SUBMISSION AND RECEIPT OF CLASS OF 2008
COMPLETED RABBINIC THESIS

I, Dean Shapiro (Please print), hereby submit two (2) copies of my/our completed thesis in final form, entitled

Journeying To Wholeness:

Towards A Psycho-Symbolic Reading of Torah

Dean Shapiro February 28, 2008
Student Signature / Date:

Additional Students, if applicable (please print, sign, and date)

"The author has my permission to submit this thesis in partial fulfillment for requirement for ordination."

Name of Advisor: Tamara Cohn Eskenazi

Signature of Advisor: Tamara Cohn Eskenazi

RECEIPT BY REGISTRAR

The above named thesis was received by the Registrar's Office

2/28/08
Date

Carol Loyer
Registrar

by

Journeying to Wholeness:
Towards a Psycho-Symbolic Reading of Torah

Dean Shapiro

Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, Advisor

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Rabbinic Ordination
Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion
Los Angeles, California

February 28, 2008

לחיים.

My sincere thanks to Professor Tamara Cohn Eskenazi who, with great generosity, shared both her wisdom and graciousness with me in agreeing to supervise this project even during her sabbatical. I am deeply appreciative of the faculty of Hebrew Union College/Los Angeles, especially Beatrice Lawrence for wandering with me through the overlapping fields of Bible, Jungian Thought, and Cinema, and Dr. Dvora Weisberg, my academic advisor. I would also like to express my thanks to Dr. Chris Milton for sharing his Jungian perspective with me. I am indebted to the several librarians who aided me in my research, including Sheryl Stahl and Joel Moss of Hebrew Union College, and Nancy Forbes of the C.G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles.

Rabbi Denise L. Eger has been an eager supporter and dear friend for many years, and I have only reached this point because of her enthusiastic encouragement. In our monthly sessions, first in someone's living room and eventually around a real table, she introduced me to the joys of adult Torah study, and showed me I had something to contribute.

I would especially like to express my gratitude to my teacher, Jim Hosney, who presented the world of myth and symbol to me, and in so doing opened my mind to extraordinary possibilities. He is the unnamed "eish" to my Joseph, the man who pointed a boy in the right direction, and sent him on the journey of a lifetime.

I am grateful to my parents, Lynne Shapiro and Bernard and Vicki Shapiro, for so much, including the extraordinary education they have provided me. It has offered me endless opportunities to grow, encounter, think, appreciate, and refine.

Profound thanks belong to my classmates and friends, especially my study partner Kate Speizer. Thank you all for your wisdom, companionship, encouragement, and support.

And, most of all, to Haim Ainsworth, who has shared his life, and the kitchen table, with me.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Bible is very much in vogue in Contemporary America. Believers, strong in number, base their life choices on its teachings, and presidential candidates quote it and promise to uphold it. This attention is due, at least in large part, to the strength—political, statistical, and financial—of the Christian Evangelical Movement. While that movement reads the Bible fervently, it also does so literally. Evangelicals believe that every word of Scripture is literally true. Yet this approach is antithetical to the Jewish way of reading Scripture, which has been polyvalent and multivocal since Classical Antiquity, if not before. The Midrash and Talmud record the Jewish understanding that Scripture possesses many meanings as well as many voices.

Judaism professes several overlapping modes of reading. These certainly include the literal (frequently called the *pshat*, or "simple" as well as "contextual" meaning), but also the symbolic (*remez*, meaning "hint"), interpretive (*drash*), mystical (*sod*, for "secret"), literary, and historical-critical. In this essay, I will explore yet another mode: the psycho-symbolic. It exists along with the others as one of several lenses one can don to read Scripture, a system that allows the text to yield meanings that are both new and consequential. If only the literalists knew how much more vivid, complex, and compelling sacred Scripture is when alternate readings are entertained. I hope to make

the psycho-symbolic lens a bit less opaque and demonstrate its value alongside other such lenses.

Psycho-symbolism means that the characters, places, and objects in the text are read not simply in and of themselves, but are understood as symbols. This means that they are encapsulations of a range of complex ideas. More specifically, some of these symbols relate to the structure of the human mind from which they spring and within which they resonate so deeply. They tell us about ourselves, and do so using the language of psychology, a primary way we human beings understand in our times. They are expressions of the invisible aspects of the conscious and unconscious.

For me, the Torah's power lies in its continuing capacity to help human beings understand ourselves and the mystery of our existence, our relationships with each other, and to the wider world. The Torah would have ceased to exist long ago if it did not do so. Beginning around the turn of the twentieth century with the work of Sigmund Freud, psychology has become a primary way in which human beings understand themselves. Since the Torah is no mere instruction manual, but rather a nuanced, layered, and open-ended treatise on the human condition, it offers profound psychological insights. It employs the language of symbols to convey such complex ideas. For these reasons, a psycho-symbolic reading of the Torah is both possible and beneficial.

In my exploration of this mode of reading, I draw primarily on the work of psychiatrist and psychologist C.G. Jung, who established and clarified the relationship between the symbols appearing in art, myth, and dream and the aspects of human existence contained in the psyche. He maintained that these exist in a reservoir of images to which we are all connected and on which we all draw—the collective unconscious.

They well up from time to time and become manifest for a particular person, crossing the boundaries from the collective to the individual and from the unconscious into the conscious where we can become aware of them. Similarly, when a particular symbol or story resonates deeply, it has triggered a connection with the collective unconscious, and a vast array of associations is made. No thing stands alone, but instead exists within a wider set of associations.

Depth psychology studies the human unconscious. Freud and Jung, its early explorers, held that depth psychology could unlock the unconscious and bring its contents to light. Dreams, spontaneous reactions, and art are all conduits through which the contents of the unconscious are revealed. Yet the unconscious does not speak in the language of the conscious. Instead, it uses symbols to express itself—a language not easily understood at first by the conscious mind. Symbols, embedded in dreams and art, can be decoded and/or experienced using the tools of depth psychology. In this way, the mind of the creator and, through it, the human psyche, are revealed.

More than Freud, Jung applied the tools of depth psychology to literature and mythology. While Jung considered the myths of many cultures, Wayne Rollins points out that he cites no document more often than the Bible (1999, 46). "The degree of Jung's critical interest in the Bible, its worldview, its images and symbols, and its interpretation in the modern world is unparalleled in the life and work of any twentieth-century psychologist" (46-7). This is hardly surprising, as Rollins notes, considering Jung's upbringing as the son of a Swiss Reformed Protestant minister, just one of the many clerics in the family. Jung was steeped in Scripture from childhood.

Yet, to Jung, the religion of his fathers sacrificed "mystery and numinosity" in its cold, literal approach, denying the "God within." (C.G. Jung, *Letters*, 2, quoted in Rollins, 47) Jung understood that the interior life was richer than his family's religion allowed. He was also exposed to biblical scholarship, but felt that it, too, suppressed the numinous by splitting the Bible from living religion and demythologizing symbols. Instead, Jung explored a different path.

According to Rollins,

> Jung likened his critical approach to the Bible to that of Wilhelm de Wette (1780-1849), initiator of the historical-critical approach to the Pentateuch and friend of Jung's grandfather, whose hermeneutical method was to 'mythize' or extract the 'symbolic value' of 'marvelous' Bible stories rather than concentrate exclusively on their literal meaning. (48, citing Jung's *Letters* 2:88, 89, 91, and 115-116.)

There can be no doubt of the importance Jung placed on biblical study. "We must read the Bible or we shall not understand psychology. Our psychology, whole lives, our language and imagery are built upon the Bible," he said (Rollins, 49, citing Jung's *Visions*, 1:156). Symbols, characters, and stories in the text are read to reveal the human condition.

Despite this devotion, according to Peter Homans, "Jung does not provide a full-blown hermeneutical system" (Rollins, 52). This was not his intention. Instead, creating such a comprehensive mode of textual analysis was left to later scholars—work that has continued but not, as yet, been satisfactorily realized from a Jewish perspective.

Rollins, a Christian scholar of religion, calls for a "renewed exegetical appreciation of the archetypal, polyvalent, and polyfunctional character of biblical symbols. This will add psychological insight to the work of contextual, feminist, reader-response, ideological, rhetorical, and autocritographical critics who have already

advanced theories on the multiple meanings of biblical texts and images" (119). The purpose of this essay is to engage in that appreciation by applying the methods of depth psychology to the Torah--to the Bible in a Jewish context.

I hope to articulate a psycho-symbolic mode of reading that sits wholly within the basket of Jewish hermeneutics, that is to say, that draws on Jewish tradition, theology, and modes of reading sacred Text even as it partakes of a wider world of culture and ideas. Underlying my investigations are questions such as: How do we read our tradition differently once we have been exposed to other ideas? What light do they shed on Jewish texts? The stories and modes of reading of world literature are unquestionably valid, inspiring, and beautiful in and of themselves. My task in this essay is to explore what they can bring to Jewish reading. We are blessed to live in a moment when we can experience other cultures safely and openly. How do Jews read our own texts when we do so by other peoples' light? As a modern man with global consciousness, I want to expose myself to other ways of life and understandings of the world. But this encounter does not mean that Jewish particularity dissolves away in the stew of the global melting pot. Rather, this essay is an exploration of the viability of learning from the big, wonderful world *and* returning home enhanced and expanded. Opened wider for having looked at the world, my eyes will, I hope, see my self, my people, and my tradition differently—and more meaningfully. When we do this, we all benefit. As I will attempt to demonstrate in this essay, my Judaism is enhanced and deepened for the experience.

I use the term "Torah" to indicate a distinctly Jewish experience of the text. I am applying Jung to a Jewish text, not world text. I do not strive to understand Jung through the use of Hebrew Scripture, but rather to deepen my reading of Hebrew Scripture by

applying Jung's insights. I make a small attempt to craft a Jewish vocabulary for psycho-symbolic reading.

To explore a psycho-symbolic hermeneutic of Jewish text, I must first select a text. Others have written on this topic, including J. Marvin Spiegelman and Levi Meier who employed general approaches using a range of texts, and Yehezkel Kluger specifically on Ruth. Jung himself refers to many "Old Testament" characters in his analysis, and Christian thinkers, including Rollins, John A. Sanford and the prolific Edward F. Edinger, among others, have applied his work to Scripture. For me, however, the choice of text was clear: Joseph. The Book of Genesis tells the story of Joseph, son of Jacob and Rachel and one of thirteen children, a tale of treachery and exaltation. The Torah devotes thirteen chapters to the story of Joseph and his brothers (Genesis 37-50), as if it cannot get enough of him. One reason to work with Joseph is that there is, simply, so much compelling material.

But there are additional specifics to his story that make this kind of analysis particularly fitting. Joseph is a good template for the study of human psychology because he is portrayed as one who goes on a long journey comprised of many phases. In this he is much like a real person, whose life and personality evolves over time. Joseph's is a varied "life" that fills many roles, each one expressing an archetype, a paradigmatic expression of an essential human experience. His "life" is a series of chapters within a unified and skillfully crafted narrative. His story echoes the essential human experience, a journey through time which takes us through many phases. In it, we can see depicted important aspects of Jung's process of individuation, the development of the Self into its full potential.

What Jung identifies as the process of individuation, Joseph Campbell sees in the hero-myth present in many cultures. This hero-myth describes the adventures of a powerful figure, and typically follows certain key steps. For Campbell, the hero's journey is the placement of full psychic development onto a character, his travails, and accomplices. There are many ways in which the Torah's story of Joseph parallels the Hero's Journey, yet there are as well key places in which the Joseph story does not match Campbell's mono-myth. These differences may indicate the Biblical author's intentions, assumptions, or biases. Another important benefit of the study of the Joseph story is that it can serve as a forum for the exploration of the process of individuation.

Importantly for this study, Joseph is depicted as a dreamer and interpreter of dreams. There are six dreams in his story—two of his own (Genesis 37:6-7 and 37:9), and four he interprets (Genesis 40:9-11, 40:16-17, 41:1-4, and 41:5-7). Joseph, then, lives the hermeneutic I am presenting: he understands that words have multiple meanings and that they can be interpreted. The narrator indicates that Joseph understands that stories tell us something important about ourselves; they are not mere narrative, but symbolic worlds that point to even greater truths. Although one needs to be careful in using such language, Joseph, as he appears in Genesis, seems to understand that dreams contain symbols and that they are received—for Joseph, from God, for C.G. Jung, from the collective unconscious.

Meir Sternberg considers two possibilities for the use of dream in the Torah:

> The context of Genesis, notably Joseph's own history, elucidates the dream's existential status within the represented world and its compositional status within the discourse. The modern view of the dream as the expression of internal states and stresses has its precedents in antiquity. One thinks of Homer (Penelope's ambivalent attitude to the Suitors surfacing in the dream where see sees herself crying because the eagle-Odysseus has killed off her flock of geese); of rabbinic thought ("A man is shown in a dream only what is suggested by his own thoughts" [*Berakhoth* 55b]; or even of the Bible's own prophecy and wisdom books (e.g., "A hungry man dreams, and behold, he is eating, and he awakes with his hunger unsatisfied" [Isa 29:8]). Yet this conception is alien to the spirit of biblical narrative. Here, as always in the Icelandic saga, the dream is not an internal but an external sign; not subjective and questionable but objective and infallible; not an illumination of the past and the present but of the future. In terms of the Bible's reality-model, the dream projects a divine scenario, and in compositional terms, a foreshadowing on the part of the narrator. This is the case with the dreams of the young Joseph (chapter 37) and of the imprisoned ministers (chapter 40); and Pharaoh's dream follows suit. (395)

While this elucidating goes far to contextualize and explain the function of dream in the Torah, depth psychology offers a third option: dream is an indication of the unconscious at work. The dream may be an indication of the character's "own" unconscious, or the collective unconscious may be at work. The dream may be a manifestation of the author's own unconscious, or the collective unconscious may be working through the author. The author is tipping his or her hand that the psyche is at play; dream is an invitation to examine a sequence and/or character from a psychological perspective. This essay is my way of accepting the invitation.

Also, Joseph speaks to me. The story captured my attention as a boy and has not yet let me go. Each time I encounter it, I see something new, whether about the text, the world, or myself. I identify with him personally, and find that echoes of his story

resound through my life again and again. This thesis is an opportunity to delve into the Joseph narrative in a scholarly way.

Finally, I see a parallel between the enterprise undertaken in this essay and the Joseph story. As outlined above, I believe that venturing into the non-Jewish world can create benefit for Jewry. In a similar sense, Joseph goes out into the world, albeit against his will. In so doing, he saves his people.

Some people question the appropriateness of using the work of C.G. Jung, particularly in a Jewish context. Jung has been accused of Nazi sympathies. Since a full analysis of the historical record is beyond my capacity, I have relied on essays on the subject by Rabbi Levi Meier and Stanley Grossman to help me consider this charge.

Based on their research and analysis, I conclude that there is certainly reason for caution about Jung vis-à-vis National Socialism and Antisemitism, but certainly no basis to consider him a Nazi. Most simply, Grossman writes, "while he showed some hesitations, the overall impression conveyed by the statements Jung made during the 1930s on the National Socialist regime show that he was relatively sympathetic" (96). According to Grossman's study, Jung wrote early in Hitler's career honoring him as a leader (93). Some language critical of the regime appears later, as well as some that can be ready as clearly in support of both Hitler and the S.S. (94, 95).

It seems more reasonable to surmise that Jung shared some beliefs with National Socialism than that he held Nazi stances. As Grossman puts it, it "would be difficult to deny that Jung contributed to the attempt to formulate a German psychotherapy which recognized the unique and dynamic aspects of the Aryan mind, a task which the Nazis sought to foster" (Grossman 98). Grossman further quotes remarks by Jung disparaging

Jews and Jewish culture and citing differences between the Jewish and Aryan minds (97). This includes a statement, published in a 1933 issue of *Zentralblatt*, of Aryan mental superiority (96). Grossman typifies these comments as in line with German stereotyped depictions of Jews at the time. In a redemptive move, Grossman points out that "the racial categories (Jung) employed were so widely disseminated in the German cultural milieu of the early twentieth century as to make them appear objective and impersonal," although incorrect (117). These observations make me cautious about Jung, and remind me to understand him as a man of his time; I do not find them sufficient to reject all of Jung's work.

Distressing as Jung's statements are, it seems to me more important to note of Jung that he and National Socialism shared several major themes. It is certain that he believed in the existence of both personal and national ("volk") psychologies. Observing the presence of the "shadow," he believed that the German nation was typified by the myths of Faust and Wotan (Grossman, 101-2). Further, according to Grossman,

> another factor which made (Jung) sympathetic toward the German regime as well as making him acceptable to it was a current of romanticism that was deeply embedded in his work: that is, an emphasis on the emotional and irrational, on fantasy, symbol and myth; a belief in the merits of synthesis over those of the dissecting intellect; and a reference for nature and the organic. (100)

These beliefs certainly transcend Nazi ideology.

Meier cites a letter from Gershom Scholem outlining the later's discussion about Jung with Leo Baeck. In it, Baeck describes how he and Jung "cleared up everything" and reached an amiable understanding when they met following the war (9).

We must be cautious about Jung's ideas relating to national psychology, but not throw away Jung's contributions there or his claims about individual psychology. The

bulk of this essay draws from the latter, and will not, I hope, offend the reader by relying on a man who admitted making mistakes during the darkest of days for the Jewish people and Europe.

To present a psycho-symbolic hermeneutic of the Torah, I will consider the overarching narrative before focusing on three powerful elements of the Joseph cycle: Joseph and his brothers, The Pit, and The Cup. These are, respectively, people, a place and a thing, but more than that, each provides an opportunity to explore an aspect of a psycho-symbolic hermeneutic. Chapter One presents an exegetical exploration of a psycho-symbolic reading of Torah. It principally considers the character of Joseph and his encounter with different aspects of the psyche as represented by other characters. The encounters between Joseph and the others in the first half of his story are read as metaphors for the process of individuation. Chapter One also compares the narrative of Joseph to Campbell's understanding of the Hero's Journey. Chapter Two, on the Pit, allows me to explore the application of universal systems of meaning/world literature to understand the text of the Torah, and to demonstrate the value of reading the Torah through eyes expanded in such a way. The Pit is a site of transformation and rebirth and plays a dramatic role in Joseph's story. Chapter Three uses the Cup to consider the meanings of symbols seen through the lens of depth psychology. I will use the Cup to demonstrate how the tension established in the first half of the Joseph cycle (and described in Chapter One) is resolved as the character of Joseph develops. In this way, I hope to present a coherent reading that pays attention to both psychological and symbolic dimensions.

A mode of reading the Torah is far more than the sum of its parts, but I am hopeful that these three considerations will point the way towards an integrated, holistic hermeneutic, another way of understanding Jewish sacred text that only complements and never detracts from other, more established modes of reading. When the youthful Joseph left his home that long-ago morning, he was unprepared for the extraordinary journey that would become his life. It is my hope that this brief introduction has served as a sufficient preparation as we journey together through the story of Joseph.

Chapter One:

Joseph as the Psyche

One of the appeals of the Joseph story is that it tells of a life in distinct stages, from boy to slave to prisoner to "Prime Minister." In this way, his story reflects the human experience of life in stages, as described by psychologists who employ this structure to describe human development. Since Joseph's story is literature, not life, each stage and development can be analyzed in an attempt to understand the human journey better. Each encounter can be approached as a symbolic representation of the growth of a human being, an encapsulation of a nuanced and complex reality that would otherwise be impossible to convey. The task of the psycho-symbolic reader is to decipher the text's clues and apply them—both to the human condition and to his or her own life.

In contemporary psychology, stage theories of human development indicate their author's emphases. Some, like that of Jean Piaget, stress the functional aspect. Piaget tracks a child's development through four stages, Sensorimotor, Preoperational, Concrete Operational, and Formal Operational. Lawrence Kohlberg, on the other hand, focuses on the social. To convey the human journey, he describes a progression from The Stage of Punishment and Obedience to The Stage of Individual Instrumental Purpose and Exchange, through The Stage of Mutual Interpersonal Expectations, Relationships, and

Conformity. The Stage of Social System and Conscience Maintenance, past The Stage of Prior Rights and Social Contract or Utility, and onto The Stage of Universal Ethical Principles (Roberta Louis Goodman). As a person moves across these stages, he or she grows.

Erik Erikson takes a different approach. Although not considered a stage theorist (because he believes that previous phases of life can be reworked if realized unsuccessfully), he nonetheless conceives of life as a series of primary tasks to be completed for optimum psychic, emotional, and social health. Each is a conflict that provides benefit when successfully completed: Trust vs. Mistrust, leading to Hope, Autonomy vs. Shame and Doubt, leading to Willpower, Initiative vs. Guild, leading to Prosperity, Industry vs. Inferiority, leading to Competence, Identity vs. Role Confusion, leading to Fidelity, Intimacy vs. Isolation, leading to Love, Generativity vs. Stagnation, leading to Care, and, lastly, Ego Integration vs. Despair leading to Wisdom (Goodman).

C.G. Jung understood human growth to occur in stages, too. He divided life into first and second halves, focusing primarily on the second half (while Freud stressed the first). In the first half, according to Jean Dalby Clift and Wallace Clift, Jung identified several primary tasks: getting established, acquiring the tools for education, finding a partner, creating a home, and establishing a business. The drives for sex and power are strong in this phase. Psychically, the individual learns to differentiate his or her own ego from the parents. This occurs especially during puberty. The individual crafts a persona to mediate between himself and the social world, and must grapple with conflicts arising from sexuality and feelings of inferiority. Although the tasks of the first half of life are primarily external, ego and persona are aspects of the psyche shaped in this time.

In the second half of life, Jung felt, one deals more with the inner world. It intrigued him more for this reason. Consciousness has the potential to expand in the "afternoon of life," allowing a person to move beyond providing for him- or herself, and, possibly, towards self understanding (Clift and Clift, 17). Jung called this journey of self enlightenment and actualization the "process of individuation." While not all people may engage with it, Jung thought, it certainly exists as a potential. This is where Jung focused much of his energy.

Individuation is a quest for inner harmony and wholeness—that is, "in-divisibility." Jung described it as "an attitude that is beyond the reach of emotional entanglements and violent shocks—a consciousness detached from the world" and as "the psychological process that makes of a human being an 'individual'—a unique, indivisible unit or 'whole man'" ("Commentary on 'The Secret of the Golden Flower,'" in *Alchemical Studies, Collected Works*, 13, 46, quoted in Anthony Storr, 81 and Jung 1952, 3, respectively).

This development comes over time, the result of a series of transformations within oneself. Jung understood these transformations to occur in conjunction with encounters with different archetypal figures, each of which was emblematic of an aspect of the psyche. In the process of individuation, one might integrate the learning gained from such an encounter and thereby achieve a more functional relationship with the Self. Primary among these archetypes are the shadow and the anima/animus, aspects of psyche arising from the unconscious—hidden, therefore, to the conscious mind. "The actual process of individuation" is "the conscious coming-to-terms with one's own inner center (psychic nucleus)" (Marie-Louise Von Franz 1964, 166). "If a man is to reach serenity

and that harmony within himself which, for Jung, became the goal of life, he must rediscover those aspects of himself which have been neglected" (Storr, 80). Those driving forces in a personality, powerful but veiled by the unconscious, can be revealed and integrated into a wise and unified sense of self.

As such, we might apply the Hebrew word שלום/*shalom* to the process of individuation. Shalom means not only "peace" but also "wholeness" or, more loosely but entirely legitimately, "completeness" or "integrity," from the root מ.ל.ש. The quest for wholeness that is the process of individuation is, then, the quest for inner *shalom*.

Why does the process of individuation typically occur in the second half of life? As Storr observes, "the importance of Jung's description of the process of individuation and the experience of the Self lies in the fact that he recognized that, for many intelligent and able people, the attainment of Freud's goals of 'honor, power, wealth, fame, and the love of women' are not enough" (99). Once existential needs and social requirements are met in the first half of life, interiority is free to blossom. In this way, a person who spends decades building up his own sense of self in the world can come to "subordinat[e] his subjectivity to a higher, more objective goal" (Storr, 91).

Jung uses the term "Self" for the fully realized individual. The Self is the archetype of wholeness and unity, and I will consider it in greater detail in Chapter 3.

The process of individuation that is a human being's idealized maturation is expressed mythologically as the hero's journey. That is, the human being's intangible inner development is dramatized and made comprehensible through stories of the travels of a special, super-human exemplar. In Jung's words, "myths are first and foremost psychic manifestations that represent the nature of the psyche" (1952, 54). Myths can be

read not only as tales of some long-ago hero, but as "symbolic expressions for the inner and unconscious psychic drama that becomes accessible to human consciousness by way of projection" (Jung 1952, 55). Myths, then, permit us to understand aspects of humanity that cannot be expressed in other ways. Reading myths like the Joseph cycle is a way to read ourselves.

