples provided are of a son having sex with one of his father's wives. This raises the question of *why* the redactors chose to offer us so much specificity around this particular brand of incest when all incest is considered taboo according to biblical law. It appears that the son-father's wife type of incest is a direct subversion of a patriarchal familial structure. A sexual encounter between a son and his father's wife could potentially destabilize the father's position of authority in the family. Thus, while all forms of incest are considered impure, the one for which there is the most information serves to protect and maintain the male head-of-household's power.²³ As we analyze the stories of illicit sex that follow, this correlation between how the act subverts the patriarchy and how men in the story decide to embark on revenge plots will remain consistent. We will continue to see men respond with violence to the actions of other men that threaten the stability of their patriarchal power while paying little regard to the women who are most directly impacted.

Methodology

In order to contrast stories of rape with other stories of sexual encounters, I created a taxonomy that would aid in the categorization according to the patterns I noticed when translating the selection of stories. Based on previous research on how

²¹ Genesis 35:22.

²² Stewart, 36.

²³ It should be noted that among the incest laws found in Leviticus 18, the Holiness Code does not specifically forbid incest between a father and daughter. The questions that this raises about the implications of such an omission warrant an analysis that is larger than the scope of this paper.

formal and informal systems of justice acted differently upon different women in the Bible based on their other identities,²⁴ particularly nationality and class, much of my line of inquiry for this research revolved around those dimensions of identity.

As such, the questions that are asked of the text in this taxonomy are as follows:

1. Does the woman speak?
2. What is the social status (class) and nationality of the victim (woman in these cases)?
3. What is the social status (class) and nationality of the perpetrator (man in these cases)?
4. What is the predominant diction surrounding and/or describing the sexual encounter?
5. How many verses are dedicated to the act of sexual assault itself?
6. How many verses are dedicated to the fallout or acts of justice from the event?
7. What constitutes the fallout or acts of justice?
8. Who initiates the fallout or acts of justice, and what is their relationship status to the perpetrator and/or victim?

Fallout

I have divided the types of fallout into three categories. The first is “restorative justice.” I define restorative justice as a resolution process in which the perpetrator admits

²⁴ See Appendix A, which provides selection from a paper written for my Advanced Hebrew class. The thesis of said paper is that Israelite women are not treated nearly as harshly as non-Israelite women for their crimes. I further argue that the difference in treatment of these categories of women is the result of post-exilic redactors modifying the characterization of women in the Bible to further their ideologies of the time after the Babylonian exile. I include sections of it in this paper because it informed my process of recognizing the intersectional identities of oppression that exist in the Hebrew Bible. Furthermore, it provides an excellent case study of restorative justice, a form of justice that is notably missing from the stories presented in this paper.

to their wrongdoing and takes the steps the community deems necessary to restore balance where harm was caused. There are examples of this type of legal proceeding in the Bible in cases of transgression other than sexual assault,²⁵ so I sought to discover if there were examples in the stories selected where that was the path chosen. The second is “retributive justice,” which I define as either the victim or people on the victim’s behalf taking violent action against the perpetrator. The final category is arguably the most telling when it comes to understanding dynamics of sexual violence in the bible: “not considered rape.” When I say that it isn’t considered rape, I am not saying that there haven’t been biblical scholars or commentators who have argued that these instances were rape because some have.²⁶ Other scholars acknowledge that in our modern understanding of human rights, Hagar was certainly raped, but that her gaining of status upon conception with Avram’s child is indicative of her being “more than happy with her situation.”²⁷ Rather, I mean they are not traditionally referred to as stories of sexual violence, meant (by the redactors) to teach readers a lesson about the event specifically regarding what happens before, during, or after, to any of the players involved in the act. As such, there is no fallout that we, as readers of the text, are witness to.

Diction

An entire analysis could be dedicated exclusively to the words and word order seen in the stories. However, the three words I’ve chosen to focus on are לָקַח (*laqah* – ‘to take’), עָנָה (*innah* – ‘to humble’, sometimes translated as ‘rape’), and שָׁחַב (*shachav*

²⁵ See Appendix A.

²⁶ Kelsey West, “Interpretations of Hagar: Pathway to Healing in the Wake of Sexual Assault” (senior inquiry: Augustana College, 2017).

²⁷ Mzukisi Welcome Faleni, “Hagar: case study of abuse of women” (master’s thesis: University of the Western Cape, 2008), 98.

- 'to lie down'). In addition to being used to describe the acquiring of an object, ל.ק.ה (laqah) can have more euphemistic meanings related to marriage ("he took her for/as his wife"), or refer to the "taking" of someone in a sexual context, the latter generally being paired with ש.כ.ב (shachav - "he took her...and he lay with her")²⁸. ש.כ.ב (shachav) similarly can either mean simply to lie down (for sleep), or, when paired with the preposition א (et 'with'), can take on the meaning of having sex with someone. Due to both of these words' multiple meanings, a translator has to rely heavily on context clues and the verbiage around ל.ק.ה (laqah) and ש.כ.ב (shachav) in order to select an appropriate meaning. I delve more into the minutiae of their use in each of the stories presented here in the analysis section.

ה.נ.ע (innah) presents even more complications for the translator. According to the Brown-Driver-Briggs (henceforth, 'BDB') Hebrew-English Lexicon, there are four separate definitions for this *shoresh*, or root.²⁹ All of the use-cases seen in the stories discussed in this paper refer to their third definition, which, in its Pa'al, or Qal, *binyan* is defined as to "be bowed down, afflicted."³⁰ However, when used in the Pi'el form, a *binyan* that is used to intensify the actions denoted by the Pa'al version of the verb, the *shoresh* is translated as to "humble, mishandle, afflict," an individual, or to "humble a woman by cohabit[ing]."³¹ To clarify the latter beyond the euphemistic BDB definition, it means to lower an unmarried woman's value by having sex with her. Depending on the translation, ה.נ.ע (innah) is either translated very literally as someone "afflicting" or

²⁸ 2 Samuel 11:4.

²⁹ Francis Brown, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English lexicon: with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic : coded with the numbering system from Strong's Exhaustive concordance of the Bible* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), s.v. ה.נ.ע.

³⁰ Brown, s.v. ה.נ.ע.

³¹ Brown, s.v. ה.נ.ע.

“humbling” a woman or is taken to mean “rape.” In spite of translators’ use of the word “rape,” the definition really has nothing to do with whether or not a woman is consenting to the sexual act. As established already in this paper, a direct translation of this word, devoid of context, is not quite sufficient to encompass the sociopolitical complexities of the act of rape both in the Bible and in our modern world.

Taxonomy Introduction

In selecting the stories for analysis through the taxonomy, I attempted to include those which are canonically considered rape, such as that of Dinah and Tamar, as well as those for which there is a much more limited group of scholars who deem them rape. They are organized in the table you will see on the following page, as well as throughout the analysis section in descending order according to how widely accepted they are as stories of sexual violence. We start off with Tamar, followed by Dinah whose story has been the center of some scholarly debate. We then move into the story of Bathsheba, for which there is some scholarship arguing for it to be considered a rape story, though that scholarship is much more limited. The story of Avram and Hagar has rarely been considered one of rape in mainstream scholarship, thus its placement at the end of the collection. We finish, however, with the story of Isaac meeting Rebekah in an attempt to contextualize these violent stories within the wider world of consensual marriage stories in the Hebrew Bible.

