Studia Antiqua

A Student Journal for the Study of the Ancient World

Studia Antiqua
A Student Journal for the Study of the Ancient World

Brigham Young University

Studia Antiqua
Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

All abbreviations are taken from *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 8.4.

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ArOr	*Archiv Orientální*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDAG	Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago, 1999.
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1907.
BMes	Bibliotheca mesopotamica
BSac	*Bibliotheca sacra*
BSC	Bible Student's Commentary
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CDME	*A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Edited by R. O. Faulkner. Oxford, 1962.
COS	*The Context of Scripture.* Edited by W. W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden, 1997–.
DDD	*Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible.* Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden, 1995.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by H. Balz, G. Schneider. Grand Rapids, 1990–93.
EgT	*Eglise et théologie*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
HBC	*Harper's Biblical Commentary.* Edited by J. L. Mays et al. San Francisco, 1988.
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
IB	*Interpreter's Bible.* Edited by G. A. Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York, 1951–57.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962.
Int	*Interpretation*
IOS	*Israel Oriental Studies*
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JFSR	*Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*

JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.
MDB	*Mercer Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by W. E. Mills. Macon, 1990.
NewDocs	*New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Edited by G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn. North Ryde, N. S.W., 1981–.
NIB	*The New Interpreter's Bible*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtSt	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
SHANE	Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East
SP	Sacra pagina
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–76.
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This issue constitutes my last issue working as editor for *Studia Antiqua*. Hopefully I have served satisfactorily as the student editor for these past two years. I have been especially grateful for the opportunity to work with the staff at the Religious Studies Center and the faculty at Brigham Young University.

I am also grateful to have had Jasmin Gimenez with me on this issue. Jasmin will be taking over as editor of Studia Antiqua; she is an excellent editor with a superb knowledge of the ancient Near East. I have full confidence in her abilities to take the journal to another level.

This issue features three articles and book reviews—all from Brigham Young University students. These articles are the winning essays from the annual ancient Near Eastern studies essay contest, a contest which we plan to continue for many years to come. They represent some of the finest work of Brigham Young University's undergraduates.

Leading off this issue is the first-place essay written by Jared Pfost. Jared analyzes the literary structure and function of the biblical flood narrative in comparison to other Near Eastern flood narratives of its type. Following Jared's article is the second-place essay written Sara K. Riley. Sara's paper surveys the hand drum in the Israelite musical tradition and the role of women in musical performances during biblical times. After Sara's paper, we have the third-place essay written by Andrew Mickelson. In his article, Andrew discusses the striking absence of the word ἐπιτιμάω in the Gospel of John. Andrew postulates some reasons why this might be lacking and gives an overview of John's narrative structure and themes. Rounding out this issue we have a book review by Amanda Colleen Brown, who reviews the book Daughter Zion: Her Portrait, Her Response.

As always, this issue would not have been possible without the generous contributions from our esteemed faculty. A double-blind peer-reviewed journal takes its toll on the faculty reviewers, but I am grateful for their kind assistance. We would have no journal without the reviewers. My deep thanks to all of them and apologies if I have overstepped my bounds or sent one too many reminders. This journal recognizes its indebtedness to our wonderful faculty.

Also, we are continually grateful to our financial donors, not only for making the journal possible but also for making the essay contest an excellent opportunity to support and promote BYU's students. We are deeply grateful to all of our donors for their continued support. Again, without them this journal—this unique opportunity for undergraduates to gain publishing experience—would not be possible.

Brock M. Mason
Editor in Chief, *Studia Antiqua*

A LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE FLOOD STORY AS A SEMITIC TYPE-SCENE

JARED PFOST

Jared Pfost is a student at Brigham Young University studying ancient Near Eastern studies who will begin a PhD program at Brandeis this fall. This essay won first place in the annual ancient Near Eastern studies essay contest.

Mesopotamian texts provide more direct comparative evidence for the Hebrew flood story in Gen 6–9 than they do for any other part of the Hebrew canon. The similarities and differences have been analyzed extensively ever since the discovery of the Mesopotamian texts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The question of the historicity of the biblical flood and its relationship to its Mesopotamian forerunners is often at the heart of the discussion: is the biblical version a historical report or simply a reworking of earlier deluge accounts?[1] In this paper I will compare the flood stories

---

1. The literature on the relationship of the biblical flood story to the Mesopotamian flood stories is voluminous. See Alexander Heidel, *The Epic of Gilgamesh and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), 224–69; W. G. Lambert, "New Light on the Babylonian Flood," *JSS* 5 (1960): 113–23; Lambert, "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," *JTS* 16 (1965): 287–300; A. R. Millard, "New Babylonian Genesis Story," *TynBul* 18 (1967): 3–18; Eugene Fisher, "*Gilgamesh* and Genesis: The Flood Story in Context," *CBQ* 32 (1970): 392–403; Tikva Frymer-Kensky, "The Atrahasis Epic and Its Significance for Our Understanding of Genesis 1–9," *BA* 40 (1977): 147–55; Frymer-Kensky, "What the Babylonian Flood Stories Can and Cannot Tell Us about the Genesis Flood," *BAR* 4 (1978): 32–41; Robert A. Oden, "Divine Aspirations in Atrahasis and in Genesis 1–11," *ZAW* 93 (1981): 197–216; Oden, "Transformations in Near Eastern Myths: Genesis and the Old Babylonian Epic of Atrahasis," *Religion* 11 (1981): 21–37; William Shea, "A Comparison of Narrative Elements in Ancient Mesopotamian Creation-Flood Stories with Genesis 1–9," *Origins* 11 (1984): 9–29; Jeffrey H. Tigay, "The Image of God and the Flood: Some New Developments" in *Studies in Jewish Education in Honor of Louis Newman* (ed. Alexander M. Shapiro and Burton I. Cohen; New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1984), 169-82; David Toshio Tsumura, "Genesis and Ancient Near Eastern Stories of Creation and Flood: An Introduction," in *"I studied inscriptions before the flood": Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11* (ed. Richard Hess and David Toshio Tsumura; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 27–57; Edward Noort, "The Stories of the Great Flood: Notes on Gen. 6:5–9:17 in its Context of the Ancient Near East," in *Interpretations of the Flood* (ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez and Gerard P. Luttikhuizen; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1–38; Richard M. Davidson, "The Genesis Flood Narrative: Crucial Issues in the Current Debate," *AUSS* 42 (2004): 49–77; Gary A. Rendsburg, "The Biblical

in Tablet III of the Old Babylonian *Atrahasis Epic*, Tablet XI of the Standard Version of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, and the Genesis account.[2] However, rather than examining the relationship between the Mesopotamian and biblical versions by seeking to determine the historicity of the flood story, I will instead focus primarily on the literary form and features of each flood account. Each of these texts plays off of what I will call a Semitic flood type-scene[3] where the author(s) of each successive text reworked the existing Semitic flood tradition for specific literary, cultural, and theological purposes. This paradigm naturally assumes that there was an urtext (or oral tradition) that was adapted by each successive text, an assumption that is confirmed by literary analysis. This methodological framework will be used for two primary purposes: (1) to analyze the characters, literary techniques, and theme of the texts to reveal the significant ways in which each text has employed, altered, or omitted the various elements of the type-scene; and (2) as a result of the first purpose, to demonstrate that much (but not all) of the Genesis account was written as polemic against its Mesopotamian predecessors.

Methodology

The scholarly consensus, especially since the appearance of Tigay's *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*,[4] is that the three flood myths are literarily

---

Flood Story in the Light of the Gilgames Flood Account," in *Gilgames and the World of Assyria* (ed. Joseph Azize and Noel Weeks; Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2007), 115–27; R. Todd Stanton, "Asking Questions of the Divine Announcement in the Flood Stories from Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel," in *Gilgames and the World of Assyria* (ed. Joseph Azize and Noel Weeks; Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2007), 147–72; Hermann-Josef Stipp, "Who is Responsible for the Deluge? Changing Outlooks in the Ancient Near East and the Bible," in "*From Ebla to Stellenbosch*": *Syro-Palestinian Religions in the Bible* (ed. Izak Cornelius and Louis C. Jonker; Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 2008), 141–53; Christine Dykgraaf, "The Mesopotamian Flood Epic in the Earliest Texts, the Bible, and the Qur'an," in *Sacred Tropes: Tanakh, New Testament, and Qur'an as Literature and Culture* (ed. Roberta Sterman Sabbath; Leiden: Brill, 2009): 233–42; and Hans Ulrich Steyman, "Gilgamesh und Genesis 1–9," *BZ* 54 (2010): 201–28.

2. A fourth text, the fragmentary so-called *Eridu Genesis* (Sumerian Flood Story), has relevant comparative value to the present topic and will be cited occasionally but is not a primary focus of this essay. For translations of this text, see Thorkild Jacobsen, "The Eridu Genesis," *JBL* 100/4 (1981): 513–29; Samuel Noah Kramer, "The Sumerian Deluge Myth: Reviewed and Revised," *AnSt* 33 (1983): 115–21; and Miguel Civil, "The Sumerian Flood Story," in Lambert and Millard, *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood,* 138–45, 167–72.

3. I have chosen this term because I am only analyzing the Akkadian and Hebrew flood stories. The Sumerian flood story and other Sumerian references to the flood (such as the *Sumerian King List*) are closely related to the Akkadian versions but will not be a primary focus of this essay.

4. Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Wauconda, Ill.: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2002). Tigay conclusively demonstrated that the flood scene from *Gilgamesh* is largely derived from *Atrahasis* and has been modified to fit its new context. See

related. *Atrahasis*[5] came first (most likely before the *Eridu Genesis)*[6], followed by *Gilgamesh*[7] and finally the Genesis[8] account.[9] In analyzing these (sometimes complex) literary relationships, this essay will utilize a combination of literary and form criticism, especially the kind employed by Robert Alter, to elucidate the meaningful ways in which the texts interact with each other. This is a synchronic approach, and thus source criticism will not play a role here, despite the fact that the flood pericope in Genesis is held up by some as the standard exemplar of the sources (in this case, P and J)[10] associated with the

---

especially pages 216–17 for a summary of the evidence for this conclusion. This occurred at a late period in the overall development of the epic, probably in the last half or quarter of the second millennium.

5. The standard critical edition is W.G. Lambert and A.R. Millard, *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969). Other English translations include Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 1–38; and Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3rd ed.; Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2005), 227–80.

6. There is some debate as to whether *Atrahasis* preceded *The Eridu Genesis* or viceversa. Hallo has argued that the earliest mentions of a flood in Sumerian literature are figurative and describe semi-nomadic Semitic invaders. See William W. Hallo, "The Limits of Skepticism," *JAOS* 110 (1990): 194–9. Chen's more recent analysis largely concurs as he claims that the flood is not used in the sense of a primeval event in either Sumerian or Akkadian literature until the Old Babylonian Period (2000–1600 BCE) at the earliest. See Y. S. Chen, "The Flood Motif as a Stylistic and Temporal Device in Sumerian Literary Traditions," *JANE* 12 (2012): 160–2. If true, this would indicate that the Babylonians misappropriated the flood symbolism as literal in *Atrahasis* (ca. 1700 BCE) and that *The Eridu Genesis* (ca. 1600 BCE) followed its lead. This view, however, has not gone unquestioned; see Richard E. Averbeck, "The Suerian Historiographic Tradition and Its Implications for Genesis 1–11" in *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context* (ed. A. R. Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 85, note 16.

7. The standard critical edition in English is A. R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic* (2 Volumes; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). Other English translations are "Epic of Gilgamesh," translated by E.A. Speiser (ANET, 72–98); Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 39–135; and Benjamin R. Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001).

8. There are numerous similarities between the accounts in Genesis and *Gilgamesh*. For a dated but in-depth discussion of these parallels, see Heidel, *The Epic of Gilgamesh,* 224–69. It is likely that the author(s) of the Genesis flood story knew of the *Gilgamesh* version because the literary similarities are too striking to deny. Rendsburg has demonstrated that the biblical account follows *Gilgamesh* point for point in the flood story, even when variation certainly could have been introduced. See Rendsburg, "The Biblical Flood Story," 115–27; especially the chart on p. 126. Also Gordon J. Wenham, "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative," *VT* 28 (1978): 345–7.

9. All translations from the Hebrew Bible are my own. Also, all biblical references are from Genesis unless otherwise noted. My extremely limited knowledge of Akkadian necessitates reliance on professional scholars for translation and interpretation of those texts.

10. Some source critics insist on analyzing the P and J flood accounts separately when discussing ancient Near Eastern flood narratives. See Noort, "The Stories of the Great Flood," 5–6.

Documentary Hypothesis.[11] In any case, the dating of the different strands does not affect my thesis because the biblical writers could have had contact with Mesopotamian flood traditions at any number of times, including before, during, and after the exile.[12]

I take the main idea for my thesis from Alter's discussion of biblical type-scenes.[13] His primary example of this in the Bible is the scene of the betrothal by a well,[14] a scene that occurs three times in narrating the betrothals of Isaac,

---

11. Wenham has defended the flood pericope against the source critics in Wenham, "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative," 336–48; likewise Rendsburg, "The Biblical Flood Story," 115–27. Emerton has refuted such arguments in J. A. Emerton, "An Examination of Some Attempts to Defend the Unity of the Flood Narrative in Genesis: Part I," *VT* 37 (1987): 401–20, and Emerton, "An Examination of Some Attempts to Defend the Unity of the Flood Narrative in Genesis: Part II," *VT* 38 (1988): 1–21.

12. While the exact dates are much debated, the J source is generally thought to be pre-exilic while P is exilic or post-exilic. Many scholars have argued that the author(s) of P redacted the J flood story to fit more with the Mesopotamian traditions that it was then familiar with. For example, see Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 303. This may very well be the case, but Israelites almost certainly knew of Mesopotamian flood traditions long before then. Fragments of *Gilgamesh* have been recovered from Megiddo and a fourteenth century Akkadian fragment of *Atrahasis* which mentions the flood has been found at Ras Shamra (for text and translation of the Ras Shamra fragment, see Lambert and Millard, *Atrahasis,* 131–133). See also note 20 below. Because the analysis below will demonstrate Israelite polemics against the Mesopotamian flood stories that are found in both the P and the J strands, it is not necessary to distinguish between them for the purposes of this paper. The history of ancient Israel has shown that Israelites had ample reasons to polemicize against Mesopotamian ideas and traditions both before and after the exile.

13. See Robert Alter, "Biblical Type-Scenes and the Uses of Convention," *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 355–68. Several studies on biblical type-scenes have been published since Alter's initial work. See James G. Williams, "The Beautiful and the Barren: Conventions in Biblical Type-Scenes," *JSOT* 17 (1980): 107–19; Robert Alter, "How Convention Helps Us Read: The Case of the Bible's Annunciation Type-Scene," *Prooftexts* 3 (1983): 115–30; Esther Fuchs, "Structure and Patriarchal Functions in the Biblical Betrothal Type-Scene: Some Preliminary Notes," *JFSR* 3 (1987): 7–13; Robert H. O'Connell, "Proverbs VII 16–17: A Case of Fatal Deception in a 'Woman and the Window' Type-Scene," *VT* 41 (1991): 235–41; Joel A. Linsider, "Pursuing and Overtaking as a Type-Scene," *Arc* 29 (2001): 71–80; Brian Britt, "Prophetic Concealment in a Biblical Type Scene," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 37–58; George Savran, "Theophany as Type Scene," *Prooftexts* 23 (2003): 119–49; Min Suc Kee, "The Heavenly Council and Its Type-Scene," *JSOT* 31 (2007): 259–73; Benjamin J. M. Johnson, "What Type of Son is Samson? Reading Judges 13 as a Biblical Type-Scene," *JETS* 53 (June 2010): 269–86; and Jonathan Kruschwitz, "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story," *JSOT* 36 (2012): 383–410.

14. Other examples of biblical type-scenes that Alter has identified include "the annunciation…of the birth of the hero to his barren mother;…the epiphany in the field; the initiatory trial; danger in the desert and the discovery of a well or other source of sustenance; the testament of the dying hero." Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New and Rev. Ed.; New York: Basic Books, 2011), 60. Alter borrowed and adapted the idea of type-scenes from scholarship on Homeric literature.

Jacob, and Moses (Gen 24:10–61; Gen 29:1–20; Exod 2:15–21).[15] Alter suggests that the mind of the ancient audience would have immediately understood the gist of what would occur in such a betrothal scene: "The contemporary audiences of these tales, being perfectly familiar with the convention, took particular pleasure in seeing how in each instance the convention could be, through the narrator's art, both faithfully followed and renewed for the specific needs of the hero under consideration."[16] Indeed, meaning is to be found in "the inventive freshness with which formulas are recast and redeployed in each new instance."[17]

With this in mind, perhaps it will be easier to see how the three flood stories under consideration can be viewed as a Semitic flood type-scene.[18] As has been recognized by many commentators, each version has essentially the same basic plot.[19] The meaning and function of each individual story is thus revealed by the difference in details and overall purpose, and analyzing these is how we determine what the author(s) of each text was/were trying to convey by using the flood story as an integral component of the story.

