

Copyright

by

Megan Lindsey Case

2013

**The Report Committee for Megan Lindsey Case  
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**Sealed with a Virgin:**

**Reconciliation through the Exchange of Women in Judges 21**

**APPROVED BY  
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

**Supervisor:**

---

Jo Ann Hackett

---

John Traphagan

**Sealed with a Virgin:**

**Reconciliation through the Exchange of Women in Judges 21**

**by**

**Megan Lindsey Case, B.A.; M.Div.**

**Report**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Master of Arts**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**May, 2013**

## **Dedication**

For my parents

## **Acknowledgements**

This report would not have been possible without the continued guidance of my readers, Dr. Jo Ann Hackett and Dr. John Traphagan. I am also grateful to the comments on a shorter version of this paper I received from the graduate students in the Hebrew Bible Doctoral Seminar II during the 2013 spring semester. Finally, I am indebted to Aren Wilson-Wright who read the earliest version of this paper and to Nanette R. Adams who continues to correct my grammar.

## **Abstract**

### **Sealed with a Virgin:**

### **Reconciliation through the Exchange of Women in Judges 21**

Megan Lindsey Case, MA

The University of Texas at Austin, 2013

Supervisor: Jo Ann Hackett

A common analysis of the Book of Judges argues that the progressive disintegration of moral values in the latter half of the book mirrors the societal breakdown of kinship ties. In the appendices (Judg 17-21) this disintegration of tribal society apparently reaches its apex, thus anticipating the formation of the monarchy in First Samuel. I argue, however, that the traffic of women in Judg 21 mediates the conflict between Benjamin and the rest of the tribes to create a peaceful resolution through the reestablishment of kinship loyalties. Rather than a chaotic ending which illustrates the need for a king, the tribes are reconciled through this exchange of women. In making this argument, I use Marcel Mauss's concept of gift exchange, its development in the anthropological kinship theories of Claude Lévi-Strauss, later critiques of Lévi-Strauss by other anthropologists and feminist scholars, such as Gayle Rubin, as well as anthropological theories concerned with the kidnapping of wives. I apply these theories to the final story of Judges (chs. 19-21), especially to the resolution

of that story in ch. 21. I also consider the developmental stages of the appendices to Judges. Specifically, I suggest that the monarchic refrain (Judg 17:6, 18:1, 19:1, and 21:25) was added during the latest stages of development to frame the final two stories and to emphasize the need for a strong central government—the monarchy. Only with this added refrain does the reconciliation of the warring tribes through the traffic of women appear insufficient.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Theoretical Underpinnings.....	4
Marcel Mauss.....	4
Claude Lévi-Strauss.....	6
Critiques of Lévi-Strauss .....	10
Kidnapping of Wives .....	13
Chapter 2: Kinship in the Hebrew Bible.....	17
Kinship Structures .....	18
The Economics of Kinship .....	24
Amphictyony vs. Lineage Groups .....	26
Chapter 3: Judges 19-21 .....	30
Chapter 4: Monarchic Refrain .....	45
Conclusion .....	52
Bibliography .....	54



## INTRODUCTION

For biblical scholars interested in studying women, the book of Judges offers several significant places of inquiry. The main body of Judges (3:12-16:31) contains stories in which, as Jo Ann Hackett argues, “the major female characters often fare better...than do the men they are involved with.”<sup>1</sup> Yet the opposite also appears in Judges. Phyllis Tribble labels chapters 19-21, the tale of the Levite’s secondary wife and its aftermath, a “text of terror,” a term she uses for sad and painful stories where women are generally used and abused by men.<sup>2</sup> In this final story in the book of Judges, women are raped, manhandled, dismembered, kidnapped, trafficked, and controlled by the men overall. They have no voice and are the subjects of very few actions. The male characters within the text, and indeed the text itself, offer these women no sympathy for their plights. Yet, despite their lack of agency, women are central to the ending of Judges.

Scholars have often interpreted the final two stories in Judges (chs. 17-18, 19-21) as examples of the Israelites’ inevitable descent into chaos before the monarchy. Noting that at this time, “every man did what was right in his own eyes” (17:6 and 21:25), these stories both foresee and support the establishment of the dynastic monarchy under David in Samuel and Kings. The time of the judges, with Israel’s lack of centralized leadership, is doomed to fail, as these stories clearly indicate. Of course,

---

<sup>1</sup> Jo Ann Hackett, “In the Days of Jael: Reclaiming the History of Women in Ancient Israel,” in *Immaculate and Powerful: The Female in Sacred Image and Social Reality* (ed. Clarissa Atkinson, Margaret Miles, and Constance Buchanan; Boston: Beacon, 1985), 32.

<sup>2</sup> Phyllis Tribble, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).

the above feminist view of Judg 19-21 as a “text of terror” and the idea of this story’s pro-monarchic slant are not mutually exclusive; Tribble, for example, argues that the editor of Judges “uses the horrors he has just reported to promote a monarchy that would establish order and justice in Israel.”<sup>3</sup>

A close look at the text, however, suggests a different ending to the story. In this study, I focus primarily on Judg 21, showing how the exchange of women, these silent, central characters to our tale, mediates the conflict between the groups of men. Though the attack on the Levite and his secondary wife results in civil war between Benjamin and the rest of the tribes, the process of providing virgin brides for the remnant of Benjamin seals the reconciliation between these warring parties. So rather than viewing Judg 19-21 as a story which points toward the unavoidable rise of the kingship, I argue that, through the traffic of women, this story describes the success of pre-monarchic society in overcoming their inter-tribal conflicts.

In order to argue this, I use several different methods. To begin with, in chapter one, I use sociological and anthropological theory to explore the role of women exchange in this story. Specifically, I use Marcel Mauss’s classic theory of gift exchange and Lévi-Strauss’s development of that theory in his study of marriage and kinship systems. I then look at kinship theory in chapter two to understand how marriage and kinship works in the Hebrew Bible. After connecting these theories to Judg 19-21 in chapter three, I look more closely at the development of Judges in chapter four, specifically at when the monarchic refrain (17:6, 18:1, 19:1, 21:25) might have

---

<sup>3</sup> Tribble, 84

been added to the final two stories. Only when this refrain is added do the stories gain a pro-monarchic angle.

# CHAPTER 1

## THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

### MARCEL MAUSS

Marcel Mauss's most famous work *Essai sur le don*, known in English as *The Gift*, theorizes the concept of gift exchange cycles in different societies. A part of the French sociological movement of the late 19<sup>th</sup>- early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Mauss first published this essay in 1925 in *L'Année sociologique*, a journal founded by his uncle, Émile Durkheim. Later published on its own in 1950 and translated into English in 1954, *The Gift* continues to influence the fields of anthropology and sociology, among others, to this day.

To support his theory of gift exchange, Mauss examines several varied examples of gift giving, including the potlatch in the Pacific Northwest and the *kula* exchange in Melanesia. He argues that the complete cycle of the gift exchange existed before the formalized institutions of trade and money, though vestiges of this system remain even in more developed societies.<sup>4</sup> Israelite society at the time period of the Judges (Iron Age I, approximately from the twelfth to the eleventh centuries BCE)<sup>5</sup> reflects a more structurally advanced culture than Mauss suggests. Certainly the ancient Israelites have established trade networks with their neighbors and have a standardized system of

---

<sup>4</sup>. See Marcel Mauss, *The Gift* (trans. W.D. Halls; London: Cohen & West, 1954; repr. London: Routledge, 1990) for examples of Roman law (61-69), Classical Hindu law (70-77) and Germanic law (77-81).

<sup>5</sup> Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 2, and Hackett, "In the Days of Jael," 22.

weights at least by the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE.<sup>6</sup> I argue that Mauss's theory of gift exchange is applicable to the study of the ancient Israelites and can help illuminate the end of Judges.

Through his comparative study of various types of gift exchange, Mauss focuses on several aspects of this process which pertain to the present study. He asserts that no gift is actually free; even the most seemingly selfless gift has some expectation of a return.<sup>7</sup> Exchange cycles involve three obligations: to give, to receive, and to reciprocate to create social, political, and economic bonds. In terms of the potlatch, Mauss argues that, "to refuse to give... just as to refuse to accept, is tantamount to declaring war; it is to reject the bond of alliance and commonality."<sup>8</sup> These exchanges take place not only between individuals, but also between families, clans, and tribes.<sup>9</sup>

When the giver gives a gift to the recipient, he (or she, though in the "primitive" societies Mauss explored, the giver more often than not is male) is giving a part of himself because the gift is indissolubly tied to the giver. Mauss explains this concept in his discussion of the exchange practices among the Maori, a group of indigenous Polynesian people in New Zealand. Each item given is connected to the *hau*, the spirit

---

<sup>6</sup> See King and Stager, 197.

Hieratic numerals are found on standardized weights from that time period. See Yohanan Aharoni, "The Use of Hieratic Numerals in Hebrew Ostraca and the Shekel Weights," in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 184 (1966), 16-18. Ostraca from both Israelite and Judahite sites also use hieratic numerals for accounting purposes from the 9<sup>th</sup>- 6<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE. See Christopher A. Rollston, *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age* (Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature, 2010), 133, and "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence," in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 344 (2006), 66. Actual manufacturing of official coinage in Israel, however, first occurs sometime after the exile; therefore references to coins belong mostly to postexilic works. See King and Stager, *Life*, 198.

<sup>7</sup> Mauss, 93-97.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

of things, which connects each gift to its origin. If the original receiver of the gift then gives it to a third party, any return gift to that original receiver must be given back to the person who gave the gift in the first place, because the return gift substitutes for the original gift, which wishes to return to its owner.<sup>10</sup> This exchange, then, creates a social bond between the giver and the recipient with an obligation for the recipient to reciprocate the gift.<sup>11</sup> According to Mauss, “The system that we propose to call the system of ‘total services’, from clan to clan—the system in which individuals and groups exchange everything with one another—constitutes the most ancient system of economy and law that we can find or of which we can conceive.”<sup>12</sup>

### CLAUDE LÉVI-STRAUSS

Claude Lévi-Strauss focuses on just one aspect of Mauss’s theory of gift exchange in his work *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, first published as *Les Structures élémentaires de la Parenté* in 1949. Here, he argues that the exchange of women for marriage participates in the exchange of gifts between groups, and that women themselves are the ultimate gift. Sometimes cycles of gifts involve the exchange of women for marriage, but the cycle continues on. Other times, however, these cycles culminate in marriage, with the exchange of women, the ultimate gift, as the ultimate

---

<sup>10</sup> See Mauss, 13-16 for his discussion of this concept.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 16, 42.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 90. What Mauss calls “total services,” I have been referring to as complete gift exchanges.

action in the cycle.<sup>13</sup> In other words, the exchange of women as wives can close a set of gift exchange, but can also be part of a continuous cycle of reciprocity. According to Lévi-Strauss, “the fact of receiving, if it involves an obligation to give, also implies a renewed right, which is always being revived, to receive again.”<sup>14</sup>

In his study, Lévi-Strauss surveys anthropological studies, including his own, covering peoples of India, East Asia, and Australia. He focuses on incest taboos, which he claims exist in all societies; that is, no society allows for completely unrestricted marriage.<sup>15</sup> Yet while all cultures have incest taboos, these taboos vary widely. As such, they cannot simply be a matter of genetics, but rather have social meaning.<sup>16</sup> He creates two overarching categories which explain how the incest taboo is maintained: restricted exchange and generalized exchange. By restricted exchange, Lévi-Strauss means societies with strict rules governing marriages, such as cross-cousin exchange.<sup>17</sup> Societies with generalized marriage exchange do not practice completely unrestricted marriage, but rather less strictly delineate acceptable marriage partners. For this study, generalized exchange will be considered.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (trans. James Harle Bell, John Richard von Strumer and Rodney Needham; Boston: Beacon, 1969), 65-67.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 435.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 9. For example, the Hebrew Bible has explicit incest laws in Leviticus 18.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>17</sup> Cross-cousin is defined as the child of a person’s mother’s brother (matrilateral or matrilineal cousin) or father’s sister (patrilateral or patrilineal cousin). This is distinct from parallel-cousins, which are children of a person’s mother’s sister or father’s brother. See H. Sidky, *Perspectives on Culture: A Critical Introduction to Theory in Cultural Anthropology* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004), 421.