Story	Does the woman speak?	Status / Nationality of victim?	Status / Nationality of perpetrator?	Predominant Verbiage	How many verses devoted to act of rape?	How many verses devoted to the fallout?	What is the fallout? (REST*, RET**, NCR***)	Who initiates the fallout/justice? What is their relationship to the assaulted and community?
<i>Rape of Tamar</i>	Y	Princess Israelite	Prince Israelite	ה.ג.ה (innah), ש.כ.ב (shachav)	4	19	RET	Tamar's brother (Absolom)
<i>Rape of Dinah</i>	N	Jacob's daughter Israelite	Prince Hivite	ה.ג.ה (innah), ש.כ.ב (shachav)	1	29	RET	Dinah's brothers (Shimon and Levi)
<i>David and Bathsheba</i>	N	General's wife Israelite	King Israelite	ה.ק.ל (laqah), ש.כ.ב (shachav)	1	22	NCR	N/A
<i>Abraham and Hagar</i>	N	Servant/ Slave Egyptian	Abraham Israelite	נ.ת.ג (natan)	1	2	NCR	N/A
<i>Isaac and Rebekah</i> (included as a comparison)	Y	Israelite	Isaac Israelite	ה.ק.ל (laqah), multiple active verbs of movement coming from Rebekah	N/A	N/A	NCR	N/A

*REST = Restorative Justice

**RET = Retributive Justice

***NCR = Not considered rape

Table 1: Taxonomy

Analysis

The following section contains translations and discussions of the five stories listed in Table 1. I have named the stories according to what seems to be the most compelling and relevant detail. Following the title, I offer my own translation of the text from the Hebrew Bible, followed up with my commentary and analysis on the passage as it pertains to the taxonomy.

The Rape of Tamar

Translation of 2 Samuel 13:

- (1) Time passed. And Absalom, son of David, had a beautiful sister, and her name was Tamar. And Amnon, son of David, loved her.
- (2) And Amnon was anguished and made himself sick because of his sister Tamar because she was a virgin, and it was impossible in the eyes of Amnon to do anything to her.
- (3) And Amnon had a friend, and his name was Yonadav, the son of Shemia who was the brother of David. And Yonadav was a very wise man.
- (4) And Yonadav said to Amnon “what’s making you this weak? Will you not tell me what’s the son of the king suffer morning in, morning out?” And Amnon said to him, “I love Tamar, the sister of Absalom, my brother.”
- (5) And Yonadav said to him (Amnon), “lie upon your bed and make yourself ill. And your father will come to see you and you will say to him, ‘please may Tamar, my sister, come, and she will feed me food, and she will do before my eyes, in order that I will see. And I will eat from her hand.’”
- (6) And Amnon laid down, and he made himself ill, and the king came to see him and Amnon said to the king “please may Tamar my sister come and make cakes before my eyes, two cakes, and I will eat from her hand.”
- (7) And David sent word to Tamar’s house saying, “please go to the house of Amnon, your brother, and make food for him.”
- (8) And Tamar went to the house of Amnon, her brother, and he was lying down. And she took the dough, and she kneaded it and she made cakes before his eyes and produced the heart-shaped cakes.
- (9) And she took the pan and put it before him, and he refused to eat, and Amnon said “send away every man,” and every man left.
- (10) And Amnon said to Tamar, bring the food to my chamber, and I will eat from your hand. And Tamar took the food that she made, and she brought it to Amnon, her brother, in his chamber.

- (11) And she drew near to him. And he grabbed her, and he said to her “come lie with me, my sister.”
- (12) And she said to him “Do not, my brother. Do not rape me because one doesn’t do this in Israel. Do not act with this foolishness.
- (13) And whither will I go with my reproach? You will be like one of the fools in Israel. And now please speak to the king, for he won’t withhold me from you.”
- (14) And he did not listen to her, and he was stronger than she, and he raped her, and he laid with her.
- (15) And Amnon hated her so much that his hatred was bigger than the love he had had for her. And Amnon said to her, “get up; leave me.”
- (16) And she said to him “this is a greater evil than that that you did with me, to send me away.” And he did not listen to her.
- (17) And he called his young man-servant, and he said, “please send her away from me to the outside and lock the door after her.”
- (18) And Tamar had on a full-coverage tunic because those were the robes worn by the daughters of the king. And the servant sent her outside, and he locked the door behind her.
- (19) And Tamar put ashes upon her head, and she tore the full-coverage tunic that she wore, and she put her hands upon her head, and she surely went, and she cried.
- (20) And Absalom, her brother, said to her, “Was your brother Amnon with you? Now my sister, stay silent. He is your brother. Do not set your heart to speak of this.” And Tamar dwelled desolate in the house of Absalom, her brother.
- (21) And the king David heard all of these things, and he had a lot of anger.
- (22) And Absalom didn’t speak with Amnon from evil to good because Absalom hated Amnon on account that he raped Tamar his sister.
- (23) Two years passed, and Absalom had shearers in Ba’al Hazor, which is near to Ephraim, and Absalom called to all the sons of the king.
- (24) And Absalom came to the king, and he said “please behold the shearers your servant has. Let the king and his servant go with your servants.”
- (25) And the king said to Absalom “no, my son. Let not all of us go, so we will not be burdensome upon you. And Absalom urged David, but he would not agree to go, and David blessed Absalom.
- (26) Absalom said “and may Amnon, my brother, at least go with us?” And the king said to him “why he would go with you?
- (27) But Absalom urged, and David sent Amnon and all the sons of the king with him.
- (28) And Absalom commanded his young men, saying “please take note when the heart of Amnon is drunk with wine, and I will say to all of you: ‘smite Amnon and kill him,’ do not fear—because I have commanded you all. Grow strong, and you will be sons of an army.

(29) And the young men of Absalom did to Amnon that which Absalom commanded. And all the sons of the king rose, and they mounted and rode, each upon his mule, and they fled.

(30) And they were on the way, and the report came to David saying “Absalom smote all the sons of the king, and from them not one remains.”

(31) And the king arose and tore his clothes, and he laid on the earth, and all his servants were standing, torn of garments.

(32) And Yonadav, son of Shemiah, brother of David answered, and he said “do not say, my lord, that all of the young sons of the king have died. Amnon on his own died because Absalom has had a scowl upon his lips from the day he raped Tamar his sister.

(33) And now, my lord the king, do not put to your heart a word saying ‘all the sons of the king have died’ because Amnon alone has died.”

(34) And Absalom fled, and the young spy lifted his eyes, and he saw. And behold, many people were coming from the road after him from the side of the mountain.

(35) And Yonadav said to the king, “behold the sons of the king are coming just like what your servant said.”

(36) And it was as he finished speaking, and behold, the sons of the king came, and they lifted their voices and they wept and also the king and all his servants wept a very great weeping.

(37) And Absalom fled and he went to Talmai, son of Amihor, king of Geshur. And David mourned over his son every day.

(38) And Absalom fled and he went toward Geshur, and he was there three years.

(39) And David the king yearned to the point of perishing to go out to Absalom because he was comforted regarding Amnon because he had died.

There are several things to note in this troubling story. The first is that, as shown in Table 1, of all the women whose stories are explored in this paper, Tamar is the only one who speaks. In verses 12 and 13, after Amnon has requested that she have sex with him, she says, “Do not, my brother. Do not rape me because one doesn’t do this in Israel. Do not act with this foolishness. And whither will I go with my reproach? You will be like one of the fools in Israel. And now please speak to the king, for he won’t withhold me from you.” In many of these stories, including that of Dinah, we can only assume that the woman involved is not consenting because of the word-choice of the redactors, the interpretations of biblical commentators who precede us, and our own interpretation of

events given the context. 2 Samuel 13 is a unique instance in which we painfully witness a woman begging her brother not to rape her. We can make guesses as to why she is objecting, one of the likely explanations being that she knows how this will impact her status as an unmarried woman in the kingdom of Israel, hence her question as to where she will go now that she has been effectively devalued by the patriarchal society in which she exists. Truthfully, however, her reasoning doesn't matter because it is beyond clear that she did not consent to what happens in the following verse, yet her pleas are ignored.

The second time she speaks is when Amnon's love for her turns to hatred after raping her, and he tells her to leave. In response to this, Tamar says, "this is a greater evil than that that you did with me, to send me away." This is because she knows that if Amnon rejects her and refuses to marry her, she will be a "humbled" woman who is unvalued in their society. This, of course, is not true for Tamar to the same extent that it is true for other women who are sexually assaulted in the Hebrew Bible, for she is a princess, the daughter of King David, which affords her a certain amount of privilege that cannot be ignored. However, she is clearly attempting to do everything in her power to appeal to her brother's empathy in reasoning with him about what her life will logistically look like if he abandons her now. Though her privilege offers her a cushion on which she can fall back, it does not protect her unequivocally, and again, her pleas are ignored.

