

IN SEARCH OF
THE EARLY CHRISTIANS
SELECTED ESSAYS

WAYNE A. MEEKS

BT
1145
2002

Edited by
ALLEN R. HILTON AND
H. GREGORY SNYDER

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW HAVEN AND LONDON

THE IMAGE OF THE ANDROGYNE

Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity

When Maximus the Confessor (seventh century) takes the “corners” of the Jerusalem wall (2 Chronicles 26:9) as a type of “the various unions (ένώσεις) of the divided creatures which were effected through Christ,”¹ we might once have assumed that he is indulging in rhetorical fancy. Similarly, we might have dismissed his chief example of such unions as the hyperbole of a Byzantine ascetic: “For he [sc. Christ] unified man, mystically abolishing by the Spirit the difference between male and female and, in place of the two with their peculiar passions, constituting one free with respect to nature.”² Now, however, the Nag Hammadi texts have reminded us of the extent to which the unification of opposites, and especially the opposite sexes, served in early Christianity as a prime symbol of salvation. To be sure, in the second- and third-century gnostic texts this sym-

bolism flourishes in some bizarre forms which are not always clear to us, but the notion itself had an important place much earlier in the congregations founded by Paul and his school. For it is the baptismal ritual that Paul quotes when he reminds the Galatians that in Christ "there is no Jew nor Greek, there is no slave nor free, there is no male and female" (Galatians 3:28).

The unification of opposites is a well-known motif alike in religious phenomenology and in the history of ancient philosophy.³ Edmund Leach goes so far as to say: "In every myth system we will find a persistent sequence of binary discriminations as between human/superhuman, mortal/immortal, male/female, legitimate/illegitimate, good/bad . . . followed by a 'mediation' of the paired categories thus distinguished."⁴ However, it does not follow from the motif's near ubiquity that it is banal. The very simplicity and universality of the structure fit it to carry communications of great variety, from the most obvious to the most profound of human experiences. While in some cases the symbol doubtless does become otiose, its actual significance in a given instance has to be determined. That can be done only by asking about its specific functions in the network of internal and external relationships of the community which uses this symbolic language. There is reason to believe that the symbolization of a reunified mankind was not just pious talk in early Christianity, but a quite important way of conceptualizing and dramatizing the Christians' awareness of their peculiar relationship to the larger societies around them. At least some of the early Christian groups thought of themselves as a new genus of mankind, or as the restored original mankind. When Tertullian sarcastically defends the church against pagans' pejorative description of it as "a third race,"⁵ his ambivalence about the phrase is only the reverse side of the pride in uniqueness that could be expressed, for example, in the quasi-gnostic Ode of Solomon: "All those will be astonished that see me. For from another race am I."⁶ Both express a sentiment that was first announced, so far as our sources permit us to see, in the Pauline congregations of the first century, and which in different settings could serve a variety of models of Christian existence, from universal mission to radical sectarianism, from strong communal consciousness to subjective isolation. To pursue all the permutations of this cluster of symbols would require a very large monograph. As a small first step toward such a study, I shall here undertake only a sketch of some ways in which one of the pairs of opposites, "male and female," functioned in several early Christian groups. First, however, it is necessary to form some picture of the way in which the difference of the sexes was ordinarily perceived in the Greco-Roman world.

I. WOMAN'S PLACE

By and large the opposition of social roles was an important means by which Hellenistic man established his identity. For example, a rhetorical commonplace was the "three reasons for gratitude," variously attributed to Thales or Plato: "that I was born a human being and not a beast, next, a man and not a woman, thirdly, a Greek and not a barbarian."⁷ As Henry Fischel points out,⁸ the pattern was adopted by the Jewish Tannaim and eventually found its way into the synagogue liturgy: "R. Judah says: Three blessings one must say daily: Blessed (art thou), who did not make me a gentile; Blessed (art thou), who did not make me a woman; Blessed (art thou), who did not make me a boor."⁹

For a long time, however, forces had been at work in the Hellenistic world that tended to reduce this sharp differentiation of role, particularly between men and women. The queens and other prominent women among the families of the Diadochoi often overshadowed the men around them by their shrewd exercise of political power. In them, as Carl Schneider remarks, the extraordinary feminine characters of Euripides' tragedies became flesh and blood.¹⁰ The legal rights of women were greatly enhanced both in East and West; the traditional absolutism of the *patria potestas* was attenuated in Roman law of the imperial era.¹¹ Particularly, the economic rights of women in cases of divorce and inheritance improved, and with them arose the figure of the wealthy woman, able to exercise considerable influence through the pervasive patron/client relationship in Roman society.¹² Some of these women of property as well as women of lesser means undoubtedly engaged in trade, though there is insufficient evidence to determine the extent of feminine participation in mercantile occupations or handicrafts. In Greece even professional athletics were opened to women in the first century B.C.¹³ It is significant both for the rising status of women and for the general weakening of social categories in the period that mixed marriages between freed slaves and free women, between Greek and barbarian, between partners of different economic status, and the like, became more and more common in the Greco-Roman period.¹⁴

In such a society, in which many forms of social relationship underwent extensive change, it is reasonable to ask whether, apart from Christianity, there were groups which significantly modified the roles of men and women or used the symbolism of the equivalence of male and female as a hallmark of group identification. Likely places to look would be religious associations,

philosophical schools, and, because of its peculiar relationship to larger Greco-Roman society, Judaism.

There are in fact signs that in some cultic associations the ordinary social roles were disregarded. For example, the famous inscription on a shrine in honor of Agdistis (and several other savior deities) in Philadelphia, Lydia, begins: "The commandments given to Dionysius [the owner of the house] (by Zeus), granting access in sleep to his own house both to free men and women, and to household slaves." And it concludes with similar words: "These commandments were placed [here] by Agdistis, the most holy Guardian and Mistress of this house, that she might show her good will [or intentions] to men and women, bond and free, so that they might follow the [rules] written here and take part in the sacrifices which [are offered] month by month and year by year."¹⁵ Initiation at Eleusis was permitted, at least as early as the fourth century B.C., to women, even *hetairai* (courtesans) as well as to slaves, and to foreigners if they spoke Greek.¹⁶ In Roman Hellenism syncretic mysteries of Oriental and Egyptian origin became important foci in the quest for identity pursued by so many persons who had been uprooted from the city, tribe or clan (πόλις, φρατρία, *gens*).¹⁷ In most of them, the notable exception of Mithraism,¹⁸ women were initiated on a par with men, just as distinctions of origin, family, class, or servitude were put aside.¹⁹ In some of the cults, moreover, the exchange of sexual roles, by ritual transvestism for example, was an important symbol for the disruption of ordinary life's categories in the experience of initiation.²⁰ This disruption, however, did not ordinarily reach beyond the boundaries of the initiatory experience—except, of course, in the case of devotees who went on to become cult functionaries, like the *galli* who irrevocably assimilated themselves to Cybele by the sacrifice of emasculation. Otherwise, dissolution of role in the initiation must have been more a safety valve than a detonator for the pressures of role antagonism in the larger society.²¹ Initiation did not have the social consequences of "conversion"; the mysteries created no enduring, inclusive *community* that could provide an alternative to the patterns of association in the larger society.²²

Within the philosophical schools the equality of women with men was generally affirmed in principle but, apart from the Epicureans, hardly ever actualized in practice. Plato had advocated similar education for boys and girls and, in the ideal state, equal participation in all occupations, including the political and the military. Yet that reflected more an extension of the gradual emancipation then taking place in Athenian society than a radical

innovation.²³ Plato himself, moreover, always regarded women as inferior by nature to men.²⁴ The Greek intellectual tradition persistently strove to discover the underlying unity of reality, a quest which could provide the motive for criticism of the empirical divisions of society. Such criticism was more likely to occur when the philosophers themselves, as not infrequently happened, were alienated from the prevailing organs of power. The Cynics are depicted throughout the literature of antiquity as the very models of alienation. Diogenes-*chriai* portray a man who, for the sake of his citizenship in the cosmos and his mission as messenger of the gods, disdains the roles and obligations that belong to the citizens of any earthly city.²⁵ Appropriately the epigram, "Virtue is the same for men and for women," is attributed to Antisthenes, teacher of Diogenes.²⁶ The Stoics took up this theme—Cleanthes is said to have written a book on the subject²⁷—and developed it into a grand picture of the unity of all rational being—the gods, men, and women—all having one virtue as they all partook of the one *logos*.²⁸

Nevertheless, the traditional philosophical school was a "closed masculine community from which women were excluded,"²⁹ which yielded only reluctantly to the ideal of equality. In late Hellenism the new educational requirements of the bureaucratic classes replaced the masculine ideology of the old education.³⁰ Ironically, though, the practical ethics of the schools came more and more to be shaped by the conventional stratification of society,³¹ so that there was little pragmatic reason for the admission of women as pupils. Like Plato, Zeno wrote a *Republic* sketching a utopia in which men and women would be equal, even wearing identical clothing,³² yet none of Zeno's disciples were women,³³ and the report that Plato had two female students who also heard Speusippus, if it is to be believed, is isolated in the traditions of the Academy.³⁴ The story of Hipparchia, who refused high-born and wealthy suitors to become the wife of Crates, adopting the Cynic's cloak and ascetic life, was a favorite subject in the collections of *chriai*.³⁵ Yet its popularity is probably an index precisely to the novelty of a woman philosopher, even among the Cynics. Only from the Roman Stoics do we hear serious advocacy of a philosophical vocation for women, for example in the essay by Musonius Rufus on the theme "That Women Too Should Study Philosophy."³⁶ Yet Musonius's own pupil, Epictetus, can speak of women with contempt,³⁷ and even Seneca by and large shares the common prejudices against women as innately inferior to men.³⁸ Though there were women in the old Pythagorean community—principally the wives and daughters of male members of the association, like the famous Timycha, wife of Myllia—

and Iamblichus lists seventeen of "the most illustrious Pythagorean women,"³⁹ the role of women depicted in the Pythagorean traditions is quite conventional.⁴⁰

Only in the Epicurean "Garden" did women participate on a fully equal basis. Both married women and *hetairai* belonged to the original fellowship of Epicurus, and one of the latter, Leontion, served as president in the rotating succession.⁴¹ The fact is more significant because the intimate fellowship of the Epicureans is a central factor in the movement's existence. Seneca remarked, "It was not instruction but fellowship [*contubernium*] that made great men out of Metrodorus, Hermarchus, and Polyaeus."⁴² The Epicureans' exaltation of *philia*, "consolidated by the communal living (*κοινωνία*) of those who have attained the full complement of pleasure,"⁴³ seems to contradict their extreme quest for self-sufficiency (*αὐτάρκεια*)⁴⁴ as well as the "dogma" attributed to Epicurus, "that man is not by nature sociable (*κοινωνικόν*) and civilized."⁴⁵ Perhaps, however, the case is not so paradoxical. The Epicureans were radically pessimistic about the public order (*πολιτεία*), for this existed by coercion, inimitable to self-sufficiency and therefore to happiness. The great cosmic state of men and gods envisioned by the Stoics was for the Epicureans a dangerous figment of the imagination. However, when Epicurus recommended the "private life,"⁴⁶ he meant not the life of a hermit, but the intimate fellowship in which the self-sufficiency of each individual could be enhanced by their mutual support. Like the Pythagorean groups, the Epicurean fellowship was a therapeutic cult.⁴⁷ Consequently, while the Epicureans rejected the institution of marriage and the duty to produce children for the society,⁴⁸ the original Garden included several married couples, at least one of which came from the marriage of two members, and Epicurus's will made elaborate provision for the care of Metrodorus's children.⁴⁹ Though the sage (*σοφός*) ought not to fall in love (*ἐρᾶσθαι*),⁵⁰ presumably because *eros* would work against self-sufficiency, the relationship between man and woman within the community could be transformed into the friendship (*φιλία*) of free persons. Thus the Epicureans, alone among the philosophical schools and initiatory groups (*θιάσσοι*) did create a communal existence in which the normal social roles of the sexes were abolished, and male and female were equal.

If there was any group in antiquity renowned in popular imagination for its peculiarity over against the laws and customs of the larger society, it was the Jews. Did any group of the Jews distinguish themselves by uniqueness of the male/female relationships among them? We might suppose so, for one outside observer at least tells us that "concerning marriage and the burial of

the dead, he [sc. Moses] established practices different from those of other men."⁵¹ Yet in practice the Jewish communities in the Roman empire seem to have reflected all the diversity and ambiguities that beset the sexual roles and attitudes of the dominant society.

The marriage laws of ancient Israel gave to women an honorable but circumscribed and decidedly subordinate place. As there was in the biblical tradition no asceticism properly so called, so also there was no misogyny,⁵² but, like all ancient Near Eastern cultures, Israelite society in all its historical periods was dominated by the male. The praise of national heroes in Ben Sira (chaps. 44 ff.) includes only "famous men"; there is no place for a Sarah or a Deborah. Indeed the older wisdom literature recognizes only two classes of women: good wives and dangerous seductresses.⁵³ Nevertheless, Judaism felt some of the winds of change that affected its neighbors. Like the larger Hellenistic kingdoms, Hasmonean Judea had its shrewd and ruthless queen, Salome Alexandra. And, despite Ben Sira, it had its legendary heroines, Esther and Judith, competent to exercise their wiles for the good of their people in any Hellenistic royal court. At a more humdrum level, there were evidently Jewish women engaged in trade and commerce, for several of the obviously well-to-do patronesses of Paul were Jewish-Christians.⁵⁴ There is no record of any woman having served as an officer of a synagogue, but at least three women in the Roman Jewish community were honored in tomb inscriptions with the title *mater synagogae*, corresponding to the more frequent (nine times) *pater synagogae*.⁵⁵

Just as the Stoics discussed the question whether women ought to philosophize, so there was disagreement among the Tannaim whether women should be instructed in Torah. The predominant opinion was certainly negative, although few would take the extreme view of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, to whom are attributed the sayings: "Every man who teaches his daughter Torah is as if he taught her promiscuity,"⁵⁶ and, "Let the words of the Torah be burned up, but let them not be delivered to women."⁵⁷ There were women who learned Torah—one of the synagogue lessons could be read by a woman⁵⁸—and the Talmud preserves numerous stories about the sagacity of Beruria, wife of R. Meir, who bested both a sectary and her own husband in argument, and whose opinion on one occasion was even accepted by R. Judah the Prince.⁵⁹ By and large, however, the presence of a woman in the rabbinic academies must have been at least as rare as it was among the pupils of the Stoics, who in theory were much less opposed to the idea.

Moreover, there were in Judaism of the Hellenistic era, as in pagan Hellenism,⁶⁰ pockets of real misogyny. The most blatant example is Philo,

who commonly uses the female figures in the Bible as symbols of feeling (αἰσθησις) or emotion (πάθος), but the male for mind (νοῦς) and reason (λόγος)⁶¹ and who associates with woman an extraordinary number of pejorative expressions: weak, easily deceived, cause of sin, lifeless, diseased, enslaved, unmanly, nerveless, mean, slavish, sluggish, and many others.⁶² When he does give a positive value to biblical women, such as Sarah, “the allegory robs these figures of their feminine character.”⁶³ Moreover, in striking contrast to pagan society in Hellenistic Egypt, where women attained unusual independence in economic, legal, and even political affairs, Philo interprets the biblical laws in a way decidedly inimical to the rights of wives and mothers.⁶⁴ To be sure, despite his ascetic and dualistic tendencies,⁶⁵ Philo is both Jewish and Greek enough to regard marriage as natural and necessary—but the husband’s relationship to his wife is like that of father to children and owner to slaves.⁶⁶ The proper relation of wife to husband is expressed by the verb δουλεύειν “to serve as a slave,”⁶⁷ and the sole legitimate purpose of marriage and of sexual intercourse is procreation.⁶⁸ We shall look in vain in Philo, therefore, for any advocacy of equalization or unification of the opposite sexes. His attitude toward male and female roles is, on the contrary, more conservative than that of his gentile environment. To the extent that the Alexandrian Jewish community as a whole tended to grant more legal equality to women than did the biblical laws, on the other hand, it did so evidently more by accommodation to Egyptian custom than in distinction from it.

