# Sacralization and Desecration of Identity in Hellenistic-Jewish Literature: Towards a Deconstructive Reading

Babu Immanuel Venkataraman
*TCA College, Singapore*

"Men never do evil so completely and cheerfully as
when they do it from religious conviction."
– Pascal –

"A word . . . when it is said . . . begins to live that day."
– Emily Dickinson –

Paul Hiebert, the eminent cultural anthropologist, speaking particularly of the Asian contexts, categorically affirms that historically and culturally speaking, plurality is inevitable.[1] Religious pluralism, whether ancient or modern, is fertile soil for inter-religious competition and violence or "civilizational incarceration."[2] Every religion posits truth claims and claims to Truth and thereby claims superiority to other religions. A tacit contempt for people of other religious affinities is the *sine qua non* of religious pluralism. A mindset of antipathy and aversion predetermines a person's responses to and interpretations of others and their religions. It defines one's own identity sometimes by defining the identity of the other person.

## Religion and Identity

Religion is a powerful tool of identity-formation. This prerogative, the right to form identity, when challenged, can lead to conflict. Lori Peek defines identity as an "individual's sense of self, group affiliation, structural positions, and ascribed and achieved statuses. Identity results from internal subjective perceptions, self reflection, and external

1. Paul Hiebert cited in Hwa Yung, *Mangoes or Bananas: The Quest for an Authentic Asian Christian Theology* (Oxford: Regnum, 1997), 64.
2. Amartya Sen, *Identity, Violence: The Illusions of Destiny* (London: Allen Lane, 2006), 10. See R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred Religion. Violence and Reconciliation* (Oxford: Roman and Littlefield, 2000).

characterizations."[3] Identity thus denotes the human tendency to discover one's self and one's relation to other selves.

Religious identities, while affirming one's own identity and the identity of its adherents, may find counterpart religious identities repulsive. This repulsion creates religious binaries. Categories such as saved/lost, insiders/outsiders, chosen/damned, and believers/non-believers may be employed to widen this chasm particularly using "we/they," "us/them," "our/their" binaries. Binarian language creates religionism[4] and functions as a Line of Control to keep outsiders out and insiders in.[5] Religious identities then begin to clash, leading to a spiral of violence, sometimes physical, but most often in the forms of verbal denigration, demonization, and caricaturing the other.

As regards the history of research, while there are several cultural anthropological and ethnographic studies on identity-formation[6], works on religion and identity, particularly from a Hellenistic-Jewish perspective are extremely exiguous. From a historical perspective, Emil Schürer

3. Lori Peek, "Becoming Muslim: The Development of a Religious Identity," *Sociology of Religion* 66.3 (2005): 215-42, here 217. On ascribed and achieved statuses, see Stephen A. Grunlan & Marvin K. Mayers, *Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 129-31. Identity is an evolving process of "becoming" rather than simply "being" according to M. Dillon, *Catholic Identity: Balancing reason, faith, and power* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 250.

4. John M. Hull, "Religionism and Religious Education," in *Spiritual and Religious Education*, ed. Mal Leicester Celia Mogdi and Sohan Mogdi (London: Falmer, 2000), 75-85.

5. The Old Testament illustrates this very well. The "Tribes of Yahweh" (cf. Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250–1050 BCE* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), as an exclusive group, shut their non-Hebrew neighbours out. The God of the Hebrews, YHWH, is the only God of the universe and the gods of the outsiders are idols. Usually, a "G" in the upper case is used to denote the God of Israel, while a small "g" denotes the other "gods." This may be a Redactor's problem, but it exhibits popular bias. Their belief that YHWH has chosen them as his people, separates and places them over the others. Since the ἔθνη commit detestable things (βδέλυγματα) for their gods, they deserve to be totally annihilated (e.g., 1 Sam 15:3) and when subjugated, they are to serve the Hebrews. It shall be committing sin (ἁμαρτάνω) against YHWH if the Jews do not totally exterminate the nations (Deut 20:10-18).

6. For example, Lori Peek, "Becoming Muslim: The Development of a Religious Identity," 215-42; M. Dillon, *Catholic Identity: Balancing Reason, faith, and Power* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Kelly H. Chong, "What it Means to be Christian: The Role of Religion in the Construction of Ethnic Identity and Boundary among second-generation Korean Americans," *Sociology of Religion* 59.3 (1998): 259-68

had shown that Gentiles in biblical literature were considered ritually impure and that this impurity was because of Gentile failure to follow the Jewish purity laws.[7] Alon holds that the ritual impurity of Gentiles was a correlate of the biblical understanding of the ritual impurity of idols.[8] Thus, there seems to be an inextricable connection between the impurity of the gods' and human impurity. In recent times, Christine Hayes discusses Gentile identity, but primarily from the perspective of Jewish purity laws.[9] She argues that while believing themselves to be a morally pure race, Jews believed Gentiles to be an impure race ritually and genealogically.[10]

While these studies do help reconstruct Gentile identity implied in Jewish literature, the language employed in Hellenistic-Jewish texts to delineate Gentile identity has so far not received scholarly attention. This paper is an attempt to address the larger issues related to the formation of religious identities, particularly based on sacralised language. The focus of this essay is, therefore, exclusively on the way Hellenistic-Jewish texts characterise Gentiles, their gods, and its relation to identity formation and identity ascription. It neither seeks nor claims to address the implications of the study for the contemporary churchgoers. The intention is to contribute to the ongoing scholarly discussion on religion and identity and not draw propositional dictates.

The literary base of this study is Hellenistic-Jewish literature where, in several places, the language to describe the Gentiles is pejorative, opprobrious, and incursive. This paper problematizes such use of language for identity assumption, construction and ascription in texts. In its most conventional and historical sense the word "text" means:

> The actual words of a book, or poem, etc., either in their original form or any form they have been transmitted in or transmuted into: a book of such words: words set to music: the main body of matter in a book. A text is a locus of meaning and value, not discrete and isolable, but as a complex of intertexts or as a "mosaic of quotations." The text "emerges

7. Emil Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Times of Jesus Christ*, 5 vols., trans. S. Taylor and P. Christie (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1891), 2:54. See also Judith M. Lieu, *Neither Jew nor Greek? Reconstructing Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2002).