<sup>18</sup> Lévi-Strauss also discusses the concepts of exogamy and endogamy within his theory of kinship. While ancient Israelite marriage practices are often best described as endogamous, Lévi-Strauss argues that there are no true endogamous societies. Instead, societies are both endogamous and

The exchange of women in marriage is an inevitable positive result of the prohibition of incest, however it is defined in a culture, because “the prohibition on the sexual use of a daughter or a sister compels them to be given in marriage to another man, and at the same time it establishes a right to the daughter or sister of this man.”<sup>19</sup> As with the gift exchanges described by Mauss, the exchange of women does not take place between individuals—certainly not between a man and woman—but between two groups of men. The women are simply objects in the exchange, not active participants.<sup>20</sup>

In generalized exchange, “women are exchanged for women,”<sup>21</sup> though this process might involve a large cycle of exchanges in practice. Many elements of generalized exchange will sound familiar to students of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>22</sup> For instance, brothers often marry the widow of their dead brother, a practice known as levirate marriage, which can be seen in Genesis 38 or in Ruth. A higher price might be asked for a younger sister if the older sister is not yet married. Jacob’s attempts to marry Rachel in Genesis 29 might fall into this pattern. The engagement process itself can be seen as supporting the claim that marriage is never between individuals, but between groups, as evidenced by Isaac’s engagement to Rebekah in Genesis 24 or Samson’s engagement in Judges 14. Finally, if a woman refuses to live with her husband, her family is required to give him another wife from their family, which could provide a

---

exogamous (45-6). I agree with Lévi-Strauss that this should be discussed in terms of a matter of degree. For instance, while marriage to non-Israelites was frowned upon (though it happened), marriage outside of one’s own clan probably was not discouraged.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 238.

<sup>22</sup> See *ibid.*, 244-49 for examples.



possible explanation for the Levite following his wife back to her father's house in Judges 19 or Samson's father-in-law's offer in Judges 15.<sup>23</sup>

Unlike restricted exchange, where permissible marriage partners are clearly marked, generalized exchange contains a certain level of trust that a proper reciprocation to the gift of a wife—typically a wife for the giver—will eventually be received.<sup>24</sup> As with gift giving in general, the exchange of women creates a bond between the giving group and receiving group; in the case of marriage, Lévi-Strauss calls this a marriage alliance. These alliances create a system of support and friendship between these reciprocating groups, which disappears if the alliance is broken. According to Lévi-Strauss, “one is the slave of one's alliance” because “from the moment that one is bound by it everything must be done to maintain and develop it.”<sup>25</sup>

While Lévi-Strauss focuses mostly on eastern cultures, he briefly mentions examples from the “Euro-African bloc,” including the prevalence in Africa of marriage by purchase. In this practice, a woman is “purchased” from her family with a bride-price. However, the woman still remains under the protection of her family: if she has just cause to leave her husband, he is not permitted to reclaim her bride-price. This offers yet another possible interpretation for the Levite's actions toward his estranged wife in Judg 19. If she can convince her family that she has the grounds to rightfully

---

<sup>23</sup> In the case of the Levite in Judg 19, his wife has left him to return to her father's house. While the Levite might follow her there because he wants her to return to his household as his wife, another possibility is that, if she refuses to return, he wants to receive another wife from her family to make up for losing her. Samson, on the other hand, left his wife, who was then given to another man as wife (Judg 14:19-20). When he returns and demands his wife, his father-in-law offers to give Samson her younger sister instead (Judg 15:1-2).

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 267.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 435.

leave her husband, then the Levite not only loses his wife but the bride-price he originally gave her family. The bride-price often starts another cycle of exchange, being used to obtain a wife for a member of the bride's family. In this way, multiple groups are interconnected through the bride-price, suggesting that this is just another form of marriage by exchange.<sup>26</sup> But here, the exchange is not woman for woman, but woman for economic gain which can then be reinvested in women or other goods.

### CRITIQUES OF LÉVI-STRAUSS

Plenty of critiques of Lévi-Strauss and his theories have been made in the decades since he entered academia. Most scholars disagree with Lévi-Strauss over his views as a structural anthropologist, a method which gained much popularity in the 1960s and 1970s, but has since fallen out of favor.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, in many ways, we cannot speak of structuralism without talking about Lévi-Strauss, as his theories are foundational to this school of thought in anthropology.<sup>28</sup>

In brief, structural anthropology “seeks to discover the universal structure of human thought.”<sup>29</sup> It is concerned with the “deep structures” which are embedded into the human mind. According to Lévi-Strauss, “the unconscious activity of the mind” impresses structures upon the content, and these structures are fundamental for all

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 466-70.

<sup>27</sup> Sidky, 245-46.

<sup>28</sup> David Kaplan and Roger Manners, *Cultural Theory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972), 171.

<sup>29</sup> Sidky, 245.

minds in all times and places.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, “it is necessary and sufficient to grasp the unconscious structure underlying each institution and each custom, in order to obtain a principle of interpretation valid for other institutions and other customs.”<sup>31</sup> The human mind, which for Lévi-Strauss is essential for explaining culture, operates much like a computer, with sets of binaries which are expressed in all forms of culture.<sup>32</sup> For structural anthropologists, the structure, i.e., the human mind, is universal, and therefore, “since all cultures are the product of human brains, there must be, somewhere beneath the surface, features common to all.”<sup>33</sup>

The value of structural anthropology as method of inquiry in anthropology has also received much criticism. For instance, Dan Sperber argues that structural anthropology offers us classifications, but not any explanations. Lévi-Strauss simply classifies the data and then analyzes them to propose the underlying thought structure.<sup>34</sup> Sperber also suggests that structural anthropology does not provide a way for us to distinguish between fundamental properties of a cultural phenomenon and those aspects which are generated by these fundamental properties.<sup>35</sup> Also, Lévi-Strauss and his school of structural anthropologists seem to ignore the empirical world, focusing strictly on logical validity, not empirical validity to make their arguments.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Anchor, 1967), 21-22.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Sidky, 249.

<sup>33</sup> Edmund Leach, *Claude Lévi-Strauss* (New York: Viking, 1970), 21-22.

<sup>34</sup> Dan Sperber, *Explaining Culture: A Naturalistic Approach* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 46-47.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>36</sup> John J. Honigmann, *The Development of Anthropological Ideas* (Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1976), 322.

Another source of criticism of Lévi-Strauss is feminist scholars, such as feminist cultural anthropologist Gayle Rubin. Rubin problematizes the difference between giver and gift inherent in Lévi-Strauss's theory. In her argument, the benefits of exchange fall only to the giver and receiver, and not to the gift, i.e., the woman being exchanged. As such, "women are in no position to realize the benefits of their own circulation."<sup>37</sup> Also, she notes that if a person can enter into a cycle of gift exchange, then they have something to give away. In the case of the traffic in women, the women are simply gifts and cannot give themselves away.<sup>38</sup> They do not have control over their own exchange, nor can they control the exchange of their own daughters. For feminist anthropologists, this interpretation of women as objects in an exchange poses problems because as merely gifts, women have no way to be an active participant in the gift exchange.

Yet Rubin also acknowledges the attractiveness of this theory of the exchange of women for feminist scholars. It roots the oppression of women in social systems, and not in biology. Certainly there are also many examples, both ancient and modern, of the traffic in women, such as we see throughout the Hebrew Bible and at the end of Judges in particular. Yet Rubin also calls Lévi-Strauss's theory of kinship a "radical gloss" on Mauss.<sup>39</sup> Mauss argued that gift exchange created social bonds that served to hold together cultures without centralized governmental institutions, and Lévi-Strauss considers the exchange of women to be most basic form of gift exchange. Thus,

---

<sup>37</sup> Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. (ed. Rayna R. Reiter; New York: Monthly Review, 1975), 174.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

according to Rubin, Lévi-Strauss suggests that the origin of culture arises from the incest taboo, which means that “the world historical defeat of women occurred with the origin of culture, and is a prerequisite of culture.”<sup>40</sup>

Yet given all these critiques of Lévi-Strauss, his theories of kinship tend to be more readily and widely accepted by the anthropological community as a whole.<sup>41</sup> While I use Lévi-Strauss in my analysis, I do so cautiously, keeping in mind the many criticisms of structural anthropology. As will be seen, however, the forms of kinship outlined by Lévi-Strauss help to explore the conclusion to Judges in a new and insightful way.<sup>42</sup>

### KIDNAPPING OF WIVES

Marriage-by-capture, or bride theft, has interested anthropologists since the discipline’s nascent stage in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The early English ethnographer Sir John Lubbock studied bride theft to argue for the evolution of marriage systems and related such practices to the origin of exogamy.<sup>43</sup> Fellow Englishman E. B. Tylor, one of the founding figures in anthropology, studied various forms of marriage-by-capture cross-

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 176. Rubin also points out that the incest taboo presupposes the existence of another earlier taboo against homosexuality. If some women are forbidden while others are available, then all men are forbidden partners for other men. See Rubin, 180.

<sup>41</sup> Robert A. Oden, Jr., “Jacob as Father, Husband, and Nephew: Kinship Studies and the Patriarchal Narratives,” in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 2 (1983), 191.

<sup>42</sup> I say “forms” instead of “structures” in an attempt to get away from Lévi-Strauss’s focus on the universal binary mind which structures the world. Throughout this paper, I try to use some of Lévi-Strauss’s theories of kinship without getting bogged down in the structural anthropology.

<sup>43</sup> Sir John Lubbock, *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man: Mental and Social Condition of Savages* (London: Longmans, Green, 1870).

culturally.<sup>44</sup> Some recent studies have suggested that Tylor's insights into the psychological dynamics of marriage-by-capture carry some truth.<sup>45</sup> Yet due to the evolutionary aspects of the theories proposed by him and by other early anthropologists studying marriage by kidnapping, this topic received little attention for decades. In 1972, the 71<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) began to rectify that situation by holding the Symposium on Kidnapping and Elopement as Alternative Systems of Marriage.<sup>46</sup> This meeting resulted in a special edition of *Anthropological Quarterly* devoted to the topic in 1974 and a general renewed interest of anthropologists in the subject which continues through today.

The term "kidnapping of wives" actually could be divided into specific practices. Bride theft, as defined by anthropologist Barbara Ayres, is "the forceable abduction of a woman for the purpose of marriage, without her foreknowledge or consent and without the knowledge or consent of her parents or guardians."<sup>47</sup> This can be further broken down into genuine bride theft and mock bride theft, where the bride still resists her captors, but has secretly agreed to or even planned the theft.<sup>48</sup> However, while bride theft involves the abduction of a particular woman from the community

---

<sup>44</sup> Edward Burnett Tylor, "On a Method of investigating the Development of Institutions Applied to Laws of Marriage and Descent," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 18 (1889), 245-272.

