

# TEACHING GENESIS AND EXODUS AS OLD TESTAMENT AND HEBREW SCRIPTURE

## *I. Bringing back the Bible*

A movement to return classic texts to our classroom has gained new support from both liberal and conservative pedagogues. Whether theorists speak of the need for a shared cultural inheritance or the need to learn and evaluate the texts of power, a consensus is emerging that students must be able to enter into dialogue with those works of Western literature that have shaped the received canon. The opening books of the Bible have a certain primacy in that canon, treating the creation of our world and laying the foundations for Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. However, our students approach these books with a maximum of pre-understanding and a minimum of actual experience. They have heard of each of the characters they will meet, and they have formed clear impressions of these characters, yet few students will have actually read more than scattered verses taken out of context. These works thus present special problems for the teacher of Western Humanities courses, problems which require a number of decisions about teaching methods particular to the teaching of the Bible among the great books.

The Old Testament taken as a whole has a triply unique position in Humanities curricula: 1. It is the only work we treat out of historical context. 2. It is the only work we do not teach under its own name. 3. It is the only work from which we fail to select those portions that were central to the

redactor's intention, preferring instead to read selections that were of central importance to one strand of the later Western tradition, namely, the Pauline Christian.

First, we read the Old Testament out of historical sequence. The reading that I will consider here consists largely of eighth-century b.c.e. traditions which were redacted in the mid-fifth century. Thus, heroic stories contemporary with Homer, which were edited by priests who lived during the Golden Age of Athens, are usually presented to our students as part of the transition between the classical world and Christian culture.

Second, we do not study the "Old Testament" under its own name, thereby reinforcing the impression that our detour into Hebraic culture is intended only as background for something else -- that something being, of course, the New Testament. While it may be argued that surveys of Western literature are, quite intentionally, forward looking -- teaching us all one needs to know to read, for example, Joyce's *Ulysses*, many instructors have increasingly attempted to discuss each work on the syllabus first on its own terms and against its own background, and then secondarily as part of the Western tradition. That, it seems to me, is a logical sequence, and one that will best serve us whatever our larger agenda happens to be. By beginning the semester with the study of the Old Testament, rather than, for example, the Hebrew Bible or Hebrew Scriptures--somewhat

less weighted designations -- we send a powerful message of theological as well as academic importance.

Finally, the choice of selections further testifies to our essential discomfort with this text. When we condense Don Quixote, we seek to follow the main story line, editing out the text's numerous digressions and smaller, self-contained episodes. Similarly, our choices from Montaigne reflect a desire to include essays that capture his range, method, and most insightful pieces. Our Old Testament selections: the story of Creation, Sinai, Job, and Isaiah, purposefully avoid what is central to the Hebrew Bible taken on its own terms in favor of what is central to the New Testament's reading of the Old. We stop at precisely the point where the Bible wants us to begin: the law and the history of the relationship between Israel and the law. The stories of creation and the slavery of the Israelites in Egypt are presented in the first five books as a necessary prologue to the law, a prologue that establishes God's dominion and his special relationship with Israel.

Implicitly, by our choice, we are preparing our students to understand Romans 4:15, "For the law brings wrath, but where there is no law there is no transgression," but not Matthew 5:18, "till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished."\*

In approaching the biblical text in this way, we are, of course, standing within the main lines of the Western Christian tradition, for that tradition is Pauline. I hope to show that while we are faithfully representing one strand of the tradition's appropriation of the Old Testament, we are excluding other, equally important readings.

My essay accordingly moves along two trajectories. First, treating the Old Testament as a link in the Western tradition, I present a reading which focuses on the position of women in the text, tracing the

Bible's attempt to control what it perceives as woman's threatening sexuality, as that tradition develops from the Matriarchs to the Virgin Mary. I then re-trace my steps and give an alternative reading of the same traditions that attends to the motif of the younger son supplanting the elder. My emphasis here will be to explain why these traditions were found meaningful by that generation of Israelites which preserved and reacted to them.

I conclude with a few words on that part of the Bible which we, following our Pauline forebearers, have put under erasure--Old Testament law. I attempt to briefly show that for those who canonized the Bible, the legal passages presented not a conservative, formal, ritualistic way of life, but rather a profound theological statement about the possibility of creating order in a world of chaos.

