

EMBRACING THE INNER WHOLENESS:
AN ANDROGYNOUS DIMENSION TO CLASSIC CREATION MYTHS

By

JUE WANG

A capstone submitted to the

Graduate School-Camden

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Arts

Graduate Program in Liberal Studies

Written under the direction of

Dr. Stuart Charmé

And approved by

Dr. Stuart Charmé

Camden, New Jersey

October 2022

CAPSTONE ABSTRACT

Embracing the Inner Wholeness:

An Androgynous Dimension to Classic Creation Myths

By JUE WANG

Capstone Director:

Dr. Stuart Charmé

This paper attempts to uncover an androgynous dimension to gender roles in classic creation myths and to discuss its practical implications for individuals through a Jungian psychological perspective. To achieve this goal, I first analyze three classic creation myths (Genesis creation myth, Enuma Elish, and the Taoist story of creation) from both traditional and androgynous perspectives. By comparison, I find that an androgynous interpretation could be an antidote for fixed gender roles because it offers the individual the possibility to build a more inclusive personality that could contain both masculine and feminine traits. Next, using Jungian theories related to the collective unconscious and individuation process, I show the possible existence of the androgyny archetype in the human psyche and suggest that embracing our opposite side (anima or animus) is a way to return to our psychological wholeness. Last, using the locus of control theory, I provide experimental evidence to support the significance of psyche wholeness, that is, people who obtain both masculine and feminine traits have a higher score on the internal control orientation and therefore live a more satisfying life.

Part One: Uncovering an Androgynous Dimension to Classic Creation Myths

Introduction

The narrative thread of the two sexes descending from a single androgynous source appears to be a cross-cultural plot in creation myths. According to Massetti Miller (1982), the concept of androgyny which refers to the integration of male and female traits “is central to ancient myths and religions” (p. 3). Through the analysis of different creation stories, I find that they often include the following process: from the void of nothing emerged or appeared an androgynous entity that created or split into two opposite parts. The union of these two oppositions created everything in the world. By analyzing the androgynous elements in different creation myths, I try to argue that although there are several ways to explain creation stories, the androgynous interpretation could be the most promising one for a liberal society. In the androgynous interpretation, androgyny symbolizes the wholeness (the union of two opposites) in creation stories, in this case, every individual was born with both masculine and feminine traits. Hence, analyzing the creation process in different creation myths may provide us a clue to better explain human potential regarding gender roles. To do so, I will discuss three chosen creation myths first, and then discuss the similarities between them. As my three main examples, I have chosen Genesis, the Enuma Elish, and the Taoist story of creation. All three creation accounts are cosmogonies, a type of creation myth in which not only are the origins of certain phenomena explained but the processes by which they are created are also explained. I have chosen these three myths because they cover both Eastern and Western religions; they have different ways of narrating the creation, and they all have a large population base of believers.

Genesis Creation Narrative

The title, “Genesis,” comes from the opening words of the first book of the Bible: “In the beginning...” Genesis narrates the history of the world. It was created by Jews and adopted by Christians, so the Genesis creation narrative is the creation myth of Judaism and Christianity. Like other old creation myths, the Genesis creation story was passed down and spread orally before the invention of writing. The later participation of different authors and editors in the composition of the written version of the Genesis creation story produced a number of conflicting and contradictory details between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. For example, the first part of Genesis (1:1-2:3) differed from the later parts (2:4-3:24) in several ways (Table 1). These differences, according to Biblical scholars, may indicate the existence of several Genesis accounts from different sources (the Priestly, Jahwist, Deuteronomist, and Elohist) before those accounts were anthologized together in Genesis (Patzia, 2010). By discussing different interpretations of the creation process in Genesis, this part of my paper aims to show that differential readings could lead to various explanations of gender roles. I aim to show how specific factors may have a strong effect on the way that the myth could be used as either a foundation or an Achilles’ Heel of the patriarchal gender roles. In addition, I wish to demonstrate how two different parts could coexist in the androgynous interpretation and suggest that androgynous interpretation is a more inclusive explanation than the traditional one.

Gen 1:1-2:3 and its Possible Meanings

In the first account of the Genesis creation story, God created the binaries of heaven and earth from the formless and empty world. If we consider the world before the

appearance of God as the original starting point (0,0), the God who brings change is the source who created all things in the world. In the first five days, God separated the light from the darkness, separated the sky from the water, and separated dry ground from the sea. In this process, one noteworthy detail is that these three sets of opposites were fused together before, otherwise God would not have to separate them. Thus, the process of creating the world in the first five days implies the original wholeness which contains two opposite sides (light vs. dark, wet vs. dry, land vs. sky). During this process, God divided the whole primordial existence into binary opposites. However, these binary opposites are not fixed, but fluid. The lengths of days and nights vary with the seasons rather than being constant. The same 6:30 pm can be classified as daytime in summer but nighttime in winter. Also, the extent of oceans and land will change while climate changes. Even the distance between the sky and the land can vary depending on various altitudes. This information is essential to our current binary gender roles, if the rest of the binary opposites created by God are fluid, then binary genders, as part of God's creation, should also be fluid.

As a fluid entity, the water element could be seen as one of the symbols of androgyny in the story because it has a gentle side (feminine) and a turbulent side (masculine). This element is mentioned many times during the creation process:

..., and the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters (1:2)

Then God said, "let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters" (1:6)

Then God said, "Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear;" and it was so (1:9)

Then God said, “Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens” (1:20¹)

From these descriptions related to the water, we could get the following information: before the appearance of the sky and the land, the world may be full of waters, and these waters exist as a whole. The sky and the land appeared when the first water was divided, and life began from water and was nourished by water. Based on these narratives, the world, or most parts of the world came from water. This is not a single case, and the indispensable element of water could be found in different creation stories of other cultures and religions. I will discuss the meaning of water in different stories in depth when I compare different myths later.

Not only is the water element present in Genesis but the concept of androgyny as well. On the sixth day, after creating the sky, earth, plants, and animals, God began to create human beings. God said:

Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth. (1:26)

This sentence is important because it describes the original human state. The man God wants to make is not only in the image of God but also in a position to rule over everything else. Then, the creation story further explains what the first humans looked like: “God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and

¹ Bible quotes, if not indicated otherwise, from New American Standard Bible, Nashville 1995.

female he created them” (1:28). This narrative may contain at least two important messages, together they may provide a clue of androgyny metaphor in the creation process. The first one is that the first human should look like God—physically, competently, or both. Since there are many diverse interpretations of the “image of God,” many Biblical authors, Christians, and philosophers “endorse the theological concept of God described by the Bible—an entity that is omniscient, omnipresent, and capable of any action” (Morewedge, 2008, p. 183). Under this interpretation, they would deny that God is a being. Thus, the only way in which people could “look like” God could be that the first human, like God himself, has the ability to create. However, some studies of religion and philosophy reveal that the image of God has sometimes been anthropomorphized (Epley et al., 2007). The anthropomorphic view describes God as an agent with humanlike characteristics and maybe even a humanlike body (“figurative anthropomorphism” or “metaphoric anthropomorphism”) (Hamori, 2008). In this case, “in his own image” could mean that God created man in his own image, or God created man in his own image and this man also has the ability like God.

The second message is the idea that God created them “male and female” at the same time. There are at least two different ways to explain this message. One interpretation is that it could lead to the assumption that “the image of God” is synonymous with “male and female.” If this is true, then God and original humans are androgynous, as they contain both male and female sides. In this sense, men and women are equal as they are two opposites of God. Another assumption is that God created males and females at the same time, but they all look like God himself. This assumption also implies equality between men and women, but it is incompatible with the Adam and Eve

story in the second chapter of Genesis. Since if God created males and females at the same time, he no longer needed to create Eve from the rib of Adam.

However, when considering the Hebrew meaning of the word “Adam,” we may have a slightly different view on the above inference. According to Mortenson (2006), “the Hebrew word adam is translated either as “man” or “Adam” depending on context and on the presence or lack of the definite article (“the” in English, ha in Hebrew)” (para. 2). In this case, we have “ha-adam” (referring to either the first man or to mankind as a whole) in Genesis 1-3 and “adam” in chapter two. That is, “male and female he created them” could mean that God created humans in two types: male and female. Even so, Mortenson (2006) points out that since God stated that he created man in “his” (singular) image, “this is a subtle but very significant witness to the triune nature of God—a plurality in unity” (para. 4). Therefore, the only way to make these two messages reasonable at the same time is to assume that God himself is a union of both opposite parts. Otherwise, he cannot create both the male and female out of his own image. On the seventh day, God finished his work and rested (2.1-2.3). The Hebrew word “rested” is the root word for “sabbath,” It means to cease from busyness (Cole, 2013). As an omnipotent existence, God does not need a day off. The meaning of the “sabbath,” according to Cole (2013), is to remind humans to worship their creator on every seventh day of the week. The relative concepts of rest day and working day also exist as a pair of opposites.

Gen 2:4-3:24 and its Possible Meanings

When talking about the Genesis creation myth, the most popular one is not the version of the first part (Gen 1:1-2:3), but Gen 2:4-3:24. The first part is more known for the origin of sabbath day rather than the creating process of human beings. The later part

(2:4-3:24) is best known for its account of the origin of men and women. The beginning of the second account of the Genesis creation story contradicts the previous part:

This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven. Now no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth, and there was no man to cultivate the ground. (2:4-2:5)

These sentences state that at this time there is “no shrub of the field,” “no plant of the field had yet sprouted,” and “no man to cultivate the ground.” But in the first part of Genesis (1:1-2:3), “the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees on the earth bearing fruit...” (1:11). Besides, God has given humans plants and trees to cultivate, and “it was so” (1:29-30). These inconsistencies may suggest that something has happened during the time gap between Gen 2:3 to Gen 2:4. I would explain why an androgyny interpretation is the way to fill this gap later in this paper. But let me put those inconsistencies aside for a moment and move on to the creation process of this account.

In contrast to Genesis 1, in which God made human beings both “in the image of God” and “male and female,” Genesis 2 simply states that God “formed man of dust from the ground” (2:7). Moreover, man is no longer the ruler of other creatures but the keeper of the Garden of Eden (2:15). As a keeper, he has some rights as well as some obligations, and even a taboo to avoid:

Rights: From any tree of the garden you may eat freely (2:16); Could name other living creatures such as birds, beasts, and cattle. (2: 20)
Obligations: to cultivate and keep the garden of Eden. (2:15)

Taboo: ...but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die. (2:17)

If we consider the first man as a keeper, none of these rules seem to be a problem as the man is at a disadvantage in this relationship and needs to submit to the “boss.” But if we refer to the related narratives in the first part (1:1-2:3), the arrangement here looks strange. Why did the status of the first humans change so quickly? To keep these two parts from contradicting each other, we may assume that an event X occurred, which lowered the status of the first human. After telling the creation story, I will try to deduce the possible content of this event X.

Since God does not want the first man to be alone, he decides to make a “helper” for him. This is an important part of the story, and different readings of this part may lead to opposite interpretations of the original status of Eve in Genesis. There is a noteworthy detail that God did not say “make him a wife or a partner” but “make him a helper.” Literally speaking, if the first man’s status is just a keeper of the Garden of Eden, the second human’s status is lower—a subordinate assistant. This could imply that the first woman or even all women in general were born of lower status than men. Although this implication could be logically correct if we consider Genesis a patriarchal text, Mowczko (2010) argues that we have another more women-friendly way of interpreting this plot. At the time that Eve was formed, there was no household work she needed to do, Mowczko explains, so “helper” should have more broad meanings. In Hebrew, “ezer” is the word for “helper” used in Genesis. The “ezer” contains two roots: “-z-r” means “to rescue, to save,” and “g-z-r” means “to be strong” (Freedman, 1983, pp. 56-58). Mowczko (2010) further points out that Moses named one of his sons Eliezer. “Eli” means “my God,” and

“ezer” means “helper.” So, Eliezer means “my God is my helper” in Hebrew. In this context, there is no way that Moses presumed God as a helper was to be subordinate. Thus, we may understand Eve’s role as a “sustainer” besides Adam. This means that she could give strength and support to Adam (Alter, 2004). Thus, at least the word “helper” has no intention of demeaning women. The birth of the first woman is described as follows:

So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; then he took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh at that place. The Lord God fashioned into a woman the rib which he had taken from the man, and brought her to the man. The man said, This is now bone of my bones, And flesh of my flesh; She shall be called Woman, Because she was taken out of Man. (2:21-2:23)

This description is easy to understand, that is, the first woman was born from the rib of the first man. However, it does not account for differences in the birth processes of men and women. Through the above analysis of God’s intention to create a woman, to create a woman from a man’s body (2:22) does not necessarily lead to women’s lower status. Because the first woman was formed from a part of the body of the first man, we may assume that there is no superior or inferior between the two.

After Eve was born, the next episode is the original sin part of the Adam and Eve story. Although the prohibition regarding the forbidden fruit was given only to Adam before Eve was created, according to Eve’s reaction when she was encouraged to eat the fruits from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, it may be implied that Eve had learned this taboo from Adam. Like other taboos, this taboo makes people obey it through

a terrible consequence, and that consequence is death. However, the crafty serpent appeared and told the woman that “You surely will not die! For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil” (3:4-5). Once this dangerous consequence was denied, this taboo was no longer taboo in the eyes of the woman, so she not only ate the fruit herself but also let her husband eat it (3:7). After that, Adam and Eve’s eyes were opened, but they began to feel ashamed of being naked. Since God does not feel ashamed because of knowing good and evil, we may say that the serpent was half right—they did know more, but they are not “like God.” This change was soon discovered by God.

