

# Christianity and the Androgyne

by *Wilfred L. LaCroix, S.J.*

Although the form of the woman, the "Great Mother," figures from man's earliest conceptualizations of deity,<sup>1</sup> by the time Abraham came on the scene, male self-assertion had momentarily overcome the more spontaneous matriarchal ruling of societies.<sup>2</sup> For apparently Yahweh presented himself to Abraham (and to the Hebrews) as masculine.<sup>3</sup> Yet even in the Christian middle ages, Dame Julian could write of the Fatherhood, the Motherhood, and the Lordship of God.<sup>4</sup> And this Christian mentioning of the Motherhood of God is not unique to Julian. Anselm of Canterbury asks Jesus if he is not also "mother."<sup>5</sup>

Such poetic usages bear the human insight that men can speak of their God as androgynous, that is, as comprising both male and female. And it has been a hidden assumption also about his people. Israel is both the beloved bride of Yahweh and Yahweh's first-born son. And the Christian assembly comprises the sons of God and the brides of Christ.

All this could be written off as interesting and quaint anthropomorphism. But it becomes more serious when a prevailing myth of the Androgyne, a myth of a perfect one comprising and including all opposites, shows up as an underlying presupposition in Christian ideas concerning the perfection of celibacy and the somehow degradation of the male through sexual intercourse with the female. So in this paper I have gathered but a few indications that the general theory of the reconciliations of opposites, which in sexual specifics comes to the myth of the Androgyne, has had some moment in Christian sexual asceticism.

## **Early Uses**

There are many indications in the Old Testament that the Hebrews, as many other peoples, carried in their tradition a myth of an initial unity of things along with the corollary that sexual intercourse somehow effected or at least symbolized the historical dis-unity of things. Although in the Hebraic Scriptures many wholesome texts praise mar-



riage, some very strange passages certainly indicate a lack of perfection in sexual contact with women.<sup>6</sup> Such at first might mislead one into thinking that the Hewbrews ruled out any androgynous conception of their God. Consequently one must remember the circumstances: (1) the Hebraic moral practices often reflected the Semitic codes prevalent in the Near East; (2) with the struggle at the time to overcome matriarchal influences in governing tribes, the myths tended to portray the woman as the villain in the "way things *actually* are"; and (3) in a tribe advancing monotheism as well as patriarchy, the God to identify with would be masculine, even though (4) the way things *ideally would be* might include a reconciliation of male and female.

The rising patriarchal codes of the Semitic peoples were greatly advanced by the widespread Gilgamesh epic in which was related Gilgamesh's condemnation of woman and Enkidu's destruction by woman. The latter episode deserves some comment since it contains interesting elements on the degradation of the male by the female.

Enkidu appears first as a human-beast who lives in peace with animals. He learns "knowledge" through sexual intercourse with a temple prostitute. After their affair she tells him, "You are wise, Enkidu, and now you have become like a god." She divides her garments and they both put on covering to go to the city. Though the woman's charms "civilize" the man, they also cause an alienation of the man from unity with beasts and nature itself. This mythical note of city-living splitting the initial unity of the "noble savage" with the universe has never died.

But what of the initial unity itself? Before I turn to the Old Testament's usage of this myth to explain man's split condition, it will be worthwhile to focus momentarily on the initial unity notes.

The story of Eve coming from the side of Adam probably had a multithematic purpose: to show that women had the same nature as men, and to show their subordinate position to men. This latter had a strong polemical tone in reaction against the matriarchal influences of the times.<sup>7</sup> The observable experience was that the males issued from the females and so the latter rather spontaneously are in position to move any society, especially a tribal one. And indeed Adam himself was taken from the (mother) earth, who generates without the male.

But underlying the story of Adam's rib was the presupposition that Adam himself, as initially generated, was androgynous until Eve was separated.<sup>8</sup> For the initial asexual generation left man united with nature. It was only after the separation of Eve that man was led to alienate himself from nature through the woman's influence. Thus the

defining of man and woman sexually was understood in the original myth as a step away from the initial unity, the initial perfection of things. This understanding continued as a strain in the Semitic culture and, indeed, in the first Christian century, several midrashim and St. Paul himself find the Genesis account distinguishing man in the image of God from man as male and female.