8. Gedaliah Alon, "The Levitical Uncleanness and the Classical World," *Jesus, Judaism and the Classical World*, trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977), 147-48. See also Saul Olyan, *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 83-84.

9. Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

10. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 19-46, 58.

as interpretive discourse caught up in a network of other interpretive discourses."[11]

### Religion, Identity, and Language

There is an intrinsic "connection between texts and the existential actualities of human life, politics, societies, and events."[12] Therefore, it is possible to decipher the nuances, particularly relating to power within these texts. Religious texts, while using language as a tool to express meaning, theme, or a proposition, also employ language as an action,[13] and an intentional action at that. Language, as an intentional action, creates and ascribes identities; as a result, a distinctive kind of person emerges as a sum total of their characterisations. On the other hand, self-definition can be accomplished by anti-other polemics and negative characterisations.[14]

This paper builds on the concept of sacralization as the main interpretive key to understand the role of religion in constructing and reinforcing identity. Sacralization is textualisation, *Quod scripsi, scripsi,* "What I have written, I have written" (cf. John 19:22). It is "the process by means of which man has pre-eminently safeguarded and reinforced . . . a complex or orderly interpretations of reality, rules, and legitimations, which provide identity."[15] That is, one's own identity is discovered and defined primarily by exclusion.

### Methods of Approach

This essay employs narrative and psychological approaches to investigate the problem, for the reason that they demonstrate the power of language in constructing or ascribing identity.

11. Vincent B. Leitch, *Deconstructive Criticism: An Advanced Introduction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 3.

12. Edward Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 4.

13. Cf. James L. Battersby, *Reason and the Nature of Texts* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 47.

14. On identity and power, consult Kenneth Hoover, *The Power of Identity: Politics in a New Key* (Chatham: Chatham, 1997).

15. Hans Mol, *Identity and the Sacred: A Sketch for a New Social-Scientific Theory of Religion* (New York: Free Press, 1976), 15.

### *Narrative Approach*

Storytelling is essential to human thought in general, and religious thought in particular.[16] Stories are what we say about ourselves or about others. The narrative approach to identity advocates that language is a text out of which identities are constructed, justified, and maintained.[17] Autobiographies, for example, show how people use language to make sense of their own lives by giving meaning and coherence to them, while biographies illustrate how others use language to make sense of someone else's life by attributing meaning and coherence. In narrative approaches, people construct stories that serve as the basis of identity and live according to the identities those narratives create. As the story evolves and their identity begins to form, they come to live the story as they write it.[18]

Further, a narrative approach defines identity in "I/we" and "me/us" terms. The "I" is the process of creating a self through the experience of narrating. The "I" is the source of experience and evolves over time to more complex levels of constructing self-understanding. The "me," on the other hand, is the product that the "I" constructs.[19] The "me" is the knowledge and awareness about oneself and is an evolving sense of self-awareness. A narrative exploration of identity, therefore, looks into the "narrating/narration" of the self that integrates many "me" constituents in such a way that provides coherence and unified experiences. Identity evolves in the unity of the "I" and the "me." Thus, a sense of narrative is intrinsic to personal and community self-understanding and self-definition.

There are, however, at least two significant limitations to the narrative approach. First, the narrative approach is highly individuated and subjective since it applies more to the interpretation of individuals' stories than to a community's story. Second, the data obtained by narrative analysis can be limited by the meaning-making skills and experiences of the storyteller. Therefore, a narrative approach is predominantly a subjective approach. Despite these limitations, this paper still employs this method to understand a community's collective religious conscious-

---

16. For story telling and projection as mental activity, consult Mark Turner, *The Literary Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 12-18.

17. On narrative analysis of identity, see D.P. McAdams, *Power, Intimacy, and the Life Story: Personological Inquiries into Identity* (New York: Guilford, 1988).

18. McAdams, *Power, Identity,* ix.

19. See D. P. McAdams, "Personality, modernity, and the storied self: A contemporary framework for studying persons," *Psychological Inquiry* 7 (1996): 295-321.

ness, primarily because this religious consciousness is inscripturated in sacred texts.

## *Psychological Approach*

It is true that story telling is a narrative activity, but the images it projects are a mental activity, thus making story telling a mental exercise at the same time. It gives a glimpse into the mind of the storyteller, which inevitably links the present study to the psychological approach as well. This study singles out the idea of pseudospeciation, related particularly to identity construction and ascription.

### *Pseudospeciation*

As stated earlier, narrative approach analyses identity in terms of "We/They" and "Us/Them" binaries. These are intrinsically connected to a problem called pseudospeciation.[20] Pseudospeciation is the tendency of members of in-groups to consider members of out-groups to have evolved genetically into different and inferior species to their own as opposed to their assumed eugenics. This tendency manifests itself in a community's thinking and polarisation in terms of "us" and "them" —in which the "us" is typically superior to the "them." Erikson clarifies:

> Exploitation exists where a divided function is misused by one of the partners involved in such a way that for the sake of his *pseudo* aggrandizement he deprives the other partner of whatever sense of identity he had achieved, of whatever integrity he had approached. The loss of mutuality which characterizes such exploitation eventually destroys the common function and the exploiter himself.[21]

Pseudospeciation is one form of denigration whereby inter-group aggression is reinforced. Erikson observes:

> Once we have learned to reduce 'the other'—any living human being in the wrong place, the wrong category, or the wrong uniform—to a dirty speck in our moral vision, and potentially a mere target in the sight of our…gun, we are on the way to violating man's essence, if not his very life.[22]

---

20. Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1999), 442.