Some caution is necessary when positing a type-scene for texts which were composed hundreds of years apart and separated by numerous geographical and cultural differences. This comparison could easily be accused of breaking the laws of propinquity.[20] Even from a purely literary perspective, Alter notes the differences between Hebrew prose style and Mesopotamian epic style,[21]

---

15. For more on the specific mechanisms and implications of this particular type scene, see Alter's discussion in *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 61–74; also Robert C. Culley, *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 41–3, and Michael W. Martin, "Betrothal Journey Narratives," *CBQ* 70 (2008): 505–23.

16. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 69.

17. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative,* 61.

18. This is a very similar concept to what some scholars have already done with biblical and Ugaritic literature. See especially Koowon Kim, *Incubation as a Type-Scene in the Aqhatu, Kirta, and Hannah Stories: A Form-Critical and Narratological Study of KTU 1.14 I–1.15 III, 1.17 I–II, and 1 Samuel 1:1–2:11* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

19. See John B. Gabel, et al., *The Bible as Literature: An Introduction* (5th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 49.

20. However, Hoskisson has demonstrated that a city such as Emar in Syria could conceivably have served as a mediating point between the Mesopotamian cuneiform tradition and Iron Age Israel. See his discussion in Paul Y. Hoskisson, "Emar as an Empirical Model of the Transmission of Canon" in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspectives: Scripture in Context IV* (ed. K. Lawson Younger Jr., William W. Hallo, and Bernard F. Batto; Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), 21–32.

21. The fact that the Mesopotamian texts are written in epic poetic form while the Genesis account is in narrative prose is significant because the two forms have to be interpreted differently. Some have posited an original poetic form underlying the current prose account of the biblical flood. Both 8:22 and 9:6 are clearly in verse while 7:11, 9:5, and 9:7, also display poetic features. See John S. Kselman, "A Note on Gen. 7:11," *CBQ* 35 (1973): 491–93; Lloyd M. Barre, "The Poetic Structure of Genesis 9:5," *ZAW* 96:1 (1984): 101–4;

suggesting that the Hebrew writer(s) worked "not only with very different theological assumptions but also with a radically different sense of literary form" than the Mesopotamian writers.[22] While what I am suggesting is not an exact parallel to Alter's biblical type-scene, I submit that a modified idea of this concept is appropriate for studying the flood narratives under consideration. The reasons for this will become obvious in the analysis below.

The Proposed Semitic Flood Type-Scene

Few scholars doubt that there is a literary connection between the Mesopotamian flood texts and the biblical flood account—the debate is more about the degree and even the direction of influence. It is thus important to lay out the assumptions of this essay regarding these issues. The account in *Gilgamesh* has the most similarity to the biblical account in details but *Atrahasis* has much more in common with Genesis in theme and structure. *Atrahasis* (as well as the *Eridu Genesis*) and Gen 1–9 share the same tripartite structure: creation, antediluvian life, and the flood.[23] This suggests that the author(s) of the Genesis flood narrative may have used this tripartite structure[24] as a model with which to create the narrative of the primeval history[25] and then used the *Gilgamesh* version to craft many of the details of the flood story itself. As I will demonstrate below, the nature of the biblical polemics strongly suggest that it was heavily borrowing from the traditions, if not the actual texts, of both *Atrahasis* and *Gilgamesh*.

---

and Bezalel Porten and Uriel Rappaport, "Poetic Structure in Genesis IX 7," *VT* 21 (1971): 363–69. Ultimately, however, it is not currently possible to determine if there was ever an independent poetic account.

22. Alter, *Biblical Narrative,* 33. Following the suggestions of other scholars, Alter also posits that the Hebrew use of prose instead of epic verse is a polemic against Mesopotamian myth (p. 27–30).

23. See Shea, "A Comparison," 9–29. Shea uses this observation to argue for an earlier date of the composition of the Genesis primeval history (fifteenth through thirteenth centuries) because of the literary comparison to *Atrahasis* and the *Eridu Genesis*. In my view a date in the first Millennium is still much more preferable.

24. This similarity in structure also provides similarity in major theme: that of creation, un-creation, and re-creation. The gods/God create(s) the earth and humanity only to witness things go awry with their/his creation. They/he then un-create(s) humanity with the flood and re-create it by saving one family that then re-populates the earth. For a summary of how the re-creation in Genesis almost exactly parallels the original creation, see Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2001), 128–9. Also see Noort, "The Stories of the Great Flood," 21–3; and Ruth Simoons-Vermeer, "The Mesopotamian Floodstories: A Comparison and Interpretation," *Numen* 21 (1974): 30–4.

25. "Anyone living in Israel who told a story about the primordial age was bound by traditions of the Ancient Near East to such a degree that he could not leave the Flood out of his account." Noort, "The Stories of the Great Flood," 8.

The Semitic flood type-scene has certain conventions that govern the basic plot sequence of the story. Recognizing these conventions and the ways in which they are altered is the key to understanding how each text adapted the flood motif to its own "national interests and different literary settings."[26] The conventions are naturally generalizations because the deviations from, or even the absence of, part of the convention convey meaning and purpose. Here is the reconstructed type-scene:[27]

1. The gods/God decide(s) to destroy humanity with a flood.
2. However, one deity warns the flood hero about the impending deluge and commands him to build a boat in which the storm can be weathered.
3. The flood is described in detail and the result of it is that all living things are wiped off the earth.
4. The flood hero offers sacrifice upon exiting the boat and the gods/God smell(s) the scent of it.
5. The flood hero is given a divine blessing.

Literary Analysis of the Type-Scene: Characters

The Flood Hero

The flood hero in each story is essentially the only main character aside from deities. The name of each flood hero foreshadows an important aspect of his role in the myth. The name Utnapishtim means "he found life," similar to Ziusudra (the flood hero of the *Eridu Genesis*) which means "life of long days." Both of these names make a great deal of sense in their literary context because both flood heroes are given immortality by the gods after surviving the flood. The name Atrahasis means "extra-wise," a name that could apply to any of the flood heroes but that specifically makes sense for Atrahasis as he fulfills the functions of a typical wise man in the ancient Near East and finds ways throughout the epic to convince Enki to subvert Enlil's attempts to destroy humanity.[28] Noah's name means "rest," and the biblical narrative uses several wordplays as well as thematic connections to intimately tie this name to the entire plot of the flood story. This aspect deserves a closer look.

---

26. Dalley, *Myths From Mesopotamia*, 6.
27. I have been greatly aided in the reconstruction of this type-scene by the chart in Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (Waco, Tex.: Word Incorporated, 1987), 163–64.
28. Enlil had attempted to limit humanity with a plague and two droughts before finally deciding on the flood. See Lambert and Millard, *Atrahasis*, 9–11.

Noah is first introduced in Gen 5:29 by his father Lamech. Notice the Hebrew lexical roots in the translation: "And Lamech called his name Noah saying, 'This one will relieve (נחם) us from our work (מעשׂה) and the pain (עצבון) of our hands from the ground which Yahweh has cursed.'" The same three Hebrew roots appear in the same order in 6:6: "And Yahweh regretted (נחם) that he had made (עשׂה) man in the earth, and he was pained (עצב) to his heart." This is an ironic wordplay showing that Lamech's "hopes for consolation by Noah correspond to the creator's disappointment with his creation."[29] Certainly this pun is not accidental, for we later learn that the flood which Noah survived would, at least for a time, bring "rest"[30] from the curse which Yahweh had mentioned in 5:29.[31]

Further, an even more intricate and extended wordplay on Noah's name is pervasive throughout the account. The name "Noah" (נֹחַ) comes from the verbal root נוח "to rest." In Gen 8:4, the same verbal root (תָּנַח) is used to describe how the ark came to "rest" on the mountains of Ararat. In 8:9, the dove could not find a מַנוֹחַ ("resting-place"). And finally, in 8:21, Yahweh smelled a נִחֹחַ ("restful")[32] scent of sacrifice. This punning emphasizes again and again the unique role of the character of Noah in helping to bring "rest" to the earth that had been filled with what God referred to as violence (חָמָס) and wickedness (רע). This idea of exactly how Noah brought rest to the earth will be discussed in more detail below.

Next, why was each flood hero chosen to be the one to perpetuate humanity on the earth after the flood? In Noah's case it seems fairly obvious: "And Noah found grace in the eyes of Yahweh" (6:8)[33] because he "was a completely righteous man in his generations" and he "walked with God" (6:9).[34]

---

29. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 144.

30. The author of the account makes somewhat of a stretch here by relating the etymology of Noah's name to the verb נחם ("to be sorry, comfort, relieve, have compassion, repent") instead of נוח, thus causing some scholars to amend the verb to נוח in 5:29 to create a better pun. However, the way נחם is used in 6:6 probably explains why that verb was chosen. For an analysis of the complex and sometimes contradictory relationship of these two verbs, see Ellen Van Wolde, "A Text-Semantic Study of the Hebrew Bible, Illustrated with Noah and Job," *JBL* 113 (1994): 23–6.

31. The curse mentioned may be the curse from 3:17 after Adam and Eve had partaken of the fruit of the tree. See W. M. Clark, "The Flood and the Structure of the Pre-Patriarchal History," *ZAW* 83 (1971): 207. The curse may also refer to 4:11–12, where God curses the ground for Cain's sake.

32. Most translators will render this word as "pleasing, soothing, tranquilizing," or the like. However, the translation "restful" seems reasonable here not only to emphasize the theme of "rest," but also because it is a natural synonym to the usual translations.

33. This verse contains another wordplay with Noah (נֹחַ) finding "grace" (חֵן). See Jack Sasson, "Word Play in Gen. 6:8–9," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 165.

34. 7:1 also states that Noah was "righteous" (צַדִּק).

Unfortunately, we are not given any information about how Noah came to be favored[35] or why he had such high standing with Yahweh,[36] but we do know that he promptly obeyed the deity's commands (Gen 6:22; 7:5).[37] An important detail about Noah is omitted, however. Who was he? Was he powerful or popular? Did he have high standing in society? The text does not say. This point takes on extra significance when it is compared with the Mesopotamian flood heroes who *did* have high social status.[38] It is explicitly stated in the *Eridu Genesis* that Ziusudra was a king and a priest, and while *Gilgamesh* does not directly claim that Utnapishtim was a king, his father (Ubar-Tutu) and his city (Shurrupak) both tie him to royal tradition.[39] The *Atrahasis* narrative implies[40] that Atrahasis was a priest, while the fragment of *Atrahasis* from Ras Shamra clearly states that Atrahasis lived in the temple of Ea, a detail that almost certainly means he was a priest.[41] All of this may be contrasted with Noah. Other than the reference to Noah's sacrifice after the flood (Gen 8:21), nothing in the text suggests that Noah was royal or priestly in any way. It could be argued that the sacrifice in Gen 8:21 means that Noah was a priest of some sort, but "priest" here is defined as a cultic functionary who worked on the behalf of a community. That is clearly not the case, as Noah is never connected with any group of people other than his immediate family. In fact, the depiction of Noah's sacrifice is directly in line with the how sacrifices were performed

---

35. Perhaps the author(s) did not have any narrative material about earlier events in Noah's life. Cf. Stipp, "Who is Responsible," 148. This would be expected if Noah was simply a literary adaptation of earlier flood heroes.

36. Barnard argues that Noah represents the typical man rather than the exceptional one and states that the text is wholly unclear about why Noah had received such favor. See A. N. Barnard, "Was Noah a Righteous Man?" *Theology* 74 (1971): 311–14. Later Jewish and Christian tradition clearly came to see Noah as a very pious man who was saved because of his righteousness. See Ezekiel 14:14, 20; Hebrews 11:7; and 2 Peter 2:5. Also Jack P. Lewis, "Noah and the Flood in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Tradition," *BA* 47 (1984): 224–39.

37. Clark argues that the Mesopotamian flood traditions and P presuppose the prior righteousness of the flood hero as a condition of his salvation. J, however, views Noah's righteousness as a condition of his election. See W. M. Clark, "The Righteousness of Noah," *VT* 21 (1971): 262. The fact that God set up his covenant (ברית) exclusively with Noah before the flood (Gen 6:18) probably confirms that Noah occupied a special relationship with God. See Sabine van den Eynde, "The Missing Link: *BRYT* in the Flood Narrative: Meaning and Peculiarities of a Hebrew Key Word" in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction, and History* (ed. Andre Wenin; Leuven, Belgium: University Press, 2001), 467–78.

38. The earliest evidence suggests that the Mesopotamian flood hero may not always have been considered to have royal or priestly status, but the later versions make it clear that he did. The later versions are the ones that Israel is most likely to have had knowledge of.

39. James R. Davila, "The Flood Hero as King and Priest," *JNES* 54 (1995): 206.

40. Oden claims that we can infer the "piety, sagacity, and lofty position within society" of Atrahasis "from his name 'Very Wise,' his position of authority with respect to the city elders, and his intimacy with Ea." Oden, "Divine Aspirations," 203.

41. Davila, "The Flood Hero," 204–6.

in Genesis. No one in Genesis (with the possible exception of Melchizedek in Gen 14:18–20) is presented as a cultic priest, a fact that can be seen in the case of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who also built altars and made sacrifices but did so in a private rather than a community context. Thus, this is a biblical polemic against Mesopotamian thought as embodied in the flood story. Noah was not a socially great or powerful man but rather simply God's agent, his qualifications apparently being only his personal righteousness and his favor with Yahweh.

The manner in which each flood hero was warned of the coming of the great deluge is a part of the type-scene that is present in each text and is even found in *The Eridu Genesis* and the fragment from Ras Shamra. Every version except the biblical account includes the curious detail of Enki (Ea) whispering to the flood hero through a reed wall (or fence) to warn him. In the *Eridu Genesis*, the communication comes either through an ecstatic vision[42] or through a dream[43] (through, just as the others, the intermediary of the reed wall). In *Atrahasis* and *Gilgamesh*, the flood heroes are definitely said to have learned of the impending deluge in a dream: "Atra-hasis opened his mouth and addressed his lord, 'Teach me the meaning [of the dream] . . . that I may seek its outcome'" (III:I:11–14).[44] "I let Atrahasis see a dream, and he perceived the secret of the gods" (XI:197).[45] Concerning the biblical account, it is likely that the detail of a deity warning the hero through a wall is simply unnecessary. The Israelite deity had no need to hide his warning because he was not worried about any other gods hearing it. This detail was thus left out to create a polemic where the biblical author(s) mock(s) the Mesopotamian concept of multiple, competing deities. It also demonstrates the distinctiveness of Israel's God, for he "reveals his plans freely with his people and does not need to hide in a 'dream' nor be conjured up in some 'ecstatic vision.'"[46]

---

42. Jacobsen and Civil have both interpreted the communication as being not a dream but rather an ecstatic vision. Jacobsen, "The Eridu Genesis," 523; Civil, "The Sumerian Flood Story," 171.

43. Kramer, "The Sumerian Deluge Myth," 119.

44. Lambert and Millard, *Atrahasis,* 89.

45. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 717. It is curious to note that the text does not indicate that Utnapishtim received a dream during the actual scene where he was warned (XI:19–31). It may also be of note that line 197, where Ea says that he revealed the flood in a dream, is one of only two places (the other is line 49) where Utnapishtim is called Atrahasis. This may simply further reflect the fact that the *Gilgamesh* flood story is derived essentially from *Atrahasis*.

46. Stanton, "Asking Questions," 155. Stanton tries in his essay to determine the manner in which God revealed himself to Noah, finally suggesting a "theophany" (p. 165), but I find no explicit evidence for this in the text itself. The exact manner in which God spoke to Noah is unknown, but for the purposes of this essay it is sufficient to note that it seems to have been a direct communication of some sort with no need to go through an intermediary.

Another telling feature of these narratives is the direct discourse (or lack thereof) of the flood heroes. This feature hints at the role and significance of the character in the narrative. Both Atrahasis and Utnapishtim have quoted speech attributed to them, while Noah does not speak a word in the entire flood pericope. Let us begin with the direct discourse attributed to Atrahasis. As previously mentioned, Atrahasis is a very proactive character who successfully pleads several times with Enki for relief from the plagues and droughts sent by Enlil. Despite the fragmentary nature of the text, Tablet 3 (the flood tablet) preserves two speeches by Atrahasis, one to Enki and one to the elders of his people. He is assertive in both, first requesting that Enki reveal to him the meaning of his dream and then boldly warning the elders about Enki's message (a bad omen for the elders, considering that they worship Enlil instead of Enki). Yet again this detail accords with the characterization of Atrahasis as a wise man because he actively seeks knowledge from a deity and then communicates that information to his community. None of the other flood heroes seem to actively seek out the knowledge as Atrahasis does.