Joseph Campbell has described a "monomyth," a classic narrative pattern embraced with minor variation by countless cultures and mythologies: "A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man" (30). This composite contains, of course, several sub-stages, which Campbell outlines in greater detail and each of which is a metaphor for the psychic development of human beings. In myth, people, places, and things all constitute symbols for aspects of the psyche and its growth. "It is the business of mythology proper, and of the fairy tale, to reveal the specific dangers and techniques of the dark interior way from tragedy to comedy. Hence the incidents are fantastic and 'unreal': they represent psychological, not physical triumphs" (Campbell, 29). But the personages of myth are not raw products of the unconscious. Rather, Campbell points out, "they are not only symptoms of the unconscious (as indeed are all human thoughts and acts) but also controlled and intended statements of certain spiritual principles" (257). That is, they are crafted by human minds, tongues, and pens that apply universal truths to specific places, times, and worldviews. The Hebrew Bible both partakes in and detours from the "monomyth," as I will describe below, as appropriate for its worldview.

This human-centered reading in no way diminishes Hebrew Scripture's sanctity. For Campbell, enticingly, "it would not be too much to say that myth is the secret opening through which the inexhaustible energies of the cosmos pour into human cultural manifestation" (3). For Jung, the source of these archetypes (or "collective representations," to use Levy-Bruhl's terminology) is the collective unconscious. Unlike the *personal* unconscious, the contents of the *collective* unconscious were never conscious, but rather "pre-existent forms...which ... give definite form to certain psychic contents" (Jung 1971, 60). Further, they are not part of personal experience but rather shared by all people, a reservoir of drives and forms that exists beyond the individual personality. Individuals access the collective unconscious through dream; societies through myth. All human beings share in it, as it informs mythologies from cultures around the globe. In this way, it may be understood as the source of divine inspiration, the well from which ideas, truths, tensions, and stories take shape and flow into human awareness.

Joseph's journey offers its own way to look into the process of human development; it matches the classical hero-myth in some respects, but not in others. The differences may tell us about the Biblical author's priorities.

Our exploration of the psyche begins with the ego, for Jung the center of consciousness. It is, in his words, "never more and never less than consciousness as a whole" (1971, 141). Ego is the complicated seat of identity, the sense one has of one's own existence in mind and body through space and time (Edward Whitmont, 232).

In addition to being the center of the psyche and its awareness, Whitmont explains, ego also appears to be the originator of choices and impulses. "The ego is only

the subject of my consciousness, while Self is the subject of my totality: hence it also includes the unconscious psyche" (Jung, quoted in Whitmont, 235). In the words of Edward Edinger, "the ego is the seat of *subjective* identity while the Self is the seat of *objective* identity. The Self is thus the supreme psychic authority and subordinates the ego to it" (1973, 3).

One of the tasks of the first half of life is separation of ego, that is, consciousness, from Self, one's entirety. In infancy, a baby has no conception that there is anything other than what she's aware of in herself. Later, a sense of her bounded-ness develops, along with the concept of other-ness. Her consciousness becomes concentrated and her "I" develops and overpowers other aspects of her Self, although it is in fact not her entirety. The ego dominates and the whole world seems to exist to support it. "The child experiences himself quite literally as the center of the universe" (Edinger 1973, 12). Afterward, ideally, ego will separate from Self and a social persona will develop to mediate between inner and outer worlds, allowing a rich interiority to exist even as the world is accepted as objective reality. The individual will learn that she is more than her consciousness alone.

The experience of oneself as the center of the universe "can persist long past childhood," however, when a person holds that "external experiences [have] no inherent reality or meaning except as they relate to him" (Edinger 1973, 12). Such a person may identify with the *puer aeternus*, the eternal youth. Edinger (1973) quotes Von Franz' description of such a person, for whom his current life ...

> is *not yet* what is really wanted, and there is always the fantasy that sometime in the future the real thing will come about. If this attitude is prolonged, it means a constant inner refusal to commit oneself to the moment. With this there is often, to a smaller or greater extent, a savior complex, or a Messiah complex, with the secret thought that one day one will be able to save the world; the last word in philosophy, or religion, or politics, or art, or something else, will be found. This can go on so far as to be a typical pathological megalomania, or there may be minor traces of it in the idea that one's time 'has not yet come.' The one thing dreaded throughout by such a type of man is to be bound to anything whatever. There is a terrific fear of being pinned down, of entering space and time completely, and of being the one human being that one is. (Originally appearing in *The Problem of the Puer Aeternus*. New York, Spring Publications, Analytical Psychology Club of New York, 1970, 2.)

Regarding such a person, Edinger suggests that

> in order to make a real accomplishment he must sacrifice a number of other potentialities. He must give up his identification with original unconscious wholeness and voluntarily accept being a fragment instead of an unreal whole. To be something in reality he must give up being everything *in potentia*. The *puer aeternus* archetype is one of the images of the Self, but to be identified with it means that one never brings any reality to birth. (1973, 14)

To be a *puer aeternus* is to be stuck forever in childhood, ego and Self so fully enmeshed that the world seems unreal and one's "I" everything. When differentiation happens, however, true adulthood can follow, with an appropriate image of the greater self and healthy relationships with others. When a person relinquishes the promise of *all* for the reality of *some*, he or she is selecting a particular path among the many that exist. It is then that the mature journey begins in earnest.

A Psycho-Symbolic Reading of Torah

Reading Torah can help us understand these difficult concepts. Torah is myth, that is, the collective story of a people that conveys its meaning not simply literally but also through metaphor and symbol. In this context, I understand myth to be those national stories that make "universals concrete or intelligible" and that explicate "beliefs, collective experiences, or values" (William G. Doty, 9). Myth is a personal truth writ large and a collective truth condensed into the life of an individual. Myth is therefore a sphere in which the contents of both the psyche and the collective unconscious mingle and express themselves. A psycho-symbolic reading of Torah decodes and interprets the ancient text to see how it uses language to allow those contents into consciousness. We explore the hidden aspects of our humanity through the text.

Because the ego is the center of human consciousness, let us start to explore a psycho-symbolic reading of Torah through the story of the first human beings, Adam and Eve. Whether we use the very different stories of their creation in Genesis 1 or 2, we may understand that the couple lives undifferentiated from each other. In Genesis 1:27 they share an image, and in Genesis 2:23 their unity extends even to their bodies:

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם

"And God created the earthling in his image, in the image of God he created him, male and female he created them." (My translation)

זֹאת הַפַּעַם עֶצֶם מֵעֲצָמַי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרִי

"This time--/bone of my bones, flesh of my flesh!" (Translation Women's Torah Commentary, as are all other translations of passages from the Torah except where noted)

Like babies, whose consciousnesses are not yet separated from their entirety, all their needs are provided for. Like babies, the first humans are naked, unaware that an Other exists. The situation, however, will not last.

The serpent tempts Eve and Adam to eat the fruit.

> כִּי יֹדֵעַ אֱלֹהִים כִּי בְּיוֹם אֲכָלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקְחוּ וַיֹּאמֶר הַנָּחָשׁ אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה לֹא־מוֹת תְּמֻתוּן
> עֵינֵיכֶם וְהְיִיתֶם כֵּאלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי טוֹב וָרָע
>
> But the serpent said to the woman, 'You most certainly will not die! On the contrary: God knows that when you [plural] do eat of it, your [plural] eyes will be opened and you [plural] will be like gods, knowing all things [literally, 'good and bad']. (Genesis 3:4-5)

The fruit comes from עֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע/the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad or, understood more expansively, perhaps, the Tree of Consciousness of Duality. The fruit of the tree, placed at the very center of the garden, represents an awareness of distinction, or separation. In this story, Eden is the Self, and Adam and Eve represent the ego, becoming aware of its distinction and drawing away. This is the opening of the eye/I. It is therefore no surprise that the couple's first act is to create clothing, representing both the move away from infancy and also an exploration of the next step of psychic development, the persona.

At this moment, when a human being first adopts an identity, he begins to leave the absolute (self) centeredness of infancy represented by the garden which was entirely

his and in which all existed to fulfill his needs. This may be experienced as an expulsion. Adam and Eve move from an existence of pure potential out into the world. The pain they experience is that of lost options: in walking one particular path, others are left unexplored and unknown. From union, the pair is now at odds with each other, demonstrated by the ways they account for their actions and inscribed in the punishments. Original wholeness is lost; identity carries a price.

Interestingly, Neumann describes the state of complete identification of ego with Self using the symbol of the uroborus, the tail-eating serpent (Edinger 1973, 7). After the expulsion, once ego and Self are differentiated, that snake will bite Eve instead.

We may also understand Exodus 32 to describe the separation of ego from Self. On the summit of Mount Sinai, Moses has a direct, unmediated experience of God, like an ego lost within Self. But when Moses returns down the mountain into society, the experience of unity is shattered, just like "שְׁנֵי לֻחֹ֥ת הָעֵדֻ֖ת/two tablets of the Pact."

Once the ego of a person has adequately emerged from the Self, he or she begins to shape a persona. Derived from the Greek for theatrical mask, a persona is the face we present to others, a representative of the roles we play in society. The persona is the interface between social expectations and internal subjectivity.

> This first persona pattern is made up of collective cultural codes of behavior and value judgment as they are expressed and transmitted through the parents; at this point parental demands and the demands of the outside world in general seem identical. In the course of adequate psychological development it is necessary for a differentiation between ego and persona to occur. (Whitmont, 156)

Whitmont likens the persona to clothing, that which represents us to others even as it protects and shapes our public appearance. Clothing can also be changed and made more comfortable when appropriate. Personas are

> the expressions of the archetypal drive toward an adaptation to external reality and collectivity. Our personas represent the roles we play on the worldly stage: they are the masks we carry throughout this game of living in external reality. The persona, as representational image of the adaptation of archetype, appears in dreams in the images of clothes, uniforms and masks. (Whitmont, 156)

The Tanakh as a whole provides us several cases through which to explore the idea of persona. With its archetypical characters, the Book of Esther provides an excellent arena for the application of depth psychology to biblical text. In it, clothing, a central device throughout, functions as an indicator of persona in the interplay between public and private identities. In the Torah, the Priestly garb is described in high detail, another example of the use of clothing to create persona. Of course garments play a crucial role in the story of Joseph.

Esther, a young woman married to Ahasuerus, Monarch of Persia, does not let it be known that she is Jewish. Her husband agrees to his vizier's desire that the Jews of the land be murdered. Even as her uncle and all the Jews of Persia fast and don sackcloth and ashes to bewail their fate, Esther is loath to admit her status. Unwilling to join in her people's collective action, Esther even sends Mordecai clothing to replace his mourner's garb. The message is clear: Esther uses clothing to indicate that she is not a member of the group. Her persona is not Jewish. But Mordecai convinces her that her Jewish identity—and obligation to her people—are paramount (4:12-16). She must intervene on the Jews' behalf, even though presenting herself before the King imperils her life.

וַיְהִי בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי וַתִּלְבַּשׁ אֶסְתֵּר מַלְכוּת וַתַּעֲמֹד בַּחֲצַר בֵּית־הַמֶּלֶךְ

> And on the third day, Esther donned royalty and stood in the courtyard of the king's palace... (5:1, my translation)

Esther wears this identity publicly, showing it to the world. For the first time, she dresses in royal responsibility to greet the king; for the first time, she assumes the leader's mantle. To be received as a queen, she must dress as a queen. In this moment, she becomes a queen. Her exterior matches her interior even as her royalty masks the fear she must have felt as she approached the monarch. Her clothing symbolizes her public persona, and an identity that, for the first time in the story, goes beyond "Jewess."

In several places, Torah describes the sacred finery Aaron and the Priests are to wear: Exodus 28, 39, and Leviticus 8:6, among others. The finery includes a fringed tunic, sash, robe adorned with tiny bells and pomegranates, ephod, breast piece and headdress declaring "קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה"/Holy to YHVH" (Exodus 28:36). The priests are required to dress in this sacred clothing when they perform cultic rites; they declare their holiness through their ritualized garb, as they declare that they are not acting solely on their own behalf, but as intercessors between the community and God.

The Tanakh is evidently familiar with the notion of public and private identities. Further, it understands clothing to be a distinction between these two, symbolic of persona, that psychic entity that sits on the border between inner and outer worlds.

Two other important archetypes contained in the psyche make themselves known once an individual has crafted an intact identity. These are shadow and anima/animus and they, more than ego and persona, play roles in the process of individuation.

The shadow is an archetype of the collective unconscious that contains those aspects of the conscious personality that are disavowed by the ego and/or the persona and, hence, often repressed. These are typically understood as dark, primitive, or violent characteristics which society actively squelches yet which are undeniable aspects of the

human animal. They are by no means necessarily evil or counterproductive. The shadow is "that part of us which we will not allow ourselves to express" and "a dominant of the personal unconscious and consists of all those uncivilized desires and emotions that are incompatible with social standards and with the persona: it is all we are ashamed of" (June Singer, 215). It "is probably the most powerful and potentially the most dangerous of all the archetypes. It is the source of all that is best and worst in man, especially in his relations with others of the same sex" (Calvin S. Hall and Vernon J. Nordby, 48).

The hero's journey requires that he face those uncivilized, repressed, and dark aspects of himself, repulsive though they are. They are aspects of his whole, and powerful ones at that. This is why a literary or mythological hero and his villain are perfectly matched: they are aspects of the same psyche, destined to struggle until the quest is completed by their merger. For the hero to emerge victorious, he must identify the villain/shadow as his own and best it. Theseus, a classic hero from Greek mythology, is removed from the enlightened world of Athens and sent across the sea, symbolic of the unconscious. Having arrived in Crete, he discovers the secret of the underground labyrinth through the aid of the Princess Ariadne, encounters the man-beast Minotaur, and slays him. Through that violent act of union, the villain/shadow's power is released, the palace/prison of Knossos is laid waste, and Theseus is free to return home (Bryan Holme). When the hero identifies the villain/shadow as his own, he absorbs his own suppressed power and emerges victorious. When the villain conquers, it is because the hero's denial of his shadow side saps all his power in the struggle to repress it.

But the shadow is not inherently bad. It is a representation of the "psychic contents which a person prefers not to show. They are parts of oneself that one considers

unpresentable, because they seem weak, socially unacceptable, or even evil" (Mary Ann Mattoon, 25-26). Precisely because of our strong aversion to the shadow and its components, it is more accessible than the anima/animus. The two are the first steps in the process of individuation.

In the Book of Esther, the shadow finds magnificent expression in the character of Haman.

Just when the reader expects Mordecai, the uncle of Queen Esther, to be promoted for his meritorious service in revealing an act of treason, the Prime Minister, Haman, appears and receives the honor in his stead. The two are paired throughout the book: Mordecai catches Haman's specific ire when the Jew will not pay him honor, and Haman must later honor to Mordecai--Mordecai dons the clothes Haman would have worn and Haman leads Mordecai on horseback through the city square (6:11). Ultimately, Haman is impaled on the spike meant for Mordecai and Mordecai is put in charge of Haman's property (7:10). Read symbolically, every hint is offered that these two are aspects of the same being.

It is not surprising that Haman makes his appearance in Esther 3:1, precisely at this moment of (mis)promotion, for Haman, the personification of self aggrandizement, wealth, and the desire for power, is the embodiment of Mordecai's shadow. Indeed, Haman's first act in the entire book is "וַיִּמָּלֵא הָמָן חֵמָה," to be "filled with anger." These are qualities that Mordecai's persona will not allow him to recognize, yet they are aspects of his personality nonetheless. In public, Mordecai wears sack cloth (4:11), yet his shadow longs for finery. He fasts at the king's gate (4:2) while his shadow-side feasts in private.

Read through the lens of depth psychology, Mordecai's refusal to bow to Haman is not an act of religious piety or political scruples, but rather the persona's denial of the existence of its shadow nature. By not bowing to his shadow, Mordecai signals that he does not accept that his meritorious act or his niece's coronation has stirred feelings of self importance, arrogance, and hunger for power in him. He cannot acknowledge them as his own, but instead rejects his dark feelings. He has failed at an important step in his development: acknowledgement of his shadow side. Indeed, in the first passage of Esther 3, Mordecai cannot even be said to see Haman. It is Haman, in fact, who recognizes Mordecai.

וַיַּרְא הָמָן כִּי־אֵין מָרְדֳּכַי כֹּרֵעַ וּמִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה

> And Haman saw that Mordecai did not kneel or bow in reverence. (My translation)

It is this very denial that triggers the shadow's destructive path.

In a classic example of projection, when Haman addresses Ahasuerus in Esther 3, he describes himself when he notes that

> There is a certain people, scattered and dispersed among the other peoples in all the provinces of your realm, whose laws are different from those of any other people and who *do not obey the* king's *laws*; and it is not in Your Majesty's interest to tolerate them. If it please Your Majesty, let an edict be drawn for their destruction, and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver to the stewards for deposit in the royal treasury. (JPS translation 3:8-9, emphasis added)

Haman targets the Jews for refusing to obey the law. Such refusal is precisely the role of the shadow.

The shadow grows in power and seeks to destroy the persona that represses it. Its destructive impulses are unbounded, extending to all aspects of the persona—in the Book of Esther, to Mordecai's people, the Jews.

Esther 3:8-9, read as the shadow's projection of self, illustrates another important aspect of the shadow. It is individual, but is also an archetype existing within the collective unconscious, that is, "scattered and dispersed among the other peoples in all the provinces." All people possess it.

Although Mordecai and Esther ultimately thwart Haman's nefarious plot, it is important to recall that not all encounters with the shadow end with destruction. Edinger observes that Jacob and Esau, like other sets of twins in mythology, can represent both ego and shadow, and also ego and the Self (1986). After traveling back across the river Jabbock (another crossing of a body of water), Jacob struggles mightily with "אִישׁ/man" in Genesis 32:26-32; following day break, when the brothers meet again, they quickly find rapprochement. Jacob accepts the blessing of his shadow side, having learned from his journey and owning up to his shortcomings (Genesis 32:27-29). The encounter with the shadow in the Jacob and Esau story can be read as the account of a successful psychic maturation, as opposed to that detailed in the Book of Esther.

The Book of Esther is more than a literary item—it is also the central element of the raucous holiday of Purim, celebrated by Jews on the 14th of Adar in commemoration of the salvation of the Persian Jews from destruction. The annual reading of the Book of Esther is therefore accompanied by a number of folk customs. These support a reading of Haman as the shadow.

Jung notes that contemporary people "are no longer aware that in carnival customs and the like there are remnants of a collective shadow figure which prove that the personal shadow is in part descended from a numinous collective figure" ("On the Psychology of the Trickster Figure," in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*,

Collected Works Volume 9, I, 262, quoted in Storr, 53).

"Upside down day" festivities, such as Purim, Carnival, and Halloween, are celebrations of the shadow's ability to undermine our everyday personae. It is no surprise that celebrants of such holidays often wear masks. Indeed, Haman, an expression of the shadow, is omnipresent in Purim celebrations. Costumes are typically worn, and Haman is depicted in black. During the reading of the Megillah, the scroll of the Book of Esther, members of the audience make noise whenever his name is mentioned, to "drown out his memory." This is an attempt by society to suppress the shadow—although, of course, it always reappears. And the injunction to "drink until one cannot tell the difference between Haman and Mordecai" is a clear acknowledgement that the two figures, while appearing to be polar opposites, in fact possess a unity. The lines are indeed blurred.

This reading of the Book of Esther reminds us that all of us, even the most noble, have Haman within us. We need not have acted destructively to posses a shadow. As Adolph Guggenbuhl-Craig notes, the core of the shadow is "a potential for behavior with which we have probably been born, which might be designated the murderer or suicidal element, that which is in and of itself destructive" (Quoted in Robert Davis, 147). The shadow exists within us, and expresses itself throughout our lives. The Book of Esther is the story of the psychic violence that occurs when one suppresses one's shadow nature even as Jacob and Esau demonstrate the power that can come from its successful integration. The process of individuation is the quest for wholeness, not goodness. It requires recognition of, struggle with and, ultimately, acceptance of the shadow.

The anima/animus is another archetype that resides in the psyche. It is a

contrasexual figure, meaning that a man has an anima, and a woman an animus, each an expression of that otherness that exists within. A man's anima, then, is a composite, internal personality to which he is bonded. The anima is usually represented as a woman, or some other female force, the identity of which reflects that man's inner Other. She may be an expression of his desire, projected onto another human being. She may appear in dreams or visions. In literature, she may also be the mother figure, femme fatale or villainess the hero encounters, positive or negative qualities that exist within his psyche personified. The process of individuation requires a man understand his anima, and a woman her animus.

According to Clift and Clift,

> the appearance of the anima in dreams or fantasies is an autonomous activity of the unconscious, representing a coming to life of something unconscious, an animated psychic atmosphere. The anima then represents a spontaneous movement toward life—to the life of concreteness, of earth, of emotionality, directed toward people and things. The anima then can lead a man toward involvement and an instinctual connectedness to other people and to a containing community or group. (75)

The anima is an incarnation of the life force, drawing a subject into engagement with deepest reality. Anima brings a man out of selfishness and into relationship.

The Torah shows us the anima in Tamar, daughter-in-law of Jacob's son Judah. When her husband dies, Judah sends his second son to Tamar in levirate marriage (Genesis 38:8). When he, too, dies, Judah withholds his third son, sending her back to her father's house unmarried and childless. He worries that Shelah will die, too, but keeps his fear secret from Tamar (38:11). Hearing that Judah is making his way towards Timnah, Tamar "discarded her widow's garb, covered herself up with a veil, wrapped herself up, and stationed herself at the entrance to Enaim on the way to Timnah"

(Genesis 38:14). Judah takes her for a prostitute, and couples with her promising her a kid (from his herd) in payment. In the meanwhile, he leaves his signet seal, chord, and staff, markers of his identity, as surety. When Judah learns that Tamar has become pregnant, he demands that she be burned, but relents when she presents him with the signs of his own complicity. Tamar gives birth to twins.

Judah is unwilling to make a commitment, withholding his son for fear of death. But Tamar, a contrasexual figure embodying the anima, draws out the desire in him, getting him to commit to a life-creating act. In this way, Tamar opens Judah's eyes to see the world, whether anew or for the first time we cannot know. Tellingly, she does so at a place called "פְּתַח עֵינַיִם/Opening of the Eyes." This is the essence of the anima figure: it (re)awakens a man to life. Tamar is veiled, as are all aspects of the unconscious. But when she confronts him (albeit obliquely) in Genesis 38:25, she uses powerful words: "הַכֶּר־נָא/recognize, please," the very words he and his brothers had used when presenting his own father the false "proof" of their brother Joseph's death-by-animal. It is as if she is familiar with his repressed guilt. Judah eventually accepts Tamar's action as appropriate: his encounter with the anima is productive, yielding two children. It may signal the turning point for a character that moves from self-centeredness to connectedness and from license to duty, as we shall see.

Rebekah functions as Isaac's anima in Genesis 24. Following the death of his wife, Sarah, Abraham sends a servant to his birthplace to bring back a wife for his son. Here is the meeting between Rebekah and Isaac:

> Going out toward evening to stroll in the field, Isaac looked up and saw—camels coming! And Rebekah looked up: seeing Isaac, she got off the camel and said to the slave: 'Who is this man striding in the field coming to meet us?' 'He is my master,' said the slave. Taking a veil, she covered herself. The slave then told Isaac all that he had done. And Isaac brought her into the tent of his mother Sarah' he took Rebekah, and she became his wife and he loved her. Thus did Isaac take comfort after [the death of] his mother. (Genesis 24:63-67)

Here, too, the anima figure appears veiled, but manages to draw a grieving man back into life.

An encounter with a "mana personality" may follow one with the anima. The "the mana-personality is a dominant of the collective unconscious, the recognized archetype of the mighty man in the form of hero, chief, magician, medicine-man, saint, the rule of men and spirits, the friend of God" (Jung, 1953 Volume 7, 226) possessing *mana*, or honor, wisdom, and spiritual power. Such an archetype, whether masculine or feminine, is a collective figure, "a superior wise man, a leader and father, some undisputed authority" or a Great Mother (Jung, 1953, 231). Coming from the collective unconscious, this power is beyond the ego, and the ego that over-identifies with the mana-personality becomes inflated. It is better for the ego to learn from the mana-personality instead, and thus continue on its journey enhanced.