When God blamed, the man blamed the woman, and the woman blamed the serpent. This part reveals God’s real fear and Adam and Eve’s true desire. The man said, “The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me from the tree, and I ate” (3:12). There is a hidden logic in this sentence. The man pointed out that this woman was given to him by God (“I trust this woman because I trust you”), so this woman gave him the fruit and he ate it without any doubt. Another possibility is that we might see Eve as the feminine side of androgynous Adam. In this case, it is much easier to submit to the other side of himself than to obey God’s discipline. Then the woman said, “The serpent deceived me, and I ate” (3:13). This is a legitimate accusation because she did not become God-like after eating the forbidden fruit. As a result, God punished the serpent and the woman first as they were the initiators. From now on, the woman must obey her husband— “Yet your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you” (3:16). For Adam, God punished him because he has listened to the voice of his wife. The message of this punishment is also clear that God was angry with Adam because he

listened to his wife instead of insisting on believing in God's word (3:19). After naming the woman Eve, God drove the man and woman out of the Garden of Eden. God's words in making this decision are worth noting:

Then the Lord God said, 'Behold, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever'...So he drove the man out; and at the east of the Garden of Eden he stationed the cherubim and the flaming sword which turned every direction to guard the way to the tree of life. (3:22-24)

Based on what God said, we may guess that God expelled Adam and Eve because he feared that they would become "like one of us," that is, like gods. From this, we could also infer that God's motivation for creating taboos was to prevent humans from becoming gods, not to prevent humans from putting their lives in danger. From this, it can be inferred that the function of the fruit of the tree of good and evil is to give the human a certain degree of divine wisdom.

From a consequential point of view, we arrive at a conclusion that God did tell the truth and the serpent did lie. Because as punishment for eating the forbidden fruit, humans become mortal. It seems that God could tolerate humans being naive and immortal or wise and mortal, but not wise and immortal. Maybe it is because man becomes more God-like once he can have both wisdom and eternal life, which God is trying to avoid in this account of the creation story.

The Traditional Reading of Genesis Creation Myth

Genesis proposes two different accounts of the creation of human beings: one in which it is presented as the crown creation of God. In this account, there is no inequality mentioned between two sexes. Another account is the more popular one, in which women are usually interpreted as subordinate to men and the source of original sin. With a more interesting narrative structure and more internal dynamics, Gomola (2014) found that Gen 2:18-24 appeals more strongly to readers of the Bible and “has become an integral part of the collective mythical memory of the Judeo-Christian world” (p. 79). Thus, the traditional reading of Gen 1:1-2:3 is almost missing, at least for the public. We may find some related literature, but because the influence of this part is limited, here I only focus on the traditional reading of the second part.

Gen 2:18-24 has traditionally been read as a story of the original sin, or in other word, the original sin of women. Because this interpretation considers Eve as the culprit of human fall. Since then, the suffering and discrimination suffered by Eve and the group of women she represents have been given a high-sounding excuse. At first, God formed the first man from the dust and gave life to him by blowing breath into his nostrils. For Adam’s benefit, God created Eve out of his body without the need for females. It was that woman named Eve, who could not resist the temptation to listen to the instigation of the serpent and ate the forbidden fruit. It was that woman named Eve, who not only disobeyed God’s order, but she also encouraged Adam to eat the forbidden fruit. It was that woman named Eve, because of her mistake, who caused human beings to face death, pain, and disease.

In this version of the reading, we see no role for Eve other than as the culprit of original sin. Not only Eve but also the female group she represents is inferior to the male

group in the story. “Eve becomes a chaos agent when she actualizes her freedom by not obeying God” (p. 68), Vajskop (2005) explains, this justifies the submission of women as women caused the degeneration of human beings. Besides, according to Mary Daly (1978), women’s creative value is denied in this creation story, because both Adam and Eve are created by God without the aid of any female character. Under this interpretation, men have an absolute higher status than women, after all, everything is created by men.

An Androgynous Interpretation of Genesis Creation Narrative

As early as half a century ago, feminist scholars have proposed different interpretations of Gen 2:18-24. Phyllis Trible (1978), for example, argues that “the earth creature here is precisely and only the human being, sexually undifferentiated” (p. 80). The “sexually undifferentiated” here is similar to the concept of androgyny. Since we cannot find any description of Adam’s biological sex in the original text, it would be a possibility that he is sexually undifferentiated. Gomola (2014) suggests that the concept of “humanity originating with one androgynous being” could be the result of cultural transfer and reinterpretation by referring to Carol Myers’s observation that “the concept of an androgynous first-person resonates with its ancient Near Eastern context” (p. 82). Besides, Gomola (2014) compares the androgynous character of Adam with the third androgynous sex mentioned in Plato’s Symposium. Adam in the creation story likely represents an initial human androgynous state. If the world before God created man was 0, Adam was the original 1, this 1 is neither male nor female, but an androgynous being. Through the appearance of a woman, according to Trible (1978), the androgynous Adam receives his sexual identity. The original 1 is thus differentiated into 2 (male and female), and through the union of male and female, all humans are born. In this process, it was not

the male Adam who created female Eve, but males and females were split from an androgynous being. This process is the same as God divides sky and land, day and night, dry and wet. Batto (1992) supports Tribble's argument by adding that the Hebrew term "rib" could broadly mean "side", that is, "God is reshaping the whole "Adam" into two complementary halves" (p. 54). This interpretation brings more equality between the sexes and more importantly, it does not contradict the first part.

According to the androgynous interpretation of the Genesis creation narrative, we might be able to connect the first and second parts logically. In the first part (Gen1:1-2:3), God created man in his image, "male and female he created them" (1:28). God let them rule over the other creatures. So far, human beings are God-like. Suddenly, maybe God is afraid that humans are too much like himself, maybe humans want to challenge God's authority, for whatever reason, God(s) decided to reset the world, including human beings, that is, to return to the origin status (0,0). If we set this event as X, it could be a way to explain why no shrubs, no rain, no people in the second part (2:4-2:5). This assumption did not arise out of thin air. The second part we discussed before belongs to the Jahwist account, which includes most of chapter two and is influenced by Greek mythology which influenced by Mesopotamian mythology (Penglase, 1994). In Mesopotamian mythology, humanity originated from one androgynous being, called "amilu" (Myers, 2013). Similar androgynous beings could be found in Plato's "Symposium," Prometheus made humans both men and women. However, when Zeus ruled, he split humans up because he was too scared that the humans might become God-like. Hence, if ancient Greek myths inspired the writing of Genesis, hidden event X is

likely to be inherited from Greek mythology. Moreover, in Gen 3:22-24, the Lord God expressed the same fear as Zeus: “the man has become like one of us.”

Assuming the hypothesis of event X is valid, the second part is easy to explain. God created an inferior version of humankind after destroying prior God-like people. To prevent man from becoming like God, God placed the first man in the Garden of Eden and instructed him not to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge. Instead of creating Eve from Adam’s rib, God separated the female half from Adam’s body for the same purpose - to make humans less like themselves. If this is the case, Eve is no longer Adam’s subordinate but his other half, and they are naturally equal. More importantly, we may consider that Eve helped Adam overcome his anxiety about being a person with unexplored potential and possibilities (Ellens, 1997). In another word, Eve helped humans to grow, not fall. Otherwise, God should not be in such a hurry to punish humans because they are no longer naive.

To conclude, the androgynous interpretation of the Genesis creation narrative is more friendly to a liberal society than the traditional one for the following three reasons. First, if the original human form, the most god-like one, contains both male and female sides, we should at least encourage human beings to think outside of the binary gender roles; second, if Adam and Eve were two halves of an androgynous being, men and women should be born equal; third, if Eve’s “sin” made humanity better and more like God, Eve should not be blamed but rather appreciated. Therefore, recommending an androgynous interpretation of Genesis may change women’s social status and people’s understanding of gender roles to some extent.

Enuma Elish, the Babylonian Epic of Creation

Like the Genesis creation story, the Enuma Elish is also a cosmogonic myth. Not only does it describe the original world and human, but it also describes the process of creating the world and human. Enuma Elish also known as “The Seven Tablets of Creation.” This title is derived from the first line of the first tablet - “When on high.” The seven tablets on which the poem was written were discovered at King Ashurbanipal’s library at Nineveh between the years of 1848 to 1876. But their colophons suggest that they are copies of an older version of the Babylonian creation myth dating back to the c. 1750 BC. Vajskop (2005) suggests that “during the Babylonian captivity, this text may have influenced the writing and rewriting of the Hebrew creation account” (p. 64). Heidel (1951) also explains that the Enuma Elish shows many parallels to the literature of the Old Testament. For example, they all have a female character who brings chaos. If this is the case, we should find some narratives of the Enuma Elish that are similar to the Genesis account, for example, we may assume that the Enuma Elish may also contain androgyny symbols.

The Creation Story in Enuma Elish and its Possible Meanings

In the beginning, everything is nameless. This is the point of (0,0), which is the original state of the world. Only sky and water exist in the beginning when Apsu appeared. One interpretation is that he begets Tiamat and Mummu, the first generation of the gods (Vajskop, 2005, p. 64). Another interpretation is that “the mingling primordial waters personified as Apsu and Tiamat (perhaps also Mummu) give birth to several generations of gods” (Xiang, 2018, p. 117). In both cases, “their waters mingled as a

single body” (1:5²). The mingled water is the source of new life. At that time all the waters came together in one place, and there was no land, no swamps; the gods were not yet formed, without names, and without belonging. Apart from the familiar element of water, the creator of gods is a combination of opposites (fresh water and salt water, god and goddess). Tiamat gave birth to twin deities named Lahmu and Lahamu. Some scholars suggest that Lahamu and her brother Lahmu are the mother and father of Anshar and Kishar (Lambert, 2013). But some scholars assume that Lahmu and Lahamu may have been only synonyms of Tiamat (Britannica, 2000). Either interpretation represents that the combination of male and female parts could create new life. Then Anshar and Kishar were born; they are twin horizons of sky and earth. From then on, the world is no longer full of a chaotic water, but separated from heaven and earth. This change is like the process of dividing heaven and earth in Genesis creation story. Then Anshar and Kishar bear Anu, and Anu in turn bears Ea.

However, these new gods “disturbed Tiamat as they surged back and forth...troubled mood of Tiamat” (1:22-23), so Apsu brought his minister Mummu to Tiamat and proposed to destroy their ill-behaved children. As a mother, Tiamat was “furious” (1:42) and “cried out aggrieved” (1:43) when she heard this suggestion. Mummu and Apsu’s plan was seen by wise god Ea, he “poured sleep upon him (Apsu)...loosened his band, tore off his tiara...fettered Apsu, he slew him” (1:67-69). At the same time, Ea also imprisoned Mummu. From Apsu’s body, Ea created his palace,

² Unless otherwise noted, all quotes of Enuma Elish are taken from the English translation by Dennis Bratcher (2018). *Enuma Elish: “when on high...” The Mesopotamian/Babylonian Creation Myth*. The Voice. <http://www.crivoice.org/enumaelish.html>

and his son Marduk was created in the heart of Apsu. Marduk is a powerful god “with a double godhead” (1:91), he “produced streams to disturb Tiamat” (1:108). Eventually, Tiamat found her son killed their father and declared war on her children. To realize her revenge, Tiamat created many monsters to help her, and “elevated Kingu, made him chief among them” (1:147).

In the Tablet II, like Eve in Genesis, Tiamat represents the disorder and chaos. Both Ea and Anu tried to confront Tiamat, but they failed. In the Tablet III-IV, after testing from the council of the gods, Marduk become a king who is commissioned to fight Tiamat. After a fierce fight, Marduk “extinguished her life” (4:103). He also divided her remains, using half of her corpse to create the sky and the other half to create the earth. Marduk “pulled down the bar and posted guards, he bade them to allow not her waters to escape” (4:139-140). The water here represents the chaotic as the Tiamat was the god of chaotic. Afterwards, Marduk built places for the other gods, established the days, months, seasons, and established the city of Babylon (Tablet V). Unlike the punishment Eve received, Tiamat was killed, and her body became heaven and earth.

Finally, in Tablet VI, Marduk decided to create human beings to be servants of gods. When talking about the purpose of making humans, Marduk says:

I will establish a savage, ‘man’ shall be his name.

truly, savage-man I will create.

He shall be charged with the service of the gods

That they might be at ease! (6:6-9)

They used Kingu’s blood to form human beings. Of all the seven tablets, this is only one clue to human creation. From this information, we could infer that the ancestors of human

beings may have a certain degree of divine power. The divine power of human beings, if any, is to enable humans to have the ability to better serve the gods. In the end, after reaffirming Marduk's heroic role in the creation process, the story ends with "the song of Marduk, who vanquished Tiamat and achieved the kingship" (7:161-162). Thus, the male power (represented by Marduk) defeated the female power (represented by Tiamat). A new order (a male king) is established, and the old androgyny existence (Tiamat and Apsu were mingled together) is eliminated.

The Traditional Reading of the Creation Myth in Enuma Elish

In the traditional reading, this is a story about how Tiamat brought chaos and how Marduk restored peace and order to the world by killing Tiamat. In this case, Tiamat is the symbol of chaos and Marduk, on the contrary, is the symbol of order. For example, Barton (1893) judges Tiamat as a "hideousness, arrogance and evil" woman who has "opposed creation, at every step resisted God, tempted and seduced man" (27). Not only in old times but also in recent ten years, Tiamat was identified as "a bad guy" and the mother of "the gang of eleven monsters" (Mobley, 2012, p. 18). It seems to me that rather than focusing on the creative process in the creation myth, people are obsessed with distinguishing between "good" and "bad."