Concerning the direct discourse attributed to Utnapishtim, it is important to note that Utnapishtim's narrative is framed as a first-person account recounted by him to Gilgamesh. This format radically expands our knowledge of the persona of this flood hero and provides a glimpse into his thoughts and feelings. This is something that does not occur with any of the other flood heroes, because the other flood stories are all told from a third-person point of view.[47] The author of the *Gilgamesh* flood account adapted *Atrahasis* in this way to fit the flood story into the context of Gilgamesh's quest for receiving the immortality that Utnapishtim had obtained.[48] Like Atrahasis, Utnapishtim directly conversed with a deity (Ea), but he did not converse with anyone else. Overall, the effect of this first-person narration is to make the story more personal and dramatic. For example, after the flood Utnapishtim looked out over the earth: "All the people had turned to clay . . . I opened a vent and sunlight fell on the side of my face. I fell to my knees and sat there weeping, the tears streaming down the side of my face" (XI:135, 137–139).[49] Utnapishtim's emotional pain at seeing the destruction of humanity humanizes this character in a way that the other flood heroes never come close to. Considering that the flood story is a late addition to *Gilgamesh*, this first-person narrative of the flood story may have served a number of purposes, one possibility being

---

47. However, the Ras Shamra fragment is told by Atrahasis in first person, perhaps providing a precedent for this use in *Gilgamesh*.

48. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic,* 230.

49. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 712–3.

that it could have served as a digression before Gilgamesh received his answer about the possibility of eternal life, thus heightening the suspense before Utnapishtim's disappointing response.[50]

In contrast, the lack of any direct discourse by a character may reveal a good deal about that character. The fact that Noah is not assigned any dialogue in the flood pericope speaks volumes. Alter notes that biblical narrative often introduces the speech of one character and then, after the recorded speech, notes that the same character speaks again without allowing the other character to participate in the dialogue.[51] An example of this is in Gen 9:1–17.[52] The entire unit consists of God speaking to Noah, yet the text introduces God's direct speech three times (v. 1, 12, 17). This narrative technique is often used because the silent character is either confused or astonished, and "dozens of such instances offer persuasive evidence that this was a clearly recognized convention."[53] Curiously, it appears that this is not the case with Noah. He never seems confused or baffled; he immediately does exactly as his deity commands. There are certainly plenty of opportunities for the author(s) to allow him a response, but such never occurs. Why should the convention be altered here? Why should Noah be denied any direct dialogue? I suggest that the author(s) deliberately refused Noah any direct speech to make a point: God is in charge, not humans. Atrahasis and Utnapishtim both asked direct questions of their deity, but Noah did not. Perhaps part of God's rationale for choosing Noah to survive is because of his submissive obedience. In fact, it is not until things go wrong, when Noah gets drunk and Ham uncovers his nakedness in 9:21–25, that Noah finally says something. Noah's silence throughout the flood pericope can thus be seen as a confirmation of Israel's theology and a polemic against Mesopotamian thought: Israel's God is the one in charge of directing history, and he utilizes a silent, submissive servant to accomplish his directives.[54]

---

50. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic,* 239–40. For other suggestions of the literary purpose of Utnapishtim's retelling of the flood story in *Gilgamesh,* see Edward L. Greenstein, "The Retelling of the Flood Story in the Gilgamesh Epic," in *Hesed Ve-emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest F. Frerichs* (ed. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 197–204.

51. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative,* 98.

52. Robert Alter, *Genesis: Translation and Commentary* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), 39.

53. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative,* 98.

54. This same idea of a silent servant is found in Isa 53:7.

The Gods/God

The nature and actions of the divine characters is another area where there is a distinct difference between Mesopotamian and Israelite thought. The flood type-scene vividly illustrates how divergent the two perceptions of deity are. When comparing Mesopotamian gods to Israel's deity, many commentators make similar cases to the following for the superiority of the theology of Genesis's flood story: "In the Mesopotamian stories the petty gods bring the flood to control overpopulation and/or get rid of the annoying noise of people. Once the flood comes, they are frightened by it, and afterward they hungrily gather around the sacrifice. In contrast, God sovereignly brings the Flood because of human wickedness, and in response to Noah's sacrifice, he pledges never again to destroy the earth."[55] A literary reading cannot take such theological statements at face value but must examine the extent of their merit.

Atrahasis and *Gilgamesh*, contrary to some incorrect notions, do give reasons for the gods' motivation in sending the flood, although these reasons are ambiguous and difficult to interpret. At the beginning of the *Gilgamesh* flood pericope, Utnapishtim simply states that "the great gods decided to cause the Deluge" (XI: 14)[56] without offering any reason for this decision. Many commentators stop at this and declare that no apparent moral motivation is given for the deluge. Firstly, one can hardly expect a reason to be given, because the story is told from Utnapishtim's point of view. He does not say why the gods had decided to send the flood because he does not know. Secondly, a reason *is* offered in a speech by Enki to the angry Enlil after the flood: "You, the sage of the gods, the hero, how could you lack counsel and cause the deluge? On him who commits a sin, inflict his crime! On him who does wrong, inflict [his] wrong-doing!" (XI: 183–186).[57] Enki goes on to list a number of ways that Enlil could have punished the human offenders rather than sending the deluge, but the important implication of this speech is that not all of humankind was guilty of whatever prompted the gods to pour out such an all-encompassing punishment. Only the transgressors, Enki argued, should be punished. Unfortunately, it is unclear exactly what transgressions had been perpetrated

---

55. Waltke, *Genesis: A Commentary,* 132. Similar statements can be found in many of the commentaries. See for example Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972), 124; Victor Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990), 274; E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (New York: Doubleday, 1962), 55; and Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, xlix. Clines also argues that Genesis polemicizes against the seeming lack of a moral component for the gods' motivation in sending the flood in the Mesopotamian versions. See David Clines, "Noah's Flood I: The Theology of the Flood Narrative," *Faith and Thought* 100 (1972–73): 128–42.

56. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 705.

57. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 715.

to elicit the unleashing of such a catastrophe. Because *Gilgamesh* uses the flood story out of its original context (and because the *Gilgamesh* flood scene is dependent on *Atrahasis*), it is most fruitful to turn to *Atrahasis* for the answer to what motivated the gods to send the flood.

The most frequent explanations for Enlil's frustration with humankind in *Atrahasis* are the *rigmu* ("noise") and *huburu* ("tumult") that entered Enlil's ears. Both terms are ambiguous in context. The predominant view takes them to mean that humans were becoming too populous and thus had to be thinned out to reduce noise levels. In this view, humans cannot be blamed for the actions of the gods, because population increase is natural. Rather, humans "constantly appear as the victims of divine inadequacy."[58] An alternative view is that *rigmu* and *huburu* can refer to scheming, impious acts. This prompted Oden, following the lead of Pettinato[59] and von Soden,[60] to conclude that "the crime for which humanity is punished in the Atrahasis Epic is the crime of rebellion; and the source of this rebellion is the human tendency to over-reach its limits and to encroach upon divine territory."[61] As attractive as this idea is,[62] especially in light of parallel rebellious acts found in the Genesis primeval history,[63] more recent scholarship has generally rejected it,[64] seeing the simpler interpretation of loud noise as the preferable cause. Ultimately, while at least some segment of humanity certainly did something to anger the gods, it seems most plausible to conclude that the catalyst for annihilation in both *Gilgamesh* and *Atrahasis* is something that was out of humankind's control. Blame for the disastrous results of the flood can be pinned on the lack of foresight of the gods rather than some conscious act of wickedness or rebellion by humankind. It is divine, not human, morality that is at issue here. We can conclude this, in part,

---

58. Stipp, "Who is Responsible," 145.

59. Giovanni Pettinato, "Die Bestrafung des Menschengeschlechts durch die Sintflut," *Or* 37 (1968): 165–200.

60. Wolfram von Soden, "Der Mensch bescheidet sich nicht: Uberlegungen zu Schopfungserzahlungen in Babylonien und Israel," in *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae: Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Bohl Dedicatae* (ed. Martinus Adrianus Beek; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 349–58.

61. Oden, "Divine Aspirations," 208. See pages 204–10 for a detailed explanation of the meanings of the words *rigmu* and *huburu*.

62. The arguments for and against each position are laid out in William Moran, "Some Considerations of Form and Interpretation in Atrahasis," in *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner* (ed. Francesca Rochberg-Halton; New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1987), 251–5.

63. See note 70.

64. "In the past, this common outlay has been interpreted as a crime-and-punishment narrative. The din occasioned by the humans was taken as a clamour of revolt, voicing the presumptuous desire to obliterate the divide between the gods and mankind. Nonetheless, the evidence to the contrary is so compelling that this position has been effectively abandoned." Stipp, "Who is Responsible," 144–45.

because of the insulting way that the authors of *Atrahasis* and *Gilgamesh* refer to the Mesopotamian deities.[65]

The question must now be posed: what exactly, then, is God's motivation for punishing humanity in Genesis? Just as the terms describing human "transgression" in *Atrahasis* are ambiguous, the terms used to describe humankind's transgression in the Genesis flood story, רַע (6:5) and חָמָס (6:11, 13) are also ambiguous. What kind of activities do these terms refer to? The term רַע, which is used pervasively throughout the Hebrew Bible, is usually translated as "evil, wicked, bad," or the like. The term חָמָס has, however, been defined in a multitude of ways. Speiser translates it to "lawlessness" and says that it "is a technical legal term which should not be automatically reproduced as 'violence.'"[66] Wenham states that it "denotes any antisocial, unneighborly activity."[67] Frymer-Kensky notes that it "has a wide range of meanings" and "encompasses almost the entire spectrum of evil."[68] Although an aspect of morality is clearly at issue, the exact nature of humanity's crimes is not directly stated in the flood story itself, which is surprising, considering that other parts of the Hebrew Bible do not hesitate to specify the sins that the accused have committed.[69] However, clues from context offer some possibilities.

Contextually, the most likely candidate for God's displeasure is the episode directly preceding the flood: the marriages of the sons of God/the gods (usually interpreted as lesser divine beings) with the daughters of men in 6:1–4.[70] There are far more opinions about these four verses than I have space to detail here.[71] The most important thing to recognize is that such mixing of the divine

---

65. See below, especially note 76.

66. Speiser, *Genesis*, 51. Alter also interprets this word to imply "lawless behavior." Alter, *Genesis*, 28.

67. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 171.

68. Frymer-Kensky, "The Atrahasis Epic," 153.

69. See, for example, Deut 32:15–18.

70. Although this episode is textually the closest to the flood, all of Genesis 1–11 can be described as a pattern of crime and punishment. Adam and Eve sought the knowledge of the gods and ate the forbidden fruit (3:5–6), prompting Yahweh to curse them (3:16–19) and ban them from the tree of life (3:24). Cain killed his brother and was cursed (4:8–12), Lemech committed murder (4:23–24), Ham uncovered his father's nakedness (9:21–25), and the divine aspirations of people at the time of the Tower of Babel prompted Yahweh to confound their language (11:1–9).

71. The literature on the subject is voluminous. For the most recent views, see Helga S. Kvanvig, "Gen 6,1–4 as an Antediluvian Event," *SJOT* 16 (2002): 79–112; R. Gilboa, "Who 'Fell Down' to Our Earth? A Different Light on Genesis 6:1–4," *BN* 11 (2002): 66–75; Horst Seebass, "Die Gottessohne und das Menschliche Mass: Gen 6, 1–4," *BN* 134 (2007): 5–22; Sven Fockner, "Reopening the Discussion: Another Contextual Look at the Sons of God," *JSOT* 32 (2008): 435–56; Walter Buhrer, "Gottersohne und Menschentochter: Gen 6,1–4 als innerbiblische Schriftauslegung," *ZAW* 123 (2011): 495–515; and John Day, "The Sons of God and Daughters of Men and the Giants: Disputed Points in the Interpretation of Genesis

with the human violated God's method of creation of having everything re-produce "according to its own kind" (Gen 1:11–12, 21, 24–25). The likelihood that this is at least part of the reason for God's displeasure with humankind is bolstered by the fact that the verse immediately following states, "Yahweh saw that great was the wickedness (רַע) of humankind in the earth" (Gen 6:5). It is thus possible that one of the evils of humankind (perhaps the primary evil) that caused God such anger in Noah's day was the unsanctioned union of the human with the divine.[72] If this is the case, it presents another polemic against Mesopotamian thought, specifically against Gilgamesh. Gilgamesh was said to be part mortal and part divine, so the association of such beings in Genesis with God's motivation for sending the flood shows just how unsavory the bib-lical author found the concept of such mixed race unions to be.

This, however, cannot be the conclusion of the matter. It is difficult to in-terpret 6:1–4 to mean that everyone on earth had been involved in the "sons of God" issue. God saw in 6:12 that "*all flesh* had corrupted its way on the earth" (emphasis added). Everyone on earth (with the apparent exception of Noah and his family) had displeased God to the point that he felt compelled to "de-stroy them" (6:13) from the earth. A linguistic clue provides insight into why humankind had become so odious to its creator. When God created Adam in 2:7 he "formed [יצר] the man from the dirt of the ground." The verb יצר here means "to form or fashion," as a potter would mold the items of his creation.[73] Compare this to 6:5 where Yahweh observes of man that "every imagination [יֵצֶר] of the thoughts of his heart were only evil continually." The word יֵצֶר is a noun form from the verb יצי and could be literally rendered as "something formed or fashioned." The picture of God carefully forming Adam (i.e. hu-manity) compared with the picture of humankind forming nothing but evil things all of the time is striking. It is no surprise that God was so angry; his

---

6:1–4," *HeBAI* 1 (2012): 427–47. For summaries of the main points of argument, see the commentaries, especially Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary* (trans. John J. Scullion; Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), 363–83.

72. However, contrast the opinion of Schmid, who connects the passage with Deut 34:7. This verse relates that Moses died at age 120, the age that is identified as humankind's maximum lifespan in 6:3. Deut 34:7, unlike other passages, does not identify a particular offense as the reason for Moses' not being able to enter the land. Therefore, "Moses' death has nothing to do with personal guilt but, rather, with fate," thus implying that "we can at least state that the heavenly interference of divine sons with human daughters in its current literary position offers an (additional) reason for the Flood: the Flood solves the problem created by the mixing of the divine and human sphere, which was not caused by human guilt but by transcendent fate." Konrad Schmid, "The Late Persian Formation of the Torah: Observations on Deuteronomy 34" in *Judah and Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainier Albertz; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 249–50.

73. Cf. Isa 29:16 and Jer 18:4 for this idea.

forming of humanity had backfired and he now had to deal with the problems that his creations had themselves created. From God's own perspective, there was certainly plenty of justification for wiping out his creations and starting anew.

But how does the Genesis text itself evaluate the legitimacy of God's decision to send the deluge? As we saw in the Akkadian versions of the flood story, the gods seem to be the ones at fault, not humankind. It is the opposite here. The author(s) in fact remove(s) God from the narrative at exactly the points one might think he would be most prominent. The following chiasm demonstrates the structure of the flood story in regards to who is, for the most part,[74] at the focus of the narrative:

A. 6:5–7:4 God (inner thoughts decry human wickedness, instructions to Noah)

    B. 7:5–7:24 Noah, the earth, and its inhabitants (preparations for flood, flood destroys)

        C. 8:1 God briefly returns (remembers Noah, recalls the floodwaters)

    B'. 8:2–14 Noah, the earth, and its inhabitants (flood abates, earth becomes inhabitable)

A'. 8:15–9:17 God (assuaged by Noah's sacrifice, rules out future floods, details the covenant)

By using this structure where God is conspicuously absent from parts 2 and 4, the narrative demonstrates that despite being justified in wiping out all of humanity, God still dissociated himself from the destruction. God easily could have been made the subject of all of the verbs describing the sending forth of the flood waters, but such is not the case.[75] This suggests that God did not want to destroy all of his creations, creations that he had referred to as being "very good" (1:31), but their wickedness and degeneracy forced his hand. The Mesopotamian gods, conversely, were definitely present during the

---

74. The one exception is 7:16 where "Yahweh closed him (Noah) in" to the ark. This action has nothing to do with the actual unleashing of the flood but rather with ensuring Noah's survival. This detail may also be significant for another reason. In *Gilgamesh*, Utnapishtim's shipwright Puzur-Enlil (XI: 94–95; see George's translation) sealed the boat before the flood. This may be another polemic where Genesis depicts God thoroughly sealing in the precious cargo of the ark while *Gilgamesh's* flood hero had to be sealed in by a mortal (and one whom Utnapishtim likely tricked into performing the seal in exchange for a palace and goods that would soon be submerged in floodwater). See David Marcus, "God Shut Noah In (Genesis 7:16), But Who Shut Utnapishtim In?" *Maarav* 9 (2002): 59.