Reuel, in the Book of Exodus, is one such mana-personality. Also called Yitro, he is identified as a "כֹּהֵן מִדְיָן/priest of Midian" (Exodus 2:16), and the father of seven daughters. These meet Moses, recently fled from Egypt, while watering their flock (Exodus 2:17). Reuel invites the sojourning Moses into his home and offers him his daughter, Tzipporah, in marriage (Exodus 2:21). Immediately following this encounter, the text depicts Moses' call at the Burning Bush (Exodus 3:2). Later, Yitro will be a

source of wisdom for Moses as he tries to lead the newly-liberated Israelites. Yitro offers Moses guidance on good governance through delegation (Exodus 18:17-23). But Yitro does not join the Israelite nation. Instead, Moses "bade his father-in-law farewell," successfully avoiding the error of over-identifying with the mana-personality (Exodus 18:27).

The Story of Joseph

Each of these aspects of psyche comes into play in the story of Joseph, a story that is particularly effective as an example of psychologically-centered symbolism in Torah. Ego is depicted in Joseph's dreams in Genesis 37: persona is represented by his coat in that same chapter. Judah, along with the other brothers, personifies the shadow throughout the cycle, and Potiphar's Wife is an embodiment of anima in Genesis 39. Through these experiences and encounters, the character of Joseph moves towards individuation.

Although the *pshat* (literal or contextual) reading of the text tells us that Joseph is seventeen years old at the beginning of his story (Genesis 37:2), when reading psycho-symbolically, at this stage he represents the undifferentiated ego. Joseph, like Edinger's child, above, "experiences himself quite literally as the center of the universe" (Edinger 1973, 12). This is expressed through his dreams, recounted in Genesis 37:7 and Genesis 37:9. In them, sheaves of wheat, which Joseph tells his kin (and the reader) represent his brothers, and the sun, the moon, and eleven stars, understood by Jacob to represent the family, bow down to him. This is a depiction of undifferentiated ego, in which the whole

world exists only to serve it. The undifferentiated ego recognizes no boundaries between itself and the outside. Joseph's family members exist for him only in how they relate to him; his tale-telling demonstrates a utilitarian, not mutual, relationship with others.

Joseph dreams that

וְהִנֵּה תְסֻבֶּינָה אֲלֻמֹּתֵיכֶם וַתִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶיןָ לַאֲלֻמָּתִי

'Your sheaves then paraded in a *circle* around mine and bowed down to my sheaf.' (Genesis 37:7, emphasis added)

The image of the circle supports this reading. "Being round in the initial period of existence is equivalent to assuming oneself to be total and complete and hence a god that can do all things." Edinger observes (1973, 8). He notes that circle images figure prominently in the images very young children first draw. Tellingly, this is the only dream that Joseph himself claims to interpret; later in the story he credits God with the power.

הֲלוֹא לֵאלֹהִים פִּתְרֹנִים סַפְּרוּ־נָא לִי

'Surely interpretations are in God's domain: but go ahead and tell them to me.' (Genesis 40:8)

But such humility is still a long way off. Joseph still needs to travel the path towards maturity. Interestingly, for Jung the symbol of the individuated Self is also the circle, often divided into quadrants by intersecting lines. This image will be considered further in Chapter Three.

At this beginning stage, Joseph evokes the *puer aeternus* described by Von Franz. His greatness exists only in potential; it will amount to nothing if he only dreams and never acts.

As we have seen, clothing frequently symbolizes the persona, the face one wears

for the outside world. Clothing plays a central role in the Joseph cycle, appearing in the garment Jacob gives his favored son, the coat Potiphar's wife uses as "ocular proof" of his transgression (Genesis 39), in the garments Pharaoh bestows upon him to signify his high status (Genesis 41), and also in the story of Judah and Tamar inserted into the Joseph narrative. In each of these cases, clothing denotes public identity.

In the classic Jungian structure, persona follows ego differentiation. It must be noted, however, that the Joseph cycle inverts this formula. It presents the coat before Joseph's first dream.

The Hebrew of the story, "כְּתֹנֶת פַּסִּים," is difficult to translate. The Women's Torah Commentary offers "coat of many colors," while Claus Westermann (1982) suggests "a sleeved tunic." W. Sibley Towner, Victor P. Hamilton, and Eric Lowenthal supply "long robe with sleeves," "colorful tunic" and "a tunic of distinction," respectively. Despite confusion about the term, it is clear that "כְּתֹנֶת פַּסִּים" refers to a garment of some description. For the psycho-symbolic interpretation presented in this essay, further distinctions are irrelevant.

As Whitmont claimed, above, a garment typically represents the persona in dreams and, by extension, art. It is the Self's presentation to the outer world, representative of an aspect but not the entirety of personhood. It cloaks interiority, and may be only one of several identities. It allows a person to interact with others and still maintain integrity of self, and is therefore a hugely important aspect in the creation of successful personhood.

Whitmont observes that a child's first persona comes about as a result of his or her interactions with parents. It is fitting, then, that father Jacob presents Joseph with his

coat (Genesis 37:3). Joseph, basking in his father's love, over-identifies with the coat that symbolizes his father's view of him, mistaking his persona for himself. Because no one can touch his true Self, he feels himself protected. "A person in such a state needs the impact of individual feeling, which develops a sense of one's own individual identity. But he will protect himself, with a formidable array of 'clothing,' against having his real skin touched, against precisely this feeling impact" (Whitmont, 157-8). Joseph is oblivious to the fact that his exterior is not his totality, and will pay dearly for the error.

Just as they are created, so too can personae be destroyed. Arrogant Joseph's persona is ripped away by his brothers who, in Genesis 37:23, strip him of his coat. When they decide to hurt him, their first target is not his person, but rather his persona. It is his presentation to the world that most infuriates them. Later, in Genesis 37:31, they dip the coat in blood and, presumably, rip it, since Jacob will be presented with a torn coat. The brothers seek to obliterate Joseph's detested public face. Its death is their goal.

Joseph grows more flexible by the time he has been sold into Egypt and is desired by the wife of his master, Potiphar. In that episode, he is prepared to shed his cloak when necessary and, by extension, release his persona (39:12). He understands that his core identity is more important than any outside face; it is that core that he needs to protect. As Joseph moves through the stages of his life, he matures and improves. In this episode, too, Joseph's clothing serves as his surrogate—his presence is proven by the garment she holds.

Joseph's continuing development can be observed the next time he is described donning clothing. Pharaoh puts Joseph in charge of all Egypt in Genesis 41:41, and in the following verse marks the Hebrew's elevated status by "dress[ing] him in linen

trappings and plac[ing] the gold chain (of office) around his neck," establishing yet another persona, this one official. This time, however, Joseph does not confuse his own identity with his public persona. As we shall see, by the time Joseph reconciles with his brothers (Genesis 45:3), even though he wears Egyptian garb he is able to say

אֲנִי יוֹסֵף

'I am Joseph.' (My translation)

Evolved Joseph has grown to understand that he is not his persona.

The person journeying towards individuation soon encounters his or her shadow, the dark, repressed aspects of Self. Joseph is no exception.

Joseph's psychic journey is represented symbolically in the narrative by the move from his father's house to visit his brothers. Joseph sets out to meet them in Shechem, but the path through life never runs straight, and he is redirected by an unnamed man to Dotham, where they are pasturing the herds. Here is his quest, as he tells the man when asked (מַה־תְּבַקֵּשׁ וַיֹּאמֶר אֶת־אַחַי אָנֹכִי מְבַקֵּשׁ/"'What do you seek?' And he said, 'I seek my brothers.'" [Genesis 37:15-16, my translation]). Joseph seeks to find his brothers, even though "they were not able to speak to him peaceably/וְלֹא יָכְלוּ דַּבְּרוֹ לְשָׁלֹם" (Genesis 37:4, my translation). His quest is for the שָׁלֹם/*shalom*, the wholeness, they deny him. This is the task his father sent him on: to see to the שָׁלֹם/*shalom* of his brothers, as well as the flocks, usually translated as "well being," but here as wholeness or integrity. Thus we read:

וַיֹּ֣אמֶר לוֹ֮ לֶךְ־נָא֒ רְאֵה֙ אֶת־שְׁל֣וֹם אַחֶ֔יךָ וְאֶת־שְׁל֖וֹם הַצֹּ֑אן וַהֲשִׁבֵ֣נִי דָבָ֔ר וַיִּשְׁלָחֵ֖הוּ מֵעֵ֣מֶק חֶבְר֑וֹן וַיָּבֹ֖א שְׁכֶֽמָה

> And he [Jacob] said to him, 'please go see to the wholeness [שָׁלוֹם]of your brothers and the wholeness [שָׁלוֹם]of the flock and bring me back world and he sent him from the Valley of Hebron and he went to Shechem. (Genesis 37:14, my translation)

Joseph is on a quest for wholeness, to heal the inner disunity symbolized by his clashing brothers. This is a depiction of the process of individuation, and it is a journey that will last a lifetime and through which his ego's dreams will be fulfilled.

When they spot Joseph approaching, the brothers waste no time in thought, but instantly decide to do away with their dreamy sibling.

וַיֹּ֣אמְרוּ אִ֣ישׁ אֶל־אָחִ֗יו הִנֵּ֛ה בַּֽעַל־הַחֲלֹמ֥וֹת הַלָּ֖זֶה בָּֽא׃ וְעַתָּ֣ה לְכ֗וּ וְנַהַרְגֵ֤הוּ וְנַשְׁלִכֵ֙הוּ֙ בְּאַחַ֣ד הַבֹּר֔וֹת וְאָמַ֕רְנוּ חַיָּ֥ה רָעָ֖ה אֲכָלָ֑תְהוּ וְנִרְאֶ֕ה מַה־יִּהְי֖וּ חֲלֹמֹתָֽיו׃ וַיִּרְאוּ֙ אֹת֣וֹ מֵרָחֹ֔ק וּבְטֶ֥רֶם יִקְרַ֖ב אֲלֵיהֶ֑ם וַיִּתְנַכְּל֥וּ אֹת֖וֹ לַהֲמִיתֽוֹ׃

> They saw him in the distance, and before he neared them, they wickedly plotted against him, to bring about his death. They said to one another, "Here comes that master of dreams! Now then, let us kill him and throw him into one of [these] pits and say 'A wild animal devoured him.' Then we'll see what becomes of his dreams!" (Genesis 37:18-20).

This is the shadow, the destructive side personified in the ten brothers, most emblematically in Judah, who takes the lead in plotting Joseph's demise. Since no other brother is named, except for Reuben who argues to save the lad, Judah stands for the lot. This is how readers from R. Johanan in Midrash Rabbah to Robert Alter in *The Art of Biblical Narrative* have understood Judah (Alter, 10). It is Judah who determines that there is more to gain by selling him than by killing him. Although the text tells us that "they" presented the bloody coat to Jacob, Tamar's echo of the phrase they use, "הַכֶּר־נָא/recognize, please," to Judah creates the impression it was he who held the up the torn and blood-encrusted cloak to his father's horrified eyes. And it will be Judah who,

through an encounter with the anima in Tamar, will reverse his selfish and violent ways and become the most responsible of all the brothers, spokesman for the rest in their reconciliation with Joseph.

Although the notion that Joseph's brothers can be understood as aspects of himself would be troubling on the *pshat* level, it has textual support.

אֵלֶּה תּוֹלְדוֹת יַעֲקֹב יוֹסֵף

> These are the descendants[1] of Jacob: Joseph... (Genesis 37:2, my translation)

The text does not name all the brothers, nor in fact any other brother or sister. Instead, only Joseph is called his child here, the son of his old age who continues his story and line. Later, in 37:27, Judah argues that Joseph "בְּשָׂרֵנוּ הוּא/is our flesh" in a second acknowledgement, when read psycho-symbolically, of the unity of all the brothers. The text gives us permission to see all Jacob's children as aspects of a single individual, called Joseph. At this early stage, however, the aspect embodied by the brothers, and particularly Judah, is that of the shadow, an aspect of psyche that is "מֻרָחֹק/distanced" from the rest (Genesis 37:18).

If Joseph is indeed a *puer aeternus* taking his first steps away from dreaming about his greatness and into reality, then his shadow may be pushing back against him—seeking to stop him in his tracks, to deny his movement towards full development. It prefers to see him as a "master of dreams" than a lonely shepherd boy wandering the hills with a message. It would rather enjoy delusions of grandeur than experience just one of

---

[1] תּוֹלְדוֹת "/Toledot," which I have translated as "descendants" from the root י.ל.ד./birth, is more commonly understood to mean "family history" (Women's Torah Commentary), or "line" (JPS and Anchor Bible).

life's paths.

But Joseph is not stopped by his shadow. His journey does not end in the pit, a symbol of transformation (considered in greater depth in Chapter Two), but rather carries on as his growth continues. The character of Joseph has passed the first challenge in the human process of individuation.

After battling the shadow, Joseph next encounters the anima. In his case, it is embodied in the wife of his master, Potiphar, who lusts after him and tries to seduce him. This is a classical guise of the anima, who seeks to draw the individual into relationship. But Joseph resists her repeated entreaties in Genesis 39:8, 39:10, and 39:12, preferring his solitary state. Although the rabbis of Midrash Rabbah consider his refusal a righteous act, a psycho-symbolic reading of the Torah suggests that Joseph's refusal of "Madam Potiphar," in Athalia Brenner's elegant rendering of the Hebrew (Women's Torah Commentary, 221), is in reality a refusal to enter into relationship with the world around him. While his rejection may be righteous on the literal or moral levels, on the psycho-symbolic it is instead damaging. "Coming to terms with his anima can lead a man to a deeper level of integration, providing him with inspiration as well as giving him a more balanced view of life. She, like other archetypal figures, can also carry the energy to complete the needed tasks" (Clift and Clift, 73). As Potiphar's wife, the anima embodying "the spontaneous movement towards life," connectedness, and community, will not be denied (Clift and Clift, 75).

Jung believes that a man seeks to resist the anima's seductive call because it makes demands on his masculinity in a way that his mother never did. A man's mother promotes "the virtues of faithfulness, devotion, loyalty, so as to protect him from the

moral disruption which is the risk of every life adventure" and to maintain her hold on him (Jung 1971, 149). In this way, the rabbis' moral objectives match the mother's emotional needs. In his refusal to be seduced, Joseph demonstrates that "he has learnt these lessons only too well, and remains true to his mother" (Jung 1971, 149). This may be especially apt in Joseph's case, since his mother is dead, having passed away birthing his younger brother, Benjamin (35:18). Joseph may resist Madam Potiphar's advances not because he is righteous, but because he is loyal to his mother's memory and because he fears the loss—of innocence, of youth, of life—that comes with sexuality.

While unsuccessful in her quest to draw him into relationship, the anima does manage to promote Joseph's growth. Madam Potiphar's accusation of rape is responsible for Joseph being thrown into prison, the next stage in his journey.

Interestingly, Joseph says "בַּבּוֹר/ba-bor" for "in this prison," a word that also means "pit" (40:15). For Joseph, the prison is a return to the pit, a descent into darkness. As we have seen, Clift and Clift note that "coming to terms with his anima can lead a man to a deeper level of integration, providing him with inspiration as well as giving him a more balanced view of life" (73). Perhaps the designation of prison as a "pit" is recognition of the deeper psychological work Joseph is experiencing. Perhaps he needs to return to a pit because he has not yet integrated the lesson of the anima, as demonstrated by his rejection of Madam Potiphar.

But the lesson is not entirely lost, and Joseph demonstrates his maturation. Before he began his journey, the boy Joseph was a tattle-tale. Now, he declines to implicate others, even to his own detriment. While a reader on the literal level will say that he had no power to accuse his master's wife, on the psycho-symbolic level we can

ascertain the psyche's maturation in it's refusal to repeat former, failed behaviors. His relationship with others has shifted; perhaps now he understands their desires. Joseph is indeed growing.

It is no coincidence that Madam Potiphar makes her appearance immediately following the story of Judah and Tamar, itself an encounter with the anima as we have seen. The biblical author places these two stories side-by-side, allowing the reader to compare them. Interestingly, the anima claims the man's clothing in both stories, although in the first case the man accepts her invitation while in the second he does not. The first anima is (repro)productive; the second is not. Judah accuses Tamar of a crime, and Potiphar's wife accuses Joseph of a crime. Although Tamar did the deed, she is called righteous and not punished. Joseph, on the other hand, abstains, is called righteous, but is punished anyway.

Classically, the anima may appear when character has lost his way.

> The appearance of the anima, who, as indicated, is connected with finding the way toward meaning, occurs frequently when all meaning is threatened or lost. The situation is characterized, Jung said, 'by the more or less sudden collapse of a form or style of life which till then seemed the indispensable foundation of the individual's whole career.' (Citation Missing)

In Potiphar, Joseph serves the wrong master. In his selfishness, Judah resists the call to life. The anima comes to push them along, towards their destinies.

Had Joseph's encounter with the anima been fully successful, we might expect him to find psychic wholeness at this point. It is not, and his journey not yet complete. Instead, Joseph returns to the *bor*/pit, this time called prison, to be transformed again.

There, he offers interpretations of the dreams of two of Pharaoh's jailed courtiers, the Cup Bearer and the Baker, in a sequence that will be explored in detail in the next

chapter. The Cup Bearer eventually introduces Joseph to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, setting Joseph's redemption into motion.

In Genesis 41, Pharaoh dreamt dreams his counselors were unable to explain. In the first, seven healthy cows are devoured by seven scrawny ones; in the second, seven healthy ears of corn are consumed by seven thin ones. Joseph, however, provides an interpretation that Pharaoh accepts: Egypt will enjoy seven years of bountiful produce to be followed by seven years of famine. Joseph advises Egypt to store in the good times to provide for the bad, and Pharaoh appoints him to lead the effort, making him second in command of the nation. Pharaoh offers Joseph a new name and set of clothes (that is, a new persona or identity) and a wife, Asenath. This time, Joseph's encounter with the female will be productive, leading within five verses to the birth of sons Manasseh and Ephraim (42:51-52). It can be no coincidence that "אָסְנַת בַּת־פּוֹטִי פֶרַע/Asenath Daughter of Potiphera," shares a name with Madam Potiphar. Gunter Plaut argues that Potiphera is "a different person" from Potiphar, "unless this passage represents a second tradition that remembers Joseph not as the steward of Potiphar but as his son-in-law" (271), while Eskenazi notes that "when Joseph had encountered Potiphar's wife, he wound up in jail (Genesis 39); but now, when he encounter's Potiphera's daughter, Joseph becomes fully integrated into Egyptian society. Perhaps the author is subtly contrasting the 'evil woman' versus the 'good woman' here" (239). While these characters may or may not be mother and daughter, they may certainly be read as two encounters, one initially unsuccessful and the second eventually successful, with the anima.

Joseph has encountered a royal figure and the reception he receives is overwhelmingly positive; Pharaoh's unexpected largess cannot but surprise the reader. In

Genesis 41:42, Pharaoh offers Joseph his own signet ring, a symbol of identity that also figures in the story of Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38:18). Joseph and Pharaoh become closely identified.

As Campbell notes, the hero's ascent to power is an important motif in mythology and legend. Often, he becomes king; Joseph's promotion to second-in-command is as close to king as the story's internal reality could permit.

For Jung, Joseph's encounter with Pharaoh is a representation of the psyche's encounter with the "mana personality," the "mighty man in the form of hero, chief, magician, medicine-man, saint, the ruler of men and spirits." (Jung, *Collected Works Volume 7* 1953, 228) This step in the hero's journey represents his accumulation of inner power and access to the transcendent force since, as John Weir Perry observes, "the king was mediator of the life force itself, giving fertility and virility; carrier of the power of authority, giving order and integrity; and bearer of the aggressive might of the executive function, giving chastisement to disorder and encouragement to obedience" (4). "To be an effective giver of livingness was the king's prime concern, and hence the mythology of fertility played a large part in this nurturant function of the kingship," as demonstrated in the English honorific "sire," meaning "father" (Perry, 16). These royal functions are seen in Pharaoh—to whom in Genesis God sends dreams that are in tune with the earth's agricultural cycles and which permit the people's salvation.

If the ego becomes over identified with the mana personality, it becomes inflated. Nor should it deny identification, placing the mana personality on too high a pedestal. Joseph appears to negotiate this balance well, at first riding closely behind Pharaoh, wearing his clothes and bearing his ring (Genesis 41:42-43) , and then separating himself

from the king (Genesis 41:46) as he exerts his saving power.

While ascending the throne and redeeming the world are satisfactory conclusions to Campbell's monomyth, they do not suffice for the biblical author. In the Bible, no human king is mediator of the life force; that role is God's alone. And the wealth and power that are now Joseph's, symbolic of inner wealth and self control, are not sufficient in the Torah.

Indeed, the Torah identifies wealth and power with Egypt, the ultimate Other. In that culture, life was understood to flow from multiple gods into the manifest realm through the person of the king. For much of Egyptian history only the king had access to divine reality (most especially the Afterlife). Monuments and gold statuary represented the gods on earth. This ideology is wholly rejected by the biblical author.

The Torah has Joseph continue on his quest instead. Joseph appears to be torn, as the names of his sons attest, between the worldview of Egypt with its focus on external riches and power, and his original mission, begun in the Promised Land, for the well-being of his brothers, that is, his own wholeness or *shalom*. Manasseh, his first born, bears a name meaning "God has made me forget completely my hardship and my parental home," while Ephraim, the second, represents "God has made me fertile in the land of my affliction." (Genesis 41:51-52, JPS translation) Part of Joseph has forgotten; part is afflicted by his absence. Part of him is content with all Egypt symbolizes; part still searches for that missing *shalom* which his brothers represent as the un-integrated shadow.

For the Bible, becoming king (or partaking of an identity with one) is never enough. While kingship can mark the end of the quest within the structure of Campbell's

monomyth, the biblical author requires something more of Joseph. The Torah presents a different world view, highlighting not the individual enlightenment of "the king within" but instead the just resolution of tension.

On the *pshat* level, the need for a just resolution of tension expresses itself in the Torah through the healthy reunion of siblings (attained, for example, by the pairs Isaac and Ishmael [Genesis 25:9], Rachel and Leah [Genesis 30:15], and Jacob and Esau [Genesis 33:4], while unattained by Cain and Abel), while a psycho-symbolic reading hopes for the psychic unification, or individuation, that this reconciliation represents. Pharaoh does not stand for interpersonal integration, and the Joseph cycle tells us clearly: this encounter is not with the ultimate Self. That Self can only be achieved through the establishment of inner harmony, as Jung's focus on interiority rather than external success would indicate. Individuation does not result in the worship of "gods" like power or externalized projections of the Self, but rather in submission to a "higher, invisible, and spiritual being" (Jung in Storr, 92).

The final resolution, with the individuation of Self it represents, will occur later in the story when Joseph is reconciled with his brothers, led by Judah. This piece of the story will be considered in the Chapter Three.

Chapter Two:

The Pit as a Symbol of Transformation

Twenty four verses into the Joseph story, the narrative takes a dramatic turn: Joseph's brothers throw him into a pit. Joseph had been wandering the Judean hills, looking for his kin, but his life suddenly takes a startling detour, sending him to lands and experiences he could never have fathomed.

Although the brothers' heartless action is surprising to the reader, it is in keeping with an established trope in myth and fairytale: a hole in the ground frequently serves as a passageway to another world, the beginning of a new set of experiences that will transform a character from a child to an adult or from an innocent to a sage. Because of this experience, Joseph will evolve to see his potential actualized, as many characters have. Whether understood as a single personage in relationship with his brothers, or as a Self whose aspects are expressed through each member of the family unit, Joseph will find the pit to be a vital step in his process of transformation. It is the threshold he must cross as a character tracing out a particular path of individuation.

The pit/cistern (*bor*/בור) makes frequent appearances in the Tanakh. Whether referring to a hole in the ground or a storage facility for water, it is sometimes simply a place, that is, a backdrop for action, and at other times a symbolic experience linked with

despair, transformation, or the afterlife/Sheol. In this way, it is like the well of water, alternatively a mere designated spot or, more prosaically, a locus for transformative encounter. As noted above, the term *bor* can also carry the meaning "prison." In general, metaphoric associations with the pit/cistern are negative.

The named cisterns of 1 Samuel 19:22 function only as place markers, as does the cistern mentioned in 2 Samuel 3:26; they are spots where actions happen. In 1 Chronicles, David craves water from a cistern in Bethlehem, and three of his chiefs oblige—despite that city's occupation by the enemy. The cistern is simply a cistern, even if it visiting it requires bravery, as in 1 Chronicles 11:17-18. In 2 Chronicles 26:10, Uzziah's hewn cisterns are functional only—the provide water for cattle. Similarly, the "בֹּרוֹת חֲצוּבִים/hewn cisterns" of Nehemiah 9:25 appear in a list of locations associated with the smooth functioning of an agrarian society, including vineyards, olive trees and fruit trees. Sometimes, a *bor* is just a *bor*.