<sup>45</sup> Barbara Ayres, "Bride Theft and Raiding for Wives in Cross-Cultural Perspective," in *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974), 238-52.

<sup>46</sup> Daniel Bates, Francis Conant, and Ayse Kudat, "Introduction: Kidnapping and Elopement as Alternative Systems of Marriage," in *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974), 233-37.

<sup>47</sup> Ayres, 238.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.* Ayres also distinguishes mock theft from ceremonial capture, which is a stylized struggle as part of a marriage ceremony, and elopement, upon which both marriage partners agree and in which there is no element of force. See Ayres, 239.

with whom the abductor would normally contract a wife, “raiding for wives” involves the abduction of unknown women from outside the marriageable community. Also, with bride theft, the possibility remains that the parents of the kidnapped bride will be compensated for their loss and come to accept the marriage. In the case of raiding for wives, however, the abductors never compensate the women’s families for their loss, and so the marriage results in strained, even antagonistic, relationships between the kidnapers and the women’s families.<sup>49</sup>

The 1972 AAA symposium on alternative marriage systems offered several results from their various contributors, several of which apply directly to our narrative under consideration in this study, specifically the kidnapping of the virgins at Shiloh by the Benjaminites in Judg 21:15-24. The relevant features of alternative marriage systems are as follows:<sup>50</sup>

1. Cultures can have multiple acceptable modes of marriage, though one mode might be preferred over the others. Alternative forms can be sanctioned, or at least tolerated, in certain circumstances.
2. Alternative forms of marriage may actually comprise a significant portion, perhaps even a majority, of all marriages in a culture, even when the alternative form of marriage is viewed negatively by the culture.

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 239.

<sup>50</sup> See Bates, Conant, and Kudat, 235-36 for the full list. The numbering in this paper is my own and does not follow the numbering of Bates et al.

3. When the situation changes for a local cultural system, the marriage system often reflects these changes, particularly in the frequency of alternative marriages.
4. Environmental changes may also contribute to the rate of alternative modes of marriage.
5. Though alternative marriage forms might not be preferred, they can have a positive result by creating and/or extending kinship alliances.

Most importantly, we should note that alternative modes of marriage, such as bride theft and raiding for wives, are often viewed as acceptable alternatives to the standard, preferred form of marriage in a society and so often follow their own clear set of cultural rules.<sup>51</sup> I will return to this discussion of kidnapping of wives in my discussion of Judg 19-21 in chapter three.

---

<sup>51</sup> See Francis P. Conant, "Frustration, Marriage Alternatives and Subsistence Risks among the Pokot of East Africa: Impressions of Co-Variance," in *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974), 314-27, and Brian Stross, "Tzeltal Marriage by Capture," in *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974), 328-46.



## CHAPTER 2

### KINSHIP IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

Kinship in general, and marriage practices in particular, is a broad topic of inquiry in the Hebrew Bible, too broad for a full account in the current study. Instead, I offer a general overview of some aspects of kinship ties and marriage practices found in the Hebrew Bible and their relevance to the exchange of women.

According to King and Stager, “the biblical family has six main features: it is endogamous, patrilineal, patriarchal, patrilocal, joint and polygynous.”<sup>52</sup> The claim to endogamy requires the most attention. As I stated above, the concept of endogamy and exogamy is a matter of degree and definition. In Lévi-Strauss’s definition, endogamy is “the obligation to marry within an objectively defined group.”<sup>53</sup> In contrast, exogamy can be defined as “a rule of marriage which forbids an individual to take a spouse from within the local, kin, or status group to which he himself belongs.”<sup>54</sup> Using these definitions, then, kinship practices within the Hebrew Bible lean toward endogamy, but the stringency of this rule fluctuates.

---

<sup>52</sup> King and Stager, 38. According to King and Stager, the term “joint” suggests more than one generation. A more commonly used term for this concept is “extended family.” See Patricia B. Christian, “Family, Extended,” in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology* 3: 943-44.

<sup>53</sup> Lévi-Strauss, 45.

<sup>54</sup> George Peter Murdock, *Social Structure* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), 18 n.28.

## KINSHIP STRUCTURES

Before any official prohibition exists in the form of a law code, at least according to the narrative sequence in the Hebrew Bible (see Exod 34:12-16 and Deut 7:3-4),<sup>55</sup> Abraham expresses concern over his son and heir, Isaac, marrying a non-Israelite, specifically a Canaanite (Gen 24:2-4).<sup>56</sup> The Deuteronomistic History (DH) intensifies and formalizes this prohibition, expanding it to include all the surrounding peoples (Deut 7:1-4; cf. Exod 34:11-16).<sup>57</sup> DH is concerned with the potential apostasy exogamous marriage could bring to the Israelites. Even with this proscription on non-Israelite spouses, intermarriages with other nations occur. In the post-exilic period, Ezra orders those married to non-Israelite women to separate themselves from their wives (Ezra 10:10-11; cf. Neh 10:31). Though he condemns such marriages, they obviously have been taking place (Ezra 9:1-2). Ruth purports to tell a story during the era of the Judges, though scholars debate its date of composition.<sup>58</sup> In this tale, Ruth, a Moabite,

---

<sup>55</sup> The prohibition in Exodus belongs to the J source, which probably was composed sometime during the divided monarchy (922-722 BCE), before the first Deuteronomistic redaction, to which this passage from Deuteronomy belongs. See Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed: A New View into the Five Books of Moses* (San Francisco: Harper, 2003), 3-5. Of course, even with the formal prohibition against marrying non-Israelites, these marriages occurred. There regularly seems to be a disconnect between what groups claim as their marriage practices and how these practices actually look on the ground. See Oden, 204.

<sup>56</sup> As Jo Ann Hackett rightly points out, all societies have some kind of formalized kinship structures, though not all necessarily have articulated these structures in official law codes. Jo Ann Hackett, e-mail message to author, April 14, 2013.

<sup>57</sup> According to Richard Elliott Friedman, both this passage and the Genesis passage above belong to the J-source, which he dates before the first Deuteronomistic redaction. Clearly, however, this is a lasting concern, as it also appears in post-exilic writings. See Richard Elliott Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (San Francisco: Harper, 1997), 246-55.

<sup>58</sup> Ruth has been dated anywhere from the early monarchic period (beginning of the Davidic dynasty) to the post-exilic period. Edward Campbell, for example, suggests an early dating, stating that the theological perspective fits in nicely with the early monarchy. He posits Solomon's reign for the basic story, which was finally fixed by the ninth century, yet still contained archaic features. See Edward F. Campbell, *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*, Anchor Bible 7 (Garden

first marries the son of Elimelech, a Judahite living in Moab. After he dies, Ruth returns to Bethlehem with her mother-in-law Naomi, where she eventually marries the Judahite Boaz, a kinsman of Elimelech. In Judges, the fear of DH is realized when the Israelites intermarry with the surrounding nations and begin to worship other gods (Judg 3:5-6).<sup>59</sup>

The degree of endogamous versus exogamous marriage might also fluctuate based on the social standing of people involved. Kings often contract dynastic marriages to foreign women to solidify their alliance. Solomon, for example, marries the daughter of the Pharaoh (1 Kgs 9:16), as well as many other women from many different nations, even strictly prohibited nations (1 Kgs 11:1-2). These women lead Solomon into apostasy in his old age (1 Kgs 11:4-6). In an infamous example, King Ahab of Israel marries Jezebel, the daughter of the king of Tyre, after which Ahab worships Baal and Asherah (1 Kgs 16:31-33). Though both of these examples result in

---

City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 23-24. Likewise, Kirsten Nielson argues that the dynasty of David is essential to understanding Ruth, and so its composition must have occurred at some point during the monarchy. See Kirsten Nielson, *Ruth: A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Louisville: John Knox, 1997), 29; Louis B. Wolfenson, "The Character, Contents, and Date of Ruth," in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 27, no. 4 (1911): 285-300; Jacob M. Myers, *The Linguistic and Literary Form of the Book of Ruth* (Leiden: Brill, 1955); Robert L. Hubbard, *The Book of Ruth*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 23-35.

Other scholars use linguistic features, such as Aramaisms, to argue for a late pre-exilic or early post-exilic date. See, for example, Frederic W. Bush, *Ruth, Esther*, Word Biblical Commentary 9 (Dallas: Word Books, 1996), 20-30. Katharine Doob Sakenfield argues for a late pre-exilic, exilic, or post-exilic date not specifically on linguistic features, but due to the theme of "the community's view of outsiders," which fits to those time periods. See Katharine Doob Sakenfield, *Ruth*, Interpretation Series (Louisville: John Knox, 1999), 1-5.

Finally, some scholars conclude that we cannot posit any date with certainty, as both early and late date arguments can be validly made. For example, see Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 240-52 and Kathleen A. Robertson Farmer, *The Book of Ruth: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*, The New Interpreter's Bible 2, ed. Leander E. Keck, et al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 895.

<sup>59</sup> While Ruth is a Moabite, when she returns with Naomi to Bethlehem, she promises to worship Naomi's God, Yahweh. See Ruth 1:16.

apostasy, they suggest that political concerns could at times trump religious/cultural/ideological concerns, especially in the higher echelons of society.

Classifying a group as endogamous or exogamous also depends on how that group is organized and defined. By surveying the archaeological record, Stager paints us a picture of how family life in villages in the pre-monarchic Iron Age I might have been arranged. Conjugal families, meaning a married couple and their children, probably live in individual houses, with multiple single-family houses linked together in compounds.<sup>60</sup> Each compound, which Stager labels the *bayit*, consists of the typical patriarchal, patrilineal, patrilocal members: father, mother, unmarried children, married sons and their families, unmarried paternal aunts, and sometimes unmarried paternal uncles.<sup>61</sup> Besides family members, the *bayit* also includes non-related individuals, such as slaves, servants, *gērîm*, widows, orphans, Levites, etc.<sup>62</sup> The source of authority in the *bayit* is the male head of the household (father or oldest son/brother) or *pater familias*.<sup>63</sup> Beyond the *bayit*, larger kinship ties connect these lineages into clans. These clans are larger groups, perhaps several lineages, which assume a common ancestor, but cannot demonstrate it genealogically.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Lawrence E. Stager, "The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 260 (1985), 18. Stager calls these "nuclear" families, but that term typically is used for neo-local families, or those families which are neither patrilocal or matrilocal. As Israelite families are patrilocal, conjugal family is a more accurate term.

<sup>61</sup> King and Stager, 36; Stager, 19-20. See also Adbulla M. Lutfiyya, *Baytin, A Jordanian Village: A Study of Social Institutions and Social Change in a Fold Community* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966), 142-43.

<sup>62</sup> King and Stager, 40.

<sup>63</sup> King and Stager, 36; Stager, 20.

<sup>64</sup> Stager, 20. See also Robert Wilson, *Sociological Approaches to the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 37-38.