75. The text uses several *niphal* (passive) verbs to de-emphasize a specific instigator. For example, 7:11 states that "all the headwaters of the great deep were broken up [נבקעו] and the windows of the heavens were opened [נפתחו]."

sending of the flood, but not in a positive way: "Even the gods took fright at the Deluge . . . the gods were curled up like dogs" (XI:114, 116);[76] "Their lips were feverishly athirst, they were suffering from cramp of hunger" (III:IV:21–22).[77] The Mesopotamian gods were frightened by their own flood and even realized that they *needed* humanity to provide food and drink for them. The biblical account, following its Mesopotamian predecessors, adopted the anthropomorphic imagery of God smelling and being pleased with the animal sacrifice of Noah after the conclusion of the flood (8:21). However, the crucial difference is that Israel's deity did not need to eat the sacrifice to survive.[78] The biblical author(s) is/are clearly polemicizing against the weakness and lack of forethought of the Mesopotamian gods. God in Genesis does not need humans to provide food for him as the Mesopotamian gods do, but he does want humanity to survive, just not in the wicked state it had formed for itself. Ultimately, the call for ethical behavior falls on humans in Genesis, whereas it falls on the gods in the other versions.[79]

In summary, there is a distinct difference between having many gods who often disagree with each other and having one God[80] who makes all of the decisions. Israel's God is portrayed as choosing to preserve the human race despite its wickedness, whereas humanity survived in the Mesopotamian versions despite the foolishness of its deities. Although the structure of the type-scene required Israel's God to make the morally questionable decision to wipe out almost all of humanity, the biblical narrative's subtle changes to its Mesopotamian predecessors readily demonstrate the Bible's conception of its God being morally and intellectually superior to Mesopotamian deities.

Literary Analysis of the Type-Scene: Themes

An analysis of the characters in the flood stories has yielded much information about how the type-scene has been altered and perpetuated in Semitic flood literature and how gods and humans are portrayed in each. Another

---

76. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 711. Later, when Utnapishtim had offered sacrifice, the gods are also said to have hovered around the food like flies. This cynical simile further degrades the Mesopotamian gods and shows that the Mesopotamian authors recognized the weaknesses of their gods (see George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 518).

77. Lambert and Millard, *Atrahasis*, 97.

78. Alter, *Genesis*, 36.

79. Stipp, "Who is Responsible," 147.

80. Shaviv argues that the two divine names in the flood pericope, Yahweh and Elohim, are actually two different deities. In his view, the Israelites originally received the flood story from their Canaanite neighbors and replaced Baal with Yahweh and El with Elohim. He sees Yahweh as the God who wants to destroy humankind and Elohim as the God who wants to save it. See Samuel Shaviv, "The Polytheistic Origins of the Biblical Flood Narrative," *VT* 54 (2004): 527–48.

important area of difference is the fact that each flood text has at least one unique theme. The flood always fundamentally changes something important about the history of the earth and humanity, but the primary theme of each flood story differs from the other accounts. I will now discuss what that change is in each of the flood texts.

The Atrahasis Epic

As mentioned above, many scholars see overpopulation as an important theme of the *Atrahasis Epic*. The final readable lines in *Atrahasis* talk about the divine bestowal of several social institutions that serve to limit human population. These include the inability of some women to bear children, the setting apart of some women as cultic functionaries who would not bear children, and a high infant mortality rate. The author(s) of the epic used the flood as the catalyst for the gods' (etiological) bestowal of this set of new social conditions.

This realization provides excellent information about the unique meaning of the *Atrahasis Epic.* Although it is fragmentary, "scholars now agree that damaged text near the end of the Epic refers to the gods' decision to institute death as a normal end to human life."[81] If humans did not die naturally, it is no wonder that Enlil had such a difficult time controlling the humans with his plagues and droughts. The post-flood social regulations actually explain how natural death entered the world and why limiting the number of births actually benefitted humanity. It is interesting to note that Genesis, in opposition to *Atrahasis*, does not consider overpopulation to be an issue. In 9:1 God commands Noah and his sons to "be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth." Thus it is logical to conclude that when "viewed in this light, Gen 9,1 ff. looks like a conscious rejection of the Atrahasis Epic."[82] Here is yet another Genesis polemic against Mesopotamian thought. In sum, the question of what changes as a result of the flood in *Atrahasis* clearly lies in the new social and mortal conditions instituted by the gods.

The Epic of Gilgamesh

Much of the *Gilgamesh Epic* deals with Gilgamesh's ill-fated attempts to obtain immortality. As has long been recognized, this is in fact the central theme of the epic as a whole. Utnapishtim's primary purpose in recounting the details of the flood to Gilgamesh was to explain why he (Utnapishtim) was the

---

81. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia,* 8.
82. William L. Moran, "Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood," *Bib* 52 (1971): 61. See also A.D. Kilmer, "The Mesopotamian Concept of Overpopulation and Its Solution as Reflected in the Mythology," *Or* 41 (1972): 160–77; and Frymer-Kensky, "The Atrahasis Epic," 152.

last mortal to receive the gift of immortality from the gods. Thus it is not dif-
ficult to deduce that both the theme and the purpose of the flood in *Gilgamesh*
is to demonstrate (etiologically) why humans cannot become immortal. In
agreement with this sentiment, Genesis also explicitly denies that humans
can become immortal (3:24). However, unlike the Mesopotamian versions,
Genesis denies immortality even to its flood hero.[83] This is a polemic: humans
cannot become immortal now, nor have they ever been able to do so.

Genesis 6–9

This leads to the question about what changed in Genesis after the flood.
Here there is a puzzling contradiction. After the flood, Yahweh says, "I will
never again curse the earth for the sake of humankind, for the inclination
[יֵצֶר] of the heart of humankind is evil [רַע] from his youth, and I shall never
again smite every living thing according as I have done" (8:21). This seems
odd because it was the evil (רַע) inclination (יֵצֶר) of humankind that prompted
Yahweh to send the flood in the first place (6:5). Yahweh promises that he will
never send a flood again despite the continued wickedness of humankind. If
people's hearts are still evil, what has actually changed?[84]

The answer may come from chapter 9, where God makes a new covenant
with Noah and his posterity. As part of this covenant God institutes laws for
humankind, an act comparable in context to the gods in *Atrahasis* instituting
new social institutions for population control. These new laws (and the associ-
ated covenant) seem to be the difference between the antediluvian and postdi-
luvian world. After all, "God must do something if he does not want to destroy
the earth repeatedly. This something is to create laws for mankind, laws to
ensure that matters do not again reach such a state that the world must be
destroyed."[85] This would make sense, considering that חָמָס, one of the reasons
for the flood, can be translated as "lawlessness." Giving laws could theoretically
help remedy the issue. But this explanation is not quite complete. Couldn't
God have just given laws to humankind without destroying the earth by flood?

---

83. Fisher suggests that "the right to kill and eat certain animals functions in the
Hebrew version as a substitute for the original (or at least earlier) gift of immortality to man
as a gift of a portion of divinity itself." Fisher, "*Gilgamesh* and Genesis," 394.

84. There are numerous ways to explain this. Petersen has addressed this dilemma by
suggesting that the author of J saw Yahweh's attempt to destroy man as ineffectual. This, in
his view, is why the redactor(s) interwove P with J to temper the cynicism of J. See David
L. Petersen, "The Yahwist on the Flood," *VT* 26 (1976): 438–46. Van Wolde believes that
Noah's sacrifice is what convinced Yahweh to withdraw his anger. See Ellen van Wolde,
Words Become Worlds: Semantic Studies of Genesis 1–11 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 82–3.

85. Frymer-Kensky, "The Atrahasis Epic," 151.

The text of 9:6 provides a clue: "He who sheds [שֹׁפֵךְ] the blood of man, by man his blood shall be shed [שָׁפֵךְ], for in the image of God he made humankind." Here God emphasizes the sanctity of human life, the reason being that he created humankind in his own image. As 9:5 also states, any person or animal that killed a human must also be killed. By beginning and ending 9:6 with the same verb (שׁפך), the text drives home the point that anyone who begins by shedding blood will, in the end, have his blood shed.[86] Capital punishment was a fundamental law in ancient Israel. However, the law of capital punishment was clearly not in effect before the flood. This is obvious from the situations of Cain (4:1–15) and Lemech (4:19–24), who both committed murder but were not slain in response. The blood of the slain polluted the earth in some way as God told Cain that "the voice of the blood of your brother cries to me from the ground. And now, cursed are you from the ground which has opened its mouth to receive the blood of your brother from your hand" (4:10–11). Further, 9:2–6 authorizes the eating of animal flesh but does not legitimize the consumption of blood, thus showing that the shedding of blood (and consequent pollution of the ground) was a major factor in the decision to send the deluge.[87] That the polluted ground needed to be cleansed is made clear by the explanation of Noah's name, "This [Noah] shall comfort us from our work and from the toil of our hands, from the ground which Yahweh has cursed" (5:29). Noah, portrayed as a second Adam who would bring rest to the earth after the curses of Adam, Cain, and Lemech,[88] helped alleviate this pollution by being the agent through which humankind could continue in an unpolluted world after the flood. More generally, the institution of capital punishment meant that guilty blood would no longer remain un-atoned for, thus eliminating the need to send another deluge.

In sum, this theme of the Genesis flood story is a great example of how its author(s) reused the conventions in the type-scene "to illuminate fundamental Israelite ideas, i.e., the biblical ideals that law and the 'sanctity of human life' are the prerequisites of human existence upon the earth."[89] The theme of the flood being sent to wash away pollution (and serving as the impetus for God to institute new laws for humans to enforce)[90] is also unique to this flood peri-

---

86. J. P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004), 34–5.

87. See Stipp, "Who is Responsible," 151.

88. Robert W. E. Forrest, "Paradise Lost Again: Violence and Obedience in the Flood Narrative," *JSOT* 19 (1994): 10.

89. Frymer-Kensky, "The Atrahasis Epic," 154.

90. In regards to humankind's creation in the image of God and God's expectation that humankind should act in accordance with law, Tigay comments that "the flood story

cope. The other flood stories do not put emphasis on the value of human life, keeping divine law, or ridding the earth of defilement, again demonstrating a large difference in theology between the Israelite and Mesopotamian flood stories.

Conclusion

The above analysis of the Semitic flood type-scene is far from exhaustive, but it does provide a starting point for further review of both the overarching themes and the minute details of the flood story. It has been amply demonstrated that the conventional flood motif has been both employed and altered by each text for its own particular literary, cultural, and theological purposes. The fact that the Hebrew account used the existing Semitic flood type-scene as its basis suggests not only that the author(s) knew of the Mesopotamian texts/tradition but also that *one* specific purpose of writing the flood story was to create polemics against Mesopotamian thought. The obvious similarities between Noah's flood story and the Mesopotamian versions betray a clear literary dependency, but it is the differences, the purposeful alteration of the type-scene, that betray the polemical intention of the biblical author.

---

testifies that man's failure to perform his Godlike role upon himself is what most disturbs God about man." Tigay, "The Image of God," 178.

THE HAND DRUM (תֹּף) AND
ISRAELITE WOMEN'S MUSICAL TRADITION

SARA K. RILEY

Sara K. Riley recently graduated from Brigham Young University with a degree in ancient Near Eastern studies and an emphasis in Hebrew. This essay won second place in the annual ancient Near Eastern studies essay contest.

While scholars have suggested that Israelite men played most of the instruments, the תֹּף (the hand-drum) was played, if not exclusively, by women.[1] The biblical text's description and the frequent appearance of female figurines with drums in the archaeological record establish that there were distinct female hand-drum performance traditions in the Iron Age kingdom of Israel, and perhaps also in the kingdom of Judah.[2] This performance context will be examined under the provenances of the figurines and the biblical text, which most likely included praising Yahweh in temple worship and victory celebrations. Furthermore, these female figurines will be categorized and discussed separately; The Type A figurines most likely represent cultic musicians and priestesses, and the Type B most likely represent ordinary women musicians. The Type A relief figurines seem to suggest that they came from Egyptian influence and the Type B figurines from Phoenician influence. Lastly, these figurines will be interpreted by discussing the sexual motifs in iconographic depictions and the biblical text.

The Hand-Drum

The hand-drum was one of the most popular instruments in ancient Israel. The Hebrew word תֹּף (plural תֻּפִּים) appears in the Bible seventeen times and is usually translated "tambourine," "tabret," or simply "hand-drum." Although it is never described in the text, the drum probably had a metal or wooden frame

---

1. Theodore W. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts: Music Culture in Ancient Palestine* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2006), 85.
2. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 40.

covered on one or both sides with skin[3] and most likely did not have jingles.[4] It was most likely played with the fingers or wrists;[5] as the figurines demonstrate, drums were played with the hand typically at six o'clock position that would beat the head and the other hand placed at the nine or three o'clock position to press the head to mute or change the pitch.[6] The Hebrew Bible never mentions the instrument being played with sticks.[7] Additionally, although the Bible has an abundant vocabulary of instruments, only one word for drum is found:[8] a perplexing fact, as there are many varieties of drums found in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and other areas in the ancient Near East.[9]

The Appearance of Female Drummer Terra-Cottas

To begin with, there is very little archaeological evidence of actual instruments in Israel during the Iron Age, probably due to the fact that most parts of the drum were made from organic material such as animal skin or wood.[10] But while there is not much to speak of with instruments, there are nearly ninety-seven figurines and figurine fragments of female drummers found in Israel/ Palestine in the Iron Age, a significant amount of iconographical representations of drums.[11]

---

3. Yelena Kolyada, *A Compendium of Musical Instruments and Instrumental Terminology in the Bible* (London: Equinox Publishing, 2006), 107–109.

4. Ovid R. Sellers, "Musical Instruments of Israel," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 4/3 (1941): 33–47; Alfred Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1969), 373.

5. Kolyada, *Compendium of Musical Instruments,* 108.

6. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 33, 2.8 and 2.9. "These figures are very similar to positions used today in the Middle East."

7. Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel*, 373.

8. "At least nine kinds of stringed instruments (chordophones) are mentioned, along with a dozen or so wind instruments (aerophones), and five shaking, scraping or rattling instruments (idiophones; this would include cymbals)." Carol L. Meyers, "Of Drums and Damsels: Women's Performance in Ancient Israel," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 54/1 (1991): 16–27.

9. Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel,* 372.

10. Joachim Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine: Archaeological, Written, and Comparative Sources* (translated by Douglas W. Stott; Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002), 39. The only conceivable evidence available for hand-drums are clay rings found that are 15–30 cm across, or the small cylindrical clay fragment found in a temple in Abu Hawan. However, most scholars believe these are rings that were for supporting storage jars. Paz thinks that it being a drum is improbable, as "there is no indication of a membrane being stretched over the frame," *Drums, Women, and Goddesses: Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 11, footnote 6.

11. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 118.

Yet, these figurines vary greatly in size, style, manufacture, skill of artistry,[12] pose, markings of the drum, and sometimes hand positions of the figurine;[13] no two figurines are identical.[14] Burgh has not observed two designs on the surface of drum heads that are exactly alike, and these markings may possibly indicate different music ensembles, or simply personal choice, as the meaning of the markings is uncertain.[15] Most of these Iron Age figurines were made by a wheel-made base, and then a hand-made or mould-made head was attached; the hands and arms were also hand-made. Some others, however, are completely hand-made or made entirely from a mould.[16] While the wide variety suggests that they were mass-produced, there have been found figurines that are identical, and discovered at different sites from Rehov, Beth Shean, and Tell el-Farah.[17] Consequently, the variety of figurines requires that interpretation must be very careful and that there may be more than one correct understanding of the figurines' purpose.[18] Likewise, there are many different views on what these figurines represent.[19] Scholars have suggested they were used for

---

12. Carol L. Meyers, "Miriam the Musician," in *A Feminist Companion to Exodus to Deuteronomy* (ed. Athalya Brenner; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 214.

13. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 18.

14. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 86.

15. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 32. There are also some instances of the drum frames being decorated. For example, there are two parchment membranes (for the drum frame) from the Late Period (664 bce–332 bce) that are now in the Cairo Museum. The membranes are decorated with a girl playing the drum in front of Isis. There is also a fragment of a large round tambourine in the Ashmolean Museum; the membranes have a floral border and decorations celebrating birth (date of tambourine is uncertain). See Lise Manniche, *Ancient Egyptian Musical Instruments* (Münchner Ägyptologische Studien 34; Munnich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1975), 1–2.

16. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 19; Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 86.

17. Paz, *Drums, Women, and Goddesses,* 57.

18. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 18.

19. Until the 1960s, the finds from Israel were overlooked, and instruments and figurines were mostly focused on Mesopotamia and Egypt, such as Ovid R. Sellers, "Musical Instruments of Israel," *BA* 4/3 (1941): 33–47. P. Gradenwitz's book *The Music of Israel* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1949) asserted that there were not any music-related finds in Israel prior to the Hellenistic period. However, in the 1960s and 1970s there grew a bulk of musical classification in Israel and their iconographic depiction, such as M. Gorali's *Music in the Ancient World* (Haifa, Israel: The Haifa Music Museum and AMLI Library, 1977). These drummer figurines increasingly received more attention. The general problem of whether the figurines were holding a tambourine or another disk-shaped object has been studied by A.M. Bisi's two special studies of the figurines found in sanctuaries and tombs in Cyprus ("Un Gruppo di Terrecotte Cipriote nel Museo di Torino e il Problem Della Colonizzazione Fenicia Dell'isola," *Bollettino della Società Piemontese di Archeologia e Belle Arti* 20 [1966]: 5–37). See also D.R. Hillers, "The Goddess with the Tambourine," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 41: 606–19; on the figurine from Gezer holding a round object see R. Amiran "A Note on Figurines with 'Disks' *Eretz-Israel* 5 (1967):52–54 (Hebrew). For a discussion of the object as a sun disk or "Holy Bread" see E. R Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period* (vol. 5; New York: Pantheon Books, 1953). See also D.

votive offerings,[20] a representation of a servant, or a well-known drummer in the community.[21] Others believe they were used to accompany the deceased musically into the afterlife, or represented a female deity or temple priestess.[22] While all these interpretations are feasible, a careful analysis can eliminate the lesser possibilities.