21. Erik Erikson, *Childhood and Society* (New York: Norton, 1950, 1963), 185-86.

22. Erik Erikson, *Gandhi's Truth* (New York: Norton, 1969), 390-91; Erik

Pseudospeciation usually caricatures the other person.[23] The fact that these identities are constructed and proffered by a dominant religious group with a condemnatory attitude makes them negative. Martin Goodman argues that on the religious plane, any religion, particularly a proselytising religion, will hold that all other religions other than itself are unsatisfactory.[24] Tirades can be hurled at the other religious groups until they acquiesce to the stereotypical negative identities.[25] One major premise of this paper is that this is how the Hellenistic-Jewish texts portray Gentiles. Before delving into the texts to delineate and elaborate this, a brief discussion on the meaning of the term "Gentiles" is in order.

### *Gentiles*

The term ἔθνος, translated "nation," is the *terminus technicus* denoting Gentiles. On the surface, *ethnos* seems to be a plain and innocuous term, but it contains various nuances.[26] Etymologically, ἔθνος perhaps originates from ἔθος (*ethos*: habit, custom, morals and manners).[27] Thus, ἔθνος can mean a group of people related to each other by shared habits, morals, and manners or any other characteristics.[28] ἔθνη, the plural of ἔθνος used in Hellenistic-Jewish texts, has special connotations. It denotes the barbarians, who are non-Greek (ἔθνη βαρβαρα) and differ from the Greeks in morals, manners, and principally in language.[29]

---

Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility: Lectures on the Implications of Psychoanalytic Insight* (New York: Norton, 1964), 233. On the political pathologies of identity formation, consult, Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990), 201-202; Erik Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility: Lectures on the Ethical Implications of Psychoanalytic Insight* (New York: Norton, 1964), 126; Erik Erikson, *Identity: Youth and Crisis* (New York: Norton, 1968), 41-41; Erikson, *Gandhi's Truth*, 432.

23. For Erikson's analysis of the ways that the dominant culture creates negative identities for minorities cited by leaders of the civil rights movements, see Erik Erikson, "Conversations with Huey P. Newton," in *In Search of Common Ground*, ed. Kai Erikson (New York: Norton, 1973).

24. Martin Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 38.

25. Kelly H. Chong, "What It Means to be Christian: The Role of Religion in the Construction of Ethnic Identity and Boundary among Second-Generation Korean Americans," *Sociology of Religion* 59.3 (1998): 259-86, here 264.

26. For a detailed study of the various nuances of the term ἔθνος, see Theodor Nikolaou, "The Term ἔθνος (Nation) and Its Relevance For the Autocephalous Church," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 45.1-4 (2000): 453-78.

27. H. Frisk cited in Nikolaou, "ἔθνος," 454.

28. K.L. Schmidt, "ἔθνος in the New Testament," *TWNT*, 2.336. See also "ἔθνος," in BAGD, 276-77.

29. Nikolaou, "ἔθνος," 455.

Of particular importance to this paper is Nikolaou's delineation of the term:

> This (τὰ ἔθνη) use runs more or less parallel to the Hebrew expression *gowin*, which denotes peoples other than…the nation of the chosen people of Israel…the Greek emphasizes the different morals and manners of the so-called barbarians, whereas the Hebrew usage emphasizes the difference in religion…In the New Testament (several) passages uses the expression τὰ ἔθνη in the sense of the Hebrew "goyim," i.e., as a *terminus technicus* for the pagans in contrast to the Jews . . .[30]

A few centuries later, St. Basil, the Great interprets the Gentiles as pagans (in contrast to Jews [and Christians]). He categorises the ἔθνη as belonging to those who, as a whole, live far from piety, lead a vain life, a life estranged from the salvation in Christ and are therefore, deserving of judgment. Also, they do not recognise the existence of God.[31] Socially, according to the Greek understanding, Gentiles possess the morals and manners of barbarians. In religious terms, they are outside the community of chosen people; they are ritually and morally impure (cf. Eph 2:11-12).

After laying the methodological bases, the paper now turns to some of the texts in Hellenistic-Jewish literature with a view to exploring the way Hellenistic-Jewish texts pseudospeciate Gentiles, their gods, and their religion and what readers can understand, by implication, about the Jews' self-understanding.

### *Jews Are Human Beings and Gentiles Are Animals*

The contrast between the ἔθνη and Jews is as stark as the difference between animals and humans. In his second dream, Enoch sees a vision in which the nation of Israel is symbolised by sheep whereas the ἔθνη are seen as various beasts and birds (*1 En.* 90:27-33).

| We | They |
|---|---|
| "…it is said, And ye My sheep the sheep of my Pasture, are men; you are called men, | the idolaters are not called men… The All Merciful declared their children to be legally fatherless, for… whose flesh is as the flesh of asses, and whose issue is like the issue of horses" (*Yevamot* 61a, 98a). |

30. Nikolaou, "ἔθνος," 455.
31. Nikolaou, "ἔθνος," 456 and also 470, # 23.

The *Babylonian Talmud* contains strong anti-Gentile sentiments:

> "Gentiles prefer sex with cows…Gentile girls are in a state of *niddah* (filth) from birth" (*Avodah Zarah* 22a-22b, 36a).

Similarly, *Jubilee* warns against ἔθνη as follows:[32]

| We | They |
| --- | --- |
| (are) morally superior | (are) morally inferior and demonically related to evil powers (*Jubilee* 15:31) "…their rites are unclean. They offer their sacrifices to the dead and worship demons, and they eat among the graves; yet all their rites are worthless and to no purpose. They have no mind to understand, and their eyes do not see what it is they really do, and how great is their error when they say to a piece of wood, You are my god, and to a stone, You are my lord, and, You are my deliverer. They have no mind to understand (*Jub.* 22:16-18). |

The *Letter of Aristeas* makes a clear distinction between the Jews and the Gentiles as follows:

| We | They |
| --- | --- |
| You observe…what an effect our modes of life and our associations produce upon us | …by associating with the bad (κακοῖς), men catch their depravities (διαστροφὰς) and become miserable (ταλαίπωρος) throughout their life, but if they live with |

---

32. Translation by R. H. Charles (Revised by C. Rabin) in H. F. D. Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 1-138, here p. 72. The Prophet Isaiah portrays Jews in similar language (Isa 6:9-10; cf. Acts 28:26-27).

the wise (σοφός) and prudent (φρό-νιμος)they find the means of escap-ing from ignorance (ἄγνοια) and amending their lives…remaining Pure in body, and soul, free from all imaginations (ματαίοτης), worship-ping the One Almighty above the whole creation (139)…lest we be cor-rupted by any abomination (φαῦλος) or our lives perverted by evil commu-nications (διαστρέφω)…he (Moses) hedged us round on all sides by rules of purity (ἀγνεία) affecting alike what we eat, or drink or Touch, or hear, or see (142)…We have been distinctly Separated (διαστολή) from the rest of mankind (πάντα ἀνθρώ-ποι) (151).

