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Abstract

The paper discussed the negative images of women in some selected passages of the Old Testament. Since it is not possible to deal with all negative pictures about women in the Old Testament, the work concentrated only on three images of women which are viewed negatively: women’s biological make up, women as temptress, women as harlots. The methodology used is a systematic and scrupulous referenced study of relevant books, journals and theses. The paper recognized that even though there are good pictures of some women like Deborah, Miriam and Huldah in the Bible, but these women in actual sense do not represent the condition of every Israelite woman. Perhaps more than any other, the patriarchal Old Testament culture that treat women as sinners affirms and reinforces the attitude of men to women in the contemporary society. Different images and languages of denigration usually used against women in the Nigerian society are clearly spelt out. However, the paper concludes that a new form of expression and interpretation of tradition should be used to uphold the images of women. Equally, the paper recommended that there is need to change the negative linguistic models against women by specifically following the example of Jesus attitude to women of his days.
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Introduction
In the Bible, several negative images and languages are being made use of to qualify women. These negative images and languages used in the Bible frequently present problems for women and often time place them in disadvantageous position. As rightly noted by DeBeavoir's primary thesis and as the title of her book suggests, was that women as a group were assigned to second-class status in the world. Woman was defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her. DeBeauvoir believed that the male sex comprised the prime measure by which the whole world – including women - were named and judged. Therefore, the world belonged to men. Women were the non-essential “other”. DeBeauvoir argued: ‘… she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the subject, he is the Absolute- she is the other.” She equally noted this inequity of sex status in every area of society including economics, industry, politics, education, and even language:

Woman has always been man’s dependent, if not his slave, the two sexes have never shared the world in equality….. almost nowhere is her legal status the same as man’s and frequently it is much to her disadvantage. Even when her rights are legally recognized in the abstract, long-standing custom prevents their full expression in the mores. In the economic sphere men and women can almost be said to make up two castes: other things being equal, the former have the better jobs, get higher wages and have more opportunity for success… In industry and politics men have a great many more positions and they monopolize the most important posts. In addition to all this, they enjoy traditional prestige that the education of children tends in every way to support, for the present enshrines the past and in the past all history has been made by men… In actuality the relation of the two sexes is not quite like that of two electrical poles, for man represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the common use of man to designate human beings in general; whereas women represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, without reciprocity.¹

In the light of this, several feminist theologians had written on how religion has become oppressive to women. Also, they were busy in the re-writing of history so that distortions and various discrimination and language of abuse against women are made visible and corrected. Some of the most popular post Christian feminist are Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Elizabeth Schussler Florenza, Rosemary R. Ruether, Letty M. Russell, Mary Daly and a host of others like, Dorcas Akintunde, Oyeronke Olademo and Amba Oduyoye.ⅱ Their position shares with most traditional interpretation of the general supposition that the biblical witness with regard to women is essentially negative. Indeed, these critics have helped us see much more clearly the extent of the subordinations of women in the biblical materials.

For instance, Rosemary Radford Ruether proposed that Christianity had inherited a system of dualism that had distorted its “epistemological, moral and ontological perception”. Ruether explained that a dualistic philosophy maintained that all phenomena in the universe could be explained in terms of two fundamental exclusive principles of good or bad, right or wrong. She cited the Gnostics, for example, as possessing an anti-material subject-object dualism that
regarded the non-material universe as good and the physical, material universe as bad. The Gnostics, therefore, experienced salvation through repressing their sensual appetites and carnal feelings, and focusing instead on their inward, transcendent, spiritual selves. iii According to Ruether, Christians adopted this Gnostic view, and Christian reality was then split into a “non-material thinking substance” and a “non-thinking extension” or matter.iv She argued that Western Judaeo-Christian culture operated out of a psychology that extended the same dualism of body and soul, subject and object into sociological alienation and oppression.