Unfortunately, this binary way of dividing the good from the bad will not help us understand the creation story itself. On the contrary, labeling the characters in a story with binary labels could take us away from a lot of notable details. For example, Tiamat's contribution to the creation of the gods, her forbearance and kindness. And Marduk's callousness and cruelty. When her children disturbed her body and troubled her mood, Tiamat was "speechless" (1:26). It was their father Apsu who wanted to "destroy" them

(1:39). Tiamat declined Apsu's plan by saying that "should we destroy that which we have built? Their ways indeed are most troublesome, but let us attend kindly" (1:45-46). Instead of evil, we could only see tolerance and her respect for creation in these words. But her husband Apsu, when he made the decision to destroy his child, "his face grew radiant. Because of the evil he planned against the gods, his sons" (1:51-52). From this dialogue alone, Tiamat cannot be judged as evil.

On the one hand, the traditional binary interpretation of this myth makes people ignore the details that are contrary to this one-sided evaluation. On the other hand, it also guides the reader's understanding of this myth to a binary extreme. The binary evaluation of characters in this creation myth was influenced by old binary gender roles (e.g., the women should be obedient and gentle, pretty, and harmless) and may, in turn, influence how people perceive gender roles in real life. Under this traditional interpretation, whatever her motives, all mothers who want to be against their children are evil and against creation. Anyone who overcomes those who try to disrupt the order is a hero, even if he kills his own mother in a brutal way. This is a one-sided evaluation of success. Under this evaluation standard, all behaviors are simply divided into two-- good and evil; strong and weak; success and failure. Over time, people will rely on these established rules to evaluate themselves and others, leading to a one-sided view of the world.

An Androgynous Interpretation of the Creation Story in Enuma Elish

There are at least two androgynous symbols hidden in this myth. The first one is that "their waters mingled as a single body" (1:5). The "single body" here is androgynous as it involves both freshwater and saltwater, both male god and female god. The other androgynous symbol is hidden in Tiamat's character and behavior, which is the important

one. The evaluation of this character is essential because she led the development of the entire myth, and she was a direct participant in the entire creation process. She is both a mother and a revenger, both tolerant and crazy, both gentle and cruel. When we analyze Tiamat in all aspects, we could find that she is neither an evil nor a good person. An androgynous interpretation may provide us with a new way to review the creation story in Enuma Elish. And this new way, in turn, may change our way of understanding binary gender roles. Xiang's paper (2018) is a good example of interpreting Tiamat from an androgynous perspective, and his arguments provide us with a new way to evaluate Tiamat's multifaceted personality in Enuma Elish.

Xiang (2018) argues that: "Enuma Elish provides a rich and complex narrative in which motherhood and monstrosity do not oppose each other (as some early feminist critiques would like), nor do they run together with each other (as misogynist reading would like)" (p. 115). People only see Tiamat's violent behavior, Xiang explains, but ignore Marduk's violence after he defeats Tiamat:

In their eyes, the violent slaughtering seems to be merely symbolic/metaphorical and therefore negligible. This selective blindness is supported by a dichotomous logic that neatly separates good and evil, cosmos and chaos, younger and older generation, activity and passivity, masculinity and femininity. (p. 123)

Therefore, Xiang (2018) suggests that we should go below the logic of "either/or." "It suggests an adherence to the 'queer' space that is inside Tiamat (and Apsu)" (p. 128), he explains. Since Tiamat and Apsu's waters mingled as a single body since the beginning and other gods including Marduk could make noise inside Tiamat's belly, we may

assume that all gods are still inside this watery body. Under this situation, noisy young gods inside Tiamat watery body could annoy the Apsu and other gods. That is the reason why Apsu and Mummu must destroy these annoying gods to restore the quiet. If there are not inside the same watery body, how could they be bothered by these ill-behaved gods? Similarly, after Marduk was born, “he produced streams to disturb Tiamat. The gods, given no rest, suffer in the storm” (1:108-109). Tiamat is the only one Marduk disturbed. If they do not remain in the same body, why are the rest of the gods disturbed?

From Xiang’s argument, I further speculate that these gods do not just exist in the same body, but this body is both masculine and feminine, that is, androgynous. Because this watery body is mingled by male god Apsu and female goddess Tiamat, it carries an androgynous nature. In the original text, the gods were not born from Tiamat but formed from her. As a goddess of primordial chaos, she exists in the form of water. Since the Genesis authors were familiar with the Babylonian creation story and adapted it, we could find a similar watery chaos in Genesis— “and darkness was over the surface of the deep” (1:3). “The deep” here could be understood as a kind of watery chaos, which likely comes from Tiamat. Besides, in Genesis God divides the watery chaos in half, into the waters above the firmament and waters below the firmament, just like Marduk divides Tiamat’s body in half to create the new world. The difference is that Genesis eliminates the maternal quality of “the deep” (the primordial chaos) and locates all creativity in the father God. If we assume that Tiamat is the name of this watery body or the primordial chaos, that will explain why Apsu needs to ask her to destroy their children. The reason why Tiamat is the main consciousness of this watery body is unknown, one possible explanation is that around 97 percent of water in the earth is salt water which could be

found in the ocean (Water Science School, 2019). With such a disproportionate mix, their relationship must be difficult to balance, so, “she who bore them all” (1:4). When Apsu was still alive, in contrast to the masculine Apsu, Tiamat exhibits feminine qualities, a patient and gentle mother. But when her children said “your vitals were diluted and so we can have no rest. Let Apsu, your consort, be in your mind... You do not love us!” (1:115-119), Tiamat decided to fight against other children. From this moment on, she let her husband in her mind, and her masculinity started to dominate. On tablet IV, after smashing Tiamat’s head, Marduk used half of her corpse to create the earth and the other half to create the sky (4:137-138). Besides, he also “pulled down the bar and posted guards, he bade them to allow not her waters to escape” (4:139-140). However, please notice that on the Tablet I, there are the nameless sky and earth (1:1-2). Only if we assume that all gods remain in a watery body, Marduk need to create the second sky and earth. Thus, it is reasonable for Marduk to worry about Tiamat’s waters escaping, since they are in a watery body.

Marduk’s victory seemed to me a victory of barely restoring balance and order. Although Tiamat did wage war on her children, we cannot consider her only as good or evil because her motivation was complicated—she wanted to protect her bullied children. Just like we cannot judge the sea only as gentle or cruel because the sea not only nourishes life but also destroys life. This is a perspective that goes beyond the binary thinking, compared with the traditional interpretation, it allows Tiamat’s motherliness and devilishness in the story to exist at the same time and all be reasonable.

To conclude, the androgynous interpretation of Enuma Elish is more friendly to a liberal society than the traditional explanation for the following two reasons. One is that

this explanation rationalizes personal traits that are incompatible with stereotyped gender roles, such as motherhood and monstrosity. This way of thinking could help us jump out of gender stereotypes and pay more attention to individual diversity. By allowing a grey area to exist between two opposite concepts, it could be an antidote for binary gender roles. Another one is that the androgynous interpretation could reverse the one-sided view of Tiamat. Tiamat represents the woman in the story, and the demonization of her also symbolizes the demonization of all the women. In the traditional interpretation, she is the chaotic agent who lets her husband die, gives birth to demons to fight against her children, and finally dies at the hands of the child who had the courage to rebel against her. Tiamat is like a mad witch in this reading. The androgynous one, however, without trying to twist any of the storylines or denying her anger, rationalized every choice she made, returning Tiamat to the role of a regular person. Like everyone, she could be patient and kind, angry and aggressive. If we did not blame Marduk for killing his own mother, we should not blame the mother who stood up to her child because she wanted revenge. This way of discussing a person's character without gender labels explains the plot of the story more fairly than traditional interpretations. Bringing this evaluation into reality, we could try to first evaluate an individual as a person rather than their gender to evaluate their words or behaviors.

Taoist Cosmogonic Myth

Although Genesis and Enuma Elish share many similarities, because of the overlapping cultural backgrounds of these two myths, they are not enough to prove that the androgynous symbols exist among various creation myths. Taoist cosmogonic myth, therefore, may provide an additional piece of evidence from a completely different

cultural background. If the androgynous symbol could exist in the creation myths of unrelated cultures, we might be able to infer that it could be a common motif in human creation myths.

Taoist cosmogonic myth could refer to the myth of Taoist philosophy (Taology) and the myth of Taoist religion (Taoism). They are two different concepts that are closely related. Taoism philosophy refers to a school of thought represented by Lao Tzu and Zhuang Tzu in the pre-Qin period. This school believes in Tao, advocates Tao, and regards Tao as the highest standard of mankind. They advocate that a person should do nothing but deal with the relationship between man and nature with a peaceful mind. This is a philosophical system in ancient China called Taology. A book that represents this system is called “Tao Te Ching” (Lao Tzu, 400 BC). As for Taoism, it is a religion that originated from the Eastern Han Dynasty to the Northern and Southern dynasties. It advocates that people should eventually become immortals through spiritual cultivation. Although the pursuits of Taology and Taoism are different, they share similar understandings of Tao and cosmogonic myth.

What is Tao? The Chinese words “宇宙” (universe) originated from Taoism. The space is “宇” and time is “宙.” Whether it is East or West, ancient or modern, religion or science, all recognize the existence of the universe, and that it has certain laws. As big as the gravity of the earth, the changes of the seasons, as small as the life of a small grass, the flow of a drop of water, everything exists in its own laws and runs naturally. And this law is called the Tao. Taology encourages people to follow this law, while Taoism encourages people to discover this law and use it to become immortals. Thus, they share the same creation myth, but have different interpretations of it.

The Creation Myth in the Taoist Cosmogonic Myth and its Possible Meanings

Different from Genesis and Enuma Elish, Taoist creation myth is short and abstract:

Tao gave birth to One.

One gave birth to two.

Two gave birth to Three.

Three gave birth to all the myriad things.

All the myriad things carry the Yin on their backs and hold the Yang in their embrace.

Deriving their vital harmony from the proper blending of the two vital Breaths..." (Tao te ching, translated by Wu, chapter 42)

One possible interpretation is that Tao produces the indistinguishable one. The name of this one is Wu Chi, it is "the unmanifest aspect of Tao: Tao-in-stillness" (Reninger, 2019). The real Tao has no form; we could think of Wu Chi as the incarnation of Tao with form. That is "all things under heaven are born of the corporeal; the corporeal is born of the Incorporeal" (Tao Te Ching, translated by Wu, chapter 40). Wu Chi is the corporeal form of incorporeal Tao; this is the process of creating a thing out of nothing. When we split this one in half, we get two opposing sides – Yin and Yang. When these two opposites merged again, a new life was born. The "Three" here represent not the quantity but the combination of the Yin and Yang, which we would consider the third step. Through this step, everything was born. The translation of the last two sentences seems strange to me as many people translate "负" to "carry," how could one "carry the Yin"? The "负" here could mean "reliance" or "dependence." Therefore, the meaning of

this sentence can also be understood as Yin embraces Yang, which is, the uterus embraces sperms. It is a process of natural reproduction. From this reproduction, according to Lao Tzu, harmony was born from the combination of Yin and Yang. From this harmony, everything was born.

The Traditional Reading of the Taoist Creation Myth

In Taology, Lao Tzu considers Tao as the original root of everything. “Tao is the source of the ten thousand things” (Tao Te Ching, translated by Feng and English, chapter 62), Lao Tzu stated. The Tao produced the one; this one became two opposite halves and after the combination of these two opposites, ten thousand things were born. In this sense, not only is there no distinction between men and women, but there is no difference between human beings and other creatures/things: “Heaven and earth are impartial; They see the ten thousand things as straw dogs” (Tao Te Ching, translated by Feng and English, chapter 5).

Although Lao Tzu did not discuss the gender differences in his book, he repeatedly used feminine words such as “mother” and “female” to describe Tao. For example, “The gate of the subtle and profound female; Is the root of heaven and earth” (Tao Te Ching, translated by Chan, chapter 6). Tao gives birth to all things, which can be compared to a mother giving birth to children. In nature, all those who have the power of reproduction are females. Tao is the mother of all things in the universe. There is no greater motherhood than the Tao, so Lao Tzu considers Tao as “the gate of the subtle and profound female” (Tao Te Ching, translated by Chan, chapter 6).

However, the creation of all things still depends on the cooperation of Yin and Yang. Without the two (Yin and Yang), there is no Three that produces new life. Thus, in

a traditional sense, the Taoist creation story could be explained as an abstract description of the reproduction process of life. In this process, people simplify Yin as the symbol for women and Yang as the symbol for men. According to Jespersen (2016), Yin and Yang became associated with the female and male in two ways. One is that later commentators added the gender assignments to “I Ching” which gives structure and context to the “Tao Te Ching.” Another one is Confucius’s appendix. Since ancient China was a hierarchical and patriarchal society that highly value the social order (women were subservient to males), a desire for social orderliness assigned the female gender to the Yin and the male gender to the Yang. Since then, the Yang symbols many positive things in the world, such as life, growth, and success. And Yin, on the contrary, symbols many negative things in the world, such as death, stopping, and failure.

As the biggest pursuit of Taoism is to become immortals, they integrated the immortals into this creation story, making it a veritable myth. From 58 to 88 AD, Wang Fu wrote the “Laozi Sheng Mu Bei”, in which he combined Lao Tzu and Tao into one and regarded Lao Tzu as a god who created heaven and earth. This idea became the prototype of Taoist creation theory. During the Han Dynasty, Emperor Huan regarded Lao Tzu as the ancestor of immortality. It is said that Lao Tzu lived in the Taiqing fairyland of Daluo, and his Taoist name was “Daode Tianzun” (The Heavenly Lord of Dao and its Virtue). He also known as “Taishang Laojun” (The Supreme Venerable Sovereign). During the Eastern Jin Dynasty, Ge Hong wrote “Shen Xian Zhuan” (the Biographies of the Immortals), which included all the previous biographies about Lao Tzu. After this book, Taoism linked Lao Tzu with the founder of Tao. Therefore, the Taoist creation story is the same and has not changed. The only difference is that Lao Tzu

himself has become Tao's founder and Tao's incarnation in the secular world. In other words, Taoism believes that Lao Tzu created the Tao and the world.