Here Gentiles are bad, depraved, miserable, ignorant, enslaved by vain imaginations, abominable, and perverted by evil communications. In contradistinction, the Jews are wise, prudent, worshippers of the one Almighty God, pure, and separated from the rest of the human race. In fact, any association with Gentiles will lead to moral corruption. *3 Mac-cabees* states:

| We | They |
|---|---|
| The Jews, however, continued to maintain goodwill and unswerv-ing loyalty toward the dynasty; but because they worshiped God (σεβό-μενοιτὸν θεὸν) and conducted them-selves by his law, they kept their separateness (χωρισμός) with re-spectto foods.… they adorned their style of life with the good deeds of upright people, they were established in good repute with everyone. | |
| | Nevertheless those of other races (οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι) paid no heed to their good services to their nation, which was common talk among all; instead they (ἔθνη) gossiped about the differ-ences in worship and foods, alleging |

> that these people were loyal neither to the king nor to his authorities, but were hostile (δυσμενής) and greatly opposed to his government. So they attached no ordinary reproach to them (3-7).

Jews also believed that the mere presence of impure Gentiles in the Temple precincts can desecrate the whole *Sancta*. Jews would commit sacrilege if they permitted Gentiles to enter the Temple. In other words, the Gentiles themselves are pollutants. For example 1 Maccabees 14:36 states: "The Gentiles…defile the environs of the sanctuary, doing great damage to its purity."[33] Likewise, the Third *Sibylline Oracles* also attacks the impurity generated by the immoral deeds of Gentile nations:

> Woe to the race of Phoenicians, men and women . . . because of their unrighteous tongues and their lawless and unclean life which all have led, opening their mouth for uncleanness, and because they covenanted with monstrous words, false and unjust and stood before God the great king and opened with falsehood their filthy mouth (*Sib. Or.* 492, 496-500).

Gentiles are identified with sinners and are thus unavoidably defiled by virtue of their sinful behaviour (*Jub.* 23:24, 28). The *Letter of Aristeas* (v. 152) portrays non-Jews as defiled by sexual immorality.

Also, Gentiles are characterised by vices such as fornication, lying, magic, and adultery. They are morally impure and idolatrous and therefore, any association with Gentiles can lead to moral and ritual impurity. 1 Esdras demonstrates this point well:

> Even the leaders of the people and of the priests committed many acts of sacrilege and lawlessness beyond all the unclean deeds of all the nations (ἔθνει) and polluted the temple of the Lord . . ." (1:49; Cf. Ezra 9:1-2; 2 Chr 36:14).

> The people of Israel who had returned from exile at it, all those who had separated themselves from the abominations of the peoples (ἔθνων) of the land and sought the Lord" (7:13; Cf. Ezra 6:21).

> The people of Israel and the rulers and the priests and the Levites have not put away from themselves the alien peoples of the land (ἀλλογενής) and their pollutions, the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Edomites. For they and

---

33.   Also Alon, "Levitical Uncleanness," 165-66. For contrary interpretation, see, Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 51-52. Alon ("Levitical Uncleanness," 154) also cites *Antiquities of the Jews* 14:285 as evidence for intrinsic ritual impurity.

their descendants have married the daughters of these people, and the holy race has been mixed with the alien peoples of the land (ἀλλογενής); and from the beginning of this matter the leaders and the nobles have been sharing in this iniquity (8:69-70).

The author of Jubilees observes that Israel alone was chosen for salvation and the Gentile nations were doomed for total annihilation from the earth: "And anyone who is born whose own flesh is not circumcised on the eighth day is not from the sons of the covenant which the Lord made for Abraham since (he is) from the children of destruction.... (he is destined) to be destroyed and annihilated from the earth and be uprooted from the earth . . ." (*Jub.* 15:26-32).[34]

In contrast to Gentiles, Jews had a sense of uniqueness about themselves. It has already been pointed out that the Jews thought of themselves as wise, prudent, worshippers of the one almighty God, pure and separated from the rest of the human race. Therefore, salvation is limited to the members of the covenant community (*Jub.* 15:26-32).[35] They were a peculiar people and they alone were a chosen race by YHWH to be guides to blind Gentiles, to be the light of the world and to be the priest of the nations (*Sib. Or.* 3.195; *1 En.* 105:1; cf. Isa 42:6; 49:6; Acts 26:17-18; Rom 2:17-18). This self-understanding set them apart from other nations, involving a sense of *Amixia* as stated earlier.

The *Testament of Levi* projects the Jews as the custodians of human salvation; without them the entire human race is lost:

> For what will all the nations do if you become darkened with impiety? You will bring down a curse on our nation, because you want to destroy the light of the law which was granted to you for the enlightenment of every man (*T. 12 Patr., T. Levi* 14:4).

Not only Jews, but also Judaism as a religion is far superior to all the other religions of the world. It is the only way and in the end all nations of the world will flock to it. As the only true religion, Judaism contains within itself the best found in any other religion in the world. Philo, for example, shows that everything best in Greek thought is paralleled by Jewish thought and that Judaism contains moral and philosophical truths only hinted at by the Greeks.[36] Philo portrays Israel as the most ideal nation or the only representative of nations. In *De vita Mosis*, *De*

34.  This quotation is from J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983).

35.  See also *Jub.* 15.26; *4 Ezra* 12.33; 13.38; *2 Bar.* 40.1; *Apoc. Ab.* 31.2.

36. See Peder Borgen, "Debates on Circumcision in Paul and Philo," in *John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 233-55.

