

# Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church

Susan Gilchrist<sup>1</sup>

SuH0422d

15 November 2015

## Abstract

A bible passage: often of greatest concern to transgender people is Deuteronomy 22:5, which states “A woman shall not wear a man's apparel, nor shall a man put on a woman's garment; for whoever does such things is abhorrent to the Lord your God”. For those who take the bible literally the meaning is simple: the act of cross-dressing is in itself a sin.

Different meanings have been applied to this passage at different times. These include the misuse of cross-dressing for deception, preventing women carrying the weapons of war, condemning cross-dressing for prostitution and foreign religious practice, preventing women wearing religious items of apparel worn by Jewish men, prohibiting men adopting women's customs regarding hairstyles etc., and stopping men and women entering places assigned to the opposite gender for the purposes of illicit sex. The most common theme is that of cross-dressing for sexual advantage and abuse. A further area of relevance relates to the power struggles and the abuses of gender and sex within gender unequal and patriarchal societies. Clement of Alexandria made it clear that maintaining masculinity was paramount if early Christianity was to succeed in gaining a foothold of respectability inside Roman society. He considered that this was the purpose of the prohibition. In the Old and the New Testament understanding no literal interpretation has ever been applied.

The interactions between power and sex are examined. It is demonstrated that an important purpose of Deuteronomy 22:5 was to enforce social differentiation in gender divided and discriminatory societies. It is shown that in Christianity where; as Paul states in Galatians 3:28, “All are as one in the Love of Christ”, the prohibition of Deuteronomy 22:5 is no longer applicable, nor is it required.

© Susan Gilchrist 2015

[sgen4144@gmail.com](mailto:sgen4144@gmail.com)

Use this link to access the presentation slides that are associated with this paper  
<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/SuG0505e-TransAndFaithPresentationShort.pdf>

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal Biography <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/SusanBiographyPapers.pdf>

# Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church

Susan Gilchrist<sup>2</sup>

SuG0402a

15 November 2015

“A woman shall not wear a man's apparel, nor shall a man put on a woman's garment; for whoever does such things is abhorrent to the Lord your God”. (NRSA)

Some people today consider that the statements contained in Deuteronomy 22:5 condemn every type of role where cross-dressing is involved<sup>3</sup>. However this passage needs to be examined in more detail<sup>4</sup>. One of the most relevant sources for this is an Early Church Father, Clement of Alexandria. Around AD 195 Clement wrote: “What is the purpose in the Law's prohibition against a man wearing woman's clothing? Is it not that the Law would have us to be masculine and not to be effeminate in either person or actions - or in thought and word? Rather, it would have the man who devotes himself to the truth to be masculine both in acts of endurance and patience - in life, conduct, word, and discipline”. In the *Paedagogus* (the Instructor) Clement defines appropriate standards for Christian clothing and behaviour as part of an extensive discussion about how Christians should behave.<sup>5</sup> This makes it clear that maintaining the respectability of the Church is the major concern. It is the attack on the male dominated social structure which effeminacy presents, and not cross dressing by itself. The need to maintain these strong images of masculinity and respectability are examined in detail in the other sections of this investigation, and this statement would have reflected the understanding of the early Roman Church<sup>6</sup>.

The Jewish concern in this passage is not about creating or reinforcing gender differences but in preventing the gender associations of clothing, or possibly body hair from being used to deceive others for those purposes which lead to sexual immorality or to dishonest behaviour. No literal interpretation has ever been applied. Care is needed in translating Deuteronomy 22:5 in order to preserve the differences in the words, for unfortunately many of the freer translations of the Christian bible do not<sup>7</sup>. A literal translation reads: “A man's

---

<sup>2</sup> Personal Biography <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/SusanBiographyPapers.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> In the Revised Standard version of the Bible, Deuteronomy 22:5 states “A woman shall not wear a man's garment, nor shall a man put on a woman's cloak, for whoever does these things is an abomination to the Lord your God”. Young's Literal translation reads “The habiliments of a man are not on a woman, nor doth a man put on the garment of a woman, for the abomination of Jehovah thy God [is] any one doing these”.

<sup>4</sup> This article is an expanded version of section 17: “Deuteronomy 22:5” in Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*”: Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>5</sup> Clement of Alexandria (ca 195) “*The Paedagogus: The Instructor (Book III)*”

Translated by William Wilson: From Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2: Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885. Also available at:

<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02093.htm> : [Accessed 27 November 2012] See also: Bercot, David W. Ed. (1998): “*Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs*”: p 445. Hendrickson ISBN-10: 1565633571 ISBN-13: 978-1565633575 ISBN 1-56563-357-1

<sup>6</sup> See Gilchrist, S. (2015): “*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*”: Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>7</sup> This can be a major problem. For example the New International Version of the Bible states. “A woman must not wear men's clothing, nor a man wear women's clothing, for the LORD your God detests anyone who does

item shall not be on a woman, and a man shall not wear a woman's garment; whoever does such a thing is an abhorrence unto Adonai". Here there are three clauses. (a) A man's item shall not be on a woman; (b) a man shall not wear a woman's garment and (c) whoever does such a thing is an abhorrence unto God. The first two of these clauses are not identical in structure; and these differences are reflected in the various Jewish interpretations of the verse. One of the oldest documents - which is known as Targum Unkulus<sup>8</sup>, (ca100 to 200 AD) interprets the verse as a prohibition against women carrying weapons, and against men using the "vessels" of a woman. Rabbi Eliezar ben Ya'akov (ca 226)<sup>9</sup> declares that: "A woman must not wear instruments of war or go to war." The word used in the first statement (Keli) means "Mens" things i.e. clothes, armour, weapons and tools rather than just the clothes, while the word for women's things (Simlah) which is used in the second statement describes a type of women's outer clothing. The interpretation of the first clause as relating to "war gear" rather than clothes is also found in the Midrash Mishlei<sup>10</sup>. Josephus (ca. 37-100) states "Take care, especially in your battles, that no woman use the habit of a man, nor man the garment of a woman"<sup>11</sup>. In a further attempt to identify the quintessential "Men's items," Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob (ca. 80–110) is quoted in the Talmud (edited c.800 C.E.)<sup>12</sup>, asking: "What is the proof that a woman may not go forth with weapons to war?" He then cites this verse, which he reads to say: "A warrior's gear may not be put on a woman"<sup>13 14</sup>.

It is stated that this interpretation has obtained the widest acceptance among the Jewish sages whose views are reflected inside the mainstream legal codes<sup>15</sup>. The Shulhan Arukh (Yore De`a) says that the prohibition of a man wearing simlat isha "women's dress" or "women's fashion" refers to the wearing of women's hair styles. This prohibition includes specifically shaving one's underarm or pubic hair. Men may not shave their armpits and their genital regions as women do, unless it is the local custom for men to do that.<sup>16</sup> This considers quintessential "Men's items" to be the tzitsit and the tefillin. It is considered that these rules are imposed by the Halakha (Jewish law) and condemning the incorrect wearing of these, or inappropriate trimming of hair is the purpose of the verse.

---

this".. See [www.biblegateway.com/verse/en/Deuteronomy%2022:5](http://www.biblegateway.com/verse/en/Deuteronomy%2022:5) [Accessed 16/11/2015]. Similar concerns are found elsewhere. See Section 3:6: "Translation Drift and Re-Interpretation" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>8</sup>Targum Unkulus. <http://targum.info/targumic-texts/pentateuchal-targumim/>

<sup>9</sup> Babylonian Talmud, Nazir 59a, Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov (2nd - 4th C CE): [Accessed: 30 March 2016]. Access the Talmud at: <http://halakhah.com/>

<sup>10</sup> Proverbs 31:19

<sup>11</sup> Josephus(ca 97) "*Antiquities*", Book 4, 8:43 <http://www.earlyjewishwritings.com/text/josephus/ant4.html> : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>12</sup> Eliezer ben Jacob, sometimes referred to as "the Elder" lived in the second part of the 1st Century. He was regarded as an authority on the Temple which he had seen, and because he was familiar with matters pertaining to Temple services and practices (e.g., Yoma 16b). Rashi claimed that his statements are few but they are reliable. The Babylonian Talmud states that his Mishnah was small in quantity but trustworthy (Yeb. 49b).

<sup>13</sup> Talmud: B. Naz. 59a. [Accessed: 30 March 2016]. Access the Talmud at: <http://halakhah.com/>

<sup>14</sup> See also Horton, David (1994): "*Changing Channels? A Christian Response to the Transvestite and Transsexual*": Grove code: E92-ebook. ISBN: 1851742581. This book is now out of print but it may be bought online at: [http://www.grovebooks.co.uk/cart.php?target=product&product\\_id=16755&category\\_id=346](http://www.grovebooks.co.uk/cart.php?target=product&product_id=16755&category_id=346) : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>15</sup> Rabbi Jon-Jay Tilsen on Cross Dressing and Deuteronomy 22:5 accessed at <http://www.beki.org/crossdress.html> [Accessed: 6 December 2012].