Under the traditional interpretations, the Taoist creation story becomes concrete, no longer abstract metaphors and symbols. The advantage is that it is easy to spread among folks, but the disadvantage is that the Tao and its related concepts such as Yin and Yang, which could contain everything, become limited and one-sided. However clear the interpenetrating relationship between the symbol for Yin (black) and Yang (white) in the Tai Chi diagram is, the traditional reading chooses to ignore that each side has at its core an element of the other. When we simply define man, and everything related to masculinity as Yang while defining woman, and everything related to femininity as Yin, Yin and Yang become incompatible parts. Besides, the "God Creation Movement," which regards Lao Tzu as the incarnation of Tao, has also reduced the Tao, which could have represented the laws of the universe, into an omnipotent normal god. Therefore, the traditional interpretation makes the meaning contained in the Taoist creation story one-sided and narrow.

An Androgynous Interpretation of Taoist Cosmogonic Myth

An androgynous interpretation is that Yang is not male, and Yin is not female because Yin and Yang are inseparable, they exist simultaneously in everything. The inner nature of everything is that Yin and Yang are always turning into each other, Jespersen (2016) explains, that is, "the height of Yin contains the beginning of Yang, and vice versa" (Jespersen, 2016, p. 328). Like the length of day and night in a day. The summer solstice has the longest daytime of the year, but after this day, the daytime gets shorter, and the nighttime gets longer. In this case, Ames (1981) suggests that we could assume

that everyone is born androgynous. Since our nature includes Yin and Yang, finding the inner balance of Yin and Yang could be a way for people to return to their original Tao.

This androgynous interpretation not only made the meaning of Tao broader but also closer to the original meaning of Lao Tzu's words. In "Tao Te Ching," heaven and earth consider ten thousand things as straw dogs (Chapter 5). As every straw dog will be thrown away after sacrifice, Lao Tzu uses this metaphor to describe the insignificance of the individual to the objective world. From this perspective, it is reasonable to assume that everyone shares the same status--Yin and Yang equally exist among ten thousand things. That is, when the current is turbulent, it is Yang, and when it is gentle, it is Yin. Hence, we could use Yang to represent more active status while using Yin to represent more conservative status, but we cannot deny that everything has a Yin and Yang side.

Like water in Genesis and Enuma Elish, water in Taoist creation myth also symbols the ideal state of the androgyny. When Lao Tzu saying that "there is nothing softer and weaker than water...all the world knows that the weak overcomes the strong and the soft overcomes the hard" (Tao Te Ching, translated by Chan, chapter 78), the "weak" and "soft" here could be understood as flexibility. Water is the weakest and softest, this kind of softness and weakness means that the water can bow to everything and flow quietly through everything. So, the reason why the weak can overcome the strong is that the weak is flexible enough to overcome the strong. In addition, the flexibility here refers to the flexibility of conforming to the Tao, that is, the flexibility of conforming to the laws of nature. The laws of nature, according to Lao Tzu, is the balance of Yin and Yang. He believes that Yin and Yang are unified in every individual naturally, but as one gradually grows up and is influenced by outside environments, they

gradually forget their androgynous nature and possess unbalanced or even polarized energy (Ames, 1981). To return to our natural balanced status, we need to consider the power of non-being. This is to say, we could recognize the true meaning of Tao only if we could forget the old views of Tao. Therefore, once we could exclude the influence of the environment on our nature and embrace every side of ourselves, we could return to the balance again.

The state of “non-being,” in this interpretation, is returning human beings to the state they were before being influenced by social norms. Compared to traditional readings, the androgynous one gives people more freedom to explore their potential. If men are Yang and the women are Yin, this explanation puts men and women on totally opposite sides. To maintain one’s gender role, one needs to stay away from personality traits that contradict their own gender. Over time, individuals will move further and further away from the natural state of the Yin and Yang balance. The androgynous interpretation, on the contrary, holds that Yin and Yang exist in everyone. This view is not intended to challenge existing binary gender roles, it allows for the existence of personality traits different from one’s own gender. So, this would be a promising direction for people to reconsider the meaning of gender roles in a liberal society.

The Comparison of Three Creation Myths

There are many differences among these three myths because of isolated cultural backgrounds. But I choose to focus on the common ground between them, the similar settings, and similar metaphors. As humans’ understanding of nature and themselves are hidden in their own myths, if we could find the common ground in different myths, we

may find the primordial consensus regarding human nature. Such findings may provide us with a new perspective on today's binary gender roles.

Water is an important element in almost every myth. It usually appears at the beginning of the story. In Genesis creation narrative, in the beginning, "...the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters" (1:2); In Enuma Elish, "when on high... their waters mingled as a single body" (1:1-5); In Taoist creation myth, everything is born from Yin and Yang. They are two kinds of Qi, so life is a gathering of Qi. The Taoist cosmology originates from the concept that water generates Qi, Qi generates people, and everything in the universe (Hendrischke, 2017). In the latter two myths, water appears directly as the source of life. Although water does not directly produce life in the Genesis, we might infer that water is still the source of new life. As the God said that "Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures" (1:20), water is mentioned here as an element that nourishes life.

The waters, in the beginning, all share one characteristic: they contain two opposite sides. Or to put it another way, they are androgynous. In Genesis, before God "separates the waters from the waters" (1:6), the world is full of waters. According to the original text, we may infer that God may have separated freshwater from seawater, so the land and the ocean appeared after separation. In Enuma Elish, the mingled water includes freshwater (Apsu) and saltwater (Tiamat). In Taoist myth, the original water contains Yin qi and Yang qi. We might think of this state of containing two opposites as a primordial wholeness. This is a state of unity before differentiation. Symbolically, the water at this time is in the possession of both masculine and feminine characteristics. The biblical story has the flood that drowned the world and the water that nourishes all things. The

Enuma Elish has angry mother Tiamat and gentle mother Tiamat. And the Taoist has the water that could defect all strong things and the water that could benefit everything. No matter how the form and composition of water change in the mythical world, it always seems to contain two sides, one soft and the other hard. Since the original water is full of the undifferentiated world, the water element in mythology may represent a primordial standard of wholeness. And this wholeness, according to the characteristics of water, refers to the nature of having both masculine and feminine sides. From this, we may infer that androgyny is at least one signified of the primordial wholeness.

While water may be a symbol of primordial wholeness, the creators themselves were androgynous in all three myths. In Genesis, only if God is androgynous, he could create males and females in his own image (1:28). In Enuma Elish, the mingled water is in possession of God Apsu and Goddess Tiamat. In Taoism, the Tao contains Wu Chi, and it includes Yin and Yang. If it is a metaphor to say that water represents the wholeness of life, then the image of the creator directly expresses what the idealized form of the human being looks like. The creators in different cultures have the same trait; that is, they have both masculine and feminine sides. Thus, we may assume that androgyny is one universal character of the creator. And because the creators represent the highest form of life, we may infer that they also represent the wholeness of life, and androgyny, therefore, is a manifestation of wholeness in this sense.

Although the stories are told in completely different ways, the gender roles involved in the three myths are similar. In traditional reading, women or feminine sides are inferior to the men or masculine sides. Eve is the “helper” of Adam; Tiamat is a personification of chaos; Yin symbolizes dark, death, and failure. This interpretation

divides the world into two halves, with the bright half represented by men and the dark half represented by women. Not only that, but the woman is also the one who brings chaos while the man saves the world. People blame Eve for her original sin but ignore Adam who also committed original sin; people accuse Tiamat of starting a war with her children but ignore the brutality of Marduk; people link Yin to failure and darkness but ignore that too much Yang can also cause imbalance and failure. This traditional one-sided interpretation helps patriarchal societies establish one-sided gender roles.

Although the definition of binary gender is reasonable on the basis that humans have two biological sexes, the conventional way of defining a gender trait as unique to men or women creates gender stereotypes. These stereotypes, however, limited the possibility and freedom of individuals to pursue a balance of their masculine part and feminine part. Since the waters and creators in myths all contain both masculine and feminine sides, and they symbolize the original wholeness and highest deity in the eyes of human ancestors, the act of labeling personality traits with a single gender tag ignored the human desire for fulfillment.

An androgynous interpretation could be an antidote for one-sided gender roles, as it returns to the individuals the possibility of pursuing a balance of the masculine part and feminine part. Whereas traditional readings interpret the personalities and behaviors of women and men in creation myths from a one-sided perspective, androgyny accounts return diversity to the individual through a more inclusive interpretation. From an androgynous perspective, Adam is no longer just a man who only listens to God or Eve and could not think for himself. He could be bothered because he cannot realize his possible potential. Eve was no longer just a sinner who ate the forbidden fruit because she

could not resist temptation. She was also a pioneer in helping mankind open their eyes and escape their comfort zone. Tiamat was not just a vicious mother who declared war on her children, she was also a mother who tenderly endured her children's rowdy and steadfastly refused when Apsu wanted to kill their children. Marduk was not only a brave hero who defeats his demon mother, but he can also be a tyrant who brutally murdered his own mother. Not only can Yang qi be linked to growth and light, but an excess amount of Yang qi can also be linked to failure and darkness. Yin qi is not only a symbol of retreat and failure, but a proper amount of Yin qi can also be a symbol of success and intelligence. Acknowledging the fluidity of personality traits contained in binary gender is the essential difference between the traditional and the androgynous gender views.

The Conclusion of Part One

In this part, I have attempted to show four things. First, different creation myths from isolated cultures share similar storylines and androgynous symbols. Second, the water in the creation myths may symbolize the original wholeness, and the androgynous characters of water which contains two opposite parts could imply androgynous human nature. Third, the similar androgynous creators among the three creation myths indicate human ancestors saw people with both masculine and feminine qualities as higher beings, therefore, to awaken the divinity of us, we need to see another side of ourselves. Fourth, the androgynous interpretation is the better choice for a liberal society regarding the binary gender roles, because this way provides more freedom for every individual.

I close this part by making one important disclaimer. The androgyny I discussed in this paper entails that one has both male and female characteristics. This means that the androgynous readings I advocate do not contradict binary gender divisions. What I am

emphasizing is that the androgynous interpretation could offer the individual a possibility, a possibility for the full realization of individual potential. The ancient feudal society and the current patriarchal society interpret the creation myth to consolidate their rule, so they discredit those who challenge the rules, limit the potential of human beings, and encourage people to stick to stereotypes. However, the definition of original wholeness and our ancestors' pursuit of their potential are hidden in the creation myth. Every myth itself is an ideological tool. Since the creation myth can be used by the patriarchal society as a tool to restrain gender roles, it can also be used by the liberal society as a tool to liberate gender roles. In the second part of this paper, I will use psychological theory to analyze the impact of mythical androgynous signs on the human collective unconscious, and to explain why encouraging psychological androgyny could help individuals live a happier and healthier life.

Part Two: Embracing the Inner Wholeness through Jung's Individuation Process

Introduction

After uncovering an androgynous dimension to classical creation myth, this part tries to discuss the androgyny archetype in creation myths from a psychological perspective which revolves around the following three questions. One question that remains unsolved in the last part is why these creation stories would include ideas that undermine patriarchal gender roles. Put in another way, how could androgynous symbols have survived in the patriarchal society. By introducing related Jungian theories, I will explain that it is not a coincidence that symbols of androgyny appear in different myths, but because we all share the same archetype of androgyny. These persistent repeated patterns lend support to Jung's idea of the collective unconscious. While not everyone accepts the existence of the "collective unconscious," like there are different versions of creation myths, I am just offering an explanation that I think is suitable for my topic. There are of course other explanations for this "coincidence." For example, some texts in myths have been fused with local myths in translation; the geographical environments where myths originated were similar; or there was even a real androgynous being. But none of these explanations could provide a new way to revalue the personal traits regarding gender roles like the collective unconscious theory does.

The appeal of Jungian theory regarding androgyny is that it could help us use the patriarchal spear to attack its shield by implying that androgynous characteristics, like anima and animus, are innate. If we consider that the advantage of the androgynous models over fixed gender roles is that it has nothing to do with biological sex, then this view contradicts to the Jungian theory. However, the appeal of androgynous models is

not that they could free us from our innate sex differences but is that they suggest that we have an innate potential to realize our other side (anima or animus). The androgynous model does not attempt to deny gender roles, but to transcend them by suggesting that we have other possible characteristics that beyond our gender. This view, like fixed gender roles, is based on nature or biology. In this case, no culture, religion, or social structure could shake this natural existence of an androgynous archetype. As long as the patriarchal society could claim that our fixed gender roles are based on biological differences, we could argue that the androgynous model is also based on innate sex differences. So, not only the patriarchal one, but this model could also exist in any society.

The second question is the significance of the androgyny archetype. By comparing the concept of wholeness in the selected creation myths with the wholeness in the individuation process, I show that the androgyny archetype is closely related to the psyche wholeness. The inner wholeness is also a central theme of Jungian theory. The Jungian model of psychological health is based on balance and wholeness, as one expression of wholeness, androgyny is related to many Jungian theories. This connection makes it possible to analyze creation myths through a Jungian perspective because recognizing and reuniting the opposites of oneself (anima and animus) is the core of Jungian theory and the central spirit of creation mythology. This connection gives our interpretation of creation myths a meaning in real life—an androgynous interpretation may be positively linked to our mental health and psyche wholeness.