*Abrahamo*, *De specialibus legibus* 14:9, (cf. *Abr.* 98; *Spec.* 1:97), he suggests that Israel as a nation is supposed to pray for the world so that the world might "be delivered from evil and participate in what is good."[37]

The second area of pseudospeciation is in the area of the Gentile gods. This is obvious from the way the Gentile gods are derided and ridiculed (cf. 1 Kgs 18:16-29).

### Your "gods" and our "God"

Hellenistic-Jewish texts equate idols and idolatry with ritual impurity. As stated earlier, the ritual impurity of Gentiles in biblical times was rooted in and an expression of the biblical idea of the ritual impurity of the idols.[38]

The gods of Gentiles are also intrinsically impure just as their worshippers. In fact, Gentiles are ritually impure because their gods are impure. Jubilees says of Gentiles: "They will walk after the Gentiles, and after their uncleanness, and after their shame and will serve their gods" (*Jub.* 1:9). Alon affirms: "The defilement of non-Jews is therefore an extension of the ambit of the uncleanness of the idol itself, incorporating its worshippers."[39] For example, Abram understood "the errors of the earth that all went astray after graven images and after uncleanness . . . and he separated himself from his father, that he might not worship idols with him" (*Jub.* 11:16-17). He admonishes his sons and grandchildren: ". . . walk not after their idols and after their uncleannesses, and make not for yourselves molten or graven gods" (*Jub.* 20:8; cf. 22:19; 35:14).

Further, the earliest lesson the proselytes to Judaism received was to despise "the gods." The *Sibylline Oracles*, speaking directly to the Greeks, state, "To what purpose do you give vain gifts of the dead and sacrifice to idols? Who put error in your heart that you should abandon the fact of these great things?" (3:547-49). Salvation can be attained by Greeks provided they forego idolatry and offer sacrifices at the Temple of the great God in Jerusalem (3:624-34).

---

37. See H. A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), 2:165-321.

38. Alon, "Levitical Uncleanness," 147-48. For Gentiles being characterised as impure in biblical Israel, see Saul Olyan, *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 83-84.

39. Alon "Levitical Uncleanness," 147.

### The Gods of Gentiles Are an Abomination

The Gentile gods are impure as well as an abomination. Erecting them in the Temple is a sacrilege and sacrilege leads to desolation. First Maccabees records the defilement of the sanctuary during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes by erecting an idol on the altar in the holy of holies: "Now on the fifteenth day of Chislev, in the one hundred forty-fifth year, they erected a desolating sacrilege on the altar of burnt offering. They also built altars in the surrounding towns of Judah…On the twenty-fifth day of the month they offered sacrifice on the altar that was on top of the altar of burnt offering" (1 Macc 1:54, 59; 2 Macc 5:15-17; cf. Matt 24:15: βδέλυγματα ἐρημώσεως cf. 1 Sam 15:3). Similarly, Josephus refers to Hezekiah's order to the Levites and priests of the first temple to purify the temple from its former pollutions, i.e., the idols introduced by his father (*Ant.* 9:262-263, 273; 1 Macc 14:36).

The Old Testament Apocrypha derides the gods of the nations. They are no gods (Ep Jer 6:51). The idols are abominable "stumbling blocks to the souls of men and a snare to the feet of the unwise" (Wis 14:11). Devising idols is the beginning of spiritual fornication and corruption of life (14:12). Idolatry is the beginning, the cause and end of all evil (14:27). Further, "all the idols of the heathen . . . neither have the use of eyes to see, nor noses to draw breath, nor ears to hear, nor fingers of hands to handle, and as for their feet, they are slow to go" (15:15).

### Your gods are corpses

Hellenistic-Jewish texts portray Gentile gods as corpses. For example, Abraham warns against idolatry: "They offer their sacrifices to the dead and they worship evil spirits, and they eat over their graves" (*Jub.* 22:17; cf. Ps 106:28). The Third *Sibylline Oracle* refers to "idols of dead gods of wood and stone" (588) and "idols and images of men that are dead" (723). The fifth oracle refers to "Lifeless Hermes and gods of stone" (356) and idols that are "lifeless and dumb, smelted in the fire" (84).[40] The Epistle of Jeremiah refers to the gods of Gentiles as "gods of wood and overlaid with gold and with silver . . . like a dead body that is cast forth into the dark" (v. 71). The Wisdom of Solomon further reinforces the same characterisation of Gentile gods:

> But miserable, with their hopes set on dead things, are those who give the name "gods" to the works of human hands, gold and silver fashioned with skill, and likenesses of animals, or a useless stone, the work of an

---

40. In Acts Paul describes them as ματαίων, worthless things (Acts 14:15).

ancient hand . . . he (the idol worshipper) . . . is not ashamed to address a lifeless thing . . . he prays to a thing that is dead (13:10-19).

Philo also holds that the gods of the nations are man-made. Gentile gods are actually nature and animals deified (*Decal.* XV.74–XVI 76-79). Since they are human invention, they have no power even to move on their own. They are made of stone and wood designed and hewn by a stone-cutter and a wood-cutter (*Contempl.* I.3-7). In Philo's thought, the objective of prayer is to attain to the likeness of God (*Decal.* XV.73). Therefore, the implied question is, what will the worshippers of stone and wood become like? Gentiles as well as their gods are an abomination. Given this existential condition, there are only a few options for the Gentiles to create an alternative realm of existence.