Stager's archeological evidence correlates well with the terminology found in the Hebrew Bible itself. Persons identify first with their *bayit* (lineage), or *bêt 'āb*, then with their *mišpāḥā(h)* (clan), their *šēbet* or *maṭṭe(h)* (tribe), and finally with the inclusive *'am* (people) or *bānê-Yisrā'el* (children of Israel). Josh 7:14-18 gives us an example of these different levels of classification when Joshua narrows down the group to find the guilty man responsible for their loss against Ai (Josh 7:3-5). He first finds the guilty tribe (*šēbet*), followed by the guilty clan (*mišpāḥā(h)*) and lineage (*bayit*), finally settling on the guilty individual, Achan, punishing both him and his nuclear family (Josh 7:24).<sup>65</sup>

A biblical portrayal of the *bêt 'āb* can be found in Judg 17-18 with the story of Micah. Apparently, Micah himself is the head of the household, as there is no mention of his father and throughout the story he makes the decisions for his house. His extended family lives in a grouping of buildings. This can be seen in Judg 18:15, where the Levite has his own house in the compound, and in Judg 18:22, where men in different houses are part of the *bêt mīkā(h)*.<sup>66</sup>

Marriage practices are most clearly defined in the narratives of the patriarchs in Genesis, where lineages including mothers are described. Terry Prewitt, for example, argues that the Genesis genealogies, specifically Gen 11:27-32 and the descendents of Terah, portray the “ideal” marriage as matrilineal cross-cousin marriage, or marrying

---

<sup>65</sup> A modified hierarchy emerges in 1 Samuel 10:21, which omits the lineage level (*bayit*). However, the rest of the levels of classification remain in the same order.

<sup>66</sup> Stager, 22.

the mother's brother's daughter.<sup>67</sup> He takes Abram, Nahor, and Haran as three separate lineages<sup>68</sup> who exchange women in marriage. Milcah, the wife of Nahor, is also the daughter of Haran. The marriage of Rebekah to Isaac and the marriages of Leah and Rachel to Jacob connect the lineages of Nahor and Abram.<sup>69</sup> In order to complete his pattern of circular marriage alliances, Prewitt argues that the unknown wife of Lot could have easily come from Abram's lineage. He sees this as a plausible explanation for the link between Lot and Abram in Genesis.<sup>70</sup>

Prewitt's efforts to see cross-cousin marriage in the Genesis genealogies are valiant, but ultimately unconvincing. To begin with, only one marriage he mentions actually occurs between first cousins, which is the basic form of cross-cousin marriage:<sup>71</sup> Jacob marries Leah and Rachel, the daughters of Laban, his mother's brother.<sup>72</sup> Nahor married his niece and Isaac married his first cousin once removed. Secondly, his link between Abram and Haran, needed to complete the cycle, is plausible at best.

---

<sup>67</sup> Terry J. Prewitt, "Kinship Structures and the Genesis Genealogies," in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 40, no. 2 (1981), 91.

<sup>68</sup> In Stager's conceptions of these terms, they could still belong to the same lineage because they can clearly trace their genealogies back to one common ancestor, Terah. See Stager, 20. Prewitt, in return, could argue that these are not historical genealogies, but were created with specific social and political goals in mind. Thus, Terah might simply be a mythical common ancestor, leaving these three separate lineages. See Prewitt, 88.

<sup>69</sup> Prewitt, 91-2.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 94.

<sup>71</sup> See E. R. Leach, *Rethinking Anthropology* (London: Athlone, 1961), 59-61 and Maria Velioti-Georgopoulos, "Endogamy," in *Encyclopedia of Anthropology* 2: 812-14.

<sup>72</sup> Oden, 194-95. Isaac might also have married his first cousin, Rebekah, depending on the identity of her father. According to Gen 24:15 and 24:24, Bethuel is Rebekah's father, while Gen 24:48 and 29:5 seem to suggest that Nahor is her father. If Bethuel is her father, then Isaac married his first cousin once removed. If Nahor is her father, then he married his first cousin and this is a second example of true cross-cousin marriage.

Robert Oden suggests a compelling alternative to the marriage preferences described in Genesis. Until the children of Jacob, Genesis presents a fairly linear lineage of the group soon to be called Israelites, from Abraham down to Jacob. Those adjacent to this direct line, such as Ishmael, Lot, or Esau, establish other Semitic nations, but those lineages are not followed. After Jacob, this linear genealogy becomes segmented, split between the twelve sons of Jacob/Israel, the ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>73</sup> These two types of genealogies, linear and segmented, create a distinction between the Israelites and other nations (linear genealogy) and between different Israelites (segmented genealogy). As Oden puts it, “*externally* Israel is the particular line descended solely from Abraham and from Isaac, but *internally* the Israelites are the various descendents of the various sons of Jacob.”<sup>74</sup>

Oden’s proposal is attractive for several reasons. For the past hundred years, anthropologists like Alfred L. Kroeber and A. R. Radcliffe-Brown have warned scholars against drawing conclusions about historical kinship systems based on traditional literature.<sup>75</sup> Oftentimes a culture’s myths will hold cross-cousin marriage as an ideal, while in reality, it is never practiced.<sup>76</sup> Oden’s proposal allows us to see the two types of genealogies presented in the Genesis accounts as both a conscious differentiation between Israelites and other nations and a way to distinguish groups within Israel. In practice, however, marriages do not typically follow stringent guidelines throughout the

---

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 195.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 196.

<sup>75</sup> Murdock, 119.

<sup>76</sup> Oden, 204.

Hebrew Bible. Marriage to non-Israelites is discouraged, but there does not seem to be a restriction to cross-cousin marriage.

### THE ECONOMICS OF KINSHIP

The main purpose of marriage in Ancient Israel was to produce and raise children, especially sons.<sup>77</sup> The emphasis on sons comes from concern over the land, the inheritance (*naḥlā(h)*) which is passed down through the *bêt 'āb*, preferably through the male line.<sup>78</sup> The importance of land inheritance can be seen in the story of Zelophehad's daughters, Num 27:1-11. With their father dead, the five daughters of Zelophehad approach Moses to ask for their father's inheritance among his brothers, the clan (*mišpāḥā(h)*). They are permitted to do so, and God describes the line of succession in the absence of a son. The land, regardless of who inherits it, remains within the original clan.

Num 36:5-10 further articulates the necessity for land to stay within a particular group.<sup>79</sup> Though Zelophehad's daughters have already inherited the land, the land will then pass to their husbands and any sons that result from their marriages. If they marry outside their tribe, the land passes to their husbands' tribe. As a result, the daughters must marry men of their choosing within one of the clans of their father's tribe. Notice

---

<sup>77</sup> King and Stager, 54. One of the first commands God gives any people in the narrative of the Hebrew Bible is to have children (Gen 1:28).

<sup>78</sup> Stager, 22.

<sup>79</sup> It will come as no surprise to the Hebrew Bible scholar that most of the biblical material on kinship discussed in this section, including the Genesis lists and the stories about Zelophehad's daughters belong to the P-source, as P tends to be most concerned with matters of ritual and genealogy.



that the daughters are not told to engage in cross-cousin marriage. The only restraint on their marriages is the command to stay within their father's tribe.

If land is the most important element in kinship structures, then marriage among the Israelites is, in part, an issue of economics. The goal of a marriage is to produce children, especially a male to inherit the land from his father. The wife's family receives a bride-price (*mōhar*) for giving up their daughter for marriage. Whether or not the Israelites practice any kind of dowry-giving is unclear, but a term for bride-price, *mōhar*, appears three times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 34:12, Ex 22:16, and 1 Sam 18:25).<sup>80</sup> In its first occurrence, *mōhar* parallels *mattān*, meaning gift, which echoes the cycles of gift exchange, including marriage, discussed above.

Seeing kinship among ancient Israelites as “houses nested within households on up the scale of the social hierarchy”<sup>81</sup> suggests that the social bonds created through kinship gave structure to society before the advent of the monarchy. Kinship ties created alliances between individuals and groups, from the level of the *bēt 'āb* all the way up to the *bānê-Yisrā'ēl*. In Judges we see the conflict that can arise from these different levels of kinship affiliation. Judg 19-21, in particular, presents a story where the majority of the tribes of Israel honor their highest affiliation, that of the *bānê-Yisrā'ēl*, while the Benjaminites uphold their lower, and therefore closer, tie to their own tribe.

---

<sup>80</sup> King and Stager, 54.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

## AMPHICTYONY VS. LINEAGE GROUPS

While I suggest in this paper that Judg 19-21 illustrates an instance where the majority of the Israelite tribes successfully band together in a common goal, and also where the kinship loyalty which links all *bənê-Yisrā'el* mediates conflicts of the group, I am not arguing in favor of Martin Noth's amphictyonic league. As the name suggests, Noth bases his argument on the Delphic Amphictyony in Greece, which involved twelve member tribes who banded together in a mutually beneficial alliance and also supported a particular temple or temples. For Noth, the existence of twelve members is very important, and he argues that this system actually existed in Israel and that the twelve tribes of Israel formed their own amphictyonic league.<sup>82</sup> He suggests that the judge served as "central office in the Israelites' twelve-tribe association and that the law played a decisive role in this association."<sup>83</sup> These allied twelve tribes worshiped at a central shrine before the ark, and during festivals at this shrine, the tribes "no doubt met to consult on questions of common interest, through their official representatives."<sup>84</sup> The tribal association punished violations of the divine law and could be called to enforce the punishment of its members.<sup>85</sup>

While Noth uses Judg 19-21 to support his theory of the historical presence of the Israelite amphictyonic league, Norman K. Gottwald claims that nothing in this story

---

<sup>82</sup> Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), 87-88.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 98.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 104.

supports Noth's notion of an amphictyonic league.<sup>86</sup> Likewise, Barnabas Lindars argues that the Deuteronomic historian added an introduction to a "collection of traditions of tribal exploits" and "imposed upon the book its pan-Israelite interpretation," without which the amphictyony disappears.<sup>87</sup> Throughout the book of Judges, all the tribes do not seem to cooperate fully. As Lindars point out, most of the individual judges, in fact, appear to lead on a local level.<sup>88</sup> Noth's model, then, does not effectively account for the social organization of the Israelites before the establishment of the monarchy.

The model which I propose appears in these final chapters of Judges more closely relates to Robert Wilson's lineage model. He argues that "lineages use the concept of kinship as their fundamental organizational principle and are based on the model of the nuclear family."<sup>89</sup> Most everyday activities and decisions occur at the level of what I, following Stager's description, label as the lineage, the *bêt 'āb*.<sup>90</sup> The larger kinship groups, the *mišpāḥāh* (clan), *šēbet* or *maṭṭeh* (tribe), and *bənê-Yisrā'el* in Stager's model, rarely participate in these activities. In fact, they only function for ritual or militaristic purposes, times when the smaller unit cannot sufficiently defend themselves. All these different groupings, from the lineage to the people of Israel, can

---

<sup>86</sup> Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979), 350.

<sup>87</sup> Barnabas Lindars, "The Israelite Tribes in Judges," in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 96.

<sup>88</sup> Hackett, "In the Days of Jael," 24.

<sup>89</sup> Wilson, *Sociological Approaches*, 40.