Some pits and cisterns appear not as part of a narrative, but rather in legal texts. Exodus 21:33-34 declares that a pit's owner is responsible for animals that fall into it and die. When Leviticus considers the ritual purity of vessels following an encounter with a dead creature, it determines that "a spring or cistern in which water is collected shall be טָהוֹר/[ritually] pure, but whoever touches such a carcass in it יִטְמָא/shall be [ritually] impure" (11:36, modified from the Women's Torah Commentary translation). Proverbs 28:17 requires that "a man oppressed by bloodguilt will flee to a pit; let none give him support" (JPS Translation).

From these legal mentions, we can understand why the *bor* was a place associated with danger for the biblical author: animals, and perhaps people, could fall in and be

unable to climb out. Certainly, it is not unusual for a legal text to deal with difficulties and disturbances. Still, these references to accident and death show a cistern to be not simply a collector of waters, but perilous. This is not automatic: other water sources, like wells and rivers, carry abundant positive connotations. The dangers indicated by the Tanakh's legal passages help us understand the text's dark associations with the place.

While most of the *bor's* connotations are negative, not all are. When Isaiah quotes the King of Assyria, a cistern represents abundance and peace: "Make your peace with me and come out to me, so that you may all eat from your vines and your fig trees and drink water from your cisterns, until I come and take you away to a land like your own, a land of bread and wine, of grain and vineyards" (36:16, JPS Translation). More moderately, in Isaiah 51:1, the "rock you were hewn from, the quarry [*bor*] you were dug from" refers to one's ancestry, in this case, Abraham and Sarah (JPS Translation).

On the other hand, the term's negative associations are demonstrated in two important appearances of the pit in the Book of Jeremiah. In one case, the prophet is thrown in prison and kept in a pit in the house of the scribe Jonathan for "many days" (37:16), released, and then taken away again. "They took Jeremiah and put him down into the pit of Malchiach, the king's son, which was in the prison compound; they let Jeremiah down by ropes. There was no water in the pit, only mud, and Jeremiah sank into the mud" (38:6, JPS Translation). Later, Jeremiah is pulled up and released (38:7-13). It is no wonder, then, that for Jeremiah the pit is a place of suffering and murder. Jeremiah 41 describes Ishmael son of Methaniah's killing of the most of the eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, and subsequent stashing, in verses 7-9, of the bodies in a cistern until it was full. When Exodus describes the death of the first born Egyptians,

it tells us that every first-born died—"from the first-born of Pharaoh who sat on the throne to the first-born of the captive who was in the *bor*, and all the first-born of the cattle" (12:29, modified JPS Translation). Being in the *bor*, here likely prison, represents being at humanity's nadir. Even when connected to real, not metaphorical, pits, the associations are with despair and even death.

As in Exodus 29 and Jeremiah, above, *bor* can refer to a prison or dungeon, certainly in keeping with the word's association with isolation and emptiness/desperation. This usage occurs in the Joseph story, Genesis chapters 40 and 41, Isaiah 24:22, and Zechariah 9:11.

Other biblical poets use the *bor* to convey desperation and death. For the Psalmist, the planner of evil "has dug a pit and deepened it, and will fall into the trap he made" (7:16, JPS Translation). In Psalm 40:3, redemption comes when YHVH lifted the narrator from "miry pit, the slimy clay, and set my feet on a rock, steadied my legs" (JPS Translation). To be in the pit is to be isolated and in despair. Kohelet's *bor* is part of a somber scene, often interpreted as an allegory for death (12:6). When the author of Lamentations wants to express utter abandon, he summons the image of the pit: "They have ended my life in a pit and cast stones at me/Waters flowed over my head; I said 'I am lost!'/I have called on Your name, O YHVH, from the depths of the pit" (3:53-55, modified from JPS Translation). The pit is a place of hopelessness and despair.

In several places, Tanakh clearly understands the *bor* as Sheol, or the Afterlife.

Proverbs understands the Pit and Sheol as one and the same: "Let us swallow them alive like Sheol/Whole, כִּיוֹרְדֵי בוֹר/like those who go down to the Pit" (1:12, JPS Translation). Psalm 30:4 makes and identical linkage between Sheol and the Pit, and the

same expression appears in Psalm 28:1: "Oh YHVH, I call to You; my rock, do not disregard me, for if You hold aloof from me, I shall be עם־יורדי בור/among those who go down to the Pit" (JPS Translation). This *bor* is the punishment for the wicked doers of evil, and is certainly otherworldly. In Psalm 88, the author uses the image of the Pit/Sheol to convey his absolute desperation, crying out to God in the night.

> I am at the brink of Sheol/I am numbered with those who go down to the Pit/I am a helpless man abandoned among the dead, like bodies lying in the grave of whom You are mindful no more, and who are cut off from Your care. You have put me at the bottom of the Pit, in the darkest places, in the depth. Your fury lies heavy with me; You afflict me with all Your breakers. You make my companions shun me; You make me abhorrent to them; I am shut in and do not go out. My eyes pine away from affliction; I call to You, O YHVH, each day; I stretch out my hands to You. Do You work wonders for the dead? Do the shades rise to praise You? Selah Is Your faithful care recounted in the grave, Your constancy in the place of perdition? Are Your wonders made known in the netherworld/darkness, Your beneficent deeds in the land of oblivion? (8:4-13, modified JPS Translation)

This identification between the Pit and Sheol is familiar to Isaiah: "Surely, you are brought down to Sheol, to the very bottom of the Pit" (14:15, JPS Translation). Likewise, Isaiah writes, "for it is not Sheol that [praises] You, Not [the Land of] Death that extols You; nor do they who descend into the Pit hope for Your [grace/truth]" (38:18 JPS Translation). Ezekiel makes the gruesome link between the *bor* to the underworld ("בארץ תחתיות") explicit in 26:20-21:

> I will bring you down, with those who go down to the Pit, to the people of old. I will install you in the underworld, with those that go down to the Pit, like the ruins of old, so that you shall not be in habited and shall not radiate splendor in the land of the living. I will make you a horror, and you shall cease to be; you shall be sought, but shall never be found again—A declaration of YHVH God. (modified JPS Translation)

Ezekiel makes a similarly ghastly linkage in Chapter 32, although this time the pit may also have a physical reality as a tomb:

> From the depths of Sheol the mightiest of warriors speak to him and his allies; the uncircumcised, the slain by the sword, have gone down and lie [there]. Assyria is there with all her company, their graves round about, all of them slain, fallen by the sword. There grave set in the farthest recesses of the Pit, all her company are round about her tomb, all of them slain, fallen by the sword—they who struck terror in the land of the living. (21-23, modified JPS Translation)

In the Tanakh, then, *bor* can literally designate a hole in the ground, a storage facility for water, and a prison. It can also convey a sense of abandonment and despair. In addition, particularly in Proverbs, Psalms, Isaiah and Ezekiel, the Pit represents the very underworld itself.

Indeed, the Pit is a common beginning for a hero's journey to the otherworld in world myth.

Numerous mythic traditions tell the story of a hero or heroine's entry to the otherworld through a hole in the ground. The pit, cave, or tunnel connects to the Realm of the Dead in many—but not all—stories. It may also be associated with a reality that is new for the hero. As such, descent through a hole is a form of rebirth and transformation.

As the Myth Encyclopedia states,

> From all parts of the world come myths and legends about the underworld, a mysterious and shadowy place beyond ordinary human experience. The underworld is the realm of the dead, the destination of human souls in the afterlife. In some traditions, it is also the home of nonhuman, supernatural, or otherworldly beings such as fairies, demons, giants, and monsters. Although usually portrayed as a terrifying, dangerous, or unpredictable place, the underworld appears as a source of growth, life, and rebirth in some myths. Many descriptions of the underworld include elements of earthly life, such as powerful rulers and palaces.
>
> The most common idea of the underworld is that it lies beneath the everyday world. The passage from this world to the other may begin by descending into a cave, well, or pit. However, the distance between the two worlds is more than physical, and the spiritual journey involved often includes great peril. The souls of the dead are the principal travelers, but sometimes living heroes, mystics, and shamans also make the journey. (www.mythencyclopedia.com)

An early example of this motif is that of Inanna, Sumerian goddess of fertility and Queen of Heaven and Earth. Inanna descends into the underworld so as to storm the gates of Arallu, the Land of the Dead. Arallu is under the control of Ereshkigal, Inanna's sister. As she proceeds through the seven outer gates, Inanna must strip away her clothing, until she arrives naked and powerless. She is killed, but is then revived by the god Enki with the water and food of life. Ereshkigal agrees to let her leave the underworld, but on the condition that she appoint a substitute for herself. She cannot bring herself to condemn to death the first several people she meets, until her husband, the vegetation god Dumuzi (also called Tammuz), shows no grief. Thus rejected, she selects him to take her place in death. He is condemned to Arallu for part of the year so that Inanna can receive her freedom; his sister relieves him the other part. In a related myth cycle, the hero Gilgamesh, with comrade Enkidu, "tunnels through the underground realm" (Zaleski, 15).

The Inanna story and the story of Demeter have much in common. Demeter was the Greek goddess of fertility, and her daughter, Persephone, used to wander the blossom-covered hillsides. Hades, Demeter's brother and Lord of the Dead, notices her and determines to have her. He causes the earth to open beneath Persephone's feet, and carries her down into his dark realm. Demeter, distraught, searches high and low for her. "When she failed to find Persephone, she took on the form of an old woman and sat down by a well in the town of Eleusis" (www.mythencyclopedia.com). Later, she determines where her daughter is located. But Persephone cannot be returned to the Land of the Living, having eaten of the food of the dead. A bargain is struck: Persephone will remain with Hades, surrounded by his great wealth and the shades of the dead, for six

months of the year, one for each of the pomegranate seeds she ate while with him. The rest of the year, she can return to her mother's side. A central theme of this story is Persephone's transition from Kore (maiden) to woman, initiated by her descent through a hole in the earth. The Eleusinian mysteries rely on this myth (Holme).

Several heroes of Greek mythology descend into Hades through the mouth of a cave, including Hercules and Orpheus. Theseus, on the other hand, begins his adventure by moving a boulder and digging up the sandals and sword his father, Aegeus, buried there for him. When he finds them, he discovers his true identity as the son of a king (Holme).

In the creation story of the Seneca nation, a giant tree grows at the center of the Sky-world. The Great Chief, grown jealous of his new wife, uproots the tree and pushes her down the hole he thereby creates. Pregnant, she falls to earth, bringing with her as seeds and fire with which to render earth inhabitable (Ashliman).

In the story of the Jicarilla Apache of New Mexico, the reverse happens: humanity begins underground, and moves upwards, through a hole.

> In the beginning all people, animals, and plants lived in the dark underworld. Those who wanted light played a game with those who liked darkness. The light-lovers won, and the sun and stars appeared. Then the sun, looking through a hole in the roof of the underworld, saw the surface of the earth, which was covered with water. Eager to reach this hole in the underworld, the people built four great hills that grew upward. But after girls picked the flowers from the hills, the hills stopped rising. Then the people climbed to the roof on ladders made of buffalo horns. They sent the moon and sun through the hole to light the world and dispatched the winds to blow away the water. Next they sent out animals. Last of all, the people climbed up into the new world. Once they reached the surface, they spread out in four directions. Only the Jicarilla stayed in the original homeland near the hole that led up from the underworld. (www.mythencyclopedia.com)

For the Maya, "any pit, cave, or pond could be an entrance" to Xibalba, the "place of fright" that was the underworld. For the Aztecs, the underworld held eight dangerous layers, and "souls descended through the layers until they reached Mictlan, the bottommost part of the underworld" (www.mythencyclopedia.com).

In each of these traditions, gods, heroes, and the dead descend into the underworld. But the notion of the transformative passage through the earth is not limited to death. It appears with other associations as well.

The Norse god of battle, wisdom, magic, and poetry is Odin, meaning "fury" or "frenzy." Both wise and treacherous, he is also called "Allfather," and he rules the gods from his palace, Valhalla. Once, Odin sought a wisdom-granting potion, hid by a giant at the heart of a great mountain and guarded by the giant's daughter. The only way into the mountain was through a tiny hole, so Odin transformed himself into a snake. This allowed him to slither inside. There, he changed himself into a handsome giant and seduced the daughter into giving him the potion. Having drunk it, Odin changes again—this time taking an eagle's form—and flew off to Asgard (www.mythencyclopedia.com).

In the Arabian tale of Ali Baba, a cave holds a treasure belonging to a band of thieves. The passage into the cave is blocked, and can only be opened through the recitation of a magic formula. All who cross the threshold of the cave die in the course of the story, except for the righteous woodcutter Ali Baba and slave girl Morgiana.

The Brothers Grimm tell the tale of Mother Holle about a fair maiden forced by her step mother to sit each day by a well and spin and weave until her fingers bled. One day, she drops her shuttle, and is sent down the well to retrieve it. Another world, far more beautiful than this one, exists at the bottom of the well, and there the girl

demonstrates her virtue by performing several kindnesses until she meets Mother Holle, an old woman whom she serves diligently. At the end of her servitude, the girl is rewarded handsomely—she is showered with gold—and returns to her old life. Her ugly step-sister, seeking to obtain wealth for herself, jumps down the well, but fails to demonstrate kindness in the otherworld, and is rewarded with a shower of pitch.

The association between pits and death/transformation exists in Jewish sources, albeit in minor works. The "Witch of Endor" text in 1 Samuel, as well as Leviticus Rabbah and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Exodus, all make use of this motif, the former two associating the pit with a passageway to the underworld and the latter with transformation.

In 1 Samuel, Saul, eager to know the outcome of the battle, seeks the counsel of an unnamed necromancer despite having outlawed the practice. The woman is described as a בעלת־אוב/"Mistress of the Pit" in 1 Samuel 28:7 (my translation); Saul approaches her at night and asks her to raise a spirit for him. Assured of her safety, she obliges. The text seems to have no hesitation about her ability to perform the act. Throughout, the spirit is described as .ע.ל.ה/"ascending;" it seems spirits rise from the underworld by means of the pit and, perhaps, some other magical device or incantation. Using this passage from 1 Samuel, the rabbinic discussion in Leviticus Rabbah 26:7 determines that the dead usually rise feet first, and does not challenge the practice's efficacy.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Exodus, on the other hand, uses the pit motif to indicate a character's major transformation. The text, an Aramaic translation of the Torah, amplifies the original with aggadic material. In Chapter 2, after Moses protects the Midianite shepherdesses and waters their flocks, Reuel (as he is know here, rather

than by the more name familiar Yitro, father of Tzipporah) invites him home to eat bread. But

> when Reuel learned that Moses fled from Pharaoh, he threw him into a pit. But Zipporah, his son's daughter, provided for him in secret for ten years. At the end of ten years he took him out of the pit. Moses then went into Reuel's garden, and he gave thanks and prayed before the Lord who had performed miracles and mighty deeds for him. He noticed the rod that had been created at twilight, on which was clearly engraved the great and glorious Name with which he was to work wonders in Egypt, and with which he was to divide the Sea of Reeds, and bring water from the rock. It was fixed in the middle of the garden. And immediately he stretched forth his hand and took it. Behold, Moses then wished to stay with the man, and he gave Zipporah, his son's daughter, to Moses. She bore a male child whom she named Gershom, for he said, 'I have been a resident in a foreign land that is not mine.' After a long time the king of Egypt was afflicted with leprosy' and he ordered the first-born of the Israelites to be killed so that he might bathe in their blood. The Israelites groaned because of the bondage which lay heavily upon them, and they cried out. (Maher, 166)

These Jewish texts express perfectly the archetypical meanings of the pit. Even when representing the passage to the underworld, the pit stands as an experience of transformation: from living to dead, innocence to experience, unprepared to ready.

Modern writers utilize this motif to great effect, perhaps none so famously as Lewis Carroll in *Alice in Wonderland.* Other examples include Jules Verne's *Journey to the Center of the Earth*, Guillermo del Toro's film *Pan's Labyrinth*, and the 1970s children's television series *Land of the Lost*, and *Lidsville*. In the graphic novels, television series and film franchise, Bruce Wayne descends into the Bat Cave to transform himself into his crime-fighting alter-ego, Batman.

In each of these stories, descent through a hole in the ground signals transition and transformation that bring about new power.

Some cultures have ritualized this experience. The Native American cultures of the Southwest built "kiva" to enact the transition between the everyday- and under-worlds. Kivas are rooms, often large in size, typically dug into the ground. They are usually circular, and served as meeting rooms. "In the privacy of the kiva, people sang, prayed, and prepared for more public participation," David Hurst Thomas writes (136). They were spaces for the ritual enactment of myth.

> Kivas reflect the Pueblo belief that people emerged from a previous world into this one; this process was symbolically reflected as they came up from the kiva into full view of the plaza. The kiva is an earthly representation of the original, primordial homeland, built in darkness. Into this, the ultimate cave, Ancestral Pueblo people descended through the smokehole by ladder. Set into the ground was the round, shallow, navel-like *sipapu*, symbolic of the place where the Corn Mothers emerged from the earth and ensuring spiritual access to still another world deep below. (Thomas, 136)

In Chaco Valley of what is now New Mexico, great kivas were used by the Anasazi people roughly between 900-1150 CE (Thomas, 137).

Ray Williamson explains that "sipapu," the hole dug into the floor of the dug-out kiva, means "place of emergence" in the Hopi language, and that it served as "an additional symbolic reminder of the journey from the underworld." "Imagine," Williamson writes, "what it must have meant to the Anasazi to climb the ladder through clouds of purifying smoke from the fire. Each time, they were emerging once again from the underworld, a ritual which was repeated over and over in the course of a day whenever anyone left the kiva" (71).

Jews enact the same metaphor in the ritual of "mikvah," the ritual bath. Frequently employed at moments of transition, the mikvah is a pool of natural, "living" water, sometimes called a *bor*. The participant, fully naked, immerses in the waters,

recites blessings, and emerges in a new state. Mikvah is a ritual of both letting go and rebirth.

Transitions such as these are central to the human experience. Indeed, they are the means by which human potential is actualized. It should come as no surprise, then, that they are frequently ritualized through rites of passage. Such rituals help human beings maneuver through shifting identities. And it makes sense that they are often set in holes or other dark spaces since, as Victor Turner observes, transitional phases are "frequently likened to death, to being in the womb, to invisibility, to darkness, to bisexuality, to the wilderness, and to an eclipse of the sun or moon" (512). Further, Turner notes, neophytes are often represented as possessing nothing, and may go naked.

Metaphorically, these transitions are a sort of death and rebirth—the old self and associated status dies away, and a new one emerges. This is the meaning behind mythology's strong association of the pit with the Land of the Dead: when we transform, a part of us dies and can be discarded as something new is born.

In his essay on the subject in *Four Archetypes*, Jung identifies five types of rebirth: Metempsychosis (transmigration of souls), Reincarnation, Resurrection, Rebirth, and Participation in the Process of Transformation (witnessing). Rebirth refers to transformation within the span of an individual life, whether renewal, improvement, or healing. As the one that happens directly to a person while he or she lives, rebirth is, for Jung, the transformation that brings with it the possibility for improvement. "The personality is seldom, in the beginning, what it will be later on. For this reason the possibility of enlarging it exists, at least during the first half of life" (54).

Jung identifies the hole or cave as the essential locus of such transformation. "The cave is the place of rebirth, that secret cavity in which one is shut up in order to be incubated and renewed" (1992, 69). He observes its use in ritual, as well as mythology, and its power to effect improvement:

> Instead of the transformation experience coming to one through participation in the rite, the rite is used for the express purpose of effecting the transformation. It thus becomes a sort of technique to which one submits oneself. For instance, a man is ill and consequently needs to be 'renewed.' The renewal must 'happen' to him from outside, and to bring this about, he is pulled through a hole in the wall at the head of his sick-bed, and now he is reborn. (1992, 63)

Further, Jung understands the underground to represent the unconscious. Journeying to it represents the quest to understand oneself, the opening of oneself to the unconscious' contents, whether individual or collective. When he or she accesses the unconscious, the individual is transformed.

Jung describes this beautifully in his reading of the Cave Sura.

> Anyone who gets into that cave, that is to say into the cave which everyone has in himself, or into the darkness that lies behind consciousness, will find himself involved in an—at first—unconscious process of transformation. By penetrating into the unconscious he makes a connection with his unconscious contents. This may result in a momentous change of personality in the positive or negative sense. (1992, 69-70)

A chasm in the stony earth is an established metaphor for rebirth.

Indeed, Jung reports a dream of his own that took place in his home, initially on the first floor. Wondering what the ground floor of the building was like...

> I went downstairs and found it rather dark, with paneled walls and heavy furniture dating from the sixteenth century or even earlier. I was greatly surprised and my curiosity increased, because it was all a very unexpected discovery. In order to become better acquainted with the whole structure of the house, I thought I would go down to the cellar. I found a door, with a flight of stone steps that led down to a large vaulted room. The floor consisted of large slabs of stone, and the walls struck me as very ancient. I sampled the mortar and found it was mixed with splinters of brick. Obviously it was an old Roman wall. I began to grow excited. In a corner, I saw yet another narrow flight of steps leading down to a sort of cave which was obviously a prehistoric tomb. It contained two skulls, some bones, and broken shards of pottery. Then I woke up. (1990, 93)

Jung sees in this dream his own biography—his passion for older, Eastern traditions and Greek philosophy which "relativized" his original faith. By descending into the pit, Jung came to shape a new mode of psychological understanding, one that replaced an "antiquated and obsolete" worldview, and which would come to infuse his life work and, indeed, this essay. In the pit, a person can hear the unconscious speaking, and begin the rebirth that is transformation.

Jung believes that the person capable of greatness holds an awareness of his potential—whether in his conscious or unconscious. To such a person, the revelation of greatness is a moment of recognition, not discovery.

> When a summit of life is reached, when the bud unfolds and from the lesser the greater emerges...the man who is inwardly great will know that the long expected friend of his soul, the immortal one, has now really come, 'to lead captivity captive'; that is, to seize hold of him by whom this immortal had always been confined and held prisoner, and to make his life flow into that greater life—a moment of deadliest peril! (1992, 55)

The Joseph story partakes of these tropes, both mythic and psychological. When read in their light, it yields new and useful meanings.

In Genesis 37, Joseph dreams an elevated status for himself vis-à-vis his family. He has a vision of his own greater Self, one with an expanded capacity and, perhaps,

destiny. He could be more than he was. It is this vision of self that will guide him through life, a beacon of the possible. Joseph's travels are a metaphor for each person's journey through life. As does he, we seek goals only to find they have shifted. We are injured and deceived. We hit patches when all goes well. We have less control than we think. We meet some people who do right by us, and others who harm us. But through it all, a clear vision of self can guide our pilgrim's progress.

Joseph accepts the call to journey away from the place of his childhood, that is, away from himself as a child. Echoing God's call to Abraham in Genesis 18:1—"לֶךְ־לְךָ"—Jacob sends his favorite son into the world: "לְכָה וְאֶשְׁלָחֲךָ/come, let me send you" (Genesis 37:13) The answer is the same in both cases: "הִנֵּנִי/Hineni" (Genesis 37:13). For Joseph, this is the first move in the process that will transform him from potential to actuality. "The personality is seldom, in the beginning, what it will be later on. For this reason the possibility of enlarging it exists, at least during the first half of life," Jung writes. "If some great idea takes hold of us from outside, we must understand that it takes hold of us only because something in us responds to it and goes out to meet it" (1992, 54). With his affirmation of "הִנֵּנִי/Hineni," Joseph goes out to meet not his brothers, but his potential. With this, his maturation begins.

Yet, as Jung reminds us, undertaking life's journey is not enough to guarantee we become our fullest selves. We must transform. For Joseph, as for many characters of myth, legend and folktale, the pit represents that process. We should not be surprised that Joseph, like Victor Turner's initiates, is stripped of his clothing—and with it, his status—as he is thrust into the darkness. We must disengage from the persona, represented here by clothing, in order to engage transformatively with the Self. Joseph's descent into the

metaphoric pit of transformation is psychologically successful (that is, he later ascends intact) because he was able to shed his former identity. When, in Genesis 39, Joseph is sent to prison—again called "the pit/בַּבּוֹר," (Genesis 40:15)—it follows a second shedding of clothing, this time on Potiphar's wife's couch. For Joseph, such transformation occurs twice in the pit, and both times is preceded twice by the shedding of clothing. Both times, Joseph is reborn to an elevated, that is, more mature, evolved, and well-rounded, state. If we wish to change, we must be prepared to let go.