Ruether cited the male-female dualism as the primary social extension of subject-object dualism. Spirit, mind, soul, and man were linked with the “good” end of the polarity, while body, emotion, physical matter (earth) and woman were located on the debased, fallen end. She says;

Classical Christianity attributed all the intellectual virtues to the male. Woman was thereby modeled after the rejected part of the psyche. She is shallow, fickle-minded, irrational, carnal-minded, lacking all the true properties of knowing and willing and doing.v

But as a matter of emphasis, there are some stories in the Bible that are positive with regard to women than either most traditional exegesis or post Christian feminist has generally acknowledged. Two examples can suffice here. One is the story of Ruth, the Moabites women who leaves her husband out of loyalty to her mother-in-law Naomi and settled in Judah, where she becomes the ancestress of David. The other is the remarkable motif of the personification of the divine wisdom as a woman in Proverbs chapter eight. Indeed one of the major contributions of what we might call mainstream feminist exegesis of the Bible has been to demonstrate this more positive side. A good example of presentation of positive themes in Phyllis Tribe’s God and the Rhetoric of sexuality, in which texts ranging from Genesis chapter one to the song of song are explored from a feminist perspective. This position certainly acknowledges the so-called ‘patriarchy’ of much of the biblical witness but it wrestles with the question of how this may be related to those parts of the text which are more positive about women.vi

Meanwhile, it needs to be noted that works in this area have been done from various angles with different emphasis. Then, it was discovered that despite efforts being made in different quarters to correct the negative impression about women, some men still do not see anything good about women. Therefore, the main purpose of this paper is to concentrate on three of those negative biblical images about women with a view to reflect on its implications in the contemporary society. Then, necessary recommendations that could be applied will be given.

Women’s Biological Make-Up
Women’s biological make-up, their capacity to conceive and give birth is essential for continuance of the human race, and hence a blessing from God. Yet the sign of this capacity, women’s menstrual periods are regarded as unclean. Their menstrual period lasts for seven days and everything they touch at this period is usually seen as unclean. The Bible specifically noted that women remain unclean (tum’ah) during this period until they are purified (lev 15:19).As rightly noted by Setel, it is more accurate to describe the menstrual cycle as ‘taboo’ (tame) and ritually pure (tahor) states of being impure. The significance of this for female sexuality is complex. She further noted that,
the fact that women are rendered ‘taboo’ through the life-bearing functions of
the reproductive cycle can be seen as recognition of their participation of their
divine power. At the same time, the system of ritual purity, by emphasizing
the continual need to distinguish the realm of the divine from the realm of the
human, serves to diminish –or even negate – the Power of female human begins
in the life process. vii

The question is what is there about female that elicits behavioral monitoring through religious
ritual?

In addition, a barren woman is looked on with contempt for no fault of hers. She is regarded as
one cursed by God; God is responsible for the closing and opening of the womb of a woman (cf.
Gen. 29-31, 30 -24). Peradventure she gives birth, she is also considered unclean for a period of
time and in need of still further purification. What is equally interesting is that both periods of
impurity were twice as long if a girl was born than if a boy was which would seem to indicate
that girl was considered twice as defiling as a boy. When a woman conceives and bears a male
child, she shall be unclean for seven days, as in the day of impurity through menstruation… The
woman shall wait for thirty three days because her blood requires purification, she shall touch
nothing that is holy, and shall not enter the sanctuary till her days of purification. If she bears a
female child, she shall be unclean for fourteen days as for her menstruation and shall wait for
sixty days (Lev 12: 2-5)

Also, there is legislation concerning adultery (Deut. 22, 22, also Num 5: 11-31) and virginity.
Deut. 22:13-21 speaks of women, but only control female sexuality to male advantage. The
crime of adultery is sleeping with another wife, and a man could bring his wife to trial even on
suspicion of adultery. A man who sleeps with a virgin who is not betrothed must simply marries
her. A virgin whose virginity shames her father on her wedding night can be stoned to death for
harlotry. A virgin who is raped must marry her assailant. The subject of this law is woman, but
the interest behind them is the purity of the male line.