After verse 16, we do not hear from Tamar again in the course of these specific events. She is sent away, she covers herself in a tunic and ashes in mourning, and she seeks solace from her other brother, Absalom. Not only does Absalom not give Tamar a chance to speak, but he specifically tells her that she must remain silent *because* Amnon is her brother. It is difficult to know whether he means this in the sense that she should

not speak of this because she could get in trouble for having sex with her brother, which is a crime of incest, or if she should not speak of it to protect Amnon's reputation, something she owes him because of their relationship as siblings. Again, his intention is frankly unimportant when we consider the impact his actions and words have. It is at this point in the story that Tamar loses a grasp on what little agency she previously had. She is not given a voice or space to process the trauma she just endured, and she certainly doesn't have any say in if and how justice will be enacted. There are two verses dedicated to the act of her rape, she speaks twice, both times in protest of actions that will cause harm to befall her, and then there are nineteen verses dedicated to Absalom devising a plan for and killing Amnon in revenge. Absalom claims that he hates Amnon on account of raping his sister,³² so readers can deduce that his killing Amnon is also an act of hatred on behalf of his love of Tamar. However, it should be noted that as David's firstborn son, Amnon stood to inherit more than Absalom after David's death, which raises questions as to Absalom's true motivation for murdering his brother. After all, the love Absalom has for Tamar doesn't appear to prompt him to listen to her or care for her in the aftermath of this traumatic event. Amnon's rape of Tamar was illegal in accordance with the laws of the time and place, and there would conceivably be punishment for him through the justice system, especially considering how angry David was.³³ What Tamar needed in that moment was someone to sit with her and listen when she was ready to speak; she did not need her brother to abandon her when she was at her most vulnerable in order to do something on her behalf that she did not ask for. It is difficult to think of Absalom as the hero of Tamar's story when he silences her just as Amnon did.

³² 2 Samuel 13:22.

³³ 2 Samuel 13:21.

Though nothing that befalls Tamar in this story is her own fault, it is nonetheless important to interrogate the moment Tamar stops speaking from a perspective of status and power. As stated, Tamar is able to and decides to live out her days in Absalom's house after she is raped by Amnon. She is afforded this opportunity because she is a princess, and her family has the financial and political power to keep her under their roof when she becomes unmarriageable. This is not a privilege that many families and women had at the time. In many cases, a woman who had been raped would have potentially been thrown out of her father's house or sold as a concubine since the father would no longer be able to recover the money he lost from not acquiring her bride-price. Tamar's positionality is unique, and in addition to affording her safety and physical comfort through her life, it also would have theoretically afforded her a certain level of protection if she chose to ignore Absalom's request that she stay silent. Here was an opportunity to be an ally to women who weren't wealthy and adjacent to political influence but were still suffering at the hands of violent men, but Tamar, such a fierce self-advocate up until this point, stops speaking. While she is an innocent victim of the harm that befell her, her silence becomes a weapon of the patriarchy that consequently causes harm to other women.

Although she ultimately remains silent, the extent to which Tamar vocalizes her wants, and, more importantly, what she doesn't want, early on in the story is incredibly unique. In the story of Jacob's only daughter, Dinah, our tragic protagonist doesn't speak at all, and readers are left to make conjectures about her thoughts, feelings, and desires.

The Rape of Dinah

Translation of Genesis 34:

(1) And Dinah, daughter of Leah which she begat unto Jacob, went out to visit with the daughters of the land.

(2) And Shechem, son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land, saw her, and he took her, and he lay with her, and he raped her.

(3) And his soul clung on Dinah, daughter of Jacob. And he loved the young woman, and he spoke upon the heart of the young woman.

(4) And Shechem said to Hamor, his father, saying, "take for me this young girl for a wife."

(5) And Jacob heard that Shechem sexually defiled Dinah, his daughter. His sons were with his cattle in the field. And Jacob was silent until their return.

(6) And Hamor father of Shechem, went out to Jacob to speak with him.

(7) And the sons of Jacob came from the field when they heard. And the men were deeply vexed. And there was a very angry because it is a sacrilegious deed in Israel to lie with the daughter of Jacob, so one does not do it.

(8) And Hamor spoke with them saying, "Shechem my son's soul is attached to your daughter. Please give her to him as a wife.

(9) And make us sons-in law. Give your daughters to us and take our daughters for yourselves.

(10) And stay with us, and this land will be before you all. Stay, and travel around it, and engage in trade within it."

(11) And Shechem said to Dinah's father and to her brothers, "I will find favor in your eyes, and I will give that which you all have said to me.

(12) Set a very great a bride-price and request gifts of me, and I will give them when you say so, and you will give to me the young woman as a wife."

(13) And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father with deceit, and they said that Dinah, their sister, had been sexually defiled.

(14) And they said to them "we cannot do this thing, to give our sister as a wife to he who has his foreskin because that is a disgrace to us.

(15) But you have our consent, if you will be like us, to be circumcised, all of you and all your young men.

(16) And we will give our daughters to you, and we will take for ourselves your daughters, and we will dwell with you, and we will become one people.

(17) And if you do not obey us to circumcise, and we will take our daughter, and we will go."

(18) And their words were pleasing in the eyes of Hamor and in the eyes of Shechem, son of Hamor.

(19) And the young man did not delay to do the thing (circumcision) because he (Shechem) delighted in the daughter of Jacob, and he was more honored than the house of his father.

(20) And Hamor came with Shechem his son, to the gates of the city, and they said to the men of the city, saying,

(21) “These men, they are making peace with us, and they will dwell in the land and they will travel around it, and the land, behold, is an expanse before them. We will take for ourselves their daughters for wives, and we will give to them our daughters.

(22) But the men have consented to us to dwell with us, to become one people, in (exchange for) the circumcision of all of our young men as they are circumcised.

(23) Their cattle and their acquired things and all of their animals, will they not be ours? But we have agreed to them, and they will dwell with us.”

(24) And the young men listened to Hamor and to Shechem his son outside of the gates of the city, and they circumcised every young man the outside of the gates of the city.

(25) On the third day of their being in pain, two of the sons of Jacob, Shimon and Levi, brothers of Dinah, each took up his sword, and they came upon the city securely, and they slayed all the young men.

(26) And they slayed Hamor and Shechem, his son, with the edge of the sword. And they took Dinah from the house of Shechem, and they went out.

(27) The sons of Jacob came upon the pierced ones, and they plundered the city that defiled their sister.

(28) They took their flocks and their herds and their asses and that which was in the city and that which was in the field.

(29) They captured all their soldiers, and their children, and all their wives and they plundered all that was in the house.

(30) And Jacob said to Shimon and Levi, “you have stirred up trouble for me, to make me stink in the dwelling of the land, with the Canaanites, and with the Perizzites, and I am males of a (small) number. They will gather upon me, and they will kill me, and we will be exterminated, me and my house.”

(31) And Shimon and Levi said, “will it make our sister a prostitute?”

Unlike in Tamar’s story, we don’t get to hear a single word from Dinah. This has been cause for a lot of scholarly conjecture about whether or not she did consent to having sex with Shechem, in spite of redactors using a word that commonly denotes

rape.³⁴ It is entirely possible that Dinah may have consented to this sexual intercourse. The fact of the matter is, we cannot know as sure as we can know in the case of Tamar and her objections, because Dinah doesn't speak. What we do know is that Dinah was young, and she ventured out into a city that she did not know with the intention of connecting with other women, and it was during this venture that she became an object of desire of a man she did not personally know, but with whose father her own father had been doing dealings.³⁵

According to the biblical law, it was illegal to rape an unpromised woman *if* the rapist was unwilling to pay the woman's father the bride-price.³⁶ This is somewhat complicated by the fact that Jacob and his family are not, in this story, on land that is theirs, and the rapist in question is the son of this city's leader. However, Shechem immediately fell in love with Dinah and requested that he marry her. Hamor, his father, and Shechem were willing to pay the bride-price, which included a stipulation that they both be circumcised, and that they require all young men in their city to be circumcised as well. Assuming that the redactors wanted to portray Jacob and his sons as adhering to the Hebrew Bible's laws around rape as laid out in Deuteronomy 22, they could have accepted the offer for marriage, alliance, and friendship from Hamor and Shechem, and Dinah would have had her reputation and life preserved.