Joseph's journey to the unconscious—represented by the pit—yields fruit. Although much less present in his first descent, food surrounds Joseph's second visit. The Cup Bearer and Baker dream of comestibles, as does Pharaoh, twice—both of which occur while Joseph is "imprisoned" below. Wine, bread, corn, and beef infuse Joseph's second trip to the pit, and eating and drinking is the theme of each of the four dreams, as if to telegraph to the reader that nourishment comes from the unconscious. Indeed, Joseph rebounds from this second phase of transformation reinvigorated, elevated, and improved. Unlike Persephone, whose consumption in the underworld limits her ability to proceed, Joseph's engagement with food while undergoing transformation seems to signal his psychological health and new-found capacity. The descent into the pit fuels the character's onward growth.

Joseph's own first dream is of wheat being harvested; the second is of the celestial bodies. Both occur some time before his ill-fated trip to Shechem. The association between the pit and dreams of food exists in the first instance, although it is certainly not as neat.

The Cup Bearer and Baker's dreams are paired, as are Pharaoh's twin dreams. In each dyad, one partner is stronger and victorious, the other weaker and vanquished: The Cup Bearer returns to his post while the Baker is executed, and the thin cows and thin ears of corn devour their fatter counterparts. In the story of Joseph, the lesser aspect is surpassed by the greater one.

Jung observes that the Self has a dualistic nature. Change involves evolution from one self into another—it is "inner transformation and rebirth into another being. This 'other being' is the other person in ourselves—that larger and greater personality maturing within us, whom we have already met as the inner friend of the soul" (1992, 65). As we have seen, Joseph's two dreams, beacons from his unconscious, speak of his potential. The last four dreams of the cycle signal to the reader that, despite the hardships, Joseph's greater self will win out. He will survive the transformation of the pit and emerge intact and closer to integrity of self. His potential will be actualized.

Near the end of the Joseph cycle, following his forgiveness of them and their father's burial, the brothers once again fear Joseph's wrath (Genesis 50:15-18). In Midrash Rabbah, R. Isaac posits that "they feared because he had gone and looked into that pit" on his way back to Egypt from Canaan. If he had returned to the pit, scene of the crime and point of no return on his life's journey, what might Joseph have seen? He might have caught a glimpse of the boy he had been: alone, frightened, and proud. And he might also have seen his own reflection there below, the image of the powerful, actualized, and whole man he had become. Both Josephs had inhabited that pit, but only one emerged from the darkness.

Chapter Three:

The Cup as a Symbol of Wholeness

Tossing and turning on dusty cots far away from the palace and its comforts, one imagines, the Cup Bearer spends his first night in prison in fitful and vivid dream (Genesis 40:5). He dreams of Pharaoh's wine cup. He is certain his vision means something, although he does not know what. Many years later, an elegant goblet is hidden in a bag of grain, and is carried off unknowingly (Genesis 44:2). It is a divining cup, an object that lets its master see other realities by peering into its depths. It is a silver secret that, when revealed, will reunite a family.

In a story full of dualisms, the cup is often overlooked. Many commentators have noted the Joseph cycle's repeated dreams, pits, tunics, and trips down to Egypt, but few concern themselves with the twin appearances made by the cup. Perhaps this is because the Hebrew uses a different word for "cup" in each vignette. But this neglect is surprising given the considerable importance of the wine cup in Jewish culture. It is a symbol rich in meaning.

The characters in the Joseph cycle misunderstand and overlook the value of the cups they encounter, but both are later revealed to have important symbolic meaning for the narrative. Similarly, although biblical commentators and scholars have not paid much

attention to this repeated devise, it presents an opportunity for the application of universal symbolic systems to a reading the Torah. In this chapter, I will use the cup to extend the psycho-symbolic mode of reading Torah. The cup telescopes a range of expansive concepts and injects them into the narrative. This chapter will evaluate how the symbol appears in the text and points the reader to a wider set of meanings. In particular, it will probe the significance of the cup as the devise that reunites the brothers and, thereby, the personality we have called Joseph. This chapter will consider how the cup functions in the Joseph cycle as a symbol of the individuated Self, the ultimate expression of Jung's process of individuation.

The Cup/Goblet appears twice in Joseph's story, first in Genesis 40:9-15 as "כּוֹס/*cos*" and then in Genesis 44:11-17 as "גְּבִיעַ/*g'viyah*" (See Appendix F, "Word Study"). In the former, Pharaoh's imprisoned Cup Bearer recounts his dream of the budding vine, and in the latter, Joseph's cup is "found" in Benjamin's sack.

Alone on his cot, the Cup Bearer dreams. Hoping to have it interpreted, he is prompted by Joseph to recount his vision. His is the third dream of the Joseph cycle, the first two dreamt by Joseph at the very beginning of the narrative, Genesis 37:7 and 37:9. Along with the Baker's dream that follows it immediately, this one forms half of the middle pair of dreams. These two dreams are followed shortly by Pharaoh's two dreams in Genesis 41:1-4 and 41:5-7. The episode under consideration reinforces Joseph's connection with the world of dreams, and reminds the reader of the role of dreams in the story.

The Cup Bearer's dream is the vehicle for Joseph's redemption from prison. Although the Cup Bearer does not remember Joseph immediately upon his release, as

Joseph had hoped he would, he eventually recalls Joseph's capacity to interpret dreams correctly (although in Genesis 40:8, Joseph attributes this capacity to God). The Cup Bearer informs Pharaoh and affects Joseph's redemption. Indeed, Joseph's status, predicted in his two dreams, is elevated through his correct interpretation of four dreams: these two, and Pharaoh's two that soon follow. The Cup Bearer's dream marks the beginning of Joseph's meteoric climb from prison to Prime Minister.

The dream itself is immediately followed by Joseph's interpretation. He does not seem to hesitate at all, but assigns a meaning to each of the dream's symbols and foresees the Cup Bearer's prompt return to Pharaoh's service. The pattern of dream/correct interpretation is repeated in the Baker's tale, although the ending Joseph foresees in the second case is opposite from that of the first. It repeats once more with Pharaoh.

The cup's second appearance, Genesis 44:11-17, leads up to the climax of the Joseph story. The brothers have returned to Egypt to buy provisions for their hungry family, and Joseph has dined with them, filled their sacks with foodstuffs, and sent them home. He's also secreted a silver goblet into his full-brother Benjamin's bag, and sent his servant to reclaim it and return the men to his presence. Genesis 44:11 begins immediately prior to the moment of revelation, the moment just before the brothers realize the trouble they are in.

> They hastened to lower their bags to the ground, and each opened his bag. He began searching with the eldest and ended with the youngest, until the found the goblet in Benjamin's bag. (Genesis 44:11-12)

The brothers respond to Benjamin's seeming culpability by tearing their cloaks: "וַיִּקְרְעוּ שִׂמְלֹתָם." This is the same root, ק.ר.ע, used earlier to describe Reuben's actions (and thus his grief) when he discovers Joseph is no longer in the pit (Genesis 37:39), and

the same construction used to describe Jacob when he learns of Joseph's demise in Genesis 37:34: "וַיִּקְרַע יַעֲקֹב שִׂמְלֹתָיו/Then Jacob tore his clothes." Through language and intention, this verse connects the brothers' grief at Benjamin's presumed loss to the Egyptian overlord with Jacob and Reuben's at Joseph's loss, earlier. But what was torn will soon be mended.

In Genesis 44:16, Judah pleads to Joseph. "'What can we say to my lord? How speak and how justify ourselves? God has found out the iniquity of your servants; here we are, my lord's slaves—both we and the one who was caught with the goblet in his possession!'" Judah seems to refer both to the cup's discovery and also to the brothers' primary wrongdoing, that of the sale of Joseph.

This passage leads into Judah's recitation of the family history. His passionate story and willingness to accept responsibility prompts Joseph's revelation of his true identity, the climax of the entire cycle. The reader benefits from the summary, and can discern moments when Judah's story deviates from the Biblical narrator's tale. For the first time, as Norman Cohen points out, Joseph hears the version of events the family tells itself about his demise: "Surely he's been ripped to shreds! I haven't seen him to this day." (Genesis 44:28) Little does Judah know how true his words are, Cohen observes, as he is indeed looking directly at the very brother ripped from the family.

The cup is an icon with enduring and widespread significance (Jean Chevalier and Alain Gheerbrant, 177). It appears frequently in ancient contexts, as well as daily in contemporary rituals around the world. Yet despite its wide-ranging employment, the meaning of the cup is remarkably stable: it conveys blessing, typically of immortality,

wisdom, or grace, and on rare occasions curse. It is often a symbol of transition or initiation, and also fertility.

A cup conveys sustenance, whether water or some other liquid—healthful, such as milk, or intoxicating, like wine. A single drink can represent life-giving nourishment; a cup, like a breast (imagery particularly important in Hindu and Ancient Roman ideology, Chevalier and Gheerbrant note in their *Penguin Dictionary of Symbols*), symbolizes plenty and with it blessing. Cups therefore generally possess a positive, even life-giving connotation. But any liquid may be poisoned, opening the possibility of the destructive draught. As such, a cup may represent blessing but may also represent the opposite, that is, a curse or punishment.

When a liquid is imbibed, some aspect of it is assumed by the drinker. The cup therefore conveys unity between a certain force--whether grace, knowledge or immortality--and an individual, embodied in the content of a cup; further, to drink from one cup is to share the same fate. Drinking from a single cup is a prominent aspect of weddings in many cultures: it symbolizes the shared life in which both individuals now take part. This is true in Ancient Chinese, modern Japanese, and Jewish weddings, among others. (Chevalier and Gheerbrant, 178) "So we are dealing here with a 'uniting symbol' that expresses the bipolarity of the archetype," Jung writes (1953, 450).

Abstracted, a cup may represent a tradition, secret or known, which a participant takes on as his own and through which, it may be said, he lives forever. Infinite sustenance provides eternal life.

In the Celtic world, according to Chevalier and Gheerbrant, a chalice was brought to the king by a maiden as part of the ceremony of sovereignty; it therefore became a symbol of kingship.

The cup "as a receptacle, is feminine," and hence is connected with womanhood (Jung 1953, 449-450). More specifically, the cup is traditionally identified with motherhood. The cup represents the breast, source of sustenance, and also the vagina, from which life issues. As Riane Eisler shows, the cup, chalice, or grail is a pre-eminent Christian icon, but its roots trace into ancient, pagan times. It appears in numerous mythologies. Eisler identifies the chalice with the cult of the goddess throughout the world, and with societies organized around "actualization power" and not "domination power" (28). "Symbolized by the feminine Chalice or source of life, the generative, nurturing, creative powers of nature—not the powers to destroy—were ... given highest value" in ancient, matriarchal societies such as Catal Huyuk and Minoan Crete, site of the minotaur's labyrinth in the Theseus myth (43, 33). As we shall see, this identification of the cup with motherhood will manifest itself in several ways.

Emma Jung and Marie-Louise Von Franz cite the Irish legend of Dagda's Cauldron, which, as a vessel for liquid, occupies a similar archetypical space. In his *Dictionary of Symbols*, J.E. Cirlot concurs with this connection. The cauldron is "one of four treasures belonging to the semi-divine Tuatha De Danann; it could feed an entire army without becoming empty" (150). Bran's magic cauldron, of Welsh tradition, brought the dead back to life, although they lost the power of speech in the process. The brew in Caridwen's Cauldron offered wisdom and inspiration, and the Cauldron of Tyrnog would cook meat only for brave, not cowardly, men. Equally miraculous was the

precious cup owned by Manawyddan, son of sea divinity Lir in the Celtic tradition. It broke whenever a lie was told, and was repaired whenever it heard the truth. Elisha's pot (2 Kings 4) expresses the same trope: stew prepared in it, made with what seems to be a poisonous plant, is rendered edible when Elisha's adds regular flour to the mix.

In these stories we especially see the connection between the cauldron/chalice and the cornucopia, or "horn of plenty." Jung makes the connection explicit: "The secret of the cup is also the secret of the horn, which in turn contains the essence of the unicorn as bestower of strength, health, and life" (1953, Volume 12, 449). These vessels offer blessing, especially in the form of nourishment—although that nourishment might be spiritual and not physical.

According to Hank Harrison, "the Grail, the chalice we think of as the cup used by Jesus at the last supper, is only one manifestation of a much older and archetypical ikon which can be traced to Paleolithic Shamanism in Western Europe, to Neolithic astronomy centers in Ireland and to sources in Africa and Asia. Worship of a concave object is probably traceable to the earliest practices of our species" (203). Cirlot cites several examples of decorated ritual cups from Africa (358).

In tracing the symbol of the chalice through history, Harrison claims that the ancient Eleusian mysteries presented an enactment of the Demeter-Hades-Persephone myth during which participants drank from a goblet to expand consciousness (107). The cup also represented Dionysus, god of the vine and, along with Demeter, one of two Olympian gods of agriculture—important to both the Greeks and Romans. A bountiful harvest is the manifestation *par excellence* of the gods' blessing. Harrison further suggests that the Romans depicted the bull-god Mithras holding a bowl in his left hand,

and that the third stage of initiation into the Mithraic cult was symbolized by a cape of invisibility, a cauldron, and a chalice, demonstrating again the cup's symbolism of initiation and integration (76, 78). Cups appear on Roman coins, including some dating as late as 450 CE (Harrison, 75). Playing such an important role in the cultural mix that shaped Early Christianity, it is no surprise that the chalice emerged as an central symbol in that religion, specifically in the form of the Holy Grail of legend and in the chalice of the rite of the Eucharist.

In the Sacrament, part of the Mass, the chalice holds wine that is believed to become the very blood of Christ through transubstantiation. The connection between the blood and the wine expressed in this rite is based in Matthew 26:27-28, Mark 14:22-24, Luke 22:17-18 and 20, John 6:53-56 and Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, 11:25-26. In this ritual use of the chalice, both ancient and contemporary, one can observe three central motifs of the symbol in use: the cup is reserved for initiates, imparts to them a special state—in this case, grace—and drinking from it is therefore transformative.

The chalice of blood is connected as well to the Holy Grail. Said either to be the cup used in The Last Supper, or the one that collected Christ's blood during the Passion and carried to Europe by Joseph of Arimathea (or both), it appears frequently in medieval art and literature, predominantly but not exclusively in connection to the Arthurian legends with their deep Celtic roots. There, it stands as the object of the various quests of the Knights of the Round Table, the ultimate representation of grace and often carried by a female figure. As such, the cup continues to play in the imagination. Yet, according to Harrison,

> those who see the Grail as a simple material chalice, of the type encountered by Monty Python or Indiana Jones, will miss the point entirely. The quests conducted by the legendary knights of King Arthur's Round Table were not quests for an actual chalice. Instead they were quests for the cosmological information hidden in the symbolic Grail and for the psychological transformation promised to anyone who penetrates its mysteries. (6)

As Harrison notes, "the transformation of symbols is well established in Jungian psychology, and it is well known that symbols often change in meaning during their transformation. Oddly enough, the Grail symbol, while changing outwardly, as a skull, a horn, a clay pot or a cauldron stone, has remained consistent in meaning over time" (203).

Let us now consider its meaning within the Jewish tradition. The wine cup is one of Judaism's most central and enduring symbols.

In Genesis 14:18, King Melchizedek, Priest of the Most High and a non-Hebrew, uses wine and bread to bless Abraham. The text does not speak of a cup, nor can we hope to understand the layers of intention in either the character or the biblical author for this ancient vignette, but we can discern in these verses the earliest traces of what would become a ubiquitous Jewish custom. It is a custom not mentioned in Tanakh, however; the cup is not included among the ritual objects of the Mishkan or Temple.

Despite this silence, the wine cup had certainly become a ritual object in Mishnaic times, around 200 CE. Wine, the instrument of blessing and the occasion of benediction, is measured by, offered in, and consumed from a specialized cup. In Tractate Pesachim, the rabbis debate the cups of wine to be included in the Passover seder, as well as the appropriate manner of their consumption. As they do, the rabbis use the term *cos* to describe the quantity and mode in which the wine is to be drunk. (See, for example,

Pesachim 102b and 103a.) The rabbis' debate about the necessary cups of Pesach wine is cited in Midrash Rabbah. R. Samuel b. Nachman holds that the four cups of the seder refer to the four mentions of Pharaoh's cup in Genesis 38! Kabbalists associate the four cups of wine with nothing less than four of the sephirot—Hochmah, Bimah, Tiferet and Malchut (David Ariel, 159). The Kiddush cup was used to sanctify the Sabbath. Mishnah Berakoth 51b presents the debate between the Houses of Hillel and Shammai about the blessing over the wine: Beit Shammai blesses the day first, and then the wine, while Beit Hillel blesses in the opposite order. Further, it is the custom of Beit Shammai to wash hands before filling the cup, while Beit Hillel prefers to fill the cup first.

The gemara that expounds this mishnah makes the importance of the wine clear. Beit Shammai blesses the day first "because it is on account of the day that the wine is used, and [moreover] the day has already become holy, [even] before the wine has been brought (This and all translations of The Babylonian Talmud, edited by Rabbi Dr. Isidore Epstein, from www.come-and-hear.com)." For Beit Hillel, the wine takes precedence "because the wine provides the occasion for saying a benediction." The gemara goes on to supply an additional explanation for Hillel's *minhag*: "the blessing over wine is said regularly while the blessing of the day is said only at infrequent intervals, and that which comes regularly always has precedence over that which comes infrequently." Clearly, a blessing made over a cup of wine was normative by the early Rabbinic (that is, the Late Roman) Period. The *halachah* is established according to Beit Hillel.

The Talmud considers not only the order of the ritual, but proper usage of the wine cup as well.

Berakoth 51a discusses a baraita cited by R. Zera in the name of R. Abbahu:

> Ten things have been said in connection with the cup used for grace after meals. It requires to be rinsed and washed, it must be undiluted and full, it requires crowning and wrapping, it must be taken up with both hands and placed in the right hand, it must be raised a handbreadth from the ground, and he who says the blessing must fix his eyes on it. Some add that he must send it round to the members of his household. R. Johanan said: 'We only know of four: rinsing, washing, undiluted and full.' A Tanna taught: 'Rinsing refers to the inside, washing to the outside.' R. Johanan said: 'Whoever says the blessing over a full cup is given an inheritance without bounds, as it says, *And full with the blessing of the Lord; possess thou the sea and the south.*' R. Jose son of R. Hanina says: 'He is privileged to inherit two worlds, this world and the next.' 'Crowning': Rab Judah crowned it with disciples; R. Hisda surrounded it with cups. 'And undiluted': R. Shesheth said: 'Up to the blessing of the land.' 'Wrapping': R. Papa used to wrap himself in his robe and sit down [to say grace over a cup]; R. Assi spread a kerchief over his head. 'It is taken in both hands': R. Hinena b. Papa said: 'What is the Scriptural warrant for this?' — *Lift up your hands in holiness and bless ye the Lord.*' 'And placed in the right hand'. R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: 'The earlier [students] asked: 'Should the left hand support the right?'' — R. Ashi said: 'Since the earlier [students] inquired and the question was not decided we will follow the more stringent view.' 'He raises it a handbreadth from the ground': R. Aha b. Hanina said: 'What Scriptural text have we for this?' — *I will lift up the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord.*' 'He fixes his eyes on it': so that his attention should not wander from it. 'He sends it round to the members of his household': so that his wife may be blessed.

The wine cup's association with blessing is made plain: not only must the one offering the benediction "fix his eyes on it," forging an even deeper connection with it, but the blessings provided by the full wine cup are, according to R. Johanan and R. Jose son of R. Hanina, beyond compare: an inheritance without bounds, even the sea and the south, and two worlds, this one and the next, respectively. The text once again uses the term *cos* for wine cup.

In Pesachim 100b, Rab requires those who bless wine at synagogue to bless it again before they drink it at home. In so doing, they allow their children and other

members of the household to fulfill their duty with respect to the wine. In their consideration of wine in Pesachim, the rabbis employ the term *cos*.

The Talmudic discussion of the rituals related to the blessings said over and flowing from the wine cup continue, and the ritual use of wine cups by the Jews of the Roman period is clear. They were central to religious observance, and were associated with blessing.

Another Talmudic story exemplifies the importance of the wine cup of benediction to the rabbis and Jewish tradition, and bundles it with both Genesis and universal associations with the symbol.

Baba Mezia 87a considers Genesis 18:9.

וַיֹּ֥אמְרוּ אֵלָ֖יו אַיֵּ֣ה שָׂרָ֣ה אִשְׁתֶּ֑ךָ וַיֹּ֥אמֶר הִנֵּ֖ה בָּאֹ֥הֶל

> "And they said to him, 'where is Sarah your wife?' And he said, 'Here, in the tent.'" (my translation)

To the rabbis, Sarah's modesty is demonstrated by her retirement from the presence of male company. Since, as Rab Judah points out in the name of Rab, the angelic visitors surely knew that Sarah was present in the tent, why did they even ask the question? It may be "to make her beloved to her husband," or, according to R. Jose son of R. Hanina, "in order [to get him] to send her the wine cup of benediction," as discussed in Berakoth 51a.

The rabbis continue the story a few lines down in the sugya, considering Sarah's statement upon Isaac's birth:

וַתֹּ֣אמֶר מִֽי מִלֵּ֣ל לְאַבְרָהָ֗ם הֵינִ֤יקָה בָנִים֙ שָׂרָ֔ה כִּֽי־יָלַ֥דְתִּי בֵ֖ן לְזָקְנָֽיו

> And she added, 'Who would have dared say to Abraham, 'Sarah shall nurse children'? Yet I am borne a son in his old age!' (Genesis 21:7)

The rabbis wonder: why "children" in the plural, when Sarah had only one child, Isaac? "How many children then did Sarah nurse?" R. Levi offers a story in response:

> On the day that Abraham weaned his son Isaac, he made a great banquet, and all the peoples of the world derided him, saying, 'Have you seen that old man and woman, who brought a foundling from the street, and now claim him as their son! And what is more, they make a great banquet to establish their claim!' What did our father Abraham do? — He went and invited all the great men of the age, and our mother Sarah invited their wives. Each one brought her child with her, but not the wet nurse, and a miracle happened unto our mother Sarah, her breasts opened like two fountains, and she suckled them all. Yet they still scoffed, saying, 'Granted that Sarah could give birth at the age of ninety, could Abraham beget [child] at the age of a hundred?' Immediately the lineaments of Isaac's visage changed and became like Abraham's, whereupon they all cried out, Abraham begat Isaac.

In this tale, the rabbis bring together several key strains of the cup's symbolism. The cup of blessing is miraculous, infinite like the cornucopia and linked to the female breast with unending milk, emblematic of both fertility and sustenance, the ultimate blessing. So central is the symbol to Jewish observance that the rabbis impose the Kiddush cup on the Patriarchs.

The wine cup is present in archaeological evidence of this time, too. Erwin Goodenough's study of Jewish symbols in the Greco-Roman period cites its appearance on lamps, walls of synagogues, and coins. He cites the several undated Palestinian lamps in his Figures 286 through 289 (Volume III, from Reifenberg, *Kleinkunst*, 44, fig. 43), the first of which he describes as possessing a

> definite symbolic convention whose three elements are the shrine with an arcuated lintel under a gable, the 'round objects,' and the cup. Our present interest is in seeing this architectural form, quite divorced from any reference to structure, used to indicate the sanctity of the cup and the 'round objects' (here presumably symbolizing wine and bread). The total symbolic form would seem to sanctify the lamp, which, I strongly suspect, gave sanctity to the corpse with which it was buried." (Volume 4, 113)

The symbolism of the chalice occurs in early synagogue architecture as well. In the mosaic floor of the Synagogue at Beth Alpha, a bunch of grapes is depicted near a container that Goodenough reads as a bread basket. With a second sprig of grapes perched on its rim, however, it may very well be a wine cup instead (Volume III, figure 633). Elsewhere in that mosaic, a presumed wine cup appears "at the top of each of the three vertical posts of the shrine" holding the Torah, as reproduced in Figure 639 of Goodenough's Volume III (Volume 4, 121). That synagogue is dated from the last fifth or early sixth century, CE, according to William Kramer. The wine cup was also used by the Jews of the Late Roman Period in their coins, as in a coin from the First Revolt, dated CE 66-70 from the British Museum (Goodenough Volume 3, figure 285) with pomegranates on the reverse. While a substantial review of the usage of wine cup imagery by the Jews of the Late Roman Era is beyond the scope of this essay, it is clear that the symbol was important enough to them to prompt its use on in the floors of synagogues and on coins of the era. The symbolic value of the wine cup conforms in each of these cases.