<sup>16</sup> Tur, Yoreh De'ah, Chapter 182 (14th century) Prohibitions on cross-dressing are defined by local fashion. In Shulhan Aruch Yoreh Deah 182:5 Rabbi Joseph Karo discusses if a male is allowed to remove under arm hair. The Ben Ish Hai, Rabbi Yoseph Haim of Baghdad (Rav Pealim 3 Yoreh Deah 18) addresses the issue of men shaving their body hair.

The third major set of Jewish interpretations is concerned with the control of status and immoral activity. Abraham Ibn Ezra<sup>17</sup> (ca 1140) declared that “Womenkind is not created for anything other than procreation, and were a woman to go with men to war she would fall into prostitution en route.” Other commentators take up these views on gender discrimination and sexual immorality. For example the Rabbi Shlomo Yizchaki (Rashi) (ca.1040-1105), who was one of the most highly-regarded Talmudists and Biblical commentators of all time, stated that: “(A woman dresses) that she should resemble a man in order to mingle with the men, which cannot be for any reason other than to fornicate”. Rashi also argued that “A man's item should not be on a woman so she can go out among men, for this is only for the purpose of adultery.” Likewise, he says, "A man shall not wear a women's garment: so he can go and be among the women."<sup>18</sup> The same analysis is presented in the Shulchan Arukh<sup>19</sup>. This is the 16th century law code that has become a standard law text for most of the traditionally observant Jewish people<sup>20</sup>. According to the analysis the danger of "cross-dressing," is that it might allow men to enter women's groups and women to enter men's groups. In this view the intent of the law is to prevent men and women from associating with what would normally be a single-sex group of the other gender under false pretences, in circumstances which might lead to adultery, or for “Abhorrent” behaviour<sup>21</sup>. In societies in which gender segregation and inequality was widely observed, this subterfuge was seen as a real danger. However in its discussion of the laws of the festival of Purim, the Code says men and women may cross dress during the festival because it is for the purpose of gaiety<sup>22</sup>. In all of these interpretations it is not the cross dressing itself that is being condemned, it is the purpose of the act.

The Bible makes it very clear that cultic prostitution had no place in Judaism. There is a wide variation given to the interpretations of Deuteronomy 22:5 and to Leviticus 18:33 and 20:13<sup>23</sup> in the present day. Some fundamentalist churches take a simple literalist view. However other modern Christian interpretations tend to assume that the motives for cross dressing prohibited in Deuteronomy 22:5 and same-sex intercourse condemned in Leviticus 18:33 and 20:13 were always connected with temple prohibition and inappropriate sex. In all of today's interpretations little account is taken of contrast between the privileges of power exerted in dominant societies and the oppression of submission in conquered ones: both in terms of the cultural differences that are established, and the use and abuse of sex. Evidence of the high degree of trauma and distress that these power conflicts create is present today: and that extends from the Christian practice of slavery in the Americas to the empires of the ancient world. This means that no examination of Christian theology and its attitudes to all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour can be complete without taking a full account of the relationships between power and sex, and that is an objective of this study<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Shachter Jay F. (2003) Translator: “*The Commentary of Abraham Ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch: Deuteronomy*”. KTAV Publishing House, Inc. ISBN 0881257451, 9780881257458

<sup>18</sup> Babylonian Talmud Nazir 59a (2nd - 4th C CE)

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.torah.org/advanced/shulchan-aruch/> : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Judaism/shulkhan\\_arukh.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Judaism/shulkhan_arukh.html) : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>21</sup> Babylonian Talmud Nazir 59a (2nd - 4th C CE)

<sup>22</sup> Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chayyim 696:8)

<sup>23</sup> Leviticus 18:22: “You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination”. Leviticus 20:13: “If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death; their blood is upon them”. New Revised Standard Version, Anglicised (NRSVA)

<sup>24</sup> See Gilchrist, S. (2015): “*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*”: Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

The Hebrew Bible uses two different words for prostitute, zonah and qedesha or kedeshah. The word zonah simply meant an ordinary prostitute<sup>25</sup> or a loose woman, but the word qedesha literally meant "consecrated (feminine form)"<sup>26 27</sup>. Drawing from his comparisons with the other Middle Eastern religious traditions, Saggs<sup>28</sup> notes that these were not only women; they included men who had been made eunuchs, and in line with common Middle Eastern practice, these would also be expected to dress as women<sup>29</sup>. The actions of the Jewish king Asa (913-910 BC to 873-869 BC) are described in 1 Kings 15:12. This declares that: "He put away the "male temple prostitutes" out of the land, and removed all the idols that his ancestors had made." A later king, Josiah (641/640 to 610/609 BC) demanded the exclusive worship of Yahweh and he outlawed all other types. According to the biblical account, Josiah destroyed the living quarters for the "male cult prostitutes" which were in the Temple<sup>30</sup>. He also destroyed the pagan objects inside the Temple which were related to the worship of Baal and of Asherah<sup>31</sup>, "And all the hosts of the heavens"<sup>32</sup> (See: 2 Kings 23).

---

<sup>25</sup> Sacred prostitution was a well-established tradition in ancient Mesopotamia. The goddess Ishtar was particularly well known for this practice. The story of the tribal patriarch Judah, who engaged in sex with his daughter-in-law Tamar while she was disguised as a sacred prostitute, indicates that such practices were known in Canaan as well. These priestesses were believed to bring blessing and fertility to the land, because they re-enacted the sacred marriage of heaven and earth.

<sup>26</sup> The meaning of the male form kadesh or qadesh is not entirely clear. In different bible translations the word has been defined in different ways, some of which are: Sodomites (5), male cult prostitutes (2), male prostitutes (2), shrine prostitutes, male shrine prostitutes, male temple prostitutes, sacred prostitutes, men of women's conditions, whoremongers and perverted persons.

<sup>27</sup> Elements of the behaviour of the Qedeshim appear to closely match those of the self-castrated Gallae priests of the Goddess Cybele. As male priests dedicated to the female goddess Asherah they might be expected from its acceptance in Ugarit and the example of other religions to cross dress as well. This has been indicated by Maimonides (see later). However there is disagreement over the question of self-castration. Rosco and Murray argue that they did not do this on the grounds that the qedeshim seem to have lived within temple precincts. Others point out that the place where the "Women weave clothes for Asherah" (2 Kings 23:7) could also be beside the temple and not in its inner precinct. (This is not clear from the original text, and the bible translations differ) Hebrew law also forbade castration, and there is no direct evidence for the practice. (See: Murray, Stephen O; Roscoe, Will. (1997): *"Islamic Homosexualities: Culture, History, and Literature"*: NYU Press, ISBN 0814774687, 9780814774687). Kufler on the other hand presents arguments for the adoption of the practice (see Kufler, M. (2001): *"The Practice of Self-Castration in Early Christianity: The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity"* (Chicago, 2001). A summary article is available [30 November 2012]: at

<http://www.transchristians.org/archive/the-practice-of-self-castration-in-early-christianity>

<sup>28</sup> Saggs, H. W. F. (1987/1965): *"Religion: Everyday Life in Babylonia and Assyria"*. Dorset Press. 1987, reprint of 1965 edition published by Batsford. p. 196.

<sup>29</sup> See for example: 2 Kings 23:7 RSV "And he broke down the houses of the male cult prostitutes which were in the house of the Lord, where the women wove hangings for the Asherah." The correctness or otherwise of the use of the word "prostitute" is questioned in this article.

<sup>30</sup> As followers of a Goddess cult, cross dressing might be expected.

<sup>31</sup> In the bible Baal, (the literal meaning is "lord,") was the local title given to Canaanite fertility gods. According to Canaanite mythology, El was the chief god (from which the Jewish word Elohim derives). El's consort, Asherah was worshipped as the Canaanite mother of all the gods. She represented the giving of life and the primeval sea. Baal was one of the 70 sons of El. He was considered the most powerful of all gods since he eclipsed El, who was seen as rather weak and ineffective. He appears in different forms. The Canaanites worshipped Baal-Hadad as the belligerent God of thunder, storms and rain who defeated enemies and produced crops. He is usually depicted holding a lightning bolt. Baal's sisters/consorts were Ashtoreth (sometimes called Asherah), a fertility goddess associated with the stars, and Anat, a goddess of love and war. In the story given in the Ugaritic Baal cycle, Baal defeated Yamm, the god of the sea. However his brother Mot, the god of death, poisons Baal and confines him to the underworld. Anat finds Baal's body; then she kills Mot and plants Mot's remains in the ground. The result is the revival of Baal. The analogy that seems to be presented in this epic is that of the annual cycle of drought and rainfall associated with the agricultural cycle in the area: The control of the flooding is represented in Baal's conflict with Yamm. The drought occurs when Baal is in the underworld. The rainy season occurs when Baal is on the throne. The harvest corresponds to the winnowing of Mot, and the cycle repeats with Baal's resurrection. Anat is the heroine of this fertility drama for it is by her destruction of Death that Baal can live again. Two features of Ugaritic culture are indicated. One of these is the strength and power of women; and the other is the power, sexual prowess and promiscuity of Baal. There is little indication of nurturing or care in the behaviour