Analyzing the abundant amount of figurines can be a daunting task, but the separation of these figurines into several categories will be useful. Braun has suggested two main categories of these figurines,[23] but Paz has gone even further to suggest three categories of the figurines. The first category is Type A relief terra-cottas, the second is Type B bell-shaped figurines, and the third is Type C hybrid figurines. I propose that most of the Type B bell-shaped figurines are representations of ordinary women musicians; the Type A relief terra-cottas, however, are not as definite, and may have a number of possible meanings, but are most likely cultic musicians and personnel.

Type A Figurines

The type A of these female drummers are relief/plaque terra-cottas, of which there are more than sixty-five examples, compared to fourteen of the bell-shaped figurines.[24] These figurines often portray nude or half-nude, richly decorated women, and usually also depict them with some sort of head covering or wig, often called by scholars a Hathor headdress. They appear around the same time the bell-shaped figurines appeared.[25] However, these terra-cottas

---

Morris, T*he Art of Ancient Cyprus* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1985); J. B. Pritchard, *Sarepta: A Prelminary Report on the Iron Age: Excavations of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, 1970–1972* (Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1975). Tambourine player is identified with Astarte in J. Ferron "Les statuettes au Tympanon des Hypogées Puniques" *Antiquités Africaines* 3 (1969): 11–33; also Layne Remond, *When the Dummers were Women: A Spiritual History of Rhythm* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1997). For iconographic depictions of musical instruments and their players see O. Keel and C. Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998). For arguments of the figures actually holding drums see Carol Meyers, "A Terracotta at the Harvard Semitic Museum and Disk-Holding Figures Reconsidered," *IEJ* 37 (1983): 116–22. Also T.A. Holland's *A Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representation in the Plastic Art of Palestine* (PhD diss., Oxford University, 1975); see also A. J. Amr, *A Study of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of Trans-Jordan during the Iron Age, with Special Reference to their Symbolism and Function* (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1980); P. Beck "A Figurine from Tel'Ira." *Eretz-Israel* 21(1990): 87–93 (Hebrew).

20. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 37.
21. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 85.
22. Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001): 298.
23. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 118.
24. Paz, *Drums, Women, and Goddesses,* 12.
25. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 126.

do not appear in the same areas that the bell-shaped figurines were discovered; the bell-shaped figurines are found in the coastal regions, while the reliefs are found throughout ancient Israel and Palestine.[26] Furthermore, these figurines are not found in Judah at all, except for the eastern Negev.

In addition, some scholars argue that these figurines are not holding a hand-drum, but that these disks are more likely "a raised loaf, not a tambourine"[27] or some type of plate offering. They believe these are not drums, because the figurines clutch the disc against the chest, the discs are richly decorated, and the poses are not clearly suggesting they are playing the discs.[28] However, Paul Lapp in a later report stated that he is satisfied it is now a tambourine, from seeing more evidence of other figurines that show the round object being struck.[29] Most scholars agree that the disc is some sort of tambourine and are more concerned about who the figurine represents.[30]

Hillers argues that it is justified to call these nude drummer figurines goddesses because firstly, many Palestine figurines represent goddesses "almost beyond question" and secondly, some Mesopotamian figurines with a drum "must depict a goddess."[31] While it is feasible that some of the terra-cottas represent goddesses, so far there has not been success in identifying a goddess to match the figurines, and it is still on the speculative side. But if these figurines are not goddesses, some terra-cottas at least likely have a cultic context or depict a temple/sanctuary female musician.

For many of the figurines, the information concerning the context is unknown. But the figurines that we do know the context of, were generally found in domestic or sacred contexts. For example, at Aphek it was found in a four-room house, and at Tek 'Ira it was retrieved from the room of a public building (see appendix 1). Another reason to suggest that these figurines have a cultic context is that they were found in situ in buildings interpreted as religious structures. The eigth to ninth century BCE figurine of Tel el-Farah North was

---

26. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 127.

27. Paul W. Lapp, "The 1963 Excavation at Ta'annek," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 173 (1964): 4–44, caption of fig. 21.

28. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 19.

29. D. Hillers, "The Goddess with the Tambourine," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 41 (1970): 606–17.

30. Hillers, "Goddess," 610; King, *Biblical Israel,* 298; and Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 127. Paz also states that "I accept the opinion that the object is pressed against the body owing to technicalities involved in the production of mould figurines. In most of these plaque figurines, the disc is supported at the bottom by the left hand, while the entire right hand lies over it, and can be construed as a stylized representation of beating upon it," (*Drums, Women, and Goddesses,* 73).

31. Hillers, "Goddess," 611.

discovered in what has been determined as the temple of Tel el-Farah N.[32] The Tel Taanach mould of a figurine, dated to about the ninth to eighth century BCE as well, was found in the cultic structure, along with twenty-seven other complete or fragmented human figurines.[33] Again, it has been interpreted as a goddess, but perhaps it represented a person that took part in the religious activities there.[34] Another example is the eleventh century Beth-Shean figurine, which was found in a burial with other vessels, jewelry, ivories, and weapons. Some have interpreted this figurine as a servant, or that it was used to accompany the deceased into the afterlife.[35]

Type B Figurines

There are fourteen hollow, bell-shaped figures found in this collection of women holding the drum, about fifteen to twenty-five centimeters. tall.[36] Many of these figurines have been approximately dated, but there are some that have unknown provenance and were acquired through the antiquities trade (such as the Harvard Semitic collection). These Type B figurines begin appearing during Iron Age II,[37] and were mainly found at sites in the northern coastal region of Israel and on the Phoenician Coast (see appendix 2). Indeed, scholars call these figurines "the Phoenician Type," as these figurines were also found in Tyre and Kition of Cyprus, a large Phoenician colony.[38] However, there are three figurines from the Nebo and Samarian region, with the Mt. Nebo figurine dating from eleventh to tenth century BCE,[39] which might suggest local independent development for these drummer figurines.[40]

One example of a bell-shaped figurine was found at Tel Shiqmona, south of Haifa. The female drummer figurine was discovered in a burial and was dated to the eighth century BCE. Excavators found it with several other horsemen figurines; in addition, excavations at Shiqmona have also found a figurine playing an aerophone with similar artistic style and characteristics. Both figurines are distinct in physical characteristics, which Braun argues may be representations of individuals who performed within the community.[41] The excavators concluded that the figurines were votive offerings. Burgh also

---

32. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 37.
33. Lapp, "Excavation at Ta'annek," 39–40.
34. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 36.
35. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 34.
36. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 118.
37. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 20.
38. Paz, *Drums, Women, and Goddesses,* 61.
39. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 125.
40. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 119.
41. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 37–39.

agrees with the theory of votive offerings, but goes even further to say that the figurines represented real musicians, and that these terra-cottas were buried with the dead or even the musicians themselves.[42] Other scholars have pointed out that there are many related terra-cottas that depict figures holding other instruments such as lyres, double-flutes, or cymbals, which have been found in similar contexts. Thus these female drummers are almost certainly human musicians as well.[43]

Meyers also notes there is a marked absence of decoration in these figurines, such as jewelry or headpieces. The hairstyles and clothing are simple, and the hair is either braided or loose, with bangs falling evenly across the forehead.[44] The clothing are long garments, but without any of the traditional adornment such as ruffles, pleats, or any other drapings.[45] It seems reasonable that these plain hairstyles and this plain apparel suggest that these are ordinary females and not a deity. In addition, the lack of adornment also urges the idea that these are not royalty, cultic personnel, or the elite.[46] However, one exception is the bell-shaped figurine found at Mt. Nebo who is represented half-nude. Additionally, a similar figurine with her arms placed under her breasts was found at Mt. Nebo.[47] This context probably requires a different interpretation, and perhaps is more along the lines of Type A. But in general, these bell-shaped figurines are most likely representations of women musicians in the community.

Type C Figurines

Unfortunately, most of the Type C figurines lack an archaeological context.[48] Two figurines were found in the same tomb at Nebo, and one from a palace in Megiddo and Samaria. It is interesting that they are not in any domestic contexts, but because of missing and unreliable data of the dating of the figurines (see appendix 3), I cannot come to any certain conclusions at the present.

---

42. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 39.
43. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 18.
44. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 19.
45. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 118.
46. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 19.
47. Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs About the Dead* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 97.
48. Paz, *Drums, Women, and Goddesses,* 67.

Biblical References

Although defining the purpose of the figurines and the drumming is mostly guesswork, the Hebrew Bible has a rich amount of female drummer performances, such as in Exod 15:20–21:

> And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a trimbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with drums [סִיפָּת] and with dances. And Miriam answered them, Sing to Yahweh, for he hath triumphed gloriously.

This is one of the first appearances in the Bible of women in a musical performance context. It indicates Miriam as a prophetess (נְבִיאָה), along with a large group of women, who each had a frame drum and followed Miriam in the performance as they sang praise to Yahweh for their deliverance. Additionally, it does not appear that men are involved with this musical performance; this women's performance was specifically mentioned as "answering them," meaning it took place after Moses and the sons of Israel's song (Exod 15:1).

This song of victory performed by the women with drumming and dancing became a musical genre within ancient Israel. Judges 11:34 says, "And Jephthah came to Mizpeh unto his house, and, behold, his daughter came out to meet him with drums and with dances." This gives another example of women playing drums for a victory celebration and to praise Yahweh for deliverance, as "Yahweh delivered [the children of Ammon] into his [Jepthah's] hands" (11:32). Burgh notes that in the text it seems that Jepthah's daughter comes out alone to meet him, but played more than one drum (תֻּפִּים) at the same time, and hence may suggest a musical ability that might have been required for such celebrations as these.[49] However, it seems more likely that Jepthah's daughter was the musical leader of a group of women coming to greet the victorious men, as it is assumed playing the hand drum requires one hand to hold the frame and the other to beat the skin.

This female drummer tradition continued during the early period of the monarchy, as read in 1 Sam 18:6–7:

> And it came to pass as they came, when David was returned from the slaughter of the Philistines, that the women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet king Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music. And the women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands.

---

49. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 95.

The writer describes another victory celebration with women drummers performing, as both David and Saul had triumphed over the Philistines. This performance also had great political impact, resulting in Saul envying David; the song the women sing is brought up again several times in the life of David (1 Sam 21:11; 29:5). It mentions that the women came from "all the cities of Israel," suggesting that drumming celebrations were a tradition in many areas of Israel. Burgh suggests that since it was such a large group there probably would have been a small collection of music that all the women performers knew.[50] From these passages it seems expected for returning warriors to have a joyous celebration by female drummers and dancers. Thus, performing women needed to be capable and prepared; Meyers suggests that women met often to compose and rehearse, using the daughters of Shiloh meeting "to dance in dances" (Judg 21:21) as an example.[51] Additionally, from this text it can be determined that the drumming tradition was present in Judah at least during the united monarchy, although after the division of the kingdom it is less certain.

In addition to the duties of women to perform for victory celebrations in praise to Yahweh, these female drummers also performed in the temple. While some scholars claim that these female drummers were not used in temple music,[52] it seems clear that women played the תֹּף (hand-drum) for praise in the temple[53] given that several Psalms mention these instances. For example, Ps 150: 1, 4: "Praise God in his sanctuary . . . Praise him with the drum and dance," Ps 149:1, 3: "Sing unto Yahweh a new song, and his praise in the congregation of saints . . . Let them sing praise unto him with the drum and harp," and Ps 68:24–25: "The goings of my God, my King, in the sanctuary. The singers went before, the players on instruments after; among them the damsels playing with drums." While scholars find the Psalms difficult to date,[54] it is helpful in understanding the religious musical traditions of Israel.[55] The psalmist of chapter 68 interestingly differentiates the sex of the musicians, as the "singers" (קַדְּמוּ שָׁרִים) and the "players" (נֹגְנִים) are masculine, while "the damsels" (or "young maidens" עֲלָמוֹת) were the hand-drummers.

---

50. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 100.

51. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 23–25.

52. Kolyada, *Compendium of Musical Instruments,* 109.

53. Sellers, "Musical Instruments," 36.

54. Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 104.

55. Although I will not discuss the literary analysis of Ps 68, scholars have suggested that this psalm is a pre-Deuteronomistic poem with the tradition of the northern kingdom, not that of Judah. See Paz, *Drums, Women, and Goddesses,* 85.

Psalms 68 also suggests that men and women collaborated and played music together. This may also be evident in 2 Sam 6:5 when David and "all the house of Israel played before Yahweh on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals." The phrase "all the house of Israel" seems to indicate that the musical activity included both men and women. In 1 Samuel 10:5, it is first assumed that only men are in the "band of prophets" that is coming down from the בָּמָה ("high place") and who Saul meets,[56] but Burgh suggests that the ensemble included women, and perhaps in this text a prophetess such as Miriam (Exod 15:20).[57]Also, in Judges 5, Barak and Deborah sing a duet together after the victory over the Canaanites. Thus, it seems that ancient Israel had at least two distinct musical performance traditions, one of men and women playing music together (with the women at least playing the hand-drums), and the other with women separately singing and dancing in hand-drum ensembles.[58] From the Hebrew text, we can gather that these female hand-drummers would play for festivals, rejoicings, and victory celebrations, and they had a specific role to play in religious worship.

Sexual Motifs of the Hand-Drum

These nude figurines may cause some puzzles as to how they fit into the context of the religion of ancient Israel. Braun argues that the drum has symbolism connected to sexuality and fertility, and he goes even further to say that the adornment symbolizes sacred prostitution, specifically that the figurines represent temple prostitutes.[59] While I am hesitant to make the claim that these figurines represent cultic prostitutes, the nudity can at least in part suggest that the drum did have erotic overtones and associations with sexuality and, paradoxically, virginity. Braun notes that even in the Hebrew text there are some concealed sexual motifs connected with the תֹּף ("hand-drum"), such as in the early text of Judges where Jepthah's daughter "assumes the role of drummer as she laments her virginity"[60] (Judg 11:34, 37). There are some other texts that have this possible connection, such as "O virgin (בְּתוּלַת) of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry [בִּמְחוֹל מְשַׂחֲקִים]" (Jer 31:4). Interestingly, the

---

56. Kolyada, *Compendium of Musical Instruments,* 109.

57. Theodore W. Burgh, "'Who's the Man?' Sex and Gender in Iron Age Musical Performance," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 67/3 (2004): 128–136; Burgh, *Listening to the Artifacts,* 96.

58. Meyers, "Miriam the Musician," 220.

59. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 131.

60. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 132.

context is the prophecy that Yahweh will deliver and gather his people once again, just as he had done in the past, and as a result, women (specifically "virgins") hand-drummers would sing and dance in praise. Braun also adds that the ambiguous phrase בִּמְחוֹל מְשַׂחֲקִים that is normally translated as "dance" indicates erotic undertones. [61]

As already mentioned, Ps 68:25 mentions "the young maidens [בְּתוֹךְ עֲלָמוֹת תּוֹפֵפוֹת] playing with timbrels", with "young maidens" having plausible sexual connotations. The term עַלְמָה can be defined as "a marriageable girl or young woman (until the birth of her first child)."[62] Lastly, as already mentioned above, the תֹּף ("hand-drum") helped express the joy of the women when meeting the men after a victorious battle. All these clues of sexual undertones[63] suggest possibly why women are strongly associated with the hand-drum more than men were, and may explain some of the culture behind the nude female drummer figurines.[64]

Egyptian Influence

There has also been some discussion related to how these figurines came about, and some suggest either Mesopotamian, Cypriot, Phoenician, or Egyptian influence. While there is a possibility for all of these areas, I propose that the main influence for at least the nude plaque figurines was Egypt.

The first clue of possible Egyptian influence is Miriam and the women playing drums and rejoicing to Yahweh for delivering them from the Egyptians. If the Israelites had spent centuries in Egypt, then it would be plausible that the Israelites had adopted Egyptian musical traditions. Shortly after the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty (c. 1550–c. 1290 BCE), representations of music and dancing with men in them became scarcer in Egypt, while on the other hand there are many Egyptian wall-paintings of women in musical processions, some holding hand-drums.[65] In Egyptian monuments, the hand-drum is mainly played by women, while in other monuments in Assyria/Mesopotamia

---

61. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 133.

62. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 709.

63. While this is beyond the scope of this paper, Redmond give an interesting discussion on how the drum was the primordial symbol of rhythm and the cycles of nature (also the cycles of birth and death, and even menstrual periods). She gives many examples of the circular moon-shaped vulva and even some frame drums in southeast India that are shaped to represent the crescent moon. See Layne Redmond, *When the Drummers Were Women: a Spiritual History of Rhythm* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1997).

64. King, *Biblical Israel,* 289. "Music, song, and dance were an essential part of vintage festivals, which could easily take on sexual overtones." See also Isa 5:1, 12; 16:10-11.

