

Insights From the Straight-Jacket: Epistemological Concerns Expressed by Religiously Motivated Anti-Queer Sentiments Ludger Viefhues

A Question of Understanding

In a society where 95% of evangelical fundamentalists and 72% of mainline Protestants believe (with great political impact) "that homosexual sex is always wrong," philosophizing about love, sex, and gender demands the labor of understanding.¹ (*The Fundamentalism Project* ; 3, 353). As a gay man, I wish to understand why my love for men, which seems perfectly natural to me, elicits reactions of quasi visceral disgust in so many religious Americans. Further, the question arises how a minority problem (or something that is perceived as such) can gain so much political and cultural importance. Why is the debate about same-sex marriage so heated? Which meanings are attached to our queer desires, and which religious concerns are expressed by the rejection of gays and lesbians? Finally, as a philosopher of religion, I wish to interpret these religious concerns so that they become intelligible and reasonable within the context of philosophy. Only then can it fruitfully engage in a dialogue with the religious conservative.²

Analyzing of how organization of the Christian Right, such as *Focus on the Family*, or *Concerned Women for America*, depict gays and lesbians I will first show what is *religiously* at stake for the religious conservative in the evaluation of queer love. Didi Herman's study *The Anti-Gay Agenda: Orthodox Vision and the Christian Right* provides the background for this analysis.³ Like Herman, I am not interested in extremist Christian movements, but in mainstream expressions of anti-queer sentiments. Herman focuses on evangelical Protestantism. A reading of a central passage of Paul's letter to the Romans (Rom 1:26ff) will then help us see how the religious concerns of the Christian Right are based in normative Christian scripture and therefore go beyond the denominational boundaries of evangelicalism. Reading the Christian representations of queer desires through the lens of cultural anthropology, we can further see how religious anti-queer sentiments express concerns about our capacity to know and to order the world. Finally, I will comment on ways in which philosophy can address these epistemic concerns.

What is Religiously Troublesome about Queer Love? Why Queer Love?

The current debate over queer love involves a host of fundamental religious issues. How are we supposed to read scripture? Are we allowed, e.g., to "sidestep" the scriptural injunctions against homosexual acts through a historical-critical reading of those passages? To what degree are Christians called to put pressure on governments to implement Christian values in the public sphere? It

is obvious that these questions are related to genuinely philosophical issues. The question of textual interpretation is a case in point. The whole discipline of hermeneutics owes its existence to the conundrums of biblical exegesis.

However, the fact that *queer love* becomes the probing stone to discuss these issues of scriptural authority and Christian values is surprising. Why are Christian conservatives so concerned with gay and lesbian marriage and not with laws concerning adultery or divorce? Given the clear biblical evidence that divorcing a wife amounts to adultery (Mt 5:28-32) one could make a case that the state should outlaw divorce and the courts should make sure that divorced men under no circumstances are allowed to adopt children or have custody over their children.⁴ Now, this seems like a far-fetched proposal even for most proponents of the Christian Right. But why is it far fetched? Like the queer case, the adultery case addresses central issues of biblical interpretation and of implementation of Christian values in society. Something specifically religious must be at stake for the religious conservative in the queer case, something that is most aptly represented by queer ways of loving. What is at stake for the Christian conservative? To see what is at stake for the Christian conservative let us now explore the meanings attached to our queer desires in Christian Right discourse.

Queer Desires as a Symbol for Gender Instability Gays and Lesbians in the Eyes of the Christian Right

Representations of Lesbians

Women who love women are rarely a topic in Christian Right discourse. If lesbians are mentioned, they are depicted either as "gay-lesbians" or as "feminist-lesbians." The "gay-lesbians" show how lesbian desire leads to a loss of femaleness (Herman, 1997, 98f). Gay-lesbians are oversexed, anarchic, disease-ridden, and predatory just like gay men. As one informant put it, "as the attacks on what I would call the normal sexual roles continue, . . . you see even within the lesbian side of this thing terms like bull-dyke . . . that tend to represent a male-oriented, female lesbian" (*ibid.* 98). According to the convictions of not only this informant, women are by nature gentler and more nurturing than men. Yet, lesbians lost their sense for natural womanhood. They have to relearn what it means to be truly female. The "lesbian feminist," on the other hand, is a woman who rejects all things male. Revealingly, another of Herman's sources states that we "see that lesbianism is but the logical end-result of feminist autonomism, which, pushed further, leads to the glorification of masturbation as self-assertion and freedom from males, to self-insemination, and to single parenthood as the crowning liberty" (*ibid.* 104). The lesbian feminist or feminist lesbian is "at war with motherhood, femininity, family and God" (*ibid.* 104) and paradoxically male in her anti-male militancy (*ibid.* 107).