While the wine cup and vine were important pagan symbols connected with Dionysus/Bacchus, Jews severed them from their associations with the frenzy and fertility associated with the Cult of the Maenads. According to Goodenough, "it is well illustrated that" although the wine-related

> symbols we are studying ... went from paganism to Judaism and Christianity[,] Jews and Christians rejected the old explanations, the myths and mythological representations, while they kept their sanity by retaining the symbols themselves. One of the most notable things about the forms we are studying is that they are stripped of their all their old mythological settings, because the settings implied pagan explanations. The hypothesis on which I am working, or which I am testing, is that in taking over the symbols, while discarding the myths and explanations of the pagans, Jews and Christians admitted, indeed confirmed, a continuity of religious experience which it is most important to be able to identify." (42)

Jews and Christians of the Roman world used the vine and cup or birds feeding on grapes, "but not bacchanalian cultic scenes, or portrayals of Dionysiac mythology" (Goodenough, 46). However, Goodenough maintains, in keeping with the unchanging foundation of the symbol, "pagans, Jews, and Christians, still sought the cup with its medicine of immortality, the life juice of God himself" (60).

Into contemporary times, the Kiddush cup remains the cup of blessing and joy. It is present at the beginning and end of Shabbat, on festivals, and life-cycle events, specifically *brit milah* and marriage.

When making Kiddush, the traditional blessing relates the cup of wine not only to the Sabbath, but through Shabbat to creation itself, the source of all and the ultimate moment of blessing. Along with a braided candle and spices, the wine cup is one of three objects used in Havdallah, the ceremony ending Shabbat. We see from the Talmud that these uses of the cup date back at least to Late Roman times; they continue to be enacted to this day.

Drinking from the cup of wine is an important ritual act at contemporary festivals as well. The four cups of wine remain a staple of the Passover seder, as does Elijah's Cup. A drop of wine is removed from each person's cup as the Ten Plagues are called out—beginning with the first, "*dam*/blood," so as to reduce the evening's joyfulness.

Wine is explicitly identified with joy, and—*perhaps* unconsciously—with blood. The cup of wine remains an indispensable component of the Rosh Hashanah, Sukkot, and Shavuot observances, and is present on Yom Kippur in the Havdallah that ends the fasting. It does not feature in Hanukkah celebrations.

As a conveyor of joy, wine plays a prominent role in the contemporary celebration of *simchas*. Today, *brit milah* includes the making of Kiddush. What's more, traditional *mohelim* would expel aerated wine on the baby's penis—perhaps beneficial as an antiseptic, and perhaps "as a vehicle through which a blessing may be given and as a thing to be mingled with, perhaps identified with, life-giving blood" (Goodenough, 145). At the *bris* and at Passover, Jewish culture indeed identifies wine with blood, although the connection is not made as explicitly as it is in Christian worship.

The wine cup is central to Jewish weddings, and appears to have entered the ceremony in Greco-roman times (Goodenough, 146-7). Since the contemporary Jewish wedding is an amalgamation of two different rituals, *kiddushin*, (also known as *erusin*, that is, "betrothal") and *nisuin*, (or *chupah*, "marriage"), it is fitting that two cups of wine are drunk, each a vestige of an original ritual use. *Birkat Erusin*, the blessing for the betrothal, is made over the first cup of wine. The second cup, for *nisuin*, is the first of the *Sheva B'rachot*—the first of seven blessings.

The connection between the wine cup and the joy of the occasion is made explicit in these seven blessings. Jack Stern elaborates on it to brides and grooms in *The Jewish Wedding Book*: "During the ceremony you will both drink from the cup of wine, our Jewish symbol of joy. But in this cup is not only your private joy but your family's, and your friends', and your Jewish people's and your humanity's—everybody's joy belongs

to you" (115). The blessing symbolized by the cup of wine flows outwards from the couple into the congregation.

But the wine cup does not represent joy exclusively. It is also featured in the "breaking of the glass," a ritual that ends the Jewish wedding ceremony and which may be, along with the *chuppah*, one of its most recognizable symbols.

As with all rich symbols, the shattered glass possesses a multitude of meanings at work simultaneously. These include mourning for the destruction of the Temple, an acknowledgement that sorrow exists even in joy, an attempt to drive away evil spirits, a statement that love is fragile and in need of protection and, according to some scholars, the breaking of the bride's hymen (David Syme, 120).

The cup appears twice in the marriage ritual and also in the Joseph story: once in the Cup Bearer's dream, and again just before Joseph reveals himself to his brothers. In ritual as in literature, the cup epitomizes moments of unification, drawing upon its universal symbolic dimensions.

Joseph correctly reads the Cup Bearer's dream, and tells him "וְהֵשִׁיבְךָ/he [Pharaoh] will restore you" (Genesis 40:13, translation Shapiro). The man and his office, and the servant and his king will be reunited. When Joseph's goblet appears in Chapter 44, it signals the beginning of the family's restoration: it is the device that brings the brothers back to court, sparks Judah's monologue of responsibility and, ultimately, Joseph's revelation. The cup triggers the reunion. In both cases, the cup bestows blessing, and re-establishes unity. These are fully in keeping with the universal symbolic understandings of the cup.

To grasp fully the significance of the cup in these junctures, it is important to understand how symbols work. "In general, symbols are images, words, or behaviors that have multiple levels of meaning. Symbols stand for concepts that are too complex to be stated directly in words" (Mari Womack, 1-2). Unlike signs, which point to fixed meanings, symbols are single words or images that point to multiple and complex meanings. These meanings may shift over time. Symbols, then, are a telescoped means of giving meaning to complex aspects of psychological life.

In the Joseph story, following many years of separation in which abundance came to both the Land of Egypt and Joseph the "Prime Minister," famine has struck and the remaining sons of Jacob head West in search of food (Genesis 42:5). They appear before Joseph but do not recognize him in his finery (Genesis 42:8). Calling the ten brothers spies although in truth he recognizes them, Joseph connives to hold Simeon prisoner but sends the others home with sacks full both of grain and the silver they paid for it (Genesis 42:9-26). Later, when the family has again run out of provisions, the brothers return to Egypt; this time, per the "Egyptian" overlord's instructions, Benjamin must accompany them. Judah offers himself up as surety to his father for Rachel's only remaining son and Israel begrudgingly lets him go (Genesis 43:8-14).

The brothers present themselves to Joseph, who inquires about their father in two verses in which the word שָׁלוֹם/*shalom* appears three times:

> וַיִּשְׁאַל לָהֶם לְשָׁלוֹם וַיֹּ֣אמֶר הֲשָׁלוֹם אֲבִיכֶם הַזָּקֵן אֲשֶׁר אֲמַרְתֶּם הַעוֹדֶנּוּ חָי: וַיֹּ֣אמְרוּ שָׁלוֹם לְעַבְדְּךָ לְאָבִינוּ עוֹדֶנּוּ חָי וַיִּקְדוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ [וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ].
>
> He greeted [*leshalom*] them, and he said, "How is [*hashalom*] your aged father of whom you spoke? Is he still in good health?" They replied, "It is well [*shalom*] with your servant our father; he is still in good health." And they bowed and made obeisance. (Genesis 43:27-28, JPS Translation)

Joseph has their bags filled once again with grain and payment, and this time orders "גְּבִיעִי גְּבִיעַ הַכָּסֶף/my goblet, the silver goblet" to be placed in Benjamin's sack (Genesis 44:2, my translation). His steward follows them and accuses them of stealing. The brothers vehemently deny the charge, offering that the culprit should be put to death and the rest of them enslaved. The goblet is found in Benjamin's bag, where it was hidden, and the eleven return to the palace.

> Judah and his brothers entered Joseph's house; he was still there. They fell to the ground before him. Joseph said to them, 'What is this deed you have done? Did you not know that a man like me constantly practices divination?' Judah replied, 'What can we say to my lord? How speak and how justify ourselves? God has found out the iniquity of your servants; here we are, my lord's slaves—both we and the one who was caught with the goblet in his possession!' (Genesis 44:14-16)

Now, the brothers take responsibility for themselves, most especially Judah who offers himself in Benjamin's stead. Now, Joseph stands poised to complete the mission assigned to him by his father decades before:

> וַיֹּ֣אמֶר לוֹ֮ לֶךְ־נָ֣א רְאֵה֒ אֶת־שְׁלוֹם֙ אַחֶ֣יךָ וְאֶת־שְׁל֣וֹם הַצֹּ֔אן וַהֲשִׁבֵ֖נִי דָּבָ֑ר וַיִּשְׁלָחֵ֙הוּ֙ מֵעֵ֣מֶק חֶבְר֔וֹן וַיָּבֹ֖א שְׁכֶֽמָה

> And he [Jacob] said to him, 'please go see to the wholeness [*shalom*] of your brothers and the wholeness [*shalom*] of the flock and bring me back world and he sent him from the Valley of Hebron and he went to Shechem. (Genesis 37:14, my translation)

Joseph reveals himself to his brothers, sobbing loudly. The brothers, who earlier could not speak to Joseph "לְשָׁלֹ֑ם/peaceably" (Genesis 37:4), now cannot speak at all. Joseph bids them approach, and explains that he understands that his sale into slavery was part of a larger plan to ensure the survival of the family. It was God who sent Joseph to Egypt to prepare for the famine; the family is invited to come live in the region of Goshen. Joseph embraces his brother Benjamin first, and weeps, and then kisses and

weeps upon all his brothers. At long last, they can speak; in Genesis 45:15, wholeness has arrived.

This moment of reconciliation—of the twelve brothers, in a literal reading of text, and of the several aspects of the psyche, when read psycho-symbolically, is the climax of the Joseph cycle. Although individuation is a process that is never completed, this moment represents an archetypical image of an actual person's potential to become whole, as signaled by the repetition of the root ש.ל.מ in the verses prior. This שָׁלוֹם/*shalom* is brought about and symbolized by a cup.

As we have seen, the cup is a universal symbol of unity and a conveyor of blessing. These qualities are profoundly present in Joseph's goblet, serving, as it does, to reunite the family. In the Joseph cycle, individuation (and the individuating function of the Self) are represented by the cup that rendered it.

Curtis Smith describes the Self as "the archetype of unity and wholeness of the entire psychic system, and, as such, is the expression of one's uniqueness and individuality. The self in this capacity serves to unify the entire personality—both consciousness and the unconscious—into a coherent whole" (68). Further, he writes, "whereas the ego is the center of consciousness, the self is the center of the psyche in its totality and the basis of identity" (68). The Self is the foundation from which individual experience and consciousness arise. The Self is a construct that describes the entirety of both the personal consciousness and unconscious, combining two incompatible components into a single entity: the complete personality.

For Jung, the Self is the unattainable goal of the process of individuation: "so too the self is our life's goal, for it is the completest (sic) expression of that fateful combination we call individuality" (Jung, *Collected Works*, Volume 7, in Smith, 78).

The Self is "more than simply unifying one's psyche," Smith writes. "The bounds of the self extend beyond the individual to include a oneness with the world at large. The self, although expanded to cosmic proportions, is nonetheless located within a particular individual. Hence it is through the individual that one gains access to the universal" (Smith, 93-4). Selfhood allows a knowledge of something which is at once far bigger than the ego and also intimately connected to the person. The Self can see the bigger picture, in which troubles and setbacks, though painful, play a necessary role in a larger story. So, too, are pleasures and successes understood to be in service of a higher truth. A more functional relationship with the Self, therefore, can bring with it a sense of detachment from the world.

Jung called the Self "God within us" because it "transcends our powers of comprehension" and also because it can assimilate the bigger picture although it is located within a particular individual (Jung, 1953, *Collected Works*, Volume 7, 236). Joseph expresses this consciousness when he tells his brothers:

> וַיֹּ֣אמֶר יוֹסֵף֮ אֶל־אֶחָיו֒ גְּשׁוּ־נָ֣א אֵלַ֔י וַיִּגָּשׁוּ֙ וַיֹּ֔אמֶר אֲנִ֥י יוֹסֵ֖ף אֲחִיכֶ֑ם אֲשֶׁר־מְכַרְתֶּ֥ם אֹתִ֖י
> מִצְרָ֥יְמָה: וְעַתָּ֡ה אַל־תֵּֽעָצְבוּ֩ וְאַל־יִחַ֨ר בְּעֵינֵיכֶ֜ם כִּֽי־מְכַרְתֶּ֣ם אֹתִ֗י הֲנָּה֙ כִּ֣י לְמִחְיָ֔ה שְׁלָחַ֥נִי
> אֱלֹהִ֖ים לִפְנֵיכֶ֑ם: כִּי־זֶ֗ה שְׁנָתַ֤יִם הָרָעָב֙ בְּקֶ֣רֶב הָאָ֔רֶץ וְעוֹד֙ חֲמֵ֣שׁ שָׁנִ֔ים אֲשֶׁ֥ר אֵין־חָרִ֖ישׁ וְקָצִֽיר:
> וַיְשַׁלְּחֵ֥נִי אֱלֹהִ֛ים לִפְנֵיכֶ֖ם לָשׂ֣וּם לָכֶ֣ם שְׁאֵרִ֔ית בָּאָ֑רֶץ וּלְהַחֲיוֹת֥ לָכֶ֖ם לִפְלֵיטָ֥ה גְדֹלָֽה: וְעַתָּ֡ה
> לֹֽא־אַתֶּם֩ שְׁלַחְתֶּ֨ם אֹתִ֜י הֲנָּה֗ כִּ֤י הָאֱלֹהִים֙ וַיְשִׂימֵ֣נִי לְאָ֔ב לְפַרְעֹ֖ה וּלְאָד֣וֹן לְכָל־בֵּיתוֹ֑ וּמֹשֵׁ֕ל
> בְּכָל־אֶ֖רֶץ מִצְרָֽיִם:

> 'I am Joseph your brother, whom you sold to Egypt; and now, don't be troubled, don't be chagrined because you sold me here, for it was to save lives that God sent me ahead of you. There have already been two years of famine in the land, and [there remain] five more years without plowing or harvesting. So God sent me ahead of you to assure your survival in the land, and to keep you alive for a great deliverance. So it's not you who sent me here but the God who made me a father to Pharaoh, a lord of all his household, a ruler of the whole land of Egypt.' (Genesis 45:4-8)

A *pshat* reading requires Joseph to display empathy and largess beyond imagining. A psycho-symbolic reading allows Joseph, a character now personifying individuation, to comprehend the big picture, to see beyond his own bounded existence, and to understand the role he played in the larger narrative.

The Self as archetype is known through images, symbols that express this complex construction in dreams, visual art, or literature. For Jung, the mandala, a symbolic image typically with a circle at the center, is the central graphic representation of the Self. "Hence the centre of the circle [mandala] as an expression of wholeness would correspond not to the 'I', but to the self as epitome of the total personality," Jung wrote (*The Integration of the Personality* in Smith, 93). The circle may appear in many forms, but it represents the integrity of the realized human being.

According to Whitmont,

> the many symbolic representations of the Self, of which we can give only a few examples, are images that point to totality or wholeness—of either a psychological or transcendental (infinite or eternal) character—as well as to a central entity of order and direction. The former, or encompassing images have circular, square, cubic or global shapes or have some other infinite or eternal character. (222)

In Genesis, גְּבִיעַ הַכֶּסֶף/the silver cup symbolizes Joseph's individuated Self. Round in the hand, it is the instrument that reunites the brothers, that is, the disparate components of the psyche, as many grapes are gathered together to form a single cup of

wine. Cups represent infinity, as idealized in the related cornucopia and as the Self is infinite. This reading allows the cup to function in Genesis precisely within its universal symbolic range as a unifier and vehicle for blessing, typically wisdom or grace and in this case שָׁלוֹם/*shalom*, or wholeness.

Symbols for the Self usually also demonstrate *quaternity*, that is, a four-fold aspect connotative of the four elements in one. In Joseph's cup, the sons of four mothers (Rachel, Leah, Bilhah, and Zilpah) are brought together. So too does the ancient, feminine aspect of the cup as woman and mother reappear.

For many readers of the Joseph cycle, the cup is just another object, like the silver coins first secreted into the brothers' bags, or the baker's basket. But if we are to respect the enormity of the text's wisdom, then every word conveys meaning on multiple levels. The cup is not a random choice (just as the coins and basket elsewhere in the story are not), but rather one that partakes in a universal symbolic system. Understanding that system allows a reader of the Torah to see the story with eyes opened wide, admitting more layers of meaning. Not only does the Torah's use of the cup fall well within universal connotations, it also expresses beautifully the individuation demonstrated by the character Joseph, who has journeyed long and hard to achieve a unity of psyche denied real human beings. He has shaped an ego, created personae only to have them repeatedly torn from him, struggled with his shadow and his anima. At last he has reconciled these disparate parts of himself, and has become in-divisible, or whole. This state of grace is expressed in the silver goblet that brings it about.

Conclusion:

מַה־תְּבַקֵּשׁ

> *We have come to realize that myths are among the subtlest and most direct languages of experience. They re-enact moments of signal truth or crisis in the human condition. But myth is more than history made memorable; the mythographer -- the poet -- is the historian of the unconscious. This gives to the great myths their haunting universality.* (George Steiner 1977, 173)

When Joseph begins his quest, he is asked a simple question: "What do you seek?" (Genesis 37:15) Through this essay, I sought to understand the basic ideas of Jungian thought, and whether their application to the Torah was instructive—and if so, how. I have also sought to understand how the Torah might be read in light of universal mythic tropes.

From his initial wanderings in the hills and valleys near Hebron, Joseph experiences an unimaginable violation: his brothers strip him, cast him into an empty pit, contemplate murdering him, and ultimately sell him into slavery. Not even skipping lunch, they let their father believe he was devoured by wild beasts.

But Joseph lifts himself up and out of the בּוֹר/bor, the container of death, to reclaim his life and reunite with his brothers, both acts symbolized by the גֶּבִיעַ/g'viyah, the container of blessing.

Along the way, the boy meets a host of characters and becomes a man. Some of these favor him and some do him harm, but each has an impact on the course of his life.

The story of Joseph is surely universal in its understanding of human relationships, pain, longing, and exaltation. But more than that, it employs several universal literary motifs, of which this essay has highlighted just a few: clothing as representation of identity, the pit as locus of transformation, and the cup as conveyor of blessing. The reader need not be aware that these motifs appear in other literary traditions for them to be effective; generations of Jewish readers have not. But our reading is enhanced by the comparison to other works, including those from other cultures and eras: the Joseph story takes on a very different flavor if we are able liken his descent down the hole to Alice's, and his fantastic journeys in Egypt to hers in Wonderland. Joseph no longer seems nearly so alone down below—rather, he is kept company by a host of characters who have descended to the depths only to be reborn. We become deeper readers when we are aware that our tradition does not exist separate and apart from others. What is ours is also theirs.

Still there are some key differences between the Jewish tradition and those of other cultures. In particular, the Joseph cycle has shown us that the monomyth is not, in fact, universal, and that the Bible's divergence from it is not an aberration but instead a statement of values. The Joseph story, among other tales in Genesis, does not end with

the king, but rather with a reunification with the brothers. The Hebrew Bible rejects the symbolism of gold for a healthy life, and uses instead a united family.

Joseph has served as a guide through the human psyche, introducing us to its different aspects, including the ego, the persona, shadow, anima/animus, and mana personality, and his cup can symbolize the realized quest for psychic integrity. The Torah can present these aspects of the psyche through story, and we have seen that a psycho-symbolic reading can illuminate our understandings of the Torah by adding another to the established exegetical modes.

Even as we engage other systems to enhance our analysis, Jews read the Torah through the lenses of our own culture and history. We draw on our rich tradition to help us understand the sacred text. For the Jew, a cup is not simply a cup, but has been a conveyor of blessing since at least Mishnaic times. The Kiddush cup, ubiquitous today, can be traced spiritually back to Joseph's silver chalice. It is the cup from which newlyweds sip to seal their bond, and the cup we raise to welcome Shabbat. It is the cup from which blessings and unity flow into our lives. We can also understand the cup to represent the unity of Self, the psychic integrity that is each person's truth.

When Jews toast "*l'chaim*," we salute life's journey, a voyage through time towards wholeness. When we call out a joyful "Shabbat Shalom" over the Kiddush cup at the end of the week, we honor the wholeness/*shalom* that we hope the Sabbath will bring, and which may be ours when our journey is someday through. As Joseph found reconciliation and completion, we pray the cup will bring those same blessings to us.

Finally, his brothers have bowed at his feet, as their representations did in the dreams of his ego. Cup in hand, now, and brothers at his side, Joseph ultimately realizes

that the story was never about him, never about his power nor his pain. Rather, it was about the collective good represented by his family and the Israelite mission itself...a journey towards *shalom*.

Appendix A: Literary Setting

The Joseph cycle occupies Genesis Chapters 37-50 through Exodus 1, ending with Exodus 1:8: "A new king arose over Egypt who did not know Joseph." Genesis 38 interrupts the narrative flow with the story of Judah and Tamar. The Joseph cycle tells the story of Jacob's favorite son, his dreams, enslavement in Egypt, promotion to Second-in-Command, saving of Egypt from famine, and reconciliation with his brothers and father.

The opening line of Parshah Vayeishev, Genesis 37:1 refers to Jacob's story. It follows a recitation of Esau's line (36:1-43), an off-shoot of the Patriarchal narrative. In so doing, Genesis 37:1 frames the generations of Esau within the Hebrew saga and returns the reader to that main thrust. As a conclusion, it marks the shift from Genesis' focus on the third patriarch to that of his sons, including most important among them, Joseph. This shift is made evident in the second verse of the chapter, which begins by telling the family history of Jacob, and resolves with a clear statement that "Joseph, at seventeen years old," is the continuation of the line—the primary focus of the biblical author.

The generational turn is abrupt, but by no means absolute. While Genesis 37:2 shifts focus from Jacob to Joseph—and not to his other brothers—with breathtaking precision, Jacob remains an important character in the entire chapter. Indeed, his

presence and absence are felt throughout the Joseph cycle. The opening lines of Chapter 37 refer to Bilhah and Zilpah, requiring the reader to be familiar with the family story.

Bilhah and Zilpah are maids to the sisters Rachel and Leah, both married to Jacob. As Genesis 30 recounts, Jacob worked seven years to marry his beloved Rachel, but her father Laban substituted the elder sister on the day of the wedding. Jacob subsequently marries Rachel, who then discovers her difficulty in conceiving. Leah, on the other hand, is fruitful, bearing seven sons and one daughter. Bilhah and Zilpah, too, bear sons for their mistresses with Jacob as the sisters' competition grows. Into this environment of sadness and envy, Joseph is born to Rachel (Genesis 30:23).

This may be the back story that explains the cryptic 37:3: "Yet Israel loved Joseph better than his sons, for he was to him the son of his old age; he therefore made him a coat of many colors." An understanding of the family dynamic, including Jacob's primary love of Rachel and Joseph's status as Rachel's first born, is necessary; the author assumes the reader's knowledge and provides no specifics.

Joseph's dreaming (37:5) reminds the reader of Genesis 28:12, in which his father dreams of a ladder to heaven. The connection shared by father and son is reinforced and, perhaps, explained. Dreams are a central motif of the Joseph story. Six of them are recounted in sets of two (Genesis 37, 40, and 41), each time indicating an important turning point of the narrative, foretelling the future, and providing a means of comparison for the evolving character of Joseph. Joseph is known for his dreams and the ability to interpret them, called variously "בַּעַל הַחֲלֹמוֹת/Master of Dreams" by his brothers (Genesis 37:19) and "אִישׁ כְּפִתְרוֹן חֲלֹמוֹ חָלָמְנוּ/man who interprets dreams" by the Cup Bearer (Genesis 40:11).

By reminding the reader of the setting—Canaan—at the very end of the Jacob cycle, the author asserts the centrality of the land and the promise it embodies. The author subtly foreshadows the family's long-term departure from its birthright, led by Joseph at the end of this chapter and a major theme of the Torah.

The Book of Genesis ends with the death of Joseph in Chapter 50, Verse 26: "Joseph died at one hundred, ten years of age, and they embalmed him and he was placed in a coffin in Egypt." While Exodus (and the books that follow) will focus not on the Patriarchal family but rather on the Hebrews as a people, it begins with a repetition-in-miniature of the story of Jacob's clan, its migration to Egypt, and Joseph's death. This encapsulation of the Joseph cycle provides names, but no narrative detail other than the death of all members of Joseph's generation. Once Exodus sees the Hebrews beyond Joseph's demise, it takes the narrative forward with the family's increase, and closes his chapter by announcing, in Exodus 1:8, that Joseph's legacy is forgotten by the new King of Egypt.