Just for interest and handy reference, I will repeat the texts of Genesis here (RSV version) :

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created *him*; male and female he created *them*. (1.27)

Then the man said, This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. (2.23)

When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them. (5.1-2)

A theory of a double creation of man, as image of God and as male and female, carries some options. One can fuse the two parts and speculate that being male and female is being in the image of God, hence God is androgynous. Or one can speculate that being male and female is a mark of being different from God, even though humans are *also* in the image of God. This latter, though, would really imply that the initial state of the androgynous Adam was in perfect harmony with nature and with God, and that God really is still androgynous.

This latter has much evidence. With the general anti-feminist tone of Genesis 1-11 and the strong echoes of the Enkidu story in the relation of the fall and punishment, the undertones constantly sound of an initial loss of unity in the sexual division and a further fall thanks to the woman. That this could be held along with God's leading the woman to the man and judging that "it was good" causes no difficulty if one keeps in mind the various religious insights and cultural myths that the author tried to balance. The Androgyne myth is not the only religious statement of the Hebrews about the sexes or man's alienated condition, but it does seem to figure in the explanation.

### **New Testament Uses**

Although in our day of conscientious hermeneutics, few scholars would take New Testament passages in their isolated meanings, this was not always the case with Christian writers. Hence many passages of Scriptures have been read as signifying an underlying theme of the

reconciliation of opposites, including specifically the male-female, in the spiritual goals of Christians. I will here omit the possible coincidence of opposites in all passages of paradox, such as "the first shall be the last and the last first," "he who is to be the first among you, let him be the servant," and so on. All I will do is note those passages which especially lend themselves to a reconciliation theme and which, in my study, have been found to be actually incorporated in Christian writers for this purpose.

Surprisingly, the discourse in John (e.g., 17.11, 20-23) was used often as evidence for saying that Christ's mission was to reconcile all the opposites in creation. Origen for one read in Christ's words a future subsuming of all the opposites, including male and female, in the final resurrection. The recurrent "that they may be one as we are one" imports not a simple unity of wills, but a unity of all the opposite marks of creation which were first in God the creator.

Paul's allusions to a body of Christ (e.g., Rm 12.4-5; I Cor 1.10; Eph 4.3-4) note that in one body there will be many opposites. It was easy for those who held a reconciliation theme from their culture or their philosophy to read into the Pauline concept a real, existential unification in one Christ who would thus have all the opposites in the world in himself and reconcile them. I Cor 12.27 could be read as saying: you are the body of Christ; you, male and female, are one body and that body is Christ who has taken up your opposing characteristics into a higher unity. Gal 3.28 explicitly mentions the reconciliation of male and female and Eph 1.23 is a clear text easy to take over into a theory of an All who includes in himself and reconciles all opposites.

Again, let me insist, while certainly opening up possibilities of meaning, these texts as such support no one theory of the unity of the world and the people of God coming from Christ's resurrection. However, there must be admitted the distinct leaning towards a reconciliation theory in Paul, especially when one goes deeply into the two-Adam theme, a theme that perhaps had much to do with the tradition of Christ's asexual generation from Mary. I shall not go into the Pauline treatment of this theme here, for I am more interested in this paper in how this theory of the reconciliation of opposites moved along historically.

The first non-canonical signs after Christ show up in the gnostic writings. For example, in the Gospel of Thomas, the notion of androgyne is directly associated with perfection:



[To enter the Kingdom] When you make the two one, and when you make the inner as the outer, and the outer as the inner, and the above as the below, and when you make the male and the female into a single one. [22]

Simon Peter said to them: Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of the life. Jesus said: See, I shall lead her, so that I will make her male, that she too may become a living spirit resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the kingdom of heaven.<sup>9</sup>

Although the second statement strongly hints of cultural prejudice against women, it and the first still convey the impression that perfection demands the reunion of opposites by ascending from the male-female "natural" level to the new way of being. The idea comes out even more clearly in the pseudo-second epistle of Clement:

