MALE AND FEMALE HE CREATED THEM: THE IMPLICATIONS OF A PARADIGMATIC READING OF GENESIS 1–3 FOR THE COMPLEMENTARIAN-EGALITARIAN DEBATE

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Ministry

---

by

Douglas Brent Ponder

May 2024

APPROVAL SHEET

MALE AND FEMALE HE CREATED THEM:
THE IMPLICATIONS OF A PARADIGMATIC READING
OF GENESIS 1–3 FOR THE COMPLEMENTARIAN-
EGALITARIAN DEBATE

Douglas Brent Ponder

Read and Approved by:

Faculty Supervisor: Samuel C. Emadi

Second Reader: Mitchell L. Chase

Defense Date: March 25, 2024

To Jessica, my δόξα and my עֵזֶר in the Lord.

Your continual encouragement and sacrificial support made this possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

PREFACE

"Apart from me you can do nothing," Christ said (John 15:5). He was, of course, referring to good works done by those who abide in him. But might not his words apply to all things? For the Lord gives "life and breath and everything" (Acts 17:25), even the time and ability to complete a thesis such as this. Hence Paul asked, "What do you have that you did not first receive?" (1 Cor 4:7). David likewise prayed, "But who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able thus to offer willingly? For all things come from you, and we have given you only what comes from your own hand" (1 Chr 29:14). Thus, if any part of this thesis fails to represent the truth of God's Word, the fault is some ill stewardship of my own. Yet inasmuch as this is a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to the Lord (Phil 4:18), I say thanks be to God, from whom all blessings flow.

Other thanks are in order. First, I wish to thank my wife, Jessica, without whose manifold support my studies at Southern Seminary would not have been possible. You know the hours of reading, writing, and studying away from home, for you shared in these trials. What is more, you did so as the full-time caretaker and teacher of our sons. As was true of Dorothea, so it may be said of you:

> Her full nature, like that river of which Cyrus broke the strength, spent itself in channels which had no great name on the earth. But the effect of her being on those around her was incalculably diffusive: for the growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts; and that things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life.[1]

One day our children will rise up and call you blessed; your husband already does.

Second, I wish to thank the people of Remnant Church. You are my brothers and sisters in the Lord (Rom 15:14), my sons and daughters in the faith (1 Cor 4:15), my

[1] George Eliot, *Middlemarch* (1872; repr., Oxford: Oxford University, 1997), 785.

joy and crown in life and death (Phil 4:1). Your friendship, prayers, and support enable me to carry out my vocation with joy instead of groaning (Heb 13:17). The same is true of the pastors who share a calling to shepherd this church with me. I am honored to serve as your brother, coworker, and fellow soldier (Phil 2:25).

Third, I would like to thank several men that I met in my cohort. To Nathan Cobb, Brett McDonald, Foster Toft, and Landon Byrd: thank you for welcoming me into the fold. To Yong Shan and James Guy: thanks for carrying the torch with me after the others were gone. The time we spent together was a true delight. May the Lord continue to bless and grow our friendship for many years to come.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not publicly thank the professors of Southern Seminary who labored in the Biblical Theology program during my time there. I am also grateful to Dr. James Hamilton, whose love of God's Word is truly contagious. This program would not exist without him. I am also thankful for Dr. Brian Vickers, who once remarked that students tend to remember him for his sarcastic sense of humor. I will remember him for his passion to ensure that biblical theology enriches our lives, not just our ability to make connections in the canon. I am also grateful to Dr. Mitchell Chase for teaching us books like Leviticus and Numbers with a keen eye for typology and allegory. And though my time with Dr. Peter Gentry was brief, it was indelibly memorable. His skill in biblical languages is surpassed only by his love for the Lord. Finally, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Samuel Emadi, whose feedback and encouragement were utterly invaluable along the way.

Doug Ponder

Richmond, Virginia

May 2024

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Unless the trajectory of the last few decades is suddenly and unexpectedly altered, the doctrine of anthropology will likely remain a key battleground of our time. Indeed, this area of doctrine is the source of many disputes which have only grown in both prevalence and intensity since the mid-twentieth century. Such debates include the nature of masculinity and femininity, the ordination of women to pastoral ministry, the appropriateness of same-sex attraction and certain expressions of the same, the proposed distinction between sex and gender, the possibility of "transitioning" from one gender to another, even the *reality* of gender itself (i.e., whether gender is merely a social construct). There are other pressing issues connected to the doctrine of anthropology, of course, but the common thread in the aforementioned debates is the question of what it means to be a man or a woman.[2] This question is so fundamental to human nature that Christians cannot afford to downplay its significance.

Unfortunately, in the face of growing secularism some Christians are increasingly waving off debates about manhood and womanhood as being "a political battle that distracts from the gospel."[3] Such a claim is problematic for two reasons. First, as theologian Herman Bavinck notes, "Grace does not repress nature . . . but rather raises it up and renews it, and stimulates it to concentrated effort."[4] In other words, grace

[2] Time would fail me to tell of all the ways the doctrine of anthropology is also intrinsically related to the intense (and intensifying) discussions about race and ethnicity.

[3] Tish Harrison Warren, "I Got Ordained So I Can Talk about Jesus. Not the Female Pastor Debate," *Christianity Today*, May 11, 2021, https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2021/may-web-only/womens-ordination-saddleback-jesus-not-female-debate.html.

[4] Herman Bavinck, *De Bazuin*, XLIX, 43 (October 25, 1901), quoted in Jan Veenhof, *Nature and Grace in Herman Bavinck*, trans. Albert M. Wolters (Sioux Center, IA: Dordt College, 2006), 18–19.

restores nature; therefore, Christians cannot dismiss created order as an insignificant facet of life in God's world. To do so would entail not only diminishing anthropology but soteriology as well—asserting that salvation consists only in forgiveness but has nothing to do with the restoration of man and woman to God's prelapsarian designs. *Prima facie*, such a claim seems to contradict many New Testament teachings on this point (cf. Acts 3:21; 1 Cor 11:2ff; Eph 4:24; 5:21–25; Col 3:10, 18–20; Titus 2:1–8, 11–14).

Second, it is not necessary to hold that male-female distinctions are the most central element of "the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3) to insist that they still warrant special attention in our time.[5] In fact, one could easily argue that—far from being a distraction—the increasingly egalitarian outlook of the West means that male-female distinctions ought to receive *far more* attention than they might otherwise require in other contexts. As Elizabeth Rundle Charles once wrote,

> It is the truth which is assailed in any age which tests our fidelity. . . . If I profess, with the loudest voice and the clearest exposition, every portion of the truth of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Christianity. Where the battle rages the loyalty of the soldier is proved; and to be steady on all the battle-field [sic] besides is mere flight and disgrace to him if he flinches at that one point.[6]

In other words, to ignore or downplay a basic Christian teaching in a culture that confuses or denies the same is a double error: it mutes the offense of God's revealing law where it may be most noticed and it erases the blessing of God's restoring grace where it may most be needed.

The only way to stem this destructive lawlessness is to return to the Creator's designs for the sexes in all spheres of life. In turn, this means revisiting the Scriptures, which are the authoritative rule of faith and life for confessing Christians, paying careful

---

[5] Unless otherwise noted, all Scriptures are from the English Standard Version of the Bible.

[6] Elizabeth Rundle Charles, *Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family* (New York: W. M. Dodd, 1864), 321.

attention to the way its opening chapters establish a male-female paradigm that is both explained by the apostles and exemplified by various figures throughout the canon.[7]

Survey of the Literature

Within the church, anthropological debates about the nature of the sexes have given rise to a significant body of literature on the subject.[8] Indeed, the number of such works has grown considerably since the 1960s and 1970s, which witnessed both the ordination of the first woman to pastoral ministry in a major denomination[9] and the emergence of the "evangelical feminist" movement.[10] For my purposes in this thesis, these works may be classified into three streams. The first contains the works of authors who hold to what will be termed "the traditionalist view" of the sexes.[11] That is, they are the works of authors whose views are consonant with the historical consensus found in Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Reformational Protestantism. Though some dissimilarities exist within this broad consensus, the core of the traditionalist view is that the differences between men and women have God-given significance for male-female relationships in the home, in the church, and in society.[12]

---

[7] The authority of the Scriptures is set forth in Matt 5:17–19; Mark 7:6–9; John 17:17; Acts 17:11–12; Rom 1:2; 15:4; 1 Cor 4:6; 2 Tim 2:15; 3:15–17; 4:2; 2 Pet 1:3–4, 19–21; 3:16; Rev 22:18.

[8] The scope of this thesis does not permit analysis of secular and/or non-Christian assessments of this subject.

[9] The United Methodist Church first granted full clergy rights to women, ordaining Maud Keister Jensen to pastoral ministry in 1956.

[10] Pamela Cochran, the associate director of the Center on Religion and Democracy at the University of Virginia argues that a distinctly evangelical appropriation of feminist ideals began between 1973 and 1975 with the founding of the Evangelical Women's Caucus and the publication of Nancy Hardesty and Letha Scanzoni, *All We're Meant to Be: Biblical Feminism for Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,1992). See Pamela Cochran, *Evangelical Feminism: A History* (New York: NYU, 2005), 11–31.

[11] For a defense of the designation "traditionalist view," as well as the essential elements of the same, see "Genesis 1–3 and the Framing of Intra-Christian Debates" in chap. 5, "Paradigm Explored: The Implications of Genesis 1–3 for Gender and Sexuality."

[12] For example, these faith traditions have been united for hundreds of years in restricting the office of presbyter [i.e., πρεσβυτέρος] to qualified men. This agreement is quite stunning in view of the many other matters that have been a perennial source of debate among them.

The second stream consists of works that argue for an "innovationist view" of the sexes.[13] These works argue from within the Christian faith, advocating a position that uses Scripture to critique the church's historical tradition regarding gender-based prescriptions for certain roles.[14] In other words, these authors are professing Christians who hold that differences between the sexes do not entail sex-based prescriptions or proscriptions for the roles men and women are gifted to embody in society, in the home, and in the church.

Finally, the last group of works are those that argue for a type of mediating position between the previous streams. Some of these authors have sought to revise an aspect of an established, mainstream position from within the traditionalist perspective. Others aim to reframe the entire debate through a reexamination of starting assumptions, premises, and terms used by proponents of both streams. Still others have attempted to articulate a novel view, one that is envisioned not as a compromise between two poles, but as a "third way" to conceive of the sexes in altogether different manner, along a different plane or set of axes.[15]

All three categories of works will be analyzed for their handling of key biblical texts. Such texts include Genesis 1–3, which I will argue deserves priority of place, along with scriptural passages where subsequent biblical authors articulate a vision for the sexes in view of the paradigm established in the creation account (e.g., 1 Cor 11:2–16; Eph 5:22–33; 1 Tim 2:8–15). Additionally, the aforementioned works will be analyzed

[13] For a defense of the designation "innovationist view" as well as the essential elements of the same, see "Genesis 1–3 and the Framing of Intra-Christian Debates" in chap. 5.

[14] Scot McKnight is forthright on this point, saying, "In this instance [viz., the question of the ordination of women to pastoral ministry], the tradition got it wrong." See Scot McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet: Rethinking How You Read the Bible*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 197.

[15] This is not to say that any of these mediating positions actually exist as *genuinely* mediating positions; it is simply to indicate that many recent works have been pitched by their authors as such. Indeed, the argument could be made that the presence or absence of any gender-based restrictions is an unavoidable binary that forces all views into either the traditionalist or innovationist streams, despite any nuance a particular view attempts to carve out. Nevertheless, this section of the thesis will focus on each author's self-categorization of his or her own work.

for the (sometimes implicit) interpretive grid or principles that guide the authors' (often divergent) interpretations of the same passages in the Scriptures.

Traditionalist Works

The origin of the traditionalist viewpoint naturally begins in the early church. Tertullian is among the earliest authors to extensively address the significance of male and female in "On the Apparel of Women,"[16] written around a century after the death of the last living apostle.[17] Here Tertullian explores the application of the apostolic commands governing female adornment (e.g., 1 Cor 11:6–16; 1 Tim 2:9–10; 1 Pet 3:3–6). Though he unequivocally blames Eve for the fall of the human race[18] and refers to women as "the devil's gateway," he also refers to women as "best beloved sisters."[19] At the very least, this tension suggests more complexity in Tertullian's view of women (and men) than is often assumed by modern interpreters.[20] In any case, the work is valuable as an early Christian attempt to explore sexually asymmetrical instruction given in the Scriptures.[21]

Chrysostom is another early Christian interpreter who, through his homilies, has left a body of writing that addresses a Christian view of the sexes. His homily on Ephesians 5:22–33 is particularly valuable as a work that sets Genesis 1:27 alongside Galatians 3:28,

---

[16] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," trans. S. Thellwall, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325,* vol. 4, ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and Cleveland Coxe, vol. 4, *Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second*, (1885; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 14–25.

[17] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," 14n1.

[18] Tertullian speaks of "the ignominy, I mean, of the first sin, and the odium (attaching to [Eve] as the cause) of human perdition." See Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women*, 14.

[19] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," 14.

[20] For example, see Sarah Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church: Building Consensus on Christian Leadership* (Downers Grown, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 40–42.

[21] For example, channeling Eph 5:22–33, Titus 2:5, 9, and 1 Pet 3:1, 3, Tertullian closes the work by saying, "Submit your head to your husbands, and you will be enough adorned." See Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," 25.

showing that the latter does not overturn the former.[22] He also shows that Christ reaffirms the enduring paradigm of creation by appealing to God's design in the beginning (Matt 19:4).[23] He also writes that, though the household is not a democracy of equals, a wife's obedience to her husband should be as "a free-woman" and not as a "slave."[24] His homily on 1 Corinthians 11:3 is also significant in affirming male headship while avoiding the Trinitarian heresy of subordinationism.[25]

Writing as a contemporary of Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan penned *Paradise* as an extended exegesis of Genesis 2, giving attention to the differences between Adam and Eve in their origins, their vocations, and their proclivities to various temptations.[26] Ambrose's interaction with this passage of Scripture demonstrates a clear connection between Adam and the men who follow him, and Eve and the women who follow her. Ambrose's work also shows that the historical use of the terms "superior" and "inferior" did not refer to intrinsic worth or value but to ordered relationships. Medieval scholastic Thomas Aquinas uses the same terms (i.e., "superior" and "inferior") in a similar fashion, not only with reference to men and women,[27] but also with respect to other ordered relationships in society (e.g., in reference to a monarch and his citizens or subjects).[28]

The Reformers also wrote widely on the significance of God's design for the

---

[22] John Chrysostom, "Homily XX on Ephesians," in *Homilies on Ephesians*, trans. Gross Alexander, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 13, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 143, emphasis added.

[23] Chrysostom, "Homily XX on Ephesians," 143.

[24] Chrysostom, "Homily XX on Ephesians," 146.

[25] John Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," in *Homilies on First Corinthians*, trans. Talbot W. Chambers, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 12, *Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 148–57.

[26] Ambrose, *Paradise*, in *Saint Ambrose: Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*, trans. John J. Savage, in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, vol. 42, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1961), 287–356.

[27] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (1920; repr., n.p.: New Advent, 2017), I, Q. 92, Art 1, ad. 2.

[28] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, II-1, Q. 92, Art. 1, ad 4.

sexes. For example, Martin Luther gave considerable attention to the nature of man and woman in his commentary on Genesis.[29] Luther grounds the headship of the man and the submission of the woman to her husband in God's postlapsarian judgment, rather than in God's prelapsarian designs.[30] Nevertheless, he is no egalitarian, for Luther not does in any sense hold that the inaugurated order of the gospel overturns the judgments of God in this age.[31] Calvin, given the scope of his commentaries, naturally gives much attention to the significance of the sexes in the Scriptures. Unlike Luther, however, Calvin holds that woman had "previously been subject to her husband," that is, according to created order and not simply as a consequence of the fall.[32]

Subsequent Reformed theologians, e.g., Dutch Reformed thinker Herman Bavinck, have largely followed Calvin rather on the Luther in grounding male headship in creation rather than in the fall.[33] In any case, the complementarity of the sexes and the headship of the man is not an exclusively Reformed doctrine. For example, in 1948, C. S. Lewis penned an essay rejecting the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood.[34] He affirms the equality of the sexes, while insisting upon the fact that "unless 'equal'

[29] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis 1–5*, ed. Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, trans. George V. Schick, Luther's Works 1 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1958).

[30] Luther, *Lectures on Genesis 1–5*, 203.

[31] Luther writes, "Wherefore the rule and government of all things remain in the power of the husband whom the wife according to the command of God is bound to obey. The husband rules the house, governs the state politic, conducts wars, defends his own property, cultivates the earth, builds, plants, etc." see Luther, *Lectures on Genesis 1–5*, 202.

[32] John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis*, vol. 1 of *Calvin's Commentaries*, trans. John King (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 172.

[33] See Herman Bavinck, *The Christian Family*, trans. Nelson D. Kloosterman (Grand Rapids: Christian's Library, 2012).

[34] C. S. Lewis's response first appeared alongside Nunburnholme in *Time and Tide,* vol. 29, August 14, 1948. Unfortunately, that publication no longer exists, and Nunburnholme's essay has perished with it. All that remains of her essay is the scattered quotes in Lewis's response. See C. S. Lewis, "Priestesses in the Church?," in *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*, ed. Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2014), 256–62.

means 'interchangeable,' equality makes nothing for the priesthood of women."[35] Lewis goes on to apply the non-interchangeability of the sexes to society as well, arguing that Christians must reject any view of the sexes that would treat them as "neuters,"[36] that is, as if there were no God-given significance to sexuality.

Since the mid-twentieth century, the number of Christian works exploring the significance of human sexuality increased significantly. One of the first traditionalist works to respond to the evangelical feminist movement of the 1970s[37] is Stephen Clark's *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Role of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences*.[38] Predating the formation of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Woman (CBMW; 1987), the drafting of the Danvers Statement (1989), and the publication of *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (1991), Catholic author Stephen Clark in many ways laid the foundation for the view that would later become known as "complementarianism." His work begins with Jesus Christ's explicit affirmation of God's design for the sexes "in the beginning" (cf. Matt 19:4), which establishes a principle that all of Scripture should be read through the Genesis account, not the other way around.[39] It is also valuable for its extensive treatment of key scriptural passages (e.g., Gen 1–3; 1 Cor 11:2–16; 14:33–36; Gal 3:28; Eph 5:22–33; 1 Tim 2:8–15; 1 Pet 3:1–7) as well as how the teaching of the Scriptures might be applied in contemporary (i.e., late twentieth century and beyond) society.

The multi-author *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* is another standard text for traditional evangelical treatments of

---

[35] Lewis, "Priestesses in the Church?," 260.

[36] Lewis, "Priestesses in the Church?," 260.

[37] See n10 under "A Survey of the Literature."

[38] Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant, 1980).

[39] The work also examines biological and psychological data as empirical evidence of God's design for the sexes; however, this examination goes beyond this scope of this thesis.

the relevant passages of Scripture.[40] This book, together with the Danvers Statement, is a foundational text for CBMW. Section 1 includes discussions on the relationship of masculinity and femininity to maleness and femaleness, respectively, as well as an overview of the general issues at stake in the debate. Section 2 offers exegetical and theological studies on Genesis 1–3, 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 and 14:33b–36, Galatians 3:28, Ephesians 5:21–33, Colossians 3:18–19, 1 Timothy 2:11–15, and 1 Peter 3:1–7, as well as examples from the life of Jesus and the narratives of the Old and New Testaments. The section ends with theological reflections on the image of God and the church as family. Section 3 covers studies from church history, biology, and sociology. Section 4 concludes with the implications of the views presented in the book.

Over a decade after the publication of *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, Wayne Grudem published *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth.*[41] The book addressees 118 questions raised or arguments advanced in response to CBMW or *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. Of particular interest for this study are his chapters on Egalitarian interpretations of Genesis 1–3, claims about narratives in the Old Testament (e.g., Deborah) and the New (e.g., the Gospels and Acts), and Paul's teaching on marriage and the prohibitions of women in the church. Grudem concludes with chapters dedicated to other arguments based not on exegesis of particular texts, but on doctrines (e.g., the priesthood of all believers) and ideals (e.g., fairness and equality).

Andreas Köstenberger and Margaret Köstenberger's work, *God's Design for Man and Woman: A Biblical-Theological Survey*, is (as the title accurately describes) a biblical-theological survey of how the vision of the sexes in Genesis 1–3 is upheld across the Scriptures.[42] Unlike *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, which

[40] Wayne Grudem and John Piper, eds. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991).

[41] Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2004).

[42] Andreas Köstenberger and Margaret Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman: A Biblical-Theological Survey* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014).

focuses on the exegesis of individual passages (often in isolation from one another), *God's Design for Man and Woman* explicitly aims to trace some of the patterns established in Genesis 1–3 throughout the Old Testament, the Gospels, the book of Acts, and the New Testament Epistles. This work is closest in aim to my thesis; however, it lacks emphasis on the intentionality of Moses in providing a paradigm for the sexes in the creation account—an omission that might have significantly strengthened their arguments.

Finally, Zachary Garris has recently written *Masculine Christianity*, a book that represents new developments within the traditionalist camp which allege that the view known as "complementarianism" did not recover enough of the church's historical view of men and women. [43] Instead, theirs was a partial recovery built largely (but not entirely) on divine command theory without reference to natural law. In other words, Garris argues that *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* tends to ground the roles of men and women in God's commands instead of in God's creation. As such, God's commands seem arbitrary and capricious instead of gracious guidance intended to help man and woman orient their lives toward the gendered telos of each. Because of his emphasis on natural law and created order, Garris focuses a good deal on Genesis 1–3, which will prove helpful as a traditionalist viewpoint that essentially aims to show that patriarchy, not complementarianism, is the viewpoint that most accurately reflects the church's historical interpretation of Scripture.

Innovationist Works

Paul Jewett's work *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View* is considered the *locus classicus* for evangelical feminism (i.e., the view that the differences between men and women do not constitute restrictive prescriptions for their work in the home, the church, and/or the society).[44]

[43] Zachary Garris, *Masculine Christianity* (Ann Arbor, MI: Reformation Zion, 2020).

[44] Paul Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975).

Jewett's work is interesting in that he simultaneously affirms that (1) "sexuality permeates one's individual being to its very depth; it conditions every facet of one's life as a person" while insisting that (2) these differences do not place upon the woman any restrictions (e.g., to the pastoral office or to spiritual authority in the home).[45] Many egalitarians have since abandoned the first premise of Jewett's argument while trying to keep the second, but his first premise is making something of a return among those who advocate mediating views.

Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy, edited by Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, is the counter to CBMW's *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.[46] Now in its third edition,[47] *Discovering Biblical Equality* is a collection of essays on various passages or sections of Scripture (e.g., Gen 1–3; the Mosaic Law; the Gospels; 1 Cor 11:2–16; 14:34–35; Gal 3:26–29; Eph 5:21–33; 1 Tim 2:11–15; 1 Pet 3:1–7) as well as essays on the theological and cultural perspectives that influence interpretation of the same. All essays advance an egalitarian understanding of the sexes, namely, that the differences between men and women that exist do not in any way entail a kind of submission, authority, or hierarchy.

Anglican author Scot McKnight's *The Blue Parakeet: Rethinking How You Read the Bible* is notable for two reasons.[48] First, he writes as one who has changed his mind on the ordination of women to pastoral ministry (from the complementarian to the egalitarian position), which means McKnight is familiar with traditional complementarian arguments. Second, and related to the previous, because of his deep familiarity with his

[45] Jewett, *Man as Male and Female*, 172.

[46] Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2005).

[47] Ronald W. Pierce, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural, and Practical Perspectives*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2021).

[48] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*.

former position, he advances critiques of complementarian approaches to Scripture, which he says affect their exegesis of the relevant passages at every level. McKnight's work is particularly intriguing in this respect: it will be argued that his preferred way of reading Scripture (i.e., holistically) actually strengthens the traditionalist (as opposed to innovationist) understanding of gender.

Philip Payne's *Man and Woman: One in Christ* is similar to the exegetical portion of Grudem's *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*.[49] Payne, however, looks almost exclusively at Pauline texts concerning men and women. For example, Genesis 1–3 is only given attention in the first chapter in the context of "Backgrounds to Paul's Teaching regarding Man and Woman." The second chapter considers the names of women Payne asserts Paul appointed to ordained ministry. And the third chapter establishes theological maxims that Payne says imply the equality of man and woman. Against this background, Payne exegetes—almost verse by verse in some cases—passages such as Galatians 3:28, 1 Corinthians 7, 11:2–16, 14:35–36, Ephesians 5:21–33, 1 Timothy 2:8–15, 3:1–13, and Titus 1:5–9. He concludes, "Paul consistently champions the equality [read: interchangeability] of man and woman in Christ."[50]

Similar to Payne, Cynthia Westfall's *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ* examines the central Pauline texts in the debate, but with updated arguments that are advanced in response to the latest research from the biblical studies world.[51] She surveys the culture of the ancient world and seeks to show that Paul applied common masculine stereotypes to all believers, even as he applied common feminine stereotypes to men. In the next chapters, Westfall examines classic biblical texts in light of the theological categories of creation, fall, and eschatology. The

[49] Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman: One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009).

[50] Payne, *Man and Woman*, 461.

[51] Cynthia Westfall, *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016).

final chapters look at the biblical metaphor of the body, Paul's doctrine of "calling," and Paul's teaching on "authority," especially in 1 Timothy 2:11–15.

Andrew Bartlett, a lawyer by trade, set out to discover the Bible's teaching on the nature of the sexes by examining the relevant texts and their history of interpretation, "without bias" (i.e., he claims not to have had a position before beginning his study). He has written about his discoveries in *Men and Women in Christ: Fresh Light from the Biblical Texts*.[52] After giving his rationale and a brief biblical survey, Bartlett embraces a form of egalitarianism that deems the traditionalist view as being irrevocably and destructively patriarchal. In this regard he views complementarianism as an improvement, though he still finds the arguments for that position wanting. Ultimately, Bartlett wants the church not to divide over this issue, so he advocates for peace between dissenters. His book is valuable for its assessment of historical interpretations from various ages offered in defense of the traditionalist view of the sexes.

Anglican author William Witt (professor at the Trinity School for Ministry in Pennsylvania) has written *Icons of Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Theology for Women's Ordination*.[53] This work takes up three types of arguments against the ordination of women to pastoral ministry: cultural (i.e., nontheological) arguments, Protestant arguments on the nature of authority, and Catholic arguments based on sacramental integrity. Witt's book is unique in that aims to show that both complementarians *and* egalitarians have essentially advanced new positions in response to cultural changes in the modern era. He seeks to sidestep some of these modern innovations, returning to a different foundation for analyzing the sexes. However, despite beginning in a different place and proceeding along a different path, he *functionally* lands in the same place as egalitarians. For this reason, his book has been classified with those in the innovationist

[52] Andrew Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ: Fresh Light from the Biblical Texts* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2019).

[53] William Witt, *Icons of Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Theology for Women's Ordination* (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2020).

camp, despite advancing different arguments involving differing interpretations of the relevant scriptural texts.

More recently, Kristin Kobes du Mez's *Jesus and John Wayne: How White Evangelicals Corrupted a Faith and Fractured a Nation* and Beth Allison Barr's *The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How the Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth* reflect recent trends in the debates about Christian conceptions of male-female roles in society, home, and church.[54] These works are similar in that they approach the issue from historical and sociological frameworks rather than a primarily exegetical starting point. It is worth nothing that both authors claim that their view of the sexes is not an innovation (despite contradicting the broad consensus of the church through the ages) but rather a correction of patriarchal misinterpretation and abuses.

Mediating Works

Sarah Sumner's *Men and Women in the Church: Building Consensus on Christian Leadership* represents one of the earliest mediating works in the American context.[55] Part 1 of her work begins with her own story of sensing a calling to public speaking (preaching) ministry. She then addresses the impasse between complementarians and egalitarian, the nature of women, men, and God (cf. 1 Cor 11:7), how to interpret the Bible, woman as the "weaker" vessel (cf. 1 Pet 3:7), husband as the "head" (cf. 1 Cor 11:3; Eph 5:1–21), and God as the "head" of Christ (1 Cor 11). She also makes a distinction between headship and entitlement, which she applies to 1 Timothy 2. In part 2 of the book Sumner responds to the questions raised in chapters 1–4, attempting to build a consensus between complementarians and egalitarians, before closing with a mediating vision for the church. Sumner's book is valuable for its interaction with both CBMW's and

[54] Kristin Kobes du Mez, *Jesus and John Wayne: How White Evangelicals Corrupted a Faith and Fractured a Nation* (New York: Liveright, 2020); Beth Allison Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How the Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2021).

[55] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*.

Christians for Biblical Equality's (CBE) traditionalist and innovationist resources, respectively.

Michelle Lee-Barnewall's *Neither Complementarian nor Egalitarian: A Kingdom Corrective to the Evangelical Gender Debate*[56] highlights a trend that has continued to gain traction through the present. Specifically, she attempts to build, on exegetical grounds, a vision for the sexes that does not fit squarely within either the traditionalist or innovationist views. To do so, she focuses on the nature of the discussion as having gotten off track with questions about "rights" and "authority." Instead, she suggests the biblical-theological categories of "unity," "holiness," and "reversal" ought to have priority of place. This means neither authority nor equality are Lee-Barnewall's guiding point, and as such, her book never explicitly answers questions about what a man or woman is, nor what they can do. Nevertheless, the book worthy of examination because of its conscious attempt to part ways from both traditionalist and innovationist readings of the key biblical texts.

In a similar vein is Rachel Green Miller's *Beyond Authority and Submission: Women and Men in Marriage, Church, and Society*.[57] Miller's work, like Lee-Barnewall's before it, seeks new categories for talking about the relevant biblical texts that discuss the nature of men and women and their relationships in the home, the church, and society. Miller is particularly frustrated with framing the discussion about gender around authority and submission. She argues that those who affirm the relevance of these theological and ethical categories (that is to say, the traditionalists) ought to limit their application to the marriage relationship instead of "mapping" them onto all male-female types. Miller's work is noteworthy in that she affirms male-only eldership and male leadership in the

[56] Michelle Lee-Barnewall, *Neither Complementarian nor Egalitarian: A Kingdom Corrective to the Evangelical Gender Debate* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016).

[57] Rachel Green Miller, *Beyond Authority and Submission: Women and Men in Marriage, Church, and Society* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2019).

home; however, she seeks to challenge (via a reexamination of key biblical passages) certain enculturated instantiations of these without overturning them.

Finally, professing complementarian Aimee Byrd has recently written *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*,[58] which aims to show how the exegetical arguments, doctrines, and structures of "biblical manhood and womanhood" as taught by CBMW (et al.) are based on cultural stereotypes, not the Scriptures.[59] She also advocates for interpreting Scripture from "female-centered" perspectives or "gynocentric interruptions."[60] Though Byrd still gives a nod to male-only ordination, she represents a strongly revisionist movement within complementarian circles today that argues women can do anything that a non-ordained man can do.[61] Her work is especially valuable for the attention she draws to certain biblical figures, especially in the Old Testament, that have often been advanced by innovationists as types that disprove the traditionalist conception of the sexes. This makes Byrd unique in that she agrees with many innovationist critiques of the traditionalist view while simultaneously seeking to maintain some distinctions between the sexes (however radically re-envisioned).

Void in the Literature

Since the emergence of second-wave feminism in the early 1960s (and the sexual revolution that coincided with it), the Western world has not stopped debating gender's impact on the family, the workplace, and the general relations between the sexes. Writing as members of the church, Christian scholars likewise have produced scores of books that seek to address these questions with the teachings of Scripture. Yet this

[58] Aimee Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2020).

[59] See chap. 4, "Why Our Aim Is Not Biblical Manhood and Womanhood," in Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 99–132.

[60] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 43–45, 51–68, 73–91.

[61] See chap. 8, "When Paul Passes Phoebe the Baton," in Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 213–35.

extensive (and growing) body of literature has still not given sufficient attention to the paradigmatic implications of Genesis 1–3 for the biblical writings that follow it. To be sure, the last decade has seen growing interest in the import of symbolic patterns from non-prescriptive texts (e.g., Köstenberger and Köstenberger's *God's Design for Man and Woman* and Kevin DeYoung's *Men and Women in the Church*[62]). Nevertheless, there is room for further work to be done in showing how the paradigm established in the earliest chapters of Scripture is embraced and developed by biblical authors in later revelation.

Such a void in the literature is particularly noticeable in view of the intentional presentation of the narrative in Genesis 1–3, which indicates that Moses was aware of this narrative's far-reaching implications for humanity in general and for men and women in particular (cf. Gen 2:24). Not only this, but subsequent biblical authors recognize the same, presenting their own writings on the nature and function of maleness and femaleness with a view to how their teachings reflect the initial sketch of the sexes in the creation account. In view of all this, this thesis will not only demonstrate that Moses presents Genesis 1–3 as paradigmatic for humanity but also will trace the development of the paradigm first established in Genesis 1–3 across the canon.

Thesis Statement

Both the internal structure of Genesis 1–3 and the interaction of subsequent biblical authors with the passage suggest that these chapters are meant to be read *paradigmatically*. In other words, I argue that *Genesis 1–3 contains, in seed form, the essence of maleness and femaleness as seen in patterned relationships that are upheld, expounded, and applied by biblical authors across the canon*. If correct, one should expect explicit reference to these texts by later biblical authors and implicit repetition of the same patterns as they "echo" throughout the Scriptures. By drawing attention to how the biblical authors interact with Genesis 1–3, I aim to substantiate the broad contours of

[62] Kevin DeYoung, *Men and Women in the Church: A Short, Biblical, Practical Introduction* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021).

the traditionalist view of the sexes, which faithfully reflects the biblical teaching on the sexes and affirms the goodness and wisdom of God's design.

Outline of Chapters

The following chapter descriptions are given to provide an overview of the argument with a view to filling the previously examined void in the literature.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This introductory chapter lays a foundation for the thesis. First, I sought to establish the significance and timeliness of the subject of anthropology, in general, as well the that of masculinity and femininity, in particular. Second, I surveyed several Christian works throughout church history to demonstrate a familiarity with the literature. After identifying a void in the literature on the subject, I then provided a thesis statement with a view to filling said void. Specifically, I aim to give a thorough analysis of the male-female paradigm of Genesis 1–3 and the ways that biblical authors recognize and develop the same. Finally, I will close this introduction with an overview of the remaining chapters in the thesis.

Chapter 2: The Paradigm Established: The Significance of Genesis 1–3

Chapter 2 examines the meaning of the sexual paradigm in Genesis 1–3. To do this, it is first necessary to demonstrate that Genesis 1–3 is, in fact, genuinely paradigmatic. To establish this claim, I will first call attention to Moses's awareness of creation's paradigmatic nature as seen in the explicit framing of Adam and Eve's relationship as a type for all marriages (Gen 2:24). A second line of evidence for the paradigmatic nature of Genesis 1–3 is the explicit reference to the Lord's pattern of work and rest (Gen 2:3) as the grounding for the Sabbath day (Exod 20:11). I will next draw attention to tabernacle-temple paradigms observed by G. K. Beale's work in *The Temple and the Church's Mission*. A fourth line of evidence for the paradigmatic nature of the creation

account in Genesis 1–3 is seen in the federal headship of Adam, which the apostle Paul recognizes in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15. Having thus established the paradigmatic nature of Genesis 1–3 in general, I will close by analyzing the details of the creation of male and female with a preliminary conclusion sketching some implications of reading Genesis 1–3 paradigmatically.

Chapter 3: The Paradigm Explained:
The Apostolic Use of Genesis 1–3

In the third chapter I will give special attention to the apostolic recognition and reliance on the male-female paradigm established in Genesis 1–3. The chapter will briefly defend apostolic hermeneutics as faithful interpretations of the Old Testament. Second, I will look at Paul's explicit mentions of the male-female paradigm in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16, showing that—whatever one thinks of the infamous head covering instructions—the crux of Paul's argument is the paradigm of the sexes presented in Genesis 1–3. Third, I will examine Ephesians 5:22–33, showing that Paul explicitly recognizes Moses's typology in Genesis 2:24 with a view to its enduring significance for men and women. Fourth, I will consider Paul's much-debated use of Genesis 1–3 in 1 Timothy 2:8–15, arguing that the best reading of the latter requires a paradigmatic reading of the former. Finally, I will conclude this chapter by noting that apostolic confirmation of an enduring paradigm in Genesis 1–3 legitimates the expectation that other biblical authors embrace and develop the same in their own writings across the canon.

Chapter 4: The Paradigm Exemplified:
Canonical Echoes of Genesis 1–3

The fourth chapter will identify various scriptural passages that illustrate the male-female paradigms established in Genesis 1–3. I will first give attention to the asymmetry of the sexes in God's design, which is the logical foundation for all that follows. This asymmetry is especially noticeable in the way biblical authors talk about men and women in contexts where (modern) readers might have expected parity or

uniformity. Second, I will consider how biblical authors interact with both the pattern and the purpose of marriage as the union of male and female. This feature takes on special significance in view of the typological description of salvation as a wedding. Third, I will discuss the nature of man's representative headship, looking at examples across Scripture that assume or reinforce this facet of God's design. Fourth, I will consider Adam's role as the prototypical priest, as this has wide bearing on a range of debates that are central to the life of the church. Finally, I will conclude the fourth chapter with a summary of the argument so far, in preparation for an extended consideration of the implications.

Chapter 5: The Paradigm Explored: Implications of Genesis 1–3 for Gender and Sexuality

The final chapter will explore the implications of the biblical teaching on the differences between male and female as established in Genesis 1–3 and developed by subsequent biblical authors. First, I will explore at the implications of a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 for the framing of intra-Christian debates about the sexes. I will show that the traditional view of the sexes, while not beyond the need for clarification and refinement, is substantially correct despite the insistence of many modern detractors. I will conclude by exploring the implications of a paradigmatic reading for Genesis 1–3 for pressing anthropological issues of our time that stem from rejecting, ignoring, and/or softening of God's good design for men and women.

CHAPTER 2

PARADIGM ESTABLISHED: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GENESIS 1–3

This chapter will establish the paradigmatic nature of Genesis 1–3 in order to lay a biblical-theological foundation for the nature of the sexes and their relation to one another in God's design. Specifically, I will argue that Moses was aware of the creation narrative's far-reaching implications for humanity in general and for men and women in particular. As such, he intended the patterns and symbols in Genesis 1–3 to be read paradigmatically—an interpretive perspective that subsequent biblical authors embrace and develop within the scriptural canon.[1]

I have chosen to use the term "paradigm" (thus paradigmatic, paradigmatically) instead of "type" (typological, typologically) to avoid a technical critique from any who might want to limit typology exclusively to matters of salvation-history. For example, James Hamilton argues, "The two essential features of typology are *historical correspondence* between events, persons, and institutions in the Bible's salvation-historical unfolding and the consequent *escalation in significance* that accrues to recurring patterns."[2] In another place, Hamilton equates what he calls "salvation-historical significance" with "*covenantal* connection."[3] I agree with both Hamilton's definition of typology and his insistence that "when biblical authors composed their writings, they intended to signal to

[1] The confirmation of such a reading will be set forth in chap. 3, "Paradigm Explained: The Apostolic Use of Genesis 1–3," while the biblical-theological development within the canon will be explored in chap. 4, "Paradigm Exemplified: Canonical Echoes of Genesis 1–3."

[2] James Hamilton, *Typology—Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns: How Old Testament Expectations Are Fulfilled in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2022), 19, emphasis original. See also E. Earle Ellis, foreword to *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, by Leonhard Goppelt, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), x.

[3] Hamilton, *Typology*, 20, emphasis original.

their audiences the presence of promise-shaped patterns [i.e., types]."[4] Yet it is precisely because of this agreement that I choose to speak of paradigms instead of types. This keeps the focus on the intention of the human author in communicating meaningful patterns intended to shape the perspective of God's people without requiring them to possess a "covenantal connection" of salvation-historical significance.[5]

In what follows I will consider the paradigmatic nature of Genesis 1–3 in two parts. First, I will demonstrate that Moses intended for Genesis 1–3 to be read paradigmatically by drawing attention to the ways in which the narrative functions paradigmatically for a range of significant biblical-theological themes. These include the justification of Sabbath, the institution of marriage, the nature and purpose of the tabernacle-temple, and the representative headship of Adam. Second, after establishing the paradigmatic nature of Genesis 1–3 in general, the chapter will conclude by analyzing the details of the creation of male and female. Specifically, I will explore the potential implications for a biblical view of the sexes that emerges from reading Genesis 1–3 in a paradigmatic fashion. I will show that such an approach confirms the core of the traditional

[4] Hamilton, *Typology*, 5.

[5] That is not to say that Hamilton requires such a connection in every case, though his definition would seem to do so, *prima facie*. Even so, his emphasis is decidedly on the elements of historical correspondence and escalation—two features that I retain when speaking of paradigms. What I explicitly omit are the words that seem to require a covenantal connection of salvation-historical significance. In other words, all types would be paradigms on my reckoning, though not all paradigms would be types given the strictest possible interpretation of Hamilton's definition. That said, there is one sense in which some paradigms (i.e., perspective-shaping patterns) may indeed have salvation-historical significance. Since grace does not destroy or replace created order but renews and perfects it (cf. Eph 4:22–24; Col 3:10), paradigms related to the order of God's creation would enjoy the same salvation-historical significance as that of God's law, which renews the redeemed as they conform their lives to it (cf. Psalm 19:7–11). Such a connection touches upon the relationship between nature (creation) and grace (salvation/new creation). As Herman Bavinck says, "Nature precedes grace; grace perfects nature." See Herman Bavinck, *Prolegomena*, vol. 1 of *Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 322. In other words, an argument can made that the creation of man as male and female (Gen 1:27) has "salvation-historical significance" even beyond Paul's point about the institution of marriage serving as a type for Christ and the church (cf. Eph 5:22–33, especially vv. 31–32) by virtue of the fact God's created order enjoys a sanctifying role for those who are trained by it. And sanctification, of course, is an essential aspect of our total salvation (cf. John 17:17; Acts 20:32; Rom 6:19–22; 8:29; 1 Cor 1:30; 2 Cor 7:1; Eph 4:24; Col 3:1–17; 1 Thess 5:23; Heb 12:14, etc.).