The options are not vastly different if we consider all the varieties of Judaism in the Second Commonwealth period—insofar as our limited data permit us to know anything about them. Some, like Philo, sharply depreciate the worth and place of women;⁶⁹ there are groups that tend toward sexual asceticism, notably the Essenes and other baptizing sects of Palestine, yet without abandoning male dominance.⁷⁰ Nowhere in Judaism do we hear of any real tendency to harmonize the social roles of male and female, except to the limited extent that Hellenized Jews follow the general but by no means universal trend toward equality. Only perhaps in the strange vigil of the Therapeutae, as Philo describes it, is there something like a ritual unification of the sexes, which in ecstatic song dissolves their strict separation observed in the everyday life of this ascetic community.⁷¹

If any generalization is permissible about the place of women in Hellenistic society of Roman imperial times, it is that the age brought in all places a heightened awareness of the differentiation of male and female. The traditional social roles were no longer taken for granted but debated, consciously

violated by some, vigorously defended by others. While the general status of women had vastly and steadily improved over several centuries, the change brought in some circles a bitter reaction in the form of misogyny. The groups that made possible full participation of women with men on an equal basis were few and isolated; the Epicurean school is the only important example. Among those who advocated preservation of the status quo, the constantly salient concern is a sense of order: everything must be in its place, and the differentiation and ranking of women and men became a potent symbol for the stability of the world order. That concern comes through clearly, for example, in the protestations by moralists about the “natural” difference in hair styles of men and women.⁷² Thus the aphorism of an anonymous Attic comedian was still valid: “Woman’s world is one thing, men’s another.”⁷³

II. THE BAPTISMAL REUNIFICATION FORMULA

I suggested at the outset that when Paul speaks of the reunification of pairs of opposites in Galatians 3:28 he is not engaging in ad hoc rhetoric but quoting a bit of the liturgy of baptism. It is time now to vindicate that assertion by formal analysis and to inquire about the symbolic and social context of the language. The reunification language is found three times in the Pauline corpus: in Galatians 3:28, where the unified opposites are Jew/Greek, slave/free, male and female; in 1 Corinthians 12:13, Jews/Greeks, slaves/free, and in Colossians 3:11, where the terms are expanded: Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free. Perhaps there is an echo of the formula also in the “whether slave or free” in the *Haustafel* Ephesians 6:8, and in the “whether among the Jews, or among the gentiles, in one body” of Ignatius, to the Smyrnaeans 1:2. The following observations bespeak a quoted formula: (1) A synopsis⁷⁴ shows the consistency of the major motifs: baptism into Christ (or, “one body”), “putting on Christ” (or, “the new man”), simple listing of two or more pairs of opposites, and the statement that “all” are “one” or that Christ is all.⁷⁵ The simplicity of the basic pattern, within which details of wording may vary widely, is characteristic of the liturgical and kerygmatic formulas which New Testament scholarship has isolated in recent years. (2) The declaration is associated in every instance with baptism, though it is not baptism as such which is under discussion in the letters. (3) The formula stands out from its context—most clearly in Galatians 3:28, least clearly in Colossians 3:11, precisely where the context is filled with other motifs which probably come from baptismal parenesis.⁷⁶ The allusion to Genesis 1:27 in the third pair of Galatians 3:28⁷⁷ has

and suggests that somehow the act of Christian initiation reverses the fate of the division of Genesis 2:21–22. Where the image of God is restored, there, it seems, man is no longer divided—not even by the most fundamental division of all, male and female. The baptismal reunification formula thus belongs to the familiar *Urzeit-Endzeit* pattern, and it presupposes an interpretation of the creation story in which the divine image after which Adam was modeled was masculofeminine.

Myths of a bisexual progenitor of the human race were very common in antiquity, as they have been in many cultures.⁸⁷ For anyone trying to understand the strange sequence of the first two chapters of Genesis without the aid of modern source criticism, it would have been very plausible to read such a myth into the text—especially if one lived in a culture where Plato's version of the myth was widely known. Small wonder, then, that rabbis in early talmudic times knew a text of the Septuagint which translated Genesis 1:27 and 5:2, "male and female he created *him*."⁸⁸ A midrashic tradition, extant in several variants, cleverly exploits Psalm 139:5, read as, "You have shaped me back and front," and Genesis 2:21, "And the Lord God . . . took one of his *sides*," to form a coherent story that, in its fullest version, clearly betrays the influence of Plato: "R. Samuel bar Nahman said, When the Holy One, blessed be he, created the first man, he created him "two-faced" (*διπρόσωπον*). Then he split him and made two bodies, one on each side, and turned them about. Thus it is written, 'He took one of his sides.'"⁸⁹ But even the simpler versions betray by their interchangeable use of the Greek loan-words for "androgynous" and "two-faced" (often, *δύ πρόσωπα*) their Platonic paternity.⁹⁰ Though the Palestinian adaptation of the myth cannot be precisely dated,⁹¹ Philo attests the familiarity of this reading of the Genesis story in first-century Alexandria.⁹² Of course the use to which the Jews put the androgynous myth is quite different from its meaning in Aristophanes' tale in the *Symposium*. Only those elements which could be adjusted to the midrashic problems of Genesis 1–2—and to a thoroughly heterosexual ethos⁹³—were retained. In Judaism the myth serves only to solve an exegetical dilemma and to support monogamy.⁹⁴

The Adam legends may also have provided the medium for the special configuration of the *clothing symbolism* found in baptismal contexts, for the "robes of skin" of Genesis 3:21 are sometimes taken to be the physical body replacing the lost Image of God, which is correspondingly construed as a "robe of light."⁹⁵ Restoration of the Image could very readily be represented therefore by a change of clothing, most dramatically perhaps in the well-known scene in the Hymn of the Pearl, where the prince sees in the "splen-

did robe" that comes to meet him the "reflection" of his true self and at the same time the "image (*εἰκών*) of the king of kings."⁹⁶ In Jewish and Samaritan tradition, reclothing with the Image is occasionally said to have taken place at Sinai, particularly in the Moses legends,⁹⁷ or to be promised for the righteous in the age to come.⁹⁸ Robing with "garments of light" restores the heavenly self in the Mandaean *mašbuta* and *masiqta* rituals,⁹⁹ as well as in early Syrian Christian baptismal liturgies¹⁰⁰ and in the Gospel of Philip.¹⁰¹ The "removal of the body of flesh" (Colossians 2:11), that is, "the old man" (3:9), in order to "put on the new man, who is renewed . . . after the image of his creator" (3:10) can confidently be assigned to the same stream of tradition.

The mythic pattern we have been describing received its most luxuriant development at the hands of the gnostics, who were particularly entranced by the androgynous character of the primal man.¹⁰² In a number of gnostic systems the division between male and female is the fundamental symbol or even the mythical source of the human plight, and consequently their reunification represents or effects man's salvation: "When Eve was in Adam, there was no death; but when she was separated from him death came into being. Again if <she> go in, and he take <her> to himself, death will no longer exist."¹⁰³ However, the reality denoted by this reunification and the means of accomplishing it or symbolizing it are construed in various ways.

IV. RITUAL AND COMMUNITY

A number of gnostic groups developed explicit corporate rituals by which the bisexual Image was renewed or recovered. Irenaeus tells of a "mystic rite" (*μυσταγωγία*) of "spiritual marriage" practiced by some Marcosians in a "bridal chamber" (*νυμφών*).¹⁰⁴ Moreover, his vivid description of the way in which he said Marcus seduced wealthy women¹⁰⁵ is evidently a parody of the Marcosian sacrament, for it closely parallels elements of the "Mystery of the Bridal Chamber" which are now known from the Gospel of Philip and other Nag Hammadi texts: "becoming one" with the Bridegroom,¹⁰⁶ "establishing the germ of light in the bridal chamber,"¹⁰⁷ receiving grace and the Spirit.¹⁰⁸

The Gospel of Philip reveals a system of five sacraments, of which the Mystery of the Bridal Chamber is the highest.¹⁰⁹ It illustrates the tendency of motifs originally connected with baptism to become distinct rituals, as the mythical context of these motifs also becomes more and more elaborate. Thus, while the receiving of the garment or body of light is still connected

with baptism in some of the sayings in the Gospel of Philip compilation (§101, cf. §106), in others the clothing with light is effected by Chrism (§95) or the Bridal Chamber (§77). The symbolic referents of the sacral marriage itself are multiple. The restoration of the broken unity of Adam still plays a role (§§71, 78; see above), but the biblical legend is now overshadowed by theogonic myths of the Valentinian type. The sacramental union in the Bridal Chamber has its archetype in the union of the Savior with the previously barren Sophia¹¹⁰—also represented by the peculiar legends of Christ's association with Mary Magdalene¹¹¹—and its fulfillment in the eschatological union of each gnostic's true self (the "image") with its corresponding "angel."¹¹² The theme of restoration of *man's* primeval unity is here almost swallowed up in the inflated myth of "devolution" and restoration of the pre-cosmic Pleroma.

The actual ritual involved in the sacred marriage of the Valentinians cannot be determined with certainty. The heresiologists were quick to assume that physical sex relations were involved, and they may have been correct in some instances.¹¹³ Yet the Gospel of Philip speaks disparagingly of actual cohabitation, even though that is an "image" of the true union "in the Aion."¹¹⁴ Schenke has argued that the central act of the sacrament was a "holy kiss";¹¹⁵ probably the kiss did have an important place.¹¹⁶ Whatever the gnostics did in the marriage sacrament, it clearly distinguished them, in their opinion, from those who were merely baptized and anointed. It was the sacrament of the elite, the perfected (τέλειοι).¹¹⁷

The restoration of the androgynous Image (the undifferentiated "root" power)¹¹⁸ is fundamental to Simonian gnosticism also,¹¹⁹ and there is evidence from the late *Apophysis Megale* quoted by Hippolytus that it may have been dramatized in a baptismal ritual: "Thus, according to Simon, there is hidden in everyone potentially (δυνάμει) but not actually (ἐνέργεια) that blessed and incorruptible (power), which is the one who stands, stood, and will stand (ὁ ἐστῶς, στάς, στησόμενος): 'stands' above in the unbegotten power, 'stood' below in the stream of waters, begotten in an image, 'will stand' above with the blessed, unlimited power, if he is shaped by the image (ἐξεικονίζεσθαι)"¹²⁰ Haenchen sees in the explanation of the second phase (στάς) only the general plight of the divine potency in man as it stands in "temporality, depicted in the image of the chaos-flood."¹²¹ But the aorist participles point to a specific occasion of "having stood" and "being begotten in an image." The primary allusion is of course to the myth of the creation of man in Genesis 1,¹²² but the clause, "If he is shaped by the image (ἐάν ἐξεικονισθῆ)" which is the condition for being able to "stand above with the

blessed, unlimited power," cannot be just a generalized interpretation of the Adam story. It must point to some concrete possibility for the inner self of each man to realize this potential by being "iconized." To receive the Image assures eschatological salvation: the "fruit" that is "iconized" will be "gathered into the treasury," that is, will transcend the differentiated state represented by the three pairs of emanated "powers" to be assimilated to the one "unbegotten and unlimited power."¹²³ This language is applied, according to *Refutatio* 6.18.1, to Simon himself. Moreover, the warning is issued that "whoever is not 'iconized' will perish with the world."¹²⁴ The verb "to be iconized" (ἐξεικονίζεσθαι) in fact appears to be a technical term in the *Apophysis Megale*, equivalent to "to be initiated."¹²⁵ Thus the "re-formation" in the image, equated with "being begotten" and occurring "in the stream of waters," suggests a cultic act like baptism.¹²⁶ On the other hand, when Hippolytus also accuses the Simonians of reveling in promiscuous sexuality, he is evidently referring to some kind of sacred union (ιερός γάμος), for he says the practice is in imitation of Simon (and Helen). Interestingly, he reports that the rite is called "the holy of holies"—precisely the metaphor used for the Mystery of the Bridal Chamber in Gospel of Philip §76.¹²⁷ It is not unlikely, therefore, that the Simonian sect developed cultic practices analogous to the Valentinian mysteries.

The sacramental means of restoring the androgynous wholeness of the inner man, which we have found exemplified in the Gospel of Philip and the *Apophysis Megale*, presupposes a cultic community with a strong sense of corporate identity. In other gnostic circles, however, the same mythical configurations could be focused exclusively in the task of a subjective transformation of consciousness, which might lead not to sect formation but to radical isolation of the individual.¹²⁸ The latter trend is evident in the Gospel of Thomas and in the Encratite Christianity of eastern Syria, with which most scholars connect the Thomas traditions. The task of "making the two one," especially "the male and the female," is a prominent theme in the Gospel of Thomas,¹²⁹ and there is reason to believe that the associated imagery is drawn from baptismal liturgies, particularly the Syrian.¹³⁰ But the ideal of "singleness," expressed in the Coptic phrase *ΟΥΔ ΟΥΩΤ* or the Greek loan word for "solitary" (μονοχός), has a double significance: celibacy and asocial isolation.

The solitary in the Gospel of Thomas is clearly one who is beyond sexuality; he is "like a little child" (logion 22), whose innocence of sexuality is portrayed in the removal of clothing without shame—like Adam before the Fall (logion 37, cf. logion 21).¹³¹ The saying, "The solitaries are the [only] ones who will enter the bridal chamber" (logion 75) sounds like the warning in

Gospel of Philip §73 that only "free men and virgins" can enter the Bridal Chamber, yet in the Gospel of Thomas the bridal chamber seems only a metaphor, rather than a cultic anticipation, of "the kingdom."¹³² "Male and female" are to be made "one," but they are by no means treated as equals. Rather, if the female is to become a "living spirit" and thus be saved, she must become male (logion 114).¹³³ Further, it is characteristic of the Gospel of Thomas that eschatological symbols are reinterpreted in subjective terms. The "new creation (κόσμος)" and the repose (ἀνάπαυσις) of the dead have already come if one but knew it (logion 51); "the Kingdom of the Father is spread upon the earth and men do not see it" (logion 113). Obtaining life is consistently said to depend upon obtaining "secret knowledge," which on the one hand means grasping the esoteric meaning of the sayings in this book (logion 1), but on the other hand and more profoundly, obtaining *self-knowledge*: "The Kingdom is within you and it is without you. If you know yourselves, then you will be known and you will know that you are the sons of the living Father. But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty and you are poverty."¹³⁴ The emphasis on salvation by self-knowledge suggests that the terms "male and female" are used metaphorically in the Thomas sayings to represent aspects of the individual personality.¹³⁵ If so, then the process of "making the two one" and "making the female male" is a gnostic parallel to Philo's more philosophical use of the same metaphors to depict the progress of the wise man through practice of virtue and contemplative philosophy to a heightened self-consciousness that leads finally to the *visio dei* or at least the *visio verbi dei*.¹³⁶ If cultic acts play any part in this process, they go unmentioned in the Gospel of Thomas. Baptism is presumably presupposed, but only as initiation, the beginning of the transformation by gnosis.

There are some similar motifs in the apocryphal Acts which stem from Encratite circles. The virgin Thecla, for example, could be taken as the very model of a female who "makes herself male," represented in the story by her wish to cut her hair short and her donning of men's clothing,¹³⁷ thus becoming what the Gospel of Thomas would call a *monachos*—not only a celibate, but also one who must break all ties to home, city, and ordinary society, becoming a wanderer. In the Encratite Acts, the ascetic life is idealized as that of an itinerant, whose baptism liberates him from "the world," understood primarily as sexuality and society. So also in the Gospel of Thomas, "becoming a single one" involves a radical separation from settled life: hatred of family, including not only marriage but also recognition of parents;¹³⁸ perceiving the world as a "corpse";¹³⁹ and rejecting trade and commerce.¹⁴⁰ Thus in these

circles the union of male and female represents not a heightened or even a spiritualized libido, but a neutralization of sexuality, and therewith a renunciation of all ties which join the "unified" individual with society.¹⁴¹

V. ROLES OF WOMEN IN THE PAULINE CONGREGATIONS

The foregoing survey demonstrates that the myth of an eschatological restoration of man's original divine, androgynous image could serve a variety of ritual, subjective, and social functions. We return now to the Pauline letters to inquire whether any of these possibilities were already realized in the first-century congregations of the Pauline school. Were there any actual modifications of the normal social roles of women in those congregations?