For the Lord himself, when asked by someone when his Kingdom would come, said: "When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female neither male nor female." . . . And the "male with the female neither male nor female" means that a brother seeing a sister has no thought of her as female, nor she of him as male.<sup>10</sup>

Besides the unification of two opposites, with again the specification of the male and the female elements, this writing also introduces into my study a new element. So far, one could read all the writings as saying: "when the kingdom comes," or "when you die and enter the kingdom, you shall be as the angels, reconciling male and female." But here there is a message for this life. Being neither male nor female carries the demand to look upon members of the opposite sex even now not in a sexual way. Yet the coincidence of opposites before this time had always been eschatological. I feel that such a new element must have been introduced to support the introduction, from contact with pagan religions, of a celibacy-virginity practice in Christianity. And I think it will be obvious on further investigation, that this theme of the androgyne will be in the back of the minds of many Christian authors as they write of the glories of the virginal state.

Before I move on, let me recall Mircea Eliade's reasoning on the popularity of the theory of the androgyne and the coincidence of opposites. He sees it as betraying a nostalgia for a lost paradise where all the multiplicities of this confused world were in a harmonious unity.<sup>11</sup> In Christian terms, this would have to be interpreted as recovering the paradisaical state of Adam through an eschatological resurrection. And this is precisely how Origen and Augustine did interpret it.

## In Some Fathers

In his *De Principiis*, Origen argued that “the end is always like the beginning.”<sup>12</sup> From his theory of the platonic (plotinian?) *henad*, Origen worked back from Christ’s priestly prayer “that they may be one,” to the way everything must have been at the start. If we are all aimed through Christ’s triumph to a unity, it will be in the overcoming of the diversity we have now. But how did we get this way? Simply from the universal law whereby, when an individual lapses, he falls into greater diversity.

From such a law, it is a simple step to say that, when God in his goodness created, his creation at first was simple, unified, and only became diversified by a falling, or, which comes to the same thing, was open to falling by becoming diversified.

Augustine, among others, also took this position, though he had his troubles with the text of Genesis. In *De bono conjugale*, he asked how generation would have taken place for man if he had not sinned. For he took as sound the principle that there could be “no sexual intercourse save of mortal bodies.”<sup>13</sup> I am not clear if Augustine was talking about carnal pleasure in the marriage act or the basic copulation itself. In *De Genesis ad Litteram*, he himself seems unsure. He asked if non-libidinous generation might have taken place in Paradise. While not answering, he suggested that without direct reference in Scripture itself, we could presume that, without concupiscence, there would have been no intercourse, and no order to increase and multiply before the fall.<sup>14</sup> Such a position implies that Augustine clearly held Adam as androgynous before the fall, or at least that the separation of Eve was a kind of fall! For he was very conscientious on the text of Genesis itself and knew that Eve was given to Adam as companion before the major fall. And if the supposition should stand—no fall, no intercourse—, one should ask why was Adam’s companion not another man! For according to Augustine’s theory on marriage, unless one gets down to sexual procreation, there is no need to have women around.

## Central Movement

The three men on whom I wish to focus now wrote their spiritual treatises during the early middle ages. They are Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus the Confessor, and Scotus Erigena. The three stand in a tradition of Plato-Plotinus and quite explicitly propose as a way to

perfection in Christian life the striving for a reconciliation of opposites which they find promised in Christ's resurrection.

Gregory of Nyssa took as his starting point the question how could miserable, sinful, passable man be the image of God. He answered that there was a two-fold creation: image of God and male-female.<sup>15</sup>

Like Origen, he too looked for the interpretation of Genesis from the end proposed in the New Testament.<sup>16</sup> Since there would be complete unity in the final state, where humans will neither marry nor be given in marriage, Gregory found reason to distinguish out a first phase in creation, where there was just man, from a second phase where there was male and female.

Asking Augustine's question on how procreation might have been if there had been no original sin, Gregory went to Christ's answer to the Sadducees and said that the "resurrection promises us nothing else than the restoration of the fallen to their ancient state."<sup>17</sup> "If the life of those restored is closely related to that of the angels, it is clear that the life before the transgression was a kind of angelic life, and hence also our return to the ancient condition of our life is compared to the angels."