65. Jeffrey Pulver, "Israel's Music-Lesson in Egypt," *The Musical Times* 56/869 (1915): 404–407.

the hand-drums are also played by men.[66] One example of an Egyptian monument is a stela of Ramses II (1300–1234 BCE), who some scholars believe was Moses' pharaoh. It portrays a procession of priests above, but in particular, the lower half of the stela depicts female musicians, five of them holding hand-drums.[67] Thus, it would only be natural for the Egyptianized Israelites to create a procession of women hand-drummers at a time of celebration.

Some other hints of Egyptian influence are the head coverings or wigs worn by the female hand-drummer plaque figurines, which can be associated with the Osiris cult.[68] It has also been suggested that some of the clothing worn on the figurines imitate the transparent Egyptian garments usually worn by Egyptian musicians.[69] In addition, excavations at Tel el-Farah found an ivory panel, dating to the Late Bronze/Iron Age, depicting a scene of musicians who wear transparent garments similar to Egyptian clothing.[70] Although this panel was found on the south side of the site, while the female hand-drummer figurine was found to the north of Tel el-Farah, it nevertheless indicates that this area incorporated Egyptian style into its own.

If there was a strong Egyptian influence for women hand-drummer practices, then Egyptian traditions can enlighten the plausible activities that were represented on the hand-drum terra-cottas. There are some interesting Egyptian cultic texts that date to the eighteenth dynasty that may help indicate the temple personnel role designated to female hand-drummers:

> Consecrate the entire house, and bring two virgins pure of body and with no body hair, with curly wigs on their heads, round frame drums in their hands . . . Let them sing from the songs of the book . . . Let the festival priest call four times: A god is coming, O earth! Let the great mourning woman call four times: Rejoice in heaven and earth! And each time they shall beat the drum.[71]

This text has some notable descriptions of the sacred procession. The women hand-drummers must be "virgins," an association with the hand drum which has already been discussed above. Secondly, they wear "wigs on their heads," and the distinct requirement of having "no body hair" may suggest they were nude, both of which are connections with the relief terra-cotta hand-drummer figurines. On the other hand, no terra-cotta nude female drummers are found in Egypt.[72] We do, however, have a figurine of a nude male cymbal player

---

66. Sellers, "Musical Instruments," 373.
67. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 22.
68. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 131.
69. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 125.
70. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 26, 88.
71. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 127.
72. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 131.

found in Egypt that dates to c. 1200 BCE, a style and instrument which is not often depicted in Egyptian scenes.[73] Hence, there may be more such type of figurines that are simply not yet discovered.

Furthermore, some of these Type A figurines were found in tombs or burial sites (see appendix 1). In Egypt, there are many depicted instances of priestesess participating in the cult of the dead. Female drummers have been shown in funerary ceremonies and processions;[74] one instance is in the Theban tomb from the reign of Amenhotep IV (also called Akhenaten), where there is a representation of women with round hand-drums receiving the tomb's owner.[75] While the actual figurines found in these Israelite burial sites may not exactly match the purpose of the Egyptian priestesses at funerals, the relation between women hand-drummers and the dead is important.

Some scholars argue assertively that these figurines were more influenced by Phoenicia, as most of the terra-cottas are found near this area, and many of the Cypriot female hand-drummer figurines indicate Phoenician influence.[76] However, chronology suggests that Israelite figurines were the first to appear, as the first female drummer figurine that was found dates to the eleventh to tenth century BCE and was found in Mt. Nebo. In contrast, the Phoenician drummer figurines do not appear until the seventh to eighth centuries.[77] Furthermore, most plaque reliefs, including the oldest, have been found in Megiddo, Beth-Shean, and the Transjordan, where Egyptian influence continued the longest.[78] Altogether, there are many clues that point to Egyptian influence for Israelite women hand-drummer ensembles, and further study will be informative.

Conclusion

These plaque and bell-shaped terra-cottas of female hand-drummers give a glimpse of a few facets of popular Israelite religion and culture. Women hand-drummer ensembles were meaningful in the community's religious activities. From the Hebrew Bible, we find that women drummers would praise Yahweh for deliverance and give returning warriors the expected musical welcome. Furthermore, they also participated in temple and sanctuary worship. It is to be surmised that these women needed to be competent and prepared to play for these activities, and they probably met to compose and rehearse.

---

73. Burgh, *Music in Listening to the Artifacts,* 59.
74. Barbara Watterson, *Women in Ancient Egypt* (Wrens Park Publishing, 1998), 40.
75. Manniche, *Ancient Egyptian Musical Instruments,* 2.
76. Meyers, "Drums and Damsels," 22.
77. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine,* 125.
78. Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine*, 127.

It was an opportunity for women to excel in their role and status in society. The bell-shaped figurines represent ordinary human musicians, as their simple adornment suggests, while archaeological evidence suggests that relief figurines were used in a cultic context. The nude figurines might possibly either represent goddesses or temple servants, and the drum has connections with sexuality, as hinted with some biblical texts mentioned above. These cultic contexts and women drummer ensembles might have been derived in part from Egyptian influence. Overall, these figurines are significant to the understanding of women's roles in Israelite worship activities, as there is a definite musical tradition of women hand-drummer's performance in a religious setting.

Appendix 1: Type A Figurines

(Note: Paz has done a significant amount of research collecting information on the figurines and gave detailed references to her information. For brevity's sake, I will cite her work unless there are other figurines that have not been collected in her work. Figurines are alphabetized by location.)

Location	Comments	Context	Date	References
Aphek	Headress, necklace, breasts are evident. Female genitals are depicted by a triangle. Drum held between both hands.	Four-roomhouse. Registration #11099	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 13
Beth Shean	Headdress, necklace, and bracelets. Left hand supports the bottom of disc and right hand is lying over it.	Found in a burial with Mycenaean vessels and other cermic assemblages, jewelry, and weapons.	9–8th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 13; Burgh 2006: 32
Beth Shean	Right breast is noticeable, drum is held against left side of chest and a little away from body. The right arm is towards drum and fingers rest upon drum.	Northern Temple, Lower Stratum V.	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 14
Beth Shean	Head and upper part of body fragment. Headdress. Drum held against left side of chest, right hand touches drum.	Lower Stratum V, Southern Temple	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 14

Beth Shean	Woman is holding a child and drum. Necklace and bracelets. Child and drum supported by left arm and right arm rests on drum.	Lower Stratum V, Area D	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 14
Delhamiya	Drum held against left side of chest. Bracelets. Body fragment.	No other information given	Iron Age I	Paz 2007: 15
Deir 'Alla	Anklets on both legs.	Unpublished	Unknown	Paz 2007: 32
Deir 'Alla	Body fragment. Fingers are shown.	Stratum IV, no other information given	8th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 32
Deir 'Alla	Nude and wears bracelets and anklets. The drum's rim has triangles.	Not certain	Unknown	Paz 2007: 32
Deir 'Alla	Nude and wears a necklace with a pendant. Rim has zigzag pattern. Genitals are depicted between thighs.	Not certain	Unknown	Paz 2007: 32
Dibon	Head and upper body preserved.	Most likely a room in the palace district	Unknown	Paz 2007: 31
El-Mashhad	Poor preservation.	Surface find	Unknown	Paz 2007: 33

Gezer	Body fragment. Naked woman, "pregnant belly" drum is held against left side of chest. Three Armlets and three Bracelets. Right hand has six fingers.	Exact Provenance unknown, part of Macalister's Third Semitic Period excavations	Unknown	Paz 2007: 15; Maccalister 1912
Gezer	Head and upper part of body. Some believe produced by same mould as above Gezer figurine.	Exact provenance unknown, part of Macalister's Third Semitic period excavations	Some date it to end of 8th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 15-16
Hazor	Headdress has vertical stripes. Right ear has a loop earring.	Stratum VIII; between fortification and houses	9th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 16
Hazor	Drum's rim has an incised line.	Open area inside fortification wall	10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 16
Helalieh	Fragment of terracotta figurine. Preserved from shoulders to waist only.	No other information given	Unknown	Bayer 1963: 14
Heshbon	Drum's rim has a dot design.	Unpublished	Probably 11th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 33

Irbed	A nude female torso. Lamps, bowls, and jugs were provided for the deceased.	Tomb A. The tombs had been disturbed prior to excavations	10th–9th C. BCE	Bloch-Smith 1992: 193; Braun 2002: 132
Jatt	Body fragment. Drum's rim is deco-rated with circles.	Surface find	Unknown	Paz 2007: 16
Jebel Qal'ah	Body fragment. Naked woman, "preg-nant belly" drum is held against left side of chest. Three Armlets and three Bracelets. Right hand has six fingers.	Surface find	Unknown	Paz 2007: 31
Kerak	Wears hat that is flat on top.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 33
Kerak	Headdress and braids.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 34
Kerak	Fragment of figurine.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 34
Kerak	Wears a conical hat.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 34
Kharayeb	Frame drum held at right angle to body, left hand holding lower rim, right palm beating in center.	Debris in pit, at the temple court	4th C. BCE	Bayer 1963: 14
Kharayeb	Woman with head-dress, holding drum at acute angle to body. Bows to hip fragment.	Debris in pit, at the temple court	4th C. BCE	Bayer 1963: 15
Khirbet 'Ayun Musa	Body fragment	Surface find	Unknown	Paz 2007: 35

Khirbet Nesiba	Detailed earrings, double necklace. Navel is accentuated and genitals are detailed.	Unstratified	Probably 9th–8th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 17
Khirbet Umm el-Butm	Head and legs are missing.	Not certain	Unknown	Paz 2007: 17–18
Megiddo	Sides of figure smoothed down by a knife.	Stratum III, no other information given	8th–7th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 19
Meggido	Drum is held by both hands to the middle of her chest.	Stratum III of Square O13, perhaps sacred area	9th–8th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 19
Meggido	Genitals depicted with a triangle.	Paved courtyard of palace	10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 20
Meggido	Headdress and double anklets on both legs.	Not certain	Probably 10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 20
Meggido	Figurine wears a wrap around her hips.	Tomb from Stratum II	Excavators dated it to 1500 BCE	Paz 2007: 20
Meggido	Poor preservation.	Paved open area	12th c. BCE (?)	Paz 2007: 20
Meggido	Fragment lacking head.	Within a dwelling structure	10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 20
Megiddo	Right hand has three bracelets. May have been produced by same mould from Tel Malhata.	Room 286	10th–9th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 21
Megiddo	Figurine is wearing a skirt.	Room in sacred precinct	10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 21

Mt. Nebo	Along with figurine were about 60 juglets, many of which were Cyro-Phoenician.	Cave tomb UCV-84	10th–8th C. BCE	Bloch-Smith 1992: 50, 196
Rehov	Figurine has pendant on forehead. Genitals depicted as a triangle.	Destruction debris above floor in a room	9th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 21
Rehov	Figurine also has pendant on forehead. Navel is depicted as incised line that runs down stomach.	Layer of burnt brick on surface	9th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 22
Rehov	Head fragment. Probably produced by same mould of the two above Rehov figurines.	Found with broken pottery	9th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 22
Rehov	Frame of drum is decorated with a zig-zag decoration.	Found with stone objects and beads	10th C. BCE (?)	Paz 2007: 23
Rehov	Figure wears a highly decorated hat.	Found while disassembling a brick wall	9th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 23
Rehov	Figurine has necklace with square beads.	Found with Phoenician pottery sherds	Iron Age II	Paz 2007: 24
Rehov	Poor preservation.	Open area, possibly a domestic area	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 24
Rehov	Body fragment. Lower part of body has four decorated bands on garment.	Found with bones, beads, metal items, and figurines	9th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 25

Rosh Pina	Head is missing. Frame of drum is decorated with dots, a circle, and a zigzag pattern.	Unstratified	Iron Age II	Paz 2007: 25
Samaria	Hair is long and has bangs over forehead.	Herodian room with earlier levels beneath	Not given	Paz 2007: 25; Braun 2002: 125
Samaria	Headdress and bangs, and drum frame is decorated with dots.	Herodian room over the palace courtyard	Not given	Paz 2007: 26
Samaria	No photograph or drawing published.	Room 423 in ostraca house	Date unknown	Paz 2007: 26
Taanach	Complete figurine mould.	Destruction level in cultic structure	10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 26; Burgh 2006: 36; Lapp 1964: 39-40
Tel ʿAmal	Body fragment. Right breast is salient.	Exact provenance not given	10th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 26
Tel Dover	Wears a garment with a belt.	Debris layer above floor	Iron Age II	Paz 2007: 27
Tel Dover	Body fragment. Back was smoothed by a knife.	Surface find	Iron Age II	Paz 2007: 27
Tel Dover	Body fragment. Fingers are clearly depicted.	Surface find	Iron Age II	Paz 2007: 28
Tel Dover	Wears anklets.	Basket containing Hellenistic, Late Bronze, and Iron Age II material	Iron Age II	Paz 2007: 28

Tel Hadar	Has headdress and a triangle over belly.	Refuse dumps near wall	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 29
Tel 'Ira	Lips are thick and ears are detailed. Belly is round. Some scholars argue has male genitals and attribute the figure as a hermaphrodite.	Near a gate in a public building	7th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 29
Tel Malhata	Arms are bent, and both hands touch the drum. Left hand supports bottom of drum frame.	Surface in a room	8th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 29
Tel Malhata	Facial features very worn, but despite poor preservation may have been produced by same mould of Megiddo figurine.	Inside room, stratum IV	8th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 30
Tell el-Far'ah (North)	Right breast is pieced in the middle. Short skirt to the knees with geometric patterns.	Located what has been identified as a temple at Tel el-Farah N	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 31; Burgh 2006: 37
Tell el-Far'ah (North)	Right hand covers edge of drum frame.	Building at edge of excavation area	10th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 31
Transjordan	Head and upper body fragment.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 35
Transjordan	Poor preservation.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 35
Provenance Unknown	Wearing dress decorated with small squares.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 35

Provenance Unknown	Girdle around waist. Genitals are prominent.	Unknown	Unknown.	Paz 2007: 35

Appendix 2: Type B Figurines

Location	Comments	Context	Date	References
Achzib	Along with this figurine, another woman drummer was found.	Tomb 13	8th–7th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 39; Bayer 1963: 14
Achzib	Hair reveals traces of black paint.	Tomb 13	8th–7th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 39; Bloch-Smith 1992: 96
Achzib	Almost complete figurine.	Unpublished	8th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 40
Achzib	Hair is braided.	Tomb, additional data unpublished	Unknown	Paz 2007: 39
Achzib	Found at the feet of one of the two skeletons (Tomb of the Horsemen). Figurine has red and black paint.	Tomb 28	8th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 40
Achzib	Along with this figurine, a flute player figurine was found.	Eastern cemetery, Tomb 12	8th–7th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 41
Amathus	Similar style to the Shiqmona figurine.	No other information given	8th c. BCE	Braun 2002: 119
Kabri	No drawings or photographs published.	Unpublished	Unknown	Paz 2007: 41

Tell Qitaf	Short braids and bangs.	Chance find during excavations	Unknown	Paz 2007: 42
Samos	No other information is given.	No other information is given	ca. 670 BCE	Karageorghis 1987: 17
Shiqmona	Curly bangs, two braid coils.	Either from Tomb B or Stratum X	9th–8th c. BCE	Paz 2007: 42; Burgh 2006: 37
Provenance Unknown	Skirt is painted red with vertical black stripes.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 42
Provenance Unknown	Hair is drawn back behind the ears.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 42
Provenance Unknown	Fragment of head and upper part of body.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 43

Appendix 3. Type C Hybrid Figurines

Location	Comments	Context	Date	
Ain Jenin	Headdress. Triangle attached to chin may be a beard, but also has noticeable breasts.	Unstratified	Iron II	Paz 2007: 47
Amman	Left hand supports drum, right hand over it.	Tomb F	Not given	Paz 2007: 48
Amman	Hair is painted black, and traces of red paint on forehead.	Surface find	Unknown	Paz 2007: 47
Jemmeh	Hollow body, head is surrounded by a frame of clay.	Unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 45

Nebo	Hollow body, breasts are salient.	Tomb 84	Iron II on the basis of tomb artifacts	Paz 2007: 47
Megiddo	Ornament over the brow.	Palace, Stratum V	Unknown	Paz 2007: 45
Qitmit	Drum is held between fingers of left hand and thumb.	Three fragments found on surface	7th–6th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 45
Samaria	Ornament over the brow.	Royal quarter, exact provenance unknown	Unknown	Paz 2007: 46
Tell el-Mazar	Drum is perpendicular to body.	Information not given	7th–6th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 46
Tell er-Rumeith	Necklace. Drum is held by both hands to the left side of her chest.	Stratum 7, exact context unknown	9th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 48
Tell er-Rumeith	Figurine is handmade.	Stratum 12, exact context unknown	10th–7th C. BCE	Paz 2007: 48

THE ABSENCE OF ἐπιτιμάω IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

ANDREW MICKELSON

Andrew Mickelson is a senior at Brigham Young University majoring in ancient Near Eastern studies with an emphasis in the Greek New Testament. This paper won third place in the annual ancient Near Eastern studies essay contest.