\*Our choice of editions is also critical. To demonstrate the independence of the Hebrew Bible would require the purchase of two separate Bibles each containing one Testament. Such a gesture would be not only impractical but also inappropriate to a course that attempts to illustrate how each text was understood by later writers. Still, a modern scholarly edition that points out the meaning of Old Testament passages in their own contexts (such as the New English Bible or the Oxford Annotated Bible) is preferable to the King James version.

## *II Defamiliarizing the Biblical Heroine*

If our task as teachers of Humanities is to introduce students to the unfamiliar, it is also to defamiliarize texts that they know all too well. If this rule applies to any work in the curriculum it certainly applies to the Bible. In reading Genesis and Exodus most of our students are on familiar ground, rereading stories that they have either read or heard before and which have influenced such a high percentage of everything else they have been exposed to in our culture.

The position of women in the text thus becomes a fruitful starting point for fresh examination. The issues raised by a close reading of the presentation of the mothers and lovers of the Old Testament lead to important questions about the role of the Bible in shaping both literary conventions and social norms in the later tradition. I would even argue that this is, in fact, uniquely suited to such a task.

A feminist reading also commends itself because the Bible has recently been the subject of a wide range of apologetic and harshly critical reappraisal, among literary critics both feminist and non-feminist. For this purpose, a single quote from Robert Alter's The Art of Biblical Narrative suffices:

Biblical narrative...includes a remarkable gallery of women--Rebekah, Tamar, Deborah, Ruth--who are not content with a vegetative existence in the corner of the house but, when thwarted by the male world or when they find it lacking in moral insight or practical initiative, do not hesitate to take their destiny or the nation's into their own hands. (p. 146)

Alter's "remarkable gallery of women" includes a woman who tricks her blind husband, a woman disguised as a prostitute who seduces her father-in-law, a woman judge whose sole act in the Bible is to shame the Israelite general into action, and a noble convert who seduces her late husband's cousin into marriage. In other words, by attempting to treat the female characters in the Bible as ideals who succeed in conventionally male roles, Alter and other apologetic literary critics and Bible scholars unwittingly defeat their own purpose of making the Bible inoffensive to feminist sensibilities. Each of these women acts only within one of two narrowly circumscribed roles--that of mother and that of lover. In either case, female power in the Bible is sexual power, and each of the

Bible's heroines accomplishes her ends (whether military, political or domestic) in the private space of the bedroom. (See Lefkowitz, "When Lilith Becomes a Heroine.")

It has long been observed that the mothers of the Bible commonly share the trait of barrenness. That is, the favored wife is unable to conceive a child until late in life (in the case of Sarah) or until long after her rival has produced offspring (for example, Rachel or Hannah--Samuel's mother). Other mothers who follow this pattern include Rebekah and Samson's nameless mother. In all of the cases of a loved barren wife, God intervenes to remove the curse of barrenness, and a miraculous birth follows. As Lefkowitz has explained, the special child will be a hero and will hold a unique place in the history of Israel's redemption as God removes barrenness and enters into a pact with the mother of the hero. But mother must consecrate the son into the service of God. Isaac will be put on the altar as a sacrifice, Jacob will leave home to flee Esau, Joseph goes into Egypt, Samson becomes a Nazirite, and Samuel a prophet in God's temple.

What does this repeated motif tell us about the construction of women in the text? The text reasserts the Divine prerogative to create whenever heroes have birth stories, first by insisting that man alone is insufficient to impregnate the mother of the hero and second, by depriving the female of her full creative powers, allowing her to be the receptacle of such remarkable seed only if she renounces claim to its issue, affirming her willingness to give the son to God by allowing him to leave her.

The other female model provided by the Bible is that of the lover who, like her maternal counterpart, uses her sexual power to shape Israel's future. In this list we find such women as Tamar, Delilah, Jael, Esther and from the Apocrypha, Judith. In four of these instances, the

woman uses her power in the bedroom to entrap and kill her opponent. Tamar's desires require less drastic fulfillment.

The case of Deborah, which seems to be an exception to this thesis, is instructive. We are told in Judges 4 that Deborah was a Judge. And while we are told nothing of her activity as a judge, we are told how she shamed the Israelite general Barak into attacking the enemy Sisera by stating that since he has hesitated and insisted that she join him in battle, Barak will not kill the enemy but rather "the Lord will sell Sisera into the hand of a woman." Seeking to escape his fate, Sisera enters Jael's tent and in a surprise for both Sisera and the reader, instead of providing him with shelter, she kills him, driving a tent peg into his head. Woman as political leader takes no action; woman as military savior performs her acts of bravery in the bedroom (Lefkowitz, *The Character of Beauty*, pp. 67-74).