Still he did argue for some aspect of procreation in the original state, for, much as there are many angels, man would have become many men by procreating asexually, as the angels themselves must!

Such an asexual state, though, is only an ideal, for, as Genesis clearly shows, there was even at first sexual procreation. Thus, sexual distinction came through God's pre-knowledge of the fall.<sup>18</sup> This made man slip from the angelic mode of living and would have made him incapable of procreating as the angels do. Gregory then saw the separation out of Eve as involved in the fall of man, as it split the originally perfect unity of man.

There is reason to believe that Gregory had read Philo and was familiar with the latter's thought: "The man as the image of God is spiritual, incorporeal, neither male nor female."<sup>19</sup> This position, according to Daniélou, is in direct rapport with the androgyne of Plato and the gnostics.<sup>20</sup> Being the image of God consists in possessing entirely a similitude with the model.<sup>21</sup> As such an image, man is without distinction in sexuality.<sup>22</sup> And being without sexuality means being without animal generation.

The key here is that the irrational passions of sex go with man's fall into participation in irrational life. The thrust of the spiritual life in Christianity then must be to get back to rationality, to the original image-of-God state. Virginity will be the sign and the anti-



pation of the eventual overcoming of diversity in the final resurrection wherein there will be either androgynous beings or totally asexual beings, both of which signify the same unity in the perfect Christian.

Man is already in this world the perfect microcosm of all the opposing elements in the world below him.<sup>23</sup> All that remains is to reconcile the sexual split in man himself. And Christ in his resurrected state does this for all men.

Maximus the Confessor (580-622) also took up the problem of the divisions in being. According to him, there are five basic divisions: the uncreated and the created, the intelligible and the sensible, the heaven and the earth, paradise and the world, masculine and feminine.<sup>24</sup> In the stream of thought coming from the Scriptures as well as the Greeks through Origen and Pseudo-Denis, Maximus continued the opinion that the diversity of sexuality as we have it now is the result of sin and is to be overcome and reconciled in Christ's resurrection.

Had man not sinned, he would not have been subject to the pain of carnal generation.<sup>25</sup>

I am still uncertain how to read such lines. At some places, it appears as if the force is simply that, without sin and its resulting concupiscence, generation would have been by copulation without passion. In his *Exposition on the Prayer of the Lord*, Maximus held that Christ did not have passions and then cites Gal 3.28 in referring to the androgynous condition of the body of Christ.<sup>26</sup> But this might be understood as either (a) a fully androgynous condition, one wherein one being reconciles the opposite sexes in his one body; or (b) a semi-androgynous condition, wherein there still remains the real division of sexes but with a reconciling in the body of each sex the carnal passions and drives without physical intercourse, i.e., virginity.

Maximus himself concentrated rather on the unity of the resurrection restoring the unity of the beginning, a theme used as the foundation of his statements on sin and carnality. He, too, brought in the principle of a double creation: first of man as the image of God, then the biological life as a consequence of sin by which man has the likeness of the irrational beasts. An outright statement of the non-sexual condition in Paradise is found in his *Book of Ambiguities*.<sup>27</sup> Christ's role, again, is to overcome this diversity, this struggle of opposites flowing from the condemnation of nature and splitting man in his activities. Christ underwent punishment as a son of Adam, yet, because of the basic unity within himself, he did, by so undergoing, restore and deify (i.e., unify) nature.<sup>28</sup>

Again, then in Maximus one discovers the controlling identification of the ideal state with an overcoming of opposites, especially the sexual division of male and female. And again, since Christ has already done this for nature, the way for the Christian to imitate his master is to participate in as much as he can and anticipate the fullness of the androgynous condition. Sexual matters and behavior diversify a man and make him less like what he was intended to be and what he now aims at in Christ.

Scotus Erigena (b. 800?) translated the works of the Pseudo-Denis and Maximus the Confessor, and he relied on their thoughts along with those of Gregory of Nyssa for his own position. Most especially he utilized the thought of Augustine. So he was deeply within the stream that looked on perfection in a unification of opposites.

Quoting Maximus's division of being, Scotus recorded that these divisions were the result of sin.