Deuteronomy 23:18-19 says that: “None of the daughters of Israel shall be a qedesha, nor shall any of the sons of Israel be a qadesh. You shall not bring the hire of a prostitute (zonah) or the wages of a dog (kelev) into the house of the Lord your God to pay a vow, for both of these are an abomination to the Lord your God”. The Hebrew word “kelev” may also be used to signify a male dancer or a prostitute<sup>33 34</sup>. Around 622 BC Josiah ordered the High

---

of Anat. These considerations demand a rethink of the purpose of fertility cults. Instead of focussing on sex for its own sake, as the bible suggests, it is the reproductive capability, productivity, strength and virility of crops and offspring that are the major concern. (For a description of Anat, see: Wilson, Ellie. (1993): “*Anat: Autonomous Goddess of Ugarit*”. Presented at Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting, Nov. 1993 [Accessed 29 March 2016] <https://heartwellproductions.wordpress.com/anat-autonomous-goddess-of-ugarit/>). As the Great Mother goddess Cybele was worshipped under many names. These include: Astarte (Syria), Ceres (Rome), Demeter (Greece), Ishtar (Babylon), and Isis (Egypt). The Olympian virgin goddesses include Athena, Minerva, Artemis, Diana and Hestia. Both Anat and Cybele are represented as virgins; and this theme of virginity is common to the Goddess fertility cults. This distancing of the Goddesses from actual participation in acts of sexual intercourse contributes a significant element to the behaviour of the fertility cults. A virgin Goddess could never be sullied by sexual penetration, and reproduction took place by miraculous means. In common with other fertility deities Baal and Anat are associated with power and the violence of the wilderness, mountains and forest. (See for example: Rigoglioso, Marguerite. (2010): “*Virgin Mother Goddesses of Antiquity*” Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-230-61886-2). One of the tablets found at Ugarit indicated that Baal copulated with Anat “by the thousand”, but her virginity remained intact. In the Baal cycle stories this took place when Anat and Baal transformed themselves into a cow and a bull. Maintaining perpetual virginity implies that this act of copulation would be carried out for the first time, for thousands of times. A figurative understanding would be more relevant, where Baal and Anat was inside every person, animal, fish or plant. For every cow and every bull that produces a calf the copulation of Baal and Anat is also seen to take place. That would also be true of the germination of every seed in the ground. The self-castrated priests of the Goddess Cybele were considered more than priests, and were regarded as channels to the Goddess herself. In human activity the copulation of men with eunuchs (who have removed the equipment for sexual arousal and reproduction) could provide the blessings of the Gods and Goddesses to ensure future fertility in their own lives. Ugaritic culture in North Canaan was disappearing at the time when the Israelites were first gaining a foothold in the South and there was a considerable overlap of themes and ideas. For the enemies of these cults the prevalence of the stories of copulation, bestiality and sexual promiscuity makes them easy targets for accusations of the abuse of sex. However when the cults are examined in detail, the degree of abuse that might be expected may not always be found. The difficulties in relating myths to reality are considered by Kimuhu: (Kimhu, Johnson M. (2008): “*Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa*”: Volume 115 of Studies in biblical literature, ISSN 1089-0645. Peter Lang, pp 182-188: ISBN 1433102005, 9781433102004). These disparities of sexual expectation are also found in the descriptions of the behaviour of the qedeshim and qedeshot in Biblical and Ugaritic literature. The traditional bible translations condemn these as prostitutes. However the stories about them in Ugarit take a much more nuanced approach. Their status and behaviour is examined later in this article. Further explorations will be given in Gilchrist, S: “*Sex and Thunderbolts: A Speculation*”: In Preparation.

<sup>32</sup> Alan Hooker contributes an interesting blog on this topic. He argues that the context of 2 Kings 23:4-7 does not, in his opinion, legitimate a translation of “male temple prostitutes.” The problem with these translations is that qdš denotes holiness, and a more fitting translation would be “holy ones,” or “consecrated ones.” (See the descriptions in this article of the Gallae priests). He notes that in King Josiah commands the accoutrements of Baal, Asherah, and the šēbā haššāmāyim (“heavenly host”) to be taken away from the Temple. He puts away the priests, he removes the cult statue of Asherah from the Temple and he burns it in the Kidron valley (2 Kgs. 23:4-6). He also destroys the “houses of haqqēdēšim” which were in or by the Temple, where “the women weave clothes for Asherah.”(2 Kings 23:7) Since the haqqēdēšim were located where the women wove for Asherah, it is probable, in his opinion, that haqqēdēšim, or the “Hosts of Heaven”, are male priests consecrated to Asherah. See <http://awhooker.wordpress.com/tag/sacred-prostitution/>, [accessed 28 November 2012].

See also: Olyan Saul M. (2010) “*What Do We Really Know about Women’s Rites in the Israelite Family Context?*” Department of Religious Studies, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912-1927: Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden. Also available online at:

[http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/docserver/15692116/v10n1\\_s3.pdf?expires=1354221085&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=C1008E53B58E5FEB73B2FB0E5457D559](http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/docserver/15692116/v10n1_s3.pdf?expires=1354221085&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=C1008E53B58E5FEB73B2FB0E5457D559) : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>33</sup> Cross dressing and self-castration was widely practiced in different contexts in the Middle Eastern religious traditions. The priests of the very male god Hercules cross-dressed as women in honour of his time in service dressed as a woman to Queen Omphale. The gods could also appear in other genders. In The Odyssey Athena is described as often going to the aid of people in the guise of men. In the cult of Aphroditus, worshippers of both sexes cross-dressed, men wore women’s clothing and women dressed in men’s clothing. Ritual cross dressing is found in Canaanite fertility religion. Lucian of Samosata and Eusebius write of masquerade in the worship of Astarte, and in the Mishne Torah of Rabbi Moses Maimonides, Deuteronomy 22:5 is debated under the section

Priest Hilkiah to renovate the temple. During this time, Hilkiah claimed to have discovered the lost scroll of the “Book of the Law”, which was written by Moses. Most modern scholars consider that this scroll was a compilation of texts which are now found in Deuteronomy and Leviticus in their present form. The other books of the Pentateuch may have been codified at this time. Other passages may also be relevant. In an earlier pogrom Jehu (ca 842-815 BC) called an assembly of all the worshippers of Baal in Israel. In 2 Kings 10:21-22 it declares that “They crowded into the temple of Baal until it was full from one end to the other. And Jehu said to the keeper of the wardrobe, “Bring robes for all the servants of Baal.” So he brought out robes for them”. After he was certain that only worshippers of Baal remained in the temple, he slaughtered them.

Judaism had to deal with some very unpleasant adjacent gods. Molech<sup>35</sup> was a Canaanite god whose worship according to the bible required children to be sacrificed to him through “Passing through fire”. Molech is condemned four times in the Bible, (see Leviticus 18:21, Leviticus 20:2–5, 2 Kings 23:10 and Jeremiah 32:35). The medieval Jewish philosopher Maimonides said “Men in his day put on women’s clothing to invoke the aid of the goddess Venus and he found it was commanded in the books of the idolaters that men, when they are in the worship of Venus, and the Astarte or Ashtaroth of the Phoenicians<sup>36</sup>, should wear

---

dealing with idolatry. Gender transgression including self-castration is common to many religious traditions. However cross dressing may be carried out in honour of the god or goddess is being worshipped rather than sex. See “*The Works of Lucian of Samosata: Volumes 1, 2, 3 & 4 (Forgotten Books)*”, Fowler F. G., Fowler H. W. (Translators) (2007): Tredition (11 Nov 2011) ISBN-10: 3842462611 ISBN-13: 978-3842462618: Available free on Kindle. See also Maimonides RN45, RN171; Meir MN28, MN164; Chinuch C467, C468.

<sup>34</sup> An interesting aside is given by Cyrus Gordon, in his book “*The Bible and the Ancient Near East*” (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1997), p. 160. Gordon wrote that: “Another biblical law that now can be explained through recourse to the Ugaritic texts is the prohibition against transvestism in Deuteronomy 22:5. This act is described in the Epic of Aqhat as well. After the hero is slain, his sister Pughat seeks revenge against Anat for the murder. To do so, Pughat disguises herself as a male, replete with rouge (the colouration of males, especially warrior heroes), man’s clothing and weaponry. The Israelite reaction is to forbid transvestism, another aspect of Canaanite society that they found reprehensible. Again, one needs to place this in its proper context. No doubt the average Canaanite male or female dressed in proper fashion throughout most his or her life. But since Canaanite epic literature describes transvestism in a noble manner, we may conclude that this act not only was practiced but also was countenanced”. This issue is of course explored in this article.