The last question concerns the validity of the meaning of wholeness. It is, whether the wholeness is only a fancy illusion of the Jungian school and androgyny interpretation. Locus of control (LOC) refers to the degree to which people believe that they have

control over the events in their lives. According to related LOC research, people with both masculine and feminine traits have more chances to have an internal LOC, which means that they could achieve a happier, healthier, and more successful life than others who only have gender-typical traits. Related LOC studies show that having atypical gender traits could help individuals build a more internal orientation, and internal LOC means people would feel that they have more control over their own life because people with an internal LOC will praise their own abilities when they succeed and recognize the need to improve their ability when fail. Since LOC orientation has gradually developed in people's interactions with the outside world, people could change their type of LOC when they changed the way to see the world. Thus, we may think of LOC as a tool that could test whether a person has changed their view of the world and self. I will use this tool to analyze the behaviors of main characters in the creation myths and to discuss the possible changes in their LOC orientation. Besides, I plan to use LOC theory as extra support and complement to Jungian theory on androgyny. The psyche wholeness is the ultimate purpose of the Jungian individual process (to extent consciousness and develop personality). This wholeness, as defined by the Jungian school, is the freedom to possess both masculine and feminine traits. Since LOC research proved that people with both masculine and feminine traits are more internal in LOC than others who only have gender-typical traits, we may infer that the psychological androgyny is not only beneficial to individual growth, but also one's relationships with others.

Jungian Collective Unconscious Theory and the Androgyny Archetype

It is no coincidence that the concept of androgyny forms a cross-cultural mythological prototype. In his collective unconscious theory, Carl Gustav Jung (1981)

asserts that myth reveals the psyche of the group through specific archetypes. The collective unconscious, according to Jung (1981):

It is a part of the psyche which can be negatively distinguished from a personal unconscious by the fact that it does not, like the latter, owe its existence to personal experience and consequently is not a personal acquisition...the contents of the collective unconscious have never been in consciousness, and therefore have never been individually acquired, but owe their existence exclusively to heredity. (p. 43)

Jung has chosen the term “collective” to distinguish the collective unconscious from the personal unconscious. Different people may have diverse personal unconscious according to their experiences, but the collective unconscious has the same contents in all people.

Jung (1981) believes that people cannot dream of things that do not exist in their conscious and unconscious minds. For example, in the era of no television, no internet, and no developed transportation. People who were born and raised in a small remote town without a sea and anything about the sea, do not have any chance to see the sea in person. And the sea should not appear in their dream. In this case, if a sea-like landscape appeared in their dream, we may infer that the image of the sea is likely to exist in their unconscious. Not only that, if almost all people from isolated locations who have never seen the sea have dreamed about it, but the image of the sea could also be called an archetype that exists in their collective unconscious. This reminds me of water elements in many creation myths. Given the characteristics of water (slow and turbulent), we may think that the image of water may be the manifestation of the androgyny archetype, which is in the collective unconscious of human beings. The archetype of the sea is

impossible as a result of personal acquisition because people who have dreamed of it have never seen it in the real world. The same is true for the difference between the collective unconscious and conscious. Since humans cannot consciously think about something that never existed in their real life, one possible hypothesis for the source of the collective unconscious, in this case, is that it is inherited. The archetype of the sea is impossible a result of the personal acquisition because people who have dreamed of it have never seen the real sea. Moreover, this archetype is not just a random knowledge from the human ancient but a key element in helping humanity survive and thrive. The human civilization has always developed near bodies of water—rivers, oceans, lakes, etc. The earliest explorations of the world occurred by ship, so it may be true that the majority of people throughout history have had personal experience with the various characteristics of large bodies of water. This is also certainly true in the areas where the Babylonian and Biblical creation stories developed, so there are many water elements in Genesis and the Babylonian creation myth. To conclude, it is reasonable that there is such an essential archetype in the collective unconscious of humanity.

As can be seen from the creation myths in the first part, androgyny symbols exist in three myths, and they are from different cultural backgrounds. Thus, we may consider the androgyny symbol as a kind of archetype. In the collective unconscious theory, archetypes are definite forms in the human psyche that exist everywhere and anytime (Jung, 1981, p. 43). Jung cited a sentence from Irenaeus to explain the relationship between the collective unconscious and the archetype: “The creator of the world did not fashion these things (collective unconscious) directly from himself but copied them from archetypes outside himself” (Jung, 1981, p. 15). This explanation reminds me of the

origin of humankind in Genesis - God said: "Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness" (1:26). We may understand the "God" here as the collective name of the original creator. If we could accept that human beings are all descended from a common source (whether from the creation of God or the evolution of apes or a marine species), we may also tolerate that the human mind could derive from the same root. Just as everyone has two arms and two legs, people also yearn for the same love and fear the same death. Thus, there could be a common psychological mechanism that exists in everyone's psyche, across nationalities and cultures. The androgyny archetype is one example of this psychological mechanism.

The argument that we are all born with an archetype of androgyny because it exists in different creation myths may bring us to a related objection that there is an archetype of gender hierarchy, which is why patriarchy is almost universal in the world. This is a good objection. However, people would not develop the belief of gender hierarchy until they interact with the outside world in the early childhood (Mandalaywala et al., 2020). They conform to this social norm because it provides order and predictability in social relationships (McLeod, 2008). The androgyny archetype, on the contrary, is innate as no matter how masculine and feminine behaviors are defined, we could always find individuals with opposite gender traits on either male or female group.

Like Taoist Yin and Yang, the androgyny in this paper includes but goes beyond the concept of the union of the two sexes. It refers to the union of all opposites. Even those who have no idea of the androgyny concept will naturally feel that the existence of the opposite pairs is familiar: light and dark, weak and strong, low and high, and so forth. Tying androgyny with these opposing pairs seems to make the notion of androgyny relies

on binary gender stereotypes or even hierarchical gender stereotypes. I do not wish to dispute the facts. The gender binary is based on the binary biological sex of the human, which is a fact of biology. Likewise, other binary pairs such as day and night, strong and weak, low and high, etc. are also objective facts that are true in the natural world. Thus, the concept of androgyny is based on the existence of binary genders. However, the androgyny archetype has nothing to do with hierarchical gender stereotypes.

Acknowledging the legitimacy of binary gender is not the same as acknowledging that one gender is superior to the other. The former is based on biological facts, while the latter is based on bias.

Androgyny is a broader concept based on binary gender—that is, an individual possesses both masculine and feminine qualities. The length of night and day could change with the change of seasons, the judgement of low and high could change with the change of the reference, and a person’s traits could also flow with the change of their personal experience. In this expression, these opposites are all objective existences, and no one is superior to the other. As long as we do not associate one side with good and other side with bad, their binary classification is not based on hierarchical stereotypes. The androgyny concept does not tie anything to good or bad, is based on the binary gender concept but goes beyond it by suggesting that feminine and masculine traits are not limited to either sex but could be fluid between the two genders.

The significance of collective unconscious and androgyny archetype

Like any part of our physical body, collective unconscious exists also for a reason. The function of the collective unconscious is to help people “assign structure and meaning to the world” (Gimbel, 2020). The memories of our ancestors are in our

unconscious. The transpersonal nature which contains the ancient wisdom has developed and passed through the collective unconscious over time.

As part of the Jungian theory of the collective unconscious, Jung (1981) defines the anima as the men's unconscious feminine side and the animus as the women's unconscious masculine side. So, we all have both feminine and masculine sides within us (Singer, 1976). We need to notice that the concept of anima or animus "is a purely empirical concept, whose sole purpose is to give a name to a group of related or analogous psychic phenomena" (Jung, 1981, p. 53). In other words, anima and animus are not a single existence, but a collective group of related characteristics. We could find the symbols of anima and animus in almost all the opposite pairs. Thus, we may safely assume that anima and animus are universal (Jung, 1981). Since androgyny means the combination of two opposites, anima and animus are included in the androgyny archetype. That is, they are all related to the wholeness concept in the creation myths.

The term "archetype" originally refers to the "image of God in man." If we consider this "image" as a metaphor for God's state, then "archetype" could mean "God's state in man." In this sense, we may assume that the archetype in our collective unconscious may contain "potential" about being a better version of ourselves. The anima and animus, therefore, are unrealized personal potential of males and females. The union of the male and female qualities within an individual psyche could change one's control orientation and this new orientation may eventually create a new version of oneself. Say, Jing is a friend of mine, she just found out a few months ago that the man she was going to marry was cheating on her. Since she was emotionally dependent on this man very much, this accident completely crushed her at first. But after this painful chaos, an inner

masculine part in her unconscious was awakened. She suddenly realized that she had the ability to calm her emotions, instead of relying on another man to coax her to calm down. From this case, we could see that androgyny archetype could be activated when people are in a chaotic situation. Once people find that they could become more brave or soft than they think, a new movement of the control orientation may happen, and this movement may lead to a more integrated personality.

An Objection to Jungian Collective Unconscious Theory

Not everyone accepts Jung's collective unconscious theory. As it is difficult to scientifically prove that archetypes of myths are inherited rather than learned. Literal interpretations of the collective unconscious have the potential to be considered pseudoscientific theories (Fritscher, 2020). For example, Percival (1993) argues that Jung's theory of archetypes tends to be deterministic because it is incompatible with the Darwinian theory of evolution. The biggest problem in Jung's formulations of archetype, according to Percival (1993), is "the assertion that ideas can be biologically inherited" (p. 463). Since individual experience and psyche could be biologically inherited, Jung's theory of archetypes "implies that Neo-Darwinism is false" (Percival, 1993, p. 470). He supports his argument by stating that there is no way to scan an individual's experience, translate it into the genetic code, and pass it down from generation to generation (p. 473).

Although I agree that it is hard to scientifically explain and prove the transmission process of the collective unconscious, "a symbolic interpretation of the collective unconscious is thought to have some scientific grounding because of the belief that all humans share certain behavioral dispositions" (Fritscher, 2020, Para. 20). That is to say, no matter how different our growing and living environments are compared to ancients,

and how great the cultural differences are between people, human beings still have common emotional responses toward certain things such as hot weather, fluffy kittens, and delicious food. In addition, since we have found androgyny archetype is one of the common grounds in the creation myths from isolated cultures, at least the existence of the collective unconscious is a reasonable derivation, not an unsubstantiated fantasy.

As an indispensable correlate of the collective unconscious theory, anima and animus are also a pair of controversial concepts. Percival (1993) criticizes anima and animus archetypes by indicating that recognizing people could have both male and female traits could lead to narcissism. And this narcissism is against the natural desire for reproduction. However, first, not all kinds of narcissism are bad, Besser and Priel (2010) proved that people with grandiose narcissism are inclined to exaggerate their importance, have more confidence, and are less sensitive to others' criticism. Thus, we may assume that individuals could survive and reproduce more reliably if their beliefs make them more adaptable to a particular environment. Second, logically, narcissistic people should prefer to have their genes passed on rather than the other way around. And I have not found any studies that claim that narcissism is against the natural desire for reproduction.

Besides, individuals who have both masculine and feminine sides are more charming and happy in their relationships (Moore, 2007). In this case, having both masculine and feminine traits should benefit one's love relationship and therefore increase one's possibility of reproduction. As Siegfried Sassoon (1886-1967) writes: "In me the tiger sniffs the rose". The tiger represents the one side of human nature, which could be the manliness, fierceness, and aggressiveness; while the rose symbolizes another side, which could be the femininity, benignity, and vulnerability. It is necessary to tie

these two different sides to gender in this paper because these two relative traits appear universal, and human society labels these qualities as masculine (fierceness and aggressiveness) and feminine (benignity, and vulnerability). Naturally, the tiger and the rose symbolize the masculine traits and feminine traits of human beings. Yu Kwang-chung (1952) believes that this sentence expresses, concretely and subtly, what many philosophers cannot articulate: the two relative natures of humans. At the same time, it also represents the reconciliation of those two opposites. The “sniffs” symbolizes the relationship between the two, harmony and unity. We cannot say that the bravest man has not been vulnerable for his whole life, just like we cannot say that the weakest woman has not been strong in her whole life. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that every woman has a masculine side inside her mind while every man has a feminine side inside his mind.

Jungian Individuation Process

Understanding the existences of anima and animus is still one step away from touching the core of the androgyny archetype. This step is the process of individuation, or the process of wholeness. “The individuation process is a process of course of development arising out of the conflict between the two fundamental psychic facts. Out of this union emerges new situations and new conscious attitudes” (Jung, 1981, p. 210). Individuation is a special term in Jungian analytic psychology, it could even be seen as “the purpose of Jungian psychoanalysis” (Alessio De Fiori, 2019, p. 63). Jung used the concept of individuation to refer to the process by which a person eventually becomes themselves, an integrated process. Samuels (1997) suggests that individuation is a

process that enables a person to realize in what ways they are unique and at the same time an ordinary man or woman (pp. 76-79).

Jung (1923) defines that the final goal of individuation as the development of the whole personality. During this process, although individuation admits the relationship between individuals and communities, it naturally involves a certain degree of opposition to social norms. It is a very personal process of psychological exploration and realization. Jung et al. (1964) uses a story told by Zhuangzi, one of the representatives of Taoism, to describe the process of individualization: A carpenter named Stone saw a gigantic oak tree standing in a field. He immediately judged that it was a useless tree because it was too old to make any ship or tool. He felt sorry for this old tree. On the same day, the oak tree appeared in Stone's dream and explained that its uselessness is the reason why it was useful to itself—because it was useless, it has reached the biggest size of its species. This dream made Stone realize that he should pursue whatever he believed he should do instead of pursuing fame and fortune like others. "The tree symbolizes the process of individuation," Jung et al. (1964) suggests. To fulfill one's destiny, "one must surrender consciously to the power of the unconscious, instead of thinking in terms of what one should do, or of what is generally thought right, or of what usually happens" (Jung et al., 1964, p. 160). As such, people should consider leaving the social norms alone when they explore the true self.