And if he had not sinned, there would have not been in him the division of the sexes, but only man would have been.<sup>29</sup>

If man had remained integral and in paradise, he would not have split into sexes, like irrational animals, but would have multiplied in angelic fashion.<sup>30</sup>

Again in Scotus, therefore, there is the concept of an original unity within which were all the opposites of nature as possible and the concept of a diversification through the actualization of these opposites as an effect of the sinful fall. The overcoming of sin will accordingly again imply an eventual coincidence of all the opposites in nature. This restoration began with Christ's resurrection.

Citing Maximus, Scotus wrote:

First therefore he taught clearly that our Lord united (*adunasse*) in himself the division of nature, that is, the masculine and the feminine; for not in a body of sex, but in man alone he rose from the dead. In himself there is neither masculine nor feminine even though in his own male sex, in which he was born from the virgin, and in which he suffered, he appeared to his disciples after the resurrection, to confirm their faith in his resurrection.<sup>31</sup>

The verb *adunasse*, meaning "to make one" or "to unify," is found in Latin only in Justinus the historian (fl. 142) and in the Christian fathers. With such evidence on its use, one might find matter for an essay on *adunasse* as a technical term for the androgynous condition of Christ (and Christians) after resurrection. For Scotus stated that all men, after the resurrection, will lack sexuality.<sup>32</sup> And this, as the lowest of Maximus's divisions of being, will be but the first step in the eventual, full unification in the All.

As I was reading these early writers, I could not help but be struck by the kind of Hegelian dialectic that could possibly be read into their worldview. At the start, an All that is totally unified goes out in diversity to defined existence, which then returns to the All through a reconciliation that is also a completion. Of course, there are great dissimilarities, but the comparison remains. All dialectical thinking revolves around the crucial principle that yes and no are two poles of one movement, that they coincide on a higher level.

The major problem I have with the proposals by the fathers comes from the ambiguity of "passions." Today most people would separate two levels of passions: those that cannot be overcome (birth, death, sexual generation), and those that can be at least controlled (the concupiscences that lead to the major sins). The question really is: are both levels the result of sin? There is the diversity in me that draws to sin, the one that Paul spoke of as another law within the members. This may be easily acknowledged as an undesirable condition resulting from man's alienation from God and God's activities. But it is not as clear on the first level, and especially not so clear as regards sexual diversity. Christ may have overcome sin (the second level) and death (first level), but did he overcome sexual distinction? Is this last assumption the real basis for the Christian praise of the celibate life?

### Through the Centuries

Yet the theory that perfection consists in the coincidence of opposites did not die with Erigena. In the early Renaissance, it found supporters in Meister Eckhart and Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464). Cusanus held that the coincidence of opposites was the most appropriate definition of the nature of God. The absolute maximum was that which in actuality was everything that can possibly exist. Nothing can be placed in opposition to it, for it is one and it is all.<sup>33</sup>

The principle of contradiction was limited by Cusanus to the finite order, though he did not to my knowledge expressly take up androgynous man after the resurrection.

As the Renaissance flowered, the curious Jacob Boehme (1574-1624) echoed more directly the androgynous theme of former times. "For in Adam the virgin disappeared," he wrote in *Signatura Rerum*, and "When Adam was in the image of God, and was neither man nor woman, but both. . . ."<sup>34</sup>

So here, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, the androgynous myth carried on. And Boehme, being a Christian, completed

the theme of Christ's reconciliation of opposites as he discussed what happened after the resurrection.

Christ after his resurrection walked forty days in the mystery of all the three principles at once, in the property of the first Adam after his creation before his sleep, and before Eve was formed.<sup>35</sup>

### **Contemporary Reflections**

Even with such a cursory examination of the myth of the androgyne in Christian spirituality, I think that enough has already been uncovered to substantiate a case for its various elements being used as a strong rationale supporting celibacy as a Christian virtue. For the androgyne is a symbol of standing close to God and free from sin, standing unified in oneself and not diversifying oneself through sexual contact with women, either like Adam before the fall or like Christ after conquering sin through his death-resurrection. Being celibate is participating in and anticipating the fullness of the conquering of sin and its diversifying results. Hence Nicolas Berdyaev can write:

The great anthropological myth which alone can be the basis of anthropological metaphysics is the myth about the androgyne. . . . According to his Idea, to God's conception of him, man is a complete, masculinely feminine being, solar and teluric, logic and cosmic at the same time. . . . Original sin is connected in the first instance with the division into two sexes and the fall of the androgyne, i.e., of man as a complete being. It involves the loss of human virginity and the formation of the bad masculine and the bad feminine. . . . Christian asceticism has made heroic efforts to overcome the horror and the curse of sex.<sup>36</sup>

As Eliade has suggested, this quest for the androgyne is a desire for paradise regained. It constrains man to conceive the opposites as complementary aspects of some unique reality. We stand today as the result of some primordial rupture. The split into sexes and the sinful fall are somehow interrelated. In such diverse German minds as Rainer Marie Rilke, Martin Heidegger, and Karl Rahner, death is the one ultimately complete way back:

We have remarked before that it is in death, and in death alone, that man enters into an open, unrestricted relationship to the world as a whole. Only in death will man be integrated, as a constant and determined factor, into the world as a whole, through his own total reality achieved in his life and in his death. In other words, because death in some way opens to man the real-ontological relationship of his soul to the world as a whole, it is through his death that man in some way introduces as his contribution the result of his life into the basic, real oneness of the world.<sup>37</sup>

Of course, in Rahner's thought, Christian death includes the full entrance into the life of the resurrection, and, indeed, the only word that he fails to include in his *traditional* thought on death is androgyne.

In this paper I have touched much too briefly on hints through history that the Christian sexual asceticism may have inherited very much from a primitive myth of a fully united creature, an androgyne, who was split into male and female and, henceforth, by pursuing a male-female existence, intensifies the split in himself, and only hopes for a reconciliation from outside, from a salvation, a rescue from self-alienation, from sexuality. If in our day, we are actually moving towards a kind of sacralization of sexuality itself, if that part of the myth that says sexual intercourse further diversifies a man, what might be the future for that part that says salvation implies a reconciliation of sex within one being and that celibacy is the proper state of the Christian saved?

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> This fascinating and archetypal myth and its many ramifications was undoubtedly reinforced by the absence of clear understanding of the connection between sexual intercourse and generation in primitive tribes. Bronislaw Malinowski pointed this out early this century. The woman was thought to be self-reproductive just as the earth (from which Adam came asexually). For some interesting aspects of this position, see Edward J. Foye, "The Androgynous Church," *Front Line*, V, 4 (Sp., 1967), 146 n.2, 147 n.3. E. O. James thinks it at least possible that the first men more or less spontaneously conceived the god as female. *Cult of the Mother-Goddess* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1959), 11. See also, Erich Neumann, *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype*, tr. Ralph Manheim (New York: Pantheon, 1955); Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology* (New York: Viking, 1959); Robert Graves, *The White Goddess: A Historical Grammar of Poetic Myth* (New York, 1948, 1958); W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Egypt and Israel* (London, 1911), 21-26; G. Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion* (New York, 1951), 56-57; S. von Cles-Reden, *The Realm of the Great Goddess* (London, 1961).

Some have conjectured that this was not true of the hunting tribes, but the discovery of the Venus of Laussel and Abbé Breuil placing it in paleolithic times in southern France (about 30,000 B.C.) indicates at least a strong feminine deity for the hunters also.

<sup>2</sup> On the matriarchal tendencies in tribal societies, see the general studies mentioned in n.1, plus E. O. James, *The Worship of the Sky-God* (London, 1963), 20; and W. Koppers, *Primitive Man and His World Picture* (London, 1952), 102.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Ex. 15.3; Ex. 16.8; Ex. 4.22.

<sup>4</sup> *The Revelations of Divine Love of Julian of Norwich*, tr. by Manes Walsh (London, 1961), c. 59.