In the Book of Exodus, the biblical author takes a personal journey, begun with a misguided trip to Shechem, and extends it to the national. Only then does the reader come to understand the full implication of Joseph's sale into Egypt. The personal has become political.

The deaths of the Patriarch Jacob (Genesis 49:33) and his son Joseph (Genesis 50:26, restated in Exodus 1:6) anticipate a major theme of Exodus: death. Pharaoh calls for the death of all Hebrew baby boys in Exodus 1:16, repeated in 1:22. This massacre is emblematic of the cruelty of slavery. Moses murders an Egyptian in 1:12, and the King of Egypt dies in 1:23. The first born of the Egyptians die in the final plague, and the

entire Torah will close with Moses' death at the end of Deuteronomy. Indeed, the question of whether Moses will enter the land before he dies under girds the narrative sections of the Biblical saga, with animal sacrifice central to the ritual codes. At the end of Genesis, the family is saved from famine. Jacob and Joseph's deaths prefigure the misery to come.

Moses and Aaron's primacy as protagonists of the final four books of Torah signals an important shift from the Joseph cycle: the brothers are members of the House of Levi (Exodus 2:1-2). Levi is silent in Genesis; Judah is by far the most important of Joseph's brothers to the drama, with Reuben, Simeon, and Benjamin playing supporting roles. Indeed, Jacob's "blessing" of Levi, along with Simeon, in Genesis 49:5-7, is violent and wrathful. This malediction appears to be linked to those sons' murder of Hamor, Shechem, and their male subjects, over the Rape of Dinah (Genesis 34:25-29). The dynastic shift that occurs following the end of the Joseph cycle is surprising.

Appendix B: Literary Structure

The Joseph cycle is long and intricate. While other story cycles in Genesis have an episodic nature, one narrative following another with only a general arc to describe a character's forward movement, the Joseph story is comprised of a single narrative, each piece of which builds onto the one that came before it. It is more solidly unified than the others; the protagonist's development occurs organically as the plot unfolds. That plot is so central to the Joseph story explains why the structure of Joseph is something of a Rorschach test: scholars see in it what they will. Their priorities for the story are reflected in the structural analysis they offer, as the examples that follow demonstrate.

Martin Kessler and Karel Deurloo, for example, approach the story through historical considerations. For them, the story describes the struggle for leadership of the Israelites between the Joseph tribes in subsequent history and the tribe of Judah, the struggle for tribal primacy retrojected onto biblical characters. The structure serves the question "who would be the central figure in Israel?" (218). The divisions they recognize deal primarily with the struggle between Joseph and his brothers, and single Judah out most often from among the eleven.

They divide the story as follows:

37:1 Who Will Be the Firstborn (Primary Heir) among Jacob's Sons?
37:2a Judah or Joseph
37:2b-4: Focus on Joseph
37:5-11 Joseph's Dreams
37:12-17 Joseph's Visit to his Brothers
37:18-14 The Brothers' Revenge on Joseph
37:25-36 Joseph Sold to Egypt
38:1-30 Judah's Dynasty?
39:1-23 Joseph, the Blessed One
40:1-23 Was the Cupbearer Forgetful?
41:1-13 Pharaoh's Dreams
41:15-36 As Great as Pharaoh, Except for the Throne
41:37-57 Joseph Publicly Honored
41:1-38 The First Journey of the Brothers
43:1-44:17 The Second Journey
44:18-34 Judah pleads for Benjamin
45:1-28 Joseph Reveals Himself
46:1-30 Israel's Descent to Egypt
46:31-47:10 A Double Audience
47:11-28 Free in the Land of Slavery
47:28-31 Jacob Did Not Wish to Be Buried in Egypt
48:1-20 Joseph Blessed in His Two Sons
48:21-22 A Final Word for Joseph
49:1-28 The Sons of Jacob Blessed by Their Father
49:29-50:3 The Death and Embalming of Jacob
50:4-14 The Funeral Procession to Canaan
50:15-18 The Fear of the Brothers
50:19-21 Joseph Responds to His Brothers
50:22-26 Joseph's Coffin in Egypt (Kessler and Deurloo, 183-218)

The structure presented by David Dorsey, as outlined in the book *Genesis* by David Cotter, similarly focuses on the dynamic between Joseph and his brothers. It does not, however, consider that struggle historically. Dorsey's structural analysis emphasizes the many doublets contained in the story, although Cotter wonders whether Dorsey's structure suggests too tight a parallel. This is a Joseph to be understood primarily through his relationships with others: his brothers, his prison-mates, Pharaoh, Jacob.

Dorsey's structural analysis reads as follows:

a. Trouble between Joseph and his brothers (37:2-11)
a1. More trouble between Joseph and his brothers (37:12-36)
b. Sexual temptation involving Judah (38:1-30)
b1. Sexual temptation involving Joseph (39:1-23)
c. Joseph interprets two dreams of prison mates (40:1-23)
c1. Joseph interprets two dreams of Pharaoh (41:1-57)
d. Brothers come to Egypt for Food (42:1-38)
d1. Brothers again come to Egypt for Food (43:1-44:3)
e. Joseph has some of his family brought to him (44:4-45:15)
e1. Joseph has all of his family brought to him (45:16-47:12)
f. Prospering in Egypt: Joseph in ascendancy (47:13-26)
f1. Prospering in Egypt: Blessings on Jacob's sons (47:27-49:32)
g. Death of patriarch: Jacob (49:33-50:14)
g1. Death of patriarch: Joseph (50:15-26) (Cotter, 267)

Similarly, George Coats' structural outline of the story focuses on power. As outlined by David Cotter, it emphasizes Joseph's rising and falling power, not the struggle between the protagonist and his siblings. Coats' terminology focuses on the narrative, rather than on the relationships:

1. Exposition: introduction of principals (37:1-4)
2. Complication: Joseph's power is challenged, the family is broken (37:5-36)
3. Digression: Joseph rises to new power (39:1-41:57)
4. Complication: Joseph challenges the power of his brothers (42:1-38)
5. Denouement: by Joseph's power, reconciliation of the family (42:1-45:28)
6. Conclusion: from Canaan to Egypt (46:1-47:27) (Cotter, 264)

For his part, Cotter's structure is primarily plot driven. Each point is broken down by Exposition, Inciting Moment, Development, Turning Point, Resolution, Conclusion, Complication, and other plot-driven moments. The story is about both Joseph and his brothers, his ups and downs in Egypt paralleled by the brothers' travels to and from Egypt. (268-9)

More specifically, Cotter provides the following analysis of the structure of the Joseph cycle:

a. Joseph and the family strife he incites (37:1-36)
    Exposition: 37:1-2b
    Inciting Movement: 37:2c-3
    Development: 37:4-17
    Turning Point: 37:18
    Resolution: 37:19-33
    Conclusion: 37:34-36
a1. Judah and the family strife he incites (38:1-30)
b. The descent and ascent of Joseph (39:1-41:57)
    A Temporary Garment (39:1-23)
    The Trusty who Reads Dreams (39:20-40:23)
    Reclothed in a New Identity
b1. The descent and ascent of the brothers (42:1-47:27)
c. Blessings: Joseph (47:28-48:22)
c1. Blessings: All of the brothers (49:1-28)
d. The end for Jacob (49:29-50:14)
d1. The end for Joseph (50:15-26) (Cotter, 2003)

A Psycho-Symbolic reading of the Joseph story yields a vastly different structural analysis. The narrative becomes a representation of the process of individuation, as described by C.G. Jung. Each step of Joseph's journey corresponds to the movement of the psyche towards individuation. These steps are fundamental to the classic hero's quest.

I. Undifferentiated Ego and the Creation of the Persona (Genesis 37:1-11)

- A. Joseph Singled Out and Given the Coat (37:2-4)
- B. Dreams of the Future
    1. First Dream: Sheaves Encircle Him (37:5-8)
    2. Second Dream: Sun, Moon and Stars Bow Down (37:9-11)

II. Call to Transformation: The Journey towards Wholeness (*Shalom*) Begins (Genesis 37:12-17)

- A. The brothers depart (37:12)
- B. Joseph follows (37:12-17)
    1. Joseph accepts to the quest (37:12-14)
    2. Joseph redirected (37:15-17)

III. Encountering the Shadow: Alone In The Pit/The Brothers' Villainy (Genesis 37:18-35)

A. The brothers reject and plot against the Dreamer (37:18-22)
B. Joseph is stripped and cast into a pit (37:23)
C. Joseph sold into Egypt (37:24-36)

IV. Judah's and Joseph's Encounters with the Anima (38:1-39:20)

A. Judah's productive encounter (38:1-30)
B. Joseph's unproductive encounter (39:1-20)
    1. Joseph succeeds in Potiphar's house (39:1-6)
    2. Joseph resists Potiphar's wife's attempts to seduce him (39:7-19)
    3. Joseph sent to prison (39:20-23)

V. Encountering the Mana Personality

A. Back in the Pit/Transformation: First Encounters with the King's Courtiers (40:1-23)
    1. Cupbearer's and Baker's Dreams (40:1-5)
    2. Joseph interprets the dreams (40:6-19)
        a. The Cupbearer's Turn (40:9-15)
            I. His dream: Vines and Cup (40:9-11)
            II. Joseph's positive interpretation (40:11-13)
            III. Joseph's plea to be remembered (40:14-15)
        b. The Baker's Turn (40:16-19)
            I. His dream: Baskets and Baked Goods (40:16-17)
            II. Joseph's negative interpretation (40:18-19)
    3. The dreams come true but Joseph is forgotten (40:20-23)

B. Joseph encounters Pharaoh – The Mana personality (41:1-44)
    1. Pharaoh's dreams (41:1-24)
        a. First Dream: Cows (41:1-4)
        b. Second Dream: Corn (41:5-7)
    2. Joseph is remembered and brought to Pharaoh (41:8-16)
    3. Pharaoh recounts his dreams
        a. First Dream: Cows (41:17-22)
        b. Second Dream: Corn (41:23-24)
    4. Joseph's interpretation: plenty then famine (41:25-32)
    5. Joseph's appointment as chief of Egypt (41:33-44)
    6. Joseph married to Asenath Daughter of Potiphera (41:45)

C. The fulfillment of Pharaoh's dreams and Joseph's sovereignty over Egypt (41:46-43:5)

VI. Towards Reconciliation

A. Joseph encounters his brothers (42:6-20)
    1. Joseph recognizes his brothers but does not disclose his identity to them (42:6-8)
    2. Joseph accuses his brothers (42:9)
    3. The brothers deny the charge (42:10-14)
    4. Joseph tests his brothers (42:15-20)
    5. The brothers express their guilt (42:21-23)
    6. Joseph hears and weeps (42:24-25)

B. The brothers return to Canaan with unexpected money in their bags (42:26 - 38)

C. Joseph encounters his brothers again (43:1-44:2)
    1. The brothers prepare to return to Egypt with Benjamin (43:1-14)
    2. The brothers' arrival (43:15-44:2)
        a. The brothers present themselves to Joseph (43:15)
        b. Joseph prepares to dine with them (43:16-17)
        c. The brothers fear Joseph and recount the story of the money (43:18-22)
        d. Joseph accepts their account and returns Simeon (43:23)
        e. The brothers are refreshed at Joseph's house and offer him gifts (43:24-26)
        f. Joseph learns his father is well (43:27-28)
        g. Joseph sees Benjamin and breaks down (43:29-30)
        h. The meal resumes (43:31-34)
        i. Joseph plots (44:1-2)
    3. The brothers' departure (44:3-13)
        a. The brothers set off (44:3-5)
        b. The steward catches up with them and "catches" Benjamin with the "stolen" cup (44:6-13)
    4. The brothers return to Egypt and Joseph (44:14-34)
        a. Judah and the brothers genuflect before Joseph (44:14)
        b. Joseph challenges them (44:15)
        c. Judah declares collective guilt (44:16)
        d. Joseph rejects Judah's plea (44:17)
        e. Judah recounts the story (44:18-29)
        f. Judah's climactic plea before Joseph (44:30-34)
    5. Joseph reveals himself to his brothers and reunites with them (45:1-15)
        a. Joseph reveals himself to his brothers (45:1-8)
        b. Joseph bids them bring Jacob to Egypt (45:9-13)
        c. The brothers kiss (45:14-15)

6. Jacob and his family move to Egypt (45:16-46:7)
    a. Preparations and Jacob's departure (45:16 – 46:7)
    b. The line of Jacob (46:8-27)
    c. Joseph meets Jacob (46:28-30)
    d. Pharaoh meets Joseph's family (46:31 - 47:10)
    e. Jacob's clan settles and prospers in Egypt (47:11-131)

VII. Approaching Death

A. Jacob's blessing of Joseph's sons (48:1-22)
B. Jacob's vision for all the brothers (49:1-28)
C. Jacob anticipates his burial with his sons (49:29-32)
D. Jacob death and burial (49:33-50:14)
E. Jacob's burial (50:1-14)
    1. Joseph weeps (50:1)
    2. Embalming (50:2-3)
    3. Pharaoh's permission (50:4-6)
    4. The return to Canaan (50:7-14)
        a. The cortège (50:7-9)
        b. Mourning (50:10-12)
        c. Internment (50:13)
        d. Return to Egypt (50:14)
F. The brothers unnecessarily fear Joseph's retaliation (50:15-21)
G. Joseph's old age and death (50:22-26)

Appendix C:

Word Study – *Cos* and *G'viyah*

The Joseph cycle uses both the words כּוֹס/*cos* and גְּבִיעַ/*g'viyah* for the drinking vessels that appear within it. While the two terms certainly overlap semantically, differences exist in meaning and usage.

In the Joseph story, the term *g'viyah* is used only to refer to Joseph's cup, placed surreptitiously in Benjamin's sack of grain, appearing specifically in Genesis 44:12, 16, and 17. It is said that this *g'viyah* is used for divining. *Cos*, on the other hand, is only used to describe Pharaoh's cup, specifically in Genesis 40:11, 13 and 21. Within the Tanakh, *cos* possesses a far wider range of meaning than does *g'viyah*. It also appears far more frequently: forms of *g'viyah* occur fourteen times, while *cos*, as cup, is found in thirty one places. *Cos* appears an additional three times (Leviticus 11:17, Deuteronomy 14:16, and Psalms 102:7) meaning "owl," from the Samaritan, according to Koehler-Baumgartner. There does not appear to be any semantic importance to this connection.

G'viyah refers only to a fancy or elegant vessel used to hold liquid but not necessarily only for drinking. It is either Joseph's cup, in Genesis 44, the almond-shaped cups made of gold, part of the menorah in the *mishkan*, from Exodus 25 and 37, or the drinking set carried by Jeremiah to the members of the house of the Rechabites, of the Temple (Jeremiah 35:5). *Cos*, on the other hand, can be the cup of a poor man (2 Samuel

12:3) or Pharaoh, a person or the Diety (Jeremiah 25:17), a woman (Ezekiel 23:32) or a man. It may hold wine, as in Proverbs 23:31, but need not. In Jeremiah 35:5, both "*g'viyim m'lei'm ya'yin v'chosot*" ("goblets full with wine and cups") appear, indicating a difference between the two vessels.

Although *g'viyah* is used to describe the menorah's cups and is therefore part of a highly symbolic system of enormous complexity, *cos* has a far wider semantic range. The meaning of *cos* is not limited to the literal; rather, the biblical author understands and makes use of the term metaphorically. This is particularly true in prophetic and poetic texts. Unlike *g'viyah*, *cos* is understood both literally and symbolically within Torah.

Isaiah uses the term *cos* for his image of drinking from God's cup(s) of wrath and poison to convey extraordinary punishment (51:17). Jeremiah, too, uses *cos* in his image of drinking from God's wine cup of wrath as a metaphor for warfare and ruin (25:15, 17). Jeremiah uses *cos* again to liken Babylon to "a golden cup in the hand of YHVH," exporting frenzy to other nations (51:7). In all three of these instances, the reference is to national, not personal suffering.

The Psalmist, too, understands *cos* metaphorically, although his connotations are positive, and generally personal. In Psalm 11:6, the term *cosam* (literally, "their cup") means "their portion," or "lot in life," as it does in Psalm 16:5, literally "YHVH is the measure of my portion and my cup." Famously, in Psalm 23, the "full-up cup" represents a life of bounty, free from want. In Verse 13, Psalms 116 refers to a "Cup of Deliverance." In a return to the negative and national connotations of *cos* seen in the Prophets, Lamentations 4:21 promises that the daughter of Edom, Israel's enemy, will receive the cup, get drunk and vomit, that is, suffer punishment.

Appendix D:

Translation of Genesis 37:12-36

יב וַיֵּלְכוּ אֶחָיו לִרְעוֹת אֶת־צֹאן אֲבִיהֶם בִּשְׁכֶם׃ יג וַיֹּאמֶר יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יוֹסֵף הֲלוֹא

And his brothers went to pasture[1] their father's sheep[2] in Shechem. And Israel said to Joseph, "Come--[3]

אַחֶיךָ רֹעִים בִּשְׁכֶם לְכָה וְאֶשְׁלָחֲךָ אֲלֵיהֶם וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ הִנֵּנִי׃ יד וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ לֶךְ־נָא

your brothers are shepherding[4] in Shechem. Go and I will send you to them," and he said to him "Here I am, ready[5]." And he said to him, "please go

רְאֵה אֶת־שְׁלוֹם אַחֶיךָ וְאֶת־שְׁלוֹם הַצֹּאן וַהֲשִׁבֵנִי דָּבָר וַיִּשְׁלָחֵהוּ מֵעֵמֶק חֶבְרוֹן

see to the well-being[6] of your brothers and the well-being of the sheep[7] and and return word to me." And he sent him from the valley of Hebron

וַיָּבֹא שְׁכֶמָה׃ טו וַיִּמְצָאֵהוּ אִישׁ וְהִנֵּה תֹעֶה בַּשָּׂדֶה וַיִּשְׁאָלֵהוּ הָאִישׁ לֵאמֹר

and he came to Shechem. And a man[8] found him[9] and look--he wandered in error[10] in a[11] field and the man asked him, saying,

מָה־תְּבַקֵּשׁ׃ טז וַיֹּאמֶר אֶת־אַחַי אָנֹכִי מְבַקֵּשׁ הַגִּידָה־נָּא לִי אֵיפֹה הֵם רֹעִים׃

"What do you seek[12]?" And he said "I seek my brothers. Tell me, please, where do they

---

1. NIV: "graze." The verb contains within it the word רע or "vicious." This word will appear again in this passage in verses 20 and 33.
2. Singular, meaning, "herd of sheep."
3. Fox, JPS: "come." Alter, Westermann: "you know." NIV: "As you know...." NICOT: "you are aware."
4. Stative verb in the present tense also functioning as a noun.
5. Literally, "here I am." A formulaic statement indicating complete, mindful presence and commitment.
6. Literally, "peace." The use of "*shalom*" here resonates with 37:4, where Joseph's brothers "wouldn't speak a peaceful word to him."
7. As above, ff. 2
8. "a man," here, but in later in this verse and verse 17, "the man."
9. NICOT: "chanced upon him." Westermann: "met him."
10. Verb contains both "wandered" and "to err." I try to convey both meanings with my translation.
11. MT would have "in the field," but there is no need for the definite article.
12. Alternatively, "what do you request?"

shepherd?"

יג וַיֹּאמֶר הֲאִישׁ נָסְעוּ מִזֶּה כִּי שָׁמַעְתִּי אֹמְרִים נֵלְכָה דֹתָיְנָה וַיֵּלֶךְ יוֹסֵף אַחֲרֵי

And the man said "they went from here[13] for I heard them saying 'let's go to Dotham.'" And Joseph went after

אֶחָיו וַיִּמְצָאֵם בְּדֹתָן׃

his brothers and he found them in Dotham.

יח וַיִּרְאוּ אֹתוֹ מֵרָחֹק וּבְטֶרֶם יִקְרַב אֲלֵיהֶם וַיִּתְנַכְּלוּ אֹתוֹ לַהֲמִיתֻֽוֹ׃

And they saw him from a distance but[14] before he got near to them and they conspired to kill him.

יט וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־אָחִיו הִנֵּה בַּעַל הַחֲלֹמוֹת הַלָּזֶה בָּא׃ כ וְעַתָּה לְכוּ

And they said to each other,[15] "here comes this Dream Master.[16]" And now go

וְנַהַרְגֵהוּ וְנַשְׁלִכֵהוּ בְּאַחַד הַבֹּרוֹת וְאָמַרְנוּ חַיָּה רָעָה אֲכָלָתְהוּ וְנִרְאֶה מַה־יִּהְיוּ

and let's kill him[17] and throw him[18] into one of these pits[19] and let's say a vicious[20] beast ate him and we'll see what will be of

---

13. Literally, "this," perhaps as in "this place."
14. Vav, alternatively meaning "and."
15. Literally, "a man to his brother..."
16. Westermann: "this dream-addict." NICOT offers "this dream-lord."
17. Although the verbs in this sentence are formulated in the future tense, the brothers seem to be conspiring only. The plan is not yet determined, therefore, "let's." As Sarna notes, the word וְנַהַרְגֵהוּ evokes Cain's killing of his brother, Abel.
18. NICOT: "When used with a person as its object, salak almost always refers to the placing of a dead body in a grave (e.g., 2 Sam. 18:17; 2 Kings 13:21; Jer. 41:9) or the placing of a living body into what is assumed to be its grave (e.g., Gen. 21:151 37:24; Jer. 38.6)."
19. Or, "cisterns."
20. A motif of the story, seen first in v. 2. NICOT: "This *ra'a* appears twice in this chapter; first Joseph is the author or source of the ra'a, then he is the victim of the *ra'a*." See f.1, above.

Appendix D:

Translation of Genesis 37:12-36

חֲלֹמֹתָיו׃ כא וַיִּשְׁמַע רְאוּבֵן וַיַּצִּלֵהוּ מִיָּדָם וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא נַכֶּנּוּ נָפֶשׁ׃ כב וַיֹּאמֶר

his dreams." And Reuben heard and tried to save[21] him from them[22]. And he said, "let's not take[23] his life." And Reuben said

אֲלֵהֶם רְאוּבֵן אַל־תִּשְׁפְּכוּ־דָם הַשְׁלִיכוּ אֹתוֹ אֶל־הַבּוֹר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר בַּמִּדְבָּר וְיָד

to them "don't spill blood, (but rather) throw him into this pit that is in the wilderness but don't lay a hand[24]

אַל־תִּשְׁלְחוּ־בוֹ לְמַעַן הַצִּיל אֹתוֹ מִיָּדָם לַהֲשִׁיבוֹ אֶל־אָבִיו׃ [שלישי] כג וַיְהִי

on him," so that he could save him from them[25] and return him to their father.

כְּאֲשֶׁר־בָּא יוֹסֵף אֶל־אֶחָיו וַיַּפְשִׁיטוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף אֶת־כָּתָּנְתּוֹ אֶת־כְּתֹנֶת הַפַּסִּים

When Joseph came towards his brothers and they stripped him of his tunic, his stripped tunic[26] that was upon him.

אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו׃ כד וַיִּקָּחֻהוּ וַיַּשְׁלִכוּ אֹתוֹ הַבֹּרָה וְהַבּוֹר רֵק אֵין בּוֹ מָיִם׃ כה וַיֵּשְׁבוּ

And they took him and threw him into the pit and the pit was empty; it had no water. And they sat

לֶאֱכָל־לָחֶם וַיִּשְׂאוּ עֵינֵיהֶם וַיִּרְאוּ וְהִנֵּה אֹרַחַת יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים בָּאָה מִגִּלְעָד

to bread and they lifted up their eyes and saw and behold! a caravan of Ishmaelites came from

---

21. Literally, "saved him" Sarna: "came to the rescue" NICOT: "he tried to snatch him." Also, note the presence of the word צל, or "shadow."
22. Literally, "from their hands."
23. Fox, Alter, NIV: "take." NICOT, literally: "Let us not smite him as in life." NICOT also offers Williams' "let us not wound him mortally."
24. Idiom meaning "to harm, to smite," and according to NICOT appears as such 21 times in OT. Note, for example, its appearance in the Akeidah, Genesis 22:12. Sarna notes Reuben's change from the first to the second person.
25. Literally, "from their hands..."
26. Others offer "sleeved tunic."