Both pictures share that lesbian desire is represented as leading to "unwomanly women," to a breakdown of the "natural" understanding of what it means to be a

man or a woman. We might now expect that the men who love men are perceived as too female or as limp-wristed fairies. Surprisingly this is not the case.

The Representation of Gays

Contemporary Christian Right material does not focus on overly feminine men. Rather, gay desire is perceived as hyper-sexed, predatory, pagan, hedonistic and aggressive. Gay sexuality is male sexuality out of bounds (*ibid.* 78, 80f). The visual message of a video series widely available through *Focus on the Family* and the 700 Club is clear. *The Gay Agenda: March on Washington* (1993) or *Stonewall: 25 Years of Deception* (1994) show screaming, half-naked or naked men, clad in leather or chains, openly engaged in sexual activity, parading their erections. Herman concludes "these images of gay sexual behavior contain an extraordinary combination of power, degradation, excitement, pleasure, savagery, and bacchanalian hedonism" (*ibid.* 81). Lacking spiritual and physical discipline gay desire "embodies hyper-masculinity, a maleness so extreme it literarily (ex)implodes" (*ibid.* 81f.).

Gay desire is perceived as not only self-destructive but also as deeply threatening to the ordinary American male. The uncontrolled gay phallus will penetrate and conquer the ordinary American male. The fear that America will be conquered, forced into submission, by pagan gays is a pervasive theme in Christian Right discourse. Nothing could better express the full force of this fear than the non-satiric adoption of a satiric text originally published in 1987 by Boston's *Gay Community News*: "We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your feeble masculinity" (*ibid.*, 85). Numerous Christian Right publications quote this text as proof for a secret homosexual conspiracy. The gay hyper-phallus threatens "normal men" to lose their masculinity. Gay desire turns men who are supposed to penetrate women into those who are penetrated.⁵

Mastery and Submission

Whereas lesbians are unwomanly, gays are hyper-male in the perception of the Christian Right. Combining both attitudes toward lesbian and gay love alike is a notion of control. Lesbians are perceived as refusing to be controlled by *their* "rightful" male master. Gays are resisting the control of their rightful master, they are like pagans or the worshipers of Baal rejecting the force of G*d's commandments (*ibid.* 82, and 88).⁶ Queer desire is desire out of control.

Gays and lesbian desire run counter to the "divinely ordained" distribution of mastery and submission expressed in the "natural" meaning of maleness and femaleness. Queer desire threatens the system of understanding male and female roles and relationships, and thereby the sexual fabric of societal order and hierarchy.⁷ To better understand the theological claims involved in the connection between gender and control let us turn to Paul's letter to the Roman.

Paul and the Order of Creation

One of the key Christian texts rejecting homosexual behavior is a part of the first chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans (1:26ff). Paul states that "those who by their wickedness suppressed the truth" were subjected by G*d to their degrading passions. "Their women exchanged natural intercourse for unnatural, and in the same way also the men, giving up natural intercourse with women, were consumed with passion for one another. Men committed shameful acts with men and received in their own persons the due penalty for their error" (Rom 1:26-27).

Homosexual acts are tied to a willful suppression of G*d's truth and to a confusion about what constitutes "natural intercourse." Bernadette J. Brooten notes in her commentary on this passage that for the antique world the "shameful acts" mentioned in both verses refer to a confusion of gender identity.⁸ A woman in Greco-Roman antiquity who had sexual relations with other women was seen as having become like a man. "She was both anomalous and ambiguous by deviating from the norm of a culturally defined femaleness; in other words, her gender was ambiguous" (Brooten, 1996, 215). In a similar vein, a man engaging in sexual intercourse as the passive partner was prone to "suffer from the disease of effemination."⁹ The penetrating partner is culpable of participating in the passive man's loss of masculinity. Brooten argues that "Paul, like Philo and many other Greek-speaking diaspora Jews, considered male-male intercourse a transgression of social roles, which he understands as dictated by nature" (Brooten, 1996, 256).