<sup>5</sup> *Oratio ad Sanctum Paulum*, PL 158.975-983, esp. 981-82. For more, see André Cabassut, "Une dévotion médiévale peu connue: La dévotion à 'Jésus notre mère.'" *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 25 (1949), 234-245.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., I Kgs. 21.4-5; Ex 19.15; Lev 15.18; Lev 23.3. And at least at times it is ambiguous if the defilement is only if prostitutes are touched. There are definite anti-feminist tones in laws on sexual acts in Lev 18 and 20, and Dt 22.13-29, and

the uncleanness after the birth of a girl (Lev 12.1-5) is longer than for a boy and, indeed, carry a most "inauspicious" number for the Hebrews, 66 days. The Divorce Law in Dt 24.1-4 is blatantly anti-feminist. I am grateful for much information here to J. Edgar Bruns, "Old Testament History and the Development of a Sexual Ethic," *The New Morality: Continuity and Discontinuity*, ed. William Dunphy (New York: Herder, 1967), 55-82.

Saint Paul's plea for abstinence from sex for the sake of prayer (I Cor 7.5) certainly continues this degradation from the holy because of sexual intercourse theme.

<sup>1</sup> The punishment of Eve, to have painful childbirth and to be subject to the male, make little sense unless childbearing gave her strong social position in primitive life. See, Burns, *op. cit.*, 61.

<sup>8</sup> See W. D. Davis, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Aspects in Pauline Theology*, 2nd ed. (London, 1955), 48-55.

<sup>9</sup> *The Gospel According to Thomas*, tr. Guillaumont et al. (New York: Harpers, 1959), log. 22, 114.

<sup>10</sup> In *The Fathers of the Church: The Apostolic Fathers*, tr. Glimm et al. (New York: Cima, 1947), c. 12, pp. 72-73.

<sup>11</sup> *Mephistophiles and the Androgyne*, tr. J. M. Cohen (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965), 122.

<sup>12</sup> In *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, IV, ed. Roberts and Donaldson (New York: Scribners, 1926), 1.6.2, p. 260.

<sup>13</sup> *De bono conjugale*, 2, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, III, ed. Schaff (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 399. See *De Civitate Dei*, XIV. 23.

<sup>14</sup> *De Genesis ad Litteram*, 9.5-8.

<sup>15</sup> *On the Making of Man*, MG 44.181, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, V, ed. Schaff and Wace (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 16.6-8.

<sup>16</sup> Jean Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique* (Paris: Aubier, 1944), 51-56.

<sup>17</sup> *On the Making of Man*, MG 44.188 (Schaff and Wace, 17.2).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, MG 44.189 (Schaff and Wace, 17.4).

<sup>19</sup> Philo, *On the Making of the World*, in *Loeb Classical Library* tr. Colson and Whitaker (Cambridge: Harvard, 1956) c. 46, p. 107.

<sup>20</sup> Daniélou, *op cit.*, 57.

<sup>21</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Soul and the Resurrection*, MG 46.41c (Schaff and Wace, p. 436).

<sup>22</sup> *Treatise on Virginity*, MG 46.348a (Schaff and Wace, pp. 350-351); *On the Making of Man*, MG 44.185a, c. 16.14; *Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles*, MG 44.916b.

<sup>23</sup> *On the Making of Man*, MG 44.177 (Schaff and Wace, 16.1).

<sup>24</sup> *Book of Ambiguities*, MG 91.1304d, cited by Erigena, *On the Division of Nature*, PL 122.530.

<sup>25</sup> *Questions to Thalassan*, MG 90.629; 636; *Amb.* 91.1156d; 1321a.

<sup>26</sup> MG 90.890d.

<sup>27</sup> MG 91.1309a.

<sup>28</sup> *Thal.*, MG 90.628cd; 632d; 633b; 632a.

<sup>29</sup> *On the Divisions of Nature*, PL 122.536; 896.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 836.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 537-538; see 894.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 896.

<sup>33</sup> *De Docta Ignorantia*, I, xxii.

<sup>34</sup> New York, Everyman's Library, n.d., pp. 140, 147.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>36</sup> *The Destiny of Man*, tr. Natalie Duddington (London: Bles, 1937), 82-83.

<sup>37</sup> *The Theology of Death*, tr. C. H. Henkey (New York: Herder, 1961), 71.