Where does this tradition lead? The stories of that great oxymoron the "barren mother" lead to the extreme case of the virgin mother Mary, where the husband is totally removed from the picture and where the son is taken from his family in the most extreme form imaginable. Unlike Isaac, Jesus is sacrificed, and before his death and resurrection, he publicly renounces his family connection to Mary. But as Mary's story marks the culmination of the biblical matriarchal tradition, her lack of sexuality (she is a virgin, and she has no role in the machinations surrounding her son's future) mark the creation of a new dichotomy. No longer are women mothers or lovers but they are now conceived of more specifically as virgins and whores, Mary and Mary Magdalene, Whore of Babylon and Ecclesia, and later still, Synagogue and Ecclesia. Two types of women are envisioned, the spiritual, ethereal, pale Christian beauty and the sensual, tempting, lustful, exotic, dark Hebrew beauty. The development of these two types can be traced throughout later literature.

### *III The Code of the Younger Son*

The Bible's birth stories tell a second tale as well. We can focus our students' attention not on mothers but on sons, and in so doing we might notice a motif that is as powerful and as oft-repeated as that of the barren wife, that of the ascendance of the younger son over the elder. The ancient Near East world adhered to the principle of primogeniture--the eldest son inherited the father's estate. The Bible, in the stories of Abel, Abraham, Perez, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Ephraim, Moses, and David, reverses that principle, establishing a contrast between the eldest son and the son of the promise, the favored son who will come to preserve the true line. A series of dramatic contrasts is announced and reinforced. The young Isaac is quiet and pastoral; Ishmael becomes an expert marksman. Jacob stays at home, while Esau hunts. The young dreamer Joseph must overcome the hatred of his older, more aggressive brothers. The Israelite hero is the younger and weaker child who is able to overcome opposition by fathers and brothers to achieve his rightful place.

A special case of this motif is found in the story of Moses' birth and early life, a story told in a scant 10 verses, Exodus 2:1-10:

Now a man from the house of Levi went and took to wife a daughter of Levi. The woman conceived and bore a son; and when she saw that he was a goodly child, she hid him three months. And when she could hide him no longer she took for him a basket made of bulrushes and daubed it with bitumen and pitch, and she put the child in it and placed it among the reeds at the river's brink. And his sister stood at a distance, to know what would be done to him. Now a daughter of Pharaoh came down to bathe at the river, and her maidens walked beside the river; she saw the basket among the reeds and sent a maid to fetch it. When she opened it she saw the child; and lo, the babe was crying. She took pity on him and said,

"This is one of the Hebrew's children."...  
And the child grew, and...Pharaoh's  
daughter named him Moses for she said,  
"Because I drew him out of the water."

Verse eleven begins: "And it came to pass  
in those days when Moses was grown  
up...."

The birth story serves as a brief prologue to  
the real Moses story: Moses, the leader of  
the Israelites, Moses, the lawgiver. Our  
suspicion that the birth story represents a  
later addition to the main epic is confirmed  
by a review of the numerous close parallels  
to Moses' birth found in the literature of the  
ancient world. The most striking is the  
Akkadian story of Sargon:

Sargon, the mighty king, king of Agade,  
am I. My mother was a high priestess,  
my father I knew not...My priestly  
mother conceived me, in secret she bore  
me. She set me in a basket of rushes, with  
bitumen she sealed my lid. She cast me  
into the river which rose not over me.  
The river bore me up and carried me to  
Akki, the drawer of water. Akki, the  
drawer of water, lifted me out as he  
dipped his ewer, Akki, the drawer of  
water, took me as his son and reared me.  
(The Torah, p. 392)

The parallels direct our attention to the  
three main features shared by the two ac-  
counts. (1) Doubtful, but upper class  
parentage. We are not told the names of  
Moses' parents, but the story takes pains to  
repeat twice that they were of the blessed  
tribe of Levi. In Sargon's story we are told  
that his mother was a priest, though his  
paternity is left unclear.

(2) Danger attends the child's birth.  
Moses' life is, of course, threatened by  
Pharaoh. Like Sargon, his mother saves  
him by hiding the child in a basket and  
floating him downriver. (3) Divine  
providence returns the child to safety.