From "the collected works of Jung" (1981) and Alessio De Fiori's reading of the "coniunctio" in Jung's "Red Book" (2019), I roughly summarize the individuation process into the following three steps. Step one is to recognize the existence of one's anima or animus. People could encounter their own latent side in dreams. They may also

be aware of their hidden personalities in their interactions with others. Some may choose to face the task that “the psyche consists of two incongruous halves which together should form a whole” (Jung, 1981, p. 209). Others may avoid this contradiction by burying it deep in the unconscious. The former will move on to the next step, while the latter will miss out on the opportunity to realize their full self.

Step two is a chaotic fight between conscious and unconscious. Before the new union, a conflict that leads to a new state is unavoidable (Fiori, 2019, p. 57). Jung (2009) believes that “disorder and meaninglessness are the mothers of order and meaning...if you marry the ordered to the chaos you produce the divine child, the supreme meaning beyond meaning and meaninglessness” (p. 235). “A divine child” means the possibility to realize wholeness (Fiori, 2019). Androgyny is associated with chaos when it goes against the current social order. For example, when Eve ate the apple, which is against God’s command, this behavior created chaos. And when Tiamat waged war on her children, she violated the social definition of motherhood. Eve and Tiamat’s actions go against social gender norms - women are supposed to be submissive and gentle. So, chaos ensued, God banished Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, and Tiamat’s world was full of wars. New orders were established after the chaos, Eve and Adam multiplied the human race, and a new world was established on Tiamat’s corpse. Thus, as Jung writes, the disorder is not always a bad thing. From a psychological perspective, God may want human beings to gain knowledge by eating the forbidden fruit (otherwise why the tree of the knowledge of good and evil exists in the Garden of Eden?), but that there is a price to this knowledge which is the death of the innocence of childhood thinking and the acceptance of adult responsibility. In addition, many stories start with the chaos caused by the protagonist

realizing their anima or animus, and many inventions occur in disordered social environments such as wars and revolutions.

Step three is the “coniunctio.” This means “from the split to wholeness” (Fiori, 2019, pp. 63-64), which is the way suggested by Jung to help individuals back to wholeness. The wholeness and the final goal of the individuation is the union of two opposites. It is “embedded between Yang and Yin, heaven and earth; the state of everlasting balance and immutable duration” (Jung, 1981, p. 537). Stated more straightforwardly, wholeness refers to a person’s acceptance of all aspects of their personality. At the same time, they could choose how to make good use of every aspect of themselves at their own will. Like the story of Oak and Stone, the Oak knew and accepted its advantages and disadvantages. Since it wanted to live longer, it struggled to grow gigantic. Socrates once said that “Know yourself.” I think the individuation process is also the process of knowing ourselves. Every individual is full of infinite possibilities, we need to break the old shackles to embrace the true self.

The Individuation Process in the Selected Creation Myths

The symbols of androgyny running through many creation myths indicates the individuation process. This part of the paper will explore the development of the anima and animus in selected creation myths and illustrate how the androgyny interpretation could lead to building an integrated self.

Genesis Creation Narrative: The Anima of Adam and the Animus of Eve

There could be two explanations for the anima inside Adam. One is that Eve awakens the anima in Adam’s unconscious by encouraging him to eat the forbidden fruit. According to Jung (1981), “when the anima is strongly constellated, she softens the

man's character and makes him touchy, irritable, moody, jealous, vain, and unadjusted" (p. 63). Not even a single line in Genesis is about how Eve persuaded Adam to eat the forbidden fruit. Only a brief description— "and she also gave some to her husband with her, and he ate" (3:6). Through this simple line, we could infer that Adam readily agreed to Eve's proposal. This assumption contains a change in his personality. As the first resident and the keeper of the Garden of Eden, if Adam wanted to eat the forbidden fruit, he did not have to wait until Eve offered the fruit. If this is the case, we could say that at least Eve changed Adam to some extent. Interestingly, the result of eating the fruit is as same as the result of the individuation process— "like God" (3:4), "knowing good and evil" (3:5), and "the eyes of both of them were opened" (3:8). If we consider God as the symbol of perfection in the Genesis world, then to be like God is to be nearer to a state of wholeness. In this case, we could say that Eve awakened the feminine side of Adam. She (Adam's anima) would listen to his wife's advice emotionally rather than obeying God's order rationally.

Another assumption is that, symbolically, Eve is the anima part of Adam. We could find some clues in the story. God created Eve from the rib of Adam (2:22), this behavior may imply that God has cut off the "female sexual organs" of Adam. First Adam was a hermaphrodite, and through God's intention of creating a helper for him, was robbed of his androgynous. Leaving the other half changed Adam from wholeness into an ordinary man. In this interpretation, we may think of the forbidden fruit as a symbol of the reunion of Adam (masculine side) and Eve (feminine side). This way also could make Adam's obedience to Eve reasonable, as everyone longs to be united with the

other half they are missing. And God's angry is also reasonable, as he did not want Adam back to the original wholeness.

Likewise, there could be two explanations for the animus inside Eve. One is that the words of the serpent awaken the animus in Eve's unconscious. Olson (1996) suggests that the serpent in the Genesis creation story was a symbol of chaos and rebirth. If this is the case, it makes perfect sense for the serpent to play the role of awakening Eve's inner animus. Although Eve was not the first resident of the Garden of Eden, if she wanted to eat forbidden fruit before, she could do it freely. Based on her reaction to the serpent's words, we could infer that she was willing to obey God's order for two reasons—one is that God has said: "you shall not eat from it or touch it, or you will die" (3:3); another one is that she did not know that the forbidden fruit would "make one wise" (3:6). Once she was told that these two reasons are all invalid, which is, "you surely will not die...in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (3:5). She ate the fruit without any hesitation. From this, we could infer that Eve was not afraid of God, but of death; what she wanted is not to show loyalty to God, but to become like God.

Besides, I venture to speculate that Eve believed the serpent's words not because it was necessarily believable, but because her desire outweighed her fear. This emotion, we call courage. Jung uses "animus" as a term to describe the masculine side of women, which originated from Latin and was used to describe ideas as the rational mind, courage, desire, and power. Since we could find that what the serpent encouraged Eve to do was to question God's commands and to pursue her own desires bravely, we may consider serpent awakens the animus in Eve's unconscious. On the one hand, the serpent indeed

brought chaos. Eve's behavior of eating the forbidden fruit violated God's rules, God was so angry that he expelled Eve and Adam from the Garden of Eden. On the other hand, the serpent indeed brought rebirth. If we think of the Garden of Eden as a cage that limited personal individuation development, then the fall of human beings instead led to the rebirth of mankind. The moment Eve's courage triumphed over her fears, she embraced her animus, and she began her journey of the individuation process.

Another assumption is that, as Eve was to Adam, Adam could also be the animus part of Eve symbolically. From this perspective, we may assume Adam was the male part of Eve before God cut off "Eve" from Adam. Separation from her other part turned Eve from an androgynous person into an ordinary woman. Like I wrote in the account of Adam, if we consider the forbidden fruit as a symbol of the reunion of Eve (feminine side) and Adam (masculine side), this way will make Eve's behavior of encouraging Adam to eat the fruit reasonable. Eve's eyes widened and she wanted to back to wholeness by reuniting with her male half (animus), such behavior certainly made God feel threatened because it was a near-God state—*androgynous*.

Either Eve helped Adam realize his anima or Eve and Adam were reflections of each other's anima and animus, the unity of Adam and Eve (mentally or physically) made them more like gods. From this perspective, the Garden of Eden is like a golden cage. If Adam refuses the individuation process, he will continue to live there in ignorance. But he will never realize his potential because his psyche cannot grow (Ellens, 1997). Without the help of Eve (the feminine side), Adam (the masculine side) alone will not change his attitude toward God's order.

The above analysis indicates that people could become more like gods when they reunite with their anima or animus. Jung also states that “with the archetype of the anima we enter the realm of the gods” (1981, p. 33). To avoid the appearance of new gods, “everything the anima touches becomes numinous—unconditional, dangerous, taboo, magical” (p. 33). With the growth of the mind comes the birth of chaos, which is dangerous to one’s identity and the current order. Out of fear of change and chaos, people selectively ignored Eve’s courage while emphasizing that she cannot resist temptation. But this chaos is motivated by the individual’s desire for a more integrated state. The order and chaos are like the two sides of Yin and Yang in the Tai Chi figure; we cannot eliminate one side and leave the other side alone. No matter how calm the sea is, there will be wind and waves, and no matter how strong the wind and waves are, there is still calm in the depths of the ocean. The same is true of the human mind and social environment. While every growth and change may bring some degree of chaos, individuals and societies could always embrace this discomfort like a clam shell embraces a grain of sand and turn it into a shining pearl. Thus, the best way to deal with the discomfort of chaos is to embrace it, just as surfers embrace storms and waves. We could never eliminate the waves as it exists objectively, but we could sail through the winds and waves by finding our balance in chaos. That is, seeing and embracing our anima or animus is a possible way for us to live with the chaos.

Enuma Elish: The Animus of Tiamat

Different from the individuation process of Adam, Tiamat’s individuation is a tough one. She was a gentle and forgiving mother at the beginning. When Apsu wanted to destroy their children, Tiamat cried (1:43). Although she was “furious” (1:42), it was

non-aggressive anger that stemmed from a mother's desire to protect her children. What awakened the animus in her unconscious was hatred. The traditional reading is that she wants revenge for her husband, and a less popular interpretation is that she wants revenge for her bullied children (Xiang, 2018). Whatever the reason, the desire for revenge brought out her unconsciously masculine side. She went from a mother to a warrior, or in a worse term, a monster.

The war that Tiamat created corresponds to the chaotic stage in the process of individuation. It is devastating and ugly. I believe the reason why Tiamat is not a favorable character in many traditional interpretations is that she is androgynous at that time. On the one hand, she can constantly breed new monsters; on the other hand, she could fight against her children. In fact, there are many fathers who tried to kill or killed their children in the myth and the history. Say, Abraham was willing to show his loyalty to God by sacrificing his own son (Genesis 22); Peter the Great killed his son (Paul, 2020); Emperor Taizong of Tang killed Prince of Qi (Wechsler et al., 1979); in the *Enuma Elish*, Apsu intended to kill his children. However, traditional readings were very forgiving of the motives and actions of fathers who want to kill their children.

I guess this bias may have something to do with the "nature" that society has given to men. Male traits are considered aggressive and sometimes violent. Just as people do not blame lions for eating rabbits, people do not find it strange that men are aggressive. On the contrary, people will feel uncomfortable when they find a mother who wants to kill her children. So, people call Tiamat a monster, the source of the chaos. But they all deliberately ignored the obvious fact that Tiamat's action was no different from what Apsu was trying to do before. We could even say that her killing had a more moral

motive - she wanted revenge. And her husband wanted to destroy their children just because they were noisy.

People tend to ignorantly fear things and phenomena that are different from their perceptions. Like the androgynous Tiamat. Notwithstanding her monstrosity, androgynous Tiamat has turned into a savior for a few of her children. This war was also a bringer of healing because of the appearance of the new order. One cannot make an omelet without breaking eggs; Marduk cannot get new power and make new order without the chaos caused by Tiamat. Therefore, the individuation process is a process of first destroying and then creating.

Taoist Cosmogonic Myth: The Anima and Animus Inside the Tao

If the last two creation myths only imply the existence of anima and animus, the Taoist creation myths directly point out that everyone has both sides of Yin and Yang. Moreover, it also contains the individuation process: “Tao gave birth to One. One gave birth to two. Two gave birth to Three. Three gave birth to all the myriad things” (Tao te ching, translated by Wu, chapter 42). From a Jungian perspective, “one” could be understood as the beginning of life. Everyone comes from the Tao. Since Tao is the great perfection in Taoism, we may say that we all come from wholeness. Then, we may find two opposite sides inside ourselves. Not only do we need to see these two opposing sides, but we also need to “give birth to” them. That is, to make them manifest from the unconscious to the conscious. The new self which is called “Three” was born after the combination of the two opposite parts: Yin and Yang, the light and dark, the feminine and masculine, and so forth. In this way, all new things were born.

The concept of Yin and Yang not only includes both masculine and feminine sides, but it also represents all opposites. Wilhelm (1938) suggests that the characters of Yin and Yang “refer to phenomena in nature” (p. 12). He believes that if we could understand “Tao” as a method or a conscious path to unify things that are separate, we may be approaching the psychological content of the concept of “Tao.” At a higher level of consciousness, the unity of opposites is a process of spiritual development expressed in symbols. Wilhelm defines anima and animus as the incarnations of the unconscious and thus sees them as a bridge to the unconscious, that is, the functions that could connect the unconscious. Thus, the essence of the androgyny archetype is not only the combination of feminine and masculine sides but also the connection of conscious and unconscious.

Although I did not find any detailed description of animus or femininity worth mentioning in “Collected Works of Jung” (1981), I stumbled across Jung’s interpretation of femininity in the Chinese version of “The Secret of the Golden Flower” (2016): “the mind of the professional scholar is purely male, and for such a reason, breeding is an unnatural process alien to nature...the greater spirit is feminine, with a receptive, nurturing womb that transforms the unfamiliar into the familiar” (pp. 2-3, translated from Chinese). With this description of the feminine spirit, Jung praises Wilhelm’s work at the beginning of the book. From Jung’s remarks, the feminine spirit could also be applied to men to make men more tolerant and accepting. Besides, it is “greater” than the purely masculine mind because it would accept and transform unfamiliar concepts. Likewise, I believe women could benefit from the masculine spirit as well. For example, connecting with one’s animus can make women more open-minded and braver.