Among the persons named in Paul's letters for particular messages or greetings, a fair number are women. Some of these, as E. A. Judge suggests, were evidently patronesses of Paul and his associates, at least in the sense of providing funds, housing, and the like:¹⁴² Phoebe, the deaconess (διάκονος) of Cenchreae, who is actually called "leader" (προστάτις, Romans 16:2), the equivalent of *patrona*; Mary the mother of Rufus "and of me" (Romans 16:13); and those women who have "a church in their house" (Romans 16:5; 1 Corinthians 16:19, Prisca and her husband; Colossians 4:15, Nympha). From Acts 16:14–15, the name of Lydia, the well-to-do textile merchant, may be added to the list of *patronae*. Their support of the movement, however, is a testimony as much to the freer participation of women in the economic life of Greco-Roman society as to any specific homogenization of roles within Christianity. More important is the fact that some of the women mentioned by Paul had positions of leadership in local congregations or in the missionary activities of the Pauline school. Thus Phoebe is given the title of deaconess (Romans 16:2, here perhaps referring to a local office as in Philippians 1:1),¹⁴³ and the naming of "Apphia our sister" with Philemon and Archippus (Philemon 2) may suggest that she was a leader of the Colossian congregation.¹³⁷ Further, the "laboring" of Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, and Persis (Romans 16:6, 12) probably implies evangelical or teaching activity, for the verbs "to labor" (κοπιᾶν and its cognates) are ordinarily used by Paul of the missionary labors of himself and others. The same is true of Euodia and Syntyche, whose disagreement is an object of Paul's concern in Philippians 4:2–3, for they have "shared the struggle with me (συνήθησαν μοι) in the gospel." The place of the couple Prisca and Aquila in Paul's letters and in later tradition (Acts and the Pastorals) attests their extraordinary mobility and leadership—apparently they presided over house churches and

perhaps even catechetical schools in Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome and certainly Prisca is at least her husband's peer in this activity (four times out of six her name is mentioned before his: Acts 18:2, 18, 26; Romans 16:3; 1 Corinthians 16:19; 2 Timothy 4:19). Thus there are a number of signs that in the Pauline school women could enjoy a functional equality in leadership roles that would have been unusual in Greco-Roman society as a whole and quite astonishing in comparison with contemporary Judaism. When Marcion permitted women to administer baptism and to conduct other official functions—not the least scandalous of his practices in the eyes of the second-century Great Church¹⁴⁴—he may have had better grounds than for his other innovations in thinking he was following the Pauline model.

In one of Paul's congregations the unification of male and female became a particular focus of identity and dissension—the church at Corinth. Although the situation is beclouded by the ambivalence of Paul's response, and a much-needed full discussion of the issue would far exceed the limits of the present essay, a few observations are possible, based on the phenomena we have surveyed, which may suggest directions for further study. There are several passages in First Corinthians in which the relation between male and female is the center of attention: a bold violation of the incest taboo, which Paul finds "arrogant" and "boastful" (5:1–13); patronage of prostitutes under the slogan "all is authorized" (6:12–20); the complex series of questions about marriage, divorce, and asceticism raised by the Corinthians's letter to Paul (chap. 7); the proper attire of "praying and prophesying" women (11:2–16); and the command for women to "be silent in the assembly" (14:33b–36). Both the situations and Paul's responses are sufficiently diverse that we should be wary of attempts to explain them all by a single "heresy" in the Corinthian church. Yet it would also be a mistake to treat each question in isolation, as if, for example, the prophesying women of 11:2–16 had nothing to do with the other pneumatic phenomena discussed throughout the letter.¹⁴⁵

Paul's most extended discussion of the relation of male and female is in chapter 7. Formally the striking thing about that chapter is the number of monotonously parallel statements made about the obligations, respectively, of men and women: verses 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 28, 32–34.¹⁴⁶ It looks as though Paul were laboring to express the male and female roles in almost precisely the same language. Even in 11:2–16, which contains an apparently unequivocal statement of male superiority in the order of creation, the same kind of rhetorical balance occurs at two points: verses 4–5, where both men and women "who pray or prophesy" with the wrong sort of head

attire are said to "dishonor the head," and verses 11–12, where the hierarchical summary of the creation story is qualified by a statement of mutual dependency "in the Lord." Thus Paul presupposes and approves in the Corinthian congregation an equivalence of role and a mutuality of relationship between the sexes in matters of marriages, divorce, and charismatic leadership of the church¹⁴⁷ to a degree that is virtually unparalleled in Jewish or pagan society of the time.¹⁴⁸

Yet in 11:2–16 and in 14:33b–36 Paul seems primarily concerned to reassert the distinction between male and female and the inferiority of the woman to the man. These passages have evoked a large and disparate body of literature because they apparently contain two fundamental self-contradictions. (1) The "subordination" of women to men, based on the order of creation, runs counter not only to the equivalence of role that, as we just noted, Paul emphasizes and reemphasizes in this letter, but even to the explicit statement in chapter 11 itself that "in the Lord" the order of creation has been replaced by reciprocity (verses 11–12). (2) The command that women must "be silent in the church," in the context of regulation of charismatic forms of speech, flatly contradicts the assumption in 11:2–16 that women like men will "pray and prophesy" in the congregation. How do these apparent contradictions arise?

The structure of Paul's argument in 11:3–16 is not one of his most lucid patterns of logic. It begins with a programmatic assertion that seems to set up a chain of rank: the head of every man is Christ, of woman is man, of Christ is God. The statement is the basis for the subsequent argument, for "head" (κεφαλή) in the following verses must be a double entendre. Verses 4–5 speak in parallel statements about ways in which a male or female prophet, respectively, may "dishonor" his or her "head": the male, by "having [something hanging] down from the head," the woman, by having "her head uncovered." Verses 5b and 6 introduce an *ad hominem* argument by analogy: for the woman to have her head uncovered is "the same thing as if it were shaved or cropped." Verse 7 returns to the "principle" laid down in verse 3: the man is not obliged to cover his head, because he is "the image and glory of God" (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ), while woman is only the glory of of man. Verses 8–9 continue the allusion to creation introduced by verse 7's reference to Genesis 1:27. If "on account of" (διὰ τοῦτο, verse 10) refers back to what precedes, as seems most natural, then the following phrase, "on account of the angels" (διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους), ought also to have some connection with creation. Verses 11–12 state the contrary of verses 8–9: "in the Lord" (ἐν κυρίῳ) there is no man apart from woman or woman apart from man.

Verse 12, by reversing the language of verse 8b and by adding the "All-mächtigformel" (τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), relativizes the principle which has dominated the argument up to this point. (Compare Paul's use of similar language in 4:21b–23 to emphasize unity despite distinction, and in 15:23–29 to emphasize distinction and sequence leading up to eschatological unity.) Verse 13 takes up the *ad hominem* argument again by asking if it is proper (πρέπον) women to pray with "head uncovered" (ἀκατακάλυπτον). Verses 14–15 continue this line by returning to the analogy of the different "natural" hair styles for men and women. Finally, it is stated that the apostle and the "churches of God" (ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ) recognize no other "custom."

In this confusing passage a few significant elements are clear. Paul nowhere denies women the right to engage in charismatic leadership of worship. Furthermore, he does not advocate *functionally* inferior roles for women. On the contrary, the parenthetical statement in verses 8–9 can best be understood as an attempt to ward off that interpretation of what he is saying. What Paul is exercised about is solely the *symbols* that distinguish male from female. Furthermore, the proper symbolic attire is just as important in his eyes for the male prophet as for the female (verses 4, 14). If the passage places most emphasis on the female, that must be because in Corinth it is the charismatic women who are donning the attire of the opposite sex.

Attempts to guess why the symbolic dress of the prophetesses had become so important at Corinth have not been notoriously successful.¹⁴⁹ We may agree with Lösche and other recent interpreters that what was involved was not an "emancipation movement," touched off either by gnostic influence in Corinth or by Paul's radical statement in Galatians 3:28.¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the older suggestions of Lütgert and Schlatter that the pneumaticism at Corinth found a starting point in traditions which Paul himself or his school had communicated to them should not be too quickly rejected. Chapter 11 is concerned with the question of traditions (παράδοσις) received by the Corinthians from Paul, and while verse 2 may be merely a *captatio benevolentiae*, he does not hesitate in verses 17–34 to scold the Corinthians for violating tradition. The argument about the veiling of prophetesses thus stands within the framework of praise for the "holding fast" of tradition. Second, I have argued that Galatians 3:28 does not represent merely radical rhetoric by Paul, but a tradition connected with baptism. Third, the "spiritualist" movement at Corinth seems to be intimately connected with a peculiar understanding of baptismal initiation into heavenly wisdom, which Paul is at pains in chapters 1–4 to correct.¹⁵¹ Fourth, we have seen some evidence from later Encratite Christianity for the notion that women might be expected to "make them-

selves male" by adopting the dress and hair style of men.¹⁵² From all this, while the precise ideology of the Corinthian pneumatics remains elusive, it is at least a plausible conjecture that the symbolic identification of male and female among them was a significant part of their "realized eschatology." And we find such a "realized eschatology" preeminently expressed in the baptismal traditions of the Pauline school—most clearly in the deutero-Pauline letters, but already presupposed in Galatians 3:27–8 and Romans 6. If Paul, on the other hand, in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 is concerned to insist on the continuing validity of the *symbolic* distinctions belonging to the humanity of the old Adam, that is in harmony with the "eschatological reservation" which he expresses throughout this letter. The Corinthian pneumatics are not "already," as they think, "enthroned" and "enriched," not already resurrected in the Spirit (4:8; chap. 15 passim) and therefore "equal to the angels" and thus beyond sexuality (cf. Luke 20:34–36). Yet in the present, in which "the form of this world is passing away," the eschatological Spirit is already at work, and *functional* distinctions which belong to that world may be disregarded, so long as the results lead to the "building up" of the community.¹⁵³ That is why, in all his discussion of the *charismata* in Corinth, Paul's prevailing concern is with *order*.¹⁵⁴

That is even clearer in the other baffling passage, 14:33b–36. The entire context deals with ecstatic phenomena, prophecy and glossolalia, and Paul's principle is, "Let everything be done for building up" (verse 27), "for God is not a God of disorder but of peace" (verse 33). Within that context, Paul lays down rules for the orderly "speaking" (λαλεῖν), both in prophecy and in tongues, and the occasions on which the ecstatic must "be silent in the assembly" (σιγάτω ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ). The following universal admonition that "women are to keep silent in the assemblies" and "not . . . to speak," is *verbally* in complete harmony with that context. However, it stands outside the framework of normative principle cited above (verses 27, 33), and it appears flatly to contradict Paul's approval of prophecy by women in 11:2–16. The simplest solution is to assume with many modern scholars that the verses are an interpolation by a later conservative member of the Pauline school, representing the kind of reaction expressed in 1 Timothy 2:11–12.¹⁵⁵ If, on the other hand, one agrees with Windisch that the passage in 1 Timothy is an elaboration of 1 Corinthians 14:34b–36 and therefore presupposes its presence in the text from the beginning, then something like Windisch's solution to the contradiction would also have to be accepted: In his concern for order in the cultic assembly, Paul adds an afterthought which is expressed unfortunately in too absolute a fashion, obscuring the fact that the speech of these

women who want to enter into a discussion to "learn" cannot be the charismatic speech of the context.¹⁵⁶ But in that case the conservative reaction which was to dominate the later Pauline school begins already with Paul, insofar as women not sealed by the charismata of leadership are concerned, for ὑποτασσέσθωσαν here certainly means "let them be subordinate," not just "let them be orderly."¹⁵⁷

In the later developments in the Pauline school the peculiar eschatological and social tensions that characterize Paul's position in the Corinthian correspondence tend to dissolve. On the one hand, the "realized eschatology" of the baptismal traditions, expressed in the language of cosmic myth, is far less restrained. On the other hand, the mythical language is linked up with a prosaic ethic of community order, upon which it has apparently little effect. A single example of this tendency will serve to conclude our survey.

The Letter to Colossians uses the mythical language of cosmic reconciliation to speak of human unity within the congregation. To an even greater extent this is true of the encyclical letter traditionally known as Ephesians. The author's central concern is with the unification of Jew and gentile. In the "baptismal reminder,"¹⁵⁸ 2:11–22, language which perhaps once spoke of the union of earth and heaven, "making the two one" (neuter, verse 14), is adapted to speak of the gentile mission.¹⁵⁹ But in the conventional catechetical material the emphasis is elsewhere. When the author of Ephesians takes up the pattern of "putting off the old man" and putting on the new" (4:17–24), he casts it also in the form of the "soteriological contrast" that reminds the gentiles of their preconversion life, as seen in conventional Hellenistic-Jewish apologetics.¹⁶⁰ The central fact about the "new man" here is not his recreated unity, but his morality. For this reason also the *Haustafel* occupies a prominent place in the parenthesis of Ephesians (5:22–6:9), as it does in Colossians.

Only at two points the author has expanded the *Haustafel* scheme to include an allusion to the baptismal reunification of opposites, the one having to do with slaves (6:8) and the other with husbands and wives (5:22–33). In the latter place, the conventional admonitions "wives be subject to your husbands" and "husbands love your wives" (cf. Colossians 3:18 f.; 1 Peter 3:1, 7; 1 Clement 1:3) are reinforced by analogy with Christ's relationship to the church. These remarkable statements evidently presuppose some mythical or at least metaphorical conception of a marriage between the Redeemer and his community. Such a conception is attested by Paul, 2 Corinthians 11:2, as well as in Revelation 19:6–9 and 21:2, 9, where, as in Ephesians 5:22–33, the "presentation" of the bride as a pure (or purified) virgin is an essential

part of the imagery.¹⁶¹ While the author of Ephesians uses the notion of Christ's marriage to the church merely as backing for the commonplace rule for ordinary marriage, the passage also contains a clear reference to baptism in verse 26.¹⁶² This is hardly the author's invention, for it stands in tension with his parenetic use of the tradition: the marriage of Christ and the church can hardly have been made simultaneously the prototype of both marriage and baptism. Hence it is apparent that the author has taken up a tradition in which baptism is identified with the "purification" and "sanctification" of the bride-community for her "presentation" to Christ the bridegroom and has connected this tradition with the *Haustafel*.

Whether that implies that a ritual sacred union (ἱερός γάμος) of which baptism was only the preliminary purification was actually enacted in the Asian congregations is a question which can hardly be answered by the evidence at hand.¹⁶³ For our present purposes, it is sufficient to observe that the baptismal reunification formula's "no more male and female" has not produced any radical reassessment of the social roles of men and women in the congregation. The traditional parenthesis has redirected the notion of reunification to refer entirely to the relation of the whole community to Christ, while the author of Ephesians uses it only to reinforce the conventional definitions of the masculine and feminine roles in marriage.