Since at least the time of the early church fathers, readers of Christian literature have recognized the profound differences between the Gospel of John and the other three canonical gospels. While Matthew, Mark, and Luke seem to be written from a similar perspective (leading to their designation as "synoptic" gospels) and share many key elements, John is distinct in many ways. The events it relates are different, the writing style is unique, and its characterization of Christ contrasts significantly with that of the other gospel texts. The complex relationships between each of these gospels is the subject of a lively debate that started in the second century and is unlikely to be definitively ended anytime soon.

One of the categories in which scholars compare and contrast each of the gospels is the vocabulary used in each account. As is the case with any writer, the ancient authors of these texts favored some terms over others and are stylistically distinct; however, the first three gospels do show a degree of unity in the terms they use. When relating stories shared among the three of them, the gospel authors sometimes use nearly identical phrasing. John's gospel once again stands distinct in this sense: not only does John use many terms that the synoptics use infrequently, it also employs certain terms that are not present at all in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Sometimes this is merely a matter of using a synonymous term to express the same idea; for example, δέχομαι is used frequently in the gospels (six in Mark, ten in Matthew, sixteen in Luke) and only once in John, while the roughly synonymous term λαμβάνω is used eleven times in John and not once in the synoptics. Such cases abound and can be attributed to the lexical preferences of each author: while the particular term used may differ, the same thought is being conveyed. More interesting, however, are differences in vocabulary which lack parallel terms in other gospels,

as this can often reflect a difference in emphasis on the part of the author. Such is the case with ἐπιτιμάω.

ἐπιτιμάω, a term usually translated as *rebuke*, occurs six times in Matthew, nine times in Mark, and twelve times in Luke. In contrast, the term is not used once in the Gospel of John, and a parallel term does not take its place; the gospel narrative simply does not describe its characters as rebuking others. The absence of this term from John in particular is noteworthy. The first three evangelists, in the tradition of the Septuagint, use ἐπιτιμάω to identify divinity: just as the Septuagint portrays the divine rebuke as the prerogative of Yahweh, so the synoptic gospels depict Jesus as the only justified rebuker. It would logically follow that John, who is regarded as demonstrating the highest Christology of the four gospels, should use this divine identifier to further exalt Jesus. Why, then, is the term not employed by the authors of John's gospel?

In this paper, I will argue that while the synoptic gospels follow the Septuagint in using ἐπιτιμάω as a mark of divinity, the Gospel of John eschews using the term in order to present a distinct view of Jesus' role as a judge.[1] To establish this argument, I will first examine the extrabiblical use of both ἐπιτιμάω and the related ἐπιτιμίον, observing how they are used by the contemporary authors (Philo and Josephus). I will then explore how the terms are used in the Septuagint, particularly the way in which their use illustrates God's prerogative to judge. In the next section, I will investigate how ἐπιτιμάω is used in the synoptic gospels. Finally, I will examine the strengths and weaknesses of each theory, explaining the absence of ἐπιτιμάω from the Gospel of John. I will assert that the fourth gospel's unique narrative style and its portrayal of Jesus as a non-judgmental (yet divisive) character are the clearest explanations for the omission of ἐπιτιμάω.

---

1. While materials treating the use of ἐπιτιμάω in particular are sparse, resources treating the gospels and their vocabulary are voluminous. I am particularly indebted to Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2005); Gerhard Kittel, "ἐπιτιμάω," *TDNT* 5:623–627; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (New York: Doubleday, 2003); Robert T. Fortna and Thom Thatcher, *Jesus in the Johannine Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001); Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture Within Scripture: The Interpretation of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1992); Timothy Michael Law, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003); C.S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986); Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i–xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 29; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966); Robert Kysar, "John, the Gospel of," *ABD* 3:912–930.

Extrabiblical use of ἐπιτιμάω

While not extremely common terms, ἐπιτιμάω and ἐπιτιμίον are used numerous times in literature from the first century AD. To assess the use of ἐπιτιμάω by other Jewish authors of the time, I will examine their use in the writings of Flavius Josephus and Philo of Alexandria. Flavius Josephus was a Jewish historiographer who wrote during the latter half of the first century CE under the patronage of Rome; his works focus on Jewish history and the Great Revolt in particular. Philo of Alexandria was a Hellenistic Jewish exegete and philosopher, who wrote numerous works allegorizing Jewish scripture during roughly the first half of the first century. While these authors were certainly in very different situations than those of the evangelists, understanding how they used ἐπιτιμάω will provide a context for understanding how it is used in the gospel accounts.

ἐπιτιμάω is used by Josephus fifteen times in his writings: five times as a participle, eight times as a transitive verb, and twice as an infinitive. The related noun ἐπιτιμίον occurs five times in his writings. The term is translated in a variety of ways, depending on the context of the passage. For example, while explaining the allowances Rome made for Jewish Sabbath observance, Josephus uses ἐπιτιμάω in a sense best translated as "fined": "In this affair that concerned the Romans, no one of them should be hindered from keeping the sabbath day, nor be *fined* for so doing"—"τοῦ πράγματος Ῥωμαίοις ἀνήκοντος, μηδένα κωλύεσθαι παρατηρεῖν τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν μηδὲ πράττεσθαι ἐπιτίμιον" (Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae,* 14.264).[2] This sense of the word is also reflected in his use of ἐπιτιμίον: "Let him that is so poor that he cannot pay what *mulet* is laid upon him, be his servant to whom he was adjudged to pay it"—"ὁ δὲ τὸ ἐπιτίμιον ἄπορος διαλύσασθαι δοῦλος ἔστω τοῖς καταδεδικασμένοις" (Jos., *Ant.,* 4.272). In other passages, ἐπιτιμάω is more sensibly translated "condemn". For example, in his famous "Testimonium Flavianum," Josephus remarks that "when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had *condemned* him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him"—"καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες" (Jos., *Ant.,*18.64).[3] "Condemn" is another meaning that ἐπιτιμάω frequently takes

---

2. Greek text and translations for Josephus, Philo, the Septuagint, and the New Testament are taken from *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* (Irvine, Calif.: University of California, Irvine).

3. While many scholars believe portions of the "Testimonium Flavianum" to be later Christian interpolations, most agree that the passage existed in some form in Josephus's original manuscript. Discerning whether this passage is original to *Antiquities of the Jews* is outside the scope of this paper.

on. After Josephus also quotes Tiberias as saying, "If indeed Eutychus hath falsely accused Agrippa in what he hath said of him, he hath *had* sufficient *punishment* by what I have done to him already"— "ἀλλ᾽ εἰ μὲν καταψεύσειε, φησὶν ὁ Τιβέριος, ἔτι δε Ἀγρίππου τὰ εἰρημένα Εὔτυχος, ἀρκοῦσαν κομίζεται παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τιμωρίαν, ἣν ἐπιτετίμηκα αὐτός" (Jos., *Ant.*, 18.183).

One of the most frequent uses of ἐπιτιμάω is to mean "rebuke" or "reprove": the meaning, as we will later see, which it most often has in the New Testament. When mentioning Caesar's reception of a message from Aretas, Josephus says that "after he had just *reproved* him (Aretas) for his rashness, in not tarrying till he received the kingdom from him, he accepted of his presents"—"καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπιτιμήσας, ὡς προπετεία χρήσαιτο τῷ μὴ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀναμεῖναι λαβεῖν, τά τε δῶρα προσήκατο" (Jos., *Ant.,* 16.355). When word reached Anileus about the wicked deeds of his brother, "he at length spake to Anileus about these clamors, *reproving* him for his former actions"—"τηνικαῦτα δή φησιν περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς Ἀνιλαῖον τοῖς τε πρῶτον γεγονόσιν ἐπιτιμῶν" (Jos., *Ant.,* 18.351). And after relating the banishment of Herod and Herodias, Joseph remarks, "And thus did God *punish* Herodias for her envy at her brother, and Herod also for giving ear to the vain discourses of a woman"—"Ἡρωδιάδι μὲν δὴ φθόνου τοῦ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ Ἡρώδῃ γυναικείων ἀκροασαμένῳ κουφολογιῶν δίκην ταύτην ἐπετίμησεν ὁ θεός" (Jos., *Ant.,* 18.255).

Philo of Alexandria's writings contain twenty-nine references to ἐπιτιμάω. Some of his uses of the term differ from how Josephus uses it. In a few places, Philo uses ἐπιτιμάω to mean "esteem"; he mentions times in which "actions that ought to be done are held in no honour, and such as ought not be done are *esteemed*"—"τότε τὰ μὲν πρακτέα ἄτιμα, τὰ δὲ μὴ πρακτέα ἐπίτιμα" (*De cherubim,* 93.3). Overall, however, Philo overwhelmingly uses ἐπιτιμάω to mean "reprove," *rebuke*, or *reproach*; his usage closely parallels that of the evangelists. When relating the story of Jacob and his favored son Joseph, Philo mentions, "For this reason his father *rebukes* this intractable youth"—"καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ" (*De Somniis,* 2.135.1). At one point he incredulously questions "on what principle can you be angry with or *reproach* a man who sees a vision in his sleep?"—"ἐπεὶ τίνα ἔξει λόγον τὸ ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ ἐπιτιμᾶν τῷ τὴν καθ᾽ ὕπνον φαντασίαν ἰδόντι" (*De Somniis,* 2.237.2). After referring to Abraham's campaign against the kidnappers of Lot, Philo says "And he, *reproving* them, began a song of victory as has here been shown"—"ὁ δὴ τούτοις ἐπιτιμῶν τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον ἐξάρχων ἐδείχθη" (*De ebrietate,* 111.1).

These example of how ἐπιτιμάω was used in the first century will provide an important backdrop for the use of the term in the New Testament. However,

before examining how the gospels use this term, it's critical to understand how another influential body of texts has used ἐπιτιμάω: the Septuagint.

ἐπιτιμάω in the Septuagint

The Septuagint is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, started sometime in the third century BC and continued for many years. It was the primary Greek translation used by Diaspora Jews (as well as Greek-speaking Jews in the Holy Land) from the time of its creation until the second century AD.[4] It comes as no surprise then that New Testament writers, composing their books in Greek, often use the Septuagint when referencing the Hebrew Bible in their writings.[5] It follows that these authors were familiar with the language of the Septuagint and were likely influenced by how it used terms—for example, ἐπιτιμάω.

ἐπιτιμάω is used in very particular ways in the Septuagint. It is used extensively to show God's mighty power to judge and punish both the earth and its inhabitants. In 2 Samuel 22:6 the author describes the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea: "Then the channels of the sea appeared, the foundations of the world were laid bare by the *rebuke* of the Lord"—"καὶ ἀπεκαλύφθη θεμέλια τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν τῇ ἐπιτιμήσει κυρίου." Job described God's awesome power by saying, "the pillars of heaven tremble and are amazed at his *rebuke*"—"στῦλοι οὐρανοῦ ἐπετάσθησαν καὶ ἐξέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως αὐτοῦ" (Job 26:11). The psalmist exulted in the Lord's destruction of wicked Egypt: "Burnt with fire and dug up it was; at the *rebuke* of your face they will perish"—"ἐμπεπυρισμένη πυρὶ καὶ ἀνεσκαμμένη ἀπὸ ἐπιτιμήσεως τοῦ προσώπου σου ἀπολοῦνται" (Ps 80:16). Psalms of Solomon 2:23 records the fear that "they (the wicked) will make an utter end, unless thou, O Lord, *rebuke* them in thy wrath"—"καὶ συντελεσθήσονται, ἐὰν μὴ σύ, κύριε, ἐπιτιμήσῃς αὐτοῖς ἐν ὀργῇ σου."

It appears that the translators of the Septuagint viewed the use of ἐπιτιμάω as the sole prerogative of God, as mortals are consistently shown to be unjustified in rebuking others. In Genesis 36:10, Jacob rebukes his son Joseph for his visionary dream ("καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ"), but the eventual fulfillment of Joseph's vision shows the rebuke to be unjustified. Boaz explicitly instructs his servants to not rebuke Ruth ("καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτιμήσετε αὐτῇ"), even

---

4. Increasing association of the Septuagint with Christians, as well as general rejection of all things Hellenistic after the Bar Kokhba revolt, led to the Jewish rejection of the Septuagint.

5. It should be noted that not all Hebrew Bible citations in the New Testament agree with the Septuagint; it appears the authors sometimes modified the citation or made their own translation. This topic will be discussed later in this paper.

though she would be taking from his crops more than would normally be acceptable (Ruth 2:16). The prophet Zachariah, instead of rebuking the devil himself, denounces Satan by calling upon the Lord to justly rebuke him: "The Lord *rebuke* you, O Satan! The Lord who has chosen Jerusalem *rebuke* you!"— "ἐπιτιμήσαι κύριος ἐν σοί, διάβολε, καὶ ἐπιτιμήσαι κύριος ἐν σοὶ ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὴν Ιερουσαλημ" (Zech 3:2). Interestingly, one of the two uses of ἐπιτιμάω in the New Testament outside of the gospels is Jude 1:9, which quotes the angel Michael shouting the same phrase at the devil because he "did not dare pronounce against him a railing judgment, but said, 'The Lord rebuke you!'" ("οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας ἀλλὰ εἶπεν, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος"). When taken together, these examples exemplify the Septuagint tradition of reserving ἐπιτιμάω for divine use, and showing as unjustified those mortals who misuse it.

ἐπιτιμάω in the Synoptic Gospels

The New Testament contains twenty-nine instances of ἐπιτιμάω being used. Of these twenty-nine, twenty-seven of them are found in the synoptic gospels.[6] As stated previously, the term occurs six times in Matthew, nine times in Mark, and twelve times in Luke. Twelve of these references are used in describing incidents common to all three synoptic gospels: these instances include Jesus rebuking the storm on the Sea of Galilee (Matt 18:26; Mark 4:39; Luke 8:24), Jesus exorcising a devil from a child (Matt 17:18; Mark 9:45; Luke 9:42), the disciples rebuking those bringing children to Jesus (Matt 19:13; Mark 10:13; Luke 18:15), and the multitude rebuking the blind man/men calling for Jesus (Matt 20:31; Mark 10:48; Luke 18:39). Six are used in pericopes mirrored in two gospels: Jesus rebuking a demonic (Mark 1:25; Luke 4:35), Jesus commanding his disciples not to reveal his Messianic identity (Mark 8:30; Luke 9:21), and Peter rebuking Jesus (Matt 16:22; Mark 8:32). The remaining nine are independent occurrences (Matt 12:16; Mark 3:12; 8:33; Luke 4:39; 4:41; 9:55; 17:3; 19:39; 23:40).

ἐπιτιμάω is used in two distinct senses in the New Testament. The less common usage of the term is "order" or (as it's rendered in the King James version) "charge." ἐπιτιμάω is used this way five times. In four of these passages, the term is used when Jesus is commanding his disciples or the recipients of his miracles to not "make him known" or reveal his divine nature. A

---

6. The two exceptions are Jude 1:9 (which has already been cited) and 2 Tim 4:2, where Paul instructs Timothy to give brotherly council to the Christians he leads: "κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, παρακάλεσον, *ἐπιτίμησον*, ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ."

representative example is Luke 9:21: just after Peter has declared Jesus to be "The Messiah of God," Jesus "*sternly ordered* and commanded them not to tell anyone"—"ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο."[7] The one time ἐπιτιμάω is used in this sense by someone other than Jesus is Mark 10:48, where blind Bartimaeus is shouting out to Jesus and "many *sternly ordered* him to be quiet"—"καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ."

The more common use of ἐπιτιμάω is, of course, "rebuke," and the other twenty-two occurrences of the term in the gospels all share this meaning. Interestingly, the gospels seem to show the same sensitivities about using ἐπιτιμάω as does the Septuagint; it is primarily used by the divine Christ as a mark of his authority, and those mortals who use it are always shown to be in the wrong. With ἐπιτιμάω, Jesus rebukes the elements, devils, sicknesses, and unwise disciples; his use of the term clearly reveals his divine stature. Those without his authority who use it are shown to be mortal and flawed. For example, both Matthew and Mark record that, after Jesus uttered his first passion prediction, "Peter took him aside and began to *rebuke* him"—"καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ" (Mark 8:32). He is quickly proven rash, however, as Jesus "*rebuked* Peter and said, "Get behind me, Satan!'"—"ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ" (Mark 8:33). When they saw that the multitude brought little children for Jesus to pray over, "the disciples *spoke sternly* to those who brought them"—"οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς" (Matt 19:13); Jesus, of course, then tells his disciples that they are in the wrong and to let the children come to him. And when the Pharisees indignantly command Jesus to rebuke his disciples for lauding him as king ("διδάσκαλε, ἐπιτίμησον τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου"), Jesus tells them that, were the disciples silenced, the stones would take up the cry (Luke 19:39–40). Only in two cases are mortals allowed to reprove without rebuke: in Luke 17:3, where Jesus commands his disciples to rebuke—then forgive—those who offend them ("ἐὰν ἁμάρτῃ ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ, ἄφες αὐτῷ"), and Luke 23:40, where one thief being crucified rebukes another for impiously "hurling abuse" at Jesus ("ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ"). Aside from these exceptions, however, ἐπιτιμάω clearly sets Jesus apart in the narrative: like the divine Yahweh in the Septuagint, the divine Jesus justly wields the divine rebuke.