(i.e., majority-historical) Christian view of the sexes with its affirmation that men and women are harmoniously complementary but distinctly non-interchangeable.

The Paradigmatic Nature of Genesis 1–3

The foundational nature of the book of Genesis has long been recognized by virtually all readers of the Bible. Even non-Christian readers of the Scriptures observe as much. As humanist philosopher Leon Kass notes, "The best place to start [when seeking to address the moral crisis of the modern moment and man's need for wisdom] is at the beginning, with the first book of the Bible."[6] The book's (Greek) name is itself an indicator of how its ancient readers understood its purposes within the Pentateuch and the rest of Scriptures. Genesis is the book of beginnings, for it is here that one reads about the beginning of the heavens and the earth, the beginning of all life, including humanity, the beginning of God's self-revelation, the beginning of sin and its consequences, the beginning of God's redemptive promises and covenants, and the beginning of Israel's calling and composition.

Rightly understood, Genesis is the beginning even of things not explicitly or directly addressed therein. For example, Italian Reformer Peter Vermigli says, "All the laws and promises begin here [in Genesis]."[7] By this he does not mean that all of God's laws and promises are explicitly expressed in this book—for they are not; rather, that the narratives of Genesis form the historical and theological foundation for the rest of God's Word. Again, Kass is perceptive on this point: "Though it contains very little prescription and propounds very few commandments, Genesis serves as a prelude to the laws (given mainly in Exodus and Leviticus, and repeated in Deuteronomy). This it does primarily *by*

[6] Leon R. Kass, *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 9.

[7] Peter Vermigli, *Primum Librum Mosis* (1569), 1v, quoted in John L. Thompson, ed. *Genesis 1–11*, Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament, vol. 1 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2012), 8.

making clear through its stories why the laws might be needed."[8] That is to say, there is an intrinsic connection between the narratives of Genesis and the rest of the scriptural canon.

It might be objected that this observation is a point of triviality. For what else could the first book of the Bible be, other than the beginning of all that followed it? But that is not the argument I am advancing here. Instead, I am suggesting that the book of Genesis—especially its opening chapters—is not merely foundational in a logical or historical sense but is enduringly paradigmatic in a theological and ethical sense. That is, the theological vision of Genesis, and its intrinsic ethical implications, are meant to be believed and obeyed by every generation. Old Testament scholar John Sailhamer observes, "The author of the Pentateuch has carefully selected and arranged Genesis 1–11 to serve its function as an introduction. Behind the present shape of the narrative lies a clear theological program."[9] The author of the Pentateuch was not merely recording history as a security camera records, with neither context nor commentary. Rather, the author was more like a documentary filmmaker, gathering, arranging, editing, and commenting on the recordings of real events (i.e., historical narratives) with a specific and explicitly theological purpose.[10]

Sailhamer argues that the author's purpose, or "program" as he calls it, is discovered by reading Genesis with a view to the whole Pentateuch. Doing so reveals the dual objective of "draw[ing] a line connecting the God of the fathers and the God of the Sinai covenant with the God who created the world" and "show[ing] that the call of the

---

[8] Kass, *The Beginning of Wisdom*, 9, emphasis added.

[9] John H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 81.

[10] Neither the language of "editing" nor "shaping" should not be taken to indicate that the accounts of Genesis were non-historical—either as myth or as deliberately distorted history. Rather, to say that an author has "edited" and/or "shaped" the narrative of a historical event is simply to recognize the principle of meaningful selectivity. As the author of John's Gospel demonstrates, "Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written so that you. may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:30–31).

patriarchs and the Sinai covenant have as their ultimate goal the reestablishment of God's original purpose in Creation."[11] Though Sailhamer can be idiosyncratic at other points, his summary of the Pentateuch's main purpose is difficult to disagree with in view of both the priority of place given to the exodus as a type of the salvation that Christ accomplishes[12] and "the pattern of the Bible's metanarrative—creation, sin, exile, restoration [of creation]."[13] The latter is particularly significant for seeing how the opening chapters of Genesis are paradigmatic. For the Scriptures are clear that God's redemptive work is nothing less than the salvation of what was lost (Luke 19:10), the restoration of what was ruined (Acts 3:21), and the renewal of what was corrupted (Matt 19:28; cf. Rom 8:19–24), especially those made in God's image (Col 3:10; Eph 4:24; Titus 3:5). Hence the goal of redemption is new creation—that is, creation made new again (Rev 21:4–5)—the regaining of paradise lost. This explains why the first three chapters of Genesis are replete with embryonic doctrines, themes, and patterns that are clarified and developed across the canon. In each case, the biblical authors are demonstrating that what the Lord began in creation is meant to continue and is therefore indicative of what his redemption aims to restore.

Hamilton argue for a similar reading of Genesis, especially the opening narrative in the first chapters:

> The beginning of Genesis sets the parameters and expectations for the rest of the book. And the story of God speaking the world into being, with all very good, of

[11] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 81.

[12] James Hamilton summarizes, "In the Pentateuch Moses himself indicates that the exodus from Egypt typifies the future salvation that God will accomplish on behalf of his people. He does this by establishing *historical correspondence* between several installments in an *exodus pattern of events*, and the repetition of the patterns produces *an escalated sense of the significance of the pattern.*" James Hamilton, "The Intent of the Human Author," Theopolis, July 23, 2020, https://theopolisinstitute.com/conversations/the-intent-of-the-human-author/, emphasis original. Elsewhere Hamilton writes, "Later biblical authors treat the events of the exodus as a paradigm of God's salvation . . . us[ing] the paradigm of Israel's past to predict Israel's future." James Hamilton, *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 37–38.

[13] James Hamilton, *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 58.

> him making man in his image and placing him in the garden to work it and keep it, with a prohibition on eating from the tree of life, of the making of male and female, and their cleaving to one another in marriage, and then of their transgression and God's word of hope-giving judgment—this story not only sets up the book of beginnings, Genesis, but the whole of the Torah of Moses. . . . Every subsequent biblical author embraced the Torah of Moses and continued the story begun in the book of Genesis.[14]

Once again, the argument is not *merely* that the events recorded in Genesis 1–3 are foundational. As already mentioned, such a feature is inevitably true of the opening chapters in any logically constructed narrative. Rather, the argument is that Moses was *aware* that the content of Genesis 1–3 was foundational and therefore necessary for understanding the rest of the Torah (and beyond, cf. John 5:46; 1 Pet 1:10). Thus, we have good grounds for expecting that Moses, as one carried along by the Spirit of God (2 Pet 1:21), should write in a way that his "words, sentences, sequences, and . . . literary structures"[15] teach not only how to understand God's Word but also how to understand God's Word; that is, how to read it.

Evidence of Intended Paradigms

There is considerable evidence that Moses consciously crafted the creation narrative to be read paradigmatically. One could consider the culmination of God's creative work in the seventh day, for example. To begin, Moses changes the style of his account in significant ways.[16] Gone is the repeated formula of evening and morning, the nth day. Instead, twice, God's work was "finished" (Gen 2:1, 2), and twice, God "rested" on the seventh day (Gen 2:2, 3). The phrase "all his work that he had done" is repeated three times (2:2a, 2b, 3). Sailhamer writes, "It is significant that the account of the seventh day stresses that very thing which the writer elsewhere so ardently calls on the reader to do: 'rest' on the seventh day (cf. Ex 20:8–11). . . . The author's intention is point to the past

[14] Hamilton, *Typology*, 17.

[15] Hamilton, *Typology*, 17.

[16] Sailhamer, *Pentateuch as Narrative*, 96.

as a picture of the future."[17] Moses intentionally crafts the narrative to draw attention to the seventh day as a paradigm for future Sabbath-keeping in view of what lies ahead (for the reader).[18]

Another example of Moses's paradigmatic writing is seen in Genesis 2:24. Note that Moses does *not* say, "Thus did Adam hold fast to his wife, and they became one flesh," as if to comment merely on a single event in history. Moses says instead, "Therefore [NASB: "For this reason," Hebrew: עַל] a man shall leave [Qal. Imperf.] his father and mother and hold fast his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen 2:24). The sense is plain: Moses is indicating that the actions of the man and the woman in Genesis 2, with respect to marriage *at the very least*, establish a paradigm for all who follow them. This is why Jesus Christ, when questioned by the Pharisees about the institution of marriage (Matt 19:3), goes back to "the beginning." Christ first points to God's design in Genesis, saying, "Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning made them male and female?" (Matt 19:4; cf. Gen 1:27). He then quotes from Genesis 2:24, saying, "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh" (Matt 19:5). The apostle Paul likewise returns to narrative in Genesis 1–3 to ground his perspective of men and women not only in marriage (Eph 5:31) but also in the church (cf. 1 Cor 11:2–9; 1 Tim 2:12–15).[19] Both instances show that Jesus and Paul embrace and develop Moses's paradigmatic view of Genesis 1–3.

---

[17] Sailhamer, *Pentateuch as Narrative*, 96–97.

[18] It is far from a novel insight, but it is worth noting that the Torah was a post-exodus document. That is to say Moses compiled, edited, and wrote the Torah after the events it describes. As such, he certainly knew the Sabbath command lay in the "future" (from the standpoint of the reader), for the Sabbath command had already been issued in his own historical past. This fact alone is enough to give sufficient credibility to the view that Moses intentionally crafted the creation account to draw attention to particular details with far-reaching significance.

[19] These passages will form the special focus of chap. 3.

As a third example of Moses's intentionality in drawing attention to paradigms in the creation account, Greg Beale writes extensively on the relationship between the Garden of Eden and Israel's tabernacle-temple. He argues, "The Garden of Eden was the first archetypal temple in which the first person worshipped God."[20] Beale arrives at his conclusion by noting that "the creation of the cosmos [in Genesis 1–2], the making of the tabernacle, and the building of the temple are all described in similar, and at times, identical language."[21] For example, Moses structures both the account of creation and of the construction of the Tabernacle around seven acts introduced by the formula, "And God/the Lord said."[22] Beale also notes, "The same Hebrew verbal form (stem) *mithallēk* (hithpael) used for God's 'walking back and forth' in the Garden (Gen. 3:8), also describes God's presence in the tabernacle (Lev. 26:12; Deut. 23:14 [15]; 2 Sam. 7:6–7)."[23] The Garden-temple connection is further confirmed by the joint use of "work/serve" (עבד) and "keep/guard" (שמר) in describing Adam's duties (Gen 2:15)—two words that, when used together, refer to the duties of the priests in the tabernacle-temple (cf. Num 3:7–8; 8:25–26; 18:5–6; 1 Chr 23:32; Ezek 44:14).[24] The meaning of these parallels for my present purpose is this: Moses wrote or arranged the creation narrative to prepare the reader to understand the new-creational purposes of the tabernacle and temple with a view to the full restoration promised in the eschaton/latter days.[25]

---

[20] G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 66.

[21] Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 60.

[22] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 298–99.

[23] Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 66.

[24] Gordan J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1 (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 67.

[25] Hence, while it is not wrong to say that "the Garden was a kind of temple," from both a canonical and chronological perspective, perhaps it would be better to say that "the temple was a kind of Garden."

T. Desmond Alexander also sees in Genesis 1–3 a paradigm for how God's authority and sovereignty is established. Though seemingly threatened by the very people created in his image to be his mediatorial kings and priests, God re-establishes his rule through Israel's theocracy and the church, the means by which the kingdom of God comes into the world (Matt 6:10).[26] Alexander notes that this is not merely a "theme" (though it is at least that); it is also a pattern or paradigm meant to show *who* mankind was created to be and *how* they are therefore meant to live under God's benevolent rule.[27] This is why God tells Israel of his plans to make them "a kingdom of priests" (Exod 19:6)—the same vocation given to humanity in the garden (cf. Gen 1:28; 2:15). This is also why the apostles state that the church, by virtue of its union with Christ, has taken up Israel's nature and purpose (1 Pet 2:9) in restoration of God's initial plan (or pattern) for all humanity from the beginning (Rev 5:10).

The temptation-and-fall narrative likewise is meant to be paradigmatic. It introduces Satan, "that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and . . . the deceiver of the whole world" (Rev 12:9), not by telling his name, but by showing his nature (that is, his aims and his tactics). Hence, Jesus calls him "a murderer from the beginning" who "speaks out of his character, for he is a liar and the father of lies" (John 8:44). It is pertinent to know the source and nature of evil from the start, for Moses tells that all of history will center on the enmity between Satan's offspring and the woman's offspring before culminating in the victory of the promised seed over the ancient serpent (Gen 3:15).[28] Indeed, Hamilton says this "struggle between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent is *the* plot conflict that informs the whole of the biblical narrative."[29] Between Genesis 3 and the

[26] See chap. 3, "Thrown from the Throne: Re-establishing the Sovereignty of God," in T. Desmond Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008), 74–97.

[27] Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem*, 74.

[28] See Alexander, chap. 4, "Dealing with the Devil," in *From Eden to the New Jerusalem*, 98ff.

[29] Hamilton, *Typology*, 9.

consummation, therefore, life consists of a battle that follows the same pattern; that is, the pattern of being tempted both to question the veracity of what God's Word (Gen 3:1; cf. Prov 3:5; Rom 1:18, 25; Eph 6:12, 14, 16) and to assert one's authority in defining what is good or doing what is right in one's own eyes (Gen 3:5–6; cf. Jdg 17:6; Isa 5:20; 53:6; Prov 3:7; Luke 18:14).

Also seen in Genesis 1–3 is a paradigm for the consequences of breaking God's holy prohibitions (Gen 2:15; cf. Exod 20:3–5, 7, 10, 13–17). This consequence includes both exile (Gen 3:23–24; cf. Deut 28:15–24) and death apart from the Lord (Gen 2:9; 3:23–24; cf. Isa 59:2; Ps 16:10–11; John 17:3; 2 Thess 1:9; Rev 2:7; 22:2, 19). Finally, there is the pattern of God's gracious intervention in providing garments to cover his people's shame (Gen 3:21; cf. Isa 61:10; Ezek 16:8; Rom 13:14; Gal 3:27; Rev 3:5, 18; 4:4; 16:15; 19:7–8), the first sign that a sacrifice will be necessary to undo what mankind has done (cf. Gen 4:4; 22:8; Exod 12; Lev 16; Isa 53; John 1:29; Acts 8:26ff; 1 Pet 1:18–20; Rev 5:9; 21:22–27).[30] In view of all these, it is no overstatement to concur with Alexander in saying, "The very strong links between Genesis 1–3 and Revelation 20–22 suggest that these passages *frame the entire biblical meta-story*."[31] That is to say, Genesis 1–3 establishes the paradigm that the rest of the canon clarifies, develops, and fulfills.

In view the many enduring biblical-theological paradigms established in Genesis 1–3, there can be little doubt that the details of the creation of man and woman are meant

---

[30] Richard Hess defends this view:

> The Garden of Eden has been understood as the prototype of the sanctuary where the faithful meet with and worship God. The tunics or skins are God's means of providing for the sin of the couple by an animal sacrifice. The skins literally cover them, thereby hiding their shame. The use of animal skins introduces physical death for the first time and implicitly suggests the erection of a barrier between God and people. (Richard Hess, "The Roles of the Woman and the Man in Genesis 3," *Themelios* 18, no. 3 [April 1993]: 15–19)

Cf. R. J. Ratner, "Garments of Skin (Genesis 3:21)," *Dor le Dor* 18 (Winter 1989/1990): 74–80.

[31] Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem*, 10, emphasis added.

to serve as a paradigm for understanding God's design for men and women.[32] Indeed, I submit that the burden of proof rests on anyone who wishes to maintain that the male-female elements of the creation narrative are somehow excluded from having the same paradigmatic character of the narrative of which they form an integral part. Yet if one reads these narratives in the way Moses intended, that is, paradigmatically, then he shall discover what even a secular humanist could observe. Leon Kass says that these chapters

> convey a universal teaching about 'human nature,' an anthropology in the original meaning of the term: a *logos* (account) of *Anthropos* (the human being). . . . Adam and Eve are not just the first but also the paradigmatic man and woman . . . provid[ing] a powerful *pedagogical beginning* for the moral and spiritual education of the reader.[33]

Or as biblical theologian Don Collett writes, "[A]t the outset, the Old Testament's account of creation . . . underscores the theological significance of God's providential ordering of things for our understanding of creation's history and the human generations that follow."[34] Genesis 1–3 is written such that "the reader learns that God's providential ordering of things in creation *shapes the meaning of human life and existence* in the post-creation world."[35]

The Beginning of Man and Woman

The narratives of Genesis 1–3 are intended to provide the reader with enduring paradigms for understanding the nature of life in God's world, which includes mankind's life as male and female. The need for such a lengthy justification of an ostensibly apparent reading of Genesis 1–3 is primarily this: it is common among egalitarian theologians to level charge that the traditional conception of male headship in the home and the church

[32] That is, for male and female in general, as opposed to only the man (Adam) and the woman (Eve) in the creation narrative itself.

[33] Kass, *The Beginning of Wisdom*, 9–10, emphasis original.

[34] Don C. Collett, *Figural Reading and the Old Testament: Theology and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020), 13–14.

[35] Collett, *Figural Reading and the Old Testament*, 14, emphasis original.

relies on "exceptional texts" instead of "a biblical theology of the sexes."[36] The implicit assumption is that traditionalists,[37] who survey the whole of Scripture instead of proof-texting it, will find that their argument does not hold up. Theologian Richard Hess makes a similar move. He affirms what was established the previous section:

> The accounts of creation, the Garden of Eden and the Fall in Genesis 1–3 contain more doctrinal teaching concerning the nature of humanity as male and female, as well as the state of the fallen world, than any other single text in the Bible. Their position at the beginning of the Torah, and thus of Scripture as a whole, makes them an important starting point for the study of biblical teaching on gender.[38]

Unfortunately, Hess goes on to claim that the theology in the narratives of Genesis 1–3 undercuts traditional arguments and offers support of "gender equality."[39] This is worth noting since I share a general agreement that Genesis 1–3 contains the most significant doctrinal teaching on the nature of humanity as male and female, while simultaneously departing from Hess at this critical point: Genesis 1–3 was written to teach precisely the opposite of what Hess concludes. That is, although I fully affirm the equal dignity and value of men and women, the focus of Genesis 1–3 is decidedly *not* on the equality of the sexes (true though it may be) but on the "alterity and harmony" of God's design.[40] In fact, Sailhamer observes that the matter of gender is deliberately absent *until* the creation of man and woman. He writes, "The author has not considered gender to be an important

---

[36] For example, see Kevin Giles, "Women in the Church: A Rejoinder to Andreas Köstenberger," *Evangelical Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2001): 225–45.

[37] I use the term "traditionalists" instead of "complementarians" to denote the historicity of the church's near-universal affirmation of the biblical principle of male headship in the home and the church.

[38] Richard Hess, "Equality with and without Innocence: Genesis 1–3," in *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, 2nd ed., ed. Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca M. Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005), 79.

[39] See Hess, "Equality with and without Innocence: Genesis 1–3," 79–95. Note that "gender equality" in this context is a codeword for "egalitarianism," and an unfair one too since contemporary complementarians do not deny the equal value and dignity of men and women in God's world. See the affirmations in The Danvers Statement, The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, "The Danvers Statement," November 1988, https://cbmw.org/about/danvers-statement/.

[40] Mark Jones, review of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, *The Calvinist International*, May 11, 2020, https://calvinistinternational.com/2020/05/11/review-of-aimee-byrds-recovering-from-biblical-manhood-and-womanhood/.

feature to stress in his account of creation of the other forms of life, but for humankind it is of some importance. Thus, the narrative stresses that God created humankind as 'male and female.'"[41] Theologian Alastair Roberts summarizes, "Sexual difference is the one difference within humanity that is prominent in the creation narrative."[42]

Furthermore, both Roberts and Sailhamer (independently, it would seem) observe that the first and second canonical references to the image of God (Gen 1:27; 5:1–2) contain a repeated pattern.[43] Specifically, mankind is first described as a singularity, a corporate man: "So God created man [sg.] in his own image, in the image of God he created him [sg.]" / "When God created man [sg.], he made him [sg.] in the likeness of God." Yet in both instances the man is then described as a plurality: "male and female he created them [pl.]."[44] Sailhamer sees in this interplay a reflection of God's own singularity and plurality as Trinity "thus casting the human relationship between man and woman in the role of reflecting God's own personal relationship with himself."[45] Reflecting on the same, Karl Barth remarks, "Could anything be more obvious than to conclude from this clear indication that the image and likeness of the being created by God signifies existence in confrontation, i.e., in this confrontation, in the juxtaposition and conjunction of man and man which is that of male and female?"[46] In other words, the being of God himself is a pattern—not exhaustively, but really and significantly—for his

[41] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 94–95.

[42] Alastair Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," *Primer* 3 (October 2016): 1–18. https://primerhq.files.wordpress.com/2018/08/primer-03-the-music-and-the-meaning-of-male-and-female.pdf.

[43] See Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 4; Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 95.

[44] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 95.

[45] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 96.

[46] Karl Barth, *The Doctrine of Creation*, part 1, trans. J. W. Edwards, O. Bussey, and H. Knights, vol. 3 of *Church Dogmatics*, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance (1958; repr., London: T & T Clark, 2007), 195.

own image-bearers, who express their likeness to him in fulfillment of the vocation God attaches to the image.[47]

The previous point is significant for Christians who agree that men and women are both made in the image of God (Gen 1:27). Yet the creation narrative does not leave the meaning of this doctrine open to interpretation. Instead, the author of the Pentateuch repeats phrases and patterns in the narrative to indicate what it means for mankind to be male and female. To give but one example, Collett notes that "Genesis 1:2 and 2:5 both follow an ancient literary convention; they describe the effects of God's ordering of things in creation (1:2) and providence (2:5) in contrast to conditions that had prevailed previously. Genesis 1:2 provides a description of the world, not before it was *created* but before it was *formed*."[48] Thus, Moses establishes a pattern before the conclusion of Genesis 1 that involves forming and filling—two actions ordered to meet the needs of an earth that is "without form and void" (1:2).[49] Against this backdrop mankind is introduced (1:27) and immediately given a divine commission: "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion . . . over every living thing" (1:28). Roberts draws attention to the fact that this vocation is specifically wed to the pattern already established in the creation account: dominion and subduing are most closely related to the first three days when God structured, separated/distinguished, subdued, and

[47] This is a matter of some debate, but whether the dominion of Gen 1:28 is coextensive with the image of God or is meant to be a subsidiary part of it, there is an element of "rule" entailed such that even those who take a wholly substantive view of the image are bound by the context of the narrative to say that the purpose of mankind's constitution is to enable to the kind of dominion that God describes in 1:28.

[48] Collett, *Figural Reading and the Old Testament*, 12, emphasis added.

[49] Several scholars have tried to discern the exact nature of the pattern. For example, Meredith Kline argues for two triads with "upper" and "lower registers," and their own sets of "fiats" and "fulfillments." Meredith Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 48 (1996): 2–15. Possibly following Kline, Alastair Roberts observes that "days one to three (verses 1–13) are days of structuring, division, taming, and naming," while "days four to six (verses 14–31) are days of generating, establishing succession, filling, glorifying, and establishing communion." Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 3ff.

named, while filling and multiplying most closely corresponds to days 4 through 6, when God fills his world with new creatures and establishes glorious communion with them.[50]

It would seem that already by the end of the first creation account (Gen 2:3), the narrative contains important terms and patterns that will shape and guide the subsequent account. Specifically, a cautious reading might expect to see the pattern of forming and filling exert itself in the second account of creation, especially given the general overlap in content. One significant change is introduced, however. Instead of merely retelling the creation of the world, the specific nature of mankind itself becomes the focus of the second creation account. Indeed, there is a dramatic increase in the number of times that man/kind [אדם] is mentioned, having been used only twice in Genesis 1:1–2:3, but occurring over twenty times from Genesis 2:4 through 4:1.[51] This alerts the reader to a significant shift in the author's intentions, setting up Genesis 2 to function as epexegetical commentary on the image of God introduced in Genesis 1, such that where chapter 1 introduces gendered differentiation in a brief and unspecified manner, chapter 2 presents a fuller, more "specific and differentiated view of male and female."[52] In other words, the relationship between Genesis 1 and 2 is that they are harmonious creation accounts given for distinct purposes: the first (Gen 1:1–2:3) provides a sweeping and general overview of God and his creative activity in the world, while the second (2:4ff) focuses on the precise nature of God's image-bearers (introduced in 1:26–7) and the particular ways they will carry out the commission he has given them (in 1:28–31).

Turning now to the details text itself, the first and most important observation is that male and female are not symmetrical, and thus not interchangeable. Indeed, many scholars have noted several significant contrasts in Moses's account of the creation of the

[50] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 4.

[51] Collett, *Figural Reading and the Old Testament*, 12.

[52] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 8.

man and the woman.[53] To begin, the man is created first (i.e., before the woman). Hess sees this fact as serving only "to demonstrate the need they have for each other, not to justify an implicit hierarchy."[54] Yet this is almost exactly the opposite conclusion the apostle Paul draws from the account when he cites and applies God's created order to the present life of the church (cf. 1 Cor 11:7–9; 1 Tim 2:13).

Second, only the man, not the woman, can sum up humanity in himself. Hence later biblical authors present Adam as the representative head of humanity before Christ. Hence Christ is called "the last Adam" (1 Cor 15:45), not simply because Christ was male, like Adam, but because Christ is the *representative head* of humanity, as Adam was before him. This one reason why God held Adam responsible for the fall of humanity, despite Eve having sinned first (Gen 3:9, 11; cf. Rom 5:12–14). It is because Adam, not Eve, was appointed to represent mankind, and thus Adam's sin, not Eve's, is the sin that ruptured humanity's fellowship with God.[55]

Third, the man is created outside of the garden (Gen 2:8, 15), prior to its creation, while the woman is created within it (Gen 2:15, 19–23). Taken on its own, this might seem to be a trivial detail, but Umberto Cassuto notes that both the male and female telos can be inferred from this facet of their design. He notes that twice at the end of this section in the narrative Adam's judgment and his vocation are connected with his particular origin. The first is when the Lord says that the man will "return to the ground, for/because of it you were taken" (Gen 3:19), and the second is when the narrator, Moses, says that the Lord cast Adam from the Garden "to work the ground from which he was taken" (Gen 3:23). Cassuto writes, "The man who was taken from the ground must associate

---

[53] See Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 9ff; Jones, review of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*"; James Jordan, "No. 86: Liturgical Man, Liturgical Woman—Part 1," Biblical Horizons, May 2004, http://www.biblicalhorizons.com/rite-reasons/no-86-liturgical-man-liturgical-women-part-1/.

[54] Hess, "Equality with and without Innocence: Genesis 1–3," 84.

[55] We are not told what would have happened if only Eve had sinned, so it is best not to speculate.

himself with it in his lifetime through his work, and return to it as his demise; similarly, the woman who was taken from the man and brought from his body must return to the man and associate with him constantly."[56] In other words, the woman was made primarily (though not exclusively) to relate to the inner world of the Garden—that is, to the people who dwell within it—while the man was made primarily (though not exclusively) to relate to the world outside the garden.[57]

Fourth, the man was placed in the garden "to work it and keep it" (Gen 2:15). This phrase explicitly refers to the duties of the priests in the tabernacle-temple, as G. K. Beale's work has highlighted.[58] Yet it is worth noting that Beale's observations are not unique. Sailhamer also notes, "In light of such an attempt to depict the Garden as foreshadowing the tabernacle of God, it is especially interesting to find that the description of God's placing the man in the Garden also bears a strong resemblance to the later establishment of the priesthood."[59] The meaning of this connection is significant. For it means the man received priestly tasks directly from God, while the woman did not.[60] In the context of his priestly duties, the man was also given the command (the law) from God regarding the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.[61] This is the second

[56] Umberto Cassuto, *From Adam to Noah*, vol. 1 of *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), 136.

[57] At first blush, this seems like an extremely tenuous connection. However, these patterns are reflected generally across all cultures before the industrial age, and more importantly, they are consonant with the emphases of the New Testament authors. For example, Paul exhorts older women to teach younger women "to love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be reviled" (Titus 2:4–5). Note first the content on their instruction—that is, to focus their love on those within their household, which corresponds to the interior world of the garden and Cassuto's inferential telos in "returning" to the place of one's origin. Second, note Paul's justification for this instruction: "so that the word of God may not be reviled." We know that husbands likewise are told to love their wives (Eph 5:25) and bring up their children (Eph 6:4), but Paul does not mention that here. Instead, he focuses on the man's self-control, good works, and teaching (Titus 2:6–7), elements that correspond to man's priestly duties, as will be shortly discuss.

[58] For an extended discussion of Beale's claims, see "Evidence of Intended Paradigms."

[59] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 100.

[60] Jones, review of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.

[61] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 10.

reason why Adam is ultimately held responsible for the fall. In fact, when the Lord judges the man in Genesis 3:17, he repeats the command from 2:17, both of which employ second masculine singular suffixes. The archaic English of the Authorized Version makes this plain: "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it" (Gen 3:17 KJV). This is not to say that the woman was free to eat from the tree, but that the law had been given to the man (as the representative head) and applied to the woman secondarily by extension. Sailhamer also reminds that the Mosaic Law builds on this pattern by holding a husband responsible for the vows his wife has made (e.g., Num 30:1–16).[62] He explains, "If the husband hears his wife make a vow and does not speak out, he is responsible for it. It may be important, then, that the author states specifically in Genesis 3 that the man was with his wife when she ate of the tree, and that he said nothing in reply to the serpent or the woman."[63]

Fifth, the woman was created to be the man's "helper," but this is not said reciprocally of the man. Roberts notes that the kind of "help" intended for the woman to provide the man is a matter of debate, but he maintains that the context provides the core of the answer: "The primary help that the woman was to provide was to assist the *adam* in the task of filling the earth through child-bearing. . . . The problem of man's aloneness is not a psychological problem of loneliness, but the fact that, without assistance, humanity's purpose [i.e., Gen 1:28] cannot be achieved by the *adam* alone."[64] Although this offends modern sensibilities, natural revelation will not permit one (in practice, even if he tries in principle) to deny this point. For it is beyond dispute that men possess a general advantage over women in size and strength, qualities that are well-suited to half of the divine mandate (namely, exercising dominion and subduing creation). When it

[62] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 105.

[63] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 105.

[64] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 9.

comes to multiplication and filling the creation, however, only women's bodies have been designed to bear children and to nurture them after they are born. Or as Roberts explains, "Although both sexes participate in both tasks [i.e., filling and ruling], exercising dominion and being fruitful are not tasks that play to male and female capacities in an equal manner, but rather are tasks where sexual differentiation is usually particularly pronounced."[65]

Sixth, the man alone was given the task of naming the animals, an expression of his dominion over them (cf. Gen 1:28; 2:19–20), while the woman does not participate in this. Moreover, the man twice names the woman, first, generally or categorically, in view of her origin (2:23), then specifically and personally, in view of her vocational destiny (3:20). Hess argues that there is no subordination implied here, being simply "logical and necessary" that the man would name his new partner as the only person (other than God) who perceives what has transpired.[66] While Hess's objection might hold for the first instance of the man naming the woman, it straightforwardly does not apply to the second. For in that case the woman was fully capable of perceiving the implications of life in a post-fall world. Gordan Wenham is therefore right to see significance in the act of naming: "Though they are equal in nature, that man names woman (3:20) indicates that she is expected to be subordinate to him, an important presupposition of the ensuing narrative (3:17)."[67]

Seventh, the institution of marriage is presented with an asymmetry fitting all that I have said thus far.[68] Moses writes, "Therefore *a man* shall leave his father and his

---

[65] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 8. Note that Roberts is careful to mention that these are fundamental (i.e., irreducible) differences of sexual distinction that should be taken as the primary and minimum starting point for consideration of vocation, not the maximum and exhaustive expression of the vocation, as if men were *only* for working and women were *only* for bearing children.

[66] Hess, "Equality with and without Innocence: Genesis 1–3," 87.

[67] Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 258.

[68] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 10.

mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen 2:24). Then he adds, "And *the man and his wife* were both naked and were not ashamed" (Gen 2:25). This androcentric asymmetry is continued in the post-fall narrative, where Cain and Adam each "knew his [own] wife" (Gen 4:17; 4:25; cf. 1 Sam 1:19), but not the other way around. Later Abram took Sarai to be his wife (Gen 11:29), establishing an androcentric pattern of "taking wives" and "giving daughters" that the Lord himself endorses (Jer 29:6).

Finally, the judgments handed down in Genesis 3 serve a double function in the narrative as far as the purposes of my argument are concerned. First, they confirm the findings in Genesis 2 regarding fundamental distinctions between man and woman. For example, the core of each judgment relates to the primary area of their vocational activities: the woman will experience greater pain in childbearing (Gen 3:16a) while the man will experience greater pain in his earth-tilling (3:17–18). Similarly, "both the man and woman will be frustrated and dominated by their source—the woman will be ruled over by the man [3:16b] and the man will return to the ground [3:19]."[69] Commenting on both facets simultaneously as they relate to the woman, Sailhamer writes, "The sense of this judgment within the larger context of the book lies in the role of the woman which is portrayed in chapters 1 and 2. The woman and her husband were to have enjoyed the blessing of children (1:28) and the harmonious partnership of marriage (2:18, 21–25). The judgment relates precisely to these two aspects of the blessing."[70] The second function of the gendered aspects of the judgments is that they demonstrate in a post-fall context that sin has corrupted God's created order, but it has not eviscerated it. In other

[69] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 10.

[70] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 108. Out of the multitude of things corrupted by sin which the Lord could have singled out here, surely it is significant that he selected these! Indeed, the proximity of these elements to the *protoevangelium*, along with other foundational doctrines in Gen 1–3, seems to be a strong indication of precisely how central anthropology is both for understanding the Scriptures and for living faithfully in response to them.

words, the fall has only frustrated, not destroyed, God's plan for male and female. In fact, a continuation of God's plan for men and women is implicit in his promise concerning the very means by which the fall will be finally overcome, namely, when the woman gives birth to a Son who bruises the head of the serpent (cf. Gen 3:15).[71]

Before moving on to consider the implications of these observations, it may be helpful to condense what has been discussed so far. Alastair Roberts offers a concise summary:

> Men and women are created for different primary purposes. These purposes, when pursued in unity and with mutual support, can reflect God's own form of creative rule in the world. The man's vocation, as described in Genesis 2, primarily corresponds to the tasks of the first three days of creation: to naming, taming, dividing, and ruling. The woman's vocation, by contrast, principally involves filling, glorifying, generating, establishing communion, and bringing forth new life—all tasks associated with the second three days of creation. The differences between men and women aren't merely incidental, but integral to our purpose. They're also deeply meaningful, relating to God's own fundamental patterns of operation. God created us to be male and female and thereby to reflect his own creative rule in his world.[72]

In other words, male and female are differently constituted, and one is hard put to envision how the author of the Pentateuch might have made this more apparent. The creation account repeatedly shows that, while man and woman may be genuinely equal before God (i.e., in matters of value and dignity as his image-bearers), they nevertheless remain *harmoniously* asymmetrical from one another. The differences between men and women are *differences by design*, given by God to the sons of Adam and daughters of Eve so that, working together with the gendered capacities and callings God has given, there might be provision and protection for those who need it, as well as the nurturing ties that bind men to the people who benefit most from that protection and provision.

---

[71] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 108.

[72] Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," 11.

Man and Woman in the Church

As a preliminary conclusion,[73] there are several ways in which the church would benefit from revisiting the foundational narratives of Genesis 1–3 and the primary differences between men and women that are established there.

First, reading Genesis 1–3 in a paradigmatic fashion might help the church understand the times and know what God's people ought to do (cf. 1 Chr 12:32). Specifically, I am referring to the ever-growing confusion over what, exactly, it means to be a man or a woman in the midst of a cultural moment marked by people who either downplay or altogether deny the reality and significance of gendered distinctions. This is a serious error, for the willful rejection of God's designs is, in the end, a rejection of God himself (Gen 18:19; Jdg 2:22; 2 Kgs 21:22; Ps 18:21). Yet the more likely error in the confessing church—that is, those who affirm the truth and authority of the Scriptures—is not a rejection of gendered distinction but a dismissal of its significance.

To give a current example, author and former Mortification of Spin podcast host Aimee Byrd recently wrote *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: How the Church Needs to Rediscover Her Purpose*.[74] Never mind that there is no need to "recover" from God's designs, the subtle dangers of her book go beyond the snarky title. She writes,

> Christian men and women don't strive for so–called biblical masculinity or femininity, but Christlikeness. Rather than striving to prove our sexuality, the tone of our sexuality will express itself as we do this. . . . My contributions, my living and moving, are distinctly feminine because I am a female. I do not need to do something a certain way to be feminine (such as receive my mail in a way that affirms the masculinity of the mailman). I simply am feminine because I am female.[75]

---

[73] I will address the implications of reading Gen 1–3 paradigmatically in greater detail in chap. 5.

[74] Aimee Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2020).

[75] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 114.

Yet, as pastor and professor Mark Jones rightly points out, "Byrd misses the vocational aspect of gender."[76] That is to say, Byrd conflates "being" and "becoming" as if to say all women (in their being) already are feminine *in all respects* (without any need for striving or becoming). In a prelapsarian world, there would be no eschatology, only existence. But we do not live in that world. And since sin can maim and corrupt our thoughts and actions, so also it can cause us to fall short of our vocations as male and female.

Jones continues, "Byrd's contention that she doesn't need to act like a woman because she is a woman is sort of like a Christian saying, 'I don't need to act like a Christian because I am one.'"[77] Yet, such an assessment of God's created order overlooks the classic Christian teaching on sanctification, which argues that Christians must become in practice what they already are by position. For example, Christians must strive to become holy (practically or progressively) because they have already been made holy (positionally). Analogously, men and women are called to become more masculine and more feminine, respectively—that is, they are called to live in step with God's design as reflected in the biblical patterns of male and female which are found in seed-form in Genesis 1–3 and which are clarified, developed, and expanded across the canon. To do anything else with these gendered differences would, rather ironically, reduce God's design to reproduction, instead of seeing God's design as the blueprint for maturation.[78]

In contrast to Byrd's unisex vision for discipleship, the church is better off confidently and joyfully embracing the differences of God's design. For God does not save unisex people; therefore, the church does not baptize unisex disciples. Rather, she baptizes men and women, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, future fathers and mothers (and

---

[76] Jones, review of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.

[77] Jones, review of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.

[78] The irony involved here is that critics of those who emphasis gendered distinctions frequently claim that traditional/complementarian conceptions of gender reduce to woman to someone who is perpetually barefoot and pregnant in the kitchen. However, it is paradoxically those who eliminate gendered distinctions that leave no purpose for the biological differences between a man and a woman's body beyond those of bearing children.

grandfathers and grandmothers). In view of this fact, churches should look for ways to affirm men and women who are committed to walking in the way of the Lord, even at great cost to themselves. This can and should be done from the pulpit whenever the text deems it appropriate. But this also may be done through gender-conscious forms of discipleship, such as those mentioned in Titus 2, which are carried out with emphases tailored especially, though not exclusively, to the fundamentally primary aspects of male and female vocations. This also requires intentional investment (from pastors) in mature women who are capable of working alongside them—not as pastors, but as sisters—in discipling half of the church with the unique gifts and opportunities, as well as intuitive understanding, that they have been given.

A second and somewhat related benefit of reading Genesis 1–3 in a paradigmatic way is that it sharpens an understanding of the rationale behind God's requirements. That is, in the absence of a clear vision of what men and women were made to do, most Christians are unable to explain why God chose patriarchs (instead of matriarchs), why our Lord's choose twelve males to be his disciples, why God's "kingdom of priests" limited to the priesthood to males (Lev 6–8), or why the apostle says "there is no male and female" (Gal 3:28), while also insisting that "wives should submit in everything to their husbands" (Eph 5:24).

Not having a good answer, most Christians resort to something along the lines of, "Because the Bible tells me so." But it is not long before this infantile form of divine command theory, severed from any kind of anchor in God's character or his created order, goes from a confident "the Bible tells me so" to an increasingly unconfident, "Has God really said?" In other words, not only is Christianity opened up to criticism from without, but uninformed Christians open themselves up to doubts from within. This kind of cross pressure is all the more common in a culture that talks incessantly of "equity" and "equality." Indeed, the number of Christian men and women who are likely to become egalitarians over the next decade is tremendously high. This is not because they will have

read excellent arguments and become persuaded by the better-reasoned position, but simply because—in the absence of any kind rationale for God's requirements—the Bible (or God himself) seems arbitrary, capricious, or even unjust. In such a setting, the biblical teaching on men and women becomes a kind of burden that Christians wish to be rid of. As result, uncourageous hearts are looking for way to hold onto their Christ without holding onto his clear teachings regarding men and women. Yet the only way to do that is to adopt a hermeneutic built on butchering what the Bible lays bare for all to see.

For all these reasons, any sort of minimalist approach to gender and sexuality, no matter how well-intentioned, ultimately jeopardizes the authority of the Scriptures, as well as the distinctively Christian set of moral claims that are derived from the same (for why should someone care what this book teaches about, say, homosexuality, when he has already found a way to ignore what it says about the related matters of male and female?). Yet if the ordered relationships in the home and the church are not random but rather are rooted in the way God has designed the very fabric of humanity, then the laws God gives to govern the sexes will not be seen as a burden, but will be counted among the commands and statutes that Lord tells us "for our good always" (Deut 6:24).