<sup>90</sup> Wilson refers to different levels of lineage groups, from the smallest level of a single family to the entire *bənê-Yisrā'el*. In keeping with my earlier discussion of Stager's kinship model, I continue to use his classifications of the different kinship levels in ancient Israel. Though their terminology differs, these two kinship models complement each other and are both useful in discussing the possible social organization of the Israelites during the period of the Judges.

adjudicate internal disputes depending on the individuals or groups involved. Within a single *bêt 'āb*, the senior male member acts as leader (*pater familias*), and so controls conflicts within his own lineage. When quarrels occur across lineages, clans or tribes, a single individual does not have authority over all the individuals involved, and a satisfactory replacement for the *pater familias* must be found. Typically, a group of “elders” from the various clans or tribes, depending on the level of the conflict, would suffice, as long as society in general and the specific parties involved are satisfied by the judgment of the elders.<sup>91</sup>

A social system based on lineages fits with the book of Judges, where the majority of the judges function at a smaller, more localized scale, as I mentioned above. Rarely do the judges seem to control more than a couple of tribes. Some examples where multiple tribes cooperate might be more oriented around the spoils of war and not the actual need for military help. For instance, the Ephraimites become angry with Gideon after he neglects to call them up for battle against the Midianites (Judg 8:1). The lineage system allows for conflicts to be resolved at all levels of society, which thus incorporates the varieties of inter- and intra-tribal cooperation found in Israel at the time of the Judges.

In the case of the Levite’s secondary wife in Judg 19-21, while on the surface the conflict occurs between specific groups of individuals, the implications are large. The group of Benjaminites denies hospitality to the Levite from Ephraim and his secondary wife, who is a Judahite from Bethlehem. Also, by attacking his guest, the

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 41-3.

Benjaminites also deny proper hospitality to the Ephraimite host, a stranger (*gēr*) in their city, and the host's daughter. They also thwart any attempt at hospitality the Ephraimite gives to the travelers. Given the parties involved—multiple Benjaminites, a Levite, a Judahite, and three Ephraimites—a larger council rightly needs to decide the outcome of this event. The attempts at reconciliation in chapter 21 also belong at the level of the tribes, as the dispute raged between one tribe and the rest of the Israelite tribes. Also, for both events, society at large, i.e., the Israelites (*bənê-Yisrā'ēl*), must find the result satisfactory. Therefore both the leaders of the people and the people themselves come to Mizpah and Bethel to judge the conflicts (Judg 20:2; 21:2, 16).<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Having all the people of Israel come to judge the situation, while the ideal, is not possible in actual practice. However, the text makes it clear that more people than just the elders come to Bethel in judgment (Judg 21:2).

## CHAPTER 3

### JUDGES 19-21

Judges 21 provides a conclusion to the story begun in chapter 19. In that chapter, a Levite who resides in Ephraim has a falling out<sup>93</sup> with his secondary wife (*pīlegeš*), who runs back to her father's house in Bethlehem in Judah. The Levite eventually follows her there with his servant (*na'ar*) to bring her back, but her father wines and dines his son-in-law for four days. On the fifth day, though the Levite lingers with his father-in-law until late in the day, he and his *pīlegeš*, along with his servant, set off for their home in Ephraim. They travel to Gibeah in Benjamin, where the Levite decides to pass the night. No one offers them hospitality, so they prepare to spend the night in the square.

At this point, the story begins to resemble the tale of the two messengers sent to Lot in Sodom in Gen 19. Whereas Lot, a *gēr* in Sodom, provides shelter to the two men, here an old man from Ephraim, a *gēr* in Gibeah, provides shelter to the Levite and his entourage.<sup>94</sup> That same night, however, a group of men come to the Ephraimite's house and demand the presence of the Levite so that they may "know him" (*y'd*) a Hebrew Bible euphemism for having sex (Judg 19:22). The Ephraimite offers instead his virgin daughter and the Levite's secondary wife. In the end, the Levite throws his wife out to

---

<sup>93</sup> The Hebrew uses the word *znh*, "to play the harlot," while the Septuagint reads the passive of *orgizō*, "to be angry."

<sup>94</sup> Perhaps the status of *gērîm* needs to be viewed incrementally. For instance, Lot is in a non-Israelite city, while the Ephraimite who rescues the Levite and his people is in an Israelite city, but one belonging to a different tribe from his.

the men to satisfy them.<sup>95</sup> With no messengers from God to save her, the woman is raped and abused throughout the night. Afterwards, she manages to crawl back to the threshold of the Ephraimite's house, where she collapses.

When she does not rise at his command in the morning, the Levite takes her home, chops her into twelve pieces, and sends them to the twelve tribes. As we learn in chapter 20, these pieces call the tribes to a council at Mizpah. They decide to destroy Gibeah for their actions, but the tribe of Benjamin chooses to support its close kin in Gibeah, and fight against the rest of the tribes of Israel.<sup>96</sup>

The battles go well for the Benjaminites for the first couple days, but on the third day, the rest of the Israelites set a trap for the Benjaminites.<sup>97</sup> This results in the complete destruction of Gibeah and all the rest of Benjamin—men, women, and children—save six hundred men. Thus we come to chapter 21, where a further problem is laid out: the rest of the tribes of Israel have made a vow at Mizpah that none of them will give their daughters in marriage to the Benjaminites. Because of this oath, without

---

<sup>95</sup> Notice that the virgin daughter of the Ephraimite has since disappeared from the story. This perhaps indicates the dependence of Judg 19 on Gen 19, suggesting that the daughter only appears because the source story has two women. See Sara J. Milstein, "Reworking Ancient Texts: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature" (PhD diss., New York University, 2010), 273-74.

Most scholars argue that Judges 19 is dependent upon Genesis 19. See Charles Fox Burney, *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Rivingtons, 1920), 443-45; Stuart Lasine, "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World," in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29 (1984), 38-39; J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 282. In contrast, Susan Niditch argues for the primacy of the Judges narrative, though, in agreement with Robert C. Culley, she notes the difficulty of coming to a definitive conclusion on the connection between the two. See Susan Niditch, *Judges* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 192; Susan Niditch, "The 'Sodomite' Theme in Judges 19-20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration," in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 44 (1982), 375-76; and Robert C. Culley, *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976), 56-57.

<sup>96</sup> Gibeah is a city in Benjamin, so by refusing to muster for battle, the Benjaminites choose their intra-tribal ties over their inter-tribal ties.

<sup>97</sup> This trap closely resembles Israel's battle strategy against the city of Ai in Josh 8.

available wives for these six hundred men, the tribe of Benjamin will completely disappear. While that may have been their original intention at the outset of the civil war, they now despair at Benjamin's extinction.

The Israelites need to get creative in order to both keep their oath and provide wives for their Benjaminite brothers. They first look for any group that did not muster for the battle against Gibeah and discover that no one came from Jabesh-Gilead. In retaliation for failing to muster, the Israelites completely destroy Jabesh-Gilead, with the exception of four hundred virgins, whom they give as wives to the Benjaminites. Still lacking enough women to satisfy all the men of Benjamin, the Israelites give permission to the Benjaminites to kidnap virgins participating in a yearly festival at Shiloh.<sup>98</sup> Though these women are members of the tribes of Israel, since they are being stolen and not given freely by their fathers, the oath has not been violated. Unfortunately for the Benjaminites, however, their stealing of virgins also means that they do not receive any kind of material bride-price, though these marriages do bring with them an alternative "exchange," a renewal of loyalties.

---

<sup>98</sup> While their tribe(s) of origin is not specified, clearly these virgins belong to the tribes of Israel. According to Norman Gottwald, the captured virgin daughters are Ephraimites. See Gottwald, 349.

Also, the exact number of virgins is not specified. Milstein uses this as one piece of evidence to argue that vv.1-14 and 15-24 originated separately, and that vv.15-24 were earlier. We know from 20:47 that six hundred men from Benjamin survived. 21:12 mentions that only four hundred virgins were found, but 21:23 does not give us any specific number. While it is possible that the number is implied, as Milstein argues, it is more probable that the four hundred virgins were specified in 21:12 as a way to set up the addition of vv. 1-14. See Milstein, 238-242 for a more detailed discussion. There is another possible option, however. With only six hundred men left, even with each man having a wife, rebuilding the tribe of Benjamin would be a long task. Perhaps the unspecified number of virgins alludes to the possibility that the men took multiple wives, which would help them rebuild faster. The lack of any bride price needed to attain these wives supports this possibility.



The presence of the oath against giving daughters in marriage is unique to Judg 21. The earlier account of the council at Mizpah gives no indication of this oath. Likewise, the oath to destroy all who did not muster for the battle against Gibeah (21:5) is not explicitly mentioned previously, though the actions of the Israelites against the Benjaminites—invoking an almost total ban—suggests this intention, even without the oath. We might interpret these late mentions of oaths as dramatic effect used to heighten the tension before the eventual resolution.<sup>99</sup> Yet if the oath condemning the Benjaminites to extinction had, in fact, been made at Mizpah, why make an oath against intermarriage with the Benjaminites? This oath against marriage has no place in the story. The Israelites tried to exterminate the entire tribe of Benjamin, but luckily, six hundred escaped (Judg 20:47).

While this oath cannot be located in the story, it still serves the purpose of suggesting an acceptable way for the Israelite victors to begin the reconciliation process, through the exchange of women and the kinship ties these marriages create. According to Mauss, a total cycle of exchanges involves the obligations to give, to receive, and *to reciprocate*.<sup>100</sup> If a receiver fails to reciprocate, the receiver is now inferior to the giver.<sup>101</sup> Perhaps, then, the Israelites should have given wives to the Benjaminites from their own daughters; as a defeated foe, even though a member of *bənê-Yisrā'ēl*, they were clearly inferior to the victors. However, as Lévi-Strauss reminds us, exchange contains a certain amount of speculation on behalf of the giver,

---

<sup>99</sup> Niditch, *Judges*, 208.

<sup>100</sup> Mauss [see note 4], 16-17.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.

who must trust that the exchange cycle will eventually close and that he will be adequately compensated for the original gift.<sup>102</sup> Gift exchange can bring profit to the giver, but always with some risk.

Consider the risk of beginning a cycle of exchange with the most precious commodity at stake—women. The prohibition to marry one set of women has the counter implication that another group of women are eligible for marriage.<sup>103</sup> But here at the end of Judges, the entire tribe of Benjamin has been reduced to only six hundred men. They have no women to give in return to the Israelites for the gift of their daughters as wives. The cycle would remain incomplete, at least for the several years it would take to once again have young women of marriageable age in Benjamin. Giving away their daughters in marriage would have the Israelites speculate without any real hope of equal return. They could not have even expected to receive a bride-price for their daughters because of the total ban placed upon Gibeah (Judg 20:37-40) and the remaining towns (Judg 20:48) as the remnant of Benjamin hid for four months (Judg 20:47). Entering into a gift exchange cycle with the Benjaminites at this point brings no economic gain to the Israelites, but would certainly result in loss. Seen in this context, the oath against giving their daughters in marriage to the Benjaminites makes sense. The Israelites cannot give up their women with no hope of profit, even though they might bewail the loss of one of the tribes of Israel.

---

<sup>102</sup> Lévi-Strauss [see note 13], 267.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

And they do both mourn dread the loss of Benjamin. The fear of losing one of the tribes is seen earlier in a smaller scale with the daughters of Zelophehad in Num 27. Here the daughters argue that their father's lineage (*bēt 'āb*) should not be cut off from his clan (*mišpāhā(h)*). As discussed in chapter two, the issue at stake here is not just the loss of a lineage, but the potential loss of land. The lineage connects directly to the land, which is given as an inheritance (*naḥālā(h)*) to the (typically male) successor. Therefore the daughters of Zelophehad are commanded to marry within their father's tribe, in order that the inherited land stays within the correct tribe.