At this point it is important to note that for Paul, and for conservatives Christians today, what we do with our bodies is not just an issue of private morality. Rather, our bodily reality is linked to both the social and the cosmological (or natural) order. This link is established through the notion of hierarchical submission. In the same way as Christ is the head of the church, so is the man head of the household and the woman is supposed to be submissive to him.¹⁰ The "natural" social order of gender-hierarchies depends on the broader cosmological hierarchy in which human beings are submissive to G*d.

Translating this idea in terms of meaning can help to see clearer the link between cosmic order and social gender roles. The body *per se* provides no answer to the question "what does it mean to be male or female."¹¹ What is natural for a man or a woman is not just a matter of biology.¹² Rather, it is one's position on a broader cosmological hierarchy, one's theological gender, so to speak, that gives meaning to social gender roles.¹³ These social gender roles in turn determine what it means to have the marks of a certain biological sex. Penises or testosterone don't tell us by themselves what it means to be a man. Rather, these biological markers become meaningful only in the context of a broader picture, a picture of cosmic order, of mastery and submission. Thus, blurring the boundaries of gender involves a resistance against the cosmological order that

provides the normative meaning of sexuality. An "effeminate man" or a "masculine women" establish a counter-meaning for their bodies over and against the natural system of cosmological hierarchy.

In more general terms, the Pauline critique attacks human attempts to create structures of meaning which are detached from cosmic order. Man tries to be active where he should be passive. Instead of humbly receiving what G*d has created, man tries to invent a cosmos all by himself. The result of this confusion of agency is for Paul (like for other straight thinking males of his time) as absurd as the confusion of gender activity in those unnatural acts of intercourse where males are passive females and females are active males.¹⁴ This, (for him) horrid and chaotic result is what you get if you refuse to passively embrace the divine structure of cosmic hierarchy. What is at stake for Paul is not just certain sexual acts but the question which attitude to take toward reality, and how to ground our most fundamental categories.

Why are sexuality and gender roles such neuralgic points for Christians? How are the issues at stake anything but theological constructs? How do they involve philosophy? A look into anthropological scholarship can help us to clarify these points.

Gendering Reality as a Key Religious Concern Creating Order

The creation of cosmos out of chaos is one of the key functions of religious activity. From *rite de passage* to creation myths, religious forms of life establish a reality in which we can find our place and realize our identities. A central tool for the creation of this ordered space is the organization of gender. Gendering reality, creating female and male spheres, separating, and demarcating maleness and femaleness are key strategies religious traditions use to create an ordered and differentiated space, a reality that can be known, and acted upon. Mary Douglas writes in her classic *Purity and Danger*: "It is only by exaggerating the difference between within and without, above and below, male and female . . . that a semblance of order is created."¹⁵ Desires that cannot be subsumed under these symbolic oppositions, desires out of bounds, defy the control of this cosmos generating gender system.

From an anthropological perspective, it is therefore not surprising that many conservative Christians associate queer desire with feces. The literature and informants quoted by Herman seem obsessed with gay men (and to a lesser degree lesbian women) playing with urine excrements, and ingesting fecal material (Herman 1996, 76,78, 100). Queer desires are perceived as desires out of their controlling place: autonomous women out of their social place, penises penetrating the wrong orifices, male desire outside of its theological place. Yet, matter out of place, or things, persons, experiences, that defy cultural systems of order are experienced as impure and dirty. Douglas states "uncleanness is

matter out of place. . . Dirt is that which must not be included if a pattern is to be maintained" (Douglas, 1966, 41). The anomalous, the ambiguous, and all that challenges and frustrate our categories of order function like dirt. Encounters with these things, persons, and experiences must be avoided. They leave us sullied.

Douglas quotes Sartre's famous meditation on the child's first encounter with stickiness.¹⁶ The viscous, a state which is neither quite fluid nor quite solid, confuses our main classifications, and elicit a feeling of disgust. "Sartre argues that melting, clinging viscosity is judged an ignoble form of existence in its very first manifestations. So from these earliest tactile adventures we have always known that life does not conform to our most simple categories" (*ibid*, 39).