However, this isn't enough for Simon and Levi, two of Jacob's sons who Leah bore. They choose to take advantage of the city while the men are all recovering from the

³⁴ Helena Zlotnick, "From Dinah to Cozbi: Rape, Sex, and Foundational Moments" in *Dinah's Daughters: Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 34.

³⁵ Genesis 33:18-19.

³⁶ Zlotnick, 38.

circumcision procedures to pillage their homes and palace, kidnap their women and children, and slay all of the men. Like in the story of Tamar, this is said to be on behalf of their sister,³⁷ yet we do not know of Dinah's welfare after these events. It is theoretically possible that she was accidentally killed in the fighting, and at the very least, if she survived, she has now lost any chance of being redeemed as a woman of value in their society. Though it is Shechem who is to blame for having raped her, it is her own brothers who took away her chance at, at the very least, surviving in a world that would otherwise shame and reject her for something that happened to her beyond her control. However, it would not look good for the legacy of Jacob's family as leaders of those in the covenant if the brothers stood by and made their sister "a prostitute"³⁸ when she was raped by an outsider, so they make an example of the people in this foreign city. This is a clear example of how even when the laws of Deuteronomy 22:28-29 are able to potentially offer protection to a woman who has been harmed, protecting the larger patriarchal structure takes precedence for the men involved.

The Rape of Bathsheba

Translation of 2 Samuel 11:

- (1) And it was the return of the year, the season of the exit of the kings. And David sent Joab and his servant with him and all of Israel. And they brought to ruin the sons of Amon, and they besieged Rabbah, and David stayed in Jerusalem.
- (2) And in the evening, David arose from upon his bed, and he paced on the roof of the house of the king. And he saw a woman bathing from upon the roof. And the woman was very good-looking.
- (3) And David sent and sought after the woman, and he said "is this not Bathsheba, daughter of Eliam? Wife of Uriah, the Hittite?"
- (4) And David sent messengers and he took her, and she came to him. And he lay with her. She had purified herself from her uncleanness, and she returned to her house.

³⁷ Genesis 34:31.

³⁸ Genesis 34:31.

- (5) And the woman conceived, and she sent word to tell David, and she said “I am pregnant.”
- (6) And David sent to Joab “send me Uriah the Hittite,” and Joab sent Uriah to David.
- (7) Uriah came to him, and David asked after the welfare of Joab, and the welfare of the people, and the welfare of the war.
- (8) And David said to Uriah, go down to your house, and cleanse your feet. And Uriah went out from the house of the king. And he went out and a portion of food from the king went with him.
- (9) And Uriah laid down in the doorway of the house of the king with all the servants of his lord, and he didn’t go down to his house.
- (10) And the servants said to David, saying, “Uriah did not go down to his house,” and David said to Uriah, “are you not coming from a journey? Why did you not go down to your house?”
- (11) And Uriah said to David, “the ark, and Israel, and Judah sit upon army dwellings, and my lord Joab, and the servants of my lord are encamping on the face of the field. And I will come to my house to eat, and to drink and to lay with my wife? It’s your life and the life of your soul if I will do this thing.
- (12) And David said to Uriah, “stay here also today, and I will send for you tomorrow.” And Uriah stayed in Jerusalem on that day and the next.
- (13) And David called to him, and Uriah ate before David, and he drank, and David made Uriah drunk. And Uriah went forth in the evening, to lie in his bed with the servants of his lord, and he didn’t descend to his house.
- (14) And in the morning, David wrote a missive to Joab and sent (it) in the hand of Uriah.
- (15) And he wrote in the missive, saying “bring Uriah to the front of the face of the violent battle, and you will all be behind him, and he will be smote, and he will die.
- (16) And while Joab was guarding the city, he gave Uriah to the place that he knew that the valorous warriors were.
- (17) And the men of the city went forth, and they fought with Joab, and they fell from the ranks of the servants of David, and Uriah the Hittite died also.
- (18) And Joab sent and told to David all of the things of the war.
- (19) And Joab commanded the messenger, saying “as you are at the end of telling of all the things of the war to the king,
- (20) If the anger of the king rises, and he says to you ‘why did you all draw near to the city to fight. Did you not know that they shoot from upon the wall?
- (21) Who killed Avimelech, son of Yeruveshet? Did a woman not throw upon him an upper millstone from upon the wall, and he died in Tevetz. Why did you all draw near to the wall?’ you will say ‘also your servant Uriah the Hittite died.’”
- (22) And the messenger went and he came, and he told to David all that Joab sent.

(23) And the messenger said to David that “the men were mighty upon us, and they went forth to us (in) the field, and we were upon them at the opening of the gate.

(24) And the shooters shot to your servants from upon the wall, and they died from the servants of the king, and also your servant Uriah the Hittite died.”

(25) And David said to the messenger “you will say this to Joab, ‘do not consider this thing bad because so it goes a sword will consume; strengthen your war to the city and besiege and give him strength.’”

(26) And the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah her husband died, and she lamented upon her husband.

(27) And the period of mourning passed, and David sent and collected her to his house, and she was to him his wife. And she bore to him a son, and this was evil that which David did in the eyes of the Lord.

Here we turn our attention again toward a story that has not been canonized through retellings as a story of rape but one that still warrants a closer examination of the scenario at play. There is no use of *innah* (יָנַח) in this chapter, but in the act of sex between Israel’s King David and the general Uriah’s wife, Bathsheba, *laqah* (לָקַח) and *shachav* (שָׁכַב) are both used. Much like the story of Dinah, we don’t hear anything from Bathsheba in this passage aside from her telling David that she is pregnant, and she takes no definitive actions outside of that communication. Thus, we cannot rely on that to determine whether or not she is consenting to this sexual encounter. However, by virtue of the fact that she is married, there is no evidence to support the fact that she was pursuing David, and there is no verbal consent from her, the assumption can be made that she is not consenting. Much like Dinah was simply trying to live her life and engage with the women of the city, Bathsheba was simply trying to bathe when she became the object of David’s sexual desire.

Similar to the stories of Dinah and Tamar, the resulting fallout from the sexual encounter is lengthy, and instead of centering the woman involved, it serves as a space for the men of the story to resolve their own interpersonal conflicts that result from the

act. Here, David is not only breaking a Deuteronomic law by raping another man's wife, but he is also in direct violation of one of the ten commandments from God, dictating one to not covet a neighbor's wife.³⁹ However, his status as king of Israel offers him protection from the law as we've seen it play out in other stories. The remainder of the passage is dedicated to a detailed description of the murder of Uriah that David sanctions in order for him to take his wife because he knows that as long as Uriah lives, the law will not allow him to have Bathsheba as a wife and raise their child in his home.

A unique element of this story that sets it apart from the others analyzed in this paper is the last line of verse 27. It says that "this was evil that David did in the eyes of the lord."⁴⁰ There has been no condemnation or judgment from the divine in any of the other stories, but here, we are told very clearly that David's actions are considered evil. Because the line follows an action taken by another character, it is difficult to determine what exactly this "evil" thing David did is. Is it plotting Uriah's death? Is it marrying Bathsheba after Uriah dies? Is it the act of raping Bathsheba? Or is it all of it? Note that even though David plotted Uriah's death, he is very careful not to take the blame for any of it, and in fact, he consoles Joab about the role that *he* had in Uriah's death on the battlefield. And although David took direct action in his marriage to Bathsheba, that was technically legal as she was widowed at that point.