---

7. Translation is the New Revised Standard Version unless otherwise noted.

The Lack of ἐπιτιμάω in John

The fact that ἐπιτιμάω is a mark of divinity makes its absence in the Gospel of John even more puzzling. John has been consistently characterized as having the "highest" Christology among the four gospels. Christians as early as Clement have recognized its unique theological focus: Eusebius records Clement as saying that "last of all, John, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain in the Gospel, being urged by his friends and inspired by the spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel" (*Hist. Eccl.* 6.14.7). Or, as Johannine scholar Raymond Brown has put it: "Modern commentators have recognized that by speaking of Christology as the center or heartbeat of John's thought, to the point where Christology is spoken of as *the* gospel message."[8]

The Jesus portrayed in the Gospel of John is consistently and thoroughly portrayed as divine. While the Jesus of Mark appears to reach divine status at his baptism and the Jesus of Matthew and Luke is divinely conceived, the first chapter of John makes clear that Jesus was the divine Word even before being born (John 1:1–15). The Johannine Jesus knows everything (John 2:24–25) and often amazes or confounds those with whom he speaks. In contrast to the other gospels, where Jesus often tells his followers not to reveal his messianic nature, in John Jesus frequently and openly proclaims his role as Christ. His numerous ἐγώ εἰμί statements throughout the gospel link him linguistically to Yahweh: in John 8 the assertion is so overt that his Jewish audience picks up stones to kill him for blasphemy. Jesus frequently mentions that the sacrifice of his life is voluntary and demonstrates that he is in control even during the passion: the party that arrests him is so awed by him that they fall to the earth (John 18:5), he calmly disparages the power of a frightened Pilate (19:18), and unlike his counterpart portrayals in other gospels, he is fully capable of carrying his own cross to Golgotha (19:17).

If, therefore, the authors of John are clearly promoting a divine, omnipotent Jesus, why do they not then employ ἐπιτιμάω to accentuate Jesus' divine authority, as the Septuagint and the synoptics do? Was the omission a conscious decision, or was it a byproduct of other unique aspects of John? The remainder of this paper will examine some of the possible explanations for why ἐπιτιμάω is not used in John. I will address the various influences that may have impacted the composition of John's gospel, the narrative style employed by John, and finally the realized eschatology of John and its impact on the Johannine view of judgment.

---

8. Brown, *Introduction to John,* 249.

Influences on the Gospel of John

One possible explanation of why John doesn't use ἐπιτιμάω is because its authors did not have access to the same sources or influences that the composers of the other gospels had. If this argument is supplied in the case of the Septuagint, it fails miserably: the influence of the Septuagint is just as strong in John as it is in the other gospels, if not more so.[9] Some of John's quotations of Septuagint verses are explicit, and some of them are somewhat modified, but even these modified references can be comfortably linked to the Septuagint.[10] These frequent Septuagint references show that the writers of the Gospel of John were very familiar with the Greek scriptures and thus would have been familiar with the traditional usage of ἐπιτιμάω.

A more complex issue is the relationship which the fourth gospel has with the first three, and whether this can explain the omission of ἐπιτιμάω. The intricacies of the synoptic debate are beyond the scope of this paper,[11] but some aspects of it have implications on the question at hand. If the Gospels of Matthew and Luke used Mark as a source, then is the Gospel of Mark (or the sources from which it was composed) the origin of the New Testament ἐπιτιμάω tradition? And is the absence of ἐπιτιμάω from John attributable to the fact that John neither had access to Mark or the sources underlying it? It is a possibility. Some scholars such as Raymond Brown have contended that the Gospel of John originated independent of the synoptic gospels and the Marcan tradition upon which they are based.[12] Many of the stories related in the synoptics which employ ἐπιτιμάω are not present in John. Thus, by not having access to these account or the sources underlying them, the writers of John might not have had access to oral or textual Jesus traditions that used ἐπιτιμάω and thus did not think to employ it.

However, strong parallels between some Johannine material and some pericopes in the synoptics lead even some of these scholars to believe that the Gospel of John *was* influenced by these texts before it reached its final form; others go a step further and claim John contained elements of these books

---

9. Indeed, there is not a book in the New Testament that the Septuagint has not clearly influenced. As W. Bauer, editor of *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* stated, the Septuagint "outweighs all other influences on [New Testament] literature." W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament,* trans. and adapted from W. Bauer's 4th ed. by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, rev. and aug. from the 5th ed.by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. xxi.

10. Schuchard, *Scripture*, 146.

11. For a good introduction and excellent bibliography, see Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (New York: Continuum, 2001).

12. Brown, *Introduction to John*, 104.

since its inception.[13] If such is the case, then it's a possibility that ἐπιτιμάω was intentionally excluded, as a few of the passages from other gospels which John parallels contain ἐπιτιμάω references which are absent in John, like the triumphal entry from Luke (John 12:12–19; Luke 19:28–40). Indeed, in many ways the ties between John and Luke seem the most pervasive—and yet Luke contains by far the most instances of ἐπιτιμάω of any gospel (12), and John still has none. Furthermore, even if John was truly written in isolation from the other gospels (a position greatly contended in scholarship), to deny that the author of John could not have incorporated ἐπιτιμάω into the narrative independently is to deny the literary and theological astuteness of its author and redactors. As has been shown by the use of ἐπιτιμάω in outside literature, and particularly by John's explicit use of the Septuagint, the author of John certainly had access to some form to the ἐπιτιμάω tradition. Thus, neither the use or lack of use of specific sources can sufficiently explain why the Gospel of John omits ἐπιτιμάω.

Johannine Narrative Style

Another possible explanation for the absence of ἐπιτιμάω is that the narrative style in the Gospel of John does not lend itself to using ἐπιτιμάω. Comparing the style of the gospel of John with the synoptics gives some credence to this theory. Mark's gospel is a gospel of action: it is a quick-paced examination of what Jesus did. C. S. Mann stated that "First and foremost . . . the evangelist [Mark] focuses his attention and ours on the *events* of the ministry of Jesus; the element of teaching is almost at a minimum."[14] Matthew and Luke's accounts build on this narrative framework, fleshing it out with more discourses and theological detail, but largely leaving the narrative structure intact. With this underlying focus on what Jesus did, it seems natural for the gospel narrator to describe Jesus's actions with verbs such as ἐπιτιμάω: the words of the rebuke (particularly in Mark) are perhaps not as emphasized as the fact that Jesus is *rebuking*.

The Gospel of John, however, has a very different narrative style. While the deeds of Jesus are certainly important in John's narrative, the gospel is distinguished from its counterparts by extended discourses given by Jesus. These include his dialogue with Nicodemus (3:1–21), his conversation with the Samaritan woman at the well (4:4–42), his discourse on the divine son (5:16–47), his discourse on the bread of life (6:25–71), his discourse at the Feast of Tabernacles (7:14–52), his discourse on the light of the world (8:12–59), and

---

13. Kysar, "John," 920.
14. Mann, *Mark,* 84–85.

his farewell discourses (14–17).[15] These discourses make up a large portion of John's account and are pivotal in its focus on the character of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of God" (20:30–31). (Even the deeds of Jesus in the gospel are less important in terms of what he did and more important in what they reveal about him.) This understanding makes it plausible that ἐπιτιμάω is absent from John for the simple reason that the authors of John are less interested in what Jesus *did* and more concerned with what he *said* (and how it revealed his divinity). Edwin Abbott insightfully noted that "the Synoptists frequently represent Jesus as 'rebuking,' 'commanding,' 'having compassion,' 'being filled with indignation': John dispenses with these words, mostly thinking it enough to say that Jesus 'said,' or 'spake,' or 'did' this or that, and leaving the words and the deeds of the Messiah to speak for themselves."[16] This view is bolstered by the fact that the other most discourse-driven gospel, that of Matthew, also contains the least instances of ἐπιτιμάω—and five of those six occurrences are from material which likely originated with Mark.[17] It's possible that the discourse-focused narrative style precludes the frequent use of ἐπιτιμάω.

It is my opinion that the narrative style of John is likely a contributing factor to the omission of ἐπιτιμάω from the gospel. However, I also feel that this explanation alone is insufficient. Even if Matthew's discourse-heavy narrative left ἐπιτιμάω in the pericopes it borrowed from Mark, it seems peculiar that John would edit ἐπιτιμάω out of the passages appropriated from the synoptic tradition. Additionally, there are certainly places in John where the speech of a character is preceded by more than just a simple "he said (λέγει)" or "she replied (ἀπεκρίθη)." John 1:20 states that John "confessed (ὡμολόγησεν) 'I am not the Messiah.'" In 4:31 the disciples "were urging (ἠρώτων) him, saying 'Rabbi, eat.'" The Samaritan woman who Jesus talked to "testified (μαρτυρούσης) 'He told me everything I ever did'" (4:39). Even Jesus, whose dialogue in the gospel is almost exclusively introduced just with λέγει or ἀπεκρίθη, is described as "st[anding] and cr[ying]out [ἔκραξεν], saying, 'If anyone is thirsty, let him come to me and drink'" (7:37). Clearly, then, such descriptive comments are not foreign to John, and including ἐπιτιμάω (particularly in descriptions of Jesus' many antagonists) would not have felt out of place. Another argument must supplement this one to adequately address the absence of ἐπιτιμάω.

---

15. Brown, *Introduction to John*, 300–303.
16. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, 157.
17. The only use of ἐπιτιμάω in John independent of Marcan material is Matt 12:6—and even this use has echoes in the other gospels.

The Johannine View of Judgement and Realized Eschatology

I believe that the absence of ἐπιτιμάω in John is most convincingly explained as a conscious choice by the authors and editors of the Gospel of John in order to promote a specific Christological image of Jesus. The foundations of this argument are the scholarly views of Johannine eschatology, which I will discuss briefly. Scholars have discerned two different strains of eschatology in the Gospel of John: future eschatology and realized eschatology.[18] Future eschatology, or the view that God (and for Christians, Jesus) will intervene in earthly affairs in a spectacular manner, fulfill prophecy, judge the inhabitants of the earth, and bring an end to history. Such a viewpoint was likely driven by Jewish messianic expectations and apocalyptic literature of the time.[19] The Gospel of John takes pains to distance itself from the immediate messianic expectations of the time: for instance, "when Jesus realized that they were about to come and take him by force to make him king, he withdrew again to the mountain by himself" (6:15). However, John does support the notion of a future eschatological event, particularly when he speaks about "the last day." John 5:28–29 speaks of a time to come "when all who are in their graves (will) come out—those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." In chapter 6 Jesus promises anyone that follows him that "I will raise him up at the last day" (6:40; see also 6:44 and 6:54). To those who reject his message, Jesus warns that "the very words I have spoken will condemn them at the last day" (12:48). These and other verses make it clear that, while rejecting the false messianic expectations of the time, John affirms the reality of a future eschatological event. This viewpoint matches the synoptic tradition, although more attention is given in the first three gospels to the apocalyptic unfolding of the eschaton (see Matt 24, Mark 13, Luke 21).

Unique among the gospels is John's additional emphasis on realized eschatology, or the view that the coming of Jesus has already ushered in the eschaton, and Christians can enjoy the blessings of it in the present. Frequently the gospel makes reference to the possibility of having eternal life *now*: "anyone who hears my word and believes him who sent me *has* eternal life, and does not come under judgment, but has passed from death to life" (5:24). Later, when comforting the grieving Martha, Jesus tells her that "everyone who lives and believes in me will never die" (11:26). And just as the future eschatological view anticipates a divine judgment, many verses in John portray Jesus' coming

---

18. See Brown, *Introduction to John*, 238–241 for a good overview of this topic.
19. Brown, *Introduction to John,* 238.

as a divine judgment in the present: just before his passion Jesus definitively states that "now is the judgment of this world" (12:31).

The presence of these two differing eschatologies in John result in some seemingly contradictory statements by Jesus. Jesus claims in 3:17 that "God did not send the Son into the world to judge (κρίνῃ) the world, but that the world might be saved through him." Yet then Jesus makes the claim in 9:39 that "I came into this world for judgement." Jesus claims that God "has given him (the Son) authority to execute judgment" and that "as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just" (5:27, 30), yet he asserts in 8:15 that "I judge no one." Can these various statements be reconciled? After presenting various contradictory Johannine statements on judgment, Raymond Brown notes that "[t]he idea in John, then, seems to be that during his ministry Jesus is no apocalyptic judge like the one expected at the end of time; yet his presence does cause men to judge themselves."[20] This can be seen as a further refutation of immediate messianic expectations which Jews (and early Christians) might have had: Jesus would not immediately judge the wicked and reward the righteous; rather, that eschatological expectation would be fulfilled at "the last day." However, this perspective still allows for a judgment in harmony with realized eschatology: Jesus' coming forces people to accept or reject his word—a preliminary judgment—which will be ratified and finalized at the last day. As John states near the beginning of Jesus' ministry, "Those who believe in him are not condemned; but those who do not believe are condemned *already*, because they have not believed" (3:18).

The interplay of these two eschatological views provides pivotal insight into why the Gospel of John excludes ἐπιτιμάω. Because the gospel authors are trying to portray Jesus' ultimate judgment as being in the future, it would counter their purpose to portray Jesus as rebuking (and implicitly passing judgment) during his mortal life. Jesus makes it abundantly clear that he has been authorized to wield the divine rebuke ("the Father . . . has given all judgment to the Son," 5:22), but he explains that he will not use it until the last day. And while the realized eschatology does make it clear in the gospel that Jesus' presence provokes judgment (and implicitly a measure of rebuke to the wicked), the agent of this judgment is never Jesus himself, but rather his word. In 12:47–48 Jesus asserts that "I do not judge anyone [presently] who hears my words and does not keep them . . . [but] on the last day the word that I have spoken will serve as judge." Thus, to portray Jesus as rebuking anyone would

20. Brown, *John,* 345.

run counter to the goal of the gospel to present judgment as being effected by the reader's acceptance or rejection of Jesus' word.

Conclusion

In sum, ἐπιτιμάω, though it indeed would have conveyed many of the high Christological ideas which the Gospel of John often advocates, was rejected from the gospel text for reasons of narrative style and eschatological consistency. While I am confident in the likelihood of this omission being a conscious decision on the part of the authors of John, I concede that certainty in this debate is impossible without the knowledge of the sources used in the creation of the gospel. As source criticism becomes more refined, and as more early Christian texts come to light, it will be possible to make more accurate observations about the compositional process the authors and redactors of John went through to produce the text we have today.

BOOK REVIEWS

Boda, Mark J., Dempsey Carol J, and Flesher, LeAnn Snow, *Daughter Zion: Her Portrait, Her Response*, Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. Pp x + 429. Hardcover. $45.86. ISBN: 1589837959.

Daughter Zion: Her Portrait, Her Response is a compilation of essays based on a monograph by Carleen Mandolfo.[1] In the book, Mandolfo's characterization of Daughter Zion in Lamentations and Jeremiah is examined and expanded. This book seeks to build off of Mandolfo's work and present differing viewpoints on the strange interplay between Daughter Zion and YHWH. Is it an abusive relationship, as Mandolfo claims, or is it something else? What can the greater Daughter Zion literature reveal on the subject? And how should this be viewed in conjunction with various methodologies? These are just a few of the questions that are answered in this book.

While there is specific praise and criticism for each article, my review will largely focus on the book as a whole. I immensely enjoyed the cohesiveness of this book. Each paper presented a new, and sometimes contradictory, view of the Daughter Zion concept, which added greatly to the work. A critical analysis using so many methodologies was also quite beneficial. Looking at the text from linguistic, narrative, and form critical perspectives, just to name a few, created an environment where the reader could view the text with a broader understanding. My greatest issue with this book was its expectation that the readers know Mandolfo's previous work in order

---

1. Carleen Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations,* Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

to understand the dialogue. As this book's purpose was to answer Mandolfo's monograph, it is only natural that this occured. However, had a brief overview of her work been included in the introduction, reading the first few papers would not have felt like stepping into the middle of a conversation.

Mandolfo's final thoughts on the work were also irksome. She had been criticized for her clearly biased reading of the text throughout the book, and her response brushed these valid points aside, which caused me as a reader to seriously question her methodology. While it is acceptable that she be content with her stance, each article pointed out significant flaws that required address. A more careful consideration in her closing reflections to this work would have closed this work more definitively.

On the whole, I immensely enjoyed *Daughter Zion* and recommend it to those who are interested in forming their own opinions on the role of Zion within the Hebrew Bible. As many interpretations were proposed, I found myself creating my own analysis on the topic and adding to it with each article I read. It set forth several alternative views on this important biblical trope and allowed the reader to come to their own conclusions on the subject. Thus, I feel that the book accomplished its main goal.

AMANDA COLLEEN BROWN