Women as Temptress:

In Judaeo- Christian tradition, women were noted to be the one that brought sin and death into
the world as a result of her disobedience to the instruction of God not to eat of the fruit of good
and evil. As a result she was being castigated as gullible and should not be trusted. Also,
marriage for her was to be condition of bondage, she would bear her children in pain and to live
in subordination to her husband viii. As Elizabeth Cady Stanton writes:

These familiar texts are quoted by clergy-men in their pulpits, by statesmen in
the halls of legislation, by lawyers in the courts, and are echoed by the press of
all civilized nations, and accepted by woman herself as “ The Word of God”. So
perverted is the religious element in her nature, that with faith and works she is
the chief support of the church and clergy, the very powers that make her
emancipation impossible. ix

In the same vein, Mary Daly noted that the Hebrew tradition and Greek philosophy had shaped
the moral teaching of the Bible. Futhermore, according to Daly the Aristotelian- Thomistic
teaching on fixed natures of men and women had contributed to the idea of women’s special
sinfulness. Eve – the woman who succumbed to temptation in paradise- was viewed as morally
inferior to Adam, whose demise she crafted. Because of this Daly reasoned, women became the
“devil”s most fearsome temptation”x Man was the embodiment of pure spirit, while woman was
the embodiment of the accursed flesh.

And of course, since woman remains always the Other, it is not held that
"reciprocally male and female are both flesh; the flesh that is for the Christian
the hostile Other is precisely woman. In her the Christian finds incarnated the
temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil. All the Fathers of the church on
the idea that she led Adam into sin.

However, it need be noted that the fall story should not be viewed as something that happened to
women alone but the entire human race. The passage in anyway does not emphasis the superiority of
man or that women is a wicked being, but clearly the fall of entire human race. As noted by Taiye Aluko, The truth of the story has been overblown because that impression was not
expressed in the context. If Adam had to neglect God’s order at the face of an offer, which came
from the wife, it meant that Adam was himself spineless and the will to disobey was inherent in
his mind. It is, therefore, expedient to state that he was a man who could not choose
appropriately when it mattered most in history. Why must the woman in turn be blame
repeatedly given this scenario?xii Meanwhile, even when women began to protest against their
civil and political degradation in the society, they were always referred to the Bible for an
answer. When they even agitate for equal opportunity in the church ministerial assignments, they
were referred to the Bible. Despite the ingenious efforts by feminists in particular to correct this,
it has proved remarkably difficult to correct popular belief and re- define Eve in more positive
terms- met with little success. One approach has been to adopt a revisionist approach to the story
itself and to re- read it, and re- interpret it in feminist term. As Rosemary Ruether concludes, the
scapegoat of Eve as the cause of the fall of Adam makes all women, as her daughters, guilty for
the radical impotence of “man “ in the face of evil, which is paid only by the death of Christ.xiii
This story and many others like that of Samson and Delilah, Ahab and Jezebel are held against
female gender in the society today.

Women as Harlot:
Women as harlot represent another negative image of women in the Old Testament. Though
women are frequently described as harlot, man is never described as harlot. This is clearly
evident in the Hebrew terms for harlotry (Zenuth) and harlot (Zonah) which connotes only
females. There is no male term for harlot in Hebrew. This shows the negative attitude towards
female sexuality. Numerous passage of the Old Testament refers to women as harlot. Warning
against loose women or harlot (Strange women are frequent in Proverbs especially 1-9). In
Prophetic writings, the identification of women as unfaithful apostate or harlot becomes so
frequent that more than two thirds of the occurrences of harlot/ harlotry, zonah/zenuthn are found
in the prophets. The notable figure is Gomer, a harlot whom God asks Prophet Hosea to marry.
But what is clear is that the writer uses a metaphor of marriage with a harlot to describe Israel’s
idolatrous relationship with Yahweh. Then Hosea makes extensive use of terms and imagery related to sexuality. The second verse of Hosea introduces the central theme of the first three chapters of the book:

when Yahweh first spoke with Hosea, Yahweh said to Hosea: Go, take yourself a wife of harlotry, and have children of harlotry. For the land commits great harlotry by departing from Yahweh (Hosea 2: 19)

As noted by Setel, “harlotry” in the specific sense of not subject to control. In the commentary work of F.I Andersen and David Noel Freedman, they are of the opinion that, the book never uses the descriptive term zonah (i.e prostitute) but uses instead, the term zenunim and the verb zonah, which they translate as “promiscuity” and to be “promiscuous” respectively. Idolatrous Israel is a harlot and adulteress, a faithless woman whoring after false gods. This is evident in Hosea 2: 15.

I will punish her for the feast days of the ba’alim (Cannanite gods) when she burnt incense to them and decked herself with her rings and jewelry, and went after lovers and forgot me.