The conservative reaction was destined to prevail in the mainstream of the Pauline school. The author of the Pastorals rejects any leadership role by women in either teaching or liturgy, finding his warrant for woman's innate inferiority in a version of the Eden myth, known in still more extreme form in the pseudo-Clementines, in which the Fall was entirely Eve's fault. Paul also knows the story of Eve's seduction by Satan, "disguised as an angel of light," but while he uses Eve as the type of the whole congregation in danger of seduction by false teachers (2 Corinthians 11:2–6, 12–15), the author of First Timothy draws from the story a generalization about the eternal weakness of women. Their sole proper function, for him, is procreation—the function of marriage which Paul, in all his discussion of the relation of men and women in First Corinthians, never mentions.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In late Hellenism, especially in the period immediately following the consolidation of Rome's imperial power, there were many pressures exerted on the traditional roles of men and women. As we have seen, the identification of what was properly masculine and properly feminine could no longer be

taken for granted, but became the object of controversy. The differentiation of male and female could therefore become an important symbol for the fundamental order of the world, while any modification of the role differences could become a potent symbol of social criticism or even of total rejection of the existing order. When early Christians in the area of the Pauline mission adapted the Adam-Androgyne myth to the eschatological sacrament of baptism, they thus produced a powerful and prolific set of images. If in baptism the Christian has put on again the image of the Creator, in whom "there is no male and female," then for him the old world has passed away and, behold! the new has come.

We have seen a variety of uses of the reunification language and conjectured a variety of social patterns which seemed to be associated therewith. Most clearly in gnostic circles, both Christian and non-Christian, the reunification of male and female, ritually enacted, produced an aura of novelty and esoteric consciousness. It became a sign of an elite, anticosmic sect. In Encratite circles, reunification was spiritualized and individualized to speak, apparently, of the transcendent self-consciousness of the gnostic. It became the sign not so much of a sect as of the radically isolated individual, who, by leaving behind the differentia of male and female, leaves behind the cosmos itself—empirically speaking, the world of settled society. In both cases the reunification of male and female became a symbol for "metaphysical rebellion," an act of "cosmic audacity" attacking the conventional picture of what was real and what was properly human.¹⁶⁴

In a sense, every kind of "realized eschatology" is a metaphysical rebellion. I have suggested above that the Corinthian "spirituals" understood the baptismal initiation in some such way, so that the removal of the symbolic differentia of the sexes would have for them a value something like that which we see flowering later in gnostic and Encratite circles. This hypothesis accords rather well with the remarkable convergence of several studies of other aspects of the Corinthian situation from various viewpoints in recent years.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, it enables us to make some sense of the apparent self-contradictions in Paul's response. Paul recognized in the gnostic appropriation of the reunification symbols an implicit rejection of the *created* order and not only of its existing demonic distortion. Dissolving—or failing ever to understand—Paul's eschatological tension, the spirituals abandoned world and community for the sake of subjective transcendence. Against this "cosmic audacity," Paul insists on the preservation of the *symbols* of the present, differentiated order. Women remain women and men remain men and dress accordingly, even though "the end of the ages has come upon them." Yet

these symbols have lost their ultimate significance, for "the form of this world is passing away." Therefore Paul accepts and even insists upon the equality of role of man and woman in this community which is formed already by the Spirit that belongs to the end of days. The new order, the order of man in the image of God, was already taking form in the patterns of leadership of the new community. Yet the old order was to be allowed still its symbolic claims, for the Christian lived yet in the world, in the "land of unlikeness," until the time should come for the Son himself to submit to the Father, that God might be all in all.

The second generation of the Pauline school was not prepared to continue the equivalence of role accorded to women in the earlier mission. Perhaps Paul himself set in motion the conservative reaction. The language of baptismal reunification persisted for a time, more and more enveloped in a myth of cosmic reconciliation, but ironically it was used to reinforce a conventional stratification of family and congregation and eventually rejected altogether in the misogyny of the Pastorals. Only Marcion briefly revived the novel place of women in the church, yet here again he misunderstood his cherished Apostle and coupled the new order with a rebellion against the world's Creator as absolute as that of any gnostic.

Thus an extraordinary symbolization of the Christian sense of God's eschatological action in Christ proved too dangerously ambivalent for the emerging church. After a few meteoric attempts to appropriate its power, the declaration that in Christ there is no more male and female faded into innocuous metaphor, perhaps to await the coming of its proper moment.

Notes

This inquiry was made possible by a summer stipend from the National Endowment for the Humanities, grant F-71-74, and by a triennial leave from Yale University. I am deeply grateful to both institutions. Excerpts from it have been presented as lectures at Harvard Divinity School, Dubuque Theological Seminary, Brown University, and the University of Chicago. Many colleagues have helped me by their suggestions and criticisms, especially Elaine Pagels, Abraham Malherbe, Jonathan Smith, Jacob Neusner, and Cyril Richardson.

1. Maximus the Confessor, *Questiones ad Thalassium* 48 (Migne, *Patrologia graeca* 90, 436A). I am grateful to Prof. Jaroslav Pelikan for calling my attention to this passage.
2. *Ibid.* The other pairs of opposites mentioned by Maximus here are: "The sensible paradise and the inhabited world," "earth and heaven," "the sensible and the intelligible," "the created and the uncreated nature." Earlier in the same section (435C) he speaks of the church as "the union of the two peoples, that

of the gentiles and that of the Jews, having Christ as the bond" (σύνδεσμος; cf. Ephesians 2:14 f.).

3. Derwood C. Smith has collected a good many instances of the unification language from Greco-Roman sources in his Yale dissertation, *Jewish and Greek Traditions in Ephesians 2:11–12* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970), 120–54. The most interesting discussion of the development and various usages of bisexual myths in Hellenism remains the monograph by Marie Delcourt, *Hermaphrodite: Mythes et rites de la bisexualité dans l'antiquité classique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958). For an extraordinarily wide-ranging ethnographic survey of occurrences of bisexual motifs, see Hermann Baumann, *Das doppelte Geschlecht* (Berlin: E. Reimer, 1955), and for a phenomenological interpretation, Mircea Eliade, *Mephistopheles and the Androgyne* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1966), 78–124. Eliade believes that myths of the *coincidentia oppositorum* always represent "man's deep dissatisfaction with his actual situation" and "nostalgia for a lost Paradise," though the latter may be construed in many different ways, from primordial chaos to the perfect harmony and freedom sought by the yogi.
4. Edmund Leach, "Genesis as Myth," in *Myth and Cosmos*, ed. John Middleton (Garden City, N.Y.: Natural History Press, 1967), 4.
5. Tertullian *Ad nationes* 1.8.1; cf. *Apologeticum* 42. Cf. the similar argument by Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 1.4.2), who has to grant that Christianity is a νέον ἔθνος, but wants to show that it is no novelty, nor a sect "small, weak, or founded in a corner," but "the most populous of the nations and the most pious," with ancient roots. The "third race" motif first appears in Christian apologetics in the *Preaching of Peter* (see A. J. Malherbe, "The Apologetic Theology of the Preaching of Peter," *ResQ* 13 (1970): 220 f.).
6. Ode 41:8, in J. H. Bernard, trans., *The Odes of Solomon*, Texts and Studies 8/3 (London: SPCK, 1912), 128.
7. Diogenes Laertius 1.33 (Thales); Lactantius *Divinae institutiones* 3.19 (Plato); cf. Plutarch *Marius* 46.1, who makes the saying Plato's last words, omitting the male/female pair in order to make a chiasm of the other two.
8. Henry Fischel, "Story and History: Observations on Greco-Roman Rhetoric and Pharisaism," in *American Oriental Society, Middle West Branch, Semi-Centennial Volume*, Asian Studies Research Institute, Oriental Series, no. 3, ed. Denis Sinor (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969), 74f., nn. 81, 82. Cf. A. Z. Idelsohn, *Jewish Liturgy and Its Development* (New York: Henry Holt, 1932), 75 ff.; Ismar Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*, 3d ed. (Leipzig: G. Feck, 1931), 90; Israel Abrahams, *A Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, rev. ed. (New York: Hermon, 1966), 16. Elbogen and Abrahams also call attention to a Parsi parallel.
9. Tosefta, Berakot 7.18 (ed. Lieberman, 38; ed. Rengstorff, 52); Palestinian Talmud, Berakot 9.2; Babylonian Talmud, Menahot 43b also gives a variant in

- which "slave" (עבד) replaces "boor" (בור), the form found in the prayer book, in the *Birkot ha-Shahar* that opens the daily service. In the latter, as in censored MSS of the Talmud, גוי replaces נזיר.
10. Carl Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1967), 1:79.
 11. Herbert Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe in der ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Berlin: Trowitsch & Sohn, 1927), 55–66; W. G. Kümmel, "Verlobung und Heirat bei Paulus (I Cor. 7:36–38)," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, 2d ed. (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), 283–85.
 12. Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte*, 1:81.
 13. Schneider gives the example of the famous three daughters of Hermesianax of Tralles, who won prizes in the Isthmian, Pythian, Nemeian, and Epidaurian games each year between 47 and 41 (*Kulturgeschichte* 1:80). Charles Seltman, *Women in Antiquity*, 2d ed. (London: Thames & Hudson, 1956), emphasizes the legend of Atalanta, who became the type of the superior girl athlete (chap. 9).
 14. Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte*, 1:102 f.
 15. Trans. F. C. Grant, in *Hellenistic Religions* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1953), 28–30; text in Wilhelm Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*, 3d ed. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1915–24), no. 985. See the discussion by A. D. Nock, "The Christian Sacramentum in Pliny and a Pagan Counterpart," *CR* 38 (1924): 58 f.; and *Conversion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 217. Note that Agdistis, a form of the Great Mother, was also regarded as androgynous; her priests are reported to have emasculated themselves (Delcourt, *Hermaphrodite*, 49).
 16. Harold R. Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), 38; Martin Nilsson, *Greek Folk Religion* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1961), 58; Erwin Rohde, *Psyche* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 1:221.
 17. The intensity of the quest and the hope placed in the initiation are poignantly expressed, despite the farcical form of the romance, in the story of Lucius's regaining his human form through the offices of Lady Isis (Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, bk. 11). See Franz Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), 27: "Born outside of the narrow limits of the Roman city, they [namely, the Oriental cults] grew up frequently in hostility to it, and were international, consequently individual. . . . In place of the ancient social groups communities of initiates came into existence, who considered themselves brothers no matter where they came from." Seen from the viewpoint of the ruling groups, such associations were countercultural and potentially revolutionary—hence the periodic attempts to expel them from Rome.
 18. Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra* (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), 173 f.
 19. Hugo Hepding, *Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, no. 1 (Giessen: Ricker, 1903), 178 f., 187 f., proposed a

kind of adoption ritual, in which initiates became a new, transnational family (cf. Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe*, 43–51).

20. Delcourt, *Hermaphrodite*, chap. 1; see further below.
21. On the function of deliberate violation of order for the sake of restoring order, see Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970), chap. 10.
22. See Nock, *Conversion*, passim. Nock will use only the term “adhesion” of the relationship of initiate to the mystery cult, reserving “conversion” for the unique and exclusive allegiance expected of a proselyte to Judaism or Christianity or, in certain instances, a philosophical-mystical school (cf. Richard Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956], 28 f. and appendix 8).
23. Henri Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956), 69.
24. H. C. Baldry, *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 79 ff.
25. See Epictetus's description of the ideal Cynic (*Discourses* 3.22). Diogenes is credited with the aphorism ἐγὼ κοσμοπολίτης (Diogenes Laertius 6.63; cf. 6.72), which was, however, essentially a negative slogan both for the Cynics and for the Stoics who took up the notion and developed it into the elaborate picture of a universal “city of gods and men” (e.g., Chrysippus, in *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, III, 81–83; Epictetus *Discourses* 1.9; 2.10; etc.). The negative force is clear in the *chriai* about Crates (Diogenes Laertius 6.93) and Anaxagoras (Diogenes Laertius 2.7). Philo seems to give the notion a somewhat less individualistic nuance when he applies it to Adam (*Opif.* 142–44) (abbreviations of works of Philo are those of the Loeb edition). See Baldry, *Unity*, 108 ff.; Marrou, *History of Education*, 98.
26. Diogenes Laertius 6.12.
27. *Ibid.*, 7.175.
28. See Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948), 1:137, 315, 351 f.
29. Marrou, *History of Education*, 30. He devotes a chapter (pp. 26–35) to the importance of pederasty in shaping the old Greek forms of education.
30. *Ibid.*, 39 ff.
31. E.g., in the so-called *Haustafel* structure of the Stoic parenesis (see Karl Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1928], 27–50).
32. Diogenes Laertius 7.33: like Crates, Zeno's Cynic teacher, and Crates's wife Hipparchia? (cf. Baldry, *Unity*, 155).
33. Pohlenz, *Stoa*, 1:140.
34. Diogenes Laertius 4.2.
35. Diogenes Laertius (6.98) says that “myriads” were told about her.
36. Text and English Translation (ET) in Cora E. Lutz, “Musonius Rufus, ‘The Ro-

- man Socrates,” *Yale Classical Studies* 10 (1947): 38–43. Cf. Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* 3.25.7: “Senserunt hoc adeo Stoici, qui et servis et mulieribus philosophandum esse dixerunt.” Musonius bases his affirmation on a remarkably far-reaching statement of the natural equality of men and women: “Women as well as men . . . have received from the gods the gift of reason (λόγος); “the female has the same senses as the male”; “also both have the same parts of the body, and one has nothing more than the other” (! 39); both have a “natural inclination toward virtue” (p. 41). On the importance of the Greek medical tradition in providing a physical basis for the development of the concept of human unity, see Baldry, *Unity*, 38 f., 45–51.
37. *Discourses* 3.24.5, “like worthless women”; 3.24.53, “weeping, silly women”; cf. 2.4.8–11.
 38. See J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), 192–96.
 39. Iamblichus, *The Pythagorean Life* 36.267.
 40. See, e.g., the speech to the women of Croton put in the mouth of Pythagoras in Iamblichus *Pythagorean Life* 11.54–57. The Pythagorean ideal of φιλία did include friendship “of man towards woman” (Iamblichus *Pythagorean Life* 16.69; the parallel, §229, adds “or children”), but this seems not to imply a dissolution of ordinary roles, but an all-embracing order, from “cosmic elements” to doctrines of the school, in which the ideal is: Each in his own place. Hence E. R. Dodds's attempt to find in the admission of women further support for his interesting theory of a “shamanistic” origin of Pythagoreanism (*The Greeks and the Irrational* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968], 144; cf. 165, n. 59) is not terribly persuasive. However, it is interesting to note that the various incarnations of his soul which Empedocles, like Pythagoras, was said to have recalled included female bodies (Diogenes Laertius 8.77 = Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, fragment (fr.) 117; cf. Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* 1.5).
 41. A.-J. Festugière, *Epicurus and His Gods*, trans. C. W. Chilton (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 29 f.; Norman W. DeWitt, *Epicurus and His Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), 95 f.
 42. Seneca, *Ep.* 6.6, quoted by DeWitt, *ibid.*, 103. Cf. Cicero *De finibus* 1.65; and Numenius, *apud* Eusebius *Praeparatio evangelica* 14.5. The importance of φιλία and οἰκειότης for the Epicureans is discussed by DeWitt (90–93, 100–105, 278 f., 282 f., 307–10, et passim); Festugière, chap. 3; G. K. Strodsch, *The Philosophy of Epicurus* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963), 67–71, 111, et passim; Baldry, *Unity*, 147–51. The organization of the community is reconstructed by DeWitt, “Organization and Structure of Epicurean Groups,” *CP* 31 (1936): 205–11.
 43. Diogenes Laertius 10.120, in the translation of Strodsch, 111.
 44. One of the principal arguments against the notion of divine providence is that the gods could not be models of ἀντάρκεια if they became concerned for men. “For troubles and anxieties and feelings of anger and partiality do not accord

- with bliss, but always imply weakness and fear and dependence upon one's neighbors" (Diogenes Laertius 10.77, trans. R. D. Hicks [Loeb]).
45. Themistius *Orationes* 26 (H. Usener, *Epicurea* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1887], no. 551, 327). Opponents of the Epicureans were quick to seize on the antinomy: "So also Epicurus, when he wishes to do away with the natural fellowship (φυσικὴν κοινωνίαν) of men with one another, at the same time makes use of the very principle that he is doing away with" (Epictetus *Discourses* 2.20.6, trans. W. A. Oldfather [Loeb]) (cf. Lactantius *Divinae institutiones* 3.17.42; and see Baldry, *Unity*, 149).
 46. Λάθρα βιώσας; Themistius *Orationes* 26.
 47. Cf. Strodach, *Philosophy of Epicurus*, 67–71, 95; DeWitt, *Epicurus and His Philosophy*, 100 f.; Festugière, *Epicurus and His Gods*, 39–42.
 48. Diogenes Laertius 10.118 f. μηδὲ καὶ γαμήσειν καὶ τεκνοποιήσειν τὸν σοφόν, though in "special circumstances" the sage may marry (cf. Epictetus *Discourses* 3.7.19 f.).
 49. Diogenes Laertius 10.16–21.
 50. Ibid. 10.118, quoting the Epitome of Diogenes.
 51. Hecataeus of Abdera, *apud* Photius *Bibliotheca* 244; quoted by John Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, no. 16 (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1972), 27 f.
 52. For a useful survey, see L. M. Epstein, *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism*, 2d ed. (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1967).
 53. See, for example, Jesus ben Sira, chaps. 25–26. Moore echoes this attitude when he says, "For emancipated women there was in the ancient world only one calling" (G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962], 2:127). As a matter of fact Ben Sira 9:3–9 mentions three professions among the kinds of women to be avoided: ἑταῖρα, ψαλλούση, and πόρνη. As we have seen, the picture was not in fact quite so bleak, at least in the Hellenistic world, for the woman in search of freedom.
 54. Notably Prisca, who according to Acts 18:3 worked alongside her husband at tent making. An even better example would be Lydia (Acts 16:14 ff.) if she was Jewish, for successful trade in purple entailed considerable wealth. Lydia was at least associated with a Jewish group at Philippi; whether or not she was herself Jewish depends on whether σεβομένη τὸν θεόν is taken as a technical term or in the general sense of "a pious woman." On the importance of the patronesses for Paul, see below.
 55. Harry J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1960), 188, and inscriptions nos. 523, 496, 166. The title is evidently honorific, probably bespeaking high status of the honoree and perhaps financial support of the community. Frey plausibly equates it with *patronus* and *patrona*, respectively (*Corpus inscriptionum iudaeorum*, I:xcv).
 56. Mishnah, *Soṭah* 3:4.