Divine protection is demonstrated by the  
endangered child's rescue by a member of  
the royal court.

Those familiar with Lord Raglan's study,  
The Hero will no doubt recognize these  
three motifs as part of the code by which  
our culture identifies its heroes. Our  
tradition's heroes are not heroic on the basis  
of their human accomplishments alone.  
Rather, they are by nature heroes, and for  
the authors of these stories, nature is iden-  
tical with God. Moses, descendant of the  
house of Levi, is born at a critical moment  
in Israelite history to end the dark period of  
slavery. From the start his life is forfeit; all  
males are being put to death. Like the other  
Biblical heroes mentioned earlier, the fu-  
ture leader must leave his natural parents to  
be claimed by God to serve God's ends.  
Moses, by birth--by nature--the Israelite  
leader, becomes, most inappropriately, a  
foundling in the home of the Israelite's  
arch-enemy, Pharaoh. Through still fur-  
ther fortuitous circumstances--that is,  
through divine intervention, Moses' nature  
triumphs over his circumstances. He will  
leave the royal court to assume his true  
royal title--as leader of his people. Those  
who rule are those set apart by God, taken  
from their families to serve as God's chosen  
agents.

Within the story of Moses' birth we thus see  
the beginnings of the process of exegesis on  
the life of Moses the lawgiver and desert  
leader. By adapting a folk-motif found in  
ancient Near East literature and placing it  
in the context of the Bible's other stories of  
children lost and found, Moses is identified  
as a hero, and we are once again made  
aware that nature's choices equal God's  
choices. Those who rule were intended to  
rule.

The foundling in literature--from Oedipus  
through Perdita, Joseph Andrews and  
Heathcliff--the hero or heroine fated to live,  
the misplaced person, has changed to  
reflect the differing assumptions of dif-

ferent ages. Oedipus and Moses must fulfill their destinies because the gods or God control history; in the realist novel, nurture assumes priority over nature and we discover that we are all foundlings in democratic societies, destined to find and make ourselves.

Why did this story speak to the Israelite community that preserved and canonized it? First we must identify that community. While the standard literature or humanities course presents the Old Testament as a product of the first century c.e., the historical books (Genesis-Kings) and much of the prophetic canon took its present shape some 500 years earlier as part of the response to the destruction of the Northern Kingdom in 722 b.c.e. and to the destruction of the First Temple and the Kingdom of Judah in 586 b.c.e. The Bible was first promulgated among the Israelites only following the return from the Babylonian exile in the 5th century, and it is against this background that one can attempt to understand the motif of anti-primogeniture.

The Israelites were returning to the land of Israel after a traumatic series of events that challenged the essence of their religious faith. The first commonwealth was destroyed, many of the people killed, and the remnant driven into exile. Most significantly, the holy city, which was thought to be inviolate, was profaned, and God's dwelling place, the Temple, was destroyed. According to the prevailing view, such events could indicate only one of two things: either God had broken his bond with the Israelites or He had been defeated by superior forces. In the face of these alternatives two new options were added. First, the formerly discarded prophecies of Jeremiah and other pre-exilic anti-government prophets were recalled. These individuals, functioning outside of the guilds of professional prophets which surrounded the courts, had predicted both the destruction of Jerusalem and its restoration, linking the former to the sins of the people and

the latter to their repentance. Second, they turned to the same pro-exilic traditions concerning the collective ancestors of the Israelite tribes that seemed to have a uniquely contemporary message: things are not what they seem. There is a gap between appearance (Israel's lowly status among the nations) and reality (Israel's true position as the bearer of divine promise). In this light we can understand, for example, the truncated story found in Genesis 48. By right, Joseph's son Manasseh, who is the firstborn, deserves priority in receiving his grandfather's blessing. And such is clearly the wish of his father. Yet Jacob purposefully places his right hand on the head of Ephraim, which entails self-consciously crossing his hands, since Joseph had placed the two boys in front of him so that Jacob's right hand would have naturally fallen on the head of Manasseh. By the time of this story, the reversal of fortunes had become an accepted literary *topos* which no longer needed to be explained.

Placed against the background of the Babylonian exile, the traditions concerning the triumph of the younger, weaker son yield a special set of meanings which found expression in Psalm 118, "the stone which the builders rejected is become the chief corner-stone." Appearances are not everything: the rejected are in fact the chosen.