In allowing David to murder Uriah so he could marry Bathsheba, the redactors further their goal of preserving the patriarchal lineage of the king. Had Uriah survived and continued in his marriage to Bathsheba, David's child with her would not have been raised in the royal family. This hypothetical becomes moot as the child of that union

³⁹ Exodus 20:13.

⁴⁰ 2 Samuel 11:27.

ultimately dies,⁴¹ but had David not married Bathsheba, she also would never have borne Solomon, the child of theirs who would continue the royal line. Thus, the only action David himself takes that is both breaking a law and disrupting the patriarchal expectations is in having sex initially with Bathsheba. It is this act that the redactors are attempting to subtly condemn under the guise of making theirs the opinions of God. Again, however, they do not use *י.נ.נ* (*innah*) to connote it as rape, so it is likely that they are passing a judgment on David's having sex with her as an act of adultery as opposed to rape. Their lack of emphasis on David's murder of Uriah and focus instead on adultery as problematic demonstrates that the laws put forth in the Hebrew Bible around forbidden sex acts serve to protect the men in power who themselves wrote them, and not the women or less fortunate men who are living under them. The readers are told that David's actions are evil, but it is not a definitive condemnation of his actions because even though his murder of Uriah is criminal, we don't even know for sure *which* of his actions are referred to as "evil in the eyes of the Lord" by the redactors. If the redactors were to identify this incident as one of rape, they would in effect be sullyng the monarchical lineage of Jews in Israel, going against their own interests. Thus, they keep their condemnation of David's actions vague and small, considering the relatively few number of lines it occupies. However, even a small condemnation is a huge step compared to the acts of evil that go unnoticed and unpunished as occurs in the next story.

The Rape of Hagar

Translation of Genesis 16:1-6:

(1) And Sarai, wife of Avram did not beget any children to him. And she had an Egyptian maidservant, and her name was Hagar.

⁴¹ 2 Samuel 12:18.

(2) And Sarai said to Avram, “please behold, Adonai has stopped me from begetting children.” Please come to my maidservant and perhaps I will be built from her.” And Avram obeyed Sarai.

(3) And Sarai, wife of Avram, took Hagar, her Egyptian maidservant, after ten years of Avram dwelling in the land of Canaan, and Sarai gave Hagar to Avram, her husband, for a wife.

(4) And Avram came to Hagar, and she conceived, and she saw that she had conceived, and her lady (Sarai) was of little account in her eyes.

(5) And Sarai said to Avram “my misfortune is your doing, for I gave my maidservant into your bosom, and she saw that she conceived, and I was despised in her eyes. The lord will judge between me and between you.”

(6) And Avram said to Sarai, behold, your maidservant is in your hand. Do to her the good thing in your eyes,” and Sarai humbled Hagar. And Hagar fled from Sarai’s face.

Though I have included titles for all of the stories thus far, it should be noted that this paper is analyzing these Hebrew Bible stories through a Jewish lens, and as such, there is technically no codified nomenclature associated with each chapter and the stories housed inside them. However, Jews and Christians alike commonly denote the stories of Dinah and Tamar as “The Rape of Dinah” or “The Rape of Tamar,” and this story has no such name. Rather, it is generally titled “Hagar and Ishmael.” I have renamed it “The Rape of Hagar” here because that is the most salient piece of narrative action in the section I present. Due to most translators using *ה.נ.ע* (*innah*) as a way to signify that a story involves rape, it makes sense that this would not be categorized as a rape story because the act of sex that takes place does not include any form of *ה.נ.ע* (*innah*). However, that does not preclude the actions of characters in this story from being critically examined in the context of modern conceptualizations of sexual violence.

As described earlier in the paper,⁴² according to the Deuteronomic law, there is no protection in place for maidservants, sometimes translated as handmaids, from the actions

⁴² See footnote on page 11.

of their masters, Sarai in this case. Thus, the redactors would not have used ה.ג.ע (*innah*) to describe the sex act in this story because this was not a case of a free woman losing her status or value through an act of sex with a man. Hagar, an Egyptian handmaid, is already not valued at the level of a Canaanite free woman. However, this story doesn't even have any of the other verbiage we associate with a union, sexual or otherwise, such as ל.ק.ה (*laqah*) or ש.ח.ב (*shachav*). Rather, the way the redactors frame it is as Sarai giving (ג.ת.נ , *natan* – 'to give') her handmaid to Avram "for a wife." It should be noted that this is not necessarily a wife in the same way Sarai was Avram's wife. *Isha* (woman) in this case likely just means a woman whom he will impregnate. Regardless of the differences in wifely status of the two women, the action originates from Sarai instead of Avram.

This is not the only example of characters taking on an unexpected role in this story. When Sarai grows jealous of Hagar's ability to conceive, Avram tells her that Hagar is still her maidservant, so she should handle her how she sees fit. It is here that ה.ג.ע finds a place in the story. However, instead of it being used and commonly translated as a man "humbling," or, raping a woman, it is most often translated here as Sarai "afflicting" Hagar, thus humbling her. In BDB, this is a separate definition entry from the version of ה.ג.ע that this paper has discussed thus far, but grammatically, there are no differences between the forms. The fact that the lexicon marks it as a separate definition is simply a result of years of interpreters dictating that it has a different meaning. Technically, a translator could argue that in this moment, Sarai is raping Hagar. Rather than arguing that, I think that the redactors here are noting the fact that what befell Hagar was a horrific act of violence perpetrated by two of the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Jewish religion, but instead of placing the blame on both of them, or solely on Avram, they use

Sarai as a scapegoat by making her the actor. Instead of Avram *taking* Hagar, Sarai *gives* her to him. Instead of saying that Avram raped Hagar, Sarai takes out her frustration and jealousy on the maidservant and “humbles” her. In this way, there is subtle acknowledgement of the atrocities committed by these revered figures, but there is no accountability and no justice for Hagar. This is additionally, however, another biblical story of sexual violence where it is prudent to examine dynamics and differentials of power and privilege between women.

In this situation, Sarai has all of the power. She is not Egyptian, as Hagar is, and she is a free woman, as Hagar isn't. Beyond that, she is already inherently acting violently toward Hagar in the simple act of owning her as a maidservant. Sarai, herself, is admittedly in a difficult position. In the patriarchal structure in which she exists, her sole role is to conceive Avram's children, so he can continue his line, and she is failing at this, which makes her understandably upset. Unlike less privileged women, however, she owns someone who can change this for her, and she abuses this privilege and betrays her fellow woman by נָתַן (*natnah*, “giving,”) her to her husband. She does this knowing that Hagar has no say in any part of the matter and likely also knowing that this experience would be traumatic. And even after she betrays Hagar by removing all of her autonomy and making a desperately intimate and personal decision *for* Hagar, she gets jealous of Hagar's ability to fill a role she couldn't, and she violently humbles her out of her own misdirected anger at patriarchal expectations.

There can no liberation for all women until the role we play in oppressing each other both as tools of the patriarchy and in our own privileged actions is acknowledged. Once we recognize this reality, the tragedy of Hagar's story is amplified; a woman who is, to

this day, revered as a matriarch of a major world religion is not held accountable for playing an active and central role in an act of gendered violence, her own experience of patriarchal oppression making no difference in her actions.

The Meeting of Isaac and Rebekah

Translation of Genesis 24:

(55) And Rivkah's brother and mother said, "the young woman will remain with us a period of ten days. After, she will go."

(56) And the messenger said to them, "do not delay me, and The Lord has made my way successful. Let me go, and I will go to my lord."

(57) And they said "let us call to the young woman, and let us ask her opinion."

(58) And they called to Rivkah, and they said to her, "will you go with this man?" and she said "I will go."

(59) And they sent Rivkah, their sister, and her wet nurse with the servant of Avraham, and with his men.

(60) And they blessed Rivkah, and they said to her "our sister, you will beget a great number by the thousands, and your offspring will take possession of the gates of those who hate them."

(61) And Rivkah and her young women arose, and they mounted and rode upon the camels, and they went after the man, and the servant took Rivkah and went.