Encountering queer desires is for the religious conservative like Sartre's encounter with the viscous. These unbound desires frustrate the conservatives "most simple categories of order" in two ways. First, they represent a reality that resists being subsumed under the fundamental dichotomy of female and male. Secondly, these resisting desires challenge the effectiveness and validity of this and any system of order." Our pollution behavior is the reaction which condemns any object or idea likely to confuse or contradict cherished classifications" writes Douglas (*ibid*, 37).

Troubled Order

I take it that the challenge of queer bodies and desires goes beyond *this particular* religious and patriarchal, system of order. The structures of gender, the creation of gender roles and gendered spheres is too deep and too pervasive a categorization for the perceived confusion of gender not to be troubling. Even though Christianity and religious traditions in general have a lasting and fundamental investment in this way of ordering reality, normative structures of gender are enforced in all societies.¹⁷ David Gilmore, for example, presents in a *tour de force* the whippings, hazing rites, blood-draining and many other means through which different cultures create and enforce "real" manhood. If gendering were a negligible cultural practice or if the meaning of gender were simply given it would be hard to understand why all cultures invest so much in the creation of an ordered system of gender. Catherine Bell observes in her discussion of Gilmore's work that this investment suggests "that the purpose of cultural gender constructions and the rituals that reinforce them is to distinguish and polarize gender roles as the most fundamental form of cultural "ordering" that human beings attempt to impose on nature."¹⁸

Together with the enforcing comes, however, also a sense of threat. David Gilmore asks "why people in so many places regard the state of being a "real man" or "true man" as uncertain" (Gilmore, 1990, 1). He finds "a constantly recurring notion that real manhood is different from simple anatomical maleness." (*ibid.*, 11). *Gender is created as the most fundamental form of order, yet it is also experienced as fragile.* This tension is echoed by Herman's informants. They

insist on the one hand that gender-roles are not culturally constructed but naturally given (through G*d's creation), yet they claim, on the other hand, that cultural and personal choices can confuse this given order (Herman, 1996, 106). The awareness of the fragility of the "natural" gender structures resonates, further, in the strategy of "minorization" and "universalization."¹⁹ Queer desire is simultaneously construed as a minority phenomenon (affecting only 2% of the population) and as a quasi infectious threat to an entire population (and thus having an universalizing quality).²⁰

Queer desires unmask the tension between the idea that gender presents a given and most fundamental structure of order, and the awareness that this order is fragile and open to cultural constructions. In other words, queers raise the suspicion that something is wrong with our fundamental systems of order, that any form ordering of reality, which relies on any set of symbolic oppositions, is fragile. They give rise to the suspicion that all we have is a *semblance of order*, without any solid ontological grounding.

Between Scylla and Charybdis The Epistemic Concern

We can now see the epistemic concern that is expressed in religiously motivated anti-queer sentiments. If gender, which seems to be such a *natural*, and *given* category is perceived as highly problematic and unstable, on which grounds do we employ any categories? Is there any solid basis for our epistemic enterprise?

The religious conservative's desire for "natural" gender structures reflects a metaphysical realist intuition. Hilary Putnam notion of the "myth of the ready made world" comes to mind. According to the myth of the ready made world, "the notions of an object and a property each have just one philosophically "serious" meaning, and . . . the world divides itself up into objects and properties in one definite unique way."²¹

The religious conservative fears the consequences of letting go of this myth. The following passage from Stanley Cavell's *Claim of Reason* illustrates best what the religious conservative and the metaphysical realist fear.

Horror is the title I am giving to the perception of the precariousness of human identity, to the perception that it may be lost or invaded, that we may be, or may become, something other than we are, or take ourselves for; *that our origins as human beings need accounting for, and are unaccountable.*²²

The desire to hold on to the idea that the world is "naturally" ordered, at least in the most basic way (for example through gender), and to ward off challenges to our capacity to detect an ordered universe is motivated by such a perception of horror. Without fundamental structures of order, such as gender, our identity as

human beings seems threatened.