#### *IV The Competing Discourse of Priest and Prophet*

The Biblical response to the events of 722/586 b.c.e. took another, non-narrative form as well, namely Old Testament law. The western tradition looks at biblical law in the way the New Testament describes it. For Paul, the law is spiritually and morally dangerous, and the path to salvation is therefore not through law but rather through faith. Furthermore, as the continuators of priestly legalism, Matthew portrays the Pharisees as hypocritical formalists who lack compassion and moral concern.

The biblical tradition, however, has never seen itself that way. Psalm 19 presents the accepted view:

The law of the Lord is perfect, reviving the soul...the precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart.

From the biblical perspective, law, and more specifically legal discourse, can be the vehicle for expressing morality and conveying theological ideas. Specifically, the same desire to understand a chaotic world and Israel's place in it that motivates the anti-primogeniture motif may be seen to underlie the priestly legal system that forms the Old Testament's centerpiece.

As I alluded to earlier, Genesis 1-Exodus 20 may be seen as a prologue to the priestly legal code, a code which begins with the priestly account of creation in Genesis I and then continues through the last half of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The God who commands is the God who created the world and who in the words of Exodus 20:2 (the first commandment) brought Israel out of Egypt, the house of bondage. One thread runs through this material--the desire to create order in the universe. God creates the world through a series of differentiation. Light from Darkness, Heaven from Earth, Land from Sea, the great chain of being culminating in the creation of man and woman. Each type of creation is brought forth in order of ascending importance, with (among living things) plant life appearing first, then animal life and finally humanity. All living things, furthermore, were created each according to its kind. Creation is thus an act of ordering, the purpose of which is to make the world perfect and thus prepare it to be made holy. Leviticus 19 consists of a list of rules headed by the command, "You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy." Priestly law teaches the connection between order and the ability to receive the divine presence; order creates the precondition for holiness. The priestly legal code

therefore insists upon rigid differentiation between types of produce which may not be sown together, animals which may not be yoked together, foods which may and may not be eaten, an economy of purity which may not be disturbed.

Mary Douglas, in Purity and Danger attempts to understand the dietary rules of Leviticus 11 in this context. She rejects earlier attempts to interpret the rules on the basis of their ethical content, educational value, foreign influences, allegorical significance or irrationality. Instead, she would direct our attention to seeing Israelite purity rules as the dominant symbol of the community's social life. If the Israelite on earth keeps the pure and the unclean distinct, this act of ordering will be maintained by God's reciprocal actions. If we permit chaos on earth, then God will withdraw the blessings of order.

Specifically, this means that the dietary rules create a taxonomy of animal life which differentiates between things that swim (defined by fins and scales), land animals (defined by split hooves and the chewing of cud), and things that fly. The pig is especially forbidden because it straddles the boundary, having one trait of clean land animals and one of the unclean. Lobsters as sea animals that walk also violate a boundary and become the objects of special prohibition.

Why did this system come to exert a hold on the Israelite people and become so large a part of their main literary statement--the first five books of the Bible? We can find the answer by, as I suggested at the outset, looking to the period during which these laws were promulgated. The priestly code, which might seem to be the product of obsessive compulsives living a tightly ordered life, is, in fact, the product of a period of disorder--of boundaries violated and sancta profaned. The divisions between the land of Israel and the gentile world, between Jerusalem and the rest of Israel,

between the Temple precincts and the city had all been violated and the priests sought to create an idealized system of original divine order to compensate for their profound experience of disorder. Perhaps, they felt, if we can create a world of order in language and later attempt to replicate it on earth, we will never have to suffer destruction and exile again. We will maintain our part of the bargain, and God will fulfill His in preserving the distinctions set up when the world was so carefully created. Biblical law then is a form of theodicy, and it functions in the historical narratives as the touchstone by which to judge the behavior of the people and God's response.

If, in fact, the priestly system presents laws of such rich meaning and religious/social significance how are we to understand the prophetic invective against the priestly cult? How should we interpret Isaiah's cry against the people:

Is this the fast that I have chosen? Is this affliction of the soul? Is it to droop your head like a bulrush, to grovel in sackcloth and ashes?...This is my chosen fast: to loosen all the bonds that bind men unfairly, to let the oppressed go free, to break every yoke. (Isaiah 57:5-6)

In order to understand the underlying differences between these two religious systems that underlie so much of biblical law and narrative, I offer the following set of contrasts.