(62) And Yitzhak came from the desert of Be'er Lachai Roi, and he was staying on the land of the Negev.

(63) And Yitzhak went out to meditate in the field before evening, and he lifted his eyes, and he saw, and behold, the camels were coming.

(64) And Rivkah lifted her eyes, and she saw Yitzhak, and she fell from upon the camel.

(65) And she said to the servant, "who is this man walking in the field to meet us?" and the servant said, "he is my lord," and she covered herself (with) the veil.

(66) And the servant told to Yitzhak all the things that happened.

(67) And Yitzhak brought Rivkah toward the tent of Sarah, his mother, and he took Rivkah, and she became his wife, and he loved her, and Yitzhak was consoled after his mother.

It is reasonable for one to argue that the Hebrew Bible was written at a different time by and for men, and thus it is unfair to hold it to the standards of our modern

understandings of consent and sexual violence. To that argument, I respond by presenting the story of Rebekah and Isaac meeting for the first time before getting married. At this point in Genesis, Abraham knows he is close to dying, and he is hoping to repair his relationship with Isaac which had been fragmented after Abraham attempted to sacrifice Isaac. To do this, he sends a messenger to find a woman from Abraham's extended family, stipulating that the woman right for his son will offer water to both him (the messenger) as well as the camels. After Rebekah gives water to both the messenger and his camels, the messenger asks if there is room in her father's house for them to stay. It is there that the messenger reveals to Rebekah's family Abraham's request. The section presented in translation in this paper details the conversation that occurs between the messenger and Rebekah's family about whether or not they will allow Rebekah to go with this stranger. Note that the family asks Rebekah whether or not *she* wants to go with the man who will take her to marry yet another stranger. And when she says yes, there is no argument from her mother, nor any male family members, including her brother. They take her at her word and send her off with warm blessings of a fruitful life.

In addition to this verbal consent, there is a much more subtle form of interest displayed by Rebekah, demonstrating the biblical authors' ability to include a spectrum of types of consent. Upon seeing Isaac and realizing that this is the man she is set to marry, she falls from her camel. While this could be interpreted as falling down from fear, I prefer to use the context of the following verse to apply a different meaning to this. Rather than being afraid, she is so struck by love for this stranger, that she stumbles and falls from her camel. In the following verse, she immediately covers her face with a veil, a misleading action to take before her betrothed, in front of whom she is required no

modesty. However, contemporary biblical commentator Asher Wassertheil notes that this is possibly a sign that she already views herself as married to Isaac, and thus decides she must cover herself for modesty's sake in front of the other men who are around them.⁴³ Rebekah has just traveled with Abraham's male servants while betrothed to Isaac without covering herself, so why is it in this moment she chooses to cover herself? It is because she was still harboring some reticence about this marriage, and it isn't until she sees Isaac and has this moment of "love at first sight," that she decides *for herself* that she will marry him. Upon coming to this conclusion, she takes the definitive action of covering herself out of respect to the man she now considers her husband.

Lastly, if one dissects the verbiage in the final verse of this chapter, it illuminates another quiet sort of autonomy Rebekah holds. In describing Isaac's actions towards Rebekah, the authors include the לָקַח (*laqah*) we are used to seeing in situations like this. However, whereas in other stories, a man "*laqah l'ishto*" ("took for his wife"), here, "*va'ti'hi lo l'isha*," or "she became his wife." Instead of being taken as a wife, like a conqueror taking his prize, she becomes his wife, and thus she has the agency to transform from someone's daughter into someone's wife. While this may seem like a minor victory, it is enough to distinguish this story from the others examined in this paper and enough to demonstrate that consent is possible in the Hebrew Bible. It is with this in mind that it becomes prudent to scrutinize the stories where such consent does not exist and inquire as to the reason behind those omissions.

⁴³ Arthur Wassertheil "Genesis 24:65:2" in *Birkat Asher on Torah*, trans. Emma Kippley-Ogman (2021). Accessed April 7, 2021. <https://www.sefaria.org/sheets/358150.1?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en>

Conclusions & Further Research

I would be remiss in concluding this paper without addressing the limitations of the work completed and the ways in which I hope myself and other scholars can continue exploring the questions raised here. Though addressed to a degree, there is certainly room for expanded investigation into how sex with women of different statuses is characterized in the Hebrew Bible and why. In the stories analyzed here, a pattern began to emerge that differentiated how sex with a woman of a higher status is described from how sex with a woman of a lower status is characterized. While Dinah, Tamar, and Bathsheba were all described as having been laid with, Avram is described as having “come to” Hagar. Further research into comparing other stories with women of varying social statuses, and even potentially stories involving bestiality, could be an avenue of interesting revelation on the subject. More generally, while the taxonomy I created was helpful in categorizing the stories presented, a wider sample of cases from both higher and lower social classes could yield additional support for or contradiction to what I put forth and further develop the taxonomy.

In addition to a necessary expansion of quantity, there needs to be a greater amount of variety in the identities of characters explored in these stories. This paper has focused entirely on cases of women being abused in the Hebrew Bible. It is irrefutable that male perpetrator-female victim is the most common form of rape throughout the text. However, that doesn't mean it isn't important to discuss and critically analyze stories of male victim-survivors. Stories that are frequently touted as examples of women using their sexuality to defeat enemies of the Israelites⁴⁴ could be compared to those of non-

⁴⁴ The story of Jael killing Sisera with a tent peg would be an example of this in Judges 4.

Israelite women using their sexuality to betray men⁴⁵ to unpack how the redactors and popular commentators have treated the two differently and examine when a man is considered a victim, or when he is considered a fool undeserving of pity for falling for the wiles of a woman.⁴⁶ If we are to continue on the path of interpreting this ancient text to make it useful for instruction in modern times, there needs to be accountability across the spectrum of identities and acknowledgement of the capacity for evil outside of the typical “man of certain political, capital, and social influence.”

That being established, this paper has been an important step in demonstrating the ways in which biblical definitions and conceptions of rape need to be critically examined. My translations and interpretations thereof should serve as another starting point for calling into question the actions of revered biblical figures, and the roles those actions have played in building the Jewish tradition on the backs of the abused, the enslaved, and the otherwise marginalized. It is logical that the biblical redactors would not have characterized the stories of Hagar and Bathsheba as rape because that would implicate the founding member of Judaism and one of the great Israelite kings as rapists, and that would not further their patriarchy-focused goals. Contrasting that, in dramatically describing the violence that befalls those who abuse important figures’ daughters and sisters, like Dinah and Tamar, the redactors reinforce the entrenched feelings of xenophobia toward outsiders as well as the importance of sons serving as protectors of the family, again emphasizing the benefit (in their eyes) of continuing the patriarchal line. If we are to take *יָנַח* (*innah*) as the redactors’ way of indicating that a rape has taken place, their definitions of sexual assault serve only to promote the existing structures that

⁴⁵ The story of Delilah seducing Samson would be an example of this in Judges 16.

⁴⁶ See Appendix A

benefit them. Luckily, as biblical scholars, we don't have to take their definitions as the end-all-be-all. Though the Hebrew Bible has long been canonized, any text that is the basis of modern religion must be living in order to maintain its relevance to those who will continue using it. That is why Rabbis and scholars have been interpreting the text and each other's interpretations for centuries, and why scholarship like this is and will continue to be important as we strive to produce interpretations that promote equality and reduce harm.

Appendix

Appendix A: Selection from *Deceit, Jealousy, and Slander: The Dual Narratives of Two Women's Mistakes* (Final Paper for Advanced Hebrew class at Macalester College, by Gabrielle Isaac-Herzog, Dec. 2020)

Jezebel, Phoenician princess-turned Israelite queen, has been the archetypal mold for all manner of “dangerous” women in pop culture, most notably, the idea of the femme fatale, a woman who causes the downfall of a film’s protagonist through the use of “feminine wiles,” i.e. sex. Having successfully made Jezebel an idolatrous, sex-craved villain for the ages, it seems post-exilic redactors have yet again succeeding in bending the character of a Biblical woman to fit their ideologies.⁴⁷ Living in a time of xenophobia towards non-Israelites, as well as the erasure of women leaders, it makes sense that these redactors would manipulate Jezebel’s character in this way. Viewing Jezebel through this myopic lens, however, doesn’t do justice to the fullness and multidimensionality of her character. In examining the specific ways in which the redactors characterize Jezebel through two of her most famed stories, we can begin to shed a light on the precise reasons her character was assassinated in such a dramatic way.