CHAPTER 3

PARADIGM EXPLAINED: THE APOSTOLIC USE OF GENESIS 1–3

In the previous chapter I argued that Moses intended the creation account to be read paradigmatically. Hence, the author draws attention to various aspects of the narrative that serve his purposes at a later point in the Pentateuch. Examples include the foundation of the Sabbath (Gen 2:1–4; cf. Exod 20:8–11), the institution of marriage (Gen 2:24; cf. Exod 20:14; Lev 20:11–20; see also Matt 19:3–5), the temple-like nature of Eden (Gen 3:8; cf. Lev 26:12; Deut 23:14 [15]; see also Gen 2:15; cf. Num 3:7–8), the sovereignty of the Lord (Gen 2:16–17; cf. Exod 20:3–5, 7, 10, 13–17), the deadly consequences of siding with Satan in rebellion against him (Gen 3:23–24; cf. Deut 28:15–24), and the Lord's gracious intervention to deal with his people's sin (Gen 3:21; cf. Gen 4:4; 22:8; Exod 12; Lev 16).

In view of the demonstrably paradigmatic nature of Genesis 1–3 for so many themes of biblical-theological significance, I then argued that one should expect the details of sexual differentiation in the creation account to have the same paradigmatic character as the narrative of which they form an integral part. This means Adam and Eve are not just the first man and woman (chronologically) but the model man and woman (paradigmatically) for all who follow them. Specifically, the man is the representative head of the woman, just as Adam was the representative head of humanity in general (Rom 5:12–14; 1 Cor. 15:45) as well as his wife in particular (Gen 2:15–17; 3:17; cf. Eph 5:23–24). Correspondingly, the woman is the man's helper (Gen 2:18), taken from him (Gen 2:21) and given to him by the Lord (Gen 2:22) for their mutual edification (Gen 1:26–28; 2:24; 1 Pet 3:7). In other words, man and woman are not merely different *from* each other

but different *for* each other.[1] To deny these differences is therefore to deny the design of God, with detrimental effects to men and women, the families which they form, and the societies of which they are a central part.

Having established that the author intended the sexual details of man and woman's creation to serve as an enduring paradigm for the sexes, the present chapter will confirm such a reading by appealing to the apostolic use of Genesis 1–3 in key New Testament texts. I will first defend apostolic hermeneutics as faithful interpretations of the Old Testament. Second, I will consider Paul's explicit use of the creation account in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16, Ephesians 5:22–33, and 1 Timothy 2:8–15. In each case I will give attention to three things: the apostle's recognition of the paradigm (thus confirming that he grasped Moses's intention), his fuller explanation of its significance, and his authoritative application of the same. I will conclude the chapter by showing how the apostolic confirmation of the sexual paradigm in Genesis 1–3 legitimizes the recognition of Old Testament patterns and New Testament passages where the sexual paradigm established in Genesis 1–3 is implicitly assumed.

The Answer Key at the Back of the Book

I remember the day I first discovered, as a young high schooler, that the back of my algebra book contained an answer key to the problems therein. Math was never the same after that.[2] Readers encounter something similar in the New Testament, which is, in

[1] The contrast of different from and different for is adapted from Alastair Roberts, who writes,

> In speaking of the direct relationship between man and woman, it is not difference so much as the depth and love of one flesh unity that is emphasised [sic]. Men and women are different, yet those differences are not differences designed to polarise [sic] us or pit us against each other. Rather, these differences are to be expressed in unified yet differentiated activity within the world and the closest of bonds with each other. It is not about difference from each other so much as difference for each other. What makes the woman unique is her capacity for complementing labour [sic] in profound union with the man. The animals are also helpers, but only the woman is a suitable counterpart for the *adam* in his vocation and spouse with whom he can become one flesh. The differences between men and women are precisely features that make them fitting for each other." (Alastair Roberts, "The Music of Male and Female," *Primer* 3 [October 2016]: 13)

[2] Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that *my grades* were never the same after that, but I digress.

a manner of speaking, the back of the book *par excellence*. This is no slight to the Old Testament. In fact, there is ample evidence that Old Testament authors knew they were writing a story-awaiting-an-ending. This is seen clearly when Moses and the prophets point the reader to a far-off period—"the last/latter days" (אחרית)—when the messianic promises of God would be fulfilled.[3]

The apostle Peter explicitly confirms that prophetic perspective when he writes, "Concerning this salvation, the prophets who prophesied about the grace that would come to you, searched and carefully investigated. They inquired into what time or what circumstances [τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν] the Spirit of Christ within them was indicating when he testified in advance to the sufferings of Christ and the glories that would follow" (1 Pet 1:10–12, CSB). Or, as James Hamilton summarizes, "From start to finish, the Old Testament is a messianic document, written from a messianic perspective, to sustain a messianic hope."[4] In this way, the New Testament is not a radical departure from what came before it; rather, it is a continuation of the Old Testament's plotline and themes—not only concerning the Messiah but all its content (cf. Num 23:19; Mal 3:16; Jas 1:17; Heb 13:8).[5]

This upshot of the aforementioned continuity (i.e., non-contradictory fulfillment) is that the apostolic use of the Old Testament in the New offers legitimate grounds for confirming and expanding a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3. Two objections emerge

[3] See Gen 49:1, 8–10; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; Isa 2:2 (= Mic 4:1); Jer 23:20; 30:24; Ezek 38:16; Dan 2:28; 10:14; Hos 3:5; Joel 2:28.

[4] James Hamilton, "The Skull-Crushing Seed of the Woman: Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Genesis 3:15," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 10, no. 2 (2006): 30–54.

[5] That is not to say that there is nothing new about the New Testament. Though it lays outside the scope of this chapter, much has been written about the newness of the new covenant, which *at a minimum* altered the constitution of God's people (1 Pet 2:9–10; Eph 2:11–22) as well as the signs and stipulations of membership in the new covenant (Luke 22:19–20; Rom 6:4–5; 2 Cor 3:1ff; Gal 3:15–4:31; Heb 8:1–10:31). Nor should the above be taken to mean that every individual grasped the intended meaning of the Old Testament authors. Indeed, many did not (cf. John 3:10; Rom 10:2–3). Nevertheless, a remnant within Israel did indeed perceive the meaning of the Old Testament, as indicated by their responses to the Jesus, the Messiah, when they first hear of him (cf. Luke 1:26–56; 1:57–80; 2:22–35).

at this point. First, some may suggest an impropriety in this method of biblical-theological exegesis. Why should I move straight from Genesis 1–3 to the New Testament, they inquire, leapfrogging the rest of the Old Testament in the process? Admittedly, such a move is not standard. When not expositing the thought of a particular book or author, biblical theology tends to trace "the delineation a biblical theme across all or part of the biblical corpora," as stated in the editor's introduction to every volume in the New Studies in Biblical Theology series.[6] I do intend to trace the ways in which subsequent (i.e., post-Pentateuchal) authors embrace and develop Moses's perspective of the sexes in Genesis 1–3.[7] Nevertheless, I am deliberately flipping to the back of the book, as it were, to consider the fullest and clearest exposition of the Old Testament in the New. G. K. Beale notes, "Progressive revelation always reveals things not *as clearly* seen earlier."[8] Or, to borrow a metaphor from Geerhardus Vos, I am advancing from the "seed form" paradigm in Genesis 1–3 straight to "the full-grown tree," so that in retrospect what is genuinely present from the beginning may be more clearly recognized in its various stages of development.[9]

Such a move also brings up a second and more serious objection; namely, some claim the apostles, and even Christ himself (!), were guilty of preaching "the right doctrine from the wrong texts."[10] While such a charge is not in every case explicitly incompatible

[6] For example, see D. A. Carson, series preface to *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, by G. K. Beale, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 9.

[7] Indeed, the biblical-theological development of this paradigm is the subject of the next chap., "Paradigm Exemplified: The Canonical Echoes of Genesis 1–3."

[8] G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2008), 29, emphasis added.

[9] Geerhardos Vos defends the "organic process" of progressive revelation in Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 15–16.

[10] For an extended treatment of this question, see G. K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998).

with evangelical confessions of inspiration and inerrancy,[11] some forms of this argument are all but fatal to evangelical approaches to biblical theology.[12] Against this charge David Instone-Brewer has shown from approximately one hundred pre-AD 70 examples of rabbinic exegesis that—even when not always successful—the overwhelming majority of second temple Jewish exegetes consciously attempted to interpret the Old Testament contextually.[13] In addition to this historical evidence, there is solid theological warrant for assuming the apostles not only attempted to honor the intended meaning of an author inspired by the Holy Spirit (1 Pet 1:21; 2 Tim 3:14–16) but *succeeded* in doing so, for their interpretations were superintended by the same Spirit (2 Thess 2:13; 2 Pet 3:16).[14] For all these reasons Christians can have great confidence that Christ and his apostles were accurate interpreters of the Old Testament, such that their conclusions should be our conclusions. Or as Hamilton has put it, "We're called to follow the apostles as they followed Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 11:1), and part of doing that means learning to interpret Scripture . . . the way the biblical authors did."[15]

---

[11] See Richard Longenecker, "'Who Is the Prophet Talking About?' Some Reflections on the New Testament's Use of the Old," *Themelios* 13 (1987): 4–8; "Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?," *Tyndale Bulletin* 21 (1970): 3–38; and *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

[12] For example, see Beale's sustained critique of Pete Enns in G. K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008).

[13] David Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Tübigen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

[14] To maintain the contrary is tantamount to "denying the authoritative character of their scriptural interpretation—and to do so is to strike at the very heart of the Christian faith," as Moisés Silva says. Moisés Silva, "The NT Use of the OT: Text Form and Authority," in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 162–63.

[15] James Hamilton, *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 19.

The Use of Genesis 1–2 in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16

At this point it is something of a truism to say that 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 is one of the most difficult-to-interpret passages in the New Testament.[16] Indeed, such is the alleged difficulty of the text that not a few scholars have registered their opinions that Paul's argument "lacks logical coherence,"[17] contains "contorted reasoning,"[18] and results in a "theological quagmire" for would-be interpreters.[19] Without agreeing with such a negative assessment, Tom Schreiner has identified several features that do contribute to the difficulty of interpreting 1 Corinthians 11:2–16.[20] They include questions such as: What is the relationship of verse 2 to what follows? What does Paul mean by "head," especially in verse 3? Is the head covering a veil or one's hair? In what sense is woman the glory of man (v. 7)? What does it mean for a woman to "have authority on her head" (v. 10), and what does this have to do with angels (ἀγγέλους)? Finally, what does "nature" mean in verse 14? Additionally, there is some debate about whether, or to what degree, one can reconstruct the socio-historical background(s) of the passage, which seem to be a potentially significant factor for certain aspects of Paul's argument here.[21]

---

[16] The following works cite the notorious difficulty of interpreting this text: Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, Sacra Pagina (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1999); Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000); Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 32 (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2008).

[17] Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," in *The Text and the Times: New Testament Essays for Today* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 87.

[18] John P. Meier, "On the Veiling of Hermeneutics (1 Cor 11:2–16)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 218.

[19] Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox, 1997), 186.

[20] The following questions have been paraphrased from Thomas R. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne A. Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991), 117.

[21] Thiselton notes, "A further complication arises from the existence of multiple reconstructions of the situation at Corinth." He especially has in mind several factors here, including some "fluidity in the expectations and status of women in mid-century Roman culture," as well as whether mid-first-century Corinth—with its "huge preponderance" of Latin inscriptions over Greek inscriptions—was more closely aligned with Roman cultural and social norms than with Greek norms. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the*

Because of all the interpretive difficulties previously mentioned, Schreiner notes that it might be tempting to say this passage is "too obscure" to serve as the basis for "establish[ing] any doctrine or teaching on the role relationship of men and women."[22] In contrast, he argues that "the central thrust of the passage is clear."[23] He also argues that the "key issues are not as difficult as has been claimed," and that those issues that do "remain obscure" thankfully "do not affect the central teaching of the passage."[24] Namely, 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 teaches that God created men and women differently and gave them complementary callings to be expressed in distinct ways—even if some of these expressions are culturally conditioned.[25]

Space does not permit dealing with all of these interpretive challenges. Nor do I find every difficulty in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 equally relevant for discerning Paul's basic meaning.[26] In fact, Alastair Roberts has highlighted eight principles for reading this

---

Corinthians, 801. Further still, there is the question of Jewish traditions and whether Paul would have expected his Corinthian converts to have known or cared about such customs. See David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 527.

[22] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 117. Schreiner does not list specific scholars who have said as much. Instead, he may simply be highlighting the universal temptation to dismiss difficult texts as being unhelpful for establishing clear doctrines. On the other hand, he goes on to say "In contrast to this position" by which he seems to indicate a commonly held viewpoint, not simply a hypothetical one.

[23] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 117.

[24] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 117.

[25] Specifically, Schreiner argues that the head covering—regardless of whether it was hair or some sort of veil or shawl—does not communicate the same meaning in our culture that it conveyed in first-century Corinth. See Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 129.

[26] Following the consensus view of scholars, even most critical scholars, I take all of 1 Cor 11:2–16 to be authentically Pauline. See Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 799; cf. Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (1 Kor 6, 12–11, 16), Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7, vol. 2 (Zurich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn Verlang, 1995), 496–97. Schreiner agrees, arguing, "This passage should be viewed as an interpolation only if there are convincing textual arguments, and this is hardly the case here." Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 129n1. Other scholars, such as Alan Padgett and Thomas Shoemaker, hold that part of the passage (11:3–7b and 11:2–9, respectively) expresses a Corinthian perspective, while part (11:7c–16 and 11:10–16, respectively) expresses Paul's response to the Corinthians. See Alan Padgett, "Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 and Its Context," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 69–86; Thomas R. Shoemaker, "Unveiling of Equality: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16," *Biblical Theology*

passage that either remove or significantly lessen the force of details that threaten to derail some interpreters. Though some of Roberts's principles might enjoy a general application, he formulated them specifically in light of the interpretive challenges in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16.[27] Paraphrased, they are as follows:

1. One must read the passage as part of the whole letter of which it is a part, especially with a view to the letter's earlier themes. To do otherwise falls prey to N. T. Wright's observation that "reading [Paul] is like riding a bicycle: if you stand still for more than a moment, forgetting the onward movement both of the story of [the pericope] and the letter as a whole, you are liable to lose your balance—or, perhaps, to accuse Paul of losing his."[28]

2. The passage contains teachings about both men and women, not women only, which means it rests upon a Christian conception of gender differentiation for both sexes[29]

3. Paul's argument incorporates three arenas or horizons: created order, social customs, and the order of the gospel in the age to come.[30]

4. Paul derives key elements of his argument from biblical-theological reflection on the creation narrative, which means 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 must be read alongside Genesis 1–2.[31]

Bulletin 17, no. 2 (April 1987): 60–63. Against this view Schreiner notes both the unusual length of the would-be citation and the lack of textual indication that Paul is citing a view other than his own. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 130n1.

[27] See Alastair Roberts, "1 Corinthians 11: Biblical Reading and Reflections—Part 398," *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), July 11, 2020, https://audio.alastairadversaria.com/sermons/10570/.

[28] N. T. Wright, *The Letter to the Romans*, in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 10, *Acts–First Corinthians*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 639.

[29] So, Murphy-O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in 1 Cor 11:2–16," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 92 (1980): 483; Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 805; and Hays, *First Corinthians*, 183–84; but contra Thomas R. Schreiner, "Praying and Prophesying in the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16' (Ch 8) by Gordon D. Fee," *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 10, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 17; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 517–18; and J. Delobel, "1 Cor 11:2–16: Towards a Coherent Explanation," in *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère*, ed. A. Vanhoye, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 73 (Leuven: Leuven University, 1986).

[30] Thiselton calls these three "maps" of gender relationships. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 803; cf. Judith Gundry-Volf, "Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2–16: A Study in Paul's Theological Method," in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche*, ed. Jostein Ådna, Scott Hafemman, and Otfried Hofius (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 152.

[31] This seems evident given that Paul clearly summarizes the creation account in 11:7–9 and 11–12. Yet one cannot afford to miss the force of what Paul is doing. Stephen Clark observes,

> Most of the important passages on men-women roles in the New Testament refer back either explicitly or implicitly to the first three chapters of Genesis (1 Cor 11:2–16, Gal 3:26–28, Eph 5:22–31, 1 Tm 2:9–15). These passages clearly show the foundational importance of the creation accounts for

5. When dealing with difficult texts that play an important part in current debates, the temptation is to detach and atomize isolated words and verses. Instead, one needs to connect this passage to the whole of Scripture, not treating it as pillar-like prooftext (to be cited in support or chipped away at in critique) but as one part of a vast "root system" that runs throughout the Scriptures.[32]

6. Instead of explaining away difficult texts by giving them interpretations that empty them of any unwelcome implications, one needs to give a positive explanation of the author's train of thought.[33]

7. Knowledge of the cultural context may prove to be helpful for certain questions, but Scripture itself will generally prove to be the place of greatest clarity and insight.[34]

8. Paul often plays with words and levels of meaning, so one should not assume that he always uses the same word in the same sense even within the same verse.[35]

When read with these principles in mind, one can see that 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 teaches both the non-interchangeability of the sexes and the principle of male headship—the meaning of which is best discerned not from lexical data, nor from tenuous arguments derived from the unique life of the Trinity, but from the way Paul uses Genesis 1–2.

> understanding this subject in a Christian perspective. *It is not possible to understand the New Testament teaching on men and women without understanding how it is founded on the creation of Adam and Eve* and on God's purpose as revealed in the creation of the human race. (Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ* [Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980], 5, emphasis added)

[32] Here Roberts makes a comparison to the doctrine of the Trinity, which rests not on a single verse or collection of isolated verses, but on the entirety of Scripture's witness read in concert. See Roberts, "1 Corinthians 11."

[33] Many such examples, especially in egalitarian literature, seem preoccupied with explaining what words like "submission" do not mean. However, Mark Jones notes the tendency even in recent complementarian literature in his review of Rachel Green Miller's *Beyond Authority and Submission: Women and Men in Marriage, Church, and Society* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2019). For though the book explicitly aims to consider the implications of submission and authority in "marriage, church, and society," significant texts such as Eph 5:24 and 1 Cor 11:7 are "not discussed in any detail" except to say what they do *not* mean. The lack of any positive explanation for Paul's argument, however, will leave a deficient theological anthropology. Interpreters must do better than this. See Mark Jones, "Book Review: *Beyond Authority and Submission* by Rachel Green Miller," Mere Orthodoxy, October 2, 2019, https://mereorthodoxy.com/book-review-beyond-authority-and-submission/.

[34] Roberts does not explicitly mention the difficulties noted by Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 801n6. However, reference to his work elsewhere suggests Roberts is familiar with these.

[35] See 1 Cor 11:4 for an indisputable example of this. Cf. Alastair Roberts, "Subordination in Scripture: κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3," Reformation21, November 22, 2016, https://www.reformation21.org/blogs/subordination-in-scripture-in.php; and Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 518.

The Meaning of κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3

Much ink has been spilled concerning the meaning of "head" in 1 Corinthians 11:3.[36] This is because both complementarian and egalitarian scholars tend to stake the force of their argument on the meaning of the word here. For example, Schreiner writes, "Probably the most crucial question in this passage is what Paul means by head (*kephalē*) in verse 3."[37] The verse in question reads, "But [δὲ] I want you to understand that Christ is the head [κεφαλὴ] of every man [ἀνδρὸς], and [δὲ] the man is the head [κεφαλὴ] of the woman [γυναικὸς], and [δὲ] God is the head [κεφαλὴ] of Christ" (1 Cor 11:3 CSB). As for the possible meanings of this term, Schreiner writes, "Two answers are being suggested today: source and authority."[38]

Though it is not possible to cover the extensive lexical arguments at length in this chapter,[39] Thiselton summarizes the debate in this way:

> Grudem's critique of the proposals about "source" seems convincing, but his attempts to insist that the sense of "head" used by Paul necessarily carries with it notions of authority rather than prominence, eminence, representation, or preeminence is less conclusive, especially when he concedes that some 2,000 of 2,336 occurrences presuppose the semantic contrast between physical head and physical body.[40]

In rejecting both the arguments for "source" and the arguments for ruler or "authority," Thiselton sides with Richard Cervin and Andrew Perriman, contra Wayne Grudem (and

---

[36] With apologies to the hymnist Frederick Lehman, and with not a little encouragement from the apostle (John 21:25), one might say that could we with ink the ocean fill, and were the skies of parchment made; were every stalk on earth a quail, and every scribe a man by trade; to record the κεφαλή debates above would drain the ocean dry; nor could the scroll contain the whole, though stretched from sky to sky.

[37] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 119.

[38] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 119. I discuss the accuracy of this claim (regarding the two options for the meaning of "head") in the paragraphs immediately following.

[39] See appendix 1, "Head to Head: The Meaning of Κεφαλή."

[40] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 813–14.

Joseph Fityzmer before him[41]), in claiming that κεφαλή most commonly denotes that which is preeminent or foremost, or else denotes a synecdoche in a representative role.[42] Again Thiselton writes,

> This proposal has the merit of *most clearly drawing interactively on the metaphorical conjunction between physiological head* (which is far and away the most frequent, "normal" meaning) and the notion of *prominence*, i.e., the *most* conspicuous or *top-most* manifestation of that for which the term also functions *as synecdoche for the whole*. . . . These aspects feature more frequently and prominently in first-century Greek texts than either the notions of *ruler* or *source*.[43]

The point here is not that Cervin, Perriman, and Thiselton are certainly correct, such that those who follow Grudem and Fitzmyer are hopelessly left without any room for rejoinder. In fact, Perriman concedes, "Head [κεφαλή] denotes one who is preeminent, and . . . it *may result in authority and leadership* [depending on the connotations of the context]."[44] In other words, onw must look not to the word's semantic field of domain but to Paul's use of the term in context, including especially the biblical-theological context of Genesis 1–2.[45]

---

[41] See Wayne Grudem, "Does Kephalē (Head) Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59; and "The Meaning of Κεφαλή: A Response to Recent Studies," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3–72. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Another Look at Κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 503–11; and "Kephalē in 1 Cor. 11:3," *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 32–59.

[42] See Richard S. Cervin, "Does *Kephalē* Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Rebuttal," *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 85–112; and Andrew Perriman, "The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of Κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3," *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994): 602–22.

[43] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 821, emphasis original.

[44] Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 616, emphasis added. Nevertheless, Perriman insists that authority "is not its [κεφαλή] basic denotation."

[45] I am not saying that the lexical data does not matter at all. Rather, my aim, in the words of Alastair Roberts, is to liberate exegesis form "being blown off course by the crosswinds of the gender debates . . . [which] increasingly come to focus upon the questions concerning the meanings, not just of particular proof-texts, but of *isolated words and phrases*." See Roberts, "Subordination in Scripture," emphasis added. Roberts continues,

> Slight differences in translation are used to justify remarkably different accounts of appropriate relations between the sexes. Different sides of the debates can construct vast theological edifices upon the slender pinnacles of terms such as כנגדו עזר in Genesis 2:18 or תשוק in Genesis 3:16, for instance. This can occur for various reasons. For some, it accompanies the attempt to kick the debate into the long grass of hopelessly contestable exegesis, thereby preventing Scripture from playing a deciding role in our conversations. When so many interpretations are floating around, Scripture can

Headship in Genesis 1–2

Consider the logic of Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16. After commending the Corinthians for "holding fast to the traditions" he delivered to them (11:2),[46] he transitions to what he wants them "to know" [εἰδέναι], namely, the much-discussed content of 11:3, with its teaching on headship. In addition to the difficulties noted previously,[47] a new challenge arises for the "authority (over)" view of headship: Paul does not say God is the head of Christ, and Christ is the head of man, and man is the head of woman—a linear hierarchy. Nor does Paul structure the relationship in reverse, from the woman to the man to Christ to God. Instead, Paul speaks to men and then to women, before circling back to Christ once more. Schreiner notes this unexpected order here, arguing, "Paul added the headship of God over Christ right after asserting the headship of man over woman in order to teach that the authority of man over woman does not imply the inferiority of women or the superiority of men."[48] This is plausible, yet it seems to discard the quasi-chiastic structure of the verse, in which references to Christ "frame" the statement that Paul makes about man and woman.[49] Such a framing might anticipate what Paul will shortly make explicit—that is, "all things come from God" (11:12).

Significantly, Paul is not concerned with the behavior of women only, but with the proper understanding of the man-woman relationship. Hence, he endeavors to show God's created order applies to both men and women, right from the start (cf. 11:3–5). This emphasis is also reflected in the almost equal number of references to man (14x) and

---

> no longer arbitrate and personal choice—with its tendentious, eccentric, and often wilful [*sic*] readings of particular texts and terms—steps in to take its place. (Roberts, "Subordination in Scripture")

[46] The content of these traditions and the relationship of this commendation have been much debated, but in any case, the connection to Paul's use of Gen 1–2 is of little import.

[47] See also appendix 1.

[48] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 122.

[49] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 513.

woman (16x), often in parallel statements, woven throughout the passage. In other words, Paul's main point seems not simply to rely on, but to consist in, the significance of gender-based distinctions according to God's design.[50]

For example, note how Paul grounds the cultural expressions of 11:4–6 in abiding differences that stem from created order: "A man should not cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God [εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ]. And the woman is the glory of man [δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστιν]" (11:7). Infamously, Paul does not mention that the woman is made in the image of God. However, he also does not mention man being made in God's "likeness" [ὁμοίωσιν] (Gen 1:26). The point therefore seems to focus on what is unique to each sex; namely, man is the glory of God in a special way, just as woman is the glory of man.[51] Paul defends his theological point by an appeal to the creation account in the verses that follow it: "For (γάρ) man did not come from woman, but woman came from man. Neither was man created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man" (1 Cor. 11:8–9).[52] The first of these ideas is an obvious reference to Genesis 2:21–23, while the second is a reference to Genesis 2:18.[53]

It is *these* truths, taken from the creation account, which Paul relies on to make his cultural-contextual application: "This is why [διὰ τοῦτο] a woman should have a symbol of authority on her head" (11:10a).[54] This is nothing *explicitly* stated about how Adam's priority would entail the need for a woman to have "[a symbol of] authority on her head."

---

[50] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 805.

[51] Gundry-Volf, "Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2–16," 157; Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 124.

[52] Note that Paul links these verses with the previous by use of the logical conjunction, "For" (γάρ).

[53] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 124.

[54] Fitzmyer argues that Paul is drawing a conclusion from what *precedes* (11:7–9), not from what follows ("because of the angels," 11:10b). See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1971), 190.

Egalitarian scholar Cynthia Westfall critiques Paul's argument at this point, claiming that his logic appears to be based on the antiquated notion of primogeniture.[55] However, there is ample evidence from Scripture that the ancient rite of primogeniture is not at all presumed to be a universal facet of creation. Note, for example, the repeated theme of the older serving the younger (cf. Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, Reuben and Judah, Perez and Zerah).[56] In other words, Westfall makes a dubious cultural connection precisely at the point where Paul himself invokes the created order.

Here Paul appears to follow a common interpretive practice in first-century Judaism[57] in which exegetes assume or draw upon the whole context for a verse that they cite. As Beale explains in an essay on the apostolic use of the Old Testament, Paul "did not focus merely on single verses independent of the segment from which they were drawn."[58] Thus Paul's brief summary of Genesis 1–2 is meant to recall the entirety of Genesis 1–2. As such, one ought to read Paul's explanatory comments in 1 Corinthians 7–10a[59] with a deep awareness of the creation account, including Moses's intention to signal far-reaching implications for how men and women are meant to understand their nature and place in God's world.[60]

If Paul's only use of Genesis 1–2/3 were 1 Corinthians 11:2–16, then perhaps an interpreter could not be faulted for doubting the previous claim about the totality of the

---

[55] Cynthia Westfall, *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016), 71–78.

[56] See also Thomas R. Schreiner, "*Paul and Gender*: A Review Article," *Themelios* 43, no. 2 (2018): 178–92, especially 189–90.

[57] See C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952).

[58] Beale, *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts*?, 390.

[59] Space will not permit an investigation of the highly enigmatic qualifier "because of the angels," but I share the majority opinion that Paul was likely referring to angels who participate in the gathered worship of the church in some fashion (cf. Rev 2–3). As such, Paul's passing reference to them may be his desire to highlight their own adherence to God's created order.

[60] Recall that Moses concludes the creation account by saying, "For this reason" (Gen 2:24), thus framing the relation of Adam to Eve as a paradigm for all who follow them.

creation account serving as the basis for Paul's exhortations here. However, Paul also makes a near-identical use of Genesis 1–2 (and 3) in 1 Timothy 2:8–15.[61] The parallels between that passage and 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 are worth noting. Both express Paul's apostolic will (1 Cor 11:3 = θέλω; 1 Tim. 2:8 = Βούλομαι). Both concern the conduct of men and women. Both discuss what women wear (1 Cor 11:4; 1 Tim. 2:9a), including their hair (1 Cor 11:6, 15; 1 Tim 2:9b). Both assume that women participate in the gathering of the church (1 Cor 11:5; 1 Tim 2:10–11). Both demonstrate concern for cultural evaluations of honor/propriety and shame/disgrace (1 Cor 11:4–6, 13; 1 Tim 2:9a). Both mention childbirth or procreation (1 Cor 11:12; 1 Tim 2:15). Both refer to the creation account, explicitly mentioning that Adam was made first and the woman second (1 Cor 11:8–9; 1 Tim 2:13). Finally, the point of both seems to be that a person's conduct in worship is affected by their God-given gender.[62]

In both cases the major premise of Paul's argument is *the priority of Adam*, that is, the creation of Adam/man before Eve/woman (1 Cor 11:8–9 = 1 Tim 2:13). The argument is not "Adam/the man was made first, and therefore—on the basis of birth order—Eve/the woman is subordinate." Rather, Paul uses the priority of Adam as a callback to the whole creation account, with everything that this priority entails *as a result of Adam/the man's having been created first*. Instead of concern for the cultural custom of primogeniture, therefore, Paul is concerned with upholding the God-given callings of the man and the woman in the Edenic garden-sanctuary.

I established these distinctive callings from the creation paradigm in chapter 2, but by way of reminder. (1) Adam/the man was created ("formed") first (Gen 2:7, 18–23; cf. 1 Cor 11:8). (2) Adam/the man was charged with priestly provision and protection of the garden-sanctuary (Gen 2:15; cf. Num 3:7–8). (3) Adam/the man was alone—for

[61] Schreiner notes the same in "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 125.

[62] I was first made aware of the similarity of these passages by Claire Smith, *God's Good Design: What the Bible Really Says about Men and Women* (Kingsford, Australia: Matthias, 2012), 56.

Eve/the woman did not yet exist—when the Lord issued the command not to eat from the tree (Gen 2:16–17), thus Adam/the man inherited the priestly role of teaching the law to the people of God (Mal 2:7; cf. Gen 3:2–3). (4) Eve/the woman was "built" to be Adam/the man's helper (Gen 2:18; 1 Cor 11:9). (5) Adam/the man named Eve/the woman, just as he had named the animals before her (Gen 2:18–23; 3:20). (6) The eyes of Adam/the man and Eve/the woman were not opened until after Adam/the man ate from the tree (Gen 3:6–7). (7) God sought out Adam/the man after the fall (Gen 3:9), despite Eve/the woman having sinned first (Gen 3:6). (8) God specifically rebuked Adam/the man for listening to the voice of his wife in eating "of the three of which I commanded you [second masculine singular]" (Gen 3:17). (9) God had only told Adam/the man that he would die (Gen 2:16–17), yet Eve/the woman became subject to death with him (Gen 3:19). Finally, (10) God named Adam and Eve's posterity after the man (Gen 5:1–2; cf. 1:26), despite Eve being called "the mother of all living" (Gen 3:20). All this reinforces Adam/the man's role as *representative head* (Rom 5:12; 1 Cor 15:22).

In view of this established paradigm, the genius of Paul's summary and application of Genesis 1–2 in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 becomes apparent. The garment worn by women in the first century world was an important (if no longer culturally meaningful) expression of the universal/abiding differences between men and women. In other words, the distinction between man and woman was significant not because of appearance or reputation in the surrounding culture,[63] but because of the enduring significance of created order—an order that the inaugurated age of the gospel (cf. 1 Cor 11:11, "Nevertheless, in the Lord") neither destroys nor diminishes.[64] In other words, man and woman are indeed interdependent (1 Cor 11:11–12), but they are not interchangeable. And since their differences belong to the pre-fall order of creation, the vocational expression of those

[63] Contra Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 514; and Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 621.

[64] Gundry-Volf, "Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2–16," 152.

differences must remain in force until the end of the age,[65] in both marriage and the church. It is to these two spheres that this chapter now turns.

The Use of Genesis 2 in Ephesians 5:22–33

This chapter has established that Paul's concern in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 is the culturally-appropriate expression of an abiding created-order reality.[66] Specifically, Paul understood the inspired details of the creation account (Gen 1–2) to indicate an enduring paradigm for the sexes that consists in the non-interchangeability of the sexes and the representative headship of the man. The same themes continued in Ephesians 5:22–33, where Paul again appeals to Genesis 1–2 to ground his argument for the husband-wife relationship.[67]

The Context and Function of Ephesians 5:22–33

The exhortations given in Ephesians 5:22–33 are part of a larger section that continues through Ephesians 6:9. Like its brief parallel in Colossians 3:18–4:1, Ephesians

[65] Schreiner writes, "Paul argues from creation, not from the fall. The distinctions between male and female are part of the created order, and Paul apparently did not think redemption in Christ negated creation." See Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 125.

[66] In addition to Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 129; see Andreas J. Köstenberger and Margaret E. Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman: A Biblical-Theological Survey* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 176ff.

[67] In keeping with the consensus of evangelical scholarship, I take Paul to be the author of Ephesians and will refer to him throughout. Clint Arnold summarizes the arguments for Pauline authorship with a cumulative case: First, "The pseudepigraphal hypothesis cannot adequately account for the autobiographical material in the letter." Clint Arnold, *Ephesians*, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 46. Second, "There is early attestation of Paul as the author of Ephesians" (47). Third, "The theological emphases are appropriate to a life setting in first-century Ephesus and western Asian Minor" (47). Fourth, "The alleged 'differences' between the theology of Ephesians and the theology of Paul are better explained as distinct emphases within his thought rather than as contradictions that the historical Paul could not have expressed" (48). Fifth, "Paul was capable of writing with a range of styles and exhibiting his own literary flair" (48). Sixth, "The hypothesis that the author of Ephesians used Colossians as a literary source is not persuasive" (49). Seventh, "The evidence from Judaism and early church history casts doubt over the acceptability of pseudepigraphal letter writing in Christian circles" (49). For a longer defense of Pauline authorship, see Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 2–61.

5:22–6:9 belongs to a genre of literature known as "household code"[68] or "house table"[69] (from the German *Haustafel*). It is vital to note where and how Paul uses the *Haustafeln* (pl.) in his writings. To begin, consider the overall structure of Ephesians in view of Paul's tendency to divide his letters into predominately doctrinal sections (e.g., Rom 1–11; Eph 1–3; Col 1–2; Phil 1:1–2:11; 1 Tim 1) followed by ethical exhortations rooted in the preceding doctrines (e.g., Rom 12–16; Eph 4–6; Col 3–4; Phil 2:12–4:23; 1 Tim 2–6). Paul consciously does this, as seen by his use of identical terms to signal said shift in content (e.g., Παρακαλῶ οὖν in Rom 12:1; Eph 4:1; 1 Tim 2:1).

In every case, the logic of Paul's argument is *because of that*, *therefore this*. That is, because of who Christ is and what he has done, therefore, live like those who belong to him. This is a significant factor to keep in mind when reading Paul, not least in the *Haustafeln*, for it means his exhortations do not depend on the particularities of the circumstances he is addressing but on the unchanging order of creation and the power of the gospel to restore men and women to God's good design. This is made explicit in Paul's explanation for writing to Timothy: "I hope to come to you soon, but I am writing these things to you so that, if I delay, you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the church of the living God, a pillar and buttress of the truth" (1 Tim 3:14–15). This is significant for two reasons. First, it shows that Paul did not think his instruction to Timothy was relevant for Timothy's church alone, but for all churches, that is, for "all those who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 1:2). Second, Paul's explanation is striking because it immediately follows his teaching on how men (1 Tim 2:8) and women (1 Tim 2:9–15) are to conduct themselves in the gathering,[70] as well as his teaching on the qualifications of overseers and deacons (a

[68] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 73.

[69] Köstenberger and Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman*, 180.

[70] That the context of 1 Tim 2:8ff is indeed the gathered church, see "The Integrity of 1 Timothy 2:8–15" below.

teaching that also contains gendered elements; cf. 1 Tim 3:2, 4; 3:10). In other words, Paul sees the conduct of men and women in the household of God as vital aspects of Christian piety.

Returning to Ephesians, this means—contrary to the prevailing consensus among many scholars today—the *Haustafel* in Ephesians 5:22–6:9 should not be viewed as antiquated apologetics aimed at "reducing the tension between community members and outsiders."[71] Such a view argues that the function of Christian *Haustafeln* was an attempt to protect the burgeoning Christian movement from Roman suspicion that they were a socially subversive movement.[72] For example, Craig Keener writes, "Groups accused of undermining the moral fabric of Roman society thus sometimes protested that they instead conformed to traditional Roman values, by producing their own lists, or 'Household Codes' fitting those normally used in their day."[73] Against this view, Timothy Gombis points out, "There is little evidence within Ephesians that an apologetic thrust is present" for any portion of Ephesians, including the *Haustafel*.[74] Instead, he argues that "Paul, via the *Haustafel*, is laying out a manifesto for the New Humanity, painting in broad strokes a vision for how believers ought to conduct themselves in new creation communities, thus epitomizing the triumph of God in Christ."[75]

Gombis's proposal bears similarity to what I have argued based on the thought flow of Paul's letters and his explicit concern for the conduct of Christians as members of

---

[71] See Margaret MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches: A Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph 60 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1988) 109.

[72] John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 278; cf. Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 42 (Dallas: Word, 1990), 387.

[73] Craig Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 145–46.

[74] Timothy Gombis, "A Radically New Humanity: The Function of the *Haustafel* in Ephesians," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005), 318.

[75] Gombis, "A Radically New Humanity," 319.

the household of God (1 Tim 3:15). To substantiate his argument, Gombis draws attention to the beginning of Paul's letter to the Ephesians, where he triumphantly state that God "put all things under his feet and gave him as head [κεφαλὴν] over all things to the church, which is his body" (Eph 1:22–23). Here, Gombis argues that Paul wrote Ephesians to remind them of the victory of God in Jesus Christ, who has liberated his people from the powers that rule the present evil age and has filled them with his Spirit to live as the new man/humanity, which is "created after the likeness of God" (Eph 4:24; cf. Gen 1:26).[76] Note that according to the letter of Ephesians, this restored likeness to God entails imitating him "as beloved children" (Eph 5:1) and "members of the household of God [οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ]" (Eph 2:19), who is the ultimate *Paterfamilias*, that is, "the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named" (Eph 3:14).[77]

The import of all this is that Paul's exhortations in Ephesians 5:22–6:9 are not a cultural-contextual apologetic hopelessly mired in Greco-Roman patriarchal norms. Rather, they represent an enduring paradigm for every member of the household of God. In other words, the *Haustafeln* are legitimately viewed as discourses on how to live together in the body of Christ. Stephen Clark argues that this function also explains why the household code in Ephesians (and Colossians) "does not teach on everything which goes into the relationships it considers. Rather, this part contains a very specific kind of exhortation *on order* in those relationships."[78] He goes on to say, "Additional material is unnecessary because the passage is not a general teaching on marriage [or parenthood, etc.] but is a specific exhortation to subordination in the husband-wife relationship [so also with children-parents and bondservants-masters]."[79]

---

[76] Gombis, "A Radically New Humanity," 320.

[77] Gombis, "A Radically New Humanity," 325.

[78] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 74, emphasis added.

[79] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 77–78.

One final contextual consideration concerns the omission of a verb in Ephesians 5:22. This has been the source of a great deal of debate, since it is clear that the implied verb in 5:22 is the participial phrase "submitting to one another [ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις] out of reverence [ἐν φόβῳ] for Christ" (5:21). Many scholars have attempted to argue that the phrase "submitting to one another" should govern Ephesians 5:22–33, with the implication that so-called "mutual submission" or "mutual subordination" is Paul's true intent.[80] On this view, wives and husbands, children and fathers/parents, bondservants and masters, are all summoned to submit mutually to one another.

Clark notes two significant objections to such a reading. First, the context of "submitting to one another" (5:21) most naturally lends itself to the whole series of exhortations that follow (i.e., 5:22–6:9, not 5:22–33), in which a subordinate is exhorted to submit to their respective authority volitionally, out of ultimate reverence for Christ.[81] Second, Clark notes the absurdity in the concept of "mutual subordination" itself. For the term "submit" (ὑποτάσσω) means to order oneself under another such that its denotation depends upon the existence of a hierarchical order.[82] Thus, it does not convey a general sense of being deferential or considerate to others.[83] Finally, asymmetries in the passage

[80] See Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 365; Russ Dudrey, "'Submit Yourselves to One Another': A Socio-Historical Look at the Household Code of Ephesians 5:15–6:9," *Restoration Quarterly* 41 (1999): 40; Muddiman, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 256–57; Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 157–72; Martin Kitchen, *Ephesians*, New Testament Readings (London: Routledge, 1994), 99–100; Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld, *Ephesians*, Believers Church Bible Commentary (Scottdale, PA: Herald, 2002), 243–44; Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 4–6*, Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 34 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 609–10.

[81] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 75n1.

[82] Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 517.