<sup>35</sup> Although the Bible refers directly to Molech as the God of the Ammonites, little is known about this god. Phoenicia and Carthage were noted (or notorious?) for the practice. Other gods who demanded child sacrifice were Tanit, Cronos/Saturn and Set. At least in myth, the fear of child sacrifice was present in first century Roman society and the noisy processions of the Goddess Cybele were intended to frighten Cronos away. Cleitarchus in his “Scholia” of Plato’s Republic mentions the practice: “There stands in their midst a bronze statue of Cronos, its hands extended over a bronze brazier, the flames of which engulf the child. When the flames fall upon the body, the limbs contract and the open mouth seems almost to be laughing until the contracted body slips quietly into the brazier. Thus it is that the ‘grin’ is known as ‘sardonic laughter,’ since they die laughing”. (<http://www.roger-pearse.com/weblog/2012/05/31/sacrifices-of-children-at-carthage-the-sources/> : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].) However caution should be exercised. The commonality of the various descriptions suggest that the might all come from a single source. Nevertheless it was a practice in Rome to kill unwanted babies by exposing them to the elements and leaving them to die. Child mortality was high in ancient societies and stillbirth was present. The discovery of a child cemetery near Carthage suggests at least some of these might have been ceremonies honouring children who already had died. See: Lobel Jarrett A. (2011). “Child Burials - Carthage, Tunisia”: *Archaeology Archive*: Volume 64 Number 1, January/February 2011 <http://archive.archaeology.org/1101/topten/tunisia.html> : [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>36</sup> The distinctions between gods and goddesses such as Ashtoreth, Astarte and Asherah are not always kept sharp. Often they are combined and are treated as the same. However it is also clear from their histories that they have to be treated as separate goddesses. Asherah was also the name given to the consort of Baal’s father, the supreme God, El. Asherah who was the sister/consort/mother of Baal represents traditional feminine values, and was submissive to men. Her sister was Anat, who was also a sister and spouse of Baal. In contrast to Asherah, Anat was the goddess of battle. In this role she personified the planet Venus. However she was also “the female power of fertility operative in the production of offspring as well as the fertility of the soil”: (Toombs, Lawrence. (1983): “*Baal, Lord of the Earth: The Ugaritic Baal Epic*”, “In the Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth” p621). Ashtoreth was additionally known as the western Semitic equivalent of the Roman Cybele or the

the dress of women, and that women, when in the worship of Mars, and of Moloch of the East, they should put on the armour of men"<sup>37</sup> <sup>38</sup>. The prophets railed against the importation of such beliefs and the acts of immorality into Jewish life. However in 1 Kings 11:7 it is stated that Solomon built a high place for the worship of Molech in the mountain "That is before Jerusalem". It is generally accepted that during the last days of the Jewish kingdom human sacrifices were offered at a place called Topheth, "In the valley of the children of Hinnom." to Yahweh, as King or the Counsellor of the nation.<sup>39</sup> In the standard biblical interpretations, the act of cross dressing is intimately linked to temple prostitution and to unacceptable sex. The Hebrew scripture also identified the surrounding states and religions as centres for all kinds of despicable activities and depraved sex. This evidence would have seemed incontestable before the discovery of the clay tablets and inscriptions found in Ugarit, which was one of the nearby city states that worshipped the same Canaanite gods. The religious and mythological texts give a comprehensive view of Canaanite religious practice and belief<sup>40</sup>. They present an extended picture of the type of fertility religion, characteristic of an agricultural people, which many Israelites adopted during most periods of Israelite history. There is also much less evidence of the gross immorality and the strong sexual obsession that would have been expected from the Hebrew accusations<sup>41</sup>. The cultural differences are examined. It is shown that the main targets for the Jewish invectives could instead have been against the practices of the Goddess religions in dominant Middle Eastern societies, where the abuses of power

---

Babylonian Ishtar, (see Drower, Margaret. (1975) "*Ugarit*," in the Cambridge Ancient History, 3rd edition, II.2, 154): Genealogy gets confusing with the gods!

<sup>37</sup> Townley, James. (2001): "*The Reasons of the Laws of Moses from the "More Nevochim" of Maimonides*. With Notes, Dissertations, and a Life of the Author: London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1827. Reprinted 2001 by the Lawbook Exchange, Ltd: LCCN 00-066334: ISBN 1-58477-168-2.

<sup>38</sup> However this might help explain one interpretation of the first clause in Deuteronomy 22:5 which associated women who cross dress with wearing the apparels of war.

<sup>39</sup> Jewish Encyclopaedia: <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/10937-moloch-molech>

<sup>40</sup> See for example: Knoppers, Gary. (2012): "*Turmoil in the Patriarchy: Goddesses and Femininity in Ancient Ugarit*": CAMS 044U: Elyse Mark: [accessed 30 March 2016] [http://elysemarke-profile.weebly.com/uploads/1/9/4/0/19404323/godesses\\_and\\_feminity\\_in\\_ancient\\_ugarit.docx](http://elysemarke-profile.weebly.com/uploads/1/9/4/0/19404323/godesses_and_feminity_in_ancient_ugarit.docx)

<sup>41</sup> It is shown that the bible had a political motive in defining all foreign religions as purveyors of abusive sex. In the Canaanite texts from Ugarit the equivalent term for Qedeshim is used to describe cultic singers and diviners. Deuteronomy's prohibition of qedeshim and qedeshot has been widely interpreted as referring to ritual prostitution, and the attempted link to homosexuality is evident in the translations of Deuteronomy that render qedeshim as "sodomites." However the evidence supporting for this evaporates on closer scrutiny and the majority of scholars do not link this role to cultic prostitution in any way. The qedeshim in Ugarit were an important and esteemed class of sacred people whose status ranked immediately below those of priests. References to sexual behaviour of any sort are rare and incidental. Apart from one extremely doubtful passage there is no supporting evidence whatever from Ugarit that cultic prostitution or anal penetration was engaged in, either for the joy of sex or lustful acts. There are two texts from Ugarit which suggested that bestiality may have occurred. Prostitution is one of the oldest industries in the world and no doubt it was frequently practiced. Like the Gallae there may have been a duality between the followers who took the way of darkness and those who took the way of light. There are many points of commonality between the Jewish and the Ugaritic religious traditions. However morality has to be judged by the standards of the society in which questioned acts have taken place. No combination of the terms for prostitution and that for the sacred is found in any ancient texts; and all of the ancient sources which describe cult related activities as "prostitution" are descriptions of outsiders. None of the passages in the Bible, with the possible exception of Deuteronomy 23:18 provide a contextual link between the qedeshim, prostitution and associated malpractice. However these biblical condemnations are associated with reforming Kings who sought to rid Judaism from the influence of all foreign worship practices. For that to work it is necessary to assume the all of the other religions around the Jewish state were centres of depravity and irresponsible sex. The evidence that is now available does not demonstrate this, and it has to be questioned as to whether those qedeshim who were within the Judean religious tradition were as immoral as the bible leads people to expect. (See: Kimuhu, Johnson M. (2008): "*Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa*" Peter Lang. ISBN 1433102005, 9781433102004. See Also Greenspahn, Frederick E. (2002): "Homosexuality and the Bible" *CCAR Journal: A Reform Jewish Quarterly* <http://data.ccarnet.org/journal/1102fg.pdf> : [Accessed: 30 March 2016] and Balch, David L. (1999): "*Homosexuality, Science, and the Plain Sense of Scripture*" Erdmans. ISBN-10: 080284698X ISBN-13: 978-0802846983)



and domination by these societies are inflicted on the subject ones through abuses of sex. It also appears that these Jewish conflicts with other religions could be regarded as rehearsals for the later problems that the early Christian Church would face.

In the light of these considerations it is time to re-visit what, perhaps at first sight, is the least likely of these explanations. This demands that women must not put on the weapons of war and a consideration of the interactions between the Canaanite traditions of Ugarit and those of the Israelites is required. Ugaritic culture in North Canaan was disappearing at the time when the Israelites were first gaining a foothold in the South, and there was a considerable overlap of themes and ideas<sup>42</sup>. The consort of El, the supreme Ugaritic God, (from which the Jewish word Elohim derives) was Asherah. There is evidence to show that the consort of the Jewish God, Yahweh in pre-exilic Judaism was also called Asherah, and the symbols of her and her worship are recorded in various places in the Bible<sup>43</sup>. Place names in the Bible also display the equivalent correlations, and the struggles with the followers of Baal are well described. There are three key Gods and Goddesses identified in the Ugaritic Baal cycle: these are: Baal and the two goddesses Asherah and Anat. Asherah represents the feminine aspects of women, which men could put on a pedestal, and keep under their control. In the Baal cycle Asherah is submissive to her husband El. However Anat is exactly the opposite. She is warlike, strong and controlling. She directly attacks the authority of El and would seek to dominate any male. Apart from the reports in the myth that, even though she copulated with Baal by the thousand, she always remained a virgin, there is nothing in the description of her which indicates any involvement or any other interest in sex.