## Options Available

### *The Jewish* Amixia

Gentiles are outsiders who are morally and ritually unclean. Therefore, Jews must not have any dealings with them. This is technically called the Jewish *Amixia*. *Amixia* is the absence of interbreeding or intermarriage with others outside of one's social group, whether the group is defined by ethnicity, caste, religion, or something else. Balaam had long ago typecast the Jews as "a people that dwells alone, that has not made itself one with the nations" (Num 23:9). Given this reality, *Jubilee* advises *Amixia*:

> And you, Jacob my son, remember my words, and observe the commands of your father Abraham. Keep yourself separate (χωρίζω) from the nations (ἔθνη), and do not eat with them; and do not imitate their rites, nor associate yourself with them (22:16-18).

What validates this teaching is its supposed patriarchal origin from Abraham. The motive is two-fold: a) to desist from imitating the "works," "ways," and "worship" which are *morally* impure abominations and b) to encourage advocacy to the laws and worship of the God of the Jews. Similarly, the *Letter of Aristeas* strictly advocates for *Amixia*:

> [O]ur lawgiver (Moses) being a wise man . . . fenced us round with impregnable ramparts and walls of iron, that we might not mingle at all with any of the other nations (ἔθνη), but remain pure in body and soul, free from all vain imaginations (ματαιότης; cf. Acts 14:15), worshipping the one Almighty God (μόνος θεός) above the whole creation (139) . . . Therefore, lest we should be corrupted by any abomination (φαῦλος), or our lives be perverted by evil communications (διαστρέφω), he (Moses)

hedged us round on all sides by rules of purity (ἁγνεία), affecting alike what we eat, or drink, or touch, or hear, or see (142) . . . We have been distinctly separated (διαστολή) from the rest of mankind (πάντα ἀνθρώ ποι) (151).

Jewish self-perception of διαστολή, a sense of being distinct and separate from Gentiles, necessitated the *Amixia*, particularly to avoid ritual defilement communicated by Gentile impurity. Judith, for instance, is reported to have brought her own wine and bread and to have had her food prepared by her own attendants so that the Jewish purity laws concerning food might not be violated (Jdt 10:5; 12:19). Similarly, Tobit abstains from the Gentile food for fear of violating Jewish dietary laws (Tob 1:10). Fearing defilement from Gentiles, the Wisdom of Sirach discourages even hospitality to strangers: "Receive strangers into your home and they will stir up trouble for you, and will make you a stranger to your own family" (Sir 11:34). Further, since the heathen are unclean, marrying a Gentile woman is a sin against God (1 Esd 8:87, 92).

### *The Dénouement: Total Annihilation of Gentiles*

Gentiles, because of who they are, do not deserve to exist: "[T]he Lord God shall judge them with a sword and with fire, for all the unclean wickedness of their errors, wherewith they have filled the earth with transgression and uncleanness and fornication and sin" (*Jub.* 9:15; 2 Macc 12:40). Second Baruch 72:1-6 talks about the end-time subjugation of the nations.[41] Similarly, the *Psalms of Solomon* 17:22-34 attests to the theme of the subjugation of the Gentiles.[42] Gentiles are the servants paying tribute to Israel (*1 En.* 90:30-33; 91:14).

Further, the "battle theme" in the texts speaks of vanquishing the enemies of Israel in the final battle, in which YHWH himself will wage war on their behalf with the result that the Gentiles will realize the greatness of Israel. The *Sibylline Oracles* unfolds the eschatological scenario. When the kings of the peoples attack Jerusalem, God acts in judgement. There is a bloody day of reckoning; there is total cataclysm and cosmic destruction and eventually the assault is brought to naught (669-701). In Enoch's second Dream vision, the Gentile nations who are symbolised by various beasts and birds are also utterly vanquished (*1 En.* 90:18-29). And then all islands and cities recognise God's love for Israel (*Sib. Or.* 716-20). At the end of the final showdown between the

---

41. See. R. H. Charles, "2 Baruch," in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 518.

42. J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, trans. W. F. Stinespring (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956), 321.

nations of the earth and Israel, the nations will be forced to submit to Israel and its God (*Jub.* 26:23; 39:4; *T. 12 Patr., T. Sim.* 7:2; *T. Levi* 2:11; 4:3-4; 18:1-9; *T. Jud.* 24:6; *T. Zeb.* 9:8; *T. Benj.* 10:5; Ezra 6:26).

Similar to the "battle theme," the Qumran War Scroll (1QM) describes Armageddon, the ultimate war between the Sons of Light and Sons of Darkness. The War Scroll predicts eternal annihilation for the Sons of Darkness or the forces of Belial and there shall be no survivors among them. The Sons of Light shall be undertaken against the forces of the Sons of Darkness, the army of Belial consisting of the troops of Edom, Moab, the sons of Ammon, the Amalekites, Philistia, and the troops of the Kittim of Asshur. Supporting them are those who have violated the covenant: the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin. Thus what becomes evident is that Jewish literature did not simply set up Jews against Gentiles. Rather, it defined itself over and against other Jews as well, Jews who were against an assumed orthodoxy.

Although this war is said to extend over forty years, the writer of the scroll was particularly concerned with the details of the very final day of battle. After six bloody engagements during this last battle, the Sons of Light and Sons of Darkness are deadlocked in a tie. In the seventh and final confrontation "the great hand of God shall overcome Belial and all the angels of his dominion, and all the men of his forces shall be destroyed forever" (1QM 1:14-15). Finally, the battle culminates in a ceremony of thanksgiving by the Sons of Light on the day following the victory (1QM 18:10-19:14).[43]

### *"Sword Mission"*

Sometimes, where a clear hortatory approach does not work to persuade Gentiles to convert to Judaism, force may be needed. Borgen calls this the "Sword Mission."[44] The following instances from Josephus illustrate the Jewish "Sword Mission." Josephus records that the Jewish king John Hyrcanus permitted the Idumaeans to remain in the land provided they converted properly to Judaism. He says:

---

43. Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996).

44. Peder Borgen, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 46; D. J. Deligson, "Conversion in the Post-Talmudic Period," in *Conversion to Judaism: A History and Analysis*, ed. D. M. Eichhorn (New York: Ktav, 1965), 67-95. Cited in Louis H. Feldman and Meyer Reinhold, eds., *Jewish Life and Thought among Greeks and Romans: Primary Readings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 225.