Then another verse reads:

Let her put away her harlotries from her face, and adulteries form between her breast, lest I strip her naked and make her as in the day she was born, and make her like wilderness, and set her like a parched land, and slay her with thirst (Hosea 2: 4-5)

Their children represent God’s attitude towards Israel. God again asks Hosea to love an adulterous (Hosea 3), whether this woman refers to Gomer or another woman is not clear. The above and other prophetic metaphors in the book of Hosea mark an end and a beginning of negative images of women. They confront us with the injustice of Torah, they link injustice to other central Jewish ideas. Thus transferring the hierarchy of male and female to God and his people, the prophets enshrine in metaphor the legal subordination of women. Israel, the bride, the harlot, the people is female (that is, subordinate) in relation to God is nonetheless male communal self perception.

The covenant community is the community of the circumcised (Gen17:10), the community defined as male heads of household. Women are named through a filter of male experience; the essence of their silence. But women experience are not recorded or taken seriously because women are not perceived as normative Jews or they are part of but not define the community of Israel. While scholars suggest the marriage metaphor presented in Hosea describes the relationship between Yahweh and Israel, the metaphor itself remains controversial in its meaning and interpretation in modernity. Although metaphor is essential to all theological language because as asserted by Mollenkott, “it is from metaphor that we can best get hold of something afresh” But a central issue of contemporary religious feminists concern is the extent to which the use of these (and other) Biblical writings continues to define women in our societies.
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This symbolism of the hierarchical relationship has been one of the most damaging images of women in the Old Testament. It introduces the themes of the degradation of females and their identification with the land and denies their positive role in human reproduction and nurturance. Therefore the central issue of concern here is that, to what extent has these affected women in our societies today. This will be discussed below.

The extent to which the Biblical negative images continue to define women in contemporary societies

Clearly the patriarchal Old Testament culture and writings further reinforced and affirm the negative attitude of men to women in different culture today. One would have expected by now that most men ought to have changed their attitude towards women. But the reverse is the case as most men still strictly adhere to the old cultural practices. In our society, Nigeria for example, there are still several degrading terminology, phrases and images used to describe women.

In the first place, men in most cases are never described as harlots. Then it should be noted that women alone cannot commit adultery without men, but the Jewish leaders in the Bible brought only women caught in adultery to be stoned to death. This is also true of our society. Men are not afraid of having sexual relationship and many wives. They are proud to be able to win over a woman, while a woman gets a bad name even to the extent that it would be difficult to find a suitable partner. Her reputation is so tarnished that she is not given the responsibility she would have been given had she not had sexual relationship.

On this Mary Daly claimed that the church was the promoter of the antisexual sentiments that cast women’s body as sinful, thereby stifling women’s sexuality. According to Daly, women could only overcome their special sinfulness by maintaining a perpetual virginal state. A double standard of morality therefore existed, wherein a woman had to be a virgin when she married, and thereafter was expected to remain eternally faithful to her husband. Her husband on the other hand, had the license to be promiscuous, both before and after marriage. Man suffered no disgrace as a result of his actions, whereas a promiscuous woman was punished with extreme penalties. Daly believed that this double standard reflected the Church’s patriarchal view of “women as man’s property.”

Thus, it may be said that the biblical representation of women as harlots gives support to the traditional understanding of women as “sinners”. Women get a bad name when they commit adultery while the latter do not get a bad reputation for the same action. Women have to submit meekly to this ideology (by her action the husband will change) (not by his action the wife will change) which blinds and marginalizes them.

Also, women’s importance is derived from her role as mother. Motherhood is the focus of her economic activity and her life. She earns more respect when she gives birth, and more importantly to male children. The importance attached to children is best seeing in the Yoruba oral genres which reads:

Omo niyi, omo nide, omo la’so
Omo ni l’wo’le de ni l’ojo ale
Literary means, children guarantee prestige,
Children are as brass
Then we have another one which reads:
omo omo osin, omo l’afe aye
Meaning children are to be
revered because they constitute
essence of life

Therefore, a woman with problem of fertility would go to any length to ensure they produce children. Women typically bear the social burden of childlessness even male infertility is socially acknowledged. In addition, women married to infertile men experience diminished gender identity and threats of male-initiated divorce. Besides a lot of derogatory language and statements are passed on such women. People call her ‘iya agan’ (barren woman) and in another way render thus:

B’oya gbogbo omo to ye ko bi laye o
o ti bi s’orun (maybe all the children she ought to have
given birth to had been delivered by her to the spirit world)

From the above, it could be inferred that social consequences of infertility place poor rural and urban women in Nigeria at the centre of a web of tumultuous relationship to spouses, in laws, and neighbors. Women are blamed for failure to conceive, and they often face threats of harassment, and community ostracism. Such women are haunted by condition (why am I living if I don’t have any children) not just in family and social settings, but also out of fear that husbands will continue to maltreat them. People think that if a woman has no children, a man is feeding her for nothing, observes one informant, “I worry all the time” says another.

Then, a woman that gives birth to only female child are treated with disdain in some cultural setting. In Yoruba culture for example, the birth of a male child is better news than that of a female. A female child does not have much claim to their father’s property as the male child. A woman once lied to her doctor that the three children she had at home were females. Unfortunately the result of the scan revealed a baby girl and the woman fainted on hearing this, clearly the implication of this is that, a woman with only female children in some cases are being despised by in laws and sometimes the husband, although she consoles herself because she is not barren. In fact, there is a popular saying for women in this situation, it reads:

Kaka ko san lara iya aje ofi gbogbo omo bi obinrin
A witch could have been better off,
instead she continues to give birth to female children
Asewo lo tun bi
She give birth to harlot
Eni bi obinrin ko ri omo bi
He who has a female child is as good as a barren woman
Obinrin l’odale, obinrin l’eke
E ma finu han f’obinrin
Women are betrayers, and traitors;
Do not divulge secrets to them.
Obinrin ko se fi inu han.
From the above one could see that the proverbs are a form of violence against women. However, from the sayings of male herbalist’s, women who are witches are accorded recognition as they seek for their assistance in knotty cases and this produce statements like:

O dowo eyin iya mi agba, literally,
I am committing everything to the mothers,
that is, the female witches

The above asserts to the positive roles of some women who are branded as aje (witches), among the Yoruba\textsuperscript{xxi}. The latter was used in negative way but the former portrays the positive image of women. Indeed, it needs to be noted that terms referring to females are debasing, it become negative in the middle instances and abusive in the extremes.

Moreover, women’s menstrual cycle is also seen as a taboo in religious ritual. On this, Olajubu writes;

Restriction and prohibitions based on the women’s physiological make up are a common denomination to women’s role in religion. Menstrual blood associated as it is nature of mystery, awe and pollution has been a bone of contention limiting women’s role in religion across cultures in history\textsuperscript{xxii}.

In other words, menstruating women are barred from the sacred place for fear of contamination or in order to avoid power clash. In the name of religion, women have been downgraded, rendered subservient and relegated to the background of progress and development. After all, the menstrual cycle of women ensures her productivity and giving birth to a baby does not contaminate the woman in anyway. Ironically nobody ever talks of men that would come from a bad mission like adultery, fraud and some other vices and still mount the pulpit. One must therefore begin to see the significance of the latter in terms of joy, peace and hope that it will bring to a family. While the other vices committed could result in sorrow, fear and death if caught.

Lastly, there are some linguistic practices that define females in a negative way. For example, it is common to hear women in the rural areas being referred to as Eru (Slave), or this slogan, ale l’eru ti n jeun or eru ile yi da, meaning the slaves eat on the ground, where is the slaves of this house?

The above statement implies subservience. The selective use of laws and language and their imposition have been a bulwark in the formation of the woman’s image. Besides such semantic degradation is not evidence for male. Some of the words and phrases had their roots in the bible. The canon and the civil law, church and state, priest and legislators, all political parties and religious denominations have alike taught that women was made after man and for man, an inferior being, subject to man. Creeds, codes, scriptures and statues are all based on this idea. The fashions, form, ceremonies and customs of societies, church ordinances and discipline all grow out of this idea.