When it is seen from this perspective, Deuteronomy 22:5 is no longer as benign as at first it might appear. The relationships between El, the Canaanite counterpart of the Jewish God Yahweh together with their consorts who at least had the same name, Asherah, are relevant. The Israelites very firmly made Yahweh their supreme God<sup>44</sup>. However in the Canaanite

---

<sup>42</sup> The Canaanite culture originated at the same time as the Babylonian culture out of the chaos surrounding the Amorite infiltration of Sumeria beginning around 2,200 BC. By the time cultural stability was restored around 1800 BC the Babylonians existed in Mesopotamia while the Canaanites (Phoenicians) existed along the Mediterranean. Tablets describing the Canaanite gods including Baal were found in the ruins of the Canaanite city of Ugarit (also known as Ras Shamra) located on the modern coast of Lebanon. These tablets were claimed to be dictated by the chief priest of Ugarit to a scribe between 1375 and 1345 BC. The city itself was destroyed around 1200 BC by the "Sea Peoples" at nearly the same time that the Israelites emerged into history.

<sup>43</sup> The Judean and Ugaritic symbol of Asherah was a pole. In Judaism this may be understood in the same sense that the symbol of Yahweh was the Altar. In this way it could conform to the Second of the Ten Commandments which prevent any graven image being made. It was what was done with these emblems which represented the oblations that were required. That might mean dances round the pole for Asherah, while the oblations for Yahweh were the sacrifices on the Altar. Some of this idea might survive today in the Maypole tradition. An alternative explanation is that the pole represented the staff of Moses. However the identification of Asherah with a pole, or possibly a tree predates that particular explanation, since it is found in Ugarit. One modern author: (Cavendish, Richard. (1995). *"Man, Myth & Magic: The Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Mythology, Religion, and the Unknown"*. Marshall Cavendish": suggests that the pole is intended to represent an upright penis. That sounds very possible because it would be in line with today's understanding, which sees the fertility cults as purveyors of unrestrained sex. There is another incentive for taking this approach which relates to the many figurines that have been found. These represent Asherah and other fertility Goddesses. The figurines emphasise care and nurture, for many show women holding their large and heavy breasts in their cupped hands. Below the breasts there is only a pillar, which some people could interpret as a pole. However the idea that this was a penis would be offensive in the fertility cults because these Goddesses were virgin Goddesses and their authority could never be sullied by the penetration of a male organ. The virginity of the Goddess was paramount, and the suggestion of sexual penetration of the Goddess in this way would not be acceptable to these societies. There is no association with this idea in the Ugaritic or the Jewish texts and the earliest interpretations associate the Asherah pole with a tree instead.

<sup>44</sup> Interestingly the Ten Commandments do not actually prohibit other Gods and Goddesses: The first Commandment is: "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods before Me. The second Commandment is: "You shall not make for

culture, El came to be considered remote and ineffective so that Baal, who was one of El's sons, took over the dominant role. To the Israelites; Baal was the enemy. However the word Baal appears to be used collectively in the Bible to include all of the other Canaanite deities that need not be mentioned by name. Therefore reference to every other Canaanite God and Goddess, (which includes Anat), usually disappears. The consequence of making Anat an enemy together with the prohibition of women putting on weapons of warfare was the denial of the assertive role that was given to women, which Anat represents. The only example which was left for women to follow is the submissive role of Asherah<sup>45</sup>. This establishes the framework which all Jewish women would be expected to adopt, and it provides a religious justification for the gender discrimination that occurred.

There are always two sides to any argument and the attitude of men to women should also be considered. There are many verses in the Bible which honour women as people, for their personal qualities and for their wisdom: but their submission is clearly required. That early Christian and early Jewish declaration is evident in the words which are attributed to Paul in: 1Timothy 2:11-14. "Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet". Even though men had a soul it was argued by some that women did not<sup>46</sup>. In Judean and Roman society, women were denied any form of public role. In Roman society the "Pater familias", the head of the household, was given absolute authority over it. That could include matters of life and death; it also included matters of sex.

Sexual attitudes in Rome were determined by authority and status; and these were enforced from the standpoint of domination and control<sup>47</sup>. This meant that if a male Roman citizen had same-sex intercourse with another male Roman citizen it was only the penetrated partner who was condemned. That was because the penetrated partner was understood to have desecrated the status of citizenship by his consent to the act. The Greeks and Romans had no specific words for heterosexuality and homosexuality; thus modern definitions cannot be used and sexual behaviour was judged on the purpose of each act<sup>48</sup>. Roman citizens were

---

yourself a carved image - any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them nor serve them. For I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations of those who hate Me, but showing mercy to thousands, to those who love Me and keep My commandments. These are very clear instructions to worship Yahweh above all others, and not to make idols and worship them. While the worship of a single supreme being is well understood and is demanded by post-exilic Jewish religion, the extent to which polytheism was allowed before the cleansing of the Temple by King Josiah (641/640 to 610/609 BC), is open to question. There is evidence that Asherah continued to be venerated up to the time of the exile in 597 BC.<sup>45</sup> From the mythic and cultic texts, Asherah was seen to be the chief goddess of Ugarit, as well as of the cities of Tyre and Sidon. Alone of Ugaritic goddesses, Asherah carried a spindle, which identified her with the feminine domestic role, and according to the Ugarit tablets she also acted as a wet nurse to the Gods. She was Goddess of the Stars and the Sea. Therefore, like El, Asherah was primarily a figure of authority, but only that authority which a patriarchal culture accords the feminine. In the Baal Cycle she submitted to her husband while her daughter/sister Anat did not. Asherah and Anat represented opposite end of the Ugaritic female spectrum. In a male dominated Judean patriarchal society it is not surprising that Asherah was accepted while Anat was not.

<sup>46</sup> The idea that women have an instant sex change when they die, in order to enter heaven as men, was of common parlance in the fourth century Church. Augustine devoted one complete chapter to the topic in his work, the "City of God" (This discussion is found in Chapter 17 of book XXII - Whether the Bodies of Women Shall Retain Their Own Sex in the Resurrection). A further commentary on this is found in Saying 144 in the Gospel of Thomas. See sections 2:3:3: "The Genderisation of God" and section 2:3:4: "An Apocryphal Challenge" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "An Unfinished Reformation": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>47</sup> See Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> for a full account

<sup>48</sup> The boundaries placed between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour by the Greek philosophers were not primarily determined by the biological features, they were instead established to separate the noble pursuits of love from the carnal misuses of sex. Responsible behaviour and a committed relationship were also required but loving same-sex or homosexual relationships which possessed an equivalent degree of attachment to those of

expected to act responsibly, but a Roman citizen was able to rape his own slaves, or a man who was of a lesser status, without suffering any penalty for his rape<sup>49</sup>. These same-sex acts of anal penetration are unique deeds that can be used to enforce subjection and domination between conquered and conquering societies. Therefore it is not surprising that the Goddess cults did not just appeal to women, they appealed to the slaves and to all other people who felt disadvantaged and discriminated against by these Roman attitudes to sex. The impact of the Cults, and their popularity were such that Rome could not suppress them. By giving high status to the elements of the cult it approved of, and by condemning the elements that it did not, it tried to tame them instead. The lavish banquets that were organised by fraternities of Roman citizens of high standing who gave official support to the cult of the Goddess were notorious for their ostentation, and for the sexual abuses that Roman society endorsed. This was the nature of the abuses which Paul condemned in Romans 1:18-27, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. These were and still are, rightly and totally condemned in Christian life<sup>50</sup>.

It was not just the Christians who opposed the abuses of male domination. Like the contrast between Asherah and Anat, the Goddess Cults had a dual role in Greco/Roman society. The first of these was the employment of power which challenged male domination. This was in part enforced through their gender disruptive behaviour, myths and threats. The second role promoted fertility, nurture, relationships and care through conscientious acts. Cybele was characterized by many different qualities. Most prominent among these were her universal motherhood. She was the great parent, not only of Gods but of human beings and beasts. Contrary to the present day Christian understanding, Cybele's myths embraced sex and spirituality. They provided an earlier caution against lust and the other sins of excess. They demonstrated that sex and gender were less important to the soul than love. Female concerns and the interests of people who were subjected to abuse by the dominant Roman society were of primary importance and that included responsibility in sex<sup>51</sup>. Cybele and her followers came under vicious attack from the early Christian Church. Nevertheless many of the positive aspects of the Cult were incorporated into the Christian doctrines of the Virgin Mary. However the political messages and campaigns of the Goddess cults were denied. By denying these power struggles the only tools Christianity had left to condemn the Goddess cults were their disruption of the social order and the illegitimate pursuit of sex for the climax it created. Because of the denial of the power struggles, every expression of gender and sexually variant behaviour, which included the sexual abuses considered legitimate inside the dominating Roman culture; together with the gender disruptive behaviour of the Goddess cults, which had challenged these abuses, became uniformly condemned as depraved and disordered acts<sup>52</sup>. Today the Christian condemnations of sexual abuse concentrate entirely on the lust for sex. No vestiges of these power struggles can be found in the present day Christian theology. This means that no investigation of early Christianity, Roman society or the Goddess cults can ever be complete without giving full attention to these dualities in the behaviour of the Goddess cults, including the relationships between power and sex.