> Hyrcanus also captured the Idumaean cities of Adora and Marisa and after subduing all the Idumaeans, permitted them to remain in their country so long as they had themselves circumcised and were willing to observe the laws of the Jews. And so...they submitted to circumcision and to making their manner of life conform in all other respects to that of the Jews. And from that time on they have continued to be Jews (*Ant.* XIII. 257-58).

Similarly, "those who wished to live among the Jews must be circumcised" (*Life* 23). Therefore, Aristobulus "made war on the Ituraeans . . . and compelled the inhabitants, if they wished to remain in their country, to be circumcised and to live in accordance with the laws of the Jews . . . " (*Ant*. XIII. 318-19). Sometimes refusal to comply with Jewish ways might lead even to annulling marriage (*Ant*. XX.7).

Refusal to be Judaized could lead to total destruction. Again, Josephus reports that Alexander Jannaeus' men demolished Pella, because "the inhabitants would not take upon themselves the ancestral customs of the Jews" (*Ant*. XIII. 397).

The Book of Esther further illustrates the *Jihadi* approach of the Jews to Gentiles. The book narrates the dramatic developments involving xenophobia and the genocidal measures against the Jews and how the turn of events ended with the Jews being authorised to take revenge on their enemies by military force (Esth 8:7-14; *Ant*. 11: 271-83). Against this background many pagans became Jewish proselytes from fear and were even circumcised (Esth 8:17; *Ant*. 11:285). Similarly, when Achior the Ammonite saw the head of Holofernes, he believed in God, accepted circumcision and was adopted into the household of Israel (*Jud.* 14:5-10).

### Conversion to Judaism

Given the impurity of Gentiles and the fact that they worship dead gods, the right action demanded of Gentiles is conversion to "our religion'"—Judaism—that involves renunciation as well as denunciation. Philo draws some of his conclusions from his account of Abraham whom he portrays as an ideal convert.

According to Philo, Abraham is the proselyte *nonpareil*. He is the prototype for abandoning all to go up to God (*Abr.* VI. 13:60-68; *Cher.* 31; *Mut.* 76; *Somn*. 1:161).[45] Abraham's conversion exemplifies the transition from false religion to true religion and movement from a life of ethical laxity to ethical orthodoxy.[46] Gentiles, therefore, like Abraham,

---

45. Also Scot McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 31.

46. For conversion as transition from one religion to another, see Lewis R.

must renounce "their country, their kinsfolk and their friends for the sake of virtue and true religion" (*Spec.* 1:52)[47] and denounce the vain imaginings of fathers and ancestors (*Spec.* 1:53).

Abraham came from Ur in Chaldea, known for its elaborate astrology. Chaldeans glorified visible existence. They believed that the world itself was god and likened the created to the Creator. This is the creed in which Abraham had been reared. Then, when the eyes of his soul were opened, he saw the pure light and followed it (cf. Acts 26:17-18). He had been given a new name. In Philo's words,

> What has been said is attested by alteration and change in his name, for his original name was Abram, but afterwards he was addressed as Abraham. Abram is by interpretation 'uplifted father'; Abraham, 'elect father of sound'. The former signifies one called astrologer and meteorologist . . . the latter signifies the sage, for he uses 'sound' as a figure for spoken thought and 'father' for the ruling mind...'Elect' signifies the man of worth . . . (*Abr.* VI.81-83).[48]

Following the pattern of Abraham, Gentiles must convert to Judaism by relinquishing their country, their kith and kin and friends for the express purpose of pursuing virtue and religion, i.e., Judaism (*Spec.* 1:52). They have to denounce the vain imaginings of their fathers and ancestors (*Cher.* 4-8, 31; *Praem.* 27,58, 152; *Somn.* 2:273; *Spec.* 1:53, 309; 4:176-78; *Virt.* 219; *Mos.* 149), and have to repent (*Cher.* 71; *Somn.* 2:292,299; *Spec.* 1:102-4; 2:73; *Virt.* 175-86, 220-27).[49] Each nation should abandon its peculiar ways and throw overboard its ancestral customs and turn to honouring the Jewish laws alone (*Mos.* 2:44). These converts to Judaism from other religions transit from "ignorance" to "knowledge" (*Migr.* 2:184-96; *Post.* 18-21; *Praem.* 61). From this Philo draws two implications for Gentile conversion:

Rambo, *Understanding Religious Conversion* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1993).

47. McKnight, *Light Among the Gentiles*, 39.

48. Cited in T. E. Page, W. H. D. Rouse, eds., *Philo*, VI (London: William Heinemann, 1935), 35-45. On change of name as an indicator of conversion, see G. H. R. Horsley, "Name Change as an Indication of Conversion in Antiquity," *Numen* 34 (1987): 1-17.

49. Wolfson, *Philo*, Vol. 1, 25-59; W. C. van Unnik "The Critique of Paganism in 1 Peter 1:18," in *Neotestamenticitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, eds. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969), 129-42.

### *i) Religious Conversion: Transition from*
### *Idolatrous Polytheism to Jewish Monotheism*

The focal point of conversion is the change from worshipping many gods to the worship of the One True God. True conversion is to abandon the images of their gods, and the tributes and honors paid to them and to turn to the clear vision of Truth and the worship of the one and truly existing God (*Virt*. 102-104).[50] The second implication for Gentile conversion flows from the first one.

### *ii) Ethical Conversion*

Since pagans are impure ritually and morally and lead a life of ethical laxity, they need an ethical conversion, which is rooted in the worship of the One God. Philo elaborates as follows:

> For it is excellent and profitable to desert without backward glance to the ranks of virtue and abandon vice that malignant mistress; and where honour is rendered to the God . . . The proselytes become at once temperate, continent, modest, gentle, kind, humane, serious, just, high-minded, truth-lovers, superior to the desire for money and pleasure . . . (*Virt*. 181-182).