The Androgynous God in the Creation Myths

In my analysis in the first part, every God in the selected myths could be androgynous under an androgyny interpretation. “It is a remarkable fact that perhaps the majority of cosmogonic gods are of a bisexual nature” (Jung, 1981, p. 132), Jung believes that the “hermaphrodite” or the “bisexual” in the creation myths means the union of the two opposites, which is closer to the definition of androgyny. God’s state is like a primordial state of mind, where “differences and contrasts were either barely separated or completely merged” (132). With the appearance of consciousness, the opposites slowly draw apart. In this case, it is easy to assume that the androgynous gods are products of primordial non-differentiation.

When talking about the separation from our wholeness, Singer (1976) considers the separation of the masculine and feminine as an inevitable change in the course of “the disintegration of the primordial androgyny” (p. 52). This is a reasonable assumption, but I think “disintegration” is not an appropriate word to express this phenomenon. If the primordial androgyny always exists in our collective unconscious, which Singer also agrees with, we could say that most people have lost the connection with the androgyny archetype, but not that it already coming to a piece. As Jung (1981) claims, “man’s imagination has been preoccupied with this idea (androgyny) over and over again on the high and even the highest levels of culture, as we can see from the last Greek and syncretic philosophy of Gnosticism” (p. 132). Therefore, I believe that androgyny exists in every era and every aspect of our lives, it may be occasionally forgotten, but it never goes away. After all, the androgyny is a way to resolve the conflicts by uniting opposite sides. And androgyny archetype also demonstrates the wholeness that exists in the human

collective unconscious. Thus, as a symbol of wholeness, androgyny is still, and will always have a role in every human society.

The Androgynous Water in the Creation Myths

Water is an essential symbol of the androgyny archetype in the creation myths, we could find many descriptions of water in many creation myths. At the same time, water itself is a special existence--water contains two opposed qualities because the current can be calm or turbulent. This special feature makes the water close to the ideal androgynous state, that is, different gender traits can flow in a person. The spirit of God once moved over the surface of the waters (1:2), and then separated waters to create heaven and the earth (1:9) in the Genesis creation narrative. The source of all life is the mingling primordial waters in Enuma Elish. And the water in the Taoist creation myth contains both Yin and Yang sides, it is also the symbol of the combination of the strongest and the weakest in Taoism. The water in these creation myths is a symbol of the “dark psyche” (Jung, 1981, p. 24). That is, in other words, our unconscious wholeness. So, in myths, the waters are all divided or separated by gods. Separating water from land is like separating the unconscious from the conscious. The result of the separation is the creation of the order. The price of this order is that the unconscious mind is completely cut off from consciousness, and people lose their divinity and become laity. Thus, to gain our divinity again, we need to connect our collective unconscious with our consciousness.

Traditional Readings of Creation Myths are Against the Individuation Process

In the case of traditional reading, the individuation process in these myths is invariably a failure. In Genesis, if we consider the Fall as only God’s punishment for humankind, then it is a backsliding of humans rather than growth. Moreover, the union of

Adam and Eve is a sin in this case. In Enuma Elish, if we view Tiamat's revenge as an insane act, then any intention of challenging one's gender role is also problematic. In Taoist creation myth, if we regard Yang as only the male side and Yin as only the female side, Tao's integrity of including every opposite is deprived. To sum up, only the androgyny interpretation could make the mythology fully adapt to the Jungian individuation process. So, the androgyny perspective is more inclusive and offers more freedoms to individuals.

An Additional Support: Locus of Control Theory

All significances of the androgyny archetype and wholeness that have been discussed so far in this paper are all inferences. I consider all possible interpretations as available choices for individuals to pick. Whether one chooses a traditional one or an androgynous one, the door is open to both ways of interpreting these texts. However, although Jungian individuation is a theory based on assumptions rather than experimental evidence, I still wish to provide an additional support for Jung's argument (1981) that people who choose to go through the individuation process could live happier and fuller than others who refuse to pursue wholeness.

The locus of control (LOC) theory provides additional support for the benefits of the individuation process to the individual by offering an experimental way to test whether a person has changed their view of the world and self. LOC refers to the degree to which people believe they are able to influence events that happen in their lives. For those who tend to believe that their actions are responsible for the events that influence their lives, they have an internal LOC. For others who tend to believe that the outcomes of their actions are outside their control, they have an external LOC (Gerrig & Zimbardo,

2002). Therefore, control orientation is like a tool that helps people explain the outside world, including how to interpret gender roles.

Rotter (1966) confirms that people with an internal LOC view will process their interactions with the world in a more positive way, this is also the goal of the individuation process. For instance, a religious woman with an internal control orientation believes that she could still “invent” the unique meaning of this “decision” for herself despite her gender role being determined. In this case, all stereotypes regarding women’s roles seem to her to be tests given by God, and she needs to pass these tests to complete her mission on earth (Smith, 1993, pp. 72-76). Thus, we may assume that internal LOC is positively associated with more liberal gender views. If we set an objective event as a, one’s LOC orientation as b, one’s understanding of this objective event as c, and the action based on this understanding as x; the content of x depends on the content of c, and the content of c depends on the value of b. We got the table 2. This table shows that even for the analysis of the same a (event), different b (LOC orientation) may lead to different c (understanding of event a) and generate different x (actions based on understanding of the event a). It is impossible to judge which version of x is more correct without the actual personal and social context. But we can see that the x formed by an internal LOC are more inclusive as well as provide more possibilities for individuals. In addition, this table shows a high degree of similarity between the x guided by internal LOC and the interpretations from an androgyny perspective. The same is true for the relationship between the x guided by external LOC and the explanations from the traditional reading.

The Relationship Between LOC and Androgyny

It seems that there should be no differences in the scores of LOC between males and females if everyone shares the same androgynous archetype in their unconscious. However, the archetype of androgyny exists in the human unconscious rather than conscious; most people tend to conform to socially fixed gender roles until they are reunited with their anima or animus; and society may judge men and women quite differently about the same thing (For example, people judged Marduk's killing as justice while calling Tiamat's killing an act of the devil). So, even with the same androgynous archetype in the unconscious, males and females should have different scores of LOC because control orientation is built from people's interaction with the outside world. This difference in scores between males and females may represent an unequal influence of the outside world on individuals of different genders because gender equality is still not achieved in most societies today. Therefore, we might assume that it should be possible for people with androgynous traits to break away from this inequality in LOC scores. If this is true, the relationship between LOC and androgyny is that LOC is a tool for testing whether a person can change their perception of themselves and others by having androgynous traits.

Although Rotter (1966) states that sex differences could be ignored, other scholars have shown that males have higher internal scores than females (Sherman et al., 1997). Freedman (1992) suggests that the difference in scores between males and females may be caused by different learning experiences. For example, men are encouraged to believe in themselves, and many social rules are more friendly to men (for example, the male preference in job postings). Over time, males become more internal orientation because they have received a lot of positive feedback, which confirmed their ability to achieve

success. Women are not as fortunate as men. Even if they work hard, they may not get the results they deserve due to their disadvantaged social status. Hence, the more sex-typed one person is, the more chance they will have a similar LOC as their same-sex group. Therefore, those who self-attribute atypical gender traits may have a different LOC than their same-sex group. The conclusion of Freedman's study is consistent with our previous inferences, that is, the gender inequality caused different scores for male and female groups on LOC. Therefore, to have a different LOC than one's same-sex group is a better choice for women because females generally have lower internal scores than males (Sherman et al., 1997).

Additionally, Brehony and Geller (1981) found that androgynous people (those who consider themselves have both masculine and feminine traits) would not be easily influenced by the social norms. Freedman's research (1992) supports their conclusion by showing that androgynous people have higher scores on internal LOC and self-esteem than masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated people. If this is the case, we may assume that having both masculine and feminine traits is a favorable choice for both genders. Since the final goal of the individual process is to reunite both split parts by recognizing one's anima or animus, we may infer that this goal could benefit individuals in the way of increasing their internal LOC scores.

Moore (2007) chooses a representative Israeli sample of over 500 respondents to analyze whether individuals who self-attribute both gender-typical and atypical traits will live more satisfied than those who only self-attribute gender-typical traits. Moore (2007) refers to masculine traits as "instrumental traits" while referring to feminine traits as "expressive traits" in her paper because she wants to get rid of the gendered overtones of

personal traits (p. 765). From the data results, this research achieved the following two conclusions. The first one is that “Women’s internal control was influenced directly and positively by instrumental (masculine) traits” (Moore, 2007, p. 772). Women’s instrumental traits could reduce the scores of their external LOC (p. 776). And women’s life satisfaction was positively influenced only by two factors: internal LOC ($\beta = .222$), and instrumental (masculine) traits ($\beta = .194$) (p. 776). According to these results, the more instrumental a woman is, the higher her scores of internal LOC could be, and the lower her scores of external LOC could be. Jung described the animus as the masculine side of a woman in her collective unconscious. The individuation process requires a woman to recognize this unconscious masculine side and turn it into her conscious. Moore’s research (2007) proves that a woman who could realize her animus (unconscious masculine side) would have a higher chance to evolve an internal control. Besides, since women’s life satisfaction was positively related to the internal LOC and instrumental traits, we could infer that a woman with masculine traits would live a happier life than another woman with only feminine traits. Therefore, we could boldly say that women who have achieved their inner wholeness would have higher scores on their life satisfaction than those who refuse to go through the individuation process.

The second conclusion from Moore’s research (2007) is that men’s internal LOC was positively influenced by both instrumental traits (masculine traits) ($\beta=.22$) and expressive traits (feminine traits) ($\beta = .30$) (p. 772). Men’s life satisfaction was positively related to their scores of internal LOC ($\beta = .235$), instrumental traits ($\beta = .157$), and expressive traits ($\beta = .175$). But it was negatively related to men’s scores of external LOC ($\beta=-.216$) (p. 773). Different from women’s internal LOC, both masculine and feminine

traits are positively related to men's internal LOC. Compared to the influence of masculine traits ($\beta=.22$), the influence of feminine traits ($\beta = .30$) is more powerful. And feminine traits have a more positive influence on men's life satisfaction than instrumental traits (.175 vs. .157). From these results, we could infer that a man with feminine traits would have higher scores of internal LOC and have a higher chance to live a satisfying life than another man who only has masculine traits. The feminine traits in this research could be understood as the conscious version of men's anima. Men with both feminine and masculine traits could be considered as ones who completed their individuation process and achieved psychological androgyny. According to the results above, we could say that men may live a happier life by realizing their unconscious anima.

To conclude, the combination of masculine and feminine traits is the way for people to obtain an internal LOC. Thus, the related LOC research provides a shred of experimental evidence to support the significance of the individuation process. That is, choosing to recognize one's opposite side could expand one's eyes, improve one's life quality, and help one back to the wholeness by achieving psychological androgyny. The individuation is like the "forbidden fruit" in the Genesis creation myth. Perhaps eating it seems like the wrong choice given the gender norms of most societies, but once we eat it, with androgynous wholeness, we could become "God-like" (psyche wholeness).

Conclusions

In summary, I have attempted to show three things. First, under an androgyny interpretation, the common ground (androgyny symbols) in creation myths indicates that people may share the same unconscious, that is, the androgyny archetype may exist in our collective unconscious. Second, Jungian theories related to the individuation process

support the existence of the androgyny archetype in the human psyche and suggest that we need to return to our psychological wholeness by embracing the opposite side. Third, the locus of control theory verifies the significance of the individuation process to individuals by providing experimental evidence that people who have both masculine (instrumental) and feminine (expressive) traits could have higher scores on the internal LOC and therefore live a more satisfying life.

All I have discussed throughout this paper is the possibility of a more individually friendly way to interpret the creation myth. I do not wish to claim that any interpretation or inference of creation myths discussed in this paper is the original meaning of these stories, nor do I wish to claim that the androgyny reading was the intended meaning of the author. The original texts are neutral materials to me. From these neutral materials, I tried to propose that the androgyny interpretation is more inclusive than the traditional reading. More importantly, this way provides more possibilities for individuals.

Besides, I do admit that what is good for the individual is not necessarily good for the group or society. Conversely, an interpretation that is unfriendly to the individual is not necessarily bad for the collective. The traditional reading of the creation myth may be a kind of protection against the possible chaos from gender division and social order. While the individuation process may bring a better life to individuals, it inevitably causes small-scale “chaos.” When enough people wish to achieve wholeness by challenging social gender norms, the scale of this “chaos” will gradually expand, and the relevant social orders will also be affected by a series of challenges. Just as humans currently have no perfect way to solve the trolley problem (Francis, 1989), there is no flawless interpretation of the creation myth that is good for both individuals and the collective.

Neither the androgynous archetype, the primordial wholeness, nor the Jungian individuation process want to isolate individuals from the world. On the contrary, these concepts serve only one subject: how to gather the whole world in oneself. Like Jung writes in the “Red Book” (2009):

As a man you are part of mankind, and therefore you have a share in the whole of mankind, as if you were the whole of mankind. If you overpower and kill your fellow man who is contrary to you, then you also kill that person in yourself and have murdered a part of your life. The spirit of this dead man follows you and does not let your life become joyful. You need your wholeness to live onward. (p. 253)

To Jung, everyone is a complex collection of psychological phenomena. In this collection, there are masculinity and femininity, Yin and Yang, light and darkness. We belonged to the whole of mankind, and every mankind is related to us. When we are kind to others, we are also kind to a part of ourselves; and vice versa. Based on this premise, when people are devaluing Eve, Tiamat, and Yin, they are also devaluing a part of themselves. A biased view is the castration of one’s infinite potentialities.