---

heterosexual relationships could be endorsed provided the correct social boundaries were met. See sections 3:2:3: "Same-Sex Love" and section 4:1: "Current Attitudes" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*". Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> Also Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*". Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>49</sup> Some controls did exist, but they were pragmatic ones which related to the ordering of society rather than the consequences of rape.

<sup>50</sup> See Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*". Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>51</sup> See section 2:3:2: "Transition and Resistance" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*". Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>52</sup> Cultural clashes can also be very important. What is acceptable in one society may be abhorred in another, and that applies here to certain same-sex acts.

It is important to note that gender and sexual identities form independently of each other. Therefore as wide a range of sexual orientations and identities are found within the gender variant communities as those which exist in the population at large. Thus being transgender is no indication of sexual identity or orientation, and the reverse also applies<sup>53</sup>. However the same types of formation processes are involved in both cases. In many respects gender and sexually variant people share similar issues in terms of their relationships with society and that is why they can be considered together in this account.

Large numbers of small figurines are ubiquitously discovered in the Middle Eastern Goddess fertility cults<sup>54</sup>. Those which represent the Goddess Asherah have been uncovered in many Jewish archaeological sites before and including the late monarchy; and they give further evidence that Asherah continued to be venerated within Judaism to the time when the Exile occurred<sup>55</sup>. The figurines are often mass produced and they are quite crudely moulded. Their purpose still remains unclear<sup>56</sup>. In these figurines the genital region is not shown and they usually depict women who hold their oversized breasts cupped in their hands. They are often called pillar figurines because, below the breasts, there is only the pillar on which they stand. However another completely different form of image is associated with Cult of the Goddess Cybele. These images are of men<sup>57</sup>. Some of the Roman images may have oversized erect penises<sup>58</sup>. With these contrasting sets of images the social divisions in Roman society and contrasting implications become very clear. Thus the disparity between the focus on virility,

---

<sup>53</sup> For an extended analysis of their formations see: Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*Personality Development and LGB&T People: A New Approach*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/201P-PersonalityDevelopmentAndLGBTPeople.pdf>

<sup>54</sup> Figurines of nude women are known from the Neolithic through all later periods, and in all areas of the Near East, from Egypt to Iran. In prehistory, there are no written records to explain these mute figurines, but they are commonly assumed to be images of the goddess and/or images for fertility magic. Their exaggerated hips and breasts could also be understood as stylized conventions for rendering ideal feminine beauty. No evidence exists to identify the typical figurine with any major goddess. On the rare occasions that goddesses were depicted naked, they can be distinguished by context, stance, or attribute. Written records and anthropological evidence suggest numerous possible functions and meanings for these miniature human representations. Magical ritual texts specify how the figurines of a sick person are to be used during healing rituals. An alternative suggestion put forward by the author is that they might have been used as talismans to grip while the pains of childbirth were being endured.

<sup>55</sup> Közeghy, Milkós. (2015): "The Female Body and the Archaeology of Palestine" also: "The Female Body in Israel and Judah Before the Exile" in: "Religion and Female Body in Ancient Judaism and Its Environments". Volume 28 of Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies. Editor: Xeravits, Géza G. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. ISBN 3110410125, 9783110410129

<sup>56</sup> There is an immense range of possible uses for figurines. They may have been cult figures, focal points of veneration in a private household shrine or public chapel. Conversely, figurines found in temples may well have been votive offerings given by worshippers to the deity, expressing their donors' fervent piety, heartfelt thankfulness, or heartfelt entreaty. Figurines discovered in temple depositories may have been images created as part of a temple ritual. Outside the temple, figurines were used in magic rituals to prevent or produce certain situations or states, such as ensuring fertility or good luck, warding off evil, curing illness, or causing harm to others. In these situations, the figurines might serve as talismans, amulets, fetishes, or therapeutic objects. These varied functions are known from many texts recording charms, incantations, and descriptive rituals. On a more personal level, figurines might be markers of special times such as birthing or rebirthing, or periods of transition or of other time-based processes such as female menstrual cycles. Figurines were employed as educational aids and teaching figures, used in initiation or puberty rites to illustrate sexual topics for adolescents of both sexes. Diminutive anthropomorphic images were also undoubtedly put to use as toys, in particular as dolls. They could also be adapted to illustrate songs, epics, or myths. Figurines may have been placed in graves as part of burial rites to counteract the harmful effects of the ghost of the dead, as substitutes for the dead person's body in the next world, as images of a protective deity who guided the deceased to the underworld, or perhaps as favourite possessions to be enjoyed by the dead in the afterlife. See: Johnston, Philip. (2003): "Figuring Out Figurines": *Tyndale Bulletin* 54.2 (2003) 81-104. [Accessed 30 March 2016] [http://www.tyndalehouse.com/tyndbul/library/TynBull\\_2003\\_54\\_2\\_07\\_Johnston\\_Figurines.pdf](http://www.tyndalehouse.com/tyndbul/library/TynBull_2003_54_2_07_Johnston_Figurines.pdf) : for further discussion. [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>57</sup> The Kuretes or Dactyls had two functions. One was a warrior band to protect Zeus. The second represented the technical skills, including metalworking and equivalent needs.

<sup>58</sup> To express the Roman emphasis on the penis as a sign of domination and virility



sexual and technical prowess of one set of imagery; and the emphasis upon creating and nurturing fertile, healthy and robust offspring by the powers of the virgin Goddess on the other, is reinforced. The differences between the two types of image may help to identify the cultural challenges that were faced, and this suggests that a re-think of the precepts of the fertility cults is needed in the present day<sup>59</sup>.

An important role for the Greco/Roman Goddess cults is played out in their struggles against the power of men over women, and the division of their roles in society. The same disputes can be seen in the Canaanite relationships between Asherah and Anat. Here the impact of the power struggles is considered. The images of males in the cult of Cybele represented the Kuretes or the Dactyls. These were a mythical band of warriors who were appointed by the Mother of the Gods to guard the infant god Zeus. At this time Zeus was hidden in a cave on Mount Ida in Crete to keep him safe from being devoured by his cannibalistic father, who was the god Cronus. The Kuretes drowned out his cries with their frenzied dances, which involved the clashing of spears and shields<sup>60</sup>. This same type of frenzied ceremony was re-enacted in Rome by the followers of Cybele every year. Cybele also represented the power associated with wild mountains, torrents and forests. Her entries were characterised by the forcefulness of her arrivals, riding a chariot accompanied by two lions on either side. Greece and Rome both sought and recognised the power of the Goddess when they called on her to save them from military defeat during 412 BC and 205 BC, by formally welcoming her into their societies<sup>61</sup>. However in behaviour which can be compared to that of Anat, the gender disruption created by the Goddess Cults and the activities of their self-castrated priests created a direct challenge and threat to the gendered security of a male dominated society. The expressions of this disruption could be extreme<sup>62</sup>. As well as challenging the social order of Roman society and culture, the unregulated behaviour of the Goddess cults was considered an affront to the respectability which this gender unequal culture sought to present. There was a great deal of sexual decadence in this society at the time. There is also no doubt that at least some of the devotees and the institutions of the Goddess cults were just as guilty of these misdemeanours, and that was used to attack the activities of the cults.

Jezebel was the daughter of Ethbaal, who was the King of Sidon. She was the wife of Ahab, King of Northern Israel. According to the Bible, Jezebel incited her husband, King Ahab to abandon the worship of Yahweh and to encourage worship of the deities Baal and Asherah instead. Jezebel persecuted the prophets of Yahweh, and fabricated evidence of blasphemy against an innocent landowner who refused to sell his property to King Ahab thereby causing

---

<sup>59</sup> See: Edwards, Eric. (2013): "The Cult of the Mother Goddess": Collected Works. [Accessed: 30 March 2016] at: <https://ericwedwards.wordpress.com/2013/07/17/the-cult-of-the-mother-goddess/> : Rigoglioso, Marguerite. (2010): "Virgin Mother Goddesses of Antiquity" Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-230-61886-2. An introduction is available at: <http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/doi/finder/view/10.1057/9780230113121> [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>60</sup> For the full story, see: Strabo, *Geography* 10. 3. 11 (trans. Jones) (Greek geographer Ca. 1<sup>st</sup> Century B.C. to 1<sup>st</sup> Century A.D.). [Accessed: 30 March 2016]. Access at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0198%3Abook%3D10>