57. Palestinian Talmud, *Soṭah* 3:4 (19a). The saying is attached here to a story of a *matrona* who asked R. Eliezer a difficult point of law. His response to her was, "The only 'wisdom' of a woman is that pertaining to her distaff" (cf. Babylonian Talmud, *Yoma* 66b). The function of the aphorisms in the tradition is difficult to make out. The attribution to Eliezer ben Hyrcanus is tenuous, of course, especially in view of the number of teachers named Eliezer in the tradition. There is a certain irony in the fact that Eliezer ben Hyrcanus was married to Imma Shalom, sister of Gamliel II and according to stories preserved about her, a well-educated and intellectually independent woman (see S. Mendelsohn, "Imma Shalom," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 6:562).
58. Tosefta, *Megilla* 4–11; Babylonian Talmud, *Megilla* 23a; Moore, *Judaism*, 2:131.
59. See Henrietta Szold, "Beruriah," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 3:109 f.; cf. Moore, *Judaism*, 2:129. The legend of her seduction by Meir's disciple and her subsequent suicide, told by Rashi in his commentary to Babylonian Talmud, *Avoda Zara* 18b, may very well be the fabrication of some tradent who was incensed by the traditional portrait of this strong-willed woman, for it serves to illustrate the saying, "Women are light-minded" (Babylonian Talmud, *Kiddushin*, 80b). Moore also recalls the reports of maidservants in the Patriarch's household "who spoke biblical Hebrew and were able to enlighten professional scholars on rare words in the Scripture" (p. 128). Ben 'Azzai's statement that "a man ought to teach his daughter Torah," cited by Moore (*ibid.*, n. 4), is less general when taken in its context: "that, if she drinks [the water of bitterness] she may know that the merit suspends (the punishment) for her" (*Mishnah*, *Soṭah* 3:4). It is interesting that Ben 'Azzai is known as the only Tanna to have been celibate (Babylonian Talmud, *Yebamot* 63b) and as one of the "four who entered Paradise," all of whom except for Akiba came to no good end (Babylonian Talmud, *Ḥagiga* 14b). Henry Fischel has argued that he was an Epicurean, taking "paradise" in the last-mentioned passage as the equivalent of κῆπος ("Epicurea Relating to the Near East" [unpublished paper]; see his forthcoming *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy*, *Studia Post-Biblica*, no. 21 [Leiden: Brill, 1973]). Be that as it may, Ben 'Azzai's reported attitude toward women has some similarity to the Epicurean and stands in notable contrast to the prevailing one in the rabbinic sources.
60. Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte*, 116 f.
61. Isaak Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*, 2d ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), 231–49; Richard A. Baer, Jr., *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 40.
62. Collected by Baer, *ibid.*, 42, with references.
63. Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*, 239.
64. *Ibid.*, 240–329. Heinemann shows too that Philo presupposes in several respects an actual jurisprudence more liberal toward women than his own ideal.

- E. R. Goodenough, attempting to show that Philo's treatise *On the Special Laws* reflects actual juridical practice in Alexandria, goes even farther: "The influence of Egyptian legal equality of womanhood is everywhere apparent in a way a philosopher in his study would not have introduced it, but as social pressure of generations would have made itself felt" (*The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929], 99; for a summary of Jewish marriage laws as Goodenough reconstructs them, see 217–20).
65. "Philo extensively exploits female terminology as a vehicle for expressing his widespread depreciation of the created world. . . . The female, sense-perceptible, created world stands as a constant threat to man's existence" (Baer, *Philo's Use*, 44).
66. E.g., *Hyp.* 7.14. Philo himself was married, a fact only mentioned in a single fragment of all his extant writings, so far as I can find, which puts in the mouth of his wife an apothegm clearly suggesting his view of the proper relationship: "The virtue of her husband is sufficient ornament for the wife" (Mangey ed., 2:673; quoted by E. R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1962], 7 f.).
67. *Hyp.* 7.3: γυναίκα ἀνδράσι δουλεύειν, πρὸς ὕβρεως μὲν οὐδεμιᾶς, πρὸς ευπείθειαν δ' ἐν ἅπασιν. Philo seems here to be quoting, in his summary of the laws of Moses, something like a *Haustafel*; note the close parallel in Josephus *Against Apion* 2.201: γυνὴ χειρῶν . . . ἀνδρὸς εἰς ἅπαντα. τοιγαροῦν ὑπακούετο, μὴ πρὸς ὕβριν, ἀλλ' ἰν' ἄρχηται. The latter passage is not to be regarded as a Christian interpolation (Niese, followed by Thackeray in the Loeb edition) nor as dependent on Philo; a common Hellenistic-Jewish schema is evidently used in both places as well as in the NT *Haustafeln*.
68. A viewpoint not restricted to "sectarian" Judaism (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, e.g., Testament of Issachar 2:3), Cynicism, and some Neopythagoreans, as Heinemann suggests (*Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*, 265–69), but widespread both in Judaism and in the pagan moralists. E.g., Josephus *Against Apion* 2.199, *Jewish War* 2.160; Musonius Rufus, "On Sexual Indulgence," (Lutz, "Musonius Rufus," 87); for the Pythagoreans, see Iamblichus, *Pythagorean Life* 31, 209–11; cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 3.24; see further Preisker, *Ehe*, 19 ff. On the other hand, it is a mistake to take the oft-quoted saying of R. Ḥiyya, "All we can expect of them is that they bring up our children and keep us from sin" (Babylonian Talmud, Yebamot 63a) in this sense, much less to generalize from it to the attitude of all rabbinic Judaism. Also the marriage prayer of Tobit (8:5–8: οὐ διὰ πορνείαν . . . ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας), considering the whole romance, is hardly intended to limit marriage to production of children (cf. Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*, 270, n. 3; contra Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe*, 71).
69. Josephus, while not so vehement as Philo, belongs here (*Against Apion* 2.199–203); his two divorces may have affected his attitude, but note the cavalier

- way in which he mentions them: "being displeased at her behavior," etc. (*Life*, 415, 426). His third marriage, however, seems to have been satisfactory (427). Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs regard πορνεία as "the mother of all evils" (Testament of Simeon 5:3), and Testament of Ruben 5:1–6:5 warns consequently against any association with women, since they "are overcome with the spirit of πορνεία more than men" (5:3); cf. 4:6, 7–11; Testament of Judah 15:1–6; 17:1; 18:2; Testament of Issachar 2:1; 4:4; Testament of Joseph passim; Testament of Benjamin 8:2. To what extent this ascetic tendency has been heightened by Christian redaction is difficult to say with certainty. Like Philo (*QG* 1.43), Jesus ben Sira 25:24 blames woman for being the beginning of sin and the cause of all men's death—a fundamental view likewise of the Jewish-Christian Pseudo-Clementines (see Oscar Cullman, *Le problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-Clémentin*, Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, no. 23 [Paris and Strasbourg, 1930], 196–201; Georg Strecker, *Das Judentum in den Pseudoklementinen* [Berlin: Akademie, 1958], 154–62). The rabbis were hardly forerunners of feminine liberation—witness, for example, the attitude of Bet Hillel on grounds for divorce (Mishnah, Giṭṭim 9:10; Babylonian Talmud, Giṭṭim 90a; Sifre, Deut. 269 (ed. Finkelstein, 288]), but on the whole the Tannaitic and talmudic attitude toward women seldom approaches the hostility expressed by Philo. The several tales of the rabbis' shrewish wives (see Moore, *Judaism*, 2:126) do not imply such hostility; some of them at least belong to a common picture of the henpecked but suffering sage in Cynic *chriae* (so H. A. Fischel, "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a *Chria*," in *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner [Leiden: Brill, 1967], 372–411).
70. The place of women among the Essenes remains a vexed question, since ancient external reports, the Qumran texts, and archeological evidence are all ambiguous. Pliny *Natural History* 5.15.73; Philo *Hyp.* 8.11.3, 14–17; and Josephus *Jewish War* 2.120 (cf. *Antiquities* 18.21) all agree that the Essenes did not marry but practiced ἐγκράτεια but Josephus (*Jewish War* 2.160 f.) speaks of "another order of Essene" who did marry—though solely for procreation. The Rule of the Community (1QS) is clearly a rule for an all-male, militarily oriented society, the "men of the lot of God" (1.9, 10; 2.2, 4 f.; 5.1 f., 13, 15, etc.). In the disciplinary section (6.24–7.25) there is no word about relations between men and women, about sexual offenses, or about *niddah*. Only male exposure is mentioned among the taboos (7.12 f.). Yet 1QSa explicitly includes both women and children (1.4, 6–8), specifies the age for marriage and sex (1.8–11), and probably, though the translation is disputed, provides for admission of wives to the lowest stage of adult participation in the meetings of the community (1.11). The Damascus Rule (CD) also provides for marriage and procreation of all those who "live in camps" (7.6–9 [A] = 19.3–5 [B], cf. 14.13 ff.; 16.10–12), but forbids sexual intercourse "in the city of the sanctuary"

(12.1 f.). CD 4.21–5.2 probably indicates that a man was expected to take only one wife during his lifetime (cf. Abel Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple* [Lund: Gleerup, 1965], 57–63). The main cemetery at Khirbet Qumran seems so far to have contained primarily male burials—only one skeleton has been certainly identified as female, and it was in a grave whose alignment differed from the prevailing north-south direction (T-7. See Roland de Vaux, “Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân . . .,” *RB* 63 [1956]: 571 f.; cf. his preliminary report in *RB* 60 [1953]: 103, where, however, he says that “plusieurs femmes” were tentatively identified). Excavations in the extensions of this cemetery, however, have produced, to the west, four women and a child; to the north, mixed sexes; to the south, a woman and three children (*RB* 63 [1956]: 571 ff.). These facts could support Josephus’s report of “two orders” of Essenes, or a hypothesis of successive phases of celibate and married Essenes (cf. F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961], 96–100), but hardly the reverse sequence (*contra* A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* [New York: World Publishing Co., Meridian Books, 1962], 104, n. 3). Caution is required until excavations are complete. At the latest report only forty-four out of more than 1,200 graves had been excavated (see S. H. Steckoll, “Preliminary Excavation Report on the Qumran Cemetery,” *RevQ* 6 [1967–69]: 323–44). Credence must be given to Josephus’s statement that the Essenes did not abolish marriage and procreation in principle (*Jewish War* 2.120), for even in IQS “fruitfulness of seed” (פרוט זרע, 4.7) is among the eschatological blessings promised those who follow the Spirit of Truth. The present asceticism, therefore, was evidently temporary and conditional. (Otherwise M. Jimenez, “Menções femininas nos textos de Qumran,” *Revista de cultura biblica* 2 [1958]: 272 f., who finds the phrase so anomalous in the context that he thinks it may have crept in “almost by habit” or perhaps carries a metaphorical, “spiritual significance.”) Cross, Isaksson, and others are undoubtedly correct in finding the basic reason for this temporary asceticism in the ideology of Holy War that permeates the sect’s apocalyptic self-understanding. (Though John Strugnell, “Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: Antiquities XVIII.18–22,” *JBL* 77 [1958]: 110, is certainly correct that the view that women are unreliable and sources of trouble, which Josephus [and Philo] give as the reasons for the Essenes’s celibacy, was merely a radicalization of a common view in the wisdom literature—as we have seen—yet I remain convinced that this view as stated tells us more about Philo and Josephus than about the primary orientation of the Essenes.) Thus War Scroll (IQM) 7.3 f., “And no young boy and no woman shall enter their camps when they leave Jerusalem to go into battle,” is clearly an extension of the rule for continence of soldiers in Holy War (Deuteronomy 23:10 f.; cf. 2 Samuel 11:9–13); Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 180 is probably correct in seeing in the addition of the boy an allusion to the pederasty common in Hellenistic armies; (for a different view

see B. Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la guerre des manuscrits de Qumran* [Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962], 194; J. van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la guerre* [Leiden: Brill, 1959], 112). On the whole question, see Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry*, 45–65, though his ingenious suggestion that the נער ונערה is a technical term for the twenty- to twenty-five-year age group, and that marriage and procreation at Qumran were restricted to that precise group (after Deuteronomy 20:7; cf. IQM 10.2–6), is far-fetched.

71. *Vit. cont.* 83–87. The men and women, separated by a wall in the regular sabbath meetings (30–33), eat together thereafter at the sacred banquet (54–55), men on the right and women on the left (68–69). The “sacred vigil” after dinner begins with men and women singing and dancing in separate choirs, until “having drunk as in the Bacchic rites of the strong wine of God’s love they mix and both together become a single choir (γίνονται χορός εἰς ἐξ ἀφοῶν), a copy of the choir set up of old beside the Red Sea” (85, trans. F. H. Colson [Loeb]).
72. Epictetus *Discourses* 3.1.24–45; cf. 1.16.9–14; Paul, 1 Corinthians 11:14 ff.; pseudo-Phocylides, 212; cf. Philo *Mos.* 1.54; also Euphrates’ slander of Apollonius and the latter’s reply, Epistle 8. Plutarch’s comment on mourning customs is instructive. In Greece, he says, “when any misfortune comes, the women cut off their hair and the men let it grow,” the conscious reversal of what is “customary” (συνηθές) (*Moralia* 267B, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt [Loeb]).
73. Ἄλλος γυναικὸς κόσμος, ἄλλος ἀρρένων (J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* [Leiden: Brill, 1961], fr. 1294). Though Edmonds takes κόσμος here to mean merely “garb,” see Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte*, 1:104, n. 4.
- 74.