The Philosopher's Contribution

The phenomenon of religiously motivated anti-queer sentiments presents us with the task to address this epistemic horror. Simply falling back into attempts to create grand-metaphysical theories (of any sort, scientific or theological) won't do. This would mean to exclude the fundamental experience and reality of queerness. Simply celebrating unbound relativism won't do either, because this would leave us without the capacity to order reality, to judge and even to critique. For the religious conservative, as for many others, to let go of any standards of rational argument is not an option. Relativism, the idea that we have no way of truly making sense of reality, since truth "obviously" would demand a metaphysical foundation, is only the disillusioned mirror-image of metaphysical realism.

The philosophical task is to think our way through the Scylla of metaphysical realism and the Charybdis of relativism. Hilary Putnam argues in *Renewing Philosophy*, that we should see

relativism and the desire for metaphysical foundation as manifestations of the same disease. The thing to say for the relativist is that some things are true and some things are warranted and some things are reasonable, but of course we can only say so if we have appropriate language. And we do have the language and we can and do say so, even though that language does not itself rest on any metaphysical guarantee like Reason. (Putnam, 1992, 177)

According to Putnam we have to let go of the idea that language is secured by any metaphysical guarantee. Yet, like Wittgenstein, he does not think that this ontological groundlessness has to lead to epistemic despair. Wittgenstein asks in *On Certainty* § 508: "What can I rely on?" His answer is "I really want to say that a language game is only possible if one trusts something. (I did not say "can" trust something)." ²³ That "trust" is the basis for our epistemic project will be dissatisfying for both the metaphysical realist and the relativist alike (in their different disguises). However, it might make the religious conservative think about the appropriate ways to relate to the divine and to G*d's design. ²⁴ Be that as it may. The centrality of "trust" points to the limitation and fragility of all our epistemic orderings, and to the fact that our knowledge is not simply passively received but that knowledge involves elements of risk, judgement, and responsibility.

Mary Douglas describes various ways in which religious cultures deal with a phenomenon that threatens our categories. The most benign of those involves the employment of ambiguous symbols in religious life "for the same ends as they are used in poetry and mythology, to enrich meaning or to call to attention to

other levels of existence" (Douglas, 1966, 41). Queer desires, and queer bodies can -- precisely because they represent the ambiguous, dirty rest in the context of our current straight-jacketed gender hierarchies -- enrich our understanding of our capacity to know by calling attention to the conundrums of epistemology, order and of trust.

Notes

1. Iannaccone, Laurence R, "Heirs to the Protestant Ethic: The Economics of American Fundamentalists," in: Marty, Martin E, [Editor]. Appleby, R Scott, [Editor] *Fundamentalisms and the State : Remaking Politics, Economies and Militance*, Chicago : Univ of Chicago Pr,
2. This project of philosophical understanding implies treating these sentiments neither as just religious -- thereby containing them in a sealed off realm of discourse for others, disconnected from valid philosophical concerns -- nor as reducible to other ulterior or underlying motives -- thereby implying that the religious conservative doesn't quite understand the origin of his or her own sentiments. The project of understanding involves steering a middle way: to reconstruct the religious motivation of anti-queer sentiments in such a way that they become both religiously and philosophically meaningful.
3. Herman, Didi, *The Anti-Gay Agenda. Orthodox Vision and the Christian Right*. (Chicago, Ill. Chicago Univ. Press: 1997). Herman's book allows us to understand how and why it is so important for American evangelical Christians to work for the implementation of Christian values in our society. Yet, her work leaves two important questions unanswered. First, the question of how to react to the anti-gay agenda of the Christian right remains open. After reading her analysis, all we can do is rally around those who strive for a liberal vision of civic society. Her work does not allow for a dialogue with the religious conservative. Second, it remains unclear why queer love is used as the focus of a battle revolving around the issue of how to implement Christian values in American society. Why not adultery or usury? What is particularly at stake for the conservative religious person in the issue of queer love?
4. 94% of fundamentalist Christians, and 78% of other Protestants believe that extramarital sex is always wrong. It could be argued that adultery is a bigger threat to the institution of marriage than allowing homosexual couples to enjoy marriage benefits (Iannaccone, 1993, 353).
5. This fear of losing one's maleness is echoed in the prayers of Desert Stream. "Uphold us in our maleness" reads a prayer of this change ministry group providing religious support for gays and lesbians who want to change their orientation. "Bestow on us the honor with which you uphold us in our maleness" Gold, Scott "Healing for Gays, or a New Hurt" Some conservative churches are welcoming homosexuals -- to change them. Activists and scientists deride the

effort in the *Los Angeles Times*, July 19th, 2000.