<sup>61</sup> See section 1:1:2 "Social Dynamics" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*". Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>62</sup> The three goddesses who stood at the head of the goddess cults in the three different cultural regions of the Middle East, - Cybele, Bahuchara Mata, and Inanna/Ishtar all shared important traits. All of the goddesses were credited with the power to inspire divine madness that could include the transformation of gender. In all of the three regions the respective goddess-inspired priests were believed to belong to a distinct gender category, and all of the goddess religions transgressed the patriarchal roles and structures of society just as much as their castrated male followers did. Their mythologies clearly placed them outside the patriarchal domestic sphere: See Section 13:0: "Worship and Behaviour" of in Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

the landowner to be put to death. For these transgressions against the God and people of Israel, Jezebel met a gruesome death – she was thrown out of a window by members of her own court retinue, with the flesh of her corpse eaten by stray dogs. A question to ask is, was Jezebel as evil as the bible presents, or a strong woman the traditions of Ugarit expects?<sup>63</sup>

It should be made clear that no condonation of any form of abusive sex is established by this study. Moral standards which are at least as high as those at present should continue to be applied. An aim of this examination is to determine the reasons why this abuse occurred: and that involves the relationships between power and sex. In Ugarit, Asherah represented the virtues of domesticity and of submission. Apart from the copulatory practices which are described in the Ugaritic tablets, Anat does not display any maternal instincts, nor does she reveal any other interest in sex. It is also observed that the mythical copulatory exploits of the male protagonists were the demonstrations of virility and fertility, rather than a search for the climaxes of sex. The Bible is understood to treat the Qedeshim and Qedeshot as whores and prostitutes, but some 600 years earlier in Ugarit, they were given a more positive and a much less sexual role. The same reductions in sexual connotation seem to be supported in the images that the figurines depict. In Judaism the non-appearance of genitalia in the pillar images of Asherah direct the attention towards her enlarged and heavy breasts and away from the sexual acts. The images of Asherah from the Ugaritic tradition, (which are not pillar figurines), similarly show her with naked breasts, but with the lower part of her body covered by a large garment, which could be trousers or a skirt<sup>64</sup>. Early images of Cybele show her sitting on a chair while giving birth. Later images omit the birth element but they always show her sitting or standing fully clothed, and in a pose which to the author, is reminiscent of a matriarch, or a maiden aunt. The perpetual virginity attributed to the Goddesses is a further indication that the sexual behaviour was much more nuanced than the bible presents<sup>65</sup>. This change in focus also contradicts the Christian tradition, which always portrays the Goddess cults as being purely in the pursuit of depraved and abusive sex.

These two examples uphold the dual nature of the Goddess cults. One is that of exercising the responsibilities of care, nurture, love and fertility which are essential for the robustness of offspring (and crops) needed for the wellbeing of society. The other is that of challenging the gender discrimination and sexual abuses applied to women, slaves and to those who were disadvantaged in the male dominated and authoritarian society. The cultural clashes had a strong influence. Major problems which arise from the clashes between different societies are those of determining the differences between what should be considered abuse; and what should not. Some activities that are acceptable in one society could be horrific in the other; and the intentions of all participants must be judged by the moralities expected in their

---

<sup>63</sup> Watson, Wilfred. Wyatt, Nicholas. (1999): *“Handbook of Ugaritic Studies”*. Section 1 The Near and Middle East. Brill. ISBN 9004294104, 9789004294103P670

<sup>64</sup> This is in contrast to the images of other goddesses where the sexual imagery is explicit and provocative. There were other cults which sanctioned the abuse of sex. What seems to be more important for the fertility cults is the miracle of reproduction rather than the sexual act.

<sup>65</sup> This is not quite as expected. It could reflect the situation where permission for sexual acts was given by the inequalities of power between different people and societies. Therefore it was this power difference that gave men the freedom to enjoy the climaxes of sex. It is argued that the fertility cults, because of their concern for women’s issues and the disadvantaged opposed these abuses of sex. As with Roman society there may have been strong moral constraints imposed on sexual acts between two people of equal status. It is of interest to note that the Judean condemnations of Sodom and Gomorrah focussed on the lack of hospitality and respect instead of ascribing a particular horror to the acts of rape and same-sex intercourse, around which the story is based. Many modern interpretations of this story do exactly the reverse. The moralities involved are still very much a matter of conjecture. More work is required in examining how the cultural attitudes to the act of same-sex intercourse have changed over time. It is argued that major cultural changes took place.

own societies<sup>66</sup>. The enormity of the cultural clashes and the great antagonism encountered between Judean and Roman society brought many difficulties. These differences emphasise the need to distinguish between the sexual activities that arise from the outpouring of love, and those which have the purpose of abuse in their acts.

Almost the same challenges came from another source. The Gospel which Jesus preached was to the poor, the oppressed and downtrodden of society<sup>67</sup>. The status that Jesus gave to women has been said to be without parallel within the ancient world<sup>68</sup>. The challenges that he made to people in authority, and the ferocity of the words which he used to attack them were clear and direct<sup>69</sup>. Although the Gospel which Jesus preached asked people to work within society to change it; he did not expect this to bring peace. He said: "Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword"<sup>70</sup>. The teaching of Jesus is summarised by Paul in Galatians 3:28: "So in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith, for all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus". For a Roman society which was built on the backs of the conquest and domination of others, this teaching challenged the male dominated power structures upon which it was based.

Some form of adaptation was needed if Christianity was to succeed in transferring the moral values presented by a protesting sect that came from an oppressed and conquered society into values which were acceptable to a dominant state. Therefore constant themes in the Epistles and Letters of Peter and Paul were those of maintaining the high moral values of the new religion, and obtaining respectability for the Christian Church. That meant conforming to the social divisions of Roman society, and in part this meant transferring the gender divisions which were already present in first century Jewish culture, into the Roman state. Therefore the submission of women to men in public life was expected. This is clearly set out in words

---

<sup>66</sup> This is expressed for example in different attitudes to same-sex intercourse. About half of the Greek and Roman Goddesses were virgins. Their authority could not be sullied or reduced by any act of male penetration, and this was one of the arguments for the castration of the male Gallae priests. Celibate eunuch priests could be given an even higher reverence than that given to any voluntary celibates, because of the sacrifice of their actions, and the knowledge that they could not stray from that path. They could however be anally penetrated but they could not climax, therefore all male rewards were removed. The issue of temple prostitution is a complex topic. Some may have taken advantage of their situation entirely for the misuse of sex, but there were other reasons for eunuch priests to offer themselves to men for anal penetration. It could be a method of transmitting the blessings of the virgin goddess to laymen who were seeking fertility in their own reproductive lives. Within the moral values of Greco/Roman society this would be a positive act. See also section 3: "Relationships and the Early Church" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>67</sup> See for example Luke 4:18

<sup>68</sup> See section 5:2 "Jesus and Women" in: Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*From Gender Transcendence to Gender Complementarity: the Development of Attitudes to Gender and Sexuality in the Early and the Modern Church*": Access at: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/007B-FromGndrTranscToGndrComp.pdf> : "The most striking thing about the role of women in the life and teaching of Jesus is that they are always present, and the continual testimony to the presence of women amongst the followers of Jesus and his serious teaching and treatment of them is a break with tradition which has been described as being without any precedent in contemporary Judaism. Of all of the founders of religions and religious sects, Jesus stands alone as the one who did not discriminate against women in any way". (See also for example: Stagg, Evelyn and Frank. "*Woman in the World of Jesus*": Westminster John Knox, 1978: ISBN 978-0-664-24195-7. Bilezikian, Gilbert. "*Beyond Sex Roles*": Baker, 1989: ISBN 0-8010-0885-9 p.82. King, Karen L. "*Women in Ancient Christianity: The New Discoveries*." PBS Frontline. Frontline is produced by the WGBH Educational Foundation. WGBH is a major producer of programs for PBS, the U.S. public television network <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/religion/first/women.html> [Accessed: 30 March 2016].

<sup>69</sup> See for example Mark 7:1-23

<sup>70</sup> See for example Matthew 10:34-40

which are attributed to Paul and Peter in the New Testament<sup>71</sup>. Paul's condemnation of "Soft men" should likewise be noted<sup>72</sup> and the use of Deuteronomy 22:5 by Clement of Alexandria reinforces the theme<sup>73</sup>. The prayer which asks a Jewish man to "Thank God he was not born a woman," may also be cited<sup>74</sup>. Even though the types of gender complementarity which were practiced by Judaism and Roman culture gave equal esteem to the two sexes inside the heavenly realm, on earth the divisions of men and women into separate gender defined roles meant that severe gender and sexual discrimination did occur<sup>75</sup>. In this investigation it is shown that Christianity merely embraced the Jewish ethics and values and transferred them into its own traditions. The teachings of Jesus have not fully been taken into account; and the reasons for that omission are discussed elsewhere<sup>76</sup>.

This account can only briefly summarise the changes in attitude that have taken place from antiquity up to the present time. The blatant abuse of same-sex intercourse and rape within Roman society in ways that rewarded the dominant person and humiliated the subject one was utterly abhorred by Judaism. There was also severe sexual decadence in first century Rome. It is indicated earlier that abuses of power and sex were the principal focus of Paul's disapproval in Romans 1:18-27, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10<sup>77</sup>. The same criteria were applied to the prohibitions of Leviticus 18:33 and 20:13. It is shown elsewhere in this analysis that these prohibitions were applied exclusively to same-sex intercourse, and to no other same-sex act of sex<sup>78</sup>. They were also aimed towards the purposes to which the act of same-sex intercourse was put, and they did not indicate an intrinsic horror of the act.