Galatians 3:28	1 Corinthians 12:13	Colossians 3:10 f.
εἰς Χρ. ἐβαπτίσθητε. Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε	εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν.	ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον [ἄνθρωπον] τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον . . . κατὰ εἰκόνα . . .
οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλληνι, οὐκ ἐν δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῳ	εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληες εἴτε δούλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι.	οὐκ ἐν Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαίῳ. περιτομή καὶ ἄκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστὸς.
πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ	πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν	

- Ephesians 6:8: εἶτε δοῦλος εἶτε ἐλεύθερος. Ignatius Smyrnaeans 1:2: εἶτε ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ εἶτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν. ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ. Perhaps there is a vestige of the formula also in Gospel of Philip (hereafter: Gosp Phil) §49
75. The two expressions are equivalent, for the masculine εἷς of Galatians 3:28 implies Χριστός or νέος ἄνθρωπος (Ulrich Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit* [Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1959], 13, n. 2; Robert Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* [Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967], 20).
 76. Eduard Lohse recognizes that Colossians 3:11 breaks into the context and “undoubtedly has been adopted from the tradition” (*Colossians and Philemon*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971], 143, n. 70; German original, 207, n. 2). For a similar observation on 1 Corinthians 12:13, see Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther*, 2d ed. (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1923), 64.
 77. The use of καί instead of οὐδέ to join the third pair could of course be merely a stylistic variation, as in Gosp Phil 104, 13–15; 128, 23–27. However, since the notion of reunification in baptism, as we shall see, is clearly connected with the tradition of the Image of God, Galatians 3:28 certainly alludes to ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, Genesis 1:27, Septuagint. Hans Windisch finds the allusion “unverkennbar” (“Sinn und Geltung des apostolischen ‘mulier taceat in ecclesia.’” *Christliche Welt* 44 [1930], col. 423).
 78. Therefore the quotation may begin with, “You are all sons of God,” certainly appropriate in a baptismal liturgy in which the baptized person would eventually respond, “Abba! Father!” (4:6; cf. Romans 8:15). However, since there is no parallel to this element in Colossians 3 or 1 Corinthians 12, we cannot be sure whether the pronouncement of sonship was regularly connected with the declaration of unity.
 79. Besides the contemporary philosophers who have described “performative” language (beginning with J. L. Austin, elaborated by Donald Evans, *The Logic of Self-Involvement* [New York: Herder & Herder, 1969], pt. 1), a growing number of anthropologists recognize the formative power of ritual. E.g., Mary Douglas emphasizes the ability of ritual not only to reinforce and “frame” perception and memory, but also to change them, thus not merely reflecting social reality but actually creating it (*Purity and Danger*, 78–86).
 80. The phrase is Clifford Geertz’s, who proposes to define religion as “a system of symbols which acts to establish powerful, persuasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in men by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic” (“Religion as a Cultural System,” in *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*, ed. Michael Banton [New York: Frederick R. Praeger, 1966], 4). Note that here the social scientist approaches, from a different perspective, the question of the relationship between “indicative and imperative” that has exercised Pauline scholarship for so many years. See especially Rudolf Bultmann, “Das Problem der Ethik bei

- Paulus,” *ZNW* 23 (1924): 123–40, reprinted in *Exegetica*, 36–54; Erich Dinkler, “Zum Problem der Ethik bei Paulus,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 167–200; Victor P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1968), 224–27; and, still fundamental, Hans von Soden, “Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus,” in *Rudolf Otto-Festgruss*, 1931, reprinted in *Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung*, ed. K. H. Rengstorff (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), 338–79; abridged ET in *The Writings of St. Paul*, ed. W. Meeks (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), 257–68. Two recent Yale dissertations have analyzed the attitudinal functions of Pauline parenetic language, adopting some methods of the analytic philosophers of language, in several respects providing a needed corrective to the existentialist interpretation introduced by Bultmann: Robert Webber, *The Concept of Rejoicing in Paul* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971); and Richard Davis, *Remembering and Acting: A Study of the Moral Life in I Thessalonians* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971). If I speak of the “objectivity” of the new state here as a social construction (see Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967], 47–128), I do not intend a reductionist equation of that question with the theological question about the transcendent reality of God’s action. I only wish to bracket the theological issue for the moment in order to address the sociological ones.
81. Leander E. Keck has emphasized this neglect in an excellent paper read before the Biblical Literature Section of the American Academy of Religion, October 29, 1971, “On the Ethos of Early Christians.”
 82. Disrobing before baptism is explicitly mentioned or presupposed in the earliest complete baptismal rituals known to us, as well as in the earliest paintings of baptism in catacomb art. See Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, sec. 21 in the editions by both Dix and Botte; cf. the ancient Syrian liturgy reconstructed by A. F. J. Klijn from the Syriac “Life of John” and other sources: “An Early Christian Baptismal Liturgy,” in *Charis kai Sophia. Festschrift Karl Rengstorff* . . . (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 216–28. See also Jonathan Z. Smith, “The Garments of Shame,” *History of Religions* 5 (1965): 224–30. We do not know how early special (white) robes were provided for the newly baptized, first attested in the fifth century (for references, see Klijn, p. 227). For examples of paintings of baptism, see *Atlas of the Early Christian World*, ed. F. van der Meer and Christine Mohrmann (New York: Nelson, 1958), plates 48, 396, 397. Christ is also depicted nude at his baptism, e.g., in the mosaic of the Baptistery of the Arians in Ravenna (*ibid.*, pl. 412).
 83. For example, the parenetic use is attested already in Philo *Som.* 1.224 f.; cf. Acts of Thomas 58 and the Teachings of Sylvanus (CG VII, 4. 105, 13–17). In reference to the “Coptic Gnostic Library” (CG) of Nag Hammadi, I follow the abbreviated form suggested by J. M. Robinson. See the lists in David M. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948–1969* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 109–15. Mixed with

- the imagery of investiture, Testament of Levi 8:2; mixed with the imagery of arming for the eschatological holy war (cf. Wisdom 5:18–20, of God, based on Isa. 59:17), 1 Thessalonians 5:8; Romans 13:12; Ephesians 6:10–17. Luke T. Johnson has called my attention to an unpublished dissertation by Dom Ambrose Wathen, O.S.B., “To Clothe with a Quality as with a Garment” (St. Joseph Abbey, St. Benedict, Louisiana, 1967), but I have not had access to it. P. W. van der Horst offers an interesting collection of parallels to the phrase “putting off the . . . man” (“Observations on a Pauline Expression,” *NTS* 19 [1972/73]: 181–87), but his attempt to explain Pauline usage on the basis of a *chria* about the skeptic Pyrrho misses the point by failing to see that in Paul “taking off” cannot be separated from “putting on.”
84. Philostratus, for example, tells of the remarkable transformation of a young man from whom Apollonius expelled a demon: “and he gave up his dainty dress and summery garments and the rest of his sybaritic way of life, and he fell in love with the austerity of philosophers, and donned their cloak, and stripping off his old self modelled his life in the future upon that of Apollonius” (*Vita Apollonii* 4.20, trans. F. C. Conybeare [Loeb]). Cf. Acts of Thomas 58 (Lipsius-Bonnet, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 175).
85. E.g., Apuleius’s account of the vesting of Lucius at the conclusion of his initiation into the mysteries of Isis, so that he was “adorned like the sun” (*Metamorphoses* 11.24).
86. Baumann, *Doppelte Geschlecht*, 45–59, has collected and classified a vast number of examples, mainly from “primitive” societies, with emphasis on the religious function of symbolic change of sex: “Der kultische Geschlechtswandel ist in erster Linie ein Mittel, eine spezifische Abweichung von der Norm, hier der heterosexuellen Geschlechtseigenarten, als Ausdruck einer gesteigerten magischreligiösen Wirkungsmächtigkeit zu sehen” (p. 39). For examples in classical Greece and Hellenism, see Delcourt, *Hermaphrodite*. See also Eliade, *Mephistopheles and the Androgyne*, 78–124.
87. See, besides the works mentioned in the previous note, Ernst Ludwig Dietrich, “Der Urmensch als Androgyne,” *ZKG* 58 (1939): 297–345.
88. Babylonian Talmud, Megilla 9a: זכר ונקבה בראו ולא תבו בראם; Mekilta, *Pisha* 14: זכר ונקוביו בראו, which Lauterbach translates, “A male with corresponding female parts created He him” (1:111 f.); the reading in the Palestinian Talmud is perhaps conflate or corrupt: זכר ונקוביו בראם, “male with female parts be created them.” Cf. John Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), appendix 3. The reading is not preserved, so far as I can find, in any extant Septuagint manuscript. Bowker, 142 ff., finds *zakar uneqabaww* [sic] in both Targums ps-Jonathan and Onkelos at Gen. 5:2 and translates “male with female parts,” though admitting that *naqab* may mean simply “female.” But Sperber’s edition of Onkelos attests only נוקבא, “female,” as do the editions of ps-Jonathan available to me.
89. Genesis Rabba 8.1, cf. 17.6. In Leviticus Rabba 14, the saying is attributed, with slight variants, to Resh Leqish. Compare the language of Plato *Symposium* 189c–191d.
90. “Two faces”: Babylonian Talmud, Erubin 18a, Berakot 61a (R. Jeremiah ben Eleazar); Genesis Rabba 8.1; Tanhuma “B,” ed. Buber, 3:33 (*Tazria*) (R. Samuel ben Nahman); Leviticus Rabba 14 (Resh Leqish); cf. Zohar 2, 55a. “Androgynos”: Genesis Rabba 8.1 (R. Jeremiah ben Eleazar); Leviticus Rabba 14 (R. Samuel ben Nahman). Use of *androgynos* alone would not prove Platonic influence, though the word is used in this special way in *Symposium* 189e, for it was a technical term in rabbinic writings for a hermaphrodite. But the peculiar *du prosopin* and its variants (spellings vary in the editions; διπρόσωπον, is doubtless a learned correction—the word is extremely rare even in Greek sources) can most readily be explained as an echo of Plato’s πρόσωπα δὴ (*Symposium* 189e). Also the interpretation of the צלע of Genesis 2:21 as “side” and thence “body” (גב) recalls the phrase ὠτόν καὶ πλευρὰς κύκλω ἔχον (ibid.). (Cf. Dietrich, “Urmensch,” p. 313.) The story is alluded to in *Abot de Rabbi Nathan*, chap. 1 (Schechter, p. 8; ET, Goldin, p. 15), and in Midrash on Psalms at 139.5; it is elaborated in the Zohar, 2, 55a; 3, 44b; cf. 1, 91b.
91. The attributions conflict, but all point to the school at Tiberias of the late third and early fourth centuries. However, the story is presupposed by a saying attributed to “Rab and Samuel” (Babylonian Talmud, Erubin 18a; Berakot 61a), which suggests that the tradition may have been brought by Rab to Babylonia early in the third century.
92. Philo himself speaks very disparagingly of the Platonic dialogue itself (*Vit. cont.* 57–63), but he presupposes the interpretation of Adam as bisexual and Eve as “half of his body” in *QG* 1.25 and *Opif.* 151 f., even though he has little use for it in his own allegory (cf. Baer, *Male and Female*, 83 f.). Baer thinks *Opif.* 136–70 was drawn from a source, in which case the attestation would be still earlier.
93. The 2:1 dominance of homosexuals over heterosexuals in the original tale, enhanced by Aristophanes’ witty comments suggesting the qualitative superiority of homosexual love, made the story repugnant to Philo (*Vit. cont.* 59–63).
94. Cf. Babylonian Talmud, Ketubot 8a, where the question is raised in the context of the benedictions proper for the wedding service. The monogamous implication is already clear in Philo *QG* 1.25; in medieval Jewish mysticism it is spelled out in the notion of the “marriage made in heaven”: every soul is made bisexual. Divided at birth, each half is enabled to find its complement if it leads a righteous life (Zohar, 1, 91b).
95. In Hebrew sources a pun is involved: the כטנות עור take the place of כטנות אור (see Genesis Rabba 20.12 and cf. Gershom Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* [New York: Schocken Books, 1965], 175). The identification of the “garments of skin” with the body is known already to Philo (*QG* 1.53); it was

- very frequently exploited in gnostic dualism (Clement of Alexandria *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 55.1; and *Stromateis* 3.95. 2 [Cassianus]; Irenaeus *Adversus haereses* [ed. Harvey] 1.1.10; Tertullian *De resurrectione* 7). Origen seems to have been attracted to the notion but did not fully embrace it (see *Contra Celsum* 4.40 and Henry Chadwick's note in his edition, p. 216, n. 5). In Apocalypse of Moses 20:1–3, Eve bemoans the loss of “the glory with which I was clothed.”
96. Lines 76–99 (Acts of Thomas, chaps. 112 f.) (cf. Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 168; Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, 2d ed. [Boston: Beacon Press, 1963], 122 f.).
97. Moses was “clothed with the image (אמלמ) which Adam lost in the Garden of Eden” (*Memar Marqah* 5.4). Cf. the very similar Jewish tradition preserved in Deuteronomy Rabba 11.3; Yalkut ha-Makiri on Proverbs 31:29 (ed. E. Grünhut, p. 102b) and on Psalms 49:21 and 68:13 (ed. Buber, 1:270, 330). The image is more often symbolized by a crown in the case of Moses, because of Exodus 34:30 (see W. Meeks, “Moses as God and King,” in *Religions in Antiquity*, 361–65, and further references there. See also Raphael Loewe, “The Divine Garment and the Shi'ur Qomah,” *HTR* 58 [1965]: 153–60; and Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1960], 58 f.).
98. E.g., 1 Enoch 62:15, “garments of glory,” cf. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 45. In this connection Otto Betz's proposal to connect the “glory of Adam” (1QS 4.23; Damascus Rule 3.20) with the “glorious crown and garment of honor in everlasting light,” is attractive, though his attempt to find in the Qumran texts evidence for a “proselyte baptism” which will be “von der Proselytentaufe der Endzeit übertroffen” is unconvincing (“Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament,” *RevQ* 1 [1958]: 220 f.).
99. E.g., from the group of prayers recited on the riverbank at baptism, “I worship, laud and praise Manda d-Hiia lord of healings, the being whom the Life summoned and bade him heal the congregation of souls, divesting the congregation of souls of (their) darkness and clothing them with light; raising (them) and showing them that a great restoration of life exists, a place where the spirits and souls of our forefathers sit clothed in radiance and covered with light” (*The Canonical Prayerbook of the Mandaeans* [henceforth: *CP*], ed. Ethel S. Drower [Leiden: Brill, 1959], no. 9, p. 8). The significance of investiture in Mandaean baptism, and its original position after immersion, as in early Christian ritual, is discussed by E. Segelberg, *Mašbuta: Studies in the Ritual of Mandaean Baptism* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1958), 115–30. In the *Masiqta* ritual for the dying, the apotropaic function of the robe of light as well as its symbolism of the heavenly self are particularly vivid: “When this soul of N. casteth off her bodily garment, she shall put on the dress of life and become a facsimile of the Great Life in light” (*CP*, no. 51, p. 47. Cf. no. 49, pp. 43 f., and see further Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, 122 f.).