The priestly system is one of divinely established differentiation in which it is humanity's role to maintain an established order. For the prophet, humankind awaits God's return to history to reestablish His rule. We await a golden age at history's culmination.

The priest assumes human sin and backsliding and provides a cultic system to allow people to live with the reality of sin

and move on, in the certainty that they will fail again but that a method of atonement is available. In the prophetic system, morality is absolute and the sinner must turn from sin and repent for all time.

In the temple, the individual addresses God, asking for forgiveness in exchange for an offering. In the house of the prophet, God addresses humanity, making his demands and offering absolute obedience as humanity's only salvation.

This distinction between priestly and prophetic religion may seem to be a foreshadowing, a type, if you will, of the later division between Jesus' teaching and that of the Pharisees. In many respects the parallel holds. First, pharisaic religion, with its concern for the creation of purity and order, also emerged in response to disaster--in this case the calamities of 70 c.e., the destruction of Jerusalem and the second Temple by Rome. More significantly, the gospel of Matthew, like earlier prophetic writings, while critical of commonly accepted religious practice, maintains its links to the legal system. Thus, Matthew is unique among the gospels for its extensive Old Testament proof-texting. Furthermore, Krister Stendahl in The School of St. Matthew has argued that the Gospel is divided into five divisions each marked by a unit of narrative + a unit of discourse, corresponding to the five divisions of the torah, the five books of Moses. The Sermon on the Mount thus comes in place of the revelation on Mt. Sinai both structurally and thematically (p. 25). Finally, in Matthew, Jesus takes pains to place his observance within rabbinic/pharisaic norms. Unlike Paul, the Jesus of Matthew has made no break with the law.

#### *V Naming the Bible*

I end where I began, with the question: Old Testament or Hebrew Scriptures? Many Humanities curricula aim to establish a tradition, to show our students relationships

among texts. At the same time, we respect the integrity of the works we teach, trying to historicize, and to first situate the individual work in its own immediate setting. Hebrew Scriptures poses particular problems.

First, the "Bible as Literature" presupposes that it is more usual to consider the Bible as something else. The secular university has inherited this book--Old and New Testaments bound together in one volume--from people and places that approached it from Christian perspectives. The Old Testament prefigures the New, and that is its primary purpose.

Second, the Bible is not literature in the same way that Joyce's or even Homer's Ulysses is. As a bound work that--like other literary texts, makes coherent the chaos of the world--the Bible differs insofar as it is more like a library that contains prose narrative, poetry, and law than a single work. Questions of dating, redacting and canonization are not answered simply. How we teach Hebrew Scriptures, what we call Hebrew Scriptures, even more importantly, when we teach Hebrew Scriptures, are all political choices.

In one way or another, literary critics have addressed themselves to these problems.

Writing on the eve of the second world war in Germany, Erich Auerbach's Mimesis finds the stories in Genesis more effective as literature than Homeric narratives. Writing in the same tradition, Robert Alter in The Art of Biblical Narrative treats Hebrew Scriptures as if they were a single coherent text not unlike Ulysses. I commend Alter's book for its analysis of biblical literary conventions, but I caution that Hebrew Scriptures are not a modern novel, though Alter cleverly finds it anticipating the best of literary devices. Operating from different premises, Northrop Frye, in The Great Code, sees the Old and New Testaments as a single source for the Western Tradition's assumptions.

Depending upon which choice we make, Hebrew Scriptures or Old Testament, we will emphasize different parts of the text and find therein different virtues--literary and thematic. I would only urge that when we situate Hebrew Scriptures in its own context, and the Old Testament in the context of the tradition, that we be sensitive to the fact that Hebrew Scriptures and Old Testament are not the same work.

Leonard Gordon,  
Kenyon College  
Gambier, Ohio 43022

## Works Cited

- Alter, Robert. The Art of Biblical Narrative. New York: Basic Books, 1981
- Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Trans. Willard Trask. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953.
- Douglas, Mary. Purity and Danger. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Frye, Northrop. The Great Code: The Bible as Literature. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Lefkowitz, Lori. The Character of Beauty in the Victorian Novel. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986.
- , "When Lilith Becomes A Heroine: Midrash As Feminist Response." Melton Journal (Forthcoming).
- Plaut, Gunther W. Ed. The Torah. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981.
- Raglan, Lord F. The Hero: A Study in Tradition, Myth and Drama. London: Methuen, 1936.
- Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.