6. In this way the (tasteless) association of Nazism with homosexuality used by the Oregon Citizen's Alliance makes some sense. "Nazi-gays" refuse to stand under their rightful master, i.e., G*d. (Herman, 1996, 91).

7. It is clear that the perceived attack on the Christian or American family is a perceived attack on a patriarchal structure of mastery and submission.

8. Brooten, Bernadette J. *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism*. (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1996.), 215ff.

9. Brooten 258 quotes Philo of Alexandria's *On the Special Laws* 3.37. Philo's reasons for arguing for the death-penalty for both the passive and the active partner are important. He describes the passive partner as "man-woman" "debas[ing] the sterling coin of nature." The active partner deserves to die because he teaches "the grievous vice of unmanliness [anandria] and effeminacy [malakia]." Brooten, *ibid*, 257.

10. This theology is not only expressed in Paul's letter to the Ephesians (5:21-6:9) but shines through in Paul's choice of words in other letters. He describes the man as "head of the women" in 1 Cor 11:3, and uses the term "hypandros" (under the man) for a married women in Rom 7:2. Cf. (Brooten 1996, 266).

11. The bodily markers of sexuality were experienced as quite fluid. "Excessively" male acting women could sprout penises shifting their physical form according to their place in the social hierarchy.

12. This point is naturally the crux of natural law theory. It is important to note that the telos of an act (its natural finality) is not a straight-forward biological category. For Aquinas the thesis that the natural end of sexual intercourse is procreation is not based on grounds of statistic normalcy. Statistically, this thesis would be wrong. Most instances of sexual intercourse between males and females do not lead to impregnation. Procreation is the telos of sexual intercourse in its fullest or most ideal realization. Thus, an understanding of what it means to live a flourishing human life in its most ideal realization has to be in place for natural law theory to work. Consequently, natural law is based on a rational insight into the divine design by which G*d orders and governs creation (Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1-2, q 91). Brooten echoes this idea that in the Pauline context the normativity of nature is derived from the "order of creation as laid down in the Genesis creation narratives" (Brooten, 1996, 274).

13. Laqueur, Thomas, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1990). Writing about the underlying one-sex concept of humanity he states: "A penis was thus a status symbol rather than a sign of some other deeply rooted ontological essence: real sex. It could be

construed as a certificate of sort . . . which entitled the bearer to certain rights and privileges." 134f.

14. Note the complex interaction of active and passive voice in Romans 1:24. "Therefore G*d gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the degrading of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about G*d for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever! Amen."

15. Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. (London; Boston: Ark Paperbacks, 1966, paperback 1984), 4.

16. Sartre, Jean-Paul, *L'Être et le Néant: Essai d'Ontologie Phénoménologique*, (Paris, Gallimard: 1943).

17. Gilmore, David, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity* (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press: 1990), 9.

18. Bell, Catherine M. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 101. (italics mine)

19. Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1990), 40-44, 82-90.

20. Writes Herman "Perhaps obviously, the "10% fallacy" argument is highly contradictory for the CR; it may be a case of wishing to have their cake and eat it, too. In other words, one cannot logically argue that sexuality is mutable and chosen, while insisting that lesbians and gays form an unchanging and minuscule percentage of the population" (Herman, 1996, 75).

21. Putnam, Hilary, *Renewing Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass, Harvard Univ. Press: 1992), 123.

22. Cavell, Stanley. *The Claim of Reason: Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 418. (italics mine).

23. Wittgenstein, Ludwig, G. E. M. Anscombe, and G. H. von Wright. *On Certainty* [Über Gewissheit. English & German], Edited by G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright. Translated by Denis Paul and G. E. M. Anscombe. (New York, Harper: 1969), cf. as well: Putnam, 1992, 177.

24. For ways how the notion of trust is religiously fruitful see my: "On my Bed at Night, I sought Him Whom My Soul Loves: Reflections on Trust, Horror, G*d, and the Queer Body in Vowed Religious Life," *Modern Theology*, Forthcoming.