100. E.g., Odes of Solomon 25:8 (a baptismal hymn): “And I was clothed with the covering of thy Spirit, and thou didst remove from me my raiment of skin” (trans. Bernard). Bernard cites a very similar phrase from Jerome, *Epistula ad Fabiolam*, and Moses bar Kepha: “The white robes show that the baptized . . . will put on the glory which Adam wore before he transgressed the commandment” (*Odes and Psalms*, 108). The imagery of the biblical creation and Exodus stories permeate the old Syrian baptismal liturgies; see Bernard, *Odes and Psalms*, 32–34, et passim. See further the ritual reconstructed by Klijn (in the article cited above, n. 82). Cf. Narsai's Homily 21: “He [sc. the priest] recasts bodies in Baptism; . . . he purifies the image of men (R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Texts and Studies, no. 8, pt. 1 [London: SPCK, 1909], 48 ff.; cf. 46 ff.). In the West the restoration of the image in baptism is a common conception (e.g., Tertullian *De baptismo* 5, who however distinguishes the restored “likeness” from the original “image”), but the clothing imagery plays little role.
101. Gosp Phil §101 (123, 21–25) identifies the baptismal “living water” itself with the body of “the living man.” Mr. Ron Hock has suggested to me that this positive evaluation of baptism may belong to an early stratum of the Gosp Phil collection, with §§90, 43, 59, 75, in contrast with other material that depreciates baptism in favor of chrism and especially the Bridal Chamber. As he observes, the Paraphrase of Shem, which goes much further and rejects baptism as the work of the Demon, parodies the above notion by the statement, “The water is an insignificant body” (ἐλάχιστον σῶμα, CG VII, 1. 37, 14f). Gosp Phil §24 (105, 19–23) speaks of heavenly garments put on “by water and fire” (=baptism and chrism), which unlike earthly garments are better than those who put them on. Gosp Phil §106 (124, 22–31) and 27b (106, 15 f.) develop the apotropaic function of the garb of “perfect light” for the ascent of the soul (cf., besides the Mandaean texts cited in n. 99, pseudo-Clementine *Hom.* 17.16). Similar imagery is used of Christ's descent and ascent in the Gospel of Truth, 20, 29–38. (In references to Gosp Phil I have retained the numeration of the Labib photographic edition, since that is followed by the editions accessible to most readers. To obtain the “official” page numbers, simply subtract 48; e.g., 123, 21–25 [Labib] = 75, 21–25 [official]).
102. E.g., the Marcosians, according to Irenaeus *Adversus haereses* 1.18.2 = Epiphanius *Haereses* 34.16.4–5; Naasenes, Hippolytus *Refutatio* 5.7.7–15; Apocryphon of John, BGU 8502, 27, 20–25 (ed. Till) = CG III, 1. 7, 23–28, 5; cf. CG II, 1. 5, 5–14 (ed. Krause and Labib); Gosp Phil, passim (see below); Simonians, Hippolytus *Refutatio* 6.18 (see below). Also the soul, before the Fall, was “virgin and masculofeminine” according to the Exegesis on the Soul, CG II, 6. 127, 24. Cf. Jervell, *Imago*, 161–65. As Delcourt observes, the lists of antinomies or paradoxes that are so common in gnostic literature (e.g., Hippolytus *Refutatio* 6.17.3; The Thunder . . . , CG VI, 2. 13, 16–14, 51/CG II, 5. 114, 7–

- 15; Right Ginza 5, 1 [Lidzbarski, p. 151, lines 11 ff.]) might remind one of Heraclitus's description of the ultimate reality (Diels, *Fragmente*, fr. 67), but while the philosopher gives no special place to sexual metaphors, "these obsess the gnostics" (Delcourt, *Hermaphrodite*, 119). On androgyny in the Hypostasis of the Archons (CG II, 4) see R. A. Bullard, *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1970), 60 f.
103. Gosp Phil §71 (116, 22–26) trans. R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (London: Mowbray, 1962). Schenke, Till, and Wilson agree on emending the masculine suffixes in line 25 to feminine (in brackets above), but such a solecism twice in one line seems to me perhaps deliberate. The writer may have reasoned pedantically that the feminine pronoun is no longer appropriate for the female who has become worthy to "enter" (ΒΩΚ ΕΞΟΥΝ): a double entendre? cf. Gospel of Thomas 22 [85, 35] having "made herself male" (Gospel of Thomas 114 [99, 24–26]). A fuller and more general version of the same saying is found in §78, with the further statement, "Because of this Christ came, in order that he might remove the separation which was from the beginning, and again unite the two; and that he might give life to those who died in the separation, and unite them" (Wilson).
104. *Adversus haereses* 1.21.3 (Harvey 1.14.2) = Epiphanius *Haereses* 34.20.1.
105. *Adversus haereses* 1.13.3 (Harvey 1.7.2) Epiphanius *Haereses* 34.2.6–11.
106. Δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ ἔν καταστήνα . . . ἵνα ἔση ὁ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ ὁ σύ . . . κατὰ πάντα, ἐνοῦσθα αὐτῷ προθυμουμένη, ἵνα σὺν αὐτῷ κατέλθῃ εἰς τὸ ἔν (ibid.). Cf. Gosp Phil 117, 8; 118, 12–17; 118, 19f.; 124, 6.8; 133, 31; cf. Exegesis on the Soul 132, 35, which speaks of becoming "a single life." The description in Exegesis on the Soul 132, 2–35 of the soul's preparation of a νυμφών where she awaits the heavenly Bridegroom is particularly close to Irenaeus's parody.
107. Cf. Gosp Phil 133, 33 f. (as reconstructed by Till); cf. 115, 4–9; 118, 5–9; 119, 6; 134, 4 f.
108. In Irenaeus's source, *Charis* descends and the "bride" prophesies. In Gosp Phil the receiving of the Spirit is still associated primarily with baptism, but in the Exegesis on the Soul the "life-giving spirit" is identified with the "seed" received in the (symbolic) marriage. Further similarities and differences between the Marcosian formula and Gosp Phil are outlined by Hans-Georg Gaffron, *Studien zum koptischen Philippusevangelium* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1969), 213 f.
109. §68 (115, 27–30), though §76 (117, 14–118, 4) speaks of only three (see R. M. Grant, "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," *VC* 15 [1961]: 129–40; Eric Segelberg, "The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel of Philip and Its Sacramental System," *Numen* 7 [1960]: 189–200; H.-M. Schenke [and Johannes Leipoldt], *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi*, Theologische Forschung, 20 [Hamburg-Bergstadt: Reich, 1960], 35–38;

- Nathan D. Mitchell, O.S.B., "The Coptic Gnostic Gospel of Philip and Its Sacramental System" [M.A. thesis, Indiana University, 1971]; and especially the Bonn dissertation by Gaffron [see previous note]).
110. Gosp Phil §55 (111, 30–32); cf. Irenaeus *Adversus haereses* 1.1–8 (1.8–71 Harvey); *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 43–65; Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, 35–38.
111. Gosp Phil §55: "[Sophia] is the mother of the angels, and the consort (κοινωνός) of Christ is Mary Magdalene." Κοινωνία in Gosp Phil means sexual intercourse (cf. 109, 10; Till translates *Geschlechtsverkehr*), though probably not literally (see below). Christ not only loved Mary, he frequently kissed her, thus presumably making her pregnant (as the Savior, in the Valentinian scheme, made the barren lower Sophia pregnant), for "the perfect (τέλειος) become pregnant by a kiss and give birth. Therefore we also kiss one another and receive pregnancy by the grace (χάρις) that is mutual" (107, 1–6). Gaffron insists that these passages reflect an altogether different cycle of tradition, speaking of the *lower* Sophia and the lower Christ, and that this "pregnancy" of the τέλειος has no connection with the Bridal Chamber (*Studien*, 214–16), but I find his reasoning quite unconvincing. Especially puzzling is his argument that the metaphors of "pregnancy" and "birth" would signify individuation and hence contradict the Bridal Chamber's central theme of unification. Paragraph 67, the keystone of Gaffron's own description of the Bridal Chamber, speaks directly of the gnostic's being "reborn through the image." This is no contradiction of the notion of the gnostic's becoming "pregnant," since Gaffron himself insists that the "angel" who unites with the "image," i.e., the self, in the Bridal Chamber is only a "projection" of the self—so that those who unite and that which is "reborn" through that union are ultimately identical, and Gaffron's rhetorical question, "With what should the image united with its angel become pregnant?" is readily answered: "With its own true (heavenly) self."
112. 106, 10–14; 113, 23–25; cf. 126, 33–127, 5. See Grant, "Mystery of Marriage," 131–33, 136.
113. Grant thinks this likely (ibid., 139). Gosp Phil §42 (109, 5–12) redefines adultery as "κοινωνία between those who are not alike," i.e., between pneumatics and nongnostics (cf. §113); nothing is said about relations between two pneumatics. But see Gaffron, *Studien*, 216 f.
114. §§60, 103, 126. Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 3.29, describes the Valentinian "marriage" as "spiritual" (cf. Karl Müller, "Die Forderung der Ehelosigkeit für alle Getauften in der alten Kirche," in *Aus der akademischen Arbeit* [Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1930], 70).
115. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, 38; *contra* Grant, "Mystery of Marriage," 139.
116. Cf. §31 and §55 (111, 36). Compare Hippolytus's *Apostolic Tradition*, where, as

in Gosp Phil, only those are admitted to the kiss of peace who have received both baptism and chrismation. The catholic rite, however, keeps men and women separate for the kiss (18.3–4; 22.3, 6, ed. Dix; in Botte's edition, 40, 54). See further Gaffron, *Studien*, 213–16, who decides that the ritual kiss was practiced by the gnostics of Gosp Phil in some other context than the Bridal Chamber.

117. "There is no bridal chamber (παστός) for the beasts, nor for slaves, nor for women who are defiled; rather it is for freemen (ἐλεύθερος) and virgins (παρθένος)" (§73; the exclusions recall the "three reasons for gratitude," above). Paragraph 110 defines the ἐλεύθερος as "he who possesses knowledge of the truth" (125, 15 f.) (cf. Grant, "Mystery of Marriage," 138. See also §§42, 113, 127; cf. p. 115, lines 25–27). In another Nag Hammadi text, "The Second Logos of the Great Seth" (CG VII, 2), a heavenly wedding "before the foundation of the world" becomes the paradigm for unity in an organized gnostic group, but without any mention of a *sacrament* of marriage, according to Joseph Gibbons, *The Second Logos of the Great Seth* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1973), 273–86.
118. Hippolytus *Refutatio* 6.18.2, 4.
119. Cf. Jervell, *Imago*, 161 f.; Hans Jonas takes Simonianism as the classic example of the "feminine group" of the Syrian-Egyptian (i.e., emanation-and-fall) type of gnostic myth (*Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, 3d ed. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964], 353–58; cf. *Gnostic Religion*, 103–11). The differentiation and reunion of the male and female elements in man is portrayed in the legend of Simon's consort, Helen, which was evidently fully developed before the time of Justin Martyr (see Ernst Haenchen, "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" in *Gott und Mensch* [Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1965], 289–91, 297 f.; but note the sharp criticisms by K. Beyschlag, "Zur Simon-Magus-Frage," *ZTG* 68 [1971]: 395–426. Further criticism of Haenchen's reconstruction by Roland Bergmeier, "Quellen vorchristlicher Gnosis," in *Tradition und Glaube*, ed. Gert Jeremias et al. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], 200–220, has not yet been accessible to me). We now have a striking parallel to the legend in the myth of the soul's abuse, transformation, and joining to her heavenly "bridegroom" in the Nag Hammadi "Exegesis on the Soul."
120. Hippolytus *Refutatio* 6.17.1.
121. *Gott und Mensch*, 280.
122. Cf. the continuation of the account in *Refutatio* 16.17.3 and cf. 6.14, where the εἰκὼν is identified with the "Spirit hovering over the face of the waters."
123. *Refutatio* 6.9.10; 6.12.3. The system of six "powers" arranged in pairs, all comprehended by the superior, single power that is identified with the Image and Spirit of Genesis 1, is strikingly reminiscent of the Logos and the six powers in

- parts of Philo's allegory (see E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935], 11–47).
124. *Refutatio* 6.14.6; 6.12.4. Haenchen points out the similar view of the Peratae, according to Hippolytus 5.17.10 (only τὸ ἐξεικονισμένον τέλειον γένος ὁμοούσιον will be saved) (*Gott und Mensch*, 271).
125. Thus ἐξεικονισμένοι is certainly equivalent to τέλειοι, "initiates," in the statement, πρὸς διδασκαλίαν ἀρκεῖ τοῖς ἐξεικονισμένοις τὸ λεχθὲν (*Refutatio* 6.10.2). "Having become perfect" (γενόμενος τέλειος) parallels ἐξεικονισθῆ in 6.18.1 (cf. Haenchen, *Gott und Mensch*, 271). Compare the Valentinian notion of "formation" by the Bridal Chamber: children of "the woman" (Sophia) are "incomplete and infants and senseless and weak and without form," but "when we have received form (μορφωθέντας) from the Saviour, we have become children of a husband and a bride chamber" (*Excerpta ex Theodoto* 68, ed. Casey).
126. Haenchen himself points to the mythical notion of receiving a heavenly *Lichtkleid* as the equivalent of ἐξεικονίζεται in *Refutatio* 6.9.10 (*Gott und Mensch*, 270 ff.), but he does not consider the possibility of a cultic act. Gilles Quispel cites very interesting parallels in a kabbalistic rite of "putting on the name" while standing in water, described by Gershom Scholem, and putting on a divine image in a magic papyrus, and suggests some connection with early Christian baptism, which he does not elaborate (*Gnosis als Weltreligion* [Zürich: Origo, 1951], 55 ff.). If the Simonians did practice an initiatory baptism, it would help to explain the peculiar report in pseudo-Clementine *Hom.* 2, 23 f. that Simon was one of the disciples of John the Baptist.
127. *Refutatio* 6.19.5.
128. Haenchen thinks these two tendencies resulted within Valentinianism in two distinct kinds of systems, one mythical and sacramental, the other more "spiritual," antisacramental ("Literatur zum Codex Jung," *TRu* 30 [1964]: 74–82; cf. Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, 174–79).
129. Best known is logion 22, "When you make the two one (πενταϋ οὐα), and when you make the inside as the outside and the outside as the inside . . . in order to make the male and the female into a single one (μπίογα οὐωτ) . . . you shall enter [the kingdom]," variant forms of which are known from Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 3.13.92 (citing the Gospel of the Egyptians and Julius Cassianus), 2 Clement 12:2; Acts of Peter 38; Acts of Philip 140 (the latter two without mention of "male and female"). Cf. logion 106, "When you make the two one, you shall become sons of man," logion 11b, "On the day when you were one, you became two. But when you have become two, what will you do?" and logion 4, "Many who are first shall become last and they shall become a single one." The metaphor of making "the inside as the outside" in logion 22 may perhaps be connected with the peculiar no-

- tion found in the Exegesis on the Soul that the “womb of the soul” is on the outside “like the $\phi\upsilon\sigma\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ of the male” until purified by baptism, when it is “turned inward” (CG II, 6. 131, 13–132, 2).
130. J. Z. Smith, “The Garments of Shame,” shows that the main elements of logion 37, undressing, being naked without shame, treading upon the garments, and being as little children, all point to an origin of this saying “within archaic Christian baptismal practices and attendant interpretation of Genesis 1–3” (p. 218).
131. J. Z. Smith compares homilies of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who contrasts nudity at baptism, when shame is still felt, with an eschatological nudity without shame. Logion 21 is admittedly difficult to interpret, but the most plausible explanation is that clothing here, too, represents the physical body by which the gnostic is connected temporarily to the world—“the field” (“field” also may have sexual connotations, as frequently). The notion that baptism restores the initiate to the virginal innocence of Adam, who had “no understanding of the begetting of children,” is implicit in a number of Christian Encratite texts (see Erik Peterson, “Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrus . . . ,” in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* [Rome, Freiburg, Vienna: Herder, 1959], 194–96, who collects numerous texts in which an epiphany of Jesus at baptism in the form of a $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, $\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, or the like is recounted).
132. Note the parallel in logion 49, “Blessed are the solitary ($\mu\upsilon\nu\alpha\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$) and elect [or, “blessed and elect are the solitary”] for you shall find the Kingdom, . . . because you come from it (and) you shall go there again” (trans. Guillaumont et al.). The gnostic conception of “the kingdom” here is reinforced by the following logion, “We have come from the Light, where the Light has originated through itself. It [stood] and it revealed itself in their image.”
133. The phrase “become a living spirit” ($\psi\omega\pi\epsilon \dots \nu\omicron\upsilon\gamma\pi\bar{\nu}\alpha \epsilon\phi\omicron\nu\bar{\nu}\zeta$) is perhaps an allusion to Gen. 2:7 ($\alpha\lambda\psi\omega\pi\iota \nu\alpha\chi\epsilon \pi\iota\pi\omega\mu\iota \epsilon\omicron\upsilon\gamma\psi\chi\eta \epsilon\omicron\varsigma\omicron\nu\zeta$), and possibly at the same time a pun on “Eve.” In this case the analogy with Gosp Phil §71 would be complete. *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 81 also speaks of the female “seed” becoming male when it is “formed” ($\mu\omicron\rho\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$). The Second Logos of the Great Seth warns against becoming female, “lest you give birth to $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ” (CG VII, 2. 65, 22–26).
134. Logion 3. The first part of this saying depends on a midrash on Deuteronomy 30:1–14, a favorite in Wisdom circles (see Job 28:12–22; Greek Baruch 3:29–4:1; Babylonian Talmud, Erubin 55a; Temurah 16a; Baba Mešia 59b; Jesus ben Sira 51:26; Romans 10:6–10; M. Jack Suggs, “The Word Is Near You”: Romans 10:6–10 within the Purpose of the Letter,” in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer et al. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967], 311; and *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew’s Gospel* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970], 102). See also