[83] Andrew Perriman, *Speaking of Women: Interpreting Paul* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998), 53. Indeed, Kevin DeYoung points out that it *never* has this meaning in the New Testament:

> The word for submission (*hypotasso*) [*sic*] is never used in the New Testament as generic love and respect for others. The word *hypotasso* occurs thirty-seven times in the New Testament outside of Ephesians 5:21, always with reference to a relationship where one party has authority over another. Thus, Jesus submits (*hypotasso*) to his parents (Luke 2:51), demons to the disciples (Luke 10:17, 20), the flesh to the law (Rom. 8:7), creation to futility (Rom. 8:20), the Jews to God's righteousness (Rom. 10:3), citizens to their rulers and governing officials (Rom. 13:1, 5; Titus 3:1; 1 Pet. 2:13), the spirits

preclude a mutual/symmetrical reciprocity. For example, wives are explicitly called to submit to their husbands (5:24) and to "respect" [φοβῆται] them (5:33), while husbands are not called to do the same. Meanwhile, husbands are called to "love" their wives (Eph 5:25) by "nourish[ing] and "cherish[ing]" her as he would his own flesh (Eph 5:29), but again, the wife is not called to love her husband. The point is not that love and respect will be absent for either party, but that certain forms of love and respect *must be present* for specific parties as extensions of their gendered callings. Finally, the identification of the wife with the church (5:24) and the husband with Christ (5:25) makes it quite clear that their relationship is not symmetrical or mutually reciprocal, just as Christ and the church are not reversible.[84] Having settled these matters, we are able to consider Paul's specific use of Genesis 1–2 in Ephesians 5:22–33.

Man and Woman in Marriage

Debates about egalitarianism and complementarianism can sometimes obscure the profundity of Paul's biblical-theological method in Ephesians 5:22–33. From the outset, Paul makes an appeal to the Christ-church relationship to ground his exhortations to both wives and husbands. He writes, "Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. *For* [or "because," i.e., ὅτι] the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior" (Eph 5:22–23). And again, he says,

> Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her. . . . In the same way husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. For [γάρ] no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church, because [ὅτι] we are

of prophets to the prophets (1 Cor. 14:32), women in the churches (1 Cor. 14:34); Christians to God (Heb. 12:9; James 4:7), all things to Christ or God (1 Cor. 15:27, 28; Eph. 1:22; Phil. 3:21; Heb. 2:5, 8; 1 Pet. 3:22), the Son to God the Father (1 Cor. 15:28), wives to husbands (Eph. 5:24; Col. 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:1, 5), slaves to masters (Titus 2:9; 1 Pet. 2:18); the younger to their elders (1 Pet. 5:5), and Christians to gospel workers (1 Cor. 16:16). Nowhere in the New Testament does *hypotasso* refer to the reciprocal virtues of patience, kindness, and humility. It is always one party or person or thing lining up under the authority of another. (Kevin DeYoung, *Men and Women in the Church: A Short, Biblical, Practical Introduction* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021], 105)

[84] Werner Neuer, *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*, trans. Gordan Wenham (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991), 123.

> members of his body. "Therefore [ἀντὶ τούτου] a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh." (Eph 5:25, 28–31).

There are several things to note about Paul's argument. First, he roots his ethical exhortations in unchanging theological truths (just as he does in all his letters). This explains the use of what Dan Wallace calls "logical conjunctions" throughout.[85] In other words, the basis for the husband-wife relationship is not first-century cultural expectations but the Lord's design. Or as Werner Neuer explains, "Ephesians 5 does not contain temporally conditioned patriarchal concepts in Christian dress, as many modern expositors maintain, but eternal truths which affect the fundamentals of Christian existence and cannot be set aside without damaging the foundations of the church."[86] Neuer's words about the damage done to the foundations of the church may seem like an overstatement, but they cannot be if Paul's exhortations are rooted in the purposes of God. Indeed, he goes on to say, "A wife who opposes her husband being head [or, we might add, a husband who opposes his own headship] denies her femaleness [and his maleness, respectively] *and rebels against Christ*."[87]

Second, one should consider Paul's citation of Genesis 2:24, which is central to his argument. Paul's quotation neither matches the Septuagint nor Jesus's recitation of Genesis 2:24 in Matthew 19:5 and Mark 10:7–8. Most significantly, Paul exchanges ἀντὶ τούτου (Eph 5:31) for ἕνεκεν τούτου (LXX, Matt 19:5). Paul also leaves out the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ after both τὸν πατέρα and τὴν μητέρα (cf. LXX, where it is present after both). However, Matthew's rendering of Jesus's words also omits these pronouns (Matt 19:5), while Mark's parallel account omits the pronoun only after μητέρα (Mark 10:7–8). Finally, Paul omits the preposition πρὸς in the phrase προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα (LXX), though he retains the compound verb (προσκολληθήσεται), unlike Matthew who

[85] Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 670–74.

[86] Neuer, *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*, 127–28.

[87] Neuer, *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*, 127, emphasis added.

renders the verse: κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ (Matt 19:5). Yet given the similarly of the words, and since Matthew, Mark, and Paul neither agree with each other nor with the LXX, Harold Hoehner argues, "There is no change in meaning in any of these quotations."[88]

The meaning of Paul's use of Genesis 2:24 lies not in verbal minutia, therefore, but in its function within the entire passage. Recall that Paul has been discussing Christ and the church as the basis for the husband-wife relationship (Eph 5:22–30). In other words, Paul based the husband-wife relationship on the inaugurated order of the gospel, that is to say, on new creation and the church's identity as the bride of Christ (cf. John 3:39; 2 Cor 11:2; Rev 2:9–11; 19:7–9; 21:2). Now, however, Paul reaches back to creation, citing Genesis 2:24 as legitimate grounds for his exhortations to wives and husbands. The significance of this biblical-theological move is profound.

First, Paul shows that there is no conflict between creation and new creation as such. God's prelapsarian designs remain in effect; they are neither destroyed nor supplanted by the inaugurated order of the gospel so long as this age endures. As Augustine wrote, "I defend grace, not indeed as in opposition to nature, but as that which liberates and controls [directs] nature."[89] Or as Aquinas said, "Grace does not destroy nature, but perfects it."[90] Or again, the Reformed scholastic Frances Turretin says, "Grace does not destroy nature, but makes it perfect."[91] It is for this reason that Werner Neuer says the wife's "conscious and free submission"—alluding to her desire to submit out of reverence

---

[88] See Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 771–72.

[89] Augustine, "Extract from Augustin's [sic] 'Retractions,' 2.42," trans. Peter Holmes and Robert Ernest Wallis, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 5, *Saint Augustin's Anti-Pelagian Works* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 116.

[90] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, Q. 1, Art. 8, ad. 2.

[91] See Frances Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 1, *First through Tenth Topics*, 1.13.3, trans. George M. Giger, ed. James T. Dennison Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 1997), 118. See also Herman Bavinck, *De Bazuin* XLIX, 43 (October 25, 1901), quoted in Jan Veenhof, *Nature and Grace in Herman Bavinck*, trans. Albert M. Wolters (Sioux Center, IA: Dordt College, 2006), 18–19; and Herman Bavinck, *Prolegomena*, vol. 1 of *Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 322.

for Christ (Eph 5:21–24)—"arises from 'insight into a saving structure.'"[92] That is, the Christian husband and wife are called to see the ordered relationship of marriage, first rooted in creation, as *fulfilled by* new creation. Neuer explains the interplay of creation and new creation in this way:

> Ephesians 5:22ff. shows that the headship of the husband is not just to be understand as a creation ordinance (as in Gen 1–3) but also as an *ordinance for the life of the redeemed church*, whose inner criterion of absolute love has been realised [sic] in the self-sacrifice of Christ on the cross. . . . To be sure, his appeal to creation shows that man's primary over woman is conditioned by creation and is therefore valid for all, both inside and outside the church. When he models marriage on Christ's relationship to the church (Eph 5:22ff), however, he makes it apparent that only Christians are really in the position to realise [sic], however imperfectly, the divinely intended pattern of relationships between the sexes.[93]

The change brought about by the advent of Christ, therefore, was not a change in the substance of God's design but in the ability of man and woman to carry out what God always intended.

Second, it is highly significant that Paul applies Moses's words—originally given in the context of Adam's union with Eve (Gen 2:23–24)—to the relationship between Christ and the church. Paul actually goes further than this, saying Moses's words always "refer[red] to Christ and the church" (Eph 5:32). Perhaps anticipating objections, Paul says the Christ-church symbolism of Adam and Eve is a "mystery" (μυστήριον) (5:32). Chrysostom addresses the matter head on, asking, 'Why does he call it a great mystery?" and answers, "Such *Moses prophetically showed it to be from the very first*; such now also Paul proclaims it."[94] Or as Clark explains, "The term 'mystery' here does not refer to marriage, but to the relationship between Christ and the church *as revealed in a*

---

[92] Neuer, *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*, 126. Here Neuer is quoting Rainer Riesner, *Apostolischer Gemeindebau: Die Herausforderung der Paulinichen Gemeinden* (Giessen, Germany: Brunnen-Verlag, 1978), 51.

[93] Neuer, *Man and Man in Christian Perspective*, 128.

[94] John Chrysostom, "Homily XX on Ephesians," in *Homilies on Ephesians*, trans. Gross Alexander, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 13, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 146, emphasis added.

prefigurative or prophetic way by Gn 2:24."[95] In other words, these authors understand Paul to be interpreting Moses correctly in view of the eschatological reality that marriage was always intended to typify. This is why the prophets frequently spoke of Yahweh's relationship to Israel in marital terms (e.g., Ezek 16:8; Jer 2:2; Isa 54:5; 62:5; Hos 2:16–23). These prophets seem to have read Yahweh's relation to Israel in light of the biblical pattern set forth by Moses in the beginning, such that when Christ came on the scene, Paul recognized the Lord's love for the church in view of both Yahweh and Israel *and* Adam and Eve before them. William Mouser and Barbara Mouser explain,

> Man at his creation was intended by God to be an icon of Christ; woman from the first moment of her existence was intended by God to be an icon of the Church. The relationship between Adam and Eve was intended by God, from the very beginning, to manifest in finite form a cosmic reality toward which God was guiding His new creation. . . . This is why the Bible begins as it ends, with a wedding.[96]

This, too, is another way in which Paul ties creation and new creation together, namely by connecting what God did in the beginning (i.e., before the fall) with what God had always purposed to do in Christ.

Finally, one should consider Paul's use of the body metaphor. I will not repeat what has already said about the meaning of the word "head" [κεφαλὴν].[97] Here I will focus on how the body metaphor can shed light on the meaning of headship. It is well-known that the church is said to be the "body of Christ" (1 Cor 12:12–31; Rom 12:4–5)—a theme that receives significant attention in Ephesians. For example, the first mention of the church in Ephesians is found in 1:22–23, where one reads, "He [God] put all things under his [Christ's] feet and gave him as head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all." In the second chapter, God has reconciled formerly estranged persons "in one body through the cross" (2:16). Therefore, Gentiles

---

[95] Clark*, Man and Woman in Christ*, 87, emphasis added.

[96] William E. Mouser and Barbara K. Mouser, *The Story of Sex in Scripture* (Waxahachie, TX: International Council for Gender Studies, 2006), 71.

[97] See "The Meaning of κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3" in this chap., as well appendix 1.

are “fellow heirs” and “members of the same body” (3:6). Consequently, Paul urges the church to “walk in a manner worthy” of the gospel (4:1) by maintaining unity in the “one body” (4:4) of the Spirit. Indeed, this is part of why the Lord gave some to be pastors and teachers “for the building up of the body of Christ” (4:12), so that the whole church might “grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ” (4:15), “from whom the whole body . . . when each part is working properly, makes the body grow so that it builds itself up in love” (4:16).

Paul mentions neither the “head” nor the “body” again until 5:22–33, when both terms show up together. Paul writes, “Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior” (5:23; cf. 1:22–23). Again he says, “For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church, because we are members of his body” (5:29–30). Concerning the meaning of this head-body metaphor, Clark writes,

> [T]he source for the image is its origin in the kind of Hebrew thought that we saw in Genesis 1–3. Adam, the first man, summed up in his person and represented the whole human race. Likewise, the new human race is “in Christ”—the new Adam. Moreover, Adam, the first husband, governed and represented the family. He embodied the family as a unit, including the wife, and he could act on its behalf. Paul uses the head-body image to express this very same relationship.[98]

In addition to the anatomical symbolism of the head as governing or representing the body,[99] the theme of unity or harmony is present as well. This explains Paul’s appeal to nourish and care for one’s wife in the same way one might care for his own body—for that is what she *is* by virtue of their “one flesh” union.

---

[98] Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 85.

[99] Clark notes that for ancient authors “the head of the human body was not [considered] the seat of thought processes. Thinking took place in the heart. But they saw the head as having a governing function, possibly because it was on top of the body, possibly because it spoke for the body and hence represented it, or acted on its behalf.” Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 83. The representational function of heads continues without much change. For example, one may say there are “ten heads of cattle” to refer to the whole animal, or “count how many heads are in the room” when referring to individual (human) persons. In a similar way, the husband is here called “the head” of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, which is his body. This fits squarely with what has been discussed previously regarding Adam’s capacity to sum up in himself the whole of humanity, as well as his representative authority.

There has been tremendous speculation as to the meaning of the phrase "one flesh," both here and in its original context (Gen 2:24). However, the context of Ephesians 5:22–33 would seem to make it clear that "one flesh" refers not to the offspring produced by sexual union, but to the head-body organism created by the marriage itself. Chrysostom explains, "And how is she his flesh? Hearken; 'This now is bone of my bones', says Adam, 'and flesh of my flesh' [Genesis 2:23]. For she is made of matter taken from us. And not only so, but also, 'they shall be,' says God, 'one flesh' [Genesis 2:24]. . . . [T]here are not two bodies but one; he the head, she the body."[100] In other words, just as Christ is the head of the church, which is his body by virtue of its union to him, so Paul views the union of man and woman in marriage, which—as I have established—is a type of Christ and the church.[101]

In the final analysis, Paul's argument in Ephesians 5:22–33 (and through 6:9) rests on meaningful distinctions between persons, namely, wives and husbands, children and parents, bondservants and masters. Yet unlike the parent-child relationship that changes over time as sons grow up to form their own households (Gen 2:24; Eph 5:31), and the servant-master relationship, which depended on alterable circumstances (1 Cor 7:21), the husband-wife relationship is grounded on two unchanging realities: Christ's relation to the church and the non-interchangeability of the sexes according to God's design. Furthermore, Ephesians 5 connects these reasons together such that to tamper with the particular callings given to man and woman in marriage, respectively, is to obscure with the typological symbolism of the gospel itself. Finally, because Paul connects

[100] Chrysostom, "Homily XX on Ephesians," 146.

[101] About this union Clark writes, "Just as the old Adam took a wife for himself and joined himself so completely to her that they became one person, so the new Adam takes the church, making this new people his body, his own flesh." Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 86. Similarly, Neuer says, "Paul interprets the 'becoming one flesh' of Genesis 2:24 symbolically, so that the husband is the head and the wife is the body of this 'one flesh,' just as Christ is the head and the church is his body. Paul thus views marriage as an organism which reflects the inner organic fellowship between Christ and the church. It obligates both partners to endeavor to become one in thought, will, and action." Neuer, *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*, 125.

created order with new creation, one can read Genesis 2 through the lens of Ephesians 5 and vice versa. When this is done, one is enabled to see that the gendered callings in marriage (i.e., headship or submission) are not arbitrary, but are a fitting expression of the differences between man and woman in God's design from the beginning. These differences are so significant that again and again Paul returns to ways in which they should be expressed in the church, which is the household of God. It is to one of these seminal passages that this chapter now turns.

The Use of Genesis 1–3 in 1 Timothy 2:8–15

As far as word count is concerned, few passages in the Pauline Epistles have been the occasion for spilling so much ink as 1 Timothy 2:8–15 (vv. 11–15 in particular).[102] One can scarcely fault an observer for channeling the weariness of Qoheleth in saying that when it comes to this passage of Scripture, of the making of many books and academic articles there appears to be no end.[103] Yet the disproportionate attention

[102] For a survey of various perspectives on 1 Tim 2:8–15, see Andreas Köstenberger, "Ascertaining Women's God-Ordained Roles: An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7 (1997): 107–44. Specifically, Köstenberger classifies the interpretations into seven major views. Others have combined the interpretations into broader groups. For example, Ralph Earle sees three interpretations in *1 & 2 Timothy*, in *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 11, *Ephesians through Philemon*, ed. Frank Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 362–63; Gordon Fee lists four views in *1 & 2 Timothy*, Understanding the Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 74–76. For another overview, see Jay Twomey, *The Pastoral Epistles through the Centuries* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 47–48.

[103] Full-length titles that give substantial space to analyzing this passage include Richard Kroeger and Catherine Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998); Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, eds. *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, 3rd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016); James R. Beck, ed., *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, Counterpoints: Bible and Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005); Clouse Bonnidell and Robert Clouse, eds., *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, Spectrum Multiview (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1989); Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca M. Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005); Grudem and Piper, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*; Keener, *Paul, Women, and Wives*; Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman: One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009); Westfall, *Paul and Gender*; William Witt, *Icons of Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Theology for Women's Ordination* (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2020); Korinna Zamfir, *Men and Women in the Household of God: A Contextual Approach to the Roles and Ministries in the Pastoral Epistles* (Bristol, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); John Dickson, *Hearing Her Voice: A Biblical Invitation for Women to Preach*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), R. T. France, *Women in the Church's Ministry: A Test Case for Biblical Interpretation* (Cumbria, England: Pasternoster, 1995).

given to this text appears to be a rather modern phenomenon, as the publication dates of the relevant works readily shows.[104] It is not difficult to locate the source for this rise in interest. Indeed, the number of works on this passage has grown considerably since the 1970s, right on the heels of the ordination of the first woman to pastoral ministry in a major denomination,[105] together with the emergence of the so-called "evangelical feminist" movement.[106]

It is thus understandable why this passage has received such attention, especially at this moment in time. Consider, for example, the passage's ostensible prohibitions of women teaching men in an authoritative capacity. Paul writes, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet" (1 Tim 2:12).[107] If the apostle's words convey their surface-level significance, and if they are a universally binding norm, then Paul's conclusions would appear decisive for the question of a woman's participation in any sort of ministry that intrinsically involved the function(s)

For time (and space!) would fail me to list the many academic articles on the same, not to mention the commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles that devote considerable space to examining the passage.

[104] Note that the vast majority of the titles in the previous footnote were published in the 1980s or later. Since 1 Tim 2:8–15 is not a new addition to the canon, nor have there been any recent archaeological studies to cast additional light on the passage, the disproportionate attention it has received of late would appear to demonstrative of the particular interests, concerns, and even biases of the modern era, rather than some latent interpretive difficulty in the text. In other words, if the passage itself were particularly challenging (for any reason), one might expect a similar emphasis on the same throughout church history. But there is no such fixation on this passage.

[105] The United Methodist Church first granted full clergy rights to women, ordaining Maud Keister Jensen to pastoral ministry in 1956.

[106] Pamela Cochran, associate director of the Center on Religion and Democracy at the University of Virginia, argues that a distinctly evangelical appropriation of feminist ideals began between 1973 and 1975 with the founding of the Evangelical Women's Caucus and the publication of Nancy Hardesty and Letha Scanzoni, *All We're Meant to Be: Biblical Feminism for Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992). See Pamela Cochran, *Evangelical Feminism: A History* (New York: NYU, 2005), 11–31.

[107] From the outset I should state that I take 1 Tim to be genuinely Pauline, in concert with virtually all interpreters of 1 Tim 2 until the modern era. For standard evangelical arguments defending Pauline authorship, see D. A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testamen*t, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 331–53, 554–70.

here in view.[108] Furthermore, the apostle contrasts Adam and Eve (2 Tim 2:13–14) in a way that some commentators have suggested paints the first woman—and all women with her—in a fundamentally negative light.[109] On top of all this, Paul concludes by saying that "the woman . . . will be saved through childbearing [τῆς τεκνογονίας]" (1 Tim 2:15). In the span of just a few verses, then, Paul seems to touch upon the question women's ordination, the basic nature of women, and the relationship of "childbearing" to the salvation of womankind. Small wonder that this text has received so much attention!

Despite all this, an extensive survey of how authors have handled 1 Timothy 2:11–15 reveals that—surprisingly—there remain aspects of the text that have not been sufficiently explored. Specifically, the aspects that might shed light on this important debate involve the way biblical authors—including Paul—recognized and applied the paradigmatic vision of the sexes established in the opening chapters of Genesis. As with the previous passages (Eph 5:22–33; 1 Cor 11:2–16), the crux of Paul's argument in 1 Timothy 2:8–15 does not primarily rest on the minute grammatical and syntactical details of 2:11–12, and certainly not on some hypothetical historical reconstruction, but on the paradigmatic symbolism of the creation account.[110]

---

[108] This remains true regardless of the exact nature of what is "teach[ing]" and "exercis[ing of] authority." For an extensive analysis of the grammar and syntax, see H. Scott Baldwin, "An Important Word: *Αὐθεντέω* in 1 Timothy 2:12," in Köstenberger and Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 39–51. See also Andreas Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence: The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12," in Köstenberger and Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 53–84.

[109] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 35A (New Haven, CT: Yale, 2001), 211.

[110] The not-so-veiled criticism of frenzied attempts to reconstruct the historical setting of Paul's epistles is deliberate. Brevard Childs highlights the damage of this approach:

> It has been almost universally assumed in the history of the modern study that a correct exegesis of the book depends upon reconstructing the historical referent at the time of Paul's original writing. For this reason the ability to correlate the various sections of the letter with specific historical events in Paul's relationship to his church was considered an essential element. As a result . . . tentative reconstructions [are] lifted to the same level as explicit historical argumentation. (Brevard Childs, *New Testament as Canon* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984], 332)

He also states, "It is not the historical situation which provides the canonical authority, nor the dialogue within the church which bears the weight. Rather, Paul's response in its received canonical form comprises the witness which functions authoritatively for each subsequent generation of believers" (274).

To support this claim, the integrity of 1 Timothy 2:8–15 will be briefly considered first, with special consideration given to the place of verse 8 in the textual unit. Next, Paul's brief summary of Genesis 2–3 will be examined with special attention given to the details of the creation account. These will be examined especially in view of their import for a biblical understanding of the sexes as regards the function of each sex in the context of the church when gathered for worship. Finally, the implications of such a reading will be considered with a view to the potential for explaining the seemingly odd details of 1 Timothy 2:8–15.

The Integrity of 1 Timothy 2:8–15

Grammatically, there is some question regarding whether verse 8 belongs with 2:9–15. To give a somewhat obvious example, Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15* titularly excludes verse 8. Schreiner admits that the textual relationship between verses 8 and 9 is ambiguous.[111] The ambiguity stems from the use of a single verb (Βούλομαι = "I want/desire") followed by a set of infinitives (προσεύχεσθαι, κοσμεῖν = "to pray," "to adorn") linked with adverb indicating close relationship (ὡσαύτως = "likewise"). Schreiner argues that it is more natural to take the infinite "to adorn" as completing an implied repetition of the verb "I want."[112] Thus, Paul is setting forward a double desire, one for each sex when they come together in public gatherings for worship. This does not mean, contrary to the impression given by the subtitle of the aforementioned book, that verse 8 is unrelated to 9 and following. On the contrary, as Schreiner's argument shows, the single verb indicates that the textual unit is 1 Timothy 2:8–15, not 1 Timothy 2:9–15.[113]

[111] Thomas R. Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15: A Dialogue with Scholarship," in Köstenberger and Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 176.

[112] Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 176.

[113] As to why the book's subtitle would inaccurately restrict the textual unit, I cannot say for sure. It is probable that the editors may have done so to keep the focus on the topic at hand, namely, *women* in the church (not women *and men* in the church).

Still, some contend that verse 8 belongs to the textual unit that precedes it (vv. 1–7) instead of what follows (vv. 9–15). On this point, George Knight III writes, "The question remains as to the relationship of this verse to the verses preceding and following. . . . It may be argued that the reference to prayer in v. 8 beginning with οὖν picks up on and concludes the section in vv. 1–7 with a practical ethical perspective."[114] If this were true, however, verses 9 and following would have no main verb.[115] While such a construction is not unheard of, this seems unlikely given the structure of Paul's thought in verses 1–7.[116] Paul begins his first sentence in this chapter (2:1–2) with the phrase "Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον" ("First of all, then, I urge"). Note the use of the postpositive conjunction οὖν, which is not used again until verse 8, despite several explanatory clauses in verses 3–7, precisely where one might have expected to find it.[117] In other words, Paul's rhetoric provides a clue as to the basic division of the passage: verses 1–7 function as a general call for all people to participate in worship, and verses 8–15 specify the precise manner and expression of that participation for men and women in the church.[118]

Having established the relationship of verse 8 to what follows, two additional questions arise at this point in connection to the same. First, there is some question as to whether Paul's use of Βούλομαι ("I desire") is that of personal preference or apostolic demand. Knight observes that this verb, when followed by an accusative plus an infinitive (cf. 1 Tim 5:14; Titus 3:8; Phil 1:12; Jude 5) expresses "an apostolic demand in the

[114] George Knight III, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992), 130.

[115] Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 130.

[116] Note the interesting parallel with Eph 5:21–22.

[117] Instead, Paul uses εἷς [2:5, 7] in an adverbial sense, along with γὰρ [2:7], but not οὖν.

[118] The call for men to pray in a certain manner should not be taken as an exclusion for women to pray in public gatherings. Indeed, as already seen, 1 Cor 11:5 gives stipulations for women praying in public meetings. The apostle's focus, therefore, is on prayer *simpliciter* but on the manner of prayerful participation, with one set of instructions for men and another for women.

language of personal desire."[119] Similarly, Gottlob Schrenk compares this usage in Hellenistic Judaism with the "royal will" or the language of a lawgiver, indicating Paul's language refers to "ordering by apostolic authority."[120] I. Howard Marshall agrees: "βούλομαι (which can have the weak force 'to wish', 6.9) is imperatival (5.14; Tit 3.8) . . . and authoritative, expressing a strong command by the writer."[121] This concession is particularly significant given Marshall's egalitarian interpretation of the passage.[122]

A second issue concerns the identity of "the men" [τοὺς ἄνδρας] whom Paul instructs to pray (2:8). Specifically, the question is whether Paul is speaking of husbands, particularly, or of males, more generally. If husbands, the verse might have significant implications for how to read verses 9–15, which would then be about husbands and wives, not men and women. But if the sense refers to males, generally, then the corresponding γυναῖκας in verses 9–11 would likewise refer to women, generally, not only to wives. Knight argues from the context that "τοὺς ἄνδρας means men here in distinction from women, as the use of [γυναῖκας] in the next verse implies. This distinction is borne out by the usage elsewhere in the Pastoral epistles (1 Tim 2:8, 12; 3:2, 12; 5:9; Titus 1:6; 2:5)."[123] Marshall notes,

> In both Hebrew and Greek the words for man and woman are ambiguous and therefore often use a possessive pronoun or some other means of indicating husband or wife (cf. 1 Pet 3.1; Eph 5.22; Tit 2.5; Col 3.8). In the PE [i.e, Pastoral Epistles], the contexts always make this delimitation clear ([1 Tim] 3.2, 12; 5.9; Tit 1.6; 2.5). . . . Nothing suggests that the instructions here are to be limited just to married

[119] Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 128.

[120] Gottlob Schrenk, "βούλομαι," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), 1:630–32.

[121] I. Howard Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1999), 443–44.

[122] Marshall is to be commended for not diminishing the authority of Paul's words, which might have easily resolved the tension of 2:11–12 for his preferred position.

[123] Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 128.

> men and married women. . . . The instructions are accordingly directed to men and women in the church and not specifically to husbands and wives.[124]

A final aspect of verse 8 deserves mention, as it bears directly upon the meaning of the verses that follow it. The content of Paul's apostolic wish-command is that "men should pray, lifting up holy hands [ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας]" (1 Tim 2:8). The use of χεῖρ with ἐπαίρω occurs only here in the New Testament, though the raising of hands in prayer is common throughout the Old Testament (1 Kgs 8:22, 54; Neh 8:6; Ps 28:2; 63:4; 141:2; Hab 3:10).[125] The word ὁσίους is used here in the moral or ethical sense of "holy," as evidenced both by its parallel use in Titus 1:8 (the only other use of the term in the Pastoral Epistles), and its frequent use in the LXX in contexts that emphasize the need for pure or holy hands when appearing before the Lord in worship (cf. Isa 1:15–16; Job 16:17; Ps 24:3–5).[126] Yet the meaning here is likely to be even more specific. As Marshall notes, "The need for hands to be pure or holy refers originally to the practice of washing them on entry to a sanctuary (Exod. 30.19–21)."[127] He continues, "The implication is that prayer in the Christian meeting is the equivalent of worship in the OT."[128] In other words, Paul's language in 1 Timothy 2:8 is *at least* an allusion to worship in the tabernacle-temple, if not something more; namely, Paul is signifying here, as he does in other letters (Eph 2:19–21; 1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16; 2 Thess 2:4), that the gathered worship of the people of God is an expression of their identity as the true and final temple of the Lord (cf. Rev

---

[124] Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 444. Marshall also notes, "In any case, the practical different may not be great since marriage was the normal situation for men and women" (444).

[125] Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 128.

[126] Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 129. See also William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 46 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 108.

[127] Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 445. See also Mounce who notes, "This same combination . . . is also present when Paul says, 'Greet one another with a holy kiss' [Rom. 16:16]" in the context of gathering for worship. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 108.

[128] Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 445.

21:1ff).[129] This has tremendous implications, for it connects the man and woman's origin in creation with their eschatological destiny.

To sum up the previous, the grammar of the passage strongly suggests that (1) verse 8 belongs with verses 9–15 as a unit; (2) Paul's "wish" or "desire" is an authoritative command expressed in language that is typical among contemporaneous Greek literature; (3) "the men" of 2:8 cannot be limited to husbands alone, but should be taken to refer to males in general, and (4) the context of 1 Timothy 2:8ff appears not to be mere prayer, but prayer in the context of the gathered worship of the church as God's dwelling place, which is meant to reminiscent of the Edenic sanctuary of Genesis 1–3.

The Use of Genesis 2–3 in 1 Timothy 2:8–15

Momentarily setting aside Paul's instructions to the women (vv. 9–12), I will first consider Paul's use of Genesis 2–3 in 1 Timothy 2:13–14 for it is integral to his argument.[130] The flow of Paul's thought is as follows: immediately after laying down his instructions for women in the context of the church's worship, Paul makes an appeal to the creation of the first man and first woman. It is clear from the grammar that verses 13 and 14 ground his argument. In other words, Paul understands the details of the creation account to have far-reaching significance for how men and women are to relate to one another in the context of gathered worship. Thus, it is imperative to carefully read 1 Timothy 2:12–14 as Paul's exegetical summary and application of Genesis 1–3. He writes, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. For [γὰρ] Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor" (1 Tim 2:12–14).

[129] See also Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 66.

[130] Alastair Roberts writes, "Once we appreciate the biblical logic underlying Paul's position, we will begin to see that egalitarian arguments that focus on quibbling over the fine grammatical details of verses 11–12 are really missing the powerhouse of Paul's argument, which is found in verses 13–14." See Alastair Roberts, "A Closer Examination of Junia, the Female Apostle," *Alastair's Adversaria*, December 10, 2011, https://alastairadversaria.com/2011/12/10/a-closer-examination-of-junia-the-female-apostle/.

Much has been said about Paul's exegesis of Genesis 2–3 here. On the critical end of the spectrum, Luke Timothy Johnson writes, "Paul was not in this case engaging in sober exegesis of Genesis, but supporting his culturally conservative position on the basis of texts that in his eyes demonstrate the greater dignity and intelligence of men and, therefore, the need for women to be silent and subordinate to men."[131] Contrarily, it will be shown that Paul's exegesis of Genesis 2–3 is reflective of an attentive reading to the text—a reading that affirms the paradigmatic nature of the creation account and applies (authoritatively) these male-female paradigms as a universal norms for men and women in the life of the church.

Johnson's critique focuses on Paul's comment that Eve, not Adam, was deceived. He presumes that "this is to show that women are less capable of distinguishing truth from error."[132] Historically, true interpreters commonly assumed that Paul forbids women from teaching men because they are *intrinsically* more prone to deception.[133] However, this interpretation should be rejected for two reasons. First, the Scriptures contain stories where, rather always being deceived by others, faithful women in Israel are the those who do the deceiving (not all of which is salutary). Sarai successfully executes Abram's plan to deceive the Pharaoh (Gen 22:10–20); Rebekah concocts a plan for Jacob to deceive Isaac (Gen 27:1–29); Rachel deceives Laban (Gen 31:19–35); the Hebrew midwives deceive Pharaoh (Exod 1:15–22) as do Moses's mother, sister, and the Pharaoh's daughter, who all play a part in deceiving Pharaoh (again) to secure Moses's safety (Exod 2:1–10); Rahab deceives the men of Jericho (Josh 2); Jael deceives Sisera (Jdgs 4:17–22);

[131] Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 208.

[132] Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 208.

[133] See Daniel Doriani, "Appendix 1: A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2," in *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1995), 265n202.

Michal deceives Saul (1 Sam 19:11–17); and Esther deceives Haman (Esth 5–8).[134] At the very least, the number and prominence of these stories must be set alongside verses like 1 Timothy 2:14, as well as 2 Timothy 3:6 and 1 Peter 3:7 for a fuller and more scripturally faithful view of typically feminine capacities, whether strengths and weaknesses.

A second reason why the historical interpretation (which Johnson critiques) should be rejected is that it does not pay sufficient attention to the details of the text. The main premise of Paul's argument is not, in fact, the deception of Eve versus the non-deception of Adam, but the order of creation established in the Genesis narrative. Specifically, the major premise is, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve" (1 Tim 2:13). I already noted egalitarian scholar Cynthia Westfall's critique of Paul on this point, claiming that his logic appears to be based on the antiquated notion of primogeniture.[135] I also established that Paul's argument was based not the ancient custom of primogeniture but the God-given calling of the man and the woman in the Edenic garden-sanctuary. Yet perhaps I should amend my previous conclusion in this respect: it is neither the ancient custom of primogeniture, *nor the constitution of a woman as such* that forms Paul's argument, but the respective callings of man and woman in the world. This is the basis of Paul's exhortations in 1 Timothy 2.

Here the import of the basic details of the creation account in Genesis for 1 Timothy 2:8–15 becomes apparent. I will not repeat those details again, except to show their connection to Paul's argument in 1 Timothy 2. In the first place, Paul addresses the men first (1 Tim 2:8), echoing the created order of the man and the woman (Gen 2:7, 18). Second, Paul gives *distinct* instructions to the men and women in 1 Timothy 2, again

---

[134] Alastair Roberts, "Realms and Manners of Experience/Deceiving Tyrants," *Passing the Salt Shaker*, April 2, 2015, https://passthesaltshaker.wordpress.com/2015/04/02/realms-and-manners-of-experience-deceiving-tyrants/.

[135] See "Headship in Genesis 1–2" in this chap. See also Schreiner, "*Paul and Gender*: A Review Article," 178–92, especially 189–90.

reminding that male and female are not symmetrical, and thus, not interchangeable. Third, given the Edenic-sanctuary context of the creation narrative, Roberts notes that the priestly language used to describe the man's role within the garden has special contrast with the woman's help mentioned in Genesis 2:18. That is to say, in addition to the obvious sense in which a woman's help was necessary for the fulfillment of the procreative aspects of the creation mandate, the woman's help is needed for the liturgical aspects that mandate as well.[136] This would explain both the *presence* of the "ministering women" [הַצֹּבְאֹת] at the tabernacle-temple (Exod 38:8; cf. Jud 11:40; 1 Sam 2:22) as well as their *absence* in the temple as priests (Exod 28:1; Lev 1:5, 8, 11).[137] Finally, the judgments handed down in Genesis 3 shed light on why Paul would base his exhortations to women in 1 Timothy 2:11–12 on the priority of Adam (1 Tim 2:13). Specifically, the priestly role given to the man would have included teaching the law of the Lord (cf. 2 Chron 15:3; Mal 2:7) to his wife, who was not present when it was spoken (cf. Gen 2:15–23). Thus, the woman was placed in the man's charge and, as such, was ultimately his responsibility. At the fall, the serpent subverts the Lord's order in the sanctuary by approaching the woman first, who in turn approaches the man. Yet *after* the fall the Lord subverts the serpent's subversion (i.e., he reaffirms the prelapsarian order of creation) in seeking out the man to question him first (Gen 3:9) and in holding him singularly responsible, despite the woman having eaten of the tree first (Gen 3:6).

Yet what is one to make of Paul's statement that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor" (1 Tim 2:14)? Johnson argues that the Genesis account indicates that both Adam and Eve were deceived; thus, Paul's interpretation is erroneous in view of its incorrect assessment of the passage's basic

[136] Alastair Roberts, "Man, Woman, Deception, and Authority in 1 Timothy 2," *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), November 4, 2018, https://adversariapodcast.com/2018/11/04/video-man-woman-deception-and-authority-in-1-timothy-2/.

[137] See also James Jordan, "No. 86: Liturgical Man, Liturgical Woman—Part 1," Biblical Horizons, May 2004, http://www.biblicalhorizons.com/rite-reasons/no-86-liturgical-man-liturgical-women-part-1/.

details.[138] But such an assessment fails to take note the precision of Paul's language in 1 Timothy 2:13–14 in view of the details of the creation and fall narratives in Genesis 2–3. For example, Adam had received firsthand the Lord's command concerning the Tree of Knowledge (Gen 2:15–17). Eve, on the other hand, was uniquely susceptible to the serpent's deception—not constitutionally, because she was a woman, but *chronologically*, because she was second (and thus not present for the initial command). Furthermore, she is distinct *vocationally*, and thus not ultimately culpable for her failure in the same way Adam was.[139]

In other words, Eve was a transgressor, as Paul says. Hers was a simple violation of the command of the Lord, made without *direct* knowledge of the Lord's word (Gen 2:15–17) and without *final* responsibility for its fulfillment (Gen 3:17). Adam, however, committed a "high handed" sin, i.e., one that had "despised the word of the Lord" and "broken his commandment" with full knowledge of his actions, thus incurring the penalty of being "utterly cut off" (cf. Num 15:31). The contrast in Leviticus between the unintentional sins of the people and the sins of an "anointed priest" are also significant (Lev 4:2). Specifically, in the case of the priest, his sin is said to have the effect of "bringing guilt on the people" (Lev 4:3), requiring the sacrifice of an animal without blemish to the Lord for a sin offering. The parallels between Genesis 2–3, Numbers 15:30–31, Leviticus 4:2–3, and 1 Timothy 2:13–14 are obvious: the priestly role of the man is confirmed by the special culpability he bears and the (implicit) "sacrifice" required to cover his sin in Genesis 3:21 after he brought blood guilt on all people (Lev 4:3; Rom 5:12–14).

In view of these parallels, the genius of Paul's condensed summary and application of Genesis 2–3 in 1 Timothy 2:8–15 is now apparent. Far from placing the

---

[138] Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 208.

[139] Alastair Roberts, "The Deception of Eve," *Passing the Salt Shaker* , April 3, 2015, https://passthesaltshaker.wordpress.com/2015/04/03/the-deception-of-eve/.

blame on Eve, Paul's language somewhat exonerates her—not as being completely innocent (she remains a transgressor), but as being the one who was *only* a transgressor and *not* the priestly federal head ultimately responsible for humanity's fall into sin. In other words, as Roberts puts the matter, "The issue is not one of female gullibility, but of male responsibility."[140] The fundamental failure—in chronology and in consequence—was not the deception of the woman, first and foremost, but the failure of the man to take the initiative in upholding his priestly duties which, among other things, included instruction in the law (Gen 2:17; Mal 2:7) and protection of the garden-sanctuary to keep it free from unclean and defiling things (Gen 2:15; Num 3:7–8), as all priests were charged with doing (cf. Lev 21; 2 Chr 29:16).

Against this interpretation, Schreiner argues,

> The author of Genesis is not suggesting that Eve stood at a disadvantage because she was ignorant of, or poorly instructed in, God's command (Gen. 3:2–3). What Genesis 3 indicates (and Paul is a careful interpreter of the account here in 1 Tim. 2:14) is that the Serpent deceived Eve, not Adam. We should not read into the narrative that Eve had any disadvantage in terms of knowledge during the temptation.[141]

However, the argument is not that Eve had ignorance of the command (contra Gen 3:2–3) or even poor instruction therein. Rather, the argument is that she lacked *direct* knowledge of the command, having been absent (indeed, non-existent) when the Lord first give this instruction to the man (Gen 2:15–27). Therefore, the problem is one of implicit tension between Eve's direct knowledge of the gift of all trees for food—which appears to have been given at some point to both man and woman (Gen 1:29)—and Eve's second-hand knowledge of the prohibition to eat from the Tree of Knowledge. It is this scenario, and not Eve's ignorance or Adam's bungling instruction (contra Schreiner's misunderstanding), that sets up the potential for deception. Roberts observes, "Adam's silence and failure to intervene [Gen 3:6b] may have compounded her confusion and uncertainty. Had Adam

[140] Roberts, "Man, Woman, Deception, and Authority in 1 Timothy 2."

[141] Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 212.

misreported the commandment? Had she misunderstood it? Had he been deceiving her? Whom should she trust?"[142]

Schreiner is aware of the argument that Adam sinned without deception while Eve was deceived and thereby committed a lesser transgression such that Paul's argument in 1 Timothy 2:14 would indicate that Adam was responsible as the priest/religious leader.[143] Schreiner admits that such an interpretation has the advantage in straightforwardly explaining Paul's line of reasoning that "Adam was not deceived" (1 Tim 2:14). Nevertheless, he demurs, "It is hard to see how this argument would function as a reason for [only men] teaching women. An appeal to Adam sinning willfully and Eve sinning mistakenly (because she was deceived) would seem to argue against men teaching women, for at least the woman wanted to obey God, while Adam sinned deliberately."[144] This line of criticism seems to overlook the *nature* of Adam's sin, which was not merely a matter of not wanting to do what God says—as if desire were the fundamental issue. Instead, the sin of Adam was the refusal to assume and maintain headship. In this way, Schreiner's concern (namely, that such an interpretation would not carry the weight of Paul's argument) seems to fall flat. For Paul's entire argument rests on the fact of created order's subversion of male headship (by means of the serpent's deception and Adam's abdication), which in turn gives his male and female readers *tremendous* incentive not to depart from the Lord's design, as our father and mother did in the garden-sanctuary of old. Visually, the sequence of events in Genesis 2–3 may be represented as in table 1.