Starting first with the story of Naboth and his Vineyard in 1 Kings 21, we see what we will refer to as Jezebel’s sin of murderous envy:

וַתְּבֹא אֵלָיו אִיזָבֵל אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתְּדַבֵּר אֵלָיו מִהֲזָה רֹחַדָּה סָרָה וְאֵינָהּ אֹכֵל לֶחֶם:
 וַיְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיהָ כִּי־אֲדַבֵּר אֶל־נָבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי וְאָמַר לוֹ תִּנְהַלֵּנִי אֶת־כַּרְמִי בְּכֶסֶף אוֹ אִם־חֶפֶץ
 אַתָּה אֶתְנֶנָּה־לָּהּ כָּרֶם תַּחֲתֶיךָ וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא־אֶתֵּן לָּהּ אֶת־כַּרְמִי:
 וַתֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אִיזָבֵל אִשְׁתּוֹ אַתָּה תַעֲשֶׂה מְלֹכָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל קוּם אֲכַל־לֶחֶם וַיֹּטֵב לָּהּ אָנֹכִי
 אֶתֵּן לָּהּ אֶת־כַּרְם נָבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי:

⁴⁷ Carol A Newsom and Sharon H Ringe, *The Women's Bible Commentary* / (London: SPCK, 1992), <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015025211932>.

וַתִּכְתֹּב סִפְרִים בְּשֵׁם אַחָאָב וַתִּחַתֵּם בְּחַתְמוֹ וַתִּשְׁלַח [הַסִּפְרִים כ] (סִפְרִים ק) אֶל־הַזְּקֵנִים וְאֶל־
הַחֲרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּעִירוֹ הַיֹּשְׁבִים אֶת־נָבוֹת:
וַתִּכְתֹּב בְּסִפְרִים לֵאמֹר קְרָאוּ־צוֹם וְהוֹשִׁיבוּ אֶת־נָבוֹת בְּרֹאשׁ הָעָם:
וְהוֹשִׁיבוּ שְׁנַיִם אֲנָשִׁים בְּנֵי־בְלִיעַל נֹגְדוֹ וַיַּעֲדֵהוּ לֵאמֹר בְּרַכְתָּ אֱלֹהִים וּמָלְךְ וְהוֹצִיאָהוּ וְסִקְלֵהוּ
וַיָּמָת:

“His wife Jezebel came to him and she said to him ‘what has caused your spirit to turn away, and your lack of eating food?’ And he said to her, ‘when I was speaking to Naboth the Jezreelite and I said to him give to me your vineyard with money or if you were pleased, I will give to you a vineyard in exchange for it. And he said, ‘I will not give to you my vineyard.’ And Jezebel his wife said to him, ‘you now will make the kingdom of Israel. Rise, eat bread, and let your heart be glad. I will give to you the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite.’ And she wrote letters in the name of Ahab, and affixed (sealed) them with his seal. And she sent the letters to the Elders and to the Nobles that are (were) in his city and the ones who dwelled with Naboth. And she wrote in the documents, saying, ‘declare a fast and seat Naboth at the head of the people and set two men, sons of worthlessness, in front of him, and make them bear witness to him, saying, ‘you cursed G-d and the king.’ And send him out and stone him and he will die.”⁴⁸

At face value, Jezebel’s action here admittedly seems needlessly cruel. All Naboth did was refuse to sell his rightfully owned property to King Ahab, and Jezebel used deceit to essentially sentence him to death. However, a postcolonial examination of this passage sheds a different light on Jezebel’s actions here, making them, if not justified, at least understandable.⁴⁹ Postcolonial biblical criticism examines combines biblical criticism and postcolonial academic theory, applying the lens of power differentials between the imperial and the colonial to stories in the Bible.⁵⁰ While Israel was technically a weaker power than Phoenicia, they are still the “imperial power” as far as this analysis is

⁴⁸ 1 Kings 21:5-21:7.

⁴⁹ Melissa Jackson, “Reading Jezebel from the ‘other’ Side: Feminist Critique, Postcolonialism: EBSCOhost,” accessed November 20, 2020, <http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=8a31dc05-b312-42e7-b474-a45837b443ec%40sessionmgr4007>.

⁵⁰ Stephen D. Moore and Fernando F. Segovia, *Postcolonial Biblical Criticism: Interdisciplinary Intersections* (A&C Black, 2005).

concerned because the Israelite perspective is the one highlighted in the Bible, and Jezebel is a foreigner in the land of Israel and is at the mercy of Israelite law and customs. Therefore, examining Jezebel's story through a postcolonial analysis requires us to compare Phoenician protocols to Israelite protocols. For example, in the powerful kingdom of Phoenicia, their royalty held a lot more authoritarian power. In Israel, the custom was that land was granted to each Israelite family as a divine gift from Adonai, which contrasts the Phoenician idea that a king has a right to any plot of land he desires, and any refusal to give into this should be punished as royal insubordination.⁵¹ Upon seeing her husband the king in a dejected state after being denied something he wanted, abstaining from eating as well as his role as a leader, Jezebel takes the action she sees as necessary and right as the "woman of the state" so to speak. In this way, we can view Jezebel as a powerful and politically driven queen, doing her duty as a queen, as opposed to a heathen who wanted to lead Ahab morally astray.

With the information that's been discussed thus far, it is not necessarily a given that the post-exilic redactors were intentional in framing Jezebel in this way. Perhaps they just didn't consider the fact that she was of Phoenician origin and therefore, understandably took her actions to be sinful in the context of the Israelite kingdom. This simplistic view is complicated, however, by more postcolonial examination of the longer-term dynamics at play. The way in which Jezebel is "othered" is much different than the ways in which we see other foreign women othered, such as Ruth, or the way in which we see other women like Rahab the Prostitute celebrated for using many of the same

⁵¹ Newsom; Ringe, 104.

sexual tactics that redactors use to villainize Jezebel.⁵² Frost aptly argues that this is because Rahab used these tactics to further goals of the Israelites and Adonai, whereas Jezebel was a foreigner and did not adopt the ways of Yahweh, going so far as to encourage the worship of Ba'al.⁵³ This is also exemplified in the Book of Ruth when Ruth responds to Naomi's suggestion that she return home to her people with the following:

אֶל-אֲשֶׁר תֵּלֶכִי אֵלֶיךָ וּבְאֲשֶׁר תִּלְיִנִי אֵלֶיךָ עִמִּי וְאֵלֹהֶיךָ אֱלֹהֵי:

“...I will go to where you will go, and I will lodge in that where you will lodge. Your people are my people, and your G-d is my G-d”⁵⁴

Ruth's direct acceptance of Yahweh yields a lovely life for Ruth, even in a time when a widowed, foreign woman would otherwise likely have been treated as an outcast. This stark difference in treatment of the “other women” is clear evidence of the redactors choosing to flatten Jezebel's character into a dangerous foreigner who will never be more than a hypersexual femme fatale. Redactors do this for their own purpose of furthering the xenophobia toward those who weren't Yahwists in Israel. This comparison is further emphasized in examining the culmination of the types of justice enacted upon Miriam as opposed to Jezebel.

The story of Miriam's slander and resultant affliction can be boiled down to a form of restorative justice. Restorative justice is a form of justice that focuses on direct impacts to victims of a crime, as well as more indirect impacts on the wider community. It involves the, “victim, the offender, and the community in a search for solutions which

⁵² Frost, “Judgment on Jezebel, or a Woman Wronged,” *Theology Today* 20, no. 4 (January 1964): 503–17.

⁵³ Frost, p. 505.