Equally, pornography is one of the means being used today to degrade women in our society. According to Catherine Mackinnon, who has written on and debated the issue of pornography at
length, pornography can be defined as the graphic, sexually explicit subordination of women through pictures and/or words. She says pornography includes one or more of the following: women presented as dehumanized sexual objects, things, or commodities; shown as enjoying humiliation, pain or sexual assault, tied up, mutilated, or physically hurt, depicted in postures or positions of sexual submission or servility; shown with body parts— including though not limited to vagina, breasts, or buttocks—exhibited such that women are reduced to those parts; women penetrated by animals or objects; and women presented in scenarios of degradation, humiliation, torture, shown as filthy or inferior, bleeding, bruised, or hurt in a context that makes this conditions sexual. Although, many people do not oppose pornography because they feel that it represents free speech or because they feel that the women have chosen to be part of it, or because they like the articles in these magazines. This is especially true because some see pornography as a mark of sexual freedom. However, John Stoltenberg explains how sexual freedom requires sexual justice and suggests that pornography is a violation of this justice rather than an expression of it. He writes about pornography in the context of gender and male domination in society.

Search for positive language and Images for women

One of the most powerful influences in molding and maintaining gender oppression is language. The language used in the bible though metaphorical, but those images sometimes become understood literally rather than metaphorical ways. So instead, there is need for new forms of expression about women. This search begins through the interpretation of tradition as it is recorded in the biblical experience and an examination of the names we use to refer to God.

To deal faithfully with the scriptures, it is necessary to be conscious of the way in which the event has been interpreted in various cultural contexts. It is not only to understand these developments but also to make clear the importance of continued interpretation that helps the message of the bible become good news in present society.

The way we use language reflects images in their lives and the patterns of their social behavior. As social patterns and images in the church and society change, this may have an effect on our language so that it becomes more inclusive of those who find themselves left out. One way to help such changes to come about is to begin now by taking the trouble to include others in the way we speak by changing our own linguistic models. According to feminist theory, linguistic symbols gave shape to the way people acted. But, they noted, if people’s behavior changed, then the traditional linguistic symbols were challenged. According to feminists, changing the linguistic symbols would then reciprocally reinforce and initiate further changes in behavior. Russell proposed that this was the case with the language used by the Church.
Equally women were encouraged by Ruether that anything that legitimized and recognized the full value of the female could be viewed as canonical. She submits that:

We can read between the lines of patriarchal texts and find fragments of our own (i.e., woman’s) experience that were not completely erased. We can also find, outside of canonized texts, remains of alternative communities that reflect either the greater awe and fear of female power denied in later patriarchy or questionings of male domination in groups where women did enter into critical dialogue. Whether anathematized and declared heretical or just overlooked, some of these texts are recoverable. We can resurrect them, gather them together, and begin to glimpse the larger story of our experience. In so doing, we read canonical, patriarchal texts in a new light. They lose their normative status and we read them critically in the light of that larger reality that they hide and deny. In the process, a new norm emerges on which to construct a new community, a new theology, eventually a new canon.\textsuperscript{xxv}

It is our theological and ethical tasks as men and women to redefine man-woman relations neither in terms of superiority and inferiority nor in terms one (man) holy and the other women unholy and sinner. Then, Jesus attitude towards women in general and particularly to the Samaritan women who was called a sinner (John 4) should be emulated. His attitude has turned the patriarchal value system upside down.

In conclusion, women should draw strength and meaning from those negative images. Developing self-esteem and self worth is essential, for women in order to move out of the circumscribed limits which corrupt and tradition has marked out for them. As rightly observed by Ruether, she claimed that stories became authoritative through community use in a historical movement of liberation. This was true, she said, for the patriarchal text of the Old Testament, complied by the nation of Israel in its struggle for liberation. Like the Jewish nation, women - as an oppressed group- were free to choose their own authoritative stories, which were paradigms of redemptive experience for them, so that these new stories, through community use, could become a new authoritative canon. Reuther explained:

So feminism… recognizing that patriarchal texts deform the liberating Spirit for women, rejects a theology confined to commentary on past texts. We are not only to free to reclaim rejected texts of the past and put them side by side with canonized texts as expression of truth, in the light of which canonized texts may be criticized, but we are also free to generate new stories from our own experience that may, through community use, become more than personal or individual. They may become authoritative stories, for it is precisely through community use in a historical movement of liberation, which finds in them paradigms of redemptive experience, that stories become authoritative.\textsuperscript{xxvi}
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