Appendix D:

Translation of Genesis 37:12-36

Gilead

וּגְמַלֵּיהֶם נֹשְׂאִים נְכֹאת וּצְרִי וָלֹט הוֹלְכִים לְהוֹרִיד מִצְרָיְמָה׃ כו וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוּדָה

and their camels carried spices and balm and resin[27] for bringing down[28] to Egypt. And Judah said

אֶל־אֶחָיו מַה־בֶּצַע כִּי נַהֲרֹג אֶת־אָחִינוּ וְכִסִּינוּ אֶת־דָּמוֹ׃ כז לְכוּ וְנִמְכְּרֶנּוּ

to his brothers "What do we gain[29] if we kill our brother and cover up his blood? Come, let's sell him

לַיִּשְׁמְעֵאלִים וְיָדֵנוּ אַל־תְּהִי־בוֹ כִּי־אָחִינוּ בְשָׂרֵנוּ הוּא וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶחָיו׃ כח וַיַּעַבְרוּ

to the Ishmaelites and not lay our hands on him[30] for he is our brother, he is of our flesh." And his brothers agreed.[31]

אֲנָשִׁים מִדְיָנִים סֹחֲרִים וַיִּמְשְׁכוּ וַיַּעֲלוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף מִן־הַבּוֹר וַיִּמְכְּרוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף

And Midianite merchantmen passed by and they drew him and lifted Joseph up out of the pit and they sold Joseph

לַיִּשְׁמְעֵאלִים בְּעֶשְׂרִים כֶּסֶף וַיָּבִיאוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף מִצְרָיְמָה׃ כט וַיָּשָׁב רְאוּבֵן

to the Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of silver and they brought Joseph towards Egypt. And Reuben returned

---

27. Fox: "balm, balsam, and ladanum." Alter, JPS: "gum and balm and ladanum." NIV: "spices, balm and myrrh." NICOT: "spicery, balm, and myrrh." Westermann: "gum, balm, and resin." Ladanum, or labdanum, is a dark resin used to make perfume and its use here is, according to Sarna, uncertain.
28. NICOT: Literally, "going in order to bring down (to)..."
29. NICOT: בֶּצַע contains a range in meaning including "bribe," "legitimate gain," "unjust gain," and "profit." NIV: "What will we gain..." JPS: "Do we gain..." NICOT: "How would we be ahead..."
30. With NIV. JPS: "do away with him ourselves."
31. With JPS. Literally, "heard him." NICOT points out "that in v. 21, *wayyisma* was used of Reuben, and there it meant clearly 'listened (and disagreed).' In v. 27 it appears to mean 'listened (and agreed).'"

Appendix D:

Translation of Genesis 37:12-36

אֶל־הַבּוֹר וְהִנֵּה אֵין־יוֹסֵף בַּבּוֹר וַיִּקְרַע אֶת־בְּגָדָיו׃ ל וַיָּשָׁב אֶל־אֶחָיו וַיֹּאמַר הַיֶּלֶד

to the pit and behold! Joseph was not in the pit! And he tore his clothes. And he returned to his brothers and said "The boy

אֵינֶנּוּ וַאֲנִי אָנָה אֲנִי־בָא׃ לא וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־כְּתֹנֶת יוֹסֵף וַיִּשְׁחֲטוּ שְׂעִיר עִזִּים[32]

וַיִּטְבְּלוּ

is no longer and I, please, I goes.[33]" And they took Joseph's tunic and slaughtered a goat[32] and they dipped

אֶת־הַכְּתֹנֶת בַּדָּם׃ לב וַיְשַׁלְּחוּ אֶת־כְּתֹנֶת הַפַּסִּים וַיָּבִיאוּ אֶל־אֲבִיהֶם וַיֹּאמְרוּ

the tunic into the blood. And they sent the stripped tunic[34] and they brought it to their father and they said

זֹאת מָצָאנוּ הַכֶּר־נָא הַכְּתֹנֶת בִּנְךָ הִוא אִם־לֹא׃ לג וַיַּכִּירָהּ וַיֹּאמֶר כְּתֹנֶת בְּנִי חַיָּה

"We found this. Recognize it[35], please--is it your son's tunic or not?" And he recognized it and said "my son's tunic! A vicious[36] beast

רָעָה אֲכָלָתְהוּ טָרֹף טֹרַף יוֹסֵף׃ לד וַיִּקְרַע יַעֲקֹב שִׂמְלֹתָיו וַיָּשֶׂם שַׂק בְּמָתְנָיו

has eaten him! Joseph is surely torn to pieces!"[37] And Jacob tore his garment and put sack (cloth) on his loins

---

32. I don't know what to do with this word, "strong, powerful." No translation I found deals with it.
33. According to Sarna, literally "as for me, whither do I go?" According to NICOT, literally "and I, where shall I go?" However, as I read it, Reuben's declaration does not makes literal sense, but conveys instead his sense of confusion. The imperfect grammar indicates his desperate state of mind. Alter: "where can I turn?"
34. See ff. 26, above.
35. N.K.R. also appears in 38:26, 42:7, 8, NICOT adds.
36. See ff. 1 and 20.
37. Repetition the verb ט.ר.פ. adds passion befitting both his agony and the vicious nature of the act.

Appendix D:

Translation of Genesis 37:12-36

וַיִּתְאַבֵּל עַל־בְּנוֹ יָמִים רַבִּים׃ לה וַיָּקֻמוּ כָל־בָּנָיו וְכָל־בְּנֹתָיו לְנַחֲמוֹ וַיְמָאֵן

and mourned his son for many days. And all his sons and all his daughters stood to comfort him[38] but he refused

לְהִתְנַחֵם וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי־אֵרֵד אֶל־בְּנִי אָבֵל שְׁאֹלָה וַיִּבְךְּ אֹתוֹ אָבִיו׃ לו וְהַמְּדָנִים

to be comforted[39] and he said "I will go down in mourning for my son to Sheol." And his father keened[40] for him.

מָכְרוּ אֹתוֹ אֶל־מִצְרַיִם לְפוֹטִיפַר סְרִיס פַּרְעֹה שַׂר הַטַּבָּחִים׃

And the Midianites sold him into Egypt to Potiphar, one of Pharaoh's ministers and his Chief Chef.[41]

38. Alter: "arose to console him and he refused to be consoled."
39. Infinitive of hitpael for root נחם.
40. With Alter, "to lament for the dead." Fox: "wept." JPS: "bewailed."
41. Sarna: "Hebrew *tabbah* yields the possibility of either 'cook' or 'slaughterer,' that is, executioner. The title 'chief cook' would correspond to the Egyptian *wdpw*, which originally also meant 'cook,' but which came to be a general designation for persons attached to the services of nobles, princes, and kings." Westermann: "one of Pharaoh's chamberlains, head of the bodyguard."

Appendix E:

Translation of Genesis 40:9-15

ט וַיְסַפֵּר שַׂר־הַמַּשְׁקִים אֶת־חֲלֹמוֹ לְיוֹסֵף וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ בַּחֲלוֹמִי וְהִנֵּה־גֶפֶן לְפָנָי׃

And the Steward of Drinks[1] recounted[2] his dream to Joseph and said to him: "In my dream, there was a grape vine before me.

י וּבַגֶּפֶן שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׂרִיגִם וְהִוא כְּפֹרַחַת עָלְתָה נִצָּהּ הִבְשִׁילוּ אַשְׁכְּלֹתֶיהָ עֲנָבִים׃

And on the grapevine were three tendrils and it was as if a leaf blossomed and a cluster of ripened grapes came out.[3]

יא וְכוֹס פַּרְעֹה בְּיָדִי וָאֶקַּח אֶת־הָעֲנָבִים וָאֶשְׂחַט אֹתָם אֶל־כּוֹס פַּרְעֹה וָאֶתֵּן

And Pharoah's cup is[4] in my hand and I took the grapes and I crushed[5] them into Pharaoh's cup and I gave

אֶת־הַכּוֹס עַל־כַּף פַּרְעֹה׃ יב וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ יוֹסֵף זֶה פִּתְרֹנוֹ שְׁלֹשֶׁת הַשָּׂרִגִים שְׁלֹשֶׁת

the cup into the palm of Pharaoh." And Joseph said to him "this is the solution[6]: the three tendrils/branches are

יָמִים הֵם׃ יג בְּעוֹד | שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים יִשָּׂא פַרְעֹה אֶת־רֹאשֶׁךָ וַהֲשִׁיבְךָ עַל־כַּנֶּךָ וְנָתַתָּ

three days. In another[7] three days Pharaoh will elevate you[8] and return you to your post[9] and you will give

כוֹס־פַּרְעֹה בְּיָדוֹ כַּמִּשְׁפָּט הָרִאשׁוֹן אֲשֶׁר הָיִיתָ מַשְׁקֵהוּ׃ יד כִּי אִם־זְכַרְתַּנִי אִתְּךָ

Pharaoh's cup into his hand as in the first case when you were his Drink Steward.[10] For[11] if you

---

1. Soncino, Parallel: "Chief Butler." JPS, NIV (NIB), Alter, NRSV (NIB): "chief cupbearer." המשקים appears here in the plural, and in the singular in Verse 13.
2. Following Alter, "recounted" provides the "numberic" connection: mispar/l'saper.
3. Soncino: "and as it was budding, its blossoms shot forth." NIV: "as soon as it budded, it blossomed, and its clusters ripened into grapes." Alter: "As soon as it budded, its blossoms came out and the clusters ripened into grapes." See Alter's note in *The Five Books of Moses*, page 227.
4. Although the dream is set in the past tense, the speaker does not employ the past tense in this instance. The sudden switch to the present enhances the dreamlike feeling of the passage.
5. Following Alter, "crushed" carries the violent connotation of the literal "slaughtered" from the root ש.ח.ט. NIV, et. al.: "squeezed."
6. With Alter, and in keeping with the root פ.ת.ר. Soncino offers "interpretation."
7. NRVS: "Within."
8. Literally, "Pharaoh will lift up your head." "Elevate" contains the notions of both career advancement and literal uplift. JPS: "promote you."
9. Literally, "pedestal." With JPS, "post" conveys both the idea of a block on which to stand, and also of a job. Soncino, NRSV: "office;" NIV: "position;" Alter: "place."
10. Soncino, Parallel: "butler." NRSV, JPS: "cupbearer." See Verse 9, ff. 1.
11. Alter: "But if you remember I was with you once it goes well for you, do me this kindness, pray, to mention me..."

Appendix E:

Translation of Genesis 40:9-15

כַּאֲשֶׁר יִיטַב לָךְ וְעָשִׂיתָ־נָּא עִמָּדִי חָסֶד וְהִזְכַּרְתַּנִי אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְהוֹצֵאתַנִי מִן־הַבַּיִת
will remember me when it is well with you, and would you please do a kindness for me; and remember me to Pharaoh and thus[12] you will release me from this house[13].

הַזֶּה׃ טו כִּי־גָנֹב גֻּנַּבְתִּי מֵאֶרֶץ הָעִבְרִים וְגַם־פֹּה לֹא־עָשִׂיתִי מְאוּמָה כִּי־שָׂמוּ אֹתִי
For I was stolen from the Land of the Hebrews and here, too, I did nothing that they should put me in this pit.[14]

בַּבּוֹר׃

12. Added for flow.
13. Literally, "this house," meaning, "this prison." Soncino, Parallel, Alter: "this house," JPS, NRSV: "this place," NIV: "this prison."
14. With Alter. "Pit" is not only a literal rendering of the term בור, but it also harkens back to Genesis 37, when Joseph is thrown into the pit by his brothers. Further, in English the term "pit" is used to describe a terrible place, such as a prison. Soncino, Parallel, JPS, NIV, NRSV: "Dungeon."

Translation of Genesis 44:11-17

יא וַיְמַהֲרוּ וַיּוֹרִדוּ אִישׁ אֶת־אַמְתַּחְתּוֹ אָרְצָה וַיִּפְתְּחוּ אִישׁ אַמְתַּחְתּוֹ: יב וַיְחַפֵּשׂ

And they hurried and lowered each man[1] his sack[2] to the ground and they opened it—each man his own[3] sack. And he searched

בַּגָּדֹל הֵחֵל וּבַקָּטֹן כִּלָּה וַיִּמָּצֵא הַגָּבִיעַ בְּאַמְתַּחַת בִּנְיָמִן: יג וַיִּקְרְעוּ שִׂמְלֹתָם

beginning with the eldest and finished with the youngest and the goblet was found[4,5] in Benjamin's sack. And they rent their clothing[6]

וַיַּעֲמֹס אִישׁ עַל־חֲמֹרוֹ וַיָּשֻׁבוּ הָעִירָה: יד וַיָּבֹא יְהוּדָה וְאֶחָיו בֵּיתָה יוֹסֵף

and each man loaded up[7] his donkey and they returned to the city. And Judah came[8] and[9] his brothers to Joseph's house

וְהוּא עוֹדֶנּוּ שָׁם וַיִּפְּלוּ לְפָנָיו אָרְצָה: טו וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם יוֹסֵף מֶה־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה הַזֶּה

and he was still there and they fell to the ground, prostrate before him. And Joseph said to them "what is this deed

אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם הֲלוֹא[10] יְדַעְתֶּם כִּי־נַחֵשׁ יְנַחֵשׁ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כָּמוֹנִי: טז וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוּדָה

that you[11] have done? Would that you knew that a man like me practices divination[12]? And Judah said

---

1. Although the subject of the sentence is singular ("אִישׁ"), the verbs are in the plural.
2. Alter, JPS: "bag." Parallel, NIV (NIB), NRSV (NIB): "sack."
3. Although not contained in the Hebrew, the inclusion of the word "own" in the second clause justifies the repetition of the phrase "each man his sack."
4. Shoresh: מצא, Binyan: נִפְעַל, Tense: Future, rendered past by Conversive Vav.
5. Parallel, NIV, NRSV: "cup." This fails to distinguish the גָּבִיעַ from the כּוֹס, however.
6. Soncino, JPS, Parallel, NIV, NRSV: "clothes." Alter: "garments." Since שִׂמְלֹתָם, here with the masculine plural possessive ending, is singular and is sometimes used to mean "cloth," (see Genesis 9:23), "clothing" renders the word best.
7. The use of the phrase "loaded up" retains the Hebrew's preposition. Soncino: "laded." JPS: "reloaded."
8. First person, singular, rendered past by Conversive Vav.
9. Alter's "And Judah with his brothers came into Joseph's house" preserves the use of the singular verb and the sense that all the brothers are arriving.
10. Could not find in Concordance.
11. Plural.
12. This translation contains both a noun and a verb, as in the original. This mysterious phrase seems to include a reference to snakes and, although somewhat uncertain here, is made clearer just above in Verse 5: הֲלוֹא זֶה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁתֶּה אֲדֹנִי בּוֹ וְהוּא נַחֵשׁ יְנַחֵשׁ בּוֹ "This is it (the cup) from which my Master drinks and with which he divines." Without a doubt, נָחַשׁ יְנַחֵשׁ here is an action performed with a cup other than drinking and that seems to provide information. In First Kings 20:33, the verb clearly indicates a learning of new information: וְהָאֲנָשִׁים יְנַחֲשׁוּ וַיְמַהֲרוּ וַיַּחְלִטוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וַיֹּאמְרוּ אָחִיךָ בֶן־הֲדַד וַיֹּאמֶר בֹּאוּ קְחֻהוּ וַיֵּצֵא אֵלָיו בֶּן־הֲדַד וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ עַל־הַמֶּרְכָּבָה" Alter: "would surely divine?" JPS: "practices divination." Parallel: "can certainly divine?" NIV: "can find things out by divination?" NRSV "can practice divination?"

Appendix F:

Translation of Genesis 44:11-17

מַה־נֹּאמַר לַאדֹנִי מַה־נְּדַבֵּר וּמַה־נִּצְטַדָּק הָאֱלֹהִים מָצָא אֶת־עֲוֹן עֲבָדֶיךָ הִנֶּנּוּ

"What shall we say to my lord? What shall we speak and how shall we justify ourselves?[13] God found the wrongdoing[14] of your servants. Here we are[15],

עֲבָדִים לַאדֹנִי גַּם־אֲנַחְנוּ גַּם אֲשֶׁר־נִמְצָא הַגָּבִיעַ בְּיָדוֹ׃ יז וַיֹּאמֶר חָלִילָה לִּי

servants to your Lordship both we and also[16] he in whose hand the goblet was found." And he said "God forbid[17]

מֵעֲשׂוֹת זֹאת הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר נִמְצָא הַגָּבִיעַ בְּיָדוֹ הוּא יִהְיֶה־לִּי עָבֶד וְאַתֶּם עֲלוּ

that I do so. The one in who's hand the goblet was found he will be my slave and you will return[18]

לְשָׁלוֹם אֶל־אֲבִיכֶם׃

in peace to your[19] father."

---

13. The use of the Hitpa'el renders this root--צ.ד.ק--reflexive, "justify ourselves." Soncino, JPS: "how shall we clear ourselves?" Alter: "prove ourselves right?" JPS, NIV: "prove our innocence?" NRSV: "how can we clear ourselves?"
14. Alter, JPS: "crime." Parallel: "iniquity." NRSV: "guilt."
15. The brother's statement "הִנֶּנּוּ" echoes Joseph's similar statement, made earlier in Genesis 37:13.
16. JPS: "the rest of us as much as he in whose possession the goblet was found." NIV: "the one who was found to have the cup."
17. With Parallel. The use of the phrase "God forbid" seems uncomfortable here, especially given that God uses the very phrase "חָלִילָה לִי" elsewhere in the Tanakh (see 1 Sam 2:30). Throughout the Tanakh, the phrase contains a sacred dimension missing from the alternative found in Soncino, Alter, JPS, NIV, and NRSV: "Far be it from me..." See, for example, Joshua 22:29, Joshua 24:16, 1st Sam 12:23 and Job 27:5.
18. Literally, "go up." Third Person, Plural, Past Tense from the root ע.ל.ה
19. Second person masculine possessive.

Bibliography

Alter, Robert, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, Basic Books, New York, 1981.

Alter, Robert, *The Five Books of Moses*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2004.

Ariel, David S., *The Mystic Quest*, Jason Aronson, Northvale, New Jersey, 1988.

Ashliman, D. L., *Folklore and Mythology Electronic Texts*, http://www.pitt.edu/~dash/folktexts.html, University of Pittsburgh.

Baigent, Michael, Leigh, Richard and Lincoln, Henry, *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*, Delacorte Press, New York, 1982.

Calvin S. Hall and Vernon J. Nordby, *A Primer of Jungian Psychology*, Taplinger Publishing Company, NY, 1973.

Campbell, Joseph, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1973.

Chevalier, Jean and Gheerbrant, Alain, *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols*, Penguin Books, London, 1994.

Cirlot, J.E., *A Dictionary of Symbols*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1962.

Clift, Jean Dalby and Clift, Wallace B., *Symbols of Transformation in Dream*, The Crossroad Publishing Company, New York, 1987.

Cohen, A., editor, *The Soncino Chumash*, The Soncino Press, London, 2001.

Cotter, David W., *Genesis*, The Liturgical press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 2003.

Davis, Robert H., *Jung, Freud, and Hillman, Three Depth Psychologies in Context*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, 2003.

Dotan, Aron, *The Parallel Bible*, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, Massachusetts, 2003.

Doty, William G., *Mythography*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, 1986.

Edinger, Edward F., *Ego and Archetype*, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1973.

Edinger, Edward F., *The Bible and the Psyche*, Inner City Books, Toronto, 1986.

Eisler, Riane, *The Chalice and The Blade*, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1987.

Epstein, Rabbi Dr. Isidore, editor, *The Babylonian Talmud*, www.come-and-hear.com.

Eskenazi, Tamara Cohn, editor, *The Torah: A Women's Commentary*, URJ Press, New York, 2008.

Goodenough, Erwin R., *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Volumes 3, 4, and 6, Pantheon Books, New York, 1954.

Goodman, Roberta Louis, "Developmental Psychology" in *The Ultimate Jewish Teacher's Handbook*, Nachama Skolnik Moskowitz, editor, A.R.E. Publishing, Denver, 2003.

Grossman, Stanley, "C.G. Jung and National Socialism," in *Jung in Contexts*, Paul Bishop, editor, Routledge, London, 1999.

Hamilton, Victor P., *The Book of Genesis*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1995.

Harrison, Hank, *The Cauldron and the Grail*, The Archives Press, Los Altos, California, 1992.

Holme, Bryan, *Bulfinch's Mythology*, Viking Press, New York, 1979.

Humphreys, W. Lee, *Joseph and His Family*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, South Carolina, 1988.

Kinsley, David, *The Goddesses' Mirror*, State University of New York Press, 1989.

Longacre, Robert E., *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, 2003.

Jung, C.G., *Collected Works*, Volumes 7 and 12, Pantheon Books, New York, 1953.

Jung, C.G., *Four Archetypes*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992. Translation by R.F.C. Hull.

Jung, C.G., *The Undiscovered Self with Symbols and the Interpretation of Dreams*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1990. Translation by R.F.C. Hull.

Jung, C.G., *The Integration of the Personality*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1952.
Jung, C.G., *The Portable Jung*, Joseph Campbell, editor, Penguin Books, New York, 1971.

Jung, Emma and Marie-Louise Von Franz, "The Central Symbol of the Legend: The Grail as Vessel," in *The Grail: A Casebook*, edited by Dhira B. Mahoney, Garland Publishing, New York, 2000.

Kessler, Martin and Deurloo, Karel, *A Commentary on Genesis*, Paulist Press, New York, 2004.

Kluger, Yehezkel, *A Psychological Interpretation of Ruth*, Daimon, Einsiedeln, Switzerland, 1999.

Kramer, William, *The Signs of the Zodiac in Jewish Art*, Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles, 1965.

Lowenthal, Eric I., *The Joseph Narrative in Genesis*, Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1973.

Meier, Levi, *Jewish Values in Jungian Psychology*, University Press of America, New York, 1991.

Maher, Michael, translator, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus, Volume 2 of The Aramic Bible*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1994.

Matton, Mary Ann, *Jungian Psychology in Perspective*, The Free Press, New York, 1981.

Meier, Levi, *Jewish Values in Jungian Psychology*, University Press of America, New York, 1991.

www.mythencyclopedia.com

Norman, Dorothy, *The Hero: Myth/Image/Symbol*, World Publishing Company, New York, 1969.

Plaut, Gunter, editor, *The Torah: A Modern Commentary Revised Edition*, URJ Press, New York, 2005.

Perry, John Weir, *Lord of the Four Quarters*, Paulist Press, New York, 1991.

Rollins, Wayne G., *Jung and the Bible*, John Knox Press, Atlanta, 1983.

Rollins, Wayne G., *Soul and Psyche*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1999.

Sanford, John A., *The Man Who Wrestled with God*, Paulist Press, New York, 1987.

Sarna, Nahum M., *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis*, The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1989.

Scharf Kluger, Rivkah, *Psyche in Scripture*, Inner City Books, Toronto, 1995.

Singer, June, *Boundaries of the Soul*, Doubleday Anchor Books, Garden City, New York, 1973.

Smith, Curtis D., *Jung's Quest for Wholeness*, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1990.

Snow, Dean, *The Archaeology of North America*, Viking Press, New York, 1976.

Steiner, George, "Homer and the Scholars," in *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman*, Atheneum, New York, 1977.

Sternberg, Meir, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1985.

Storr, Anthony, *C.G. Jung*, The Viking Press, New York, 1973.

Syme, David B., *The Jewish Wedding Book*, Pharos Books, New York, 1991.

The New Interpreter's Bible, Volume I, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1994.

Thomas, David Hurst, *Exploring Native North America*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.

Towner, W. Sibley, *Genesis*, Westminster Bible Companion, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, 2001.

Turner, Victor W., "Liminality and Communitas" in *Readings in Ritual Studies*, Ronald L. Grimes, editor, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 1996.

Von Franz, M.-L., "The Process of Individuation," in *Man and His Symbols*, C.G. Jung, editor, Doubleday & Company, Garden City, New York, 1964.

Von Rad, Gerhard, *Genesis*, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1972.

Waltke, Bruce K., *Genesis*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 2001.

Westermann, Claus, *Genesis*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1987.

Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 37-50*, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1982.

Whitmont, Edward C., *The Symbolic Quest*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1969.

Wiener, Nancy H., *Beyond Breaking the Glass*, CCAR Press, New York, 2001.

Williamson, Ray A., *Living the Sky*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1984.

Womack, Mari, *Symbols and Meaning*, Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, California, 2005.

Zaleski, Carol, *Otherworld Journeys*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1987.