⁵⁴ Ruth 1:15.

promote repair, reconciliation, and reassurance”⁵⁵. In processes of restorative justice, the perpetrator is held accountable by the victim as well as the community, but they are not permanently marked as “evil.” Once the process is complete, and necessary reparations have been made, the perpetrator is folded back into the society with the understanding that they know the impacts of their crimes and that community members feel safe with them there. We see that idea in action with Numbers 12 ending thusly:

וּתְסַגֵּר מִרְיָם מִחוּץ לַמַּחֲנֶה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים וְהָעָם לֹא נָסַע עַד־הָאָסֶף מִרְיָם:

“And Miriam was shut from outside to the camp seven days. And the people did not set out until Miriam was gathered.”⁵⁶

While it will continue to be hotly debated whether Miriam’s slander warranted punishment, or whether she was simply taking issue with Moses on behalf of her sister-in-law, The Cushite in question,⁵⁷ it is undeniable that her punishment was relatively mild and that Miriam was well-loved. Her brothers immediately call to G-d for the reversal of her affliction,⁵⁸ and the entirety of the camp waits for her to complete her spiritual quarantine for seven days before they move on. Jezebel’s crimes were not met with the same restorative justice mindset that Miriam’s were, which is made evident by the fact that her name is, to this day, synonymous with the word “evil,” making that label her legacy. Rather than being reformed and welcomed back into the Israelite community, Jezebel’s gruesome death is described in 2 Kings 9:

אֶל־אֲשֶׁר תִּלְכִי אֵלָיוּ וּבְאֲשֶׁר תִּלְיִנִי אֵלָיוּ עִמָּוָה עִמָּוָה וְאֵלֶּהָ אֵלֶּהָ:

⁵⁵ qtd. in Daniel W. Van Ness and Karen Heetderks Strong, *Restoring Justice: An Introduction to Restorative Justice* (Routledge, 2014).

⁵⁶ Numbers 12:15.

⁵⁷ Goldstein, 276.

⁵⁸ Numbers 12:12-12:13.

“And they returned and told to him and he said ‘it is the word of Adonai, which he spoke by the hand of his servant Elijah the Tishbite, saying ‘in the tract of Jezreel, the dogs will consume the flesh of Jezebel.’”⁵⁹

There are a total of five verses in 2 Kings 9 dedicated to graphically depicting the death of Jezebel and slandering her name after she has already been executed. Simultaneously, there are a mere two verses in Numbers 12 that describe the details of Miriam’s skin affliction as a punishment for slandering both G-d in questioning his judgment of Moses, as well as Moses himself, leader of the Israelites and G-d’s most trusted prophet. Why villainize Jezebel so intensely while letting Miriam off with what equates to a “stern warning?” The answer seems quite simple: these women and their stories are reflections of the times and the people who were controlling the narrative at the time of their stories being shared.

Appendix B: Letters to the Women

Dearest Dinah and Tamar,

I am so sorry. Dinah, I am sorry that myself and other scholars have to speculate on your story because you weren’t given the chance to speak. Tamar, I am sorry that when you spoke, your voice was ignored. I know that pain. I’m sorry that when you confided in your brother, he put his own interests and feelings above your own, choosing a path of violence and destruction that tore your family apart with no consideration for your own desires. I’m sorry that no one else apologized to you.

My heart aches, and it burns. It burns with the fire that has coursed through my veins since the first time I was sexualized as a child and has continued to grow as I listened to all of my friends come forward with their own stories. As I myself came forward one, two, three, four times. I want to root my feet to the earth and scream with the force of all of the energy that every cell of every muscle has held onto from every time I clenched my jaw to keep from screaming. Every time I tried to fight back and found myself paralyzed. I’m mad that Shimon, Levi, and Absalom took away from you the opportunity to decide what *you* wanted to do. How *you* wanted to feel angry. *If* you wanted to feel angry.

I wish I could give you back that agency.

⁵⁹ 2 Kings 9:36.

Dearest Hagar, Bilhah, Zilpah, and all of the Unnamed Concubines,

You deserve better. You deserve to be treated as humans, not a field in which my patriarchs planted their seeds without regard for your autonomy, your wellbeing, your body. I'm angry at the women, figures whom I turn to for comfort in times of distress, women who represent parts of the divine feminine, women who have many traits I want to embody, and also those I hope to never come close to emulating. They abandoned and betrayed you in allowing and, at times, convincing, their husbands to violate you.

There is no way to repair the harm done to you except to remember you, to tell your stories, and to make a promise that I will not allow the people who harmed you to go down in our history as heroes without a critical examination of the harm they caused.

I am so deeply sorry. You are an equally important part of our history and should be honored as such.

In love and solidarity,
Gabi

Bibliography

- Boase, Elizabeth, and Christopher G. Frechette, eds. *Bible through the Lens of Trauma*. SBL Press, 2016.
- Brown, Francis 1849-1916., S. R. (Samuel Rolles) Driver 1846-1914., Charles A. (Charles Augustus) Briggs 1841-1913., James 1822-1894. Strong, and Wilhelm 1786-1842. Gesenius. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon : With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic : Coded with the Numbering System from Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. [New ed.]. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Claassens, Juliana. "Trauma and Recovery: A New Hermeneutical Framework for the Rape of Tamar (2 Samuel 13). Pages 177-192 in *Bible through the Lens of Trauma*. (Elizabeth Boase and Christopher G. Frechette, Eds.; Semeia Studies 86. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2016).," 2016.
- "Deuteronomy 22 JPS Tanakh 1917." Accessed April 24, 2022.
<https://biblehub.com/jps/deuteronomy/22.htm>.
- Faleni, Mzukisi Welcome. "Hagar: Case Study of Abuse of Women," n.d., 110.
- Feinstein, Eve Levavi. *Sexual Pollution in the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199395545.001.0001>.
- Frost, Stanley Brice. "Judgment on Jezebel, or a Woman Wronged." *Theology Today* 20, no. 4 (January 1964): 503–17.
- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva Simone. *Reading the Women of the Bible*. 1st ed. New York: Schocken Books, 2002. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10056677>.
- Goldstein, Elyse. *The Women's Torah Commentary: New Insights from Women Rabbis on the 54 Weekly Torah Portions*. Woodstock, Vt.: Jewish Lights Publishing, c2000.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015050285256>.
- hooks, bell 1952-2021. *Feminist Theory from Margin to Center*. First edition. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1984. <http://www.gbv.de/dms/bowker/toc/9780896082212.pdf>.
- Kippley-Ogman, Emma. "Early Rebecca and Her Scarf Macalester Torah Study 29 October 2021 / 23 Heshvan 5782 | Sefaria." Sefaria. Accessed April 7, 2022.
<https://www.sefaria.org/sheets/358150.10?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en>.
- Kittel, Rudolf 1853-1929., Karl 1901-1977. Elliger, Wilhelm 1891-1987. Rudolph, Hans Peter. Rüger, G. E. (Gérard E.) Weil, Adrian 1939- Schenker, Rudolf 1853-1929. Kittel, et al. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Editio quinta emendata. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Lipka, Hilary, and Bruce Wells, eds. *Sexuality and Law in the Torah*. Paperback edition. T & T Clark Library of Biblical Studies. London: T&T Clark, 2021.

Moore, Stephen D., and Fernando F. Segovia. *Postcolonial Biblical Criticism: Interdisciplinary Intersections*. A&C Black, 2005.

Ness, Daniel W. Van, and Karen Heetderks Strong. *Restoring Justice: An Introduction to Restorative Justice*. Routledge, 2014.

Newsom, Carol A, and Sharon H Ringe. *The Women's Bible Commentary*. London: SPCK, 1992. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015025211932>.

Scholz, Susanne. *Rape Plots : A Feminist Cultural Study of Genesis 34*. Studies in Biblical Literature ; v. 13. New York: P. Lang, 2000.

Zlotnick, Helena. "From Dinah to Cozbi: Rape, Sex, and Foundational Moments." In *Dinah's Daughters: Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity*, 33–56. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhm7j.5>.