Though Judg 21 does not mention the loss of land specifically, the importance of land throughout the history of the Israelites makes this interpretation more than plausible. Also, the story concludes with all the people leaving by tribe (*šēbet*) and family (*mišpāhā(h)*) to return to their own ancestral land (*naḥālā(h)*). If the tribe of Benjamin disappears, where does the land go? Is it claimed by neighboring tribes? Is it completely up for grabs by anyone? Does it leave the "control" of the Israelites entirely? Losing one of the tribes creates the potential for losing that tribe's ancestral territory. Once the Benjaminites receive wives by the end of Judges, they return to their cities, to their land, and begin to rebuild (Judg 21:23). The desired outcome of the civil war has been achieved.

However, the gift exchange which needs to occur here to bring about this desired outcome is not the typical form of traffic in women. Judges 21 tells a story where there cannot be an exchange, and therefore no forgiveness, because of the oaths made at Mizpah. The question remains, what do you do about exchange when one party

has been deprived of everything—women, bride-price, etc.? What is the other option besides giving their own daughters as wives without getting anything in return? What results are alternative forms of exchange, devised to overcome the tricky situation in which the Israelites currently find themselves.

Considering the need for wives for the remnant of Benjamin and the aversion toward giving their own daughters, the function of the Israelite's second oath allegedly sworn at Mizpah becomes clear. Because the Israelites will not give their own daughters, they must find other ways of obtaining women, and the oath committing those who neglected the muster for the battle against Gibeah to the ban presents a perfect opportunity to do so. The town of Jabesh-Gilead, and the four hundred virgins found there, provides a legitimate situation for the Israelites to begin the process of reconciliation with the Benjaminites.<sup>104</sup>

This reconciliation is achieved through a gift exchange, the traffic of women which reestablishes ties between the Benjaminites and the rest of the Israelites. This exchange does not present too much risk to the Israelites as givers, since they give women captured in battle and not their own women. The Israelites begin this conciliatory exchange cycle by giving the Benjaminites the four hundred virgins as wives. It is important for the Israelites to begin this cycle, because through their refusal to give their own daughters, they have also refused the alliance which comes with such

---

<sup>104</sup> Also, as Jo Ann Hackett rightly pointed out, because the men from Jabesh-Gilead did not participate in the battle against Benjamin, presumably they also did not also swear the oath not to give their daughters as wives to the Benjaminites. See Jo Ann Hackett, "Violence and Women's Lives in the Book of Judges," in *Interpretation* 58, vol. 4 (Oct., 2004), 363. Of course, by killing the entire population of the town besides these four hundred virgins, the Israelites also ensure that there is no one left to complain about giving their daughters to the Benjaminites.

marriages. As Lévi-Strauss puts it, “marriage alliance always involves a choice between those with whom one is allied and on whom henceforth one relies for friendship and help, and those with whom an alliance is declined or ignored and with whom ties are severed.”<sup>105</sup> According to Mauss, in some societies, the failure to give “is tantamount to declaring war” because it rejects “the bond of alliance and commonality.”<sup>106</sup> Withholding their own daughters is equivalent to severing ties or declining to repair an already wounded alliance.<sup>107</sup>

If the Israelites begin this cycle of exchange with the gift of women, the six hundred Benjaminites continue the cycle by first receiving the gift and then by reciprocating.<sup>108</sup> The emphasis of this cycle is not strictly on an economical dilemma (the land), but also political reconciliation, so the reciprocal gift differs. If the Israelites had given their own women, we might expect a bride-price and/or marriageable women given in return, neither of which the Benjaminites currently have access to. Instead of this expected bride-price, the tribe of Benjamin reciprocates with the gift of a return to inter-tribal loyalty. Benjamin neglected inter-tribal loyalty in favor of intra-tribal loyalty, which resulted in the civil war. When the remnant accepts the gift of women,

---

<sup>105</sup> Lévi-Strauss, 435.

<sup>106</sup> Mauss, 17.

<sup>107</sup> The placement of this oath at the beginning of what turns out to be the reconciliation of the warring tribes could, therefore, have been seen as the Israelites once again declaring war on the Benjaminites. If nothing else, the refusal to give their own daughters to satisfy their needs could be viewed as imposing economic sanctions on the tribe of Benjamin. However, as the narrative continues, the purpose of this oath as a way to protect the rest of Israel economically becomes clear, as discussed above. Finding alternatives to giving their own daughters as wives is necessary for turning this refusal from a declaration of war into the beginning stages of reconciliation.

<sup>108</sup> The Benjaminites must trust the good intentions of the Israelites when they first offer the women from Jabesh-Gilead as wives. Trust enables the Benjaminites to accept the women, and this trust then allows for their reciprocation to the Israelites.

they return to the fold, both figuratively and literally, leaving their hiding place to rejoin the rest of the assembly. The ties between these two groups of men, which are first strained through the civil war and then severed through the refusal to give daughters as wives, have been remade.

Of course, not all the remnant of Benjamin receives wives through this first cycle of exchange. As with most gift exchanges, the end of one cycle allows for the beginning of another. The Israelites once again begin the sequence by gifting more virgins to the Benjaminites as wives (Judg 21:16-23). Notice that the oath against the giving of their own daughters to Benjamin is repeated in this second circle of gifts (Judg 21:18). Once again, the Israelites refuse their daughters because of the paucity of material profit the Benjaminites can offer in return. But this time, instead of finding another city to place under the ban like Jabesh-Gilead, the Israelites suggest another alternative, that of kidnapping the virgins dancing at a yearly festival at Shiloh. By suggesting the kidnapping of virgins, the Israelites begin the gift cycle more indirectly the second time around. Even though the Benjaminites must kidnap their brides, they are still receiving a gift and so must reciprocate appropriately.

As with the first attempt to get the Benjaminites wives from Jabesh-Gilead, this second gift cycle is not a typical exchange of women. In both of these instances, there is an honor/shame element both in breaking the oaths and in the inability to reciprocate a gift.<sup>109</sup> While the Israelites' virgin daughters are actually marrying the remaining men from Benjamin, the Israelites do not willingly give them as brides. Thus, the alternative

---

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 83.

mode of this marriage exchange permits an alternative reciprocal gift from the Benjaminites. If the Israelites voluntarily gave their daughters, they would expect the proper economic return from the Benjaminites. By simply allowing Israelite daughters to be kidnapped, a return to tribal loyalty can now be accepted as a reciprocal gift.

Notice, however, that while the entire Israelite community (*hā'ām* or *bānê-Yisrā'ēl*) participates in the first exchange of women from Jabesh-Gilead with the Benjaminites, only the elders of the congregation (*ziqnê hā'ēdā(h)*) decide upon this second course of action. Presumably, the elders have no daughters among the virgins dancing at Shiloh, and so by permitting the kidnapping of other Israelites' daughters, they themselves are not violating their first oath.<sup>110</sup> Also, by having only the elders make the decision, the fathers or brothers whose daughters/sisters are kidnapped by the Benjaminites have also not broken their oath because they did not give their daughters, nor allow for their capture. The head of each household (*bēt 'āb*) can neither allow for the kidnapping, nor accept any economic reciprocation for the “gift” of their women. To do so would violate their oath. The elders have devised a plan that effectively provides Israelite wives to the Benjaminites, but does not force anyone to break the first oath made at Mizpah.

Remember from the discussion of alternative modes of marriage in chapter one that these different forms of marriage can be sanctioned by society as acceptable, though perhaps not preferable marriage practices. And while these alternatives might

---

<sup>110</sup> The Hebrew text makes this clear in 21:22, where the elders say “we will say to them” (*wə'āmarnū 'ālēhem*), with “we” meaning the elders and “them” referring to the fathers or brothers of the virgins (*'ābôtām 'ô 'āhēhem*)

not be the ideal, they can create kinship alliances between the two parties.<sup>111</sup> As Lévi-Strauss explains it, “even marriage by capture does not contradict the rule of reciprocity. Rather it is one of the possible legal ways of putting it into practice.”<sup>112</sup> While marriage-by-capture can always be used to gain wives in some cultures, other cultures only view the kidnapping of wives as a viable marriage alternative during certain times of the year. The Pokot people of East Africa, for example, permit kidnapping unmarried women during the summer solstice ceremonial cycle.<sup>113</sup>

Here in Judg 21, the elders of the community, who therefore can make decisions for the entire Israelite people,<sup>114</sup> have sanctioned the kidnapping of women, or to use Ayers’ term, raiding for wives,<sup>115</sup> by the Benjaminites.<sup>116</sup> As with the Pokot, the kidnapping of the virgins at Shiloh must occur during the festival which brought the virgins to dance there (Judg 21:19-21). This instruction might depend solely on the fact that the virgins will be the most physically available during this festival; however, the elders’ instructions make it clear that the Benjaminites must take the women only at that time.<sup>117</sup> Presumably, if a Benjaminite wanted instead to simply check out the goods

---

<sup>111</sup> Bates , Conant, and Kudat, 235-36.

<sup>112</sup> Lévi-Strauss, 65.

<sup>113</sup> Conant, 322.

<sup>114</sup> See Wilson, 41-43.

<sup>115</sup> Ayers, 239.

<sup>116</sup> The first wives from Jabesh-Gilead could also be described as kidnapped. However, taking women as booty from a victorious battle happens elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. See, for example, Judg 5:30. I understand the traffic of women from Jabesh-Gilead as a more typical gift exchange, while the kidnapping of the virgins at Shiloh, though still a metaphorical gift exchange, falls more in line with marriage-by-capture.

<sup>117</sup> Hackett suggests that the Israelite virgins must be kidnapped during the festival at Shiloh because of the absence of their fathers/brothers at that time. The elders do not want the Benjaminites to kill more Israelites just to get wives. See Hackett, “Violence and Women’s Lives,” 362.



during the festival and then kidnap his virgin of choice at another point, the elders would not sanction this later action.

The kidnapping of women from Shiloh does not seem to fit neatly into any of Ayers' classifications of alternative modes of marriage. It most closely compares with her "raiding for wives" because it involves a mass abduction of unknown women, compared to her "bride theft," which is an individual matter. However, she sees bride theft occurring within the normal community within which marriages are brokered, while raiding for wives happens outside this normal community. As I discussed in chapter two, the "normal community" within which Israelites must marry is hard to determine, but the Shiloh virgins are Israelites, so reside within the largest potential marriageable community for the Benjaminites (i.e. all of Israel). Also, Ayers argues that raiding for wives never results in kinship alliances like bride theft can. The families of the abducted women and the raiders become estranged, even enemies as a result of the raid.<sup>118</sup>

Ayers bases her last point on the claim that the families of the women stolen by a raid never receive any compensation for their lost women.<sup>119</sup> In the case of Judg 21, however, this claim does not hold up. While the fathers and brothers of the stolen virgins from Shiloh will not receive any economic compensation for their loss,<sup>120</sup> the Israelites as a whole do obtain reciprocation from the Benjaminites in the form of

---

<sup>118</sup> Ayers, 238-39.

<sup>119</sup> Ayers, 239.

<sup>120</sup> Remember that any economic compensation, the expected recompense for giving a daughter in marriage, would result in breaking the first oath made by the Israelites at Mizpah.

renewed trust and a return to loyalty. Therefore, the kidnapping of wives in Judg 21:15-24 resembles a mix of bride theft and raiding for wives. It involves a mass kidnapping of virgins from the typical marriageable community which creates alliances in the form of kinship ties and a return to intertribal loyalty.