It is also shown that the prohibitions of Deuteronomy 22:5 were used to reinforce the power structures and gender divisions in a gender unfair and discriminatory society in an equivalent way to that in which Leviticus was employed to condemn the same-sex sexual acts. In this analysis it has been demonstrated how, in the Old Testament, one particular interpretation of Deuteronomy 22:5 was employed to enforce the authority of men over women. It is similarly shown how Clement applied this passage inside the early Christian Church for the same

<sup>71</sup> See section 3:5: "Understanding, Discipline and Doctrine": of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>72</sup> See section 3:1:2: "First Century Greek and Roman Attitudes" of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>73</sup> Around AD 195 Clement of Alexandria wrote: "What is the purpose in the Law's prohibition against a man wearing woman's clothing? Is it not that the Law would have us to be masculine and not to be effeminate in either person or actions - or in thought and word? Rather, it would have the man who devotes himself to the truth to be masculine both in acts of endurance and patience - in life, conduct, word, and discipline". Clement of Alexandria (ca 195): "The Paedagogus: The Instructor (Book III)". Translated by William Wilson: From Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2: Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe: Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885: Also available [27 November 2012] at: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02093.htm>

<sup>74</sup> This daily prayer asks Jews to thank God that they were not born Gentiles, women, or slaves. The prayer is this: "Blessed are you, G-d, King of the Universe, for not having made me a Gentile." "Blessed are you, G-d, King of the Universe, for not having made me a slave." "Blessed are you, G-d, King of the Universe, for not having made me a woman." This prayer is to be said every morning by millions of Jews around the world. According to most customs, the text of the blessing for a woman is "Blessed are you, G-d. You made me according to Your will". Modern interpretations of this prayer are various but in the first century it would have confirmed on a daily basis the subservient role.

<sup>75</sup> Men and women were considered different in essence, not in value. See Section 5 of Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> for a full account

<sup>76</sup> It is often considered that Jesus remained silent on these issues. However in Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*" this is shown not to be the case. Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>77</sup> See Section 3 of Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> for a full account

<sup>78</sup> See Section 2 of Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> for a full account



purpose. The need for these prohibitions arose directly from the gender discrimination and sexual abuses which were endemic inside the first century and earlier societies. Enormous changes have taken place during the last two thousand years. In the gender discriminatory and unequal societies which still continue today the prohibitions of Leviticus 18:33 and 20:13 and Deuteronomy 22:5 continue to have force. However their impact disappears when the foundations upon which they are based are removed. Therefore in gender equal societies of present day, and at all times in any religious belief which is guided by the New Covenant and the Gospel teaching, where; as Paul states in Galatians 3:28, all people “Live as one in the love of Christ”, there should be no doctrines, nor should there be any institution, nor should there be the scapegoating and the rejection, which sets apart any person and prevents them from entirely living out this commitment to the Christian Gospel in ways that are wholly true to themselves and to their own identities, in the Spirit and in the Love of Christ.

There is however a different way of reading Deuteronomy 22:5. This passage is found in the Holiness Code section of Leviticus, which is directly concerned with the behaviour of the priests. In this interpretation it is a direct instruction to the priests in their practice of worship. It also forms part of the rules of the Second Temple and when that temple fell in AD 70 those rules ceased to have their effect. This priestly understanding does not preclude any more general expositions when it is applied to other situations, and this can be observed in the different interpretations which have been given in this account. The most serious is the support for gender discrimination. However every interpretation condemns cross dressing for dishonest or destructive action. None of them prohibit it for just purpose, and this passage is rightly put in the section of the Holiness Code in Leviticus which deals with deceit.

Although the prohibitions which are contained in Deuteronomy 22:5 implicitly support the condemnations of the Gallae<sup>79</sup> by Augustine and the others, they are directed to the purpose of cross dressing, rather than to condemn the actions of cross dressing itself. The Christian use of the specific condemnation of cross dressing which is contained in Deuteronomy 22:5 would also be far more relevant to a Jewish audience than to a Greco/Roman one, and this may be why it does not seem to be given a prominent place. Even though sexual impropriety and effeminacy may have been the declared reasons for the condemnations of the Gallae by Augustine, Maternus and others: Another and perhaps more accurate Christian reason; may have been that of maintaining the respectability of the Church<sup>80</sup>.

For about the first three hundred years of its existence, the Christian Church continued to condemn same-sex intercourse on the grounds of discrimination and abuse<sup>81</sup>. However it could not directly condemn the power structures and institutions which had made its growth possible; because it had consented to these in order to obtain respectability for the Church. There is the danger of treating the needs, politics and stories which belong to one religion or society as being representative of them. This analysis examines the relationships between power and sex in the ancient world. However there is little direct evidence for these power struggles to be found within the bible itself. The Bible portrays the surrounding cultures as hotbeds of depraved sex. It is certainly true that activities which are horrific in one society can be acceptable in another. However the more one examines the surrounding societies the more one finds that the sexual attitudes are driven through the enforcement of subjection and domination and power and control: rather than by the simple abuses for the pleasures of

---

<sup>79</sup> Self-castrated male priests of the Goddess Cybele, who dress as women.

<sup>80</sup> Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*An Unfinished Reformation*”: Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>81</sup> Gilchrist, S. (2011) *Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>

sex. A useful overview of Middle Eastern religions is given by Johnston<sup>82</sup>. What is notable from this, and from other overviews, are the great differences that are found: and this is why a broader perspective is required. This analysis of Deuteronomy 22:5 forms one part of a much larger investigation which fuses the results of a neurophysiological and psychological analysis with the theology of the Christian Church<sup>83</sup>. These issues of power and control are considered, and an extended analysis of the teaching of Jesus is made<sup>84</sup>.

Paul's statement in Galatians 3:28 can be tested both from the scientific and the theological perspectives. The neurophysiological and psychological study demonstrates that as wide a range of moral attitudes must exist among gender and sexually variant people as there are in the population at large. Jesus makes exactly the same distinction in his teaching in the Gospels and the New Covenant, where the prohibitions that were previously based on the letter of the Law are now to be interpreted within the context of love, and also upon the intention of the acts. It is demonstrated that in the teaching of Jesus, all transgendered, transsexual, lesbian, gay, heterosexual and bisexual people who attempt to live their lives in ways that fulfil the love of Christ, and who seek to express their own identities in the roles that are true to themselves; must be accepted alike. All behaviour is governed by the purity of intention and there is no automatic condemnation of any cross-gender or same-sex act.

Over the centuries much effort has been put into finding what the correct interpretation of Deuteronomy 22:5 should be. However it is also clear that the accepted interpretation of the verse has changed as society changes. The use of one single Old Testament verse is also a very weak foundation for the different fundamental theological and pastoral judgements that have been applied to it, especially in light of 1 Samuel 16:7: "God does not see as mortals see: they look on the outward appearance, but God looks on the heart".<sup>85</sup>

-----

© Susan Gilchrist 2015: All Rights Reserved. Permission is granted to reproduce this work for personal and educational use only. Commercial copying, hiring and lending is prohibited. Other reproduction and onward transmission in any form without written permission is prohibited.

This Paper is available online at: Gilchrist, S. (2015): Gilchrist, S. (2015e): "*Deuteronomy 22:5*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

Notes for this paper are posted on: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/notes022B>

Contact: [spap4144@gmail.com](mailto:spap4144@gmail.com)

---

<sup>82</sup> Johnston, Sarah Iles. (2004): "*Religions of the Ancient World: A Guide*": Harvard University Press ISBN-10: 0674015177 ISBN-13: 978-0674015173

<sup>83</sup> Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>84</sup> See sections 7 and 8 of: Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process*". Other analyses are given in: Gilchrist, S. (2014): "*Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church*" and Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

<sup>85</sup> Horton, David (1994) "*Changing Channels? A Christian Response to the Transvestite and Transsexual*" Grove code: E92-ebook. ISBN: 1851742581. This book is now out of print but it may be bought online at: [http://www.grovebooks.co.uk/cart.php?target=product&product\\_id=16755&category\\_id=346](http://www.grovebooks.co.uk/cart.php?target=product&product_id=16755&category_id=346)

This paper is also extracted and expanded from section 17 of: Gilchrist, S: (2013): "*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*":  
<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/015B-GenderSexualityChurch.pdf> .

An introduction to the more extended analysis referred to in this paper is given in Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Taking a Different Path*". Chapter 10 in: "*This Is My Body: Hearing the Theology of Transgender Christians*", Editors: Beardsley, T. and O'Brien, M: Darton Longman and Todd: ISBN 978-0232-53206-7. Notes for this chapter are available on:  
<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/notes210P/index.htm>

"Humanity is greatly enhanced by advancements of science. Humanity is greatly diminished by its failures to think beyond a literal approach"

© Susan Gilchrist 2015