### ***Summary and Conclusion***

Without discussing the actual socio-historical and political situation of the Jews, this paper looked at the literary or textual self-portrait of Jews as well as the characterisation of the outsiders. In Hellenistic-Jewish texts, where there is reference to Jews and Gentiles, Gentiles are animalised or dehumanised always being at the receiving end of invectives.

In every reference, the Gentiles are impure morally and ritually, blind, ignorant, bad, depraved, miserable, enslaved by vain imaginations, abominable, perverted by evil, worshippers of wood and stone images sculpted by human hands. Therefore, they need to be totally annihilated, or be subjugated to serve the Jews. On the other hand, pseudo-speciation sets the Jews antithetical to all that the Gentiles collectively connote. They are wise, prudent, worshippers of the one Almighty God, pure and separated from the rest of the human race. They are the sons

---

50. The story of Joseph and Asenath best illustrates this point. In the story Asenath renounces idolatry and throws away all her idols. See E. W. Brooks, *Joseph and Asenath: The Confession and Prayer of Asenath, Daughter of Pentephres, the Priest* (London/New York: Macmillan, 1918), 34-39.

of Light, the ultimate conquerors. What conclusions do emerge from the foregoing discussion?

This paper problematized the use of language in religious texts especially for identity assumption, construction and ascription. The basic materials of a religion are its written texts in the form of a sacral language.

Hellenistic-Jewish texts are primarily first-person plural speech-acts that make a collective self-consciousness memorable. What is memorable is what the texts have sacralised. The sacralised becomes memorable, particularly when it is contrasted with an intentional apologue. The apologue, in turn, confers power upon the speaker by their utterance. In the sacralised texts, this power is self assumed, simply taken as a given, but not given.

Further, the sacral language creates an uneven playfield where there is no oral confrontation. The apologue characterises Gentiles as animals, and animals do not speak; rather, they are not allowed to speak. Since sacral language is human words put into God's mouth, or is believed to be proceeding from God's mouth, the speakers do not yield the stage to the "other" to say anything. Further, the language creates an artificial hierarchy of powers of speech. At the top stand those who claim divine validation to their discourses and the voices of those who stand at the lowest rung are muted.

A necessary concomitant question issuing out of this is "Is there truth in this text?" What is the truth-value of these texts? They have to be either true or false, necessarily. What truth-conditions do they possess? Or what are the precisely specifiable account of the conditions which determine the truth-value of the propositions conveyed by these texts?[51] From the point of view of the texts, these questions are hard to answer. On the other hand, what, as a reader, am I supposed do with such texts? The foregoing discussion points to two things.

## *Circumfession*

According to Derrida, "Circumfession"[52] is what happens when a community writes or talks about itself, of which self-explanation is a part. Gradually, what starts as explanation becomes self-justification with the likely inference that the written text could have been a mistake. Explaining oneself, then, gets closer to confession. Everything written

51. On truth-value and truth-conditions, see John Lyons, *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 142, 171.

52. For a fuller treatment of circumfession, see, Jacques Derrida, "Circumfession: Fifty-nine Periods and Periphrases," in Geoffrey Bennington and Jacques Derrida, *Jacques Derrida* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

sounds like it is something the writer is guilty of committing and for which he needs forgiveness. This is particularly so when a community justifies its right to a story and denies the same right to the "other." In sum, circumfession, a collective confession, seems to be the right action, because the language of the text is the language of the guilty. Eventually, what "they"—those who own the text—say about themselves has to remain a confession, a story of guilt about oneself, with respect to the outsider "others." The second recommendation is deconstruction.

### Deconstruction

Deconstruction is to read a text starting from "a philosophical hierarchy in which two opposed terms are presented as the 'superior' general case and the "inferior" special case.[53] The most common oppositions include good/evil, saved/doomed, etc. From deconstructionist point of view, these pairs are not simply juxtaposed oppositions; they are hierarchies. In each pair, one term is held superior while the other is regarded as inferior. The superior term in each hierarchy dominates the inferior one, serving as the norm against which the inferior term must be defined and must gain its identity. The secondary terms are antithetical to the qualities that the privileged terms characterize. Consequently, the two ends of the polarity are by no means equal terms. Rather, one is privileged and the other suppressed. The former establishes its identity and authority at the expense of the other.

Deconstruction questions the inherent logic by which these binary oppositions operate. It challenges the distribution of power between these two extremes. Derrida clarifies

> In a traditional philosophical opposition, we have not a peaceful coexistence of a vis-à-vis, but rather with a violent hierarchy. One of the two terms governs the other . . . or has the upper hand. To deconstruct the opposition, first of all, is to overturn the hierarchy at a given moment.[54]

To overturn the violent hierarchy, Derrida first exposes how the privileged term depends upon the suppressed one in the process of accumulating its own meaning. Truth, social norms, and standards gain their identity and authority by acts of exclusion via differentiation. It is an act of opposition and differentiation that expels those which are conventionally considered inferior, secondary, derived, and contaminat-

53. Robert Con Davis and Roland Schleifer, eds., *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*, 2d ed. (New York: Longman, 1989), 207.
54. Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 41.

ed.[55] Thus, by exposing the logical fallacy of binarism, deconstruction questions the accepted values, destabilising hierarchies, and undermining the absolute truth as well as power systems.[56] It must, however, be clarified that deconstruction, while insisting on an undoing, does not intend to dislodge a hierarchical opposition in order to set up the inferior term in the place of the superior. This would only serve to perpetuate hierarchization and remain within hierarchical and oppositional logic. Deconstruction, therefore, is "not simply to invert the hierarchy, which would only confirm the categories, but to transform the notion of hierarchy itself."[57]

55. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, eds., *Literary Theory: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 340.

56. For a fuller treatment of deconstruction, see Jonathan Culler, *On Deconstruction* (London: Routledge, 1983), 86.

57. G. Douglas Atkins, *Reading Deconstruction/Deconstructive Reading* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1983). 84.