The Israelites' decision to allow the Benjaminites to kidnap wives for themselves also makes sense given the sudden changes in the Benjaminites' situation due to the civil war. As the studies of alternative modes of marriage suggest, changes in the environment or circumstances can account for the frequency of different marriage practices.<sup>121</sup> The Benjaminites sit on the verge of extinction with only six hundred men and four hundred women (from Jabesh-Gilead). They have little means of economic support because the Israelites destroyed their land (Judg 20:48). The preferred mode of obtaining wives cannot work for the Benjaminites, as both they and the elders of Israel recognize. The permission to steal wives, then, offers a viable, socially-sanctioned alternative. This traffic in women by kidnapping recreates alliances between the Israelites and the Benjaminites which "could not have been contracted by following the rules of the game."<sup>122</sup>

As stated in the introduction, feminist scholars are quick to call this story out for its cruelty toward women (and men) or to agree with Tribble's label "text of terror."<sup>123</sup> The women in this story are traded, kidnapped, and raped, with no voice with which to

---

<sup>121</sup> Bates, Conant, and Kudat, 236.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> For her discussion of this story, see Tribble, 65-91.

raise any objections.<sup>124</sup> Susan Niditch calls these women “sacrificial offerings” which are needed to seal the reconciliation between the Benjaminites and the rest of the Israelites.<sup>125</sup> Jo Ann Hackett remarks that the continuous mention of these oaths apparently sworn by men in the heat of battle which strongly affect the women reminds us of the sacrifice of Jephthah’s daughter in Judg 11.<sup>126</sup> As a sacrifice, the virgin brides invoke a whole new level of gift exchanges, that between humans and gods. Mauss sees the evolution from gift exchange with gods to humans as natural because “one of the first groups of beings with which men had to enter into contract, and who, by definition, were there to make a contract with them, were...the gods.”<sup>127</sup> A sacrifice to the gods is a gift given which must then be reciprocated by the gods. Whether or not the text intends any reference to sacrifice can be debated,<sup>128</sup> but that interpretation suggests a parallel set of gift cycles—human and divine. One aspect of gift exchanges common between both humans and gods is that they both bring peace between the two groups involved.<sup>129</sup> As each cycle completes, the parties renew their ties of loyalty, eventually bringing about lasting reconciliation.

---

<sup>124</sup> For Lévi-Strauss, the silence of women in marital transactions taking place between groups of men is not problematic because even when her feelings are taken into consideration, “in acquiescing to the proposed union, she precipitates or allows the exchange to take place; she cannot alter its nature.” Lévi-Strauss, 115.

<sup>125</sup> Niditch, *Judges*, 209-10.

<sup>126</sup> Jo Ann Hackett, “Violence and Women’s Lives,” 363.

<sup>127</sup> Mauss, 20.

<sup>128</sup> Niditch mentions that total ban is equated to a whole burnt offering to God in Deut 13:16-17, which supports her interpretation of the women as sacrificial offerings. Niditch, *Judges*, 209. Perhaps the fact that the virgins at Shiloh are participating in a yearly festival also supports this interpretation.

<sup>129</sup> Mauss, 21.

This positive ending, with all the tribes being reconciled through gift exchange, is only possible because of the women exchanged. Through the traffic of virgins for marriage, no tribe is blotted out from Israel and no land is lost or needs to be parceled out to the remaining tribes. The Benjaminites are able to go home to their own inheritance (*naḥălā(h)*) to rebuild while all the rest of the Israelites also return to their own ancestral lands (*naḥălā(h)*). The women may not have had any say in their fates, they may not have exercised any agency, but without them reconciliation would not have occurred. The virgins seal the remade bonds of loyalty between the men.

## CHAPTER 4

### MONARCHIC REFRAIN

If the ending to the story surrounding the Levite's wife and the resulting civil war is positive, if the warring tribes are able to enact their own reconciliation through the exchange of women, why does the (pro-)monarchic refrain frame this story? The monarchic refrain appears only four times in Judges, twice in its full form ("In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes." Judg 17:6, 21:25) and twice with only half the phrase ("In those days there was no king in Israel..." Judg 18:1, 19:1). All four instances occur in the appendices to Judges (chs. 17-21).

Scholars have long noted the differences between the last five chapters of Judges and the main body of the text (3:12-16:31).<sup>130</sup> They do not fit into the continuous cycle of apostasy, oppression, deliverance, and a return to Yahweh which structures the body of Judges. In fact, the final five chapters lack any mention of an individual deliverer or

---

<sup>130</sup> For example, see Burney, xxxvii; John Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967), 239, 243; J. Alberto Soggin, *When the Judges Ruled* (London: Lutterworth, 1965), 64; Soggin, *Judges 4-5*; George Foot Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895; repr. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958), xxix, 403-4; Robert G. Boling, *Judges* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 30ff.

On the other hand, some scholars have argued for the overall unity of the book. For example, Brettler argues that Judg 16 offers no conclusion formula, and thus cannot be seen as the ending. He also notes ways chapters 17-21 are connected to the main body of the text, such as the comment of eleven hundred pieces of silver in 17:2. Since this is an unusual number in the Hebrew Bible, Brettler suggests this mimics the money given to Delilah by the Philistines in chapter 16. See Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Book of Judges* (London: Routledge, 2002), 80-81, 109-10. See also Yaira Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (trans. Jonathan Chipman; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 314-16 and Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 229.

saving act, focusing instead on tales about two tribes, the Danites (chs. 17-18) and the Benjaminites (chs. 19-21). The presence of the monarchic refrain also separates these stories from the rest of Judges.

Various explanations for the presence of the monarchic refrain have been offered by scholars. Writing at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, George Foot Moore concludes that it “is probably the comment of an editor, who felt it necessary to explain how such lawless doings went unrestrained and unpunished.”<sup>131</sup> And while other scholars in his day argue that this comment must have been made while the monarchy was flourishing, Moore suggests it could have occurred during the exile.<sup>132</sup> Charles Burney also remarks that the refrain is surely added by an editor to explain a seemingly low point in religious activity and morality, at least in the editor’s own perspective. He suggests more strongly than Moore that a post-exilic writer, like the Chronicler, is responsible for these comments.<sup>133</sup> Though Susan Niditch is less precise about the redactional layers in Judges than other scholars, she also argues for a late, post-exilic attribution for the monarchic refrain.<sup>134</sup>

John Gray, in contrast, argues that the refrains belong to the original stories because “the note on the regulative influence of the king in the cult (17.6; cf. 18.1) is

---

<sup>131</sup> Moore, *Judges*, 369.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 382.

<sup>133</sup> Burney, 410-11. Burney lays out the different layers of Judges as follows: The first editor is responsible for the “pragmatic” introduction (Judg 2:6-3:6), as well as the framework of the narratives that follow. This editor did not write these narratives, which represent older material, but edited them together. A later editor is responsible for the first introduction (Judg 1:1-2:5), which does not offer as good a link to Joshua as Judge 2:6-3:6 does. This editor may also be responsible for the appendices (chs. 17-21), though there seems to be older source material for these two tales. See Burney, xxxiv-xxxvii for his overview of the redactional layers of Judges.

<sup>134</sup> Niditch, 13.

more readily explicable in the context of tradition from the priesthood of the royal shrines of Dan or Bethel than from the Deuteronomist.”<sup>135</sup> These stories are attached to the book of Judges because they are well-preserved traditions from Bethel which remark upon the restraining force of the monarchy.<sup>136</sup> Robert Boling argues that the monarchic refrain refers to Yahweh as a celestial king rather than an earthly monarch. Following this line of thought, he suggests that this phrase, specifically in Judg 21:25, could have been added as late as the Babylonian exile where “it meant that the time had arrived once again for every man to do what was right before Yahweh without any sacral political apparatus to get in the way.”<sup>137</sup>

J. Alberto Soggin argues that, especially in the case of Judg 17-18, the monarchic refrain could possibly be attributed to DtrH, which is the earliest, pro-monarchic redactor suggested by Timo Veijola.<sup>138</sup> In the case of chapters 19-21, however, the refrain does not fit the content of the story because “the existence of an inter-tribal assembly is actually affirmed.”<sup>139</sup> In his view, people in fact could not do whatever they wanted because of the judgment of the tribe. Therefore, Soggin

---

<sup>135</sup> Gray, 239.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 243.

<sup>137</sup> Boling, 277.

<sup>138</sup> Soggin, *Judges*, 265, 280. Veijola argues for three redactional layers: the history editor (DtrH), the prophetic editor (DtrP), and the nomistic editor (DtrN). See Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975) and Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977).

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 280.

concludes that the presence of the monarchic refrain in this story could be from a later, anti-monarchical redaction, DtrN, which is using the earlier form deliberately.<sup>140</sup>

Not all scholars see this phrase as a purely pro-monarchic element, though the end of Judges has often been interpreted this way. For example, though Niditch argues for attribution to a post-exilic redactor, unlike Moore and Burney, she sees no judgment on the part of the redactor in using this phrase; it is simply a natural element in a story set in a past long gone.<sup>141</sup> As mentioned above, Soggin argues for a general pro-monarchic tone, although he suggests that the tone of the second story is somewhat mitigated by its contents.<sup>142</sup>

Deciding upon the origin of the monarchic refrain invariably relies on how we view the formation of the Deuteronomistic History in general. Of all the theories I have considered, I find Frank Moore Cross' theory of two redactional layers of DH—one during the Josianic reform (Dtr<sup>1</sup>) and one during the exile (Dtr<sup>2</sup>)—most convincing.<sup>143</sup> Cross takes a wide view of DH to develop his theory, rather than beginning at the sentence level à la Rudolf Smend,<sup>144</sup> tracing how various themes run throughout DH to reconstruct possible layers of composition. Nor does he suggest a longer series of

---

<sup>140</sup> Ibid, 281.

<sup>141</sup> Niditch, 13.

<sup>142</sup> Soggin, *Judges*, 5.

<sup>143</sup> See Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 274-89.

<sup>144</sup> Rudolf Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Festschrift Gerhard von Rad* (ed. H. W. Wolff; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971), 494-509.



editions, as Helga Weippert,<sup>145</sup> or in the extreme, André Lemaire suggest.<sup>146</sup> Cross proposes a model of redaction that accounts for both the similarities and differences found in the various tales of DH.

The issues surrounding when Judg 17-21 are both written and added to the main body of Judges are complex, too complicated to fully explore in the current study. In fact, simply lumping those five chapters together over-simplifies the problem, as they most likely come from different sources and are perhaps also added to the text in different stages. Following Cross's proposal and my analysis of the material thus far, however, I tentatively suggest that the first redactor added these final two stories to the rest of Judges, inserting the editorial monarchic refrain to tie the separate stories together. Cross does not mention much about Judges in general, nor about the monarchic refrain in particular, but his overarching conception of the formation of the DH can support this claim.

Working mostly from First and Second Kings, Cross identifies two prominent themes in the work of Dtr<sup>1</sup> which appear to have two different theological stances. The first, "stemming from the old Deuteronomic covenant theology which regarded destruction of dynasty and people as tied necessarily to apostasy,"<sup>147</sup> sees the sins of Jeroboam, who established cult centers at Dan and Bethel, as the critical event in the

---

<sup>145</sup> Helga Weippert, "Geschichten und Geschichte: Verheissung und Erfüllung im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk," in *Congress Volume: Leuven, 1989* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 43; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 116-31.