- logia 67, 70, 111; cf. E. Haenchen, *Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1961), 39–49.
135. Compare C. G. Jung’s interpretation of gnostic and alchemical myths as symbols of the process of individuation, which involves, in the case of a man, the bringing to consciousness of the “female” side of the psyche (which Jung calls the *anima*) and achieving a harmonious union between it and the conscious, “masculine” ego (the valences are reversed in the case of a woman and her “animus”). To stay with language closer to the historical context of our texts, however, Nathan Mitchell (“Sacramental System,” 109) has pointed out in his thesis that “Makarius tended to consider the soul as itself an $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ of the Spirit. Hence the soul’s return to paradise consisted in its being once more united with Spirit (clothed with the light). There is a double movement here: the soul’s return involves not only a reclothing with Spirit, but also a rediscovery of the soul’s authentic $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$. Baptism reintegrates soul and Spirit according to man’s true $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ and also overcomes the ‘sinful’ condition of ‘fleshness’ (more precisely, of sexuality . . .)” (p. 75). Mitchell cites especially Homilies 30.3 and 38.1 (ed. Dorries, 242, 271) and compares Gosp Phil §66.
136. See especially *Abr.* 99–102 and the comments by E. R. Goodenough, who, to be sure, extrapolates somewhat from what Philo explicitly says, in *By Light, Light*, 139–45. Philo is more direct in *QE* 1.8: “Progress is indeed nothing else than the giving up of the female gender by changing into the male, since the female gender is material, passive, corporeal, and sense-perceptible, while the male is active, rational, incorporeal and more akin to mind and thought” (trans. Marcus [Loeb]).
137. Acts of Paul and Thecla, chaps. 25, 40 (Lipsius-Bonnet, 1:253, 266). Recall also the allegory in the Shepherd of Hermas, *Vis.* 3.8.4, where the second virtue, Continence (Ἐγκράτεια) is represented by a woman “who is girded and looks like a man.”
138. Logion 16: to the apocalyptic saying about division of families (cf. Luke 12:52 f.//Matthew 10:35) is added “and they shall stand as $\mu\upsilon\nu\alpha\chi\acute{o}\iota$ ”; two variants of the saying about hatred of father and mother (cf. Luke 14:26 f.//Matthew 10:37 f.) appear in logion 55 and 101, the latter with an addition, unfortunately fragmentary, that contrasts the physical mother with “my true mother” who “gave me life.” Whoever recognizes parents “shall be called the son of a harlot” (logion 105). “Wretched is the body which depends upon a body, and wretched is the soul which depends upon these two” (logion 87, cf. 112). Note also logion 99 (Jesus’ mother and brothers: cf. Mark 3:31–35 par.).
139. Logia 56, 80.
140. Note the “moral” of the Supper parable (logion 64): “Tradesmen and merchants shall not enter the places of my father.” The excuses offered by the

invited guests (contrast Matthew 22:5//Luke 14:18–20) underline this theme—though they may also be connected midrashically with the excuses for withdrawal from Holy War (Deuteronomy 20:5–7). (On the importance of the Holy War tradition in Eastern Syrian Encratism, see A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, CSCO, no. 184 [Louvain: Secretariat du CSCO, 1958], 1:13, 93 f.) See also logion 95 (cf. Matthew 5:42//Luke 6:30). Logia 78, 81, and 110 associate wealth and political power and call for the renunciation of both. However, wealth is also used positively as a metaphor for the spiritual world in Gospel of Thomas, logia 3, 29, 76, 85. Opposition to trade (ἐμπορία) was also characteristic of the Essenes, according to Philo (*Prob.* 78; cf. *Hyp.* 11.4, 8f.) and Josephus (*Jewish War* 2.127: they engage only in barter, not purchase). Note the “three nets of Belial” in Damascus Rule 4.15–17: זנות, הון, המקדש, טמא המקדש—“fornication, possessions, defilement of the Sanctuary.” Commerce had an unsavory connotation also for some rabbis. For example, a midrash in Sifre on Deuteronomy §315 (ed. Finkelstein, 358) interprets Deuteronomy 32:12 to mean that in the age to come “there will be among you no one engaged in *pragmateia* at all.” On the other hand, the Mandaeans, whose contempt for the Christian Encratite monks of eastern Syria was boundless, regarded trades and crafts as gifts of Manda d-Hiia and a fit metaphor for the latter’s “sale” of salvation to them: *CP* no. 90 (Drower, 93), a baptismal hymn containing also an anti-Christian vow. On the positive use of the metaphor “merchandise” in Mandaean and Manichean texts, see Geo Widengren, *Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism*, Uppsala Universitets Årskrift 3 (Uppsala, 1946), 82–95. (His misuse of the English word “customer” is confusing; he means “customs officer,” “collector of duties.”) It may well be that these contrasting attitudes toward commerce are in part a function of the socioeconomic status of the respective groups in Mesopotamia. See Ramsay MacMullen’s interesting suggestion that in the late Empire ἀναχώρησις, the desperate flight of individuals from a hopeless economic situation in Egypt, in many cases provided the fertile soil for Coptic-Christian eremitism (*Enemies of the Roman Order* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966], 235 ff.). On ascetic wandering, see Hans von Campenhausen, “Die asketische Heimatlosigkeit im altkirchlichen und frühmittelalterlichen Mönchtum,” in *Tradition und Leben*, 290–317 (ET, *Tradition and Life in the Church* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968], 231–51).

141. As Delcourt points out, for Greco-Roman writers bisexuality generally meant asexuality, as in Ovid’s description of Hermaphrodite as “forma duplex, nec femina . . . nec puer . . . neutrumque et utrumque videntur” (*Hermaphrodite*, 80–82).
142. Judge, “The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community,” *JRH* 1 (1960/61): 125–37. Whether their patronage included also, as Judge claims, their spon-

- soring Christianity to the circle of their social dependents (*clientelae*) is not so clear from New Testament evidence.
143. The term here is evidently not used in the sense of an itinerant missionary, on which see Dieter Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief* (Neukirchen, 1964), 31–39. But it may not be a title at all, but only a general reference to one who “serves” the church as my colleague, Abraham J. Malherbe, suggests).
144. Epiphanius *Haereses* 42.3.4; if Tertullian *De praescriptione* 41, refers to Marcion, as Harnack supposed, Marcionite women could also *docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere* (see Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* [1924; reprint ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960], 147).
145. This is the principal fault of the very informative essay by Stefan Lösch, “Christliche Frauen in Corinth,” *TQ* 127 (1947): 216–61.
146. See now Robin Scroggs, “Paul and the Eschatological Woman,” *JAAR* 40 (1972): 283–303. This article appeared too late for me to include a discussion of it in the present essay, but I am very pleased to see that our interpretations of several key points in 1 Corinthians coincide.
147. As Hans Windisch observes (“Sinn und Geltung,” col. 415), praying and prophesying are not private, but congregational roles of great importance. Perhaps, he suggests, they are mentioned “beispielhaft,” for if the pneumatic gifts of praying and prophesying are given to women, why not also healing, teaching, glossolalia, and interpretation?
148. This is not to deny that in certain religious associations of the mystery type women play a prominent role, as Professor Dieter Georgi has stressed in discussing a version of this paper delivered at Harvard. But the point here is that men and women in Corinth fill the *same* roles.
149. In addition to the standard commentaries, see especially the articles by Lösch and Windisch just cited; F. J. Leenhardt, “La place de la femme dans l’église d’après le Nouveau Testament,” *ETR* 23 (1948): 3–50; Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry*. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., gives a good review of the most important other literature in “A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Cor xi. 10,” *NTS* 4 (1957/58): 48–58.
150. Lösch, “Christliche Frauen,” 225–30.
151. That much, at least, remains of Ulrich Wilckens’s attempt to reconstruct the “gnostic” movement at Corinth (*Weisheit und Torheit*), despite the penetrating criticisms of Helmut Koester (*Gnomon* 33 [1961]: 590–95) and Robert Funk (*Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* [New York: Harper & Row, 1966], 277–305).
152. See above, and cf. Acts of Thomas 1:13, where a bride saved by Thomas’s preaching from the awful fate of marriage now refuses to wear a veil. In the

latter passage, however, the picture is complicated by the notion of the believer's marriage to Christ, "the true man," of which there is no trace in 1 Corinthians 11 (*pace* Isaksson, *Marriage and Ministry*, 169).

153. Professor Robin Scroggs has suggested "that Paul wanted to eliminate the *inequality* between the sexes, while the gnostics wanted to eliminate the *distinctions* between the sexes" (in a letter of April 15, 1972; emphasis his). It also appears from this passage, if we are to take 11:7 at face value, that Paul himself did not—or did not always—accept the androgynous interpretation of Genesis 1:27 which, we have concluded, lay behind the baptismal language of Galatians 3:28—further reason for regarding that tradition as not of Paul's coinage.
154. "Nicht auf die Verhüllung, auf die allerdings die Bezeichnung des Haares als 'Umwurf' hindeutet, sondern auf die Einhaltung der Ordnung kommt es dem Apostel an" (Harder, *Paulus und das Gebet*, 157, cited by Lösch, "Christliche Frauen," 236). Cf. Annie Jaubert, "Le voile des femmes (1 Cor. xi. 2–16)," *NTS* 18 (1972): 427. Plutarch offers as one explanation of mourning practices in which men cover their heads and women uncover theirs (or, in Greece, men let their hair grow while women cut theirs short) that "the unusual [τὸ μὴ συνηθέϊς] is proper in mourning" (*Moralia* 267B, tr. Babbitt). That is also the explanation for the instances collected by Lösch of women uncovering and loosening their hair for certain cultic rites. "Liminal" situations, including death, birth, and initiation par excellence, demand *inversion of the ordinary*. (This may also be one of the reasons for the similar prescriptions for women being baptized in Hippolytus *Apostolic Tradition* 21.5 [Dix], though that may also be related to Jewish prescriptions for ritual baths, including proselyte baptism, that nothing must "interpose" between the skin and the water, not even braided hair [Babylonian Talmud, Erubin 4b].)
155. E.g., Hans Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 290; earlier Weiss, Schmiedel, Bousset. The hypothesis of an interpolation is supported to some extent by the transposition of verses 34–35 by some authorities of the "Western" text tradition to a place after verse 40, even though this probably means only, as Windisch suggests, that copyists have recognized that the verses interrupt the continuity from verse 33a to verse 37. The appeal to the νόμος in verse 34b is also surprising for Paul in such a context. Walter Schmithals solves the problem by means of his partition theory, apportioning chaps. 11 and 14 to different letters (*Die Gnosis in Korinth*, 2d ed. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965], 231).
156. Windisch, "Sinn und Geltung," cols. 417–20.
157. *Contra* Leenhardt, "La place de la femme," 25.
158. Smith, *Jewish and Greek Traditions*, 188; N. A. Dahl, "Anamnesis," *ST* 1 (1947): 80 f. The pattern is the "soteriological contrast" between "once" (before con-

- version) and "now" (N. A. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* [Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957], 5 f.). G. Schille, "Liturgisches Gut in Epheserbrief" (diss., University of Göttingen, 1953), 3–9, tries to isolate a hymn quoted in verses 14–18, but his observations hardly prove more than that this is carefully composed prose. Moreover, he fails to note the essential factor, that the passage is a midrash-like composition on Isaiah 57:18 f. with the help of Isaiah 52:7 (see Smith, *Jewish and Greek Traditions*, 8–43).
159. Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, 2d ed. (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1958), 124.
160. Cf. J. Gnllka, "Paränctische Traditionen im Epheserbrief," in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), 402.
161. In the New Testament form of the tradition, evidently the Adam-Eve legends (in which God presents Eve to Adam) as well as the Old Testament tradition of the Sinai covenant as the marriage of Israel to God (with Moses, in some aggadic versions, presenting the bride) have had a constitutive role. It remains an open question whether in addition gnostic conceptions of an archetypal union of male and female deities, which were to become so prominent in later gnosticism, may already have influenced the version known to the author of Ephesians.
162. The allusion to baptism is unmistakable and generally recognized by commentators. Cf. 1 Corinthians 6:11; Hebrews 10:22; Titus 3:5; Acts 22:16; Revelation 1:5 *varia lectio*; Justin *Apology* 1.61 f.; *Dialogue* 13.1; 18.1 f. Moreover, Schlier is very likely correct in seeing in ἐν ῥήματι a reference to the baptismal formula or the proclamation of the name of Jesus over the baptisand (*Epheser*, 257).
163. Those scholars who use the phrase *hieros gamos* in connection with Ephesians 5 seem generally to have a very loose, metaphorical sense in mind, not a specific reference to a *ritual procedure*, which is the ordinary meaning of the phrase in the history of religions. See Schlier's excursus, "Hieros Gamos," *Epheser*, 265–76; R. A. Batey ("Jewish Gnosticism and the 'hieros gamos' of Eph 5: 21–23," *NTS* 10 [1963/64]: 121–27, and "The *mia sarx* Union of Christ and the Church," *NTS* 13 [1966/67]: 270–81) argues for a specific Jewish-gnostic milieu similar to that represented by Justin's *Baruch*, but the imprecision of his analogies and the lack of controlled exegesis represent a step backward from Schlier's work. Most recently J. Paul Sampley, *And the Two Shall Become One Flesh* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1972) has worked out the Old Testament and aggadic background of Ephesians 5:22–33 with great care. He particularly emphasizes the importance of Ezekiel 16 and of the "theological" interpretation of Song of Songs in forming the picture of the "hieros gamos" of YHWH and Israel.

164. The quoted phrases are those of J. Z. Smith, "Birth Upside Down or Right Side Up?" *History of Religions* 9 (1970): 281–303, who describes an analogous pattern of spatial reversal. As he observes, "left and right" are often associated with "male and female." Cf. Baumann, *Das doppelte Geschlecht*, 124.
165. N. A. Dahl can speak of "a fairly wide consensus" ("Paul and the Church at Corinth in 1 Corinthians 1:10–4:21," in *Christian History and Interpretation*, ed. W. R. Farmer et al. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967], 333, n. 1.

THE MAN FROM HEAVEN IN JOHANNINE SECTARIANISM

The uniqueness of the Fourth Gospel in early Christian literature consists above all in the special patterns of language which it uses to describe Jesus Christ. Fundamental among these patterns is the description of Jesus as the one who has descended from heaven and, at the end of his mission which constitutes a *krisis* for the whole world, reascends to the Father. Not the least of Rudolf Bultmann's enduring contributions to Johannine studies was his recognition and insistence that any attempt to solve the "Johannine puzzle" must begin with this picture of the descending/ascending redeemer. Moreover, he saw that it is not simply a question of explaining the *concept* "pre-existence," but rather of perceiving the origin and function of a *myth*. The solution could not be found, therefore, by comparisons with philosophical developments in the hellenistic schools, such as the long-fa-