---

[142] Roberts, "The Deception of Eve."

[143] Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 213.

[144] Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 213.

Table 1. Created order established, subverted, reaffirmed

Created Order Established	Created Order Subverted	Created Order Reaffirmed
God ↓ The man ↓ The woman Gen 2:15–25 cf. 1 Tim 2:13	Satan/the serpent ↓ The woman ↓ The man Gen 3:1–7 cf. 1 Tim 2:14	God ↓ The man ↓ The woman Gen 3:8–20 cf. 1 Tim 2:11–12

In other words, Genesis 2–3 gives us sufficient context for understanding Paul's prohibition of women teaching with authority in the church 1 Timothy 2:11–12. That is to say, arguments based on the grammar and syntax of 1 Timothy 2:11–12 are scarcely needed once one has grasped the crux of Paul's biblical-theological argument.[145] As I have shown, Paul affirms the significance of Adam and Eve's created order (1 Tim 2:13), not because of primogeniture but because of the vocational duties that each received in turn. Note that Paul himself has followed this order, beginning with men (v. 8) who are to be followed by women (vv. 9–12). The strict prohibition of 2:12 concerns the kind of authoritative teaching associated with someone appointed/ordained as a recognized teacher.[146] Hence Timothy is called to teach (1 Tim 4:11, 6:2). Similarly, Paul calls himself a "teacher" in 2:7, and Paul defines the content of the teaching he has in view in 1:3, 7, and 6:3. Given the consistent use of the term "teach" throughout this letter, as well as the context of the gathered church established by the language of verse 8 and the background of Genesis 2–3, it is fairly clear that the sort of activity Paul has in mind is one that parallels the original instruction given to Adam in the garden.

Note also the double nature of the prohibition: Paul does not permit a women to teach *or exercise authority* over a man in the gathering, and he follows this double

[145] Contrast with Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence," 117ff.

[146] See Jordan, "Liturgical Man, Liturgical Woman—Part 1," contra John Dickson, *Hearing Her Voice.*

prohibition with his twofold justification: (1) Adam was created first as the *teacher* entrusted with passing on the Lord's command (1 Tim 2:13; cf. Gen 2:15–17), and (2) Eve was deceived (1 Tim 2:14; Gen 3:6), not because of some intrinsic fault in her as a woman, but because Adam failed to *exercise his protective authority* (as her priestly head) such that she was deceived and fell into transgression.[147] Indeed, if turning back to Genesis 3 one finds that Adam is doubly condemned as well: "Because you have listed to the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree" (v. 17). Interpreters tend to focus on the eating of the fruit; however, the Lord begins his rebuke with Adam's prior sin before the sin, namely, "listen[ing] to the voice of [his] wife" in the garden-sanctuary. Again, this is not a criticism of the woman, but on the serpent who deceived her and the man who failed to protect her. This likely explains why the word "curse" (אָרוּר) is absent from the Lord's address to the woman (Gen 3:16) but present in his address to both the serpent (Gen 3:14) and the man (Gen 3:17). Eve suffers for Adam's sin—the sin of abdicating his role in the garden-sanctuary of the Lord. Therefore, Paul enjoins his readers—both men and women—*not to reenact the fall* whereby men abdicate their priestly vocation and/or women seek to usurp it (cf. Gen 3:16). This is the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11–14.

Holy Hands and Modest Apparel

Finally, consider how the liturgical setting of Genesis 2–3 informs Paul's logic in the remainder of 1 Timothy 2:8–15, especially verses 8–10 and 15. As seen, Paul begins with the exhortation that "the men should pray, lifting holy hands," which connotes a liturgical-sanctuary context even before Paul invokes the priestly failure of Adam in 1 Timothy 2:13–14. However, Paul insists that the holy hands lifted in prayer must be done "without anger or quarreling" [χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ] (2:8b). On the one hand, such a qualification seems unnecessary: *of course* the sanctuary of gathered worship should be a place without wrath and argumentativeness. On the other hand, the qualification would

[147] Jordan, "Liturgical Man, Liturgical Woman—Part 1."

seem problematic given that this is a shockingly incomplete representation of "holiness" (holy hands). However, this list takes on another meaning altogether if one considers that Paul has in the forefront of his mind—as I have taken pains to show—the fundamental distinctions between the callings of men and women *and* the sort of tendencies befitting the constitutions of the Lord's creatures in their respective vocations. In other words, as Knight observes, "Avoidance of ὀργῆς and διαλογισμοῦ is not intended to represent Paul's total understanding of the concept of 'holy' (other aspects are mentioned in the chapters that follow). Paul highlights rather (as did Jesus) *the besetting sins of men* that affect that most affect their prayer for others by setting barriers between them and God (cf. 1 Pet. 3:7)."[148]

Knight's observation becomes even more interesting in view of a pattern established throughout Scripture. Specifically, the priestly (or priest-like) leaders of God's people are routinely rather rough men. Indeed, nearly every major male character met in Scripture is a man who has killed someone.[149] Their toughness makes sense in view of the priestly role of "keeping" ("guarding") entrusted to men in the beginning. As leaders of God's people, these men must guard against wolves, both literal and metaphorical. Moses the shepherd not only killed a man in his youth but also "struck" the Egyptians with the plagues of his rod. David the shepherd killed his tens of thousands, and before that, he stopped the lion and the bear from marauding his sheep. The Levites also, the priestly tribe of Israel, were set apart for service *immediately after* slaying 3,000 of their own brothers following the golden calf incident (Exod 32:27–29). Phineas the priest ended the unholy union of a couple with the tip of his spear (Num 25:7–8). After Saul the king spared the life of Agag, in disobedience to the Lord (1 Sam 15:9), the prophet Samuel, son of Eli the priest, "hacked Agag to pieces before the Lord" (1 Sam 15:33).

[148] Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 130.

[149] Alastair Roberts, "What Is the Case Against Women's Ordination?" *Alastair's Adversaria*, December 5, 2019, https://adversariapodcast.com/2019/12/05/transcript-for-what-is-the-case-against-womens-ordination/.

This pattern does not stop with the New Testament. Indeed, Peter and Paul especially, though also perhaps James and John (Luke 9:54), are men overtly characterized by the zeal of the Lord of hosts.[150] The point here is not that the male propensity for violence is an unbridled good. Rather, the point is that Paul's command that men lift up holy hands, undefiled by anger/wrath and quarreling is an instruction precisely tailored to areas where men might be most prone to excess and abuse.

In a similar fashion, this explains Paul's (otherwise random) shift to discussing the necessity of "respectable [καταστολῇ] apparel, with modesty [αἰδοῦς] and self-control" (1 Tim 2:9). There is some debate as to whether the word for "modesty" (a hapax legomena) refers to sexual modesty, socio-economic humility, or both.[151] Though the passage seems to suggest an interpretation in line with modesty in the sense of humility (hence the prohibitions of "braided hair and gold or pearls or *costly* attire" in 2:9b), the precise meaning is not significant for my purposes. That is to say, it is sufficient to note that women, not men, are exhorted to dress with modesty, just as men, not women, were exhorted to turn away from wrath and quarreling. The sense is this: just as Adam and his sons were created for priestly service, as the strength of men entails, so also Eve and her daughters were created for glory (Gen 2:23–24; cf. Eph 5:27ff.). It is not for nothing that women have been called "the fairer sex." This natural observation is borne out by the testimony of Scripture which illustrates (implicitly) and describes (explicitly) women as "the glory of man" (1 Cor 11:7). The apostolic exhortation, then, is one given to women in view of their propensity to sin with their glory, just as men might sin with their strength. Paul says it must not be that way in the garden-sanctuary of the Lord. The daughters of

[150] Christ's rebuke of Peter's use of the sword in the garden of Gethsemane should not be taken to indicate that such acts of violence are always unbefitting for his male followers. For in that same place Christ explains why the sword was counterproductive, namely, because he had to drink the cup the Father had given to him (John 18:10–11).

[151] See S. M. Baugh, "A Foreign World: Ephesians in the First Century," in Köstenberger and Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 44–45, and Robert W. Yarbrough, "Progressive and Historic: The Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," in Köstenberger and Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 181–83.

Eve, in addition to following the lead of their priestly brothers, must take care not to abuse their God-given glory by using it for self-glorification.

Finally, I will briefly discuss the much-debated last verse in 1 Timothy 2:8–15. A full treatment of the grammatical oddities in the verse are far beyond the scope of this chapter, but it is essential to note the following features. First, there is no subject named in verse 15, only the verb σωθήσεται ["*he/she* will be saved"] is given. Second, by contrast, the verb of the second clause (a conditional clause) is *not* singular but plural [ἐὰν μείνωσιν = "if *they* remain"). Third, the offer of salvation in the first clause is granted διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, which either means "through childbirth" (ESV) or "childbearing" (NASB) or "through the birth of the child" (ISV).[152] Concerning the first difficulty, the most natural antecedent to σωθήσεται is the woman, that is, Eve, who was just named in the previous clause (2:14).

Concerning the second difficulty, though the construction *can* mean the general act of childbearing,[153] the context of 1 Timothy 2:8–15 would seem to suggest the birth of a specific child (Jesus Christ) is in view. Against this view, Köstenberger writes, "The presence of the definite article in the original Greek (τῆς τεκνογονίας) merely indicates the generic nature of childbirth rather than pointing to a specific birth of a child. . . . An elaborate salvation-historical typology would be unexpected in the present context, especially in the light of the sparse use of the OT in the Pastorals in general."[154]

---

[152] There is the additional question as to whether the "saving" in view here refers to spiritual salvation or physical perseverance in childbirth. However, Stanley Porter has helpfully notes, "In virtually all authentically Pauline contexts, σῴζω denotes a salvific spiritual act, perhaps eschatological in consequence." Stanley Porter, "What Does It Mean to Be 'Saved by Childbirth' (1 Timothy 2:15)?," in *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*, Studies in Biblical Greek (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 258–60. Furthermore, Jared August observes, "This verb is used seven times in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 1:15; 2:4, 15; 4:16; 2 Tim 1:9; 4:18; Titus 3:5), each time denoting the act of spiritual salvation." Jared August, "What Must She Do to Be Saved? A Theological Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:15," *Themelios* 45, no. 1 (2020), https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/what-must-she-do-to-be-saved-a-theological-analysis-of-1-timothy-215/.

[153] See Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 227–29.

[154] Andreas Köstenberger, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15," in Köstenberger and Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 118.

However, there is good reason to think that (to use Köstenberger's words) "a salvation-historical typology" is precisely what one should expect to see in this context due to Paul's explicit reference to Genesis 2–3. Not only this, but Jared August has shown that "in every instance where Adam is named in the NT [Luke 3:38; Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45 and 1 Tim. 2:15], he is always mentioned in reference to the expectation that a future individual will come to undo what he did."[155]

August's observation also helps with the third difficulty mentioned, namely, the switch from the singular σωθήσεται to the plural μείνωσιν. That is, similar to the former case, the most natural antecedent for the plural μείνωσιν is Adam and Eve, whose stories are paradigmatic for men and women across the canon. Such an interpretation would also bring the passage to a fitting conclusion since it began with both male (2:8) and female conduct in the church (2:9–12) in view of both the nature of God's creation of Adam and Eve *and* their fall in the garden. Such an interpretation would mean that Paul's closing comment is equally relevant for both men and women (not women alone). His point would roughly be that the created order of Genesis 1–2—which was subverted at the fall (3:1–7) but reaffirmed by the Lord in his postlapsarian address to the guilty parties (3:8ff)—continues to exist as a means by which one demonstrates the presence of "faith, holiness, and self-control" in view of the distinct callings men and women have received.[156] The point here is not that women are only good for bearing children;[157] instead, just as the subversion of God's order brought sin and chaos into the world, so too

[155] August writes,

> Luke 3:38 presents Jesus Christ as the Second Adam, the one who has come as the true "Son of God." In Romans 5:14, Paul presents an Adam/Christ typology, demonstrating the universal scope of death brought by Adam and life brought by Christ. In 1 Corinthians 15:22, 45, Paul again develops this concept that death has come into the world through Adam's sin, yet Christ's accomplishment has brought life. (August, "What Must She Do to Be Saved?")

[156] August, "What Must She Do to Be Saved?"

[157] Nevertheless, both a homeward focus and the capacity for childbearing are centrally connected to the feminine calling (cf. Titus 2:4–5; 1 Tim 5:14–16).

the salvation of God—which has been achieved through the life of the Messiah—is one that leads men and women to embrace created order, not depart from it (cf. Col 3:10).[158]

Therefore, I conclude Paul's words in 1 Timothy 2:8–15 assume and apply the vision of the sexes begun in Genesis 1–3, just as affirmed and developed by biblical authors across the canon of Scripture. Paul specifically reinforces God's design for men and women by giving gendered directives to each for how they are to behave in God's holy household. Men must take care that their capacity for strength and their calling to protect do not turn into wrath or quarreling (1 Tim 2:8). Women must take care that their capacity for glory does become an occasion for self-serving ostentatiousness (1 Tim 2:9–10). And both must preserve in God's house the created-order vocations given to each sex: the priestly man teaches (Gen 2:16–17; 2 Chr 15:3), with final responsibility for the teaching (Gen 3:17; Heb 13:17; Jas 3:1), while the woman assists in the worship of the Lord (Exod 38:8; cf. Jdgs 11:40; 1 Sam 2:22), not as the representative head, but as a genuine and indispensable helper (Gen 2:18) to the glory of God.

Import for Paradigmatic Readings of the Canon

Paul consistently makes use of Genesis 1–3 to ground the distinct exhortations he gives to men and women in the church (1 Cor 11:2–16; 1 Tim 2:8–15) as well as in marriage (Eph 5:22–33). In two of the studied passages, Paul makes special appeal to the priority of Adam, not on the basis of some culturally conditioned assumptions of primogeniture, but on the basis of Adam's priority in God's created order and all that this entails, especially his representative headship. Furthermore, since Paul *applies* the significance of this to men and women in various contexts, the design of God on display in Genesis 1–2 (and reflected in Gen 3) is not limited to the first couple but extends to every son of Adam and daughter of Eve. Finally, the advent of Christ made these distinctions more clearly perceived (Eph 5:30–31) and more capably realized owing to

[158] Note the similarity to Riesner's "insight into a saving structure" in Riesner, *Apostolischer Gemeindebau*, 51. See also the section "Man and Woman in Marriage" in this chap.

the power of the gospel (grace) to restore created order (nature). Therefore, in view of Paul's use of the creation of man and woman and his explanation of its significance, there is sufficient warrant to read the rest of the Scriptures in light of his interpretation. The next chapter will explore several passages in this fashion, showing that subsequent biblical authors saw, at least to some degree, many of the same significances that Paul saw in the male-female paradigms established in Genesis 1–3.

CHAPTER 4

PARADIGM EXEMPLIFIED: CANONICAL ECHOES OF GENESIS 1–3

At the start of this penultimate chapter, it is helpful to summarize the whole argument so far. I have shown that Moses was aware of the paradigmatic implications of God's design in creation (e.g., Gen 2:24). Thus, he arranges his material to highlight aspects of creation that bear upon later passages in the Pentateuch. Among these highlights is man's fundamental nature as male and female (Gen 1:27). Specifically, Moses intends for his readers to see Adam and Eve not simply as the first (i.e., chronological) man and woman but as the *model* (i.e., paradigmatic) man and woman, with the man as the representative head (cf. Gen 2:15–17; 3:17) and woman as his divinely fitted helper (Gen 2:18) for their joint commission (Gen 1:28). I have also shown that Jesus and the apostles read Moses in this way, explicitly appealing to "the beginning" as the establishment of an enduring paradigm (Matt 19:4–6) with implications not just for marriage (Eph 5:32–33) but for the conduct of all men and women in the household of God (1 Tim 2:8–15; 1 Cor 1:2–16). Finally, it is historically inaccurate and theologically incoherent to suppose that Jesus and the apostles were guilty of preaching "the right doctrine from the wrong texts."[1] Rather, they are hermeneutical models for the church (1 Cor 11:1), including how it ought to conceive of man and woman.[2]

---

[1] See G. K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); David Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Tübigen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992); and Moisés Silva, "The NT Use of the OT: Text Form and Authority," in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 162–63.

[2] James Hamilton, *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 19.

This chapter will read the creation account in a biblical-theological fashion, tracing its development across the canon while guided by Jesus and the apostle's reading of the same. I aim to show that subsequent biblical authors embrace Moses's interpretive perspective by assuming and developing the male-female paradigm he established in Genesis 1–3. The chapter will focus on the way authors present particular narratives, characters, and offices in Israel with a view to the creation account of man and woman. A survey of every potentially relevant textual instance is obviously far beyond the scope of this chapter (indeed, something to that effect might well require a running commentary on a majority of the Scriptures.) Instead, I will focus on those passages that most clearly reinforce Moses's interpretive perspective.

The effect of this approach is that one's understanding of what it means to be male and female can be significantly broadened by the patterns one observes, especially when these patterns are repeated.[3] This point is sometimes overlooked or downplayed in detrimental ways. Even authors who are aware of the value of such patterns almost invariably relegate them to a lower level of significance than directly didactic or straightforward prescriptions (and proscriptions) in Scripture.[4] At one level, this is

[3] As I said in chap. 2, I have chosen the term "paradigm" (or pattern) instead of "type" to avoid a technical critique from any who might limit typology exclusively to matters of salvation-history. For example, James Hamilton restricts types to patterns with "salvation-historical significance" and "covenantal connection." See James Hamilton, *Typology—Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns: How Old Testament Expectations Are Fulfilled in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2022), 20. Of course, properly defined, there *is* a sense in which manhood and womanhood have salvation-historical significance and new covenant connection, for grace restores nature (Col 3:10). Nevertheless, the essential features of typology are the same in view here, regardless of the term "paradigm." They are "historical correspondence" and "escalation in significance." See James Hamilton, *Typology*, 19. See also E. Earle Ellis, foreword to *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, by Leonhard Goppelt, trans. Donald H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), x.

[4] For example, Kevin DeYoung writes,

> Whenever we talk about biblical manhood and womanhood we must distinguish among *prescriptions, principles, and patterns*. Later we will come to several key *prescriptions* regarding men and women. Most of these prescriptions are found in Paul's letters. Some are positive (do this), and some are negative (don't do that). They form the clearest boundaries for male and female dress, behavior,

understandable. It is a classic hermeneutical principle that more clear texts should be allowed to cast light on less clear texts.[5] While this practice is good and right, one must take care that the so-called "less clear" texts are not overshadowed altogether.

Such a result would be particularly problematic since so much of the Scriptures belongs to the genre of narrative, which is primarily descriptive by nature. Yet "descriptive" must not be taken to mean "non-instructive." As Paul explains, "For whatever was written in the past was written for our instruction" (Rom 15:4). In another place, when commenting on the exodus from Egypt, Paul derives a clear command from the narrative, saying, "Now these things took place as examples for us, so that we will not desire evil things as they did" (1 Cor 10:6).[6] Thus, Paul shows descriptive narratives can have a didactically prescriptive meaning. Other biblical authors follow suit: John writes, "We should not be like Cain [οὐ καθὼς Κάϊν] who was of the evil one and murdered his brother" (1 John 3:12). John does the same in the book of Revelation, e.g., Balaam and Balak serve as negative examples (Rev 3:14), as does Jezebel (3:20). Similarly, the author of Hebrews writes, "Make sure that there isn't any immoral or irreverent person like Esau, who sold his birthright in exchange for a single meal" (12:16). These scriptural passages establish a pattern of biblical authors deriving prescriptive instruction from descriptive

---

> attitudes, and responsibilities. (Kevin DeYoung, *Men and Women in the Church: A Short, Biblical, Practical Introduction* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021], 35, emphasis original)

DeYoung later says, "And, finally, the Bible reveals *patterns* of behavior for men and women in their mutual interaction. This is especially true in the Old Testament. We always need to be careful in using patterns, lest we turn a description into a prescription" (36). To be fair, he does admit that "the more often we see something in the Bible, the more appropriately we can derive principles from the patterns—especially if the pattern is consistent, if it is associated with noble characters, and if it reflects the design in Genesis" (36).

[5] As the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith says, "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), *it must be searched by other places that speak more clearly*." See *The 1677/89 London Baptist Confession of Faith*, "Chapter I, Of the Holy Scriptures," Christian Classics Ethereal Library, accessed January 24, 2024, https://www.ccel.org/creeds/bcf/bcf.htm, emphasis added.

[6] The use of the subjunctive mood here must not be allowed to obscure the fact that a command is clearly implied, even if it is grammatically veiled. Many biblical authors employ this form, e.g., 1 John 2:1.

texts—sometimes in the form of exhortatory examples, sometimes in the form of direct commands.[7] This exegetical pattern is important to note at the outset, for it enables a better understanding of the biblical authors' use of Genesis 1–3.[8]

In what follows I will survey how the biblical authors embrace and develop Moses's paradigm for the sexes across the canon. I will limit my focus to four major features of the creation account. First, I will give attention to the asymmetry of the sexes in God's design, which is the logical foundation for all that follows. This asymmetry is especially noticeable in the way biblical authors talk about men and women in contexts where (modern) readers might have expected parity or uniformity. Second, I will consider how biblical authors make use of the union of male and female, both its pattern and purpose. This feature takes on special significance in view of the typological description of salvation as a wedding. Third, I will discuss the nature of man's representative headship, looking at examples across Scripture that assume or reinforce this facet of God's design. Finally, I will give attention to Adam's role as the prototypical priest, as this has wide bearing on a range of debates that are central to the life of the church.

The Asymmetry of the Sexes

In Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, the erstwhile complementarian argues that Christianity's fundamental message concerning the sexes is their equality and mutuality.[9] Setting aside the fact that terms like "equal" or

[7] This is not to say that every descriptive text should be flattened to its bare moral, as if the biblical narrative were nothing but a husk to be discarded once the "real meaning" has been found. On the contrary, by appreciating the details of the story, we enrich our understanding of God and God's world, including human nature. At the same time, any hermeneutic that *refuses* to see in descriptive texts the existence of instructive patterns—to be embraced or rejected, depending on the nature of the example—is out of step with the way the apostles read and apply the Scriptures.

[8] This prescriptive-from-descriptive pattern will also prove significant in the final chapter, which explores the implications of the argument for the complementarian and egalitarian debates in the church today.

[9] Aimee Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: How the Church Needs to Rediscover Her Purpose* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2020), 25, 42, 94, 126, 173, 232–33.

"equality" (ἴσος) are never used in the Scriptures to describe the sexes, it is true that man and woman are both made in the image of God (Gen 1:27).[10] As such, they are equally owed the fundamental rights that God's Word affords to all persons by virtue of their humanity. Nevertheless, Moses's account of the creation of man and woman focuses not on their equality but on their harmonious asymmetry—how they differ *from* and *for* each other. For this reason, even when the equality of the sexes is undeniably in view (e.g., Gen 1:26–28), the kind of equality Moses has in mind is not one that eviscerates distinctions between the sexes. This is how the apostle Peter could say, "Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life" (1 Pet 3:7). The apostle's words simultaneously convey equality in one sense ("heirs with you of the grace of life"), while maintaining a clear asymmetry between the man and "the weaker vessel." In other words, the biblical authors envision the kind of equality that contains asymmetries.

It may sound odd to speak of a "kind" (or "sort") of equality, but such precision has become a necessity in the late modern world, where, increasingly, it is thought that equality denotes *sameness* or *interchangeability*. C. S. Lewis famously identified this problem in his response to Lady Majorie Nunburnholme regarding the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood.[11] After rejecting the ordination of women to that office,[12] Lewis goes on to note that Nunburnholme's argument rests on a fundamental misunderstanding of equality: "Lady Nunburnholme has claimed that the equality of men

[10] The word "equality" may not be used here, but the concept is clearly present.

[11] C. S. Lewis's response first appeared alongside Nunburnholme in *Time and Tide*, vol. 29, August 14, 1948. Unfortunately, that publication no longer exists, and Nunburnholme's essay has perished with it. All that remains of her essay is the scattered quotes in Lewis's response. See C. S. Lewis, "Priestesses in the Church?," in *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*, ed. Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2014), 256–62.

[12] Lewis calls the ordination of women a "revolutionary step" that would "cut ourselves off from the [consensus of the] Christian past" and display "an almost wanton degree of imprudence." Lewis, *God in the Dock*, 256.

and women is a Christian principle."[13] True though it may be, that is beside the point, Lewis insists, for "unless 'equal' means 'interchangeable,' equality makes nothing for the priesthood of women. And the kind of equality which implies that the equals are interchangeable (like counters or identical machines) is, among humans, a legal fiction."[14] And while it may be that, as a secular state "grows more like a hive or an ant-hill it needs an increasing number of works who can be treated as neuters," Christians insist that "we are not homogenous units, but different and complementary organs of a mystical body."[15]

Lewis's point matters because the late modern preoccupation with equality (to say nothing of its confusion regarding the meaning of the same) has left readers less apt to notice, much less appreciate, the differences between man and woman as significant features of biblical texts. Indeed, this misguided preoccupation stands at odds with the emphases of Moses, whose creation account unequivocally highlights the asymmetries in the origin, nature, and duties of the paradigmatic man and woman:

1. The man was "formed" (יָצַר) (Gen 2:7), whereas the woman was "made" or "built" (בָּנָה) (Gen 2:22).
2. The man's substance is taken from the ground (Gen 2:7; 3:19), whereas the woman is taken from the man (Gen 2:22).
3. The man is created outside the garden (Gen 2:7, 15), whereas the woman is created within it (Gen 2:22–23).
4. The man explicitly receives the priestly commission to "work" and "keep" the garden (Gen 2:15; 3:19), whereas the woman does not.
5. The man directly receives the Lord's prohibition not to eat from the tree of life (Gen 2:16–17), whereas the woman did not exist when that word was spoken; hence the Lord addresses Adam first (Gen 3:9) and holds him responsible Gen (3:17).

[13] Lewis, *God in the Dock*, 260.

[14] Lewis, *God in the Dock*, 260.

[15] Lewis, *God in the Dock*, 260.

6. The man alone is exiled from the garden: "the LORD God sent *him* out from the garden" (Gen. 3:23) and "He drove out the man" (Gen 3:24), whereas the woman is not explicitly mentioned in that judgment.[16]

7. The man names the woman, twice (Gen 2:23; 3:20), just as he had named the animals before her (Gen 2:19), whereas the woman does not name the man.

8. The man's name (אָדָם) corresponds to the ground (אֲדָמָה), recalling his unique origin (Gen 2:7) and his sphere of vocation (Gen 2:15; 3:19, 23), whereas the woman's first name (אִשָּׁה) forms a wordplay with her origin from man (אִישׁ) (Gen 2:23), even as her second name highlights her vocational sphere (Gen 3:20).

9. The man is capable of representing humanity (Rom 5:12), hence the woman's eyes are not opened until the man eats (Gen 3:7; cf. Lev 4:3), whereas the woman was able to eat without her sin immediately affecting the man (Gen 3:6).

10. The woman is introduced as the man's "helper" (עֵזֶר) (Gen 2:18), whereas the man is not called her "helper" in return.[17]

11. In marriage the man is said to leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife (Gen 2:24), whereas the woman is not symmetrically said to do the same.

Of course, it is one thing to note the aforementioned asymmetries, it is quite another to say that such differences are intentional (i.e., meaningful) features of the narrative. Yet attention to the details of Scripture reveals that these (and other) asymmetries between the sexes are upheld across the biblical canon with remarkable consistency.

Husbands Take Wives, While Daughters Are Given

Consider the paradigm Moses establishes in Genesis 2:24: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh."[18] I have already remarked that Moses does not also say, "The woman shall leave

---

[16] Naturally, the woman is *included* in this judgment on the man (Rom 5:12), yet it is significant that the Lord is able to deal with both simply by exiling the man.

[17] Debates about עֵזֶר obscure the fact that, regardless of its meaning in this context, the use of the term is asymmetrical. Hence Paul says, "Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man" (1 Cor 11:9).

[18] The LXX uses προσκολλάω in Gen 2:24, as do Mark and Paul in their citations of the same (cf. Mark 10:17; Eph 5:31)—the only two uses in the NT. However, in the parallel account in Matthew, Jesus uses κολλάω instead (Matt 19:5). The precise reason for Matthew departing from the compound verb, which is original to the LXX, is not clear. However, it is clear that the terms are synonyms, not only because of their apparent etymological similarities, but also because Paul—who uses the former in Eph 5:31—uses the latter in 1 Cor 6:16 and 1 Cor 6:17 when referring to the "joining" of a man to a prostitute or to the Lord, respectively.

her father and her mother and hold fast to her husband." Before commenting on the likely meaning of this asymmetry, simply note the fact of it. In keeping with this fact, the formation of marriages (or would-be marriages[19]) is *always* spoken of in terms of men "taking" (לָקַח) a wife (or wives, e.g., 4:19), but *never* as a wife "taking" a husband. Moses speaks asymmetrically when he records Lot's address to his future sons-in-law, "who were to marry [לָקַח] his daughters" (19:14). When Abraham sent his servant to find a wife for Isaac, Moses recounts his words in this way: "Swear by the LORD . . . that you will not take a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanites" (24:3). The servant later repeats this oath, using the same asymmetrical language (24:37–38, 40). Interestingly, he also expresses concern that "the woman may not follow [הָלַךְ] me" (24:39; cf. 24:8). This is of particular significance, for it affirms the woman's consent to the marital union, ruling out bad faith readings of the verb "to take" (לָקַח). At the same time, Moses's record upholds the asymmetrical nature of the union, beginning with the man's choice in taking and concluding with the woman's consent in "going" or "following" after him. Finally, when Laban gives his blessing, he uses the same formula: "Take her and go, and let her be the wife of your master's son, as the LORD has spoken" (24:51).

The same pattern is observed when it comes time for Isaac's son, Jacob, to find a wife. He repeats Abraham's admonition against Canaanite women (28:1), before instructing him to "go to Paddan-aram to the house of Bethuel your mother's father, and take as your wife from there one of the daughters of Laban" (28:2). The same words are repeated a few verses later, when Esau follows suit and "took as his wife . . . Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael" (28:9). Laban again uses the language of "taking" daughters when he calls God to be a witness between himself and Jacob (31:48–50).[20] Note also that

[19] E.g., Abimelech says to Abram, "Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I took her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife; take her, and go" (Gen 12:19).

[20] Note once more that what was implied in the words of Abraham's servant is here made explicit, when Laban warns against "oppressing" [עָנָה] his daughters while simultaneously distinguishing that oppression from the "taking" [לָקַח] women as wives. In other words, this asymmetrical "taking" is not in any sense to be associated with something like rape or sexual assault.

Laban warns against "oppressing" (עָנָה) his daughters (39:50) while also distinguishing this from "taking" (לָקַח) women as wives. In other words, Laban shows clear knowledge of the category of abuse, invoking the name of God against Jacob if he ever were to be guilty of "oppressing" his daughters. Yet, just as clearly, he does not regard the "taking" of wives to constitute a form of abuse. This is significant, for it signifies that the language of "taking" wives is not some sinful relic of a patriarchal age. Instead, Laban affirms the asymmetry at the heart of God's created order while also opposing the sinful mistreatment of women, who are made in the image of God.

After the patriarchal narratives, Moses uses the same language in the law codes. For this reason, critics cannot dismiss the words of Moses in the Genesis narratives as descriptively recounting what took place without endorsing the content or form of speech in every utterance.[21] Not only that, but Moses clearly says that Israel's laws were given to him by the Lord himself (e.g., Exod 20:1, 22). Thus, when reading a law that says, "If he takes [לָקַח] another wife to himself, he shall not diminish her food, her clothing, or her marital rights" (Ex. 21:10), we are not simply reading the words of Moses but the words of *God*.[22] The same language is found in laws that prohibit a man taking a woman as a rival wife to her sister (Lev 18:18) or taking his brother's wife (Lev 20:21) or his father's wife (Deut 22:30). The laws governing the marriages of priests speak in the same fashion, saying, "He shall take a wife in her virginity" (Lev 20:13) and again, "He shall take as his wife a virgin of his own people" (Lev 20:14). Moses speaks the same way throughout Deuteronomy in various contexts, from laws governing Israel's conduct toward women/wives during times of war (20:7; 21:11) to contexts involving immorality and

[21] For example, consider how the author of Judges records the horrors of what happened to the Levites' concubine, clearly without endorsing all that took place there (Judg 19).

[22] For those who affirm the Spirit's inspiration of human authors (2 Pet 1:21; 2 Tim 3:16), this is a matter of course. Yet it is worth noting that Jesus quotes the words of Moses in Gen 2:24 and claims them as God's own (Matt 19:4–5). Thus, either Jesus is wrong about Moses or Moses really did receive revelation from the Lord such that the words of Moses are the words of God—just as Jesus affirms.

adultery (22:13), to the regulation of divorce (24:1) and protections for newlyweds (24:5). In all this Moses repeatedly reaffirms the asymmetrical pattern of men "taking" wives.

Later biblical authors embrace Moses's language in their own writings, as do the people of Israel themselves. For example, the author of Judges records the words of Samson's father and mother, who ask, "Is there not a woman . . . among all our people, that you must go to take a wife from the uncircumcised Philistines?" (14:3; cf. 15:6). Samuel likewise speaks of David taking Abigail as his wife (1 Sam 25:39), as do David's servants themselves (1 Sam 25:40). The prophet Nathaniel uses identical language when rebuking David for his sin, saying, "You have struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword and have taken his wife to be your wife" (2 Sam 12:9; cf. 12:10).[23] The author of Kings follows suit (1 Kgs 4:15; 2 Kgs 4:1), as does the post-exilic author of Ezra (2:61) and of Nehemiah (6:18), showing that this asymmetrical form of speech is preserved through the end of the Old Testament canon.[24] The same is true of the prophets, who record the word of the Lord himself: "You shall not take a wife" (Jer 16:2), and "Go, take to yourself a wife of whoredom" (Hos 1:2). Nor is this asymmetry an Old Testament phenomenon only, for the angel of the Lord said to Joseph, "Do not fear to take [παραλαβεῖν] Mary as your wife" (Matt 1:20). Also, the religious leaders in the time of the New Testament continued to use the same asymmetrical language, asking Jesus about a who "must take [λάβῃ] the widow and raise up offspring for his brother" (Mark 12:19; cf. Luke 20:28). Jesus did not correct their speech in his reply, as if to set the record straight. Nor should one expect him to: since his Spirit inspired the words in all the

[23] Though it is far beyond the scope of this paper to address at length the recent controversy concerning whether Bathsheba was "raped," it is worth noting that Nathaniel portrays David's sin as being against Uriah, not Bathsheba. That is to say, David sinned doubly against Uriah, first by killing him and second by taking his wife for himself. Whatever else someone might want to say about the narrative, the first and most significant thing that is David's sin *with* Bathsheba is penultimately counted as a sin *against* Uriah (and ultimately against the Lord himself, cf. Ps 51:4).

[24] For our purposes it does not matter whether Ezra wrote the book that bears his name and/or the book of Nehemiah as well, as some scholars maintain. In either case, the books are among the last written in the OT canon, showing that the form of men taking women to be their wives continued after the exile.

aforementioned cases, our Lord is not only comfortable with asymmetrical language but *intended* it to reinforce the fact of the fundamental distinction between male and female in God's design.[25]

Correspondingly, just as wives "taken" by husbands so also daughters are also "given" by fathers. This pattern is first established in Genesis 34:8–9. There Moses recounts the words of Hamor, who says, "The soul of my son Shechem longs for your daughter. Please give [נָתַן] her to him to be his wife. Make marriages [חָתַן]with us. Give your daughters to us, and take our daughters for yourselves." The combination of "taking" wives and "giving" daughters is repeated twice more in that chapter (34:16, 21), further reinforcing the connection between these forms of speech and the asymmetry of the sexes that they highlight. By the time of Joshua and Judges, such patterns of speech have become commonplace among the people of God (Josh 15:16; Judg 21:1, 7, 18). Samuel writes of "giving daughters" as well (1 Sam 17:25; 18:17, 19, 27, 44), as does the author of Kings (2 Kgs 14:9). Once again, this form of speech not only appears in narratives but also in prescriptive instructions from the mouth of the Lord. Speaking through the prophet

[25] It is essential to note that forms of speech are not simply grammatical conventions but have a way of shaping human perception of God's world as well as our interaction with it. To give a negative example, it is common for children who are called abusive names to have higher rates of negative self-perception, anxiety, and clinical depression, not just in childhood, but persisting into adulthood as well. See Yutaka Yabe et al., "Parents' Own Experience of Verbal Abuse Is Associated with Their Acceptance of Abuse towards Children from Youth Sports Coaches," *Tohoku Journal of Experimental Medicine* 4 (December 2019): 249–54. The point here is simply that language has shaping effect—for good or for ill. Hence, the author of Proverbs says, "Death and life are in the power of the tongue, and those who love it will eat its fruits" (18:21). Beyond the example of abuse, evidence suggests language has a shaping effect on the way we think. Words do not simply *reflect* thoughts but even *shape* thoughts. For example, the famous study by Brent Berlin and Paul Kay found high levels of cross-cultural correlation between color lexicons (vocabulary) and color recognition. Brent Berlin and Paul Kay, *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution* (Berkeley: University of California, 1969). In other words, the *absence* of specific color terms in various cultures diminished their ability to consistently recognize color variation. To be sure, the light waves of the object itself do not change from place to place or culture to culture, but the presence (or absence) of words for specific colors had a measurable effect on the ability of people to recognize/distinguish particular colors from each other. The relevance of this observation for my argument is this: the Lord's words—like all other words—are not mere grammatical conventions but were precise formulations intended to have a shaping effect. Specifically, the repeated asymmetrical pattern of "taking" wives and "giving" daughters would have reinforced meaningful distinctions between the sexes. Indeed, these distinctions were reinforced even when individual Israelites were unaware that such reinforcement was taking place.

Jeremiah, the LORD tells his people, "Take wives and have sons and daughters; take wives for your sons, and give [נָתַן] your daughters in marriage" (Jer 29:6). And when tempted to intermarry with pagans, Ezra says, "Do not give your daughters to their sons, neither take their daughters for your sons" (Ezra 9:12). Later, the people of Israel make these words part of a covenant renewal ceremony under the leadership of Nehemiah (Neh 10:30). And when they fail to uphold the covenant, Nehemiah enforces it with vigor, making them swear the following oath to God: "You shall not give your daughters to their sons, or take their daughters for your sons or for yourselves" (Neh 13:25). Conversely, Moses records that the only person who ever "gives" sons is the Lord (Gen 17:16; 29:33; 30:6), who are either given in blessing (Gen 48:9) or given away in judgment (Deut 28:32). Later biblical authors follow his pattern (e.g., 1 Chr 25:5; 28:5; 2 Chr 2:12) so that no son is ever said to be "given" in marriage in the same way a daughter is given in marriage.

Male Initiative in Marriage and Sexual Intercourse

Moving on to other asymmetries, note that the man takes the initiative in leaving and cleaving (holding fast) according to Moses's paradigmatic account: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh" (Gen 2:24) This pattern is reinforced in the patriarchal narratives, where Abraham's servant is sent to find a wife for Isaac (Gen 24), just as Isaac later sends Jacob to do the same (Gen 28–29).[26] Thus, with the possible exception of Ruth, no daughter of Israel is ever sent to look for a husband in the same way that a man (son) is said to leave his father and mother to seek, find, and hold fast to his wife.[27] The wedding customs in

[26] It might be objected that one should not expect a daughter to be sent looking for a husband in a patriarchal culture, but this objection gets the matter exactly backwards. For it fails to consider that such a culture—in Israel, at the very least—might as well have arisen due to the explicit teaching of the Scriptures. Thus, what we call "patriarchy" the patriarchs would simply have called "Moses's paradigm."

[27] Even here, Ruth's story primarily stands out because it is a paradigm-reinforcing subversion of what Robert Alter calls "type-scenes." Specifically, Alter argues that some biblical narratives "are dependent on the manipulation of a fixed constellation of predetermined motifs." Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic, 2011), 60. In other words, the reason Ruth's story is *contrary to what*

Israel seem to reflect the man's initiative in this respect. Thus, one finds the speech form of the bridegroom leaving his chamber (Ps 19:5) and of "the bride com[ing] home to her husband" (2 Sam 17:3), as one who is beseeched by the seeking husband (Songs 4:8). This may also explain why there is a "bride-price" or "dowry" (מֹהַר) for daughters given in marriage (Gen 34:12; Exod 22:16–17; 1 Sam 18:25), yet there is no "groom-price." For the man/son *leaves* his father and mother, but the woman/daughter is *given*.[28]

Not unrelated to the male initiative in seeking marriage, consider the act of sexual intercourse, which is described in asymmetrical ways. For example, while both men and women may "know" each other sexually,[29] in every instance of a *named* subject, it is always the husband knowing his wife (Gen 4:1, 17, 25; 1 Sam 1:19; Matt 1:25) and never the other way around. Similarly, the Hebrew word translated "went in to" (בּוֹא) is not always sexual (cf. Gen 23:2; Exod 10:3; Num 8:22) but when used as an idiom for sex, it is always the man who "goes in to" (בּוֹא) the woman (cf. Gen 16:4; 29:23, 30; 30:4; 38:2, 9, 18; Judg 16:1; Ruth 4:13; 2 Sam 12:24; 2 Sam 16:22; 1 Chr 2:21, 24; 7:23; Ezek 23:44).[30] The last point warrants further comment. The language of the Scriptures appears

---

we expect is because there is an established expectation, one derived from the normative paradigm established (and subsequently reinforced) from the beginning. Alter notes as much in his discussion of the "boy meets girl at a well" type-scene (Gen 24:10–61). He also notes that certain features of the first such type-scene recur in Gen 29:1–20 such that the reader has a mounting sense of expectation that something similar will occur. A similar event later recurs in the life of Moses when he sits down by a well after fleeing Egypt (Exod 2:15) and immediately meets the woman who would become his wife (Exod 2:17–18). This time there is a twist, for Moses draws the water for Zipporah (2:19), instead of the other way around, as in the previous narratives. Even so, when it comes time for their marriage, there is no confusion regarding who is given to whom: "Moses was content to dwell with the man, and he *gave* Moses his daughter Zipporah" (Exod 2:21).

[28] Traditional Western wedding customs reflect this as well: the father escorts his daughter down the aisle where the presiding minister asks the question, "Who gives this woman to be married to this man?" The man is not given away. Rather, he stands as one who has already left his father and mother, waiting to hold fast to his wife. But for her to be taken as a wife, she must also be given as a daughter.

[29] For examples of men "knowing" women in a sexual sense of the term, see Gen 4:1, 17, 25; 24:16; 38:26; Judg 19:25; 1 Kgs 1:4; 1 Sam 1:19; Matt 1:25. For instances of women "knowing" men in a sexual sense of the term, see Gen 19:8; Num 31:17–18, 35; Judg 11:39; 21:11–12.

[30] The story of Esther is the singular possible exception. Esther 2:12–13 reads, "Now when the turn came for each young woman to go in to [בּוֹא] King Ahasuerus. . . . When the young woman went in to [בּוֹא] the king in this way, she was given whatever she desired to take with her from the harem to the king's palace." And again the text says, "In the evening she would go in [בּוֹא], and in the morning she

to be an intentional reflection of the anatomical realities involved in sexual intercourse. That is say, God's revealed speech patterns once again reinforce God's design.[31] The same goes for the language of "conception" (הָרָה / ἐν γαστρί ἔχειν). Though people today may loosely speak of couples conceiving (or struggling to conceive) a child, the biblical authors follow Moses's lead in using the term exclusively in reference to mothers conceiving.[32]

Sexual Asymmetry in the Law

Sexual asymmetry is also found in the commands given to God's people. For example, the tenth commandment[33] states, "Thou shalt not covet [לֹא תַחְמֹד] thy neighbor's wife [אִשָּׁה]" (Exod 20:17 KJV). Significantly, the subject of the verb is second *masculine* singular, and the object that is not to be coveted is a *wife*. Moses feels no need to give a parallel statement to the effect of, "Thou [2mf] shalt not covet thy neighbor's husband." Similarly, the punishments for sexual immorality are highly asymmetrical: "If a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death" (Lev 20:10). Again, Moses gives no parallel statement detailing

would return to the second harem. . . . She would not go in [בוֹא] to the king again, unless the king delighted in her and she was summoned by name" (Esth 2:14). Though sexual intercourse is undoubtedly the occasion for "going in to" the king, it is not the act of sexual intercourse itself that is described by this term but the appearance in the king's court. Furthermore, even if it could be conclusively proven that sexual intercourse is the singular referent intended by [בוֹא] in this context, then it is significant that each young woman did not "go in to" the king on her own but had to be summoned. In this respect, therefore, something of male initiative is still preserved.

[31] At one level, this biological fact, and the one that follows it, are both so basic that some might think it unworthy of time or attention. Yet as George Orwell once lamented, "We have now sunk to a depth at which the restatement of the obvious is the first duty of intelligent men." George Orwell, review of Russell's *Power: A New Social Analysis*, *Adelphi*, January 1939, para. 1, accessed January 31, 2024, https://www.lehman.edu/faculty/rcarey/BRSQ/06may.orwell.htm.

[32] See Gen 4:1, 17; 16:4–5; 21:2; 25:21; 29:32–34; 30:5, 7, 17, 19, 23; 38:3–4, 18; Exod 2:2; 1 Sam 1:20; 2:21; 11:5; 2 Kgs 4:17; 1 Chr 4:17; 7:23; Job 3:3; Songs 3:4; Isa 8:3; Hos 1:3, 6, 8; 2:5; Matt 1:23; Luke 1:31; 21:23; 1 Thess 5:3; Rev 12:2. Also note that the only time a man is said to "conceive" anything is the metaphorical use of the term, such as the conception of some wicked scheme (e.g., Ps 7:14).

[33] That is, the tenth in the Jewish, Orthodox, and Protestant numbering.

the punishment for a woman who commits adultery with the husband of her neighbor.[34] The asymmetrical pattern continues through the chapter with a man who lies with his father's wife (20:11), a man who lies with his daughter-in-law (20:12), a man who lies with a male as with a woman (20:13), a man who takes a woman and her mother also (20:14), and a man who lies with an animal. Indeed, it is not until verse 16 that a woman is the subject of a sentence, one that interestingly involves no other human, for the verse concerns a woman's sexual activity with an animal. After this, the pattern continues detailing punishments which, in every case, identify the man as the primary actor (20:17–21).

A few more sexual asymmetries are worth noting. In the purity laws of Leviticus, "a woman who conceives and bears a male child" is considered unclean for seven days (Lev 12:2) and must continue the purification process for another thirty-three days, for a total forty days (12:3). Yet "if she bears a female child, then she shall be unclean two weeks" (Lev 12:5), and she must continue the purification process for sixty-six more day (a total of eighty). Gordon Wenham says this law is "not easy to understand."[35] He identifies two problems, both of which asymmetrically affect the woman. In the first place, is bearing children not what the Lord had told Adam and Eve to do (Gen 1:28)? Why, then, would childbearing be a ritual defilement? Furthermore, why is the husband not defiled by the same birth? Wenham points out that it is not the child him/herself that renders the woman unclean, but "her blood or discharge of blood" (12:4, 5, 7) in keeping with other purity laws (cf. Lev 15).[36] Since the husband loses no blood during childbirth (for obvious reasons), he is not rendered impure in the same way the woman is. Though the Bible gives no explicit reason why bodily discharges should make one unclean, C. F.

[34] To be sure, these prohibitions implicitly entail the wrongness of the act itself, regardless of who is doing it. Even so, the asymmetry of the commands suggests an asymmetry in the realm of sexual sin, not limiting who *can* sin in this way, but curtailing the actions of the one *most likely* to sin in this way.

[35] Gordon Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979), 187.

[36] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 188.

Keil and Franz Delitzsch suggest that the loss of bodily fluids that are connected with life (e.g., blood or semen) is symbolically designated as a kind of death.[37]

The second "problem" Wenham identifies in Leviticus 12 is that the birth of a girl renders her mother ceremonially impure for twice as long as the birth of a boy. Wenham rightly rejects views that see this law as a "relic" of an older pre-Israelite (read: pagan) practice, for one would still have to explain why the Lord included it among the laws he gave to his people. Nevertheless, Wenham goes on to say, "No convincing explanation has been offered why the birth of a girl makes the mother unclean for twice as long as the birth of a boy."[38] And, after briefly entertaining the possibility that there may be greater postnatal discharge with the birth of girls,[39] he concludes, "Possibly there may be some reflection on the relative status of the sexes in ancient Israel. For instance, the redemption price of women is about half that of men (Lev. 27:2–7)."[40] Yet might it be a simpler explanation to say that these purity laws (as well as the price of redemption) were not intended to communicate the lesser value of woman (recall that there is no groom-price, while there is a bride-price) but simply the significance of sexual differentiation and the pattern of male priority, both chronologically (1 Cor 11:8; 1 Tim 2:13) and vocationally (1 Cor 11:9; 1 Tim 2:14; cf. Gen 2:15–17; 3:17).[41]

---

[37] C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Pentateuch*, trans. James Martin, Commentaries on the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1891), 2:374.

[38] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 188.

[39] On this point Wenham cites physician D. I. Macht, "A Scientific Appreciation of Leviticus 12:1–5," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 52 (1933): 253–60. He notes, however, that the sightly increased volume of postnatal discharge is hardly able to justify twice the length of time for purification. See Wenham, *Leviticus*, 188.

[40] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 188.

[41] The chronological sense certainly comports with the structure of Lev 12, which begins with the birth of a boy (12:2) followed by a girl (12:5). Furthermore, Paul links chronology and vocation.

Sexual Asymmetry in Male and Female Adornment

Moses writes, "A woman shall not wear anything that pertains to [כְּלִי] a man [גֶּבֶר], nor shall a man [גֶּבֶר] put on a woman's cloak [שִׂמְלָה], for whoever does these things is an abomination to the Lord your God" (Deut 22:5 NKJV). Though there is some debate about the specific garments prohibited here,[42] it is clear that the Lord intended for men and women to adorn themselves outwardly in a manner that reflected their sexual distinction. For example, the speaker in Isaiah 61 says the Lord "clothed me with the garments of salvation . . . as a bridegroom decks himself like a priest [כָּהַן] with a beautiful headdress, and as a bride adorns herself with her jewels" (Isa 61:10). Not only does this verse detail differing dress for the bridegroom and the bride, but the verb used for "decking himself like a priest" (כָּהַן) is the same used with reference to the ministry of priests and the priestly office.[43] This connection is very significant, for it not only upholds the asymmetry of the sexes, but also connects the man (i.e., the bridegroom) with the priestly office, while not doing the same for the woman. Instead, she is simply held forth as the bride, "adorned for her husband" (Rev 21:2; cf. Jer 2:32). In this way, Isaiah 61:10 not only looks back to the Edenic priest and bridegroom of Genesis 2, but also looks forward (with typological anticipation) to the ultimate Bridegroom (Matt 9:15) who decked himself as a Priest for his bride (Heb 7:28)—the very One who read Isaiah 61 at the start of his ministry and said, "Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (Luke 4:21; cf. 4:18–20).

The New Testament authors embrace this pattern of asymmetry in sexual adornment. For example, Paul tells women—but not men—to cover their heads (1 Cor

[42] The debate stems from the fact that כְּלִי is often used in contexts where it clearly denotes "armor" (Judg 9:54; 1 Sam 14:1, 6, 12; 16:21; 31:4–6; 1 Chr 10:4, 10; 11:39) or "weapons" (Judg 18:11; 1 Sam 17:54; 20:40; 31:9–10; 2 Sam 1:27; 2 Kgs 11:8, 11; 2 Chr 23:7; Eccl 9:18; Isa 13:5) instead of common clothing. Furthermore, the term גֶּבֶר is used instead of אִישׁ, though the former is clearly used to mean "men" in most places. Indeed, Exod 12:37 speaks of "six hundred thousand men [גֶּבֶר], besides women and children," showing that the term can serve as a counterpart to women. Furthermore, biblical authors sometimes use גֶּבֶר when speaking of heads of households (Josh 7:14, 17, 18). But, most significantly, the term can also be used in contexts that speak of "warriors" (Judg 5:30) or men in battle (Zech 13:7).

[43] See, for example, Exod 28:1–4, 41; 29:1, 44; 35:19; 40:13–15; Lev 7:35; 16:32; Num 3:3, 4; Deut 10:6; 1 Chr 6:10; 24:2; Ezek 44:14; Hos 4:6.

11:3–15). And again, when Paul speaks to the appropriate conduct of men and women in the household of God, he mentions the kind of clothing or apparel "that women should adorn themselves with" (1 Tim 2:9). It is notable that Paul gives no apparel-related command to men (cf. 1 Tim 2:8). Instead, he gives commands regarding male behavior that he does not give to women. In other words, when speaking of the "good works" (1 Tim 2:9) that display "good faith" and "adorn the doctrine of God our Savior" (Titus 2:10), Paul gives asymmetrical instructions to each sex.[44] As noted in the previous chapter, the same is seen in the apostle's asymmetrical exhortations to husbands and wives in Ephesians 5. Specifically, Paul commands husbands to love their wives (Eph 5:25, 28), yet he does not repeat the command for wives to love their husbands. Instead, Paul instructs wives to "submit in everything to their husbands" (Eph 5:23). Finally, Paul cites Genesis 2:24 (cf. Eph 5:31), applying it to Christ and the church (Eph 5:32), but also deriving a practical conclusion from the verse: "Let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband" (Eph 5:33). Again, sexual asymmetry is evident. Indeed, it is crucial to Paul's whole argument, for if man and woman are interchangeable—in their being, their roles, or their even behavior—then the typological symbolism of Christ's work for the church and the church's response to Christ is destroyed.

Preliminary Conclusion Regarding Sexual Asymmetry

In addition to explicitly affirming sexual asymmetry, many scriptural verses simply *assume* sexual asymmetry. For example, Proverbs 12:4 reads, "An excellent wife is the crown of her husband." Yet the biblical authors do not reciprocate, say, by immediately following the previous statement with a parallel, like, "An excellent husband is the crown of his wife." The Scriptures also address men in places where women are not addressed (e.g., 1 John 2:12–14), but direct addresses to women are almost invariably

[44] Even when there is parity in the case of reciprocal commands (e.g., 1 Cor 7:2–5, 8–9), there is still sexual asymmetry in the broader context (1 Cor 7:1, 10–11; 25–28, 39–40).

accompanied by addresses to men in the same context (e.g., 1 Tim 2:8–15; 5:1–25). There are also statements such as, "Under three things the earth trembles; under four it cannot bear up: a slave when he becomes king, and a fool when he is filled with food; an unloved woman when she gets a husband, and a maidservant when she displaces her mistress" (Prov 30:21–23). Or, "A continual dripping on a rainy day and a quarrelsome wife are alike; to restrain her is to restrain the wind" (Prov 27:15–16), meanwhile, "Iron sharpens iron as one man [אִישׁ] sharpen another" (Prov 27:17).[45] There can be no doubt that men may be "quarrelsome" on occasion (2 Tim 2:23–24), nor would anyone deny that a woman may sharpen another woman. And yet, the biblical authors apparently feel no need to make such balancing qualifications.[46]

The persistant sexual asymmetry in the biblical canon has but a few explanations. First, it may be that the biblical authors are sexist (i.e., chauvinist), while God himself is not.[47] If so, the Christian faith would need to be "rescued" from the Scriptures by means of modern (feminist) readings.[48] Second, it may be that God himself is unjustly sexist. If so, then the Christian faith itself should be abandoned (or else reinterpreted as something substantially other than what it is).[49] Finally, it may be that the

[45] Whether the "sharpening" [חָדַד] here conveys a positive or negative connotation is beside the point.

[46] Furthermore, in view of the constant push for parallel ministries for women in the modern church, it would seem that the biblical authors are much more comfortable with sexual asymmetry than Westerners are.

[47] This was the view of the late Rachel Held Evans, who wrote a book openly mocking the gender-specific biblical exhortations given to women. See Rachel Held Evans, *A Year of Biblical Womanhood: How a Liberated Woman Found Herself Sitting on Her Roof, Covering Her Head, and Calling Her Husband "Master"* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2012).

[48] For a scholarly attempt to "liberate" God from the Scriptures by means of feminist readings, see Kristin Kobes du Mez, *A New Gospel for Women: Katharine Bushnell and the Challenge of Christian Feminism* (New York: Oxford University, 2015).

[49] This was the conclusion of feminist Mary Daly, who argued that the Scriptures are so "hopelessly patriarchal" that it was impossible to salvage anything of the Christian faith. Giving up on Christianity altogether, she exclaimed, "If God is male, then the male is God." See Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation* (Boston: Beacon, 1973).

sexual asymmetry displayed throughout the Scriptures denotes a kind of equality[50] that recognizes the significant differences between men and women as part of God's "very good" creation (Gen 1:31). The final option is the only one consistent with the fullness of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). Therefore, one must conclude that the sexually asymmetrical language of the Scriptures both reflects and reinforces the reality of God's sexually differentiated design.

The Union of Male and Female

Moses writes, "Therefore [NASB: "For this reason"] a man shall leave [עָזַב] his father and his mother and hold fast [דָּבַק] to his wife, and they shall become [וְהָיוּ] one flesh [לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד]" (Gen 2:24). Having already addressed the asymmetry of the language used to describe the man's actions, I will now consider the significance of the covenantal union of asymmetrical persons. In the first place, that Adam and Eve's relationship *is* a covenantal union is implied not by the intrinsic meaning of either leave/forsake (עָזַב) or cleave/hold fast (דָּבַק) but by the *combination* of the two.[51] Note how each is used in key covenantal passages in the Pentateuch. Israel is repeatedly urged to "hold fast" (דָּבַק) to the Lord (Deut 10:20; 11:22; 13:4). Indeed, when Moses concludes the covenant renewal ceremony for the post-wilderness generation (Deut 30:19ff), he says the determining factor between "life and death, blessing and curse," is whether they will commit to "loving the LORD your God, obeying his voice and holding fast (דָּבַק) to him" (Deut 30:20).[52]

Meanwhile, the verb "forsake" is also used in covenantal contexts. For example, when the Lord reaffirms (to Jacob) the covenant he made with Abraham, he says,

> I am the Lord, the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac. . . . Your offspring shall be like the dust of the earth . . . and in you and your offspring shall

[50] That is, the kind of equality that does *not* entail interchangeability, as I have already explained.

[51] Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1 (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 71.

[52] Joshua repeats the call to תָּמַךְ the Lord when he exhorts Israel to keep the covenant (Josh 22:5; 23:8).

> all the families of the earth be blessed. Behold, I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land. For I will not leave [עָזַב] you until I have done what I have promised you. (Gen 28:13–15)

Likewise, the curses of breaking the covenant are explicitly identified: "It is because they abandoned [עָזַב] the covenant of the LORD" (Deut 29:25; cf. 1 Sam. 8:8; 12:10; 1 Kgs 11:33; 19:14). And toward the end of the Old Testament's chronology, "the awesome God, who keeps covenant and steadfast love" (Neh 9:32), never *forsook* (עָזַב) Israel (Neh 9:17, 19, 31), though she was deserving of such a punishment (Neh 9:16–21, 26–31).[53] In other words, just as דָּבַק is used to refer to keeping covenant, so also עָזַב is used for breaking covenant. Thus, to use them together strongly suggests Moses intends for the reader to see marriage as a covenant.

In addition to the covenantal language of leave/forsake (עָזַב) or cleave/hold fast (דָּבַק), Moses says that the man and his wife "become one flesh." Wenham argues that this should not be taken to denote merely the sexual activity that consummates a wedding, nor the children conceived from sexual intercourse, nor even some sort of spiritual or emotional connection forged between them.[54] Instead, the proximity to Adam's prior statement ("This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh" [Gen 2:23]) suggests the meaning of the one-flesh union is that the man and his wife become legally related as a single unit.[55] Wenham's conclusion follows from two points. First, the linguistic form of Genesis 2:23 follows the traditional kinship formula (cf. Gen 29:14; Judg 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:13–14).[56] Second, the internal logic of the laws in Leviticus 18, 20, and Deuteronomy 24:1–4 assumes the reality of a legally binding kinship. This—together with the combination of "leave" (עָזַב) and "hold fast" (דָּבַק)—is why later

[53] All this was as Moses promised: "He will not leave you or forsake [עָזַב] you" (Deut 31:6).

[54] Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 71.

[55] Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 72.

[56] Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 70.

biblical authors speak of marriage as a covenant, despite the absence of the word "covenant" (בְּרִית) in Genesis 2:24.[57]

The significance of marriage's nature as a covenant comes into view as subsequent biblical authors embrace Moses's paradigm and apply it to Yahweh's relationship with Israel. "For your Maker is your husband, the LORD of hosts is his name; and the Holy One of Israel is your Redeemer," as Isaiah explains (Isa 54:5). When Israel acted unfaithfully, the Lord said, "She is not my wife, and I am not her husband" (Hos 2:2), threatening to "strip her naked" and "make her as in the day she was born" (Hos 2:3).[58] Yet though Israel would be punished "for the feast days of the Baals,[59] when she adorned herself with her ring and jewelry, and went after her lovers and forgot me, declares the Lord" (Hos 2:13), God says, "Behold, I will allure her . . . and speak tenderly to her. . . . And in that day, declares the LORD, you will call me 'My Husband' . . . And I will betroth you to me forever" (Hos 2:16, 19).[60] Speaking of that day, Isaiah writes, "You shall no more be termed Forsaken, and your land shall no more be termed Desolate, but you shall be called My Delight Is in Her, and your land Married; for the Lord delights in you. . . . For as a young man marries a young woman . . . and as the bridegroom rejoices over the bride, so shall your God rejoice over you" (Isa 62:5). Finally, the prophet Jeremiah

---

[57] For example, when asked why the Lord did not accept Israel's sacrifices and offerings, the prophet Malachi responds,

> Because the Lord was witness between you and the wife of your youth, to whom you have been faithless, though she is your companion and your wife by covenant. Did he not make them one, with a portion of the Spirit in their union? And what was the one God seeking? Godly offspring. So guard yourselves in your spirit, and let none of you be faithless to the wife of your youth. "For the man who does not love his wife but divorces her," says the LORD, the God of Israel, "covers his garment with violence," says the LORD of hosts. So guard yourselves in your spirit, and do not be faithless. (Mal 2:14–16)

[58] The combination of "nakedness" [עָרוֹם] (cf. Gen 2:25) and the day of her birth would seem to have Edenic echoes, except that in the post-fall world, nakedness is now connected with shame (cf. Gen 3:7, 10–11).

[59] Note the Hebrew wordplay here, in which the false god Baal [בַּעַל] has the same consonants as the Hebrew word translated "husband" [בָּעַל].

[60] The term translated "betrothed" [אָרַשׂ] is elsewhere used exclusively in contexts denoting engagement to be married (Exod 22:16; Deut 20:7; 22:23–28; 28:30; 1 Sam 3:14).

connects the prophecies of Hosea and Isaiah to the new covenant: "Behold, the days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, declares the Lord" (Jer 31:31–32).

The Typological Intent of Male and Female

Much of what I have said so far concerning the nature of the marriage covenant is not novel, but it is necessary to establish the link between marriage and salvation before discussing that the asymmetry of male and female is a vital facet of this typology. One more observation will help in that regard: Attentive readers have noted that the Bible begins and ends with a wedding (Gen 2:23–24; Rev 19:6–9, 21:2, 9). Not only this, but in the same chapters one also finds garden imagery (Gen 2:8–10, 15; 3:1–3; Rev 22:1–3), rivers (Gen 2:10–13; Rev 22:1–2), and fruit (Gen 1:11–12; 1:29; 3:2–3, 6; Rev 22:2). One also sees light that overcomes darkness (Gen 1:3–4; Rev 21:23–24; 22:5), and the mention of the sun and moon (Gen 1:16; Rev 21:23). The serpent finally receives his long-promised defeat (Gen 3:1–14; Rev 20:2, 14ff), and the curse of death is lifted (Gen 2:17; 3:3–4; Rev 20:4–5, 13–14; 21:4–6; 22:2). Garments are prominently feature in both passages (Gen 3:7, 21; Rev 21:8; 22:14). Also seen are cherubim or angelic creatures (Gen 3:24; Rev 21:9, 12; 22:8, 16), barred entry to the presence of God (Gen 3:24; Rev 21:12; 22:14–15), and a sword (Gen 3:24; Rev 19:15, 21). There is much temple imagery (Gen 2:15; 3:8; Rev 21:3, 10–27), and the rarely-mentioned tree of life makes another appearance (Gen 2:9; 3:17, 22; Rev 22:2, 14, 19). All this led Desmond Alexander to conclude, "These passages frame the entire biblical metanarrative."[61]

[61] T. Desmond Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008), 10.

In view of these similarities in the opening and closing chapters of Scripture, there is good reason to expect the asymmetrical sexuality of mankind to form a central part of biblical metanarrative. For this reason, it is not enough to note the covenantal union in the garden, which later biblical authors set forth as a type of God's ultimate saving work. One also needs to see that biblical authors viewed the maleness and femaleness of the persons in that union as a central part of the typology. In other words, the symbolism of the type is not limited to the covenantal union itself but extends to the fact that is a *man* and his *wife* who enter into covenant. This can be demonstrated both theologically and biblically-theologically.

First, consider how the foreknowledge of God changes the way Moses's account of creation is read. David Murray asks, "Why did our Redeemer go to such lengths to provide us with such a varied and diverse world? Partly the reason was that He had an eye to using these things, animals, materials, and so on to teach sinners the way of salvation. He was preparing visual aids for future use."[62] That is to say, our incarnate Lord did not simply look around him for something that seemed like a good metaphor at the time. Instead, it is more accurate to say, as Murray says, "[God] created sheep so He could teach sinners about how He is the Good Shepherd. He created birds to help His redeemed people live less anxious lives. . . . He created lilies and roses so He could compare Himself with them. He created water to explain how He refreshes and revives the thirsty."[63] One might also add, with a little help from William Mouse and Barbara Mouser, "When God created man and woman, what God had in mind was Christ and His Church."[64]

---

[62] David Murray, *Jesus on Every Page: 10 Simple Ways to Seek and Find Christ in the Old Testament* (Nashville Thomas Nelson, 2013), 47.

[63] Murray, *Jesus on Every Page*, 47.

[64] William E. Mouser and Barbara K. Mouser, *The Story of Sex in Scripture* (Waxahachie, TX: International Council for Gender Studies, 2006), 71.

Beyond the theological argument, there are solid biblical-theological grounds for the conclusion that mankind's asymmetrical sexuality is an intended part of salvation typology. To begin, in the previous examples of the Lord's covenant relationship with his people, it is notable that in every case the Lord is typed as the husband and never as the wife. This is truly significant given that the Lord sometimes refers to himself with maternal imagery (Num 11:12; Isa 49:15; Ps 22:8). Furthermore, Israel is frequently called God's "son" (Exod 4:22; Deut 14:1; Jer 3:19; Hos 11:1). These realties introduce the hypothetical potential for the Lord to call himself the "bride" of Israel (his son), *yet no biblical author who employs marriage as a type ever does so*. Instead, every biblical author who employs the marriage covenant as a type always describes the Lord as the "husband" with Israel in the role of his "wife."

Additionally, some biblical authors structure their books on the paradigm that Moses established in Genesis 2:24. For example, James Hamilton has argued that the Song of Songs is not simply a book about love between a man and a woman but is intended (by the author) to be a type of Christ's love for the church.[65] In the first place, the book's setting is divided between a well-tended garden—with a keeper of the vineyard (Songs 1:6) and fruit-bearing trees (Songs 2:3)—and the city of Jerusalem (Songs 1:5), thus evoking both Eden and the New Heavens.[66] Second, the Song's plot is almost entirely bound up with the intimate love of a man and a woman who enjoy each other's nakedness without a hint of shame (cf. Gen 2:25).[67] Third, the "hero" or protagonist in the story is Solomon, who is portrayed as a new Adam (1 Kgs 4:24, 33), who not only built the temple but "made . . . gardens" with fruit-bearing trees (cf. Eccl 2:4–5). He is also David's son, and

[65] James M. Hamilton Jr., *Songs of Songs: A Biblical-Theological, Allegorical, and Christological Interpretation* (Fearn, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2015), 17. Furthermore, if my previous theological argument is sound, then Song of Songs could still serve a typological purpose, even without the human author's awareness.

[66] Hamilton, *Songs of Songs*, 22.

[67] Hamilton, *Songs of Songs*, 24–26.

thus a type of the ultimate Son (2 Sam 7:13–16; cf. 1 Chr 7:11–14).[68] Thus Solomon's pursuit of the woman foreshadows the way in which the Lord—as Israel's husband—will pursue her in the new covenant (Jer 31:31–32). In view of all this, Hamilton concludes, "Solomon knows what he is doing, and he intends to depict a glorious renewal, the consummation of the hopes of the people of God."[69]

Similarly, Moses's typological paradigm of the man leaving his father and mother to cleave to his wife finds special expression in the book of Proverbs. Note that Solomon addresses the book to his son (Prov 1:8), the only such address in the Scriptures. In the opening chapter, he explicitly calls his son to "hear . . . your father's instruction, and forsake not your mother's teaching" (Prov 1:8). The combination of "father" (אָב) and "mother" (אֵם) in a single verse is relatively uncommon (this is a bit surprising, given how much of the Scriptures are given to genealogies). The combination occurs only 75 times in the Old Testament, twelve of which are found in the book of Proverbs alone—more than any other book in the Scriptures. Similarly, combination of "father" (אָב) and "mother" (אֵם) together with man (אִישׁ) or son (בֵּן)[70] occurs only twenty times, more than a third of which (7) are found in the book of Proverbs (1:8; 4:3; 6:20; 10:1; 15:20; 19:26; 28:24). Furthermore, the combination of "father" and "mother" with a verb denoting leaving or forsaking in Proverbs 1:8 (cf. 6:20) is quite striking. The verb used (נָטַשׁ) is not the same used in Genesis 2:24, where a son leaves (עָזַב) his father and mother.[71] Yet the terms are synonyms, as seen in Proverbs 4. Solomon writes, "Hear, O sons, a father's instruction, and be attentive, that you may gain insight, for I give you good precepts; do

[68] Hamilton, *Songs of Songs*, 27.

[69] Hamilton, *Songs of Songs*, 28.

[70] Though Gen 2:24 speaks of a man [אִישׁ] not son [בֵּן] leaving his father and mother, the concept is clearly in view. (For what else is a man to his father and mother but their son?)

[71] Perhaps this change fits the context, since the man "leaves" his parents in neutral sense, whereas Solomon here exhorts his son not to "forsake" his parents' instruction in an exclusively negative sense [תּוֹרָה].

not forsake [עָזַב] my teaching" (Prov 4:1–2). In the next verse he says, "When I was a son with my father, tender, the only one in the sight of my mother, he taught me and said to me, 'Let your heart hold fast my words; keep my commandments, and live'" (Prov 4:3–4).[72]

The promise of "life" conditioned on keeping the father's "commandments" certainly echoes Eden. Furthermore, the book of Proverbs is about a son's choice between two women: the forbidden or strange woman, an adulteress (Prov 2:16) who "leaves/forsakes [עָזַב, cf. Gen 2:24] the companion of her youth, and forgets the covenant of her God" (Prov 2:17)—or the woman who is wisdom personified, whose worth is "more precious than jewels" (Prov 3:15) and who is "a tree of life [עֵץ־חַיִּים] to those who lay hold of her" (Prov 3:18a).[73] Indeed, "those who hold her fast are called blessed" (Prov 3:18b).[74] Peter Leithart notes that both the Forbidden Woman (Prov 5:5, 20) and Lady Wisdom (Prov 9:2, 5) are identified with food (cf. Gen 3:6).[75] But only Lady Wisdom brings gain (Prov 3:14), while the house of the Forbidden Woman "sinks down to death" (Prov 2:18).

By the end of the book, the son has chosen well. As one who has not forsaken his mother's teaching (Prov 31:1; cf. 1:8; 6:20), King Lemuel speaks of "an excellent wife [אִשָּׁה]" (Prov 31:10; cf. Gen 2:22–24), who is "more precious than jewels [פָּנִין]" (cf.

[72] The verb translated "hold fast" [תָּמַךְ] here is not the same that is translated "hold fast" or "cleave" in Gen 2:24 [דָּבַק]. Indeed, דָּבַק is not used anywhere in the book of Proverbs, nor in any of the writings traditionally identified with Solomon. The absence of this term in Solomon's corpus is particularly interesting, given that Song of Songs is universally understood to be about marriage, yet the term Moses designated for that union is nowhere to be found. Perhaps this suggests interpreters should not be so rigid in requiring *exact* verbal or lexical correspondence in cases where one can demonstrate clear *conceptual* and/or symbolic correspondence.

[73] This phrase is nearly identical with עֵץ הַחַיִּים in Gen 2:9; 3:22, 24. Besides Genesis, the book of Proverbs is the only book in the Old Testament to contain the phrase "tree of life" (cf. Prov 11:30; 13:12; 15:4). The book of Revelation is the only other book in the canon to do so (Rev 2:7; 22:2, 14, 19).

[74] Once again, the terms translated "lay hold of" [חָזַק] and "hold . . . fast" [תָּמַךְ] are not the term דָּבַק used in Gen 2:24. See n72 for why this does not destroy correspondence.

[75] Peter Leithart, "Proverbs 31 Woman, [Part] 1," *Theopolis*, March 13, 2018, https://theopolisinstitute.com/leithart_post/proverbs-31-woman-1/.

Prov 3:15; 8:11). Like Lady Wisdom, she brings "gain" (Prov 31:11; cf. 314).[76] She too offers food (Prov 31:15; cf. 9:2, 5). And all this "excellence" (חַיִל) springs from her fear of the Lord (Prov 31:10)—the very thing Solomon tells his son before his departure (Prov 1:7).[77] In other words, the whole book of Proverbs is structured on the pattern that Moses lays out in Genesis 2:24, with a son leaving his father and mother (without forsaking their instruction) in order to hold fast to his wife. And is this not the same pattern seen with our Lord himself, who left his heavenly Father (John 1:14, 18) and his earthly mother (John 19:25–27) in order to cleave to his wife (Eph 5:31–32)?[78] Just as it is not the woman who leaves her father and mother to hold fast to her husband, it is not the church who seeks Christ, nor is the church's union with him one of mutual engagement. Rather, "from heav'n *He* came and sought her, to be His holy bride; with His own blood He bought her, and for her life He died" (Eph 5:25; Rev 21:9; Luke 19:10; cf. Ezek 34:11, 16).[79]

Second Preliminary Conclusion
Regarding Sexual Asymmetry

I have argued that there is both theological and biblical-theological grounds for seeing the sexual asymmetry of mankind as part of God's intentional foreshadowing of Christ's relationship to the church. Furthermore, as seen previously, Moses (and every biblical author after him) consistently describes marriage in terms of the man "taking" a wife, in keeping with his description of a man leaving his father and mother to hold fast

[76] The "gain" of 31:11 is שָׁלָל, while the "gain" and "profits" of 3:14 are סְחַר and תְּבוּאָה, respectively. Once again, for a defense of conceptual correspondence, see n72.

[77] The fear of the Lord is also a repeated refrain throughout the book (Prov 1:29; 2:5; 8:13; 9:10; 10:27; 14:2, 26, 27; 15:16, 33; 19:23; 22:4; 23:17; 28:14). These instances constitute the largest occurrence of the phrase in any book of Scripture by a wide margin.

[78] Like the אֵשֶׁת־חַיִל of Prov 31:10, the church's "virtue" stems not from her own strength, but from her fear of the Lord (31:30). Yet the book of Revelation follows Proverbs in making a sharp contrast between the great prostitute (Rev 17, 19; cf. Prov 2, 5) and the bride of Christ, who has "made herself ready," being clothed with the righteous deeds of the saints (Rev 19:7–8) while she awaits the return of her husband (Rev 21:2).

[79] These lyrics are from S. J. Stone, "The Church's One Foundation" (1866). The capitalization is original; the italics are mine.

to his wife (Gen 2:24). This suggests that, just as Moses had some awareness of the far-reaching implications of the paradigm being established, he also saw something significant in the symbolism of male and female. Subsequent biblical authors picked up on this symbolism, not only using marriage as a type for salvation, but also seeing the man as a type of the Lord within marriage, just as the woman is a type of the people of God as his bride. The male-female dynamics of this type are further reinforced by books like Proverbs and Song of Songs, both of which make extended use of the male-female typology from Genesis 2:24. This strongly suggests that these features are not peripheral to the salvation-as-marriage-covenant type. Finally, the type itself is found in both the opening chapters of Genesis and the closing chapters of Revelation, together with a litany of shared details that suggest these elements are central to the story of Scripture. Without sexual asymmetry, this symbolism does not cohere.

The Headship of the Male

Having already demonstrated the fact of male headship (i.e., representative authority) from both the Genesis account and the apostles' reading of the same,[80] I need not defend that truth again here.[81] Instead, I will show that subsequent biblical authors recognized the paradigm of male headship in Moses's writings and embraced his perspective. Consider, once more, the wording of Genesis 2:24: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh." Immediately after this one read, "The man [אָדָם] and his wife [אִשָּׁה] were both naked and were not ashamed" (2:25). Note that Genesis 2:24 uses אִישׁ to speak in general about what a man must do to hold fast to his wife. However, Genesis 2:25 speaks not of any man in general but of "*the* man/Adam" [הָאָדָם] in particular. Genesis 3:8 again speaks of "the man/Adam and his wife" (cf. 2:25). Even after Eve is named (3:20), Moses

[80] See chaps. 2 and 3, respectively.

[81] Consequently, this section will be much briefer than the two prior sections.

can still speak of "Adam" and "his wife" (4:25). This establishes a pattern of a wife who is known by connection to her husband. In keeping with this pattern, many women are never named at all, even when they feature prominently in the narrative.[82] To be sure, there are many unnamed men in the Bible, but not one of these is married to a *named* wife. Contrarily, many unnamed women are known only by connection to their named husbands.[83] This is precisely the pattern one should expect if the Lord created the man to bear representative authority (headship). Similarly, as the bride of Christ, the church is comprised of those who have been baptized *in the name* (Acts 3:6; 8:12; 10:48) of her *head* (Eph 4:15; 5:23).[84]

The headship implicit in the connection of unnamed women to their named husbands is explicit in Numbers 30. There Moses gives two sets of instructions concerning vows. The first concerns vows made by men (v. 2), the second vows made by women (vv. 3–16). In the single verse addressed directly to men, Moses writes, "If a man vows a vow to the Lord, or swears an oath to bind himself by a pledge, he shall not break his word. He shall do according to all that proceeds out of his mouth" (v. 2). However, the instructions for women are not nearly so brief. First, Moses writes about a vow that woman vows "while within her father's house in her youth" (v. 3). There are two possible outcomes here: First, if her father hears and approves of her vow, then it will stand (v. 4). But if her father opposes her, then "no vow of her, no pledge by which she has bound

[82] E.g., Potiphar's wife (Gen 39:6–9, 19), Lot's daughters (Gen 19), Pharaoh's daughter (Exod 2:5ff), Jephthah's daughter (Judg 11:29–40), Samson's mother/Manoah's wife (Judg 13), Jeroboam's wife (1 Kgs 14:2ff), and Job's wife (Job 2:9; 19:17; 31:10).

[83] E.g., Cain's wife (Gen 4:17), Noah's wife (Gen 7:7, 13; 8:18), Lot's wife (Gen 19:15–16, 28), Moses's Cushite wife (Num 12:1), Gilead's wife (Judg 11:2), Samson's first wife (Judg 14:20), Isaiah's wife (Isa 8:3), Ezekiel's wife (24:16–19). Though they are not wives to the men involved, Peter's mother-in-law is not named (Matt 8:14), and neither is Paul's sister (Acts 23:16). Similarly, when it comes to our Lord himself, his brothers are named while his sisters are not (Matt 13:55–56; Mark 6:3).

[84] A wife taking her husband's name is a custom still upheld in most traditional families, whereby taking the last name of her husband, she symbolically accepts him as her head. Similarly, traditional wedding ceremonies introduce the new couple as "Mr. and Mrs. Husband's-First-Name Husband's-Last-Name," further identifying the bride with her new head, after the father has given her away.

herself shall stand. And the Lord will forgive her, because her father opposed her" (v. 5). Note that this means the woman's father has the final say in whether her vow has any binding merit. Also note that if he "opposes her" (i.e., he rejects her vow), the woman is still guilty for having rashly made it, but she will be forgiven and not held accountable for breaking it. Similarly, if a woman marries "while under her vows or any thoughtless utterance of her lips by which she has bound herself," her new husband has the same opportunity—and authority—to oppose her vows that her father had before him (vv. 6–8). After a parenthetical comment explaining that widows and divorced women must bear their own guilt (v. 9), Moses gives a woman's husband the same authority to establish or nullify any vows which "she vowed in her husband's house" (vv. 10–13), with one important caveat: if a husband hears about a vow and says nothing to oppose it, "He has established them" (v. 14). And if he attempts to make them null and void *after* he has heard of them, "then he shall bear her iniquity" (v. 15).

Though the majority of Christians would count these laws among those that have been fulfilled and abrogated/made obsolete by the new covenant (Heb 8:13), Paul applies the principle of male headship in both 1 Corinthians 11 and Ephesians 5. So even if the particularities of Numbers 30 no longer remain (being part of the mosaic law), the foundational truth on which the laws derived their authority is still in force. In other words, created order remains authoritative and stands behind the laws given here. John Sailhamer makes this connection; however, he appears to get the sequence backward: "The assumed culpability of Adam in Genesis 3 may stem from the principle behind this law."[85] That is, it would be more accurate (both chronologically and theologically) to say that the principle behind this law stems from the assigned culpability of Adam in Genesis (for the law of Moses does not come before the designs of God). In any case, Sailhamer correctly notes

[85] John Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 417.

the parallel: "In [Genesis] 3:6, Adam's wife makes a rash decision in his presence."[86] According to the law set down by Moses, he *should* have said something to "oppose her." Indeed, one's sanctified imagination might even wonder what might have happened if Adam had done so, turning to the Lord with great sorrow over the sin of his wife. Perhaps the Lord would have forgiven her (cf. Num 30:12). Instead, Adam was silent as Eve sinned in this way (cf. Num 30:14), establishing her sin and his own culpability along with it. Hence Romans 5 rightly says, "Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man [not through one man and one woman], and so death spread to all men . . . Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come" (vv. 12, 14). In what sense is Adam a type in Romans 5? He is clearly a type *as the head* of the human race. Hence, it was his sin—not Eve's—that plunged the world into death. Even as another head, another husband, will be needed to make null and void the sins of his bride (cf. Col 2:14). He was without sin (1 Pet 1:22), but in words of Moses, "He shall bear her iniquity" (Num 30:15).

As with the union of male and female, the symbolism of male headship is closely connected to the identity of Christ and his work with the church. Those who aim to eradicate male headship in other spheres (e.g., the church) will destroy more than they intend. For in erasing the headship of the man, they erase one of the biblical-theological supports for Christ's headship in salvation.

The First Man as Prototypical Priest

Shortly after Moses recounts the creation of the paradigmatic man (Gen 2:7), Genesis 2:15 reads, "The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to work/serve [עבד] it and keep/guard [שמר] it." As previously discussed, these are words that, when used together, *always* refer to the duties of the priests in the tabernacle-temple

[86] Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 417.

(Num 3:7–8; 8:25–26; 18:5–6; 1 Chr 23:32; Ezek 44:14).[87] Note that the woman does not receive this commission from the Lord. Indeed, no direct command is given to her in the entire narrative. Yet the Lord does give her a role *in relation to Adam*, saying, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make a helper [עֵזֶר] fit for him" (Gen 2:18). In other words, the man is designated as a kind of prototypical priest in the garden-sanctuary. Not so the woman, but as the priest's helper, she is like a prototype of the women who will serve at the tent of meeting (Exod 38:8, cf. 1 Sam 2:22).

Second, the woman was not alive when the Lord gives the command not to eat from the tree (Gen 2:16–17). Indeed, Moses explicitly says the Lord commands "the man" (הָאָדָם) not to eat of the tree, and every verb in the Lord's instructions has a second masculine singular subject.[88] This further confirms that God gave the command directly to Adam. If it was intended for Eve at all, it must have come to her indirectly *via Adam*. This detail establishes a connection between authoritative teaching and the office of the priest. Moses will later make this explicit in Deuteronomy, where he gives the law "to the priests, the sons of Levi" (31:9) and commanded them to read the law for the people before Israel on festival occasions (31:10–11). This is, in essence, what Adam would have done if he repeated the Lord's command to Eve. Yet the connection between the priestly office and the task of teaching the Law is even more explicit in Malachi 2:7: "For the lips of a priest should guard [שָׁמַר] knowledge [דַּעַת], and people should seek instruction [תּוֹרָה] from his mouth, for he is the messenger [מַלְאָךְ] of the Lord of hosts." Thus, in a single verse, the priest connected with the task of guarding, just as Adam was called to do (Gen 2:15). The thing he is called to guard is "knowledge" (דַּעַת), as in "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Gen 2:9, 17). And part of this guarding requires that he

[87] Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 67. See also Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative*, 100.

[88] And the Lord commanded the man, saying, "You may surely eat [תֹּאכֵל] of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat [לֹא תֹאכַל], for in the day that you eat [אֲכָלְךָ] of it you shall surely die [תָּמוּת]" (Gen 2:16–17).

give instruction to the people as the messenger of the Lord. Once again, it is clear that the biblical authors intend for the reader to see Adam as a priest.

The priestly function of Adam appears to explain why the Aaronic priesthood was limited to men (Exod 40:12–15; Lev 1:8; 21:7; Num 4:2ff; Ezek 44:22). The Lord, through Moses and the biblical authors who embrace his perspective, established a symbolic paradigm in the beginning. Adam, the prototypical priest, anticipates those who come after him.[89] This—together with the principle of male headship—is also one of the reasons why the office of elder/overseer/pastor is limited to (qualified) men.[90] Yet the connection between the pastoral office and the priesthood is one that New Testament authors never explicitly make. Indeed, the elder/overseer/pastor is never referred to as a "priest" (ἱερεὺς), perhaps because of the desire to clearly communicate that the sacrificial portion of the old covenant priesthood has been followed (Heb 9:23–26; cf. 10:11–12). Furthermore, the author of Hebrews takes great pains to establish Christ as our high priest

[89] Though no biblical author makes this connection, it is intriguing to consider that Adam was "without father or mother or genealogy," and in this way he resembled Melchizedek who—"having neither beginning of days nor end of life"—further resembled the Son of God as a priest forever (Heb 7:3).

[90] I take the terms "pastor," "elder," and "overseer" to refer to the same ecclesial office for the following reasons. First, the qualifications given for an "overseer" (ἐπισκοπή) in 1 Tim 3:1–7 and those given for an "elder" (πρεσβύτερος) in Titus 1:5–10 have significant overlap, even identical phrases. For example, both include the ability to teach (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:9). Second, Paul uses the terms "elders" and "overseers" interchangeably in Titus 1:5 and 1:7. Third, when Paul gathers the *elders* (πρεσβυτέρους) of the church in Miletus together in Acts 20:17, he exhorts them to "pay careful to yourselves and to all *the flock* [τῷ ποιμνίῳ], in which the Holy Spirit has made you *overseers* [ἐπισκόπους] *to shepherd* [ποιμαίνειν] the church of God, which he obtained with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). Similarly, Peter exhorts his "fellow *elders*" (1 Pet 5:1) to "*shepherd* [ποιμάνατε] *the flock* [ποίμνιον] of God among you by exercising *oversight* [ἐπισκοποῦντες]" (1 Pet 5:2). And he concludes with a reference not to the "chief Elder" but to the "chief *Shepherd*" [ἀρχιποίμενος], further establishing a link between "elder" and "pastor/shepherd." Finally, Paul mentions "shepherds and teachers" [τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους] in a list that also includes apostles, prophets, and evangelists (Eph 4:11). Note that Paul here refers to *persons*, not skills, as he does when he speaks of "prophecy" (Rom 12:6) or "teaching" (Rom 12:7). Relatedly, Paul clearly distinguishes the office of apostle from ministerial gifts of the Spirit when he says, "God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then miracles, then *gifts* of healing, helping, administrating, and various kinds of tongues" (1 Cor 12:28). Yet in Eph 4:11 Paul does not speak of "apostleship" but of "apostles," not of "prophecy" but of "prophets," not of "evangelism" but of "evangelists," and not of "shepherding and teaching" but of "shepherds and teachers [τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους]," two nouns sharing a single definite article. What is conspicuous by its absence, however, is any mention of "elders" or "overseers" precisely at the point where one might it expect it. The absence of these terms would make sense, however, if Paul sees "shepherds [i.e., pastors] and teachers" (or perhaps the "shepherd-teacher") as constituting an office in the church that is identical with that of "elder" and "overseer."

(Heb 2:17; 3:1; 4:14), while Peter emphasizes the typological fulfillment of Exodus 19:6 in the corporate priesthood of the church (1 Pet 2:4–9).

In what way, then, does the prototypical priesthood of Adam have any bearing on the office of the elder/overseer/pastor? Though the elder/overseer/pastor is never called a priest, he does take priestly duties, albeit in a suitably modified form. The elders are the teachers in the community (Eph 4:11; 1 Tim 4:13; 2 Tim 4:2), just as the priests were in Israel (Deut 31:10–11; 2 Chr 31:4; Mal 2:7). Furthermore, though the church has a collective responsibility to guard her temple-body and purge impurity from her midst (1 Cor 3:16–17; 5:9–13; 2 Cor 6:14–18), the church's officers have the chief responsibility in "guarding the good deposit" (1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14) by "giv[ing] instruction in sound doctrine and also rebuk[ing] those who contradict it" (Titus 1:9). Finally, in as much as the elements of bread and wine represent Christ's body and blood, church traditions that call upon the elders to lead their congregations in the Lord's Supper feature a typological form of the priest's sacrificial ministry, reminding the church of the atoning sacrifice of Christ in the new covenant. As Cyprian of Carthage said, "For, if Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, is Himself the High Priest of God the Father and first offered Himself as a Sacrifice to His Father and command this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly the priest who imitates that which Christ did . . . performs truly in the place of Christ."[91]

---

[91] Cyprian, *Letter 63*, in *St. Cyprian Letters 1–81*, trans. Rose Bernard Donna, Fathers of the Church 51 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1964), 212–13. Protestants may be (understandably) hesitant to speak of any iconic aspect to the pastoral office. Yet there is an early and consistent witness to this facet of pastoral work. For example, John Chrysostom writes, "The priest stands before us, doing what Christ did and speaking what the words that Christ spoke; but the power and grace are from God. . . . It is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit who perform everything; but the priest lends his tongue and supplies his hand." Chrysostom, *On the Treachery of Judas* 1:6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1887), 49:380, quoted in Kallistos Ware, "Man, Woman, and the Priesthood of Christ," in *Women and the Priesthood*, ed. Thomas Hopko (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary, 1999), 45–46.

The Three Types of Priestly Service

Two objections to the implications of the man's prototypical priesthood come up at this point. The first concerns biblical texts that would seem to speak of all God's people (i.e., women as well as men) as being priests. Consider how the Lord promised Israel that "you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod 19:6). One cannot restrict this promise to men in Israel, despite the second masculine plural subject (תִּהְיוּ־) and the word "sons" (בְּנֵי) in the introductory utterance the Lord gives to Moses ("These are the words that you shall speak to the sons [בְּנֵי] of Israel" [Exod 19:6]), for other biblical texts clearly have both women and men in view. For example, the apostle John, speaking to "those who hear and who keep what is written [in his book]" (Rev 1:3) says that Christ has "made us [i.e., his people] a kingdom, priests to his God and Father" (Rev 1:6). In a passage highlighting the universality of Christ's work (Rev 5:9), he also writes, "You have made them a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign on the earth" (Rev 5:10).[92] Similarly, the apostle Peter says the church is a collection of "living stones . . . being built up as a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet 2:5). Again Peter says, "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood,[93] a holy nation, a people for his own possession" (1 Pet 2:9).

On this point the confusion stems from the failure to distinguish three kinds or types of priestly ministry in the Scriptures.[94] First there is the ultimate priesthood of Jesus Christ (Heb. 3:1; 10:21), who represents us before the throne of God (Heb 4:14; 8:1), pleading his blood on our behalf (Heb 9:14). This is the priestly ministry Paul has in view when he says, "There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim 2:5). In this sense, the church has—and can only have—one priest.

---

[92] It would be highly unusual to read this verse as exclusively referring to men when it immediately follows a verse that focuses on the broadest possible scope of Christ's redemption (Rev 5:9).

[93] The Greek phrase here is βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, the same used in Exod 19:6 in the LXX.

[94] See Ware, "Man, Woman, and the Priesthood of Christ," 42–43.

Yet the New Testament authors see no contradiction between calling Jesus the one priestly mediator, while also calling the church a "priesthood" in another sense. This is second type of priesthood in the Scriptures, referring to the universal priesthood of all believers who have been set apart for the service of God (1 Pet 2:5). But this universal priesthood does not contravene the reality of ordained offices within the church.[95] This is the type of ministry Paul seems to have in mind when he cautions Timothy: "Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands" (1 Tim 5:22).[96] Or again Paul says, "For this reason I remind you to fan into flame the gift of God, which is in you through the laying on of my hands" (2 Tim 1:6), possibly referring to Timothy's ordination for the office of evangelist (2 Tim 4:5).[97]

Only the most radical sects of anti-clerical Christianity have refused to acknowledge that the pastor/elder/overseer is an ordained office within the church. For those who accept the office—including traditions that refer to pastors/elders as "priests"—the presence of a priestly role for certain (ordained) members in the church of God is no threat to the royal priesthood of all believers. And it should not be difficult to see why or how this may be so, for the universal priesthood of all believers is no threat to the unique priesthood of Jesus Christ. Therefore, when speaking of the priestly function or duties of the pastoral office, one means that certain aspects of the old covenant priesthood are carried

[95] As Ware explains, "Certain members of the Church are set apart in a more specific way, through praying the laying-on of hands, to serve God in the ministerial priesthood." Ware, "Man, Woman, and the Priesthood of Christ," 42.

[96] Similarly, though there is some debate about the precise meaning of the phrases in view, the author of Hebrews mentions "the laying on of hands" after mentioning "ritual washings" (Heb 6:2), a possible allusion to baptism as well as ordination for pastoral ministry.

[97] I take the evangelist to be an office established for the early stages of the church's growth. Note that the evangelist is not listed with the apostles and prophets in the church's foundation (Eph 2:20), yet the evangelist is listed after those offices in Paul's list given in Eph 4:11 (see n90 for a defense of the view that the "gifts" in Eph 4:7–11 are offices/officers in the church). Not only this, but the word "evangelist" is clearly used in a *titular* fashion of Philip (Acts 21:8). Among those who view the evangelist as a distinct office (and not simply a gifting) the traditional view is that the term designates a close ministry companion of an apostle, bearing some of the apostle's authority yet without *being* an apostle (perhaps due to the lack of an eyewitness encounter with the Lord Jesus). In any case, the argument I am making above does not require the reader to commit to this particular view.

over (e.g., their authoritative teaching ministry), while other priestly duties undertaken by the whole church (e.g., the typological offering of "spiritual sacrifices," cf. 1 Pet 2:5) ought to be carried out by pastors to an exemplary degree (1 Pet 5:3).[98]

The Non-Priestly Prophetess

The second objection to seeing Adam's role as a prototypical as bearing any enduring significance for the church comes from questions about the ministry of the prophetess. In the first place, it is necessary to establish several distinctions between the prophet and the priest in Israel. On this subject, the late Old Testament professor and Cambridge fellow William Henry Bennett notes, "Both prophet and priest are religious personages, otherwise they differ widely in almost every particular; we cannot even speak of them [i.e., prophets] as holding religious offices."[99] At first blush, this surely seems like an overstatement, especially given the divine promise of raising up "a prophet like [Moses]" (Deut 18:15ff, 34:10). Yet, as Bennett notes, "The qualifications, status, duties, and rewards of the priests are all fully prescribed by rigid and elaborate rules," as the relevant sections in Numbers, Leviticus, and Chronicles show.[100] Meanwhile, the description of the prophet is comparatively, even shockingly, brief (Num 12:6; Deut 13:1–5; 18:20–22). Beyond these nine verses in the Torah, we have only the narratives of

[98] Here I part ways with those who insist that the iconic nature of the pastoral office is chiefly seen in his offering of the eucharist. See Ware, "Man, Woman, and the Priesthood of Christ," 46–51. The older view is that the pastor/elder/overseer acts in God's place in all respects, as Ignatius says, "Be eager to do everything in godly harmony, the bishop [ἐπισκόπου] presiding [προκαθημένου] in the place of God." Ignatius, *To the Magnesians* 6:1, in *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed., trans. and ed. Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 207. Interestingly, translator and editor Michael Holmes notes their textual support for the reading "in the *image* [τὐπον] of God" instead of "in the *place* [τόπον] of God." See Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 207n6.1. Though the manuscript evidence is divided, the concept of pastoral representation finds expression in some of Ignatius's other writings. For example, he speaks of "the bishop [ἐπίσκοπον], who is a model [τύπον] of the Father." Ignatius, *To the Trallians* 3:1, in Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 217.

[99] William Henry Bennett, *The Books of Chronicles*, Expositor's Bible (New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1894), bk. III, chap. 9: "The Prophets," §249, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, accessed July 16, 2022, https://ccel.org/ccel/bennett/expositor10/expositor10.v.ix.html.

[100] Bennett, *The Books of Chronicles*, bk. III, chap. 9, §249.

individual prophets, which show a general pattern of receiving a word from the Lord (Jer 1:9; Ezek 2:7; Hos 1:2; Joel 1:1, Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1; Jon 1:1) in order to speak on his behalf (Deut 18:18; cf. Amos 1:3).

Note also that the priesthood was invested with a symbolic authority that prohibited a blemished male from serving in this capacity (Lev 21:16–24). By contrast, no such qualification is given for the prophet, suggesting that it is not their personage but the truth of their message that is the Lord's exclusive concern (cf. Jer 14:14; 23:21, 32; Ezek 13:6). Perhaps this is why, when a (false) prophet failed in their duties, the penalty for their sin was death *for the prophet* (Deut 13:5; 18:20). Contrast this with the failure of a priest, who "bring[s] guilt on the people" (Lev 4:3) by virtue of his representative capacity "to act on behalf of men in relation to God" (Heb 5:1; cf. Lev 16:32–33).

Furthermore, as Bennett notes, "The authority and status of the prophets rested on no official or material conditions, such as hedged in the priestly office on every side."[101] That is to say, while the priesthood required lineage through Aaron (Exod 28:1) or the tribe of Levi (Deut 18:1), the prophets had no genealogical requirement nor succession.[102] Finally, the office of priest involved a form of ordination (Num 8:10, cf. 1 Tim 5:22) and was institutional (Deut 18:1–8; cf. 1 Cor 9:13); the role of the prophet involved no such ordination and was occasional in nature (e.g., 2 Sam 7:4; Hos 1:1; Jer 1:2).[103] "For this reason," Andreas Köstenberger and Margaret Köstenberger write, "the nature of a

[101] Bennett, *The Books of Chronicles*, bk. III, chap. 9, §251.

[102] Bennett takes the "sons of the prophets" (1 Kgs 20:35; 2 Kgs 2:3) to mean "school" of the prophets, which is probably correct. However, he also regards such schools as an attempt to "naturally" bestow the prophetic gift (i.e., by circumventing the supernatural calling of a prophet). Nevertheless, he is right in saying, "The gifts and functions of the prophets did not lend themselves to any regular discipline or organization." See Bennett, *The Books of Chronicles*, bk. III, chap. 9, §252.

[103] For more on the occasional and non-institutional nature of prophets/prophecy, see Thomas Finley, "The Ministry of Women in the Old Testament," in *Women and Men in Ministry: A Complementary Perspective*, ed. Robert L. Saucy and Judith K. TenElshof (Chicago: Moody, 2001), 74–76.

prophet's authority differed from that of kings (politically) and priests (ritually)."[104] Thomas Finley likewise adds, "It would be up to the king or priest to recognize the divine authority of the prophet, or to reject him or her."[105] In this sense, a prophet was a kind of helper to the kings and priests, given by God to keep the latter in check, yet not in a sense of possessing direct authority over them.[106]

The many distinctions between the institutional office of the priest and the occasional role of the prophet already suggest the possibility of different qualifications for each. As just discussed, there was no disqualifying blemish for prophets as there was for priests (Lev 21:16–24). One should not be surprised therefore to find that there are different qualifications in other respects, for example, the possibility of female prophets (prophetesses) in contrast to the male-only priesthood. To be sure, the *fact* of female prophetesses is not debatable, for Miriam (Exod 15:20), Deborah (4:4), and Huldah (2 Kgs 22:14) are explicitly called such (הנביאה). The only question concerns their *function*.[107]

Consider the prophetess Miriam. She is present in four narratives: the rescue of Moses (Exod 2:1–10),[108] the post-exodus Song of Moses (Exod 15:20–21), her and Aaron's opposition to Moses (Num 12:1–16), and her death (Num 20:1ff). Yet only in Exodus 15:20 is she explicitly identified as a prophetess (הנביאה). The passage reads, "Then Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a tambourine in her hand, and all the

[104] Andreas Köstenberger and Margaret Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman: A Biblical-Theological Survey* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 66.

[105] Finley, "The Ministry of Women in the Old Testament," 74.

[106] Finley, "The Ministry of Women in the Old Testament," 74.

[107] This question typically focuses on the apparent (i.e., seeming) contradiction in Paul's words, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet" (1 Tim 2:12). Much has been written about the grammar and syntax of this verse. See Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, eds. *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, 3rd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016). However, the macrostructure of Paul's argument may prove most helpful for our purposes. Specifically, Paul uses Gen 1–3 to ground his prohibition such that the kind of teaching and authority he has in view (in 1 Tim 2:12) is the same sort of teaching and authority Adam exercised in the garden (cf. Gen 2:15–18; Gen 3:17).

[108] Miriam is not mentioned by name here, but tradition identifies her as the sister in Exod 2:4, 7.

women went out after her with tambourines and dancing. And Miriam sang to them: 'Sing to the Lord, for he has triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider he has thrown into the sea'" (Exod 15:20–21).

Calvin notes that it is possible Moses is simply honoring his sister with the title of "prophetess" by virtue of her connection to Moses himself,[109] though one needs not join him in this speculation. He also writes, "[Moses] does not say that she assumed to herself the office of public teaching, but only that she was the leader and directress of the others in praising God."[110] Calvin is not wrong concerning the scant description of Miriam's role in Exodus 15:20–21; however, her words in Numbers 12:2 imply some prophetic function. There she and Aaron ask, "Has the Lord spoken only through Moses? Has he not spoken through us also?" The rhetorical framing of the question strongly suggests that the implied answer to the second question is "yes, the Lord has spoken through her also." Nevertheless, the Lord himself goes on to make a distinction between the gift of prophecy possessed by Aaron and Miriam and the role fulfilled by Moses. In the first instance, the gift of prophecy is likened to spontaneous (i.e., occasional) dreams and visions given directly by the Lord (Num 12:4). By contrast, with Moses the Lord spoke "mouth to mouth, clear, and not in riddles" (Num 12:8a), a distinction that suggests some superiority of rank (Num 12:8b). At the same time, Miriam and Aaron are listed together with Moses in Micah 6:4, where the latter prophet refers to her as an agent of the Lord's redemption.[111]

What, then, is one to make of Miriam the prophetess? Perhaps influenced by her role in leading the women in song and dance (Exod 15:20), Targum Jonathan interprets her prophetic ministry as being limited to women, glossing Micah 6:4 in this way: "I sent before you three prophets: Moses to teach the tradition of the judgments, Aaron to make

---

[109] John Calvin, *Harmony of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, *Calvin's Commentaries*, vol. 2 (Ada, MI: Baker, 1974), 263.

[110] Calvin, *Harmony of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, 263.

[111] See Alastair Roberts, "Miriam, Deliverer of Her People," Adversaria Videos and Podcasts. August 26, 2019, https://adversariapodcast.com/2019/08/26/miriam-deliverer-of-her-people/.

atonement for the people, and *Miriam to instruct the women*."[112] Yet these words are not present in the MT, which simply reads, "I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam."[113] In truth, a consistent teaching on men and women is not in the least threatened by the possibility of Miriam speaking prophetically, even to men. For I have already established that her work existed alongside Moses (Mic 6:8) yet *under him* at the same time (Num 12:8)—not unlike the work of Eve, Adam's helper (Gen 2:18). And since Israel was without a king at this time (cf. Deut 17:14), Moses functioned as a king (Deut 33:4–5). In this way, Deborah's prophetic oracles—regardless of audience—would have been subject to Moses's recognition of their legitimacy.[114] Thus, Deborah's speech did not possess the same sort of representative authority as Moses—or Adam (Gen 2:15–17; 3:17).

The story of Deborah is more complex, for she is not simply said to be a prophetess but also to have been "judging [שפטה] Israel at that time" (Judg 4:4). At a minimum, this suggests the gift of wisdom and discernment.[115] However, given the pre-monarchical function of judges in Israel, it is possible that her role was invested with a considerable amount of authority that would seem to pose a challenge the pattern male representative authority established in the garden. Yet the text provides many clues that Deborah is not who some have made her to be.[116]

---

[112] Translation and emphasis mine. The Aramaic text reads: אֲרֵי אֶסִיקְתָּךְ מֵאַרְעָא דְמִצְרַיִם וּמִבֵּית עַבְדוּתָא פָּרְקְתָּךְ וּשְׁלָחֵית קֳדָמָךְ תְּלָתָא נְבִיִּין מֹשֶׁה לְאַלָּפָא מְסִירַת דִּינִין אַהֲרֹן לְכַפָּרָא עַל עַמָּא וּמִרְיָם לְאוֹרָאָה לִנְשַׁיָּא: Sefaria, "Targum Jonathan on Micah 6," accessed July 17, 2022, https://www.sefaria.org/Targum_Jonathan_on_Micah.6.4?lang=bi.

[113] Perhaps such a radical departure from the text reflects an uneasiness with the prophetess, not unlike John Piper's humble concession of not knowing what to do with such figures: "I admit that Deborah and Huldah do not fit neatly into my view." See John Piper, "Headship and Harmony: Response from John Piper," *Standard* 74, no. 5 (May 1984): 39–40.

[114] Finley, "The Ministry of Women in the Old Testament," 74.

[115] See Köstenberger and Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman*, 67n21.

[116] See Rachel Green Miller, *Beyond Authority and Submission: Women and Men in Marriage, Church, and Society* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2019), 126ff; and Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 77ff.

At the outset, it must be stated that the author of Judges portrays Deborah in a positive light. As Köstenberger and Köstenberger summarize, Deborah is portrayed "as a woman of faith serving the Lord at a time when the priesthood was corrupt."[117] Her actions were a genuine Godsend. Nevertheless, they were distinct from other judges in the book. First, she does not exercise her role directly but waits until others come to her for private wisdom and guidance (Judg 4:5). Second, Deborah urges Barak to discharge his duty (Judg 4:6), thus refusing to usurp the man's place in battle (Gen 3:15; Deut 22:5; cf. Jer 51:30). Third, when Barak refuses to go to battle unless Deborah accompanies him, she agrees to go but also prophesies a rebuke: "I will surely go with you. Nevertheless, the road on which you are going will not lead to your glory, for the Lord will sell Sisera into the hand of a woman" (Judg 4:9).[118]

After the prophecy of Deborah proves true (Judg 4:22), she and Barak compose a song of victory (Judg 5:2ff). It is significant that Deborah identifies herself as "a mother in Israel" (Judg 5:7), thereby deliberately bringing her gender into view.[119] As Alastair Roberts explains, "Her role as judge arose under exceptional circumstances, as civil life in Israel had collapsed (Judges 5:7a), and she seems to be trying to re-establish it [i.e., civil life in Israel] by serving as a mother figure who raises up Barak and his generation to take leadership."[120] Perhaps this is why the author of Hebrews lists Barak, *but not Deborah*, among those who "conquered kingdoms" and "enforced justice" (Heb 11:32). Likewise, Samuel mentions Barak *without Deborah* in his commentary on that period (1

---

[117] Köstenberger and Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman*, 67.

[118] It is sometimes suggested that no rebuke is in view here, but the language of Judg 9:53–54 indicates that a man dying at the hands of a woman was a very grave shame. Even if modern readers balk at this, it remains the case that, at the very least, *Barak* is likely to have shared these cultural expectations.

[119] Similarly, Jael is not grouped with the warriors, but with the tent-dwelling women (Judg 5:24).

[120] Alastair Roberts, "Some Lengthy Thoughts on Women in Leadership," Alastair's Adversaria, December 8, 2011, https://alastairadversaria.com/2011/12/08/some-lengthy-thoughts-on-women-leadership/.

Sam 12:11).[121] None of this should be taken as denigration of Deborah. That her role was essential none can deny. Yet Deborah saw herself not as the judge/leader, nor even as a prophetess (first and foremost), but as a *mother* (Judg 5:7) raising up Israelite sons to be like arrows in the hand of a warrior (Ps 127:3–4). In this way, Deborah was following in the steps of one who went before her, namely, Eve, the mother of all living (Gen 3:20; 4:1). Hence, Deborah viewed her own work, including her prophetic speech, in the category of the "helper" who comes alongside, not the ruler who takes the lead with representative authority—and culpability—for others.

Finally, there is Huldah, who is identified as a "prophetess" in 2 Kings 22:14 and its parallel text, 2 Chronicles 34:22. In the preceding narrative, the book of the Law has just been rediscovered. As his secretary (Shaphan) reads the book to him, Josiah is overcome with remorse for his sins and the sins of his people. So, he sends a convoy of people to ask the prophetess to "inquire the Lord on my behalf, and on behalf of the people . . . concerning the words of this book that has been found" (2 Kgs 22:13a). Köstenberger and Köstenberger note that—unlike Miriam, whose prophesying must be inferred from Numbers 12:2, and Deborah, whose prophecy seems to have been limited to matters of private judgment (Judg 4:4) and *ad hoc* utterances (Judg 4:9)—the description of Huldah implies that she was "well known as a prophetess who truly speaks the word of the Lord. Otherwise, Josiah would have no reason to send his people to her."[122]

Egalitarian scholar Christa McKirland contends that Huldah was "the first person to grant [!] authoritative status to the Torah scroll deposited in the temple treasury."[123] Allegedly complementarian author Aimee Byrd follows suit, suggesting that

---

[121] Köstenberger and Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman*, 68.

[122] Köstenberger and Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman*, 68.

[123] Christa L. McKirland, "'Huldah' Malfunction with the Wardrobe Keeper's Wife," in *Vindicating the Vixens*, ed. Sandra Glahn (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017), 213.

Huldah represents an active feminine "contribution" to the Word of God.[124] Yet these speculations are seriously flawed. To begin, the book of Law was rediscovered *within* the temple (2 Kgs 22:8), which strongly suggests that it already had canonical status before it had been "lost."[125] Huldah's role in this regard was not that of *granting* canonical status on the book of the Law (contra McKirland), but that re-confirming its canonical status after a period of unrecognition. Her role was far from insignificant, but also far from what McKirland and Byrd envision. Further, Köstenberger and Köstenberger note, "There is no presumption of authority exercised of Josiah, *especially since he sends out to hear from Huldah*."[126] That is to say, Huldah did not presume to march into the courts of the king and utter a "Thus saith the Lord." Rather, she waited until she was consulted (just as Deborah had done before her). Again, this does not denigrate the special role the Lord gave to her, but it does show that Huldah prophetess, like the prophetesses Miriam and Deborah before her, lacked the kind of representative authority uniquely bestowed on priests (and kings)—that is, the sort of authority Adam possessed in a way Eve did not.

When reading the garden narrative carefully, therefore, the paradigmatic nature of Genesis alerts to the high probability that what is observed in its opening chapters will enjoy correspondence and escalation over the remainder of the canon.[127] This is precisely what is found. The man's priestly character, with its unique representative authority, is taken up by subsequent biblical authors in their description of priestly duties, priestly

[124] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 46–47.

[125] Roger Beckwith writes, "While the temple stood, the main test of the canonical reception of a book must have been whether or not it was one of those laid up in the Temple." Roger Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder and Harry Sysling (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 44.

[126] Köstenberger and Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman*, 69, emphasis added.

[127] The language of (historical) correspondence and escalation is borrowed from Ellis, foreword to Goppelt, *Typos*, ix–xx.

culpability, and priestly authority. Sometimes all three elements are combined in a single verse (Mal 2:7).

Similarly, the biblical authors show sophistication in distinguishing the role of the prophet from that of the priest: they have differing origins, differing duties, and differing penalties for failing in their duties. These highlight differing kinds of authority: the prophet may deliver God's Word to the people, but only the priest can represent the people before God.[128] In this way, the gendered pattern in the garden permitted both men and women to serve as prophets in some capacity, while that same pattern—embraced by subsequent biblical authors—prohibited women from serving as priests. None of this was arbitrary. Rather, the Lord had in mind the "great high priest" (Heb 4:14) when he appointed men to serve on behalf of his people in relation to God (Heb 5:1). For in so doing, these men were both upholding the pattern of the garden (Gen 2:15–17) and pointing forward to the high priest who would not give in to the temptations of the serpent (Gen 3:15; Matt 4:1–11) as Adam had done (Gen 3:17; Rom 5:12). And because he did not fail, this high priest's bride (Rev 21:9) and helper (2 Cor 6:1) would again be holy and without blemish (Eph 5:25–27) in the new garden of the Lord (Rev 22:1–5).

The implications of the prophet-priest distinction for the Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah narratives are that Christians can (and should) celebrate the works of these women, yet without confusing them for what they are not. Their works follow the paradigm of a helpmeet: Miriam served alongside Moses yet was subordinate to him (Num 12:4–9); Deborah sought to raise sons for battle (Judg 5:7) and to prompt men to take the lead (Judg 4:6, 9); Huldah responded to the summons of her king by using her God-given gifts (2 Kgs 22:14). Churches today do a disservice to men and women alike when they abandon the vision of the sexes that is given in Genesis 1–3 and upheld across

[128] William Henry Bennett, *The Books of Chronicles*, bk. 3, chap. 8: "The Prophets," §226–27, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, accessed July 18, 2022, https://ccel.org/ccel/bennett/expositor10/expositor10.v.viii.html#fna_v.viii-p43.1.

the canon. Such churches not only are robbing them of the joy of discovering their God-given vocations but also are tampering with types of Christ and the church.

Summary of the Argument

In chapter 2, "The Paradigm Established," I demonstrated that Moses was aware that his writings were serving future generations (cf. 1 Pet 1:10–12). This is evident in the way he breaks the narrative with a forward-looking statement: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen 2:24). Since the man lacks both father and mother in the narrative, Moses is clearly establishing a paradigm in the creation account, one he sees as having enduring significance for every man and woman thereafter. Furthermore, I noted that the prevalence of temple imagery in the garden narrative—which subsequent biblical authors embrace and develop—strongly suggests that Moses intended for the reader to see many features of the creation account as paradigmatic for all that follows. This gives good grounds for paying careful attention to particular details in the narrative, looking for ways Moses intentionally highlights or distinguishes different elements in the story. In particular, many differences are found in the creation of the man and the woman—differences that strongly suggest male headship in the sense of representative authority.

In chapter 3, "The Paradigm Explained," I examined the words of Jesus and the writings of his apostles to explore how they interpreted the creation account in Genesis 1–3. For Jesus and his apostles are hermeneutical examples (1 Cor 11:1), showing how to interpret the words of those who went before them. In this regard, it is significant that each time Paul gives extended treatment to Genesis 1–3 (cf. 1 Cor 11:2–16; Eph 5:22–33; 1 Tim 2:8–15), he does so with a view to its enduring relevance for men and women in the household of God. Not only this, but also Paul attributes theological significance to many of the same details first observed in Genesis 1–3. Most significantly, in every case one finds that Paul's application of Genesis 1–3 confirms the paradigm that Moses established:

the man was made to be the priestly head, with representational authority, and the woman was made to be his God-given helper.

Finally, in the present chapter (chap. 4, "The Paradigm Exemplified"), I sought to show that biblical authors between Moses and Paul also saw the paradigm of Genesis 1–3 in the same fashion, embracing Moses's perspective and developing it in various ways. First was a robust asymmetry of the sexes, which biblical authors consistently uphold with unique patterns of language that both reflect and reinforce the differences in God's design. Second, the biblical authors embrace Moses's paradigm for marriage, maintaining strict typology for the Lord in the role of "the pursuing husband" and his people in the role of "the pursued wife," complete with wedding garments appropriate for the occasion (Isa 61:10; Rev 21:2). Some authors even structure entire books on the pattern of the man who seeks his bride (e.g., Prov, Songs), reinforcing the covenantal union between a man and his wife as a type of salvation (Jer 31:31–33; Eph 5:32; Rev 21:9).

Moving on to matters related to headship, authority, and representation, Moses patterned the laws regulating the vows of women (Num 30) after the principle of male headship and the man's culpable representation of humanity in the garden (Gen 3:7, 9, 17). This pattern finds expression in various laws and figures of speech through Scripture, and it proves typologically significant to Paul's theology of sin and salvation (Rom 5:12–21; cf. 1 Cor 15:21–22). Relatedly, this chapter explored Adam's designation as a kind of priest and Eve's designation as a "helper" who ministers in a different capacity alongside him in the garden-temple of Eden. The biblical authors show sophistication in their description of various offices in Israel, and, later, in the church, carefully preserving the symbolism of the paradigm Moses first laid down. To be sure, the chief concern of the biblical authors is the glory of Jesus Christ. However, the sexual differences of man and woman are divinely designed instruments for highlighting this glory. In other words, as Mouser and Mouser rightly conclude, "Sexuality. . . is *the* framework that God Himself uses to relate

the history of creation from Genesis through Revelation."[129] What therefore God has joined together, let no one put asunder.

[129] Mouser and Mouser, *The Story of Sex in Scripture*, 97, emphasis original.

CHAPTER 5

PARADIGM EXPLORED: THE IMPLICATIONS OF GENESIS 1–3 FOR GENDER AND SEXUALITY

At the outset of this study, I noted the prevalence of anthropological debates today, especially those related to gender and sexuality. This is no mystery to anyone who has been paying attention for the last few decades. Yet it is important to note that these debates, while centrally about anthropology, also touch upon theology, ecclesiology, and bibliology. For this reason, the implications of Genesis 1–3 are vast in scope and in significance.

Genesis 1–3 ought to feature prominently in the aforementioned debates because it recounts God's design for all things, especially mankind. The significance of these opening chapters is not happenstantial, however. I have argued that Moses was sufficiently aware of the far-reaching implications of Genesis 1–3 for humanity as a whole and for men and women in their particular sexual identities. I have also shown that subsequent biblical authors embraced the sexual paradigm that Moses established, presenting their writings on the sexes in ways that consistently affirm and develop the same across the canon. In other words, the biblical authors are aware of Moses's intentions, and they repeatedly demonstrate their agreement by employing types that escalate in significance through the end of the canon (Rev 19–22) and by deriving prescriptive instructions for the sexes from Moses's descriptive account of their creation.

Therefore, in view of the enduring relevance ascribed by the biblical authors to the opening chapters of Scripture, there are sufficient biblical and theological grounds for exploring the implications of the sexual paradigm established in Genesis 1–3. First, I will consider the implications of Genesis 1–3 for framing intra-Christian debates about the

sexes. Second, I will consider the implications of Genesis 1–3 for the most pressing theo-cultural issue of our time.[1]

Genesis 1–3 and the Framing of Intra-Christian Debates

This section will argue the implications of Genesis 1–3 for framing intra-Christian debates about the sexes.[2] First, I will argue that a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 supports the basic core of the traditional Christian view of the sexes, which is today represented by the position known "broad complementarianism."[3] Second, I will show that a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 refutes the common objection that it relies on sparse prooftexts. On the contrary, the traditional view is the one most strongly supported by a biblical-theological reading of the Scriptures. Finally, I will demonstrate that a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 shows that male headship, which entails the concepts of authority and hierarchy, is not a postlapsarian development. This establishes the enduring relevance of the paradigm while undermining the application of a trajectory hermeneutic to the sexes.

---

[1] The term "theo-cultural" is meant to reflect the fact that culture is "religion externalized" (cf. Acts 17:22–23; Rom 12:2) as famously described by Henry Van Til. See Henry R. Van Til, *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (1959; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 179–89.

[2] The "intra-Christian" designation denotes the stated profession of the authors who hold these views. It should go without saying that some claim the name of Christ while doing the opposite of what he says (Luke 6:46). This includes "ignorant and unstable" people who inadvertently "twist" the Scriptures to disastrous consequences (2 Pet 3:16). Yet others claim the name of Christ while "denying the Master who bought them" (2 Pet 2:1). They may have an appearance of godliness, but they deny its very source (2 Tim 3:5) by refusing to submit to what he has revealed. Such people do not belong to the believing community (1 John 2:19), despite their self-designations (Matt 7:21–23). Though it can be difficult to discern the ignorantly wayward from the willfully subversive, the Lord himself will one day reveal all this (1 Cor 3:10–15). In the meantime, the Scriptures say, "'The Lord knows those who are his,' and, 'Let everyone who names the name of the Lord depart from iniquity'" (2 Tim 2:19).

[3] I will define both "the traditional view of the sexes" and its relationship to "broad complementarianism" in the next section.

The Traditional View of the Sexes: Defined and Defended

In my opening chapter I categorized three groups of views found in intra-Christian debates about the nature and relation of the sexes. The first of these groups holds to what I have called the traditionalist view. I chose this terminology because the term "traditional" asserts the existence of a recognizable core of Christian consensus on the sexes that has been affirmed almost universally from the earliest stages of church history through the middle of the twentieth century. Namely, Genesis 1–3 shows that the sexes, though equally made in God's image (1:27), are asymmetrical by design. Furthermore, this asymmetry fits the man in his priestly calling (2:15) and his headship or representative authority (2:16–17; 3:17). Women likewise are "fitted" to be "helpers" to the man (2:18) and mothers of all living (3:20). In brief, then, this consensus affirms the asymmetry of the sexes and consonance between their respective callings and constitutions. For example, Chrysostom writes, "This is again a second superiority, nay, rather also a third, and a fourth, the first being, that Christ is the head of us, and we of the woman; a second, that we are the glory of God, but the woman of us; a third, that we are not of the woman, but she of us; a fourth, that we are not for her, but she for us."[4] The same views are affirmed by Augustine,[5] Aquinas,[6] John Calvin,[7] Herman Bavinck,[8] and most of the evangelicals

[4] John Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," in *Homilies on First Corinthians*, trans. Talbot W. Chambers, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 12, *Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 153.

[5] Augustine, *Confessions* XIII.47, trans. Sarah Ruden (New York: Modern Library, 2017), 478.

[6] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (1920; repr., n.p.: New Advent, 2017), I, Q. 92, Articles 1–4, accessed January 24, 2024, https://www.newadvent.org/summa/1092.htm.

[7] John Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, *Calvin's Commentaries*, trans. John Pringle, vol. 20 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 467.

[8] Herman Bavinck, *The Christian Family*, trans. Nelson D. Kloosterman (Grand Rapids: Christian's Library, 2012), 115.

who tend to identify with the label "complementarian."[9] In addition, both the Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church continue to maintain a similar view.[10] In other words, the traditionalist view is so called because it best reflects the faith that Vincent of Lérins described as "that which has been believed everywhere, always, by all."[11]

There are also noted detractors of the "traditional" terminology. Sarah Sumner explicitly distinguishes the complementarianism of Wayne Grudem and John Piper from "church tradition."[12] She also contends that complementarians and egalitarians are both "trying to bring reform to the church's view of women," with complementarians insisting that a woman's *worth* is equal to a man's, while egalitarians insist that a woman's *rights* are equal to a man's.[13] Yet for Sumner, "Both are revising church tradition."[14] She bases this claim on her sense that the core of church tradition is the belief "that women are by nature lower than men."[15] She goes on to quote a few passages from Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustine, and Aquinas. After surveying a few quotes from each, Sumner concludes, "Though many conservative pastors think it's good to be traditional in their thinking about women, surely we can see that it is not. If anyone ever dared to preach a truly traditional

---

[9] See John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds., *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991).

[10] The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* refers to the sexes as "equal persons . . . and complementary as masculine and feminine." See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 2000), §372. Similarly, the Catechism of the Catholic Church restricts the priesthood to men (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* §1577). For an extended rejection of women in the priesthood in the Eastern Orthodox church, see Thomas Hopko, ed., *Women and the Priesthood* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1999).

[11] Vincent of Lérins, *A Commonitory for the Antiquity and Universality of the Catholic Faith Against the Profane Novelties of All Heresies* 2.6, trans. C. A. Heurtley, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Series 2, vol. 11, *Sulpitius Severus, Vincent of Lerins, John Cassian*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 132.

[12] Sarah Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church: Building Consensus on Christian Leadership* (Downers Grown, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 40.

[13] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 40.

[14] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 40.

[15] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 40.

sermon on the nature of women, they would instantly be judged as bigoted and unfit to teach the Word."[16] And again she says, "Traditional Christian thinking is not the same thing as biblical thinking about women."[17]

Unfortunately, Sumner makes several critical mistakes that misconstrue the core of the traditional view of the sexes. She first cites Tertullian, who enjoins women to adorn "humble garb" and "meanness [lowliness] of appearance" as a kind of "penitence."[18] He also calls women "the devil's gateway" and destroyer of God's image in man.[19] Without question, these are harsh words, and Protestants are under no obligation to defend Tertullian in any place where he departs from the Scriptures. Nevertheless, it is significant that Tertullian grounds the reason for his claims not on the natural constitution of the woman but on "the ignominy . . . of the first sin, and the odium (attaching to her as the cause) of human perdition. . . . The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too."[20] As shown in previous chapters, Tertullian's exegesis leaves much to be desired. Placing the blame for the fall onto Eve completely misses the teaching of Moses that Adam, not Eve, was ultimately responsible (Gen 2:16–17; 3:17)—a truth that Paul clearly recognized (Rom 5:12). Even so, Tertullian's point does not seem to be that woman, by virtue of her being a woman, is ignominious in herself. Rather, Tertullian's argument is that all women, as types of Eve, would bear in their bodies the due penalty of *her* error.[21]

---

[16] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 45.

[17] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 45.

[18] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women" I.1, trans. S. Thellwall, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and Cleveland Coxe, vol. 4, *Fathers of the Third Century: Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 14.

[19] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," 14.

[20] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," 14.

[21] Tertullian, "On the Apparel of Women," 14.

This is a significant point because Tertullian is not alone in his (mis)interpretation that the woman's postlapsarian condition is predicated on Eve-as-prototypical-woman's sin. Martin Luther writes, "If Eve had persisted in the truth, she would not only *not* have been subjected to the rule of her husband, but she herself would also have been a partner in the rule which is now entirely the concern of males."[22] Luther also states,

> Hence it follows that if the woman had not been deceived by the serpent and had not sinned, she would have been the equal of Adam in all respects. For the punishment, that she is now subjected to the man, was imposed on her after sin and because of sin, just as the other hardships and dangers were: travail, pain, and countless other vexations. Therefore Eve was not like the woman of today; her state was far better and more excellent, she was in no respect inferior to Adam, whether you count the qualities of the body or those of the mind.[23]

Here again I have already demonstrated that such a view of the man's headship comports neither with the details of Moses's own account nor with the apostolic interpretation of the same.[24] Yet Luther's view is noteworthy for two reasons. First, like Tertullian, Luther grounds his views of women not in some divinely designed inferiority of worth (contra Sumner's claim) but in his understanding of the fall and its consequences.[25] Second, even with his view of postlapsarian woman, Luther plainly asserts the dignity of women:

---

[22] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis 1–5*, ed. Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, trans. George V. Schick, Luther's Works 1 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1958), 203, emphasis added.

[23] Luther, *Lectures on Genesis 1–5*, 202–3.

[24] See especially 1 Cor 11:2–16 and Eph 5:22–33, where the headship of the man is connected not with Eve's fall, but with the prelapsarian designs of God.

[25] It is true that Luther calls Eve "talkative and superstitious," "simple, "weak," and "little." See Martin Luther, *Reihenpredigten über 1. Mose (1523/24)*, Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe 24, ed. J. K. F. Knaake (Weimar: Böhlaus, 1883), 83–84, quoted in Mickey L. Mattox, "Luther on Eve, Women, and the Church," in *The Pastoral Luther: Essays on Martin Luther's Practical Theology*, ed. Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), 257. At first blush, these comments would seem to lend credence to the claim that the traditional view of the sexes holds to the intrinsic inferiority of the woman. However, Luther appeals to verses like 1 Pet 3:7, which refers to women as "the weaker vessel" [ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει], and 1 Tim 5:13, which enjoins younger widows not to become "idlers," "gossips," and "busybodies, saying what they should not." And though he does not do so, Luther could also have appealed to the "weak women" [αἰχμαλωτίζοντες γυναικάρια] of 2 Tim 3:6 or the gendered component in the "silly myths" or *wives'* tales [γραώδεις μύθους] that Paul warns against (1 Tim 4:7). In other words, it is not intrinsically contradictory to affirm the equality of a woman's dignity and her greater potential for

> We are exactly as [God] created us: I a man and you a woman. Moreover, he wills to have his excellent handiwork honored as his divine creation, and not despised. The man is not to despise or scoff at the woman or her body, nor the woman the man. But each should honor the other's image and body as a divine and good creation that is well-pleasing unto God himself.[26]

Another significant mistake that Sumner makes is related to misunderstanding some of the historical sources she cites. For example, she quotes Ambrose of Milan's work, *Paradise*, where Ambrose writes, "Hence, although created outside Paradise, that is, in an inferior place, man is found to be superior, whereas woman, created in a better place, that is to say, in Paradise, to found to be inferior."[27] Sumner says of this quote, "Apparently, for Ambrose, no qualification needs to be made. To him, it was a brute fact of nature that men are superior to women."[28] Yet this is not the meaning of Ambrose's words in context. Instead, his particular concern throughout this section of *Paradise* is why the woman would have been approach first instead of the man. He writes,

> [The Devil] contrived not to attack Adam first. Rather, he aimed to circumvent Adam by means of the woman. He did not accost the man who had in his presence received the heavenly command. He accosted her who had learned of it from her husband and who had not received from God the command which was to be observed. There is no statement that God spoke to the woman. We know that he spoke to Adam. Hence we must conclude that the command was communicated through Adam to the woman.[29]

Here Ambrose appears poised to conclude that Eve was targeted first because of the greater ease with which Satan could deceive the one who received the command indirectly. However, his reading of 1 Timothy 2:14 ("Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor") prevents him from coming to this conclusion. Instead, Ambrose surmises that there must have been some difference between the man

---

certain sins (just as a men have a greater tendency for other sins). This is simply what it means to affirm *both* the goodness *and* the asymmetry of the sexes.

[26] Martin Luther, *The Estate of Marriage*, in Luther's Works 45, *The Christian in Society II*, ed. Walther I. Brandt (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1962), 17–18.

[27] Ambrose, *Paradise*, in *St. Ambrose: Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*, trans. John J. Savage, Fathers of the Church 42 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1961), 301.

[28] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 43.

[29] Ambrose, *Paradise*, 333.

and the woman that made the one more prone to this particular kind of temptation. Such a supposition is not entirely without *prima facie* scriptural support (cf. 1 Pet 3:7; 2 Tim 3:5). Yet even if one disagrees with Ambrose on this point of interpretation, it is important to note that he does not argue from the general inferiority of the woman as a *premise* but reasons his way to some particular inferiority or weakness in the woman as a *conclusion*. This is not prejudicial misogyny but sincerely attempted exegesis.

It is true that the language of "superior" and "inferior" is used in ancient and medieval commentaries on the nature of man and woman. For example, Chrysostom writes, "Man was first formed, and elsewhere he shows their superiority."[30] Likewise Calvin, commenting on 1 Corinthians 11, says, "On this account, all women are born that they may acknowledge themselves as inferior in consequence to the superiority of the male sex."[31] In every case, however, the context makes clear that the use of "superior" and "inferior" refer not to worth or dignity, but to order and subordination. Hence, in that same place Calvin says, "Paul means nothing more than this—that it should appear that the man has authority, and that the woman is under subjection."[32] Similarly, Aquinas distinguishes between a "servile subjection," which is due to sin, and "another kind of subjection which is called economic of civil, whereby the superior makes use of his subjects for their own benefit and good; and this kind of subjection existed even before sin."[33] This use of "superior" next to "subject" is also helpful in showing that the language of "superior" refers

[30] John Chrysostom, "Homily IX on 1 Timothy 2:11–15," in *Homilies on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, trans. C. Marriot, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 13, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 435.

[31] Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, 467.

[32] Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, 467.

[33] Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, Q. 92, Art. 1, ad. 2.

not to intrinsic greatness or virtue, but to the notion of authority and subordination.[34] For this reason the apostle Peter writes, "Wives, be subject [ὑποτασσόμεναι] to your own husbands" (1 Pet 3:1).[35] In the same way, Calvin speaks of women "keep[ing] within their own rank,"[36] saying, "Since, therefore, God did not create two chiefs of equal power, but added to the man an inferior [i.e., subordinate] aid, the apostle justly reminds us of that order of creation in which the eternal and inviolable appointment of God is strikingly displayed."[37]

Sumner is not alone in her claim that the traditional view of the sexes consisted in the belief that that women are "by nature lower than men."[38] Andrew Bartlett's more recent book, *Men and Women in Christ*, makes the same argument. His introductory chapter states, "The traditional interpretation of the Bible, *to the effect that women are innately inferior to men*, has rightly been rejected as being based more on a patriarchal culture than on the actual text."[39] Again, similar to Sumner, Bartlett makes a distinction a between "the traditional view" and complementarianism, stating that complementarians no longer argue for "female inferiority" but "rely on the detailed contents of particular

[34] Question 104 in the *Summa* concerns whether a man is bound to obey another. There he writes, "In human affairs, in virtue of the order of natural and divine law, inferiors are bound to obey their superiors." Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, Q. 104, Art. 1. Speaking of the Christian duty to disobey superiors who contradict the Lord, Aquinas cites Acts 5:29 and writes, "Now sometimes the things commanded by a superior are against God. Therefore, superiors are not to be obeyed in all things" (Art. 5). Inferiors are not subject to their superiors in all things, but only in certain things and in a particular way" (Art. 5). Again he says, "Inferiors are not subject to their superiors in all things, but only in certain things and in a particular way" (Art. 6).

[35] Wayne Grudem notes that in Greek literature contemporary to the time of the Septuagint and the New Testament, the word translated "submit" invariably refers to the actions of one who is subject to another's authority. See Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than One Hundred Disputed Questions* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 188–200.

[36] John Calvin, *The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, *Calvin's Commentaries*, vol. 21, trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 67.

[37] Calvin, *The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, 67.

[38] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 40.

[39] Andrew Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ: Fresh Light from the Biblical Texts* (London: Inter-Varsity, 2019), 16, emphasis added.

texts" (Eph 5:22–33; Col 3:18–19; 1 Pet 3:1–7; 1 Cor 11:3) and "a hierarchical reading of Genesis 2–3."[40] Toward the end of the book, Bartlett claims that the complementarian and egalitarian debates have arisen "after it became clear that the traditional view of *women's innate inferiority* was out of step with Scripture."[41]

The problem with analyses like those given by Sumner and Bartlett, which argue that Christians assumed an "innate inferiority" of women, is that they persistently misunderstand the use of key terms in their historical contexts. As I have already shown, the word "superior" and "inferior" were routinely used in pre-modern contexts—of both men as well as women—in reference to their rank or position, not their intrinsic worth or dignity.[42] Such accounts also fail to do justice to the biblical texts themselves, which speak far more strongly of a wife's relationship to her husband than modern readers tend to be comfortable with. For example, Peter says that Sarah "obeyed [ὑπήκουσεν] Abraham, calling him lord/master [κύριον]" (1 Pet 3:6). Yet if, as Sumner and Bartlett maintain, the biblical texts are free from the alleged misogyny of church history, they need to contend with texts like these, which certainly seem to fit the (historically contextual) use of "superior" and "inferior" more naturally than they appear ready to admit.[43]

On top of all this, complementarian author Sharon James notes that such claims about the traditional view of the sexes in Christianity do not square with the actual course

[40] Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 17. For the present, I will set aside Bartlett's claim that complementarians seem to rely on "particular texts," but it should be noted that this is an especially ironic comment, given the author's privileging of 1 Cor 7 throughout his book.

[41] Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 338, emphasis added.

[42] For further reading on the pre-modern world's conception of hierarchy and dignity, see Sharon James, *God's Design for Women in an Age of Gender Confusion* (Welwyn Garden City, England: Evangelical, 2019), chap. 1.

[43] Similarly, Aimee Byrd completely ignores this passage in *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, a book that aims to carve out a mediating position between complementarianism and egalitarianism. Similarly, Byrd fails to address 1 Cor 11:2–16 and 1 Tim 2:8–15.

of history.[44] For, as secular scholar Tom Holland has admits, the foundation for "human rights" in the West is none other than the same Christian tradition that authors like Sumner and Bartlett want to condemn as a harmful relic of an ignorant and misogynistic era in the past. If this were so, one wonders why in every place that Christianity spread women were better treated than in their former pre-Christian societies.[45] In other words, if the *core* of the traditional Christian view of the sexes were indeed the "innate inferiority" of women, then one should expect precisely the opposite effect of what actually transpired when Christianity took root in various cultures.[46] For this reason it is more accurate to locate the core of the traditional view of the church in the asymmetry of the sexes, which the Lord created differently, with differing (i.e., complementary) strengths and weaknesses ordered toward their differing callings and relations.

Seen in this light, complementarianism is not a departure from the traditional view of the sexes, contra Sumner, Bartlett, et al., but an extension and refinement of the tradition. This is especially true of the subset of complementarians known as "broad" or "thick" (as opposed to "narrow" or "thin") complementarianism.[47] Though the broad/thick

[44] Sharon James, "Fresh Light or Less Light? A Review Article of Andrew Bartlett's *Men and Women in Christ*," *Eikon* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2020): 171–91.

[45] Tom Holland, *Dominion: How the Christian Revolution Remade the World* (New York: Basic, 2019), 31.

[46] Besides all this, the authors cited by Sumner and Bartlett have many other passages where they speak plainly of the equality and dignity of women in other respects. For example, Augustine writes, "[W]oman also, in physical terms, has been made for man. In her mind, of course, *she has an equal natural endowment for reasoning intelligence*, but in her physical sex she is in subjection to the male sex." See Augustine, *Confessions* XIII.47, 478. So also, Chrysostom, in the same place where he says a house is not a democracy, insists that a wife's obedience to her husband should be 'free," not servile. And to husbands he says, "Yea, even if it shall be needful for you to give your life for her, yea, and to be cut into pieces ten thousand times, yea, and to endure and undergo any suffering whatever — refuse it not." John Chrysostom, "Homily XX on Ephesians," in *Homilies on Ephesians*, trans. Gross Alexander, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 13, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 143–44. Such writings need to be considered alongside the snippets quoted by Sumner, Bartlett, et al., demonstrating that the traditional view of the sexes was anything but one of a unilateral dictator over against an ontologically inferior subservient.

[47] Andrew Naselli credits Kevin DeYoung for coining the broad and narrow terminology in a private meeting of Together for the Gospel speakers in 2018. See Andrew D. Naselli, "Does Anyone Need

and narrow/thin groups share common commitments to the equality and complementary asymmetry of the sexes, the two positions can be distinguished by the following features. Jonathan Leeman notes that narrow complementarians tend to be "driven . . . by a biblicist (Bible only) impulse," limiting what can be said about the sexes to what is *explicitly* prescribed or proscribed in Scripture.[48] Leeman explains that broad complementarians, in contrast, tend to be "driven by a theological impulse," placing biblical "precepts inside of a large theological 'vision' of 'definition' of manhood and womanhood."[49] For this reason, narrow complementarians tend to restrict the significance of sexual asymmetry to marriage and pastoral ordination, whereas broad complementarians see farther-reaching significance for the sexual asymmetry in God's design.[50] To give a simple example, Kathy Keller (a narrow complementarian) writes, "Anything that an unordained man is allowed to do, a woman is allowed to do."[51] Such a view evidently does not see any underlying *significance* or purpose for sexual asymmetry. Broad complementarians, by contrast, would not only *not* agree with the previous statement, but would explain that biblical prescriptions and proscriptions for the sexes are rooted in a fundamental consonance between male and female constitutions and the differentiated callings assigned to each—precisely as the traditional view of the sexes affirms.

The essential similarity between the traditional view of the sexes and so-called broad complementarianism has not always been appreciated by complementarians themselves. For example, Piper and Grudem write, "We are uncomfortable with the term

---

to Recover from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood? A Review Article of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*," *Eikon* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2020), 114n10.

[48] Jonathan Leeman, "A Word of Empathy, Warning, and Counsel for 'Narrow' Complementarians," *9Marks*, February 8, 2018, https://www.9marks.org/article/a-word-of-empathy-warning-and-counsel-for-narrow-complementarians.

[49] Leeman, "A Word of Empathy, Warning, and Counsel."

[50] See Naselli, "Does Anyone Need to Recover," 116–17, table 1.

[51] Kathy Keller, *Jesus, Justice, & Gender Roles: A Case for Gender Roles in Ministry*, Fresh Perspectives on Women in Ministry (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 21.

'traditionalist' because it implies an unwillingness to let Scripture challenge traditional patterns of behavior."[52] The problem is that such language, while aiming to preserve Scripture's unique role as the final source of authority for faith and practice,[53] gives the impression that complementarianism is a sharp break from the core of the view that has been handed down through the ages. Sumner and Bartlett consider this alleged novelty as a positive development,[54] while others, like Zachary Garris, are prone to see such moves as a departure from the traditional view.[55]

This extended discussion of terminology is significant because those who prefer the term "complementarianism" stress the continuity of their perspective with the core of the traditional view of the sexes. The failure to do so will suggest novelty where there is actually essential agreement, if not on every point, at least on the core emphases (i.e., the asymmetry of the sexes and consonance between the callings and constitutions and men and women). This not only helps unify perspectives among potential allies (e.g.,

[52] Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, xiv.

[53] For example, the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith, following the Westminster Confession of Faith, says, "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." *The 1677/89 London Baptist Confession of Faith*, "Chapter I, Of the Holy Scriptures," Christian Classics Ethereal Library, accessed January 26, 2024, para. 9, https://www.ccel.org/creeds/bcf/bcf.htm. These confessions also stress "a due use of ordinary means" (para. 7). Stephen Wellum has argued this phrase was meant to include "tradition and confessions" in a "ministerial role in our reading of Scripture and the doing of theology that we ignore to our peril. . . . We do not approach the Bible or theology *de novo*. We stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before us." Stephen Wellum, *From Canon to Concept*, vol. 1 of *Systematic Theology* (Brentwood, TN: B & H, 2024), 360.

[54] Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*, 45; Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 16.

[55] See Zachary Garris, *Masculine Christianity* (Ann Arbor, MI: Reformation Zion, 2020), chap. 3, "Complementarianism's Compromise." For my part, I think Garris misreads portions of *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. For example, he takes Piper and Grudem to task for rejecting the term "hierarchicalist" (60). But Piper and Grudem are clear that they do so in order to stress equality of being, not because they reject hierarchy. Garris also faults *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* for a supposed failure to root gender roles in nature. But the Danvers Statement explicitly states, "Distinctions in masculine and feminine roles are ordained by God as part of the created order"—with "created order" functioning as a classical (some would say traditional!) designation for nature. See Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, "The Danvers Statement," accessed December 31, 2023, https://cbmw.org/about/danvers-statement/.

Piper/Grudem and Garris) but also shows egalitarianism and other mediating conceptions of the sexes to be the innovationists that they are. As Denny Burk rightly says,

> The word "complementarianism" is . . . *a new term coined to refer to an ancient teaching* that is rooted in the text of Scripture. On the contrary, egalitarianism is the doctrinal innovation, not the biblical idea that men and women are created equally in God's image with distinct and complementary differences. . . . Some version of what we now call 'complementarianism' is what the church has assumed for its entire 2,000-year history. Recent attempts to flip this script amount to unserious historical revisionism.[56]

Speaking of unserious historical revisionism, Beth Allison Barr's *The Making of Biblical Womanhood* is a recent work that deserves sharp critique.[57] Barr's basic thesis is that complementarianism is a patriarchal[58] "gender hierarchy that subordinates women to men" as a significant *departure* from the Christian view of the sexes in the pre-modern era.[59] She writes, "While Paul's writings about women were known consistently through church history, it wasn't until the Reformation era that they began to be used systematically to keep women out of leadership roles."[60] In addition to several serious historical inaccuracies that border on outright misrepresentation,[61] Barr's claims are especially ironic

---

[56] Denny Burk, "Is Complementarianism a Man-Made Doctrine?" *Eikon* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2021), 24, emphasis added.

[57] Beth Allison Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How the Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2021).

[58] It should be noted that the term "patriarchy," which means "father rule," is not universally despised, despite Piper's rejection of the term. See John Piper, "A Vision of Biblical Complementarity," in Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 53. Yet in the same volume, David J. Ayers uses the term with neutral connotations. See David J. Ayers, "The Inevitability of Failure: The Assumptions and Implications of Modern Feminism," in Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 371–96. Others acknowledge the term's accuracy while suggesting that, due to negative connotations, terms such as "patricentrism" should be preferred. See Andreas Köstenberger and Margaret Köstenberger, *God's Design for Man and Woman: A Biblical-Theological Survey* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014), 59–60. Still others openly prefer the term "patriarchy," aiming to redeem its meaning from the negative connotations that feminists have associated with it. See Russell D. Moore, "After Patriarchy, What? Why Egalitarians Are Winning the Gender Debate," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49, no. 3 (September 2006): 569–76; and Garris, *Masculine Christianity*, 55–56.

[59] Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood*, 32, cf. 218.

[60] Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood*, 127.

[61] See Bradley Green, "The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How the Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth," *Eikon* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2022): 162–75.

when read next to Sumner and Bartlett, who argue that complementarianism represents a welcome development away from the *formerly* misogynistic view of women in the past. It would seem that history is something of a wax nose for certain scholars, with some (e.g., Sumner and Bartlett) dubbing it misogynistic compared to modern views, while others (e.g., Barr) contend the same tradition is "liberating" compared to the "modern obsession with male headship."[62]

The contradiction is resolved if Barr and Sumner/Bartlett are right about differing aspects of their arguments. For though Barr aims to deconstruct complementarianism, in so doing she defends much of the traditional (pre-Reformation) view of the sexes over against readings like those found in Sumner and Bartlett. Meanwhile, Sumner and Bartlett have offered qualified commendations of complementarianism (contra Barr) as a non-misogynistic revision of a historically misogynistic view of the sexes. Thus, it would seem that in their desire to avoid the doctrine of male headship, these authors inadvertently demonstrated the continuity between complementarianism and the traditional view of the sexes. Ultimately, this leaves evangelicals (who believe in the truthfulness of Scripture) with two options. First, perhaps the church has always been in the wrong about the sexes. This is a possibility, but one with disastrous implications for both God's ability to reveal truth and humanity's ability to understand with any degree of confidence what God has revealed.[63] Alternatively, perhaps authors like Sumner, Bartlett, and Barr have bumped into a consensus that spans the ages as one aspect of the "mere Christianity" that Lewis "learned to recognise [*sic*], like some all too familiar smell."[64] They may not like the scent, so they look for refuge in

[62] Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood*, 104.

[63] Not to mention the disastrous consequences this would entail for humanity's inability to know whether anyone *now* getting the matter of the sexes right. That is to say, if there is no standard of truth that can be understood, who can say whether anyone, past or present, has gotten the matter wrong?

[64] C. S. Lewis, introduction to Athanasius's *On the Incarnation*, trans. Penelope Lawson (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 1993), 6.

different eras of church history; but if they continue looking, they will find a core of Christian teaching that, as Lewis says, is "unmistakably the same; recognisable [*sic*], not to be evaded, the odour [*sic*] which is death to us until we allow it to become life."[65]

More Than Prooftexts: The Traditional View of the Sexes in Biblical Theology

Egalitarian authors, who deny any hierarchy between the sexes and therefore deny sex-specific limitations for ordination in the church or submission in the household, repeatedly suggest that complementarians are guilty of relying on isolated prooftexts to establish their arguments. Rebecca Groothuis popularized this claim in *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality*, dedicating over half of the book to "Assessing the Traditionalist Prooftexts."[66] After accusing evangelicals of engaging in "feverish debate over the exegetical intricacies of the traditionalist proof texts,"[67] she warns that "a myopic fixation on a handful of biblical texts will not ultimately resolve the gender debate."[68] Others have followed her lead. For example, Andrew Bartlett contends that complementarians "rely on the detailed contents of *particular texts*" (meaning Eph 5:22–33; Col 3:18–19; 1 Pet 3:1–7; 1 Cor 11:3ff).[69] Similarly, Barr says that those who hold to the traditional view of the sexes "let 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Timothy 2 drown out every other scriptural voice."[70]

Scot McKnight takes similar aim in *The Blue Parakeet*, a book detailing why he changed his mind about the traditional view of the sexes. He writes, "What I realized as I listened to the debates [about the sexes] was that I read the Bible as Story [*sic*] . . . and I

---

[65] Lewis, introduction to Athanasius's *On the Incarnation*, 7.

[66] See Rebecca Groothuis, *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997).

[67] Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 231.

[68] Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 231.

[69] Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 17, emphasis added.

[70] Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood*, 217.

thought (and still think) that many of the traditionalists read the Bible as a law book and a puzzle."[71] Earlier in the book he says that "many of us, instead of taking the longer but more rewarding path of reading the Bible as story, want a shortcut."[72] The "shortcuts" McKnight identifies are approaches to reading the Scriptures that look for "morsels of law"[73] or "morsels of blessings and promises,"[74] as well as approaches that "puzzl[e] together the pieces to map God's mind"[75] or read the Bible "through their maestros."[76] By "morsels" McKnight means prooftexts. By "puzzling together the pieces" McKnight means reading the Bible as a disjointed collection of ideas instead of a story. And by reading the Bible through a "maestro" he means privileging one biblical figure (e.g., Paul) over another. In a previously published form of the same chapter, McKnight explicitly blames Reformed theologians for reading the Bible through the lends of Paul,[77] saying that they "read the entire Bible as a solved puzzle that used Maestro Paul's categories to understand everything else in the Bible."[78] The not-so-subtle insinuation is that those who still hold to a traditional view of the sexes do so because they have not learned to read the Bible accurately or comprehensively.[79]

---

[71] Scot McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet: Rethinking How You Read the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 197.

[72] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 43–44.

[73] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 44.

[74] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 45.

[75] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 49.

[76] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 53.

[77] Scot McKnight, "Part 4: Bible and Doctrine," in *Church in the Present Tense: A Candid Look at What's Emerging*, ed. Scot McKnight et al. (Ada, MI: Brazos, 2011), 111. Cf. McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 54.

[78] McKnight, "Part 4: Bible and Doctrine," 110

[79] This may reflect *McKnight's* personal experience, but it does not reflect the comprehensive work of scholars across the centuries who hold to the traditional view of the sexes. Furthermore, it was by learning to read the Scriptures in precisely the way that McKnight commends that my own convictions about the traditional view of the sexes were *strengthened* rather than diminished.

There are two significant errors with the claim that the traditional view of the sexes depends on "a myopic fixation on a handful of biblical texts"[80] to the neglect of the total biblical account. In the first place, this charge frequently describes the approaches of the innovationists themselves rather than their traditionalist interlocutors. Bartlett, for example, begins his book with 1 Corinthians 7—not Genesis 1–3—and proceeds to read every biblical text through Paul's words in that singular chapter.[81] Such a move is bad enough considered on its own terms, but to do so *after* accusing traditionalists of "rely[ing] on the detailed contents of particular texts"[82] is an egregious example of hermeneutical hypocrisy.

Similarly, Barr contends that Ephesians 5:21—where Paul speaks of "submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ"—is a verse that "changes everything."[83] She appears ignorant of the arguments that the submission Paul has in view is explained by the exhortations that follow it, in which several subordinates are exhorted to submit to their respective authorities.[84] Nor does she appear aware of the linguistic arguments against such an interpretation.[85] Nor again does she deal with the parallel passage in Colossians

---

[80] Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 231.

[81] See Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, chap. 2, "Husband and Wife, Men and Women: 1 Corinthians 7," 17–30.

[82] Bartlett, *Men and Women in Christ*, 17.

[83] Barr, *The Making of Biblical Womanhood*, 50. Similarly, Aimee Byrd appeals to Ephesians 5:21 without argument, asserting it as a prooftext for her claim that, "Paul teaches mutual submission among Christians even as he addresses husbands and wives specifically." See Aimee Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2020), 105.

[84] Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant, 1980), 75n1.

[85] Namely, as Kevin DeYoung writes,

> The word for submission (*hypotasso*) [*sic*] is never used in the New Testament as generic love and respect for others. The word *hypotasso* occurs thirty-seven times in the New Testament outside of Ephesians 5:21, always with reference to a relationship where one party has authority over another. Thus, Jesus submits (*hypotasso*) to his parents (Luke 2:51), demons to the disciples (Luke 10:17, 20), the flesh to the law (Rom. 8:7), creation to futility (Rom. 8:20), the Jews to God's righteousness (Rom. 10:3), citizens to their rulers and governing officials (Rom. 13:1, 5; Titus 3:1; 1 Pet. 2:13), the spirits of prophets to the prophets (1 Cor. 14:32), women in the churches (1 Cor. 14:34); Christians to

3:18–25, where there is no mention of mutuality. Instead, Barr simply asserts that this verse has some kind of totalizing power to change *everything*, as if all other texts must submit to this one.

Furthermore, egalitarians have routinely privileged Galatians 3:28 over other biblical texts. For example, Paul Jewett called this verse "the *Magna Carta* of Humanity."[86] Similarly, egalitarian scholar Ben Witherington calls Galatians 3:28 the "Emancipation Proclamation for Women."[87] And when commenting on the legitimacy of women's ordination, egalitarian scholar Klyne Snodgrass calls this verse the most socially explosive text in the Bible."[88] Or again, David Scholer of Fuller Seminary calls Galatians 3:28 "*the fundamental Pauline theological basis* for the inclusion of women and men as equal and mutual partners in all of the ministries of the church."[89] Similarly, Groothuis gives priority of place to the verse, saying, "Of all the texts that support biblical equality, Gal 3:26–28 is probably *the most important*."[90] Finally, some scholars plainly state that Galatians 3:28

> God (Heb. 12:9; James 4:7), all things to Christ or God (1 Cor. 15:27, 28; Eph. 1:22; Phil. 3:21; Heb. 2:5, 8; 1 Pet. 3:22), the Son to God the Father (1 Cor. 15:28), wives to husbands (Eph. 5:24; Col. 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:1, 5), slaves to masters (Titus 2:9; 1 Pet. 2:18); the younger to their elders (1 Pet. 5:5), and Christians to gospel workers (1 Cor. 16:16). Nowhere in the New Testament does *hypotasso* refer to the reciprocal virtues of patience, kindness, and humility. It is always one party or person or thing lining up under the authority of another. (Kevin DeYoung, *Men and Women in the Church: A Short, Biblical, Practical Introduction* [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021], 105)

[86] Paul K. Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 142.

[87] Ben Witherington III, "Rite and Rights for Women—Galatians 3:28," *New Testament Studies* 27, no. 5 (1981): 602n1.

[88] Klyne R. Snodgrass, "The Ordination of Women—Thirteen Years Later: Do We Really Value the Ministry of Women?," *Covenant Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (1990): 34.

[89] David M. Scholer, "Galatians 3:28 and the Ministry of Women in the Church," *Covenant Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (August 1998): 8, emphasis added.

[90] Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 26.

has "hermeneutical priority"[91] as *the* text through which other biblical texts must be interpreted.[92]

In addition to the aforementioned hermeneutical hypocrisy, the second—and more serious—problem with the innovationist scholars who claim that traditionalists over rely on a handful of texts is that their own position aligns with a biblical-theological reading of Scripture. It is worth quoting D. A. Carson again on this point, who explains that biblical theology is primarily concerned with "the structure of thought of a particular biblical writer or corpus" and/or "the delineation of a biblical theme across all or part of the biblical corpora."[93] In other words, biblical theology aims to understand the arguments made by a particular biblical author and to discern how *other* biblical authors have interpreted the same. In this way, exegetical and/or biblical-theological readings of the Scriptures mitigate the kind of prooftexting that both traditionalists and innovationists should rightly reject. As such, biblical theology is uniquely positioned to correct the misreading of particular texts, without ignoring the contributions made by those texts.[94]

A biblical-theological reading of the Scriptures (with a view to the implications for a theology of male and female) is precisely what I aimed to provide in the previous chapters of this work. If I have privileged any text, it is the opening chapters of Genesis—not in isolation from the rest of the canon, but in view of how subsequent biblical authors implicitly assume or explicitly rely on the paradigm of the sexes that Moses sketches in Genesis 1–3. This is not the same as privileging a single verse (viz. Gal 3:28) in the

---

[91] Stanley J. Grenz and Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 106.

[92] For a critique of this approach, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Gender Passages in the NT: Hermeneutical Fallacies Critiqued," *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994): 259–83.

[93] D. A. Carson, series preface to *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, by G. K. Beale, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 9.

[94] Without in any way suggesting that systematic-theological and historical-theological readings of the Scriptures have no place, it is clear that exegetical and biblical-theological readings of the Bible are the foundation for the other theological disciplines.

middle of a Pauline epistle in a context manifestly *not* about gender but about the shared baptismal identity of all kinds of Christians in connection with the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham (cf. Gal 3:7–9, 26–29). By contrast, there are good grounds for expecting the features of Genesis 1–3 to form an enduring paradigm for the sexes in view of how the same account is read paradigmatically by *the biblical authors* (e.g., in reference to the Sabbath, the institution of marriage, and the Edenic nature of the tabernacle-temple).[95] In other words, the Bible itself foregrounds Genesis 1–3 as the foundation for virtually all that follows.[96] Reading the Scriptures with this biblical-theological approach has the greatest explanatory power both for the escalation of key types, whose meaning depends on the sexual asymmetry of male and female,[97] and for the apostolic use of Genesis 1–3 in texts that, unlike Galatians 3:28, explicitly address the relation of the sexes to one another in the home and in the household of God (1 Cor 11:2–16; Eph 5:22–33; 1 Tim 2:8–15).[98]

This approach stands in stark contrast not only to those who privilege isolated verses but also to those who place tremendous emphasis on relatively minor characters or events in the Scriptures out of step with the emphasis of the biblical authors themselves. For example, Lynn Cohick *begins* her argument for mutual submission in marriage with Nympha (Col 4:15), about whom almost nothing is known.[99] Cohick argues that hosting a church in her house means that "she held some sort of leadership role in the church."[100]

---

[95] For a discussion of the beginning of these paradigms in Gen 1–3, see "Evidence of Intended Paradigms" in chap. 2.

[96] For a discussion of the framing of the Bible around the features found in Gen 1–3, see "The Typological Intent of Male and Female" in chap. 4.

[97] For a discussion of the typological significance of male and female in marriage, see "The Union of Male and Female" in chap. 4.

[98] For a discussion of the apostolic use of Gen 1–3 in these texts, see chap. 3.

[99] See Lynn H. Cohick, "Loving and Submitting to One Another in Marriage," in *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural and Practical Perspectives*, ed. Ronald W. Pierce, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2021), 185.

[100] Cohick, "Loving and Submitting to One Another," 186.

She admits that "the precise nature of Nympha's leadership responsibilities eludes us," but "we can safely assume" enough about her to justify an egalitarian perspective of biblical equality in Colossians and Ephesians.[101]

In a similar fashion, Richard Bauckham argues that the occasional speech of women in the Scriptures constitute "gynocentric interruptions"[102] to pull the biblical text away from an otherwise androcentric text. For example, Bauckham writes, "Thus the book of Ruth, its conclusion tells us, is the kind of story that official, masculine history leaves out."[103] Byrd follows Bauckham on this, saying, "When we examine Scripture, we find that it isn't a patriarchal construction. And we find that it is not an androcentric text that lacks female contribution. In fact, we find that the female voice is important and necessary."[104] She seems to go further than Bauckham, however, contending that the book of Ruth "*demolishes* the lens of biblical manhood and womanhood that has been imposed on our Bible reading and opens the doors to how we see God working in his people."[105]

Bauckham's (and Byrd's) argument is bizarre for two reasons. First, there is no doubt that biblical canon includes books about women (e.g., Ruth, Esther) and that individual books in the canon contain extended speech by women (e.g., 1 Sam 2:1–10; Luke 1:46–55). I know of no one who contends otherwise. But Bauckham (and Byrd) seems to overlook the fact that there is no *known* woman who authored a single book of Scripture. As such, the books of Ruth or Esther, or the speeches of Hannah or Mary in 1 Samuel and Luke, are *not* "the kind of story that official, masculine history leaves out"[106] but precisely the kind of stories that official, masculine history (i.e., the canonical books

[101] Cohick, "Loving and Submitting to One Another," 186.

[102] Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 13.

[103] Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 11.

[104] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 42–43.

[105] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 49.

[106] Bauckham, *Gospel Women*, 11.

authored by men) chose to include. In other words, while Mary spoke the Magnificat, *Luke* determined whether to include it in his account (Luke 1:1–4).[107] Second, Bauckham's own terminology, "gynocentric interruptions," suggests he is aware that the preponderance of the biblical narrative is androcentric in nature (otherwise, such instances would not be *interruptions* but simply gynocentric *sections*).[108]

In the final analysis, the figures and texts that innovationists insist on bringing to the foreground are simply not the texts that biblical authors foreground or emphasize in the same way or to the same degree as other, more foundational texts (e.g., Gen 1–3). This does not mean these ancillary texts should be ignored. On the contrary, they offer canonical illustrations of the failures and successes of men and women in their relation to one another. Yet when innovationists give hermeneutical priority to these *relatively* scant accounts (compared with the preponderance of the biblical narrative)—whether it is Miriam, Deborah, Ruth, Huldah, Hannah, Esther, Mary, Priscilla, Lydia, Nympha, Phoebe, or Junia—they are guilty of making much out of little. As Alastair Roberts laments, such figures have become "the Jabez for the women's ordination crowd: that one character mentioned in passing that provokes intense levels of assured speculation, and on whose significance immense weight is placed."[109]

---

[107] To be sure, Luke's determination was superintended by the Spirit (2 Pet 1:21), yet not in such a way that eviscerated his own thoughts in the matter. Hence he says, "It seemed good to me . . . to write an orderly account" (Luke 1:3).

[108] It is not entirely without precedent to argue that Christianity is an "androcentric" religion. After all, the Lord identified himself to Moses as "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (Exod 3:6), not "the God of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and his wives" (cf. Gen 50:24; Deut 6:10; Matt 22:32). And again, the Lord is the God who is called "Father" (Isa 9:6; Matt 6:1, 4, 6; Eph 3:14–15) but never "Mother." For a discussion of why the (very) occasional matronly metaphors are properly distinguished from the non-metaphorical (yet still analogical) language of God as "Father," see Kyle D. Claunch, "On the Improper Use of Proper Speech: A Response to Ronald W. Pierce and Erin M. Heim, 'Biblical Images of God as Mother and Spiritual Formation,'" *Eikon* 5, no. 1 (Fall 2023): 69–77.

[109] Alastair Roberts, "Some Lengthy Thoughts on Women [*sic*] Leadership," *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), December 8, 2011, https://alastairadversaria.com/2011/12/08/some-lengthy-thoughts-on-women-leadership/.

Prelapsarian Hierarchy with Postlapsarian Confirmation

One element of the traditional view of the sexes that particularly benefits from a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 is the issue of male headship (which I have defined as representative authority, and which I have noted logically entails hierarchy of responsibility and relation, though not intrinsic being or worth). In many ways, headship and submission, which correspond to the former, form the crux of the intra-Christian debates about the sexes. Indeed, most egalitarians are fine with sexual asymmetry (i.e., complementarity), so long as asymmetry does not entail hierarchy or headship.[110] This is why egalitarian arguments tend to focus on producing non-hierarchical readings of biblical texts traditionally read in hierarchical ways.[111]

One such attempt to remove headship and submission from biblical texts is found in a "redemptive-movement hermeneutic."[112] Also called a trajectory hermeneutic,[113] this approach to understanding Scripture argues that certain biblical texts have what William Webb calls a "movement meaning" that "carries us beyond the bound-in-time components of meaning within the biblical text."[114] In other words, a redemptive-movement hermeneutic straightforwardly argues that certain biblical texts contain "a less-than-ultimate ethic"[115] that was intended (by God) to be corrected over time through the realization of progressive revelation in its implicit trajectory. Some egalitarian authors

[110] Note the subtitle of Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, and Gordon Fee, eds., *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005).

[111] For example, see Richard Hess, "Equality with and Without Innocence: Genesis 1–3," in Pierce, Groothuis, and Fee, *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 79–95. See also Peter H. Davids, "A Silent Witness in Marriage: 1 Peter 3:1–7," in Pierce, Westfall, and McKirkland, *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 228–46.

[112] See William J. Webb, "A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic: Encouraging Dialogue among Four Evangelical Views," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005): 331–49.

[113] Webb, "A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic," 331.

[114] Webb, "A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic," 332.

[115] Webb, "A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic," 331.

have made direct appeal to such a hermeneutic when dealing with New Testament texts where headship and submission are directly prescribed. For example, I. Howard Marshall argues that Paul's teaching in Colossians 3:18–19 and Ephesians 5:21–33 cannot "be applied without significant modification to our situation. . . . Adjustment to changed circumstances is required, as can be seen by a consideration of the material about children and slaves."[116] As proof of the need to adjust applications, he writes, "Today Christian theologians recognize that slavery is not an acceptable form of relationship; it is rejected on the basis of larger biblical considerations having to do with the facts that all human beings are created in the image of