<sup>146</sup> André Lemaire, "Vers l'histoire de la Rédaction des Livres des Rois," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98 (1986): 221-36.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 284.

history of the northern kingdom of Israel.<sup>148</sup> Josiah and his reforms stand as the apex of the second theme which is “drawn from the royal ideology in Judah: the eternal promises to David.”<sup>149</sup>

The second redactor changed little of the first form of the DH. Final chapters were added in Kings to bring it up to date and added bits here and there to make the history more relevant to the exile.<sup>150</sup> Cross warns us that not all passages threatening defeat and/or captivity have to be attributed to the exilic editor because those were common threats in the ancient Near East. Certain passages which “appear to be addressed to exiles and to call for their repentance, or in one case even promise restoration of the captives to their land” are attributed to Dtr<sup>2</sup>.<sup>151</sup> This light touch of the redactor gives the DH its distinctive tone, the muted hope for restoration as Wolff described,<sup>152</sup> as compared to “the great works of the Exile with their lively hope of restoration: of the eternal covenant and return (the Priestly work), of a new Exodus and Conquest (Second Isaiah), and of a new allotment of the land, a new Temple, and a new Davidid (Ezekiel).”<sup>153</sup>

Since the monarchic refrain fits with the two themes of the first redactor and does not appear to relate specifically to the concerns of the exilic redactor, it was most likely attached to the source stories of Judges by Dtr<sup>1</sup>. While I agree with Gray that the

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 279.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 284.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 285; Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, 108.

<sup>151</sup> Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 287.

<sup>152</sup> Hans Walter Wolff, “Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 171-86.

<sup>153</sup> Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 289.

monarchic refrain appears to be commenting on the regulating influence of the monarchy on the cult,<sup>154</sup> it belongs with the shaping of the history by the redactor working during the time of Josiah's reform. The culmination of the first Dtr<sup>1</sup> theme, as discussed above, is the reign of Jeroboam and his establishment of two golden calves at shrines, one each at both Dan and Bethel. Soon after, a prophet proclaims that a descendent of David named Josiah will destroy these shrines (1 Kgs 13:1-2). Later, Josiah does indeed destroy the sanctuary of Bethel (2 Kgs 23:4).

As shown above, through the work of Dtr<sup>1</sup>, Josiah is connected to the cult centers at both Dan and Bethel. Both places also figure prominently in the two stories told in the appendices to Judges. Chapters 17-18 relate the establishment of a cult center in Dan, while the Israelites use Bethel as their base of operations both during the civil war (ch. 20) and during the reconciliation process (ch. 21). Bethel acts as the central sanctuary where the Israelites can ask questions before God. This use of Bethel goes against one of the central themes in Dtr<sup>1</sup>, that of centralization of the cult in Jerusalem. With the added monarchic refrain, which connects and frames the final two stories, the inter-tribal bloodshed in the appendices is attributed to the lack of the controlling influence of a Davidic king who would properly regulate the Israelite cult. The Deuteronomist attempts to frame this otherwise successful story of the ability of the tribes to overcome inter-tribal fighting themselves as a negative story which illustrates the chaotic state of Israel before the establishment of the monarchy.

---

<sup>154</sup> See Gray, 239.

## CONCLUSION

Many traditional interpretations of the ending to Judges argue for reading chaos into the final story (chs. 19-21), chaos which can only be resolved by the establishment of the monarchy. Judges ends with a story of civil war, tribe fighting against tribe, brother against brother. Traditional feminist interpretations of Judges, if we can use the word traditional and feminist in the same sentence, focus on the positive and negative extremes in the book's portrayal of women. Deborah the prophetess/judge and Jael the warrior represent the positive extreme, while the women in this final story, the Levite's secondary wife and the virgin brides in ch. 21 represent the negative extreme.

Throughout this study, I have argued against both traditional interpretations. Bringing anthropological theories of gift exchange and marriage practices together with kinship studies of the Hebrew Bible, I offer a fresh look at the final chapter of Judges. I suggest that the traditional chaotic interpretation can only be found with the addition of the monarchic refrain. When the Deuteronomistic editor adds the monarchic refrain to tie together these disparate tales, the stories receive their pro-monarchic tone. Judges does not end with a hopeless state of affairs which can, but rather in renewed kinship loyalties. The tribes achieve this resolution on their own, without the unifying effect of the king, through the exchange of women for wives.

These women, through whom the tribes achieve reconciliation, do not speak a word of protest, do not act in self-defense, and do not receive any benefit through their

forced marriages. Though still living individuals, the authors of Judges portray them more as objects able to be exchanged than active participants in the story, yet they remain essential to the resolution of the plot. Without these virgin brides, the tribes could not have fixed their fractured relationships. While these women might not be the strong, forceful female role models try to find in the Hebrew Bible, they are no less important.

After the civil war which resulted in the near annihilation of the tribe of Benjamin, the tribes achieve reconciliation on their own, without the unifying effect of the king, through the exchange of women for wives. The gift of wives from Jabesh-Gilead and Shiloh, given by the rest of the Israelites and received by the Benjaminites, reconstructs kinship bonds between the tribes. The women, though they do not speak or act on their own, mediate this inter-tribal conflict between the men. The tribes seal their reconciliation with these virgins given as brides.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aharoni, Yohanan. "The Use of Hieratic Numerals in Hebrew Ostraca and the Shekel Weights." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 184 (Dec. 1966): 13-19.
- Amit, Yaira. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ayres, Barbara. "Bride Theft and Raiding for Wives in Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974): 238-52.
- Bates, Daniel, Francis Conant, and Ayse Kudat. "Introduction: Kidnapping and Elopement as Alternative Systems of Marriage." *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974): 233-37.
- Boling, Robert G. "Book of Judges." Pages 1107-1117 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . *Judges*. Anchor Bible 6. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. *The Book of Judges*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Burney, Charles Fox. *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Rivingtons, 1920.
- Bush, Frederic W. *Ruth, Esther*. Word Biblical Commentary 9. Dallas: Word Books, 1996.

- Campbell, Edward F. *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 7. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Christian, Patricia B. "Family, Extended." Pages 943-44 in vol. 3 of *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Edited by H. James Birx. 5 vols. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Reference, 2006.
- Conant, Francis P. "Frustration, Marriage Alternatives and Subsistence Risks among the Pokot of East Africa: Impressions of Co-Variance." *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974): 314-27.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Culley, Robert C. *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative*. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976.
- Farmer, Kathleen A. Robertson. *The Book of Ruth: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. The New Interpreter's Bible 2. Edited by Leander E. Keck, et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Friedman, Richard Elliott. *The Bible with Sources Revealed: A New View into the Five Books of Moses*. San Francisco: Harper, 2003.
- . *Who Wrote the Bible?*. San Francisco: Harper, 1997.
- Gottwald, Norman K. *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1979.
- Gray, John. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967.

- Hackett, Jo Ann. "In the Days of Jael: Reclaiming the History of Women in Ancient Israel." Pages 15-38 in *Immaculate and Powerful: The Female in Sacred Image and Social Reality*. Edited by Clarissa Atkinson, Margaret Miles, and Constance Buchanan. Boston: Beacon, 1985.
- . "“There Was No King in Israel’: The Era of the Judges.” Pages 132-164 in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Edited by Michael D. Coogan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . "Violence and Women’s Lives in the Book of Judges." *Interpretation* 58, no. 4 (Oct., 2004): 356-64.
- Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Honigmann, John J. *The Development of Anthropological Ideas*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1976.
- Hubbard, Robert L. *The Book of Ruth*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Kaplan, David, and Roger Manners. *Cultural Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972.
- King, Philip J., and Lawrence E. Stager. *Life in Biblical Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Leach, E. R. *Rethinking Anthropology*. London: Athlone, 1961.
- . *Claude Lévi-Strauss*. New York: Viking, 1970.



- Lasine, Stuart. "Guest and Host in Judges 19: Lot's Hospitality in an Inverted World." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29 (1984): 37-59.
- Lemaire, André. "Vers l'Historie de la Rédaction des Livres des Rois." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98 (1986): 221-36.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Translated by James Harle Bell, John Richard von Strumer, and Rodney Needham. Boston: Beacon, 1969.
- . *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Anchor, 1967.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "The Israelite Tribes in Judges." Pages 95-112 in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 30. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Lubbock, Sir John. *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man: Mental and Social Condition of Savages*. London: Longmans, Green, 1870.
- Lutfiyya, Adbulla M. *Baytin, A Jordanian Village: A Study of Social Institutions and Social Change in a Fold Community*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift*. Translated by W.D. Halls. London: Cohen & West, 1954.
- Repr., London: Routledge, 1990.
- Milstein, Sara J. "Reworking Ancient Texts: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature." PhD diss., New York University, 2010.
- Moore, George Foot. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895. Repr., Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958.
- Murdock, George Peter. *Social Structure*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

- Myers, Jacob M. *The Linguistic and Literary Form of the Book of Ruth*. Leiden: Brill, 1955.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- . "The "Sodomite" Theme in Judges 19-20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 44 (1982): 365-78.
- Nielson, Kirsten. *Ruth: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.
- Noth, Martin. *The History of Israel*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960.
- O'Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Oden, Jr., Robert A. "Jacob as Father, Husband, and Nephew: Kinship Studies and the Patriarchal Narratives." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102, no. 2 (Jun. 1983): 189-205.
- Peletz, Michael G. "Kinship Studies in Late Twentieth-Century Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995): 343-372.
- Prewitt, Terry J. "Kinship Structures and the Genesis Genealogies." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 40, no. 2 (Apr. 1981): 87-98.
- Rollston, Christopher A. "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 344 (Nov. 2006): 47-74.
- . *Writing and Literacy in the World of Ancient Israel: Epigraphic Evidence from the Iron Age*. Atlanta: Society for Biblical Literature, 2010.

- Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." Pages 157-210 in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna R. Reiter. New York: Monthly Review, 1975.
- Sakenfield, Katharine Doob. *Ruth*. Interpretation Series. Louisville: John Knox, 1999.
- Sasson, Jack M. *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Sidky, H. *Perspectives on Culture: A Critical Introduction to Theory in Cultural Anthropology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004.
- Smend, Rudolf. "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte." Pages 494-509 in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Festschrift Gerhard von Rad*. Edited by Hans Walter Wolff. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1981.
- . *When the Judges Ruled*. London: Lutterworth, 1965.
- Sperber, Dan. *Explaining Culture: A Naturalistic Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 260 (1985): 1-35.
- Stross, Brian. "Tzeltal Marriage by Capture." *Anthropological Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1974): 328-46.
- Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

- Tylor, Edward Burnett. "On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions Applied to Laws of Marriage and Descent." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 18 (1889): 245-272.
- Veijola, Timo. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977.
- . *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975.
- Velioti-Georgopoulos, Maria. "Endogamy." Pages 812-814 in vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Edited by H. James Birx. 5 vols. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Reference, 2006.
- Weippert, Helga. "Geschichten und Geschichte: Verheissung und Erfüllung im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk." Pages 116-31 in *Congress Volume: Leuven, 1989*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 43. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Wilson, Robert *Sociological Approaches to the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Wolfenson, Louis B. "The Character, Contents, and Date of Ruth." *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 27, no. 4 (1911): 285-300.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. "Das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 171-86.
- Yee, Gale A. "Ideological Criticism: Judges 17-21 and the Dismembered Body." Pages 138-160 in *Judges & Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Edited by Gale A. Yee. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.