In closing, all the stories and concepts described in this paper contain the same message: returning to the androgynous wholeness is a workable way to heal our binary way of thinking, and this is also a promising way to become a better self. Embrace the opposite side of ourselves (unconscious anima or animus) could balance our Yin and Yang side and thereby achieve a mentally healthier life. Like the story of the oak tree and the Stone, no one has a standard correct answer for how to live a worthwhile life. Therefore, this paper only wishes to provide a possible option for those who want to explore more

possibilities for themselves, rather than attempts to debate which interpretation, gender, personal trait, etc. are superior to the others.

References

- Adrian, C. S., Graham, E. H., & Robert, L. W. (1997). Gender differences in the locus of control construct, *Psychology and Health*, 12(2), 239-248. DOI: 10.1080/08870449708407402
- Alter, R. (2004). *The five books of moses: A translation with commentary*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Barton, G. A. (1893). Tiamat. *Journal of American Oriental Society*, 15, 1-27. American Oriental Society.
- Batto, B.F. (1992). *Slaying the dragon*. Westminster John Knox Press.
- Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2010). Grandiose narcissism versus vulnerable narcissism in threatening situations: Emotional reactions to achievement failure and interpersonal rejection. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(8), 874-902.
- Bratcher, D. (2018). *Enuma Elish: "When on High . . ." The Mesopotamian/Babylonian Creation Myth*. The Voice. <http://www.crivoice.org/enumaelish.html>
- Brehony, K. A., & Geller, E. S. (1981). Relationships between psychological androgyny, social conformity, and perceived locus of control. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 6(2), 204–217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1981.tb00408.x>
- Britannica. (2000, November 22). *Lahmu and Lahamu*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lahmu-and-Lahamu>
- Chan, W. T. (trans. & eds.). (1969). *A source book in Chinese philosophy*. Princeton University Press.
- Daly, M. (1978). *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ellens, J. H. (1997). A Psychodynamic Hermeneutic of the Fall Story: Genesis 2:25-3:24: Through a Psychological Lens. *Pastoral Psychology*, 45, 221-236.
- Epley, N., Waytz, A., & Cacioppo, J.T. (2007). On seeing human: A three-factor theory of anthropomorphism. *Psychological Review*, 4(114), 864–886. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.114.4.8649>
- Feng, G. F. & English, J. (trans.). (1989). *Lao Tsu: Tao Te Ching*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Fiori, A. D. (2019). *From the spirit to Wholeness: The “Coniunctio” in C. G. Jungs Red Book from Holism: Possibilities and Problems*. Taylor & Francis Group. ProQuest Ebook Central. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rutgers/ebooks/detail.action?docID=5988051>
- Freedman, R. D. (1983). Woman, a power equal to a man. *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 9, 53-58.
- Freedman, S. A. (1992). *Sex, Gender and Locus of Control in College Students*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association 100th, Washington, DC.
- Fritscher, L. (2020, May 15). *Understanding the Collective Unconscious*. Very well mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-the-collective-unconscious-2671571>
- Gerrig, R. J. & Zimbardo, P. G. (2002). *Psychology and Life*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Gimbel, S. (2020, October 14). *Carl Jung and the concept of collective consciousness*. WONDRIUM DAILY. <https://www.thegreatcoursesdaily.com/carl-jung-and-the-concept-of-collective-consciousness/>
- Gomola, A. (2014). The Myth of the Creation of Woman in Genesis 2: 18–23 and its Possible Translations– the Consequences for Christian Anthropology. *Studia Religiologica*, 47(2), 77–88. DOI:10.4467/20844077SR.14.006.2379
- Hamori, J.E. (2008). When Gods were men: The embodied God in biblical and near eastern literature, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (384), 36–185.
- Heidel, A. (1951). *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hendrischke, B. (2017). Dialogue Forms in the Taiping jing (Scripture on Great Peace). *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 137(4), 719–736. <https://doi.org/10.7817/jameroriesoci.137.4.0719>
- Jespersen, M. (2016). Men are not Yang and women are not yin: Gender construction in the Tao Te Ching and the I Ching. In A. P. Michele & J. H. Ellens (Eds.), *Feminism and religion: how faiths view women and their rights* (pp. 321-333).
- Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types; Or, the psychology of Individuation*. London: Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- Jung, C. G., von Franz, M. L., Henderson, J. L., Jacobi, J., & Jaffe, A. (1964). *Man & His Symbols*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.

- Jung, C. G. (1981). *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler & W. McGuire (Eds.), translated by R.F.C. Hull. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (2009). *The Red Book* (pp. 229-230). In S. Shamdasani (Eds.), translated by M. Kyburz, J. Peck, & S. Shamdasani. New York, Philemon Foundation and W.W. Norton & Co.
- Kamm, M, F. (1989). Harming Some to Save Others. *Philosophical Studies*. 57 (3), 227–60. doi:10.1007/bf00372696. S2CID 171045532
- Kłonkowska, A. (2014). Dual-unity or dichotomy? Androgyny and social construction of gender bipartition. *Creativity Studies*, 7, 118-134. 10.3846/23450479.2014.944595
- Kvam, K. E., Scheering, L. S. & Ziegler, Valarie H. (Eds.). (1999). *Hebrew Bible Accounts. Eve and Adam: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Readings on Genesis and Gender* (PP. 15-40). Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt2050vqm.5
- Lambert, W. G. (2013). *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Eisenbrauns.
- Lévi, S. C. (1974). *The Savage Mind*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Mandalaywala, T. M., Tai C., & Rhodes, M. (2020). Children’s use of race and gender as cues to social status. *PLOS ONE*, 15(6), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234398>
- Massetti, M. K. (1982). *Symbols of Sexual Separation and Androgyny in Myth and Religion*. Paper presented at the National Women’s Studies Association Conference.
- McLeod, S. A. (2008). *Social roles*. Simply Psychology. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/social-roles.html>
- Mobley, G. (2012). *The return of the chaos monsters: And other backstories of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Moore, D. (2007). Self Perceptions and Social Misconceptions: The Implications of Gender Traits for Locus of Control and Life Satisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 56, 767–780. <https://doi-org.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/10.1007/s11199-007-9238-9.17>
- Morewedge, C. K., & Clear, M. E. (2008). Anthropomorphic God concepts engender moral judgment. *Social Cognition*, 26(2), 182-189.

- Mortenson, T. (2006, January 20). *An in-depth look at the translation of the Hebrew word Adam*. 1:1 Answers In Genesis. <https://answersingenesis.org/adam-and-eve/in-depth-look-at-translation-of-hebrew-word-adam/4>
- Mowczko, A. (2008, March 8). *A suitable Helper (in Hebrew)*. Marg Mowczko. <https://margmowczko.com/a-suitable-helper/>
- Myers, C. (2013). *Rediscovering Eve: Ancient Israelite women in context* (PP. 72-73). New York.
- Nashville, T. (1995). *New American Standard Bible, 1995 update*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Olson, D. T. (1996). *Numbers (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching)*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press. pp. 135–136. ISBN 978-0-8042-3104-6
- Patzia, A. G. & Petrotta, A. J. (2010). *Pocket Dictionary of Biblical Studies*. InterVarsity Press. ISBN 978-0-8308-6702-8.6
- Paul, P. (2020, June 8). *Private Lives of the Monarchs: How did Peter the Great kill his son and why did he send 1st wife to convent?* Meaww. <https://meaww.com/private-lives-of-the-monarchs-peter-the-great-torture-son-death-sending-first-wife-convent-445171>
- Penglase, C. (1994). *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod*. Routledge.
- Percival, R. S. (1993). Is Jung's theory of archetypes compatible with Neo-Darwinism and sociobiology? *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems*, 16(4), 459-487.
- Reninger, E. (2019, May 22). *The Meaning of Wuji (Wu Chi), the Un-manifest Aspect of the Tao*. Learn Religions. [https://www.learnreligions.com/wuji-wu-chi-3183136#:~:text=The%20Chinese%20word%20Wuji%20\(pinyin,represented%20by%20an%20empty%20circle](https://www.learnreligions.com/wuji-wu-chi-3183136#:~:text=The%20Chinese%20word%20Wuji%20(pinyin,represented%20by%20an%20empty%20circle)
- Richard, W. & Jung, C. G. (1938). *The secret of the golden flower: A Chinese book of life*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- Richard, W. & Jung, C. G. (2016). *The Secret of the Golden Flower: A Chinese Book of Life (Chinese version)*. In B. T. Zhang (Trans.). The Commercial Press.
- Roger T. A. (1981). Taoism and the androgynous ideal. *Historical Reflections/ Réflexions Historiques*, 8(3), 21-45.

- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological monographs*, 80 (1), 1-28.
- Samuels, A. (1997). *A Critical Dictionary of Jungian Analysis* (pp. 76-79). London and New York: Routledge.
- Sassoon, S. (1886-1967). *In me, Past, Present, Future meet*.
- Singer, J. (1976). *Androgyny (Jung on the Hudson Book)*. Nicolas-Hays, Inc. Kindle Edition.
- Smith, I. (1993). Women and the divine plan of God. *Feminist Theology*, 1(3), 72-76.
- Steven J. C. (2013, August 22). *Lesson 5: God's Day of Rest (Genesis 2:1-3)*. Bible. org. <https://bible.org/seriespage/lesson-5-god-s-day-rest-genesis-21-3>
- Trible, P. (1978). *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*. Philadelphia.
- Vajskop, A. (2005). Finding patterns in the chaos: Woman as chaos agent in creation myths. *Denison Journal of Religion*, 5(7), 60-73.
- Wagner, R. G. (1989). The Wang Bi Recension of the Laozi. *Early China*, 14, 27-54.
- Water Science School. (2019, November 13). *How Much Water is There on Earth?* USGS. https://www.usgs.gov/special-topics/water-science-school/science/how-much-water-there-earth?qt-science_center_objects=0#qt-science_center_objects
- Wechsler, H. J., & Twitchett, D. C. (1979). Volume 3: Sui and T'ang China. In D. C. Twitchett & J. K. Fairbank (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of China* (pp. 225-227). Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-21446-9.25
- Wu, J. (Trans.). (1989). *Tao Teh Ching*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Xiang, Z. R. (2018). Below Either/Or: Rereading Femininity and Monstrosity Inside Enuma Elish. *Feminist Theology*, 26(2), 115–132.
- Yu, G. Z. (2000). Xin you meng hu, xi xiu qiang wei. *Yu Guang Zhong Zi Xuan Ji*. Yi Li Ren Min.

Tables

Table 1

Differences between the first part (1:1-2:3) and the later part (2:4-3:34)

Table 1	The first part of Genesis (1:1-2:3)	The Later parts of Genesis (2:4-3:24)
Redundant plot	"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving over the waters." (1:1-2) "Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts" (2:1),	"This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that Lord God made earth and heaven" (2:4). This introduction seems redundant as the first part already mentioned that "...the heavens and the earth were completed..." (2:1).
Genre	Written in poetry	Written in prose
Tone	Grandeur (God created everything in order, no details)	Simpler (God created men out of mud, with detailed explanation)
The process of creating humans	"God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them" (1:27).	But there is a different creation sequence in the later part: "Then the Lord God formed man from the dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being" (2:7-8).
The sequence of creation	Animals are created before men. A female is created simultaneously with a man.	Animals are created after men. A female is created after the first man.
God's appellation	The first part refers to God as "Elohim" (the lords).	The later parts refer to God as "Yahweh" or "Yahweh Elohim".

Note: These differences, according to Biblical scholars, may indicate the existence of several Genesis accounts from different sources (the Priestly, Jahwist, Deuteronomist, and Elohist) before those accounts were anthologized together in Genesis (Patzia, 2010). By using these differences, I wish to suggest how two different parts could coexist in the androgynous interpretation and suggest that the androgynous interpretation is a more inclusive explanation than the traditional one.

Table 2

How different LOC orientations lead to diverse behaviors based on the same event

a (An objective event)	b (LOC orientation)	c (The understanding of a)	x (The action based on c)
Eve ate the forbidden fruit (Genesis 3:6)	internal	Eve was responsible for her own actions, and she ate the forbidden fruit because she wanted to be like God	We could use the information we have to make the most reasonable judgments for ourselves
Eve ate the forbidden fruit (Genesis 3:6)	external	Eve ate the forbidden fruit because of the cunning serpent, not because she wanted to violate God's order	We should stay as far away as possible from those who want to incite us to challenge the existing rules
Marduk extinguished Tiamat's life (Enuma Elish 4:103)	internal	Marduk was responsible for his own behaviors. Likewise, Tiamat She also responsible for her own death.	In any case, we could make our own choices: to fight or flight
Marduk extinguished Tiamat's life (Enuma Elish 4:103)	external	Marduk was destined to create a new world by killing Tiamat, and Tiamat was destined to die for revenge.	There is nothing we can do about our destiny. Our choices are pre-determined.
Wu Chi includes Yin and Yang (<i>Tao te ching</i> , chapter 42)	internal	Everyone has Yin and Yang inside. We could work to balance our Yin and Yang	We should not be limited by our gender, but should see our possibilities outside our gender roles
Wu Chi includes Yin and Yang (<i>Tao te ching</i> , chapter 42)	external	Yin is unique to women and Yang is unique to men. The difference between Yin and Yang is like the difference between men and women—they are all innate and fixed	We should abide by our gender roles. Otherwise, confusion and misfortune will result, as this is behavior that challenges the rule of Tao

Note: This table shows that even for the analysis of the same a (event), different b (LOC orientation) may lead to different c (understanding of event a) and generate different x (actions based on understanding of the event a). It is impossible to judge which version of x is more correct without the actual personal and social context. But we can see that the x formed by an internal LOC are more inclusive as well as provide more possibilities for individuals. In addition, this table shows a high degree of similarity between the x guided by internal LOC and the interpretations from an androgyny perspective. The same is true for the relationship between the x guided by external LOC and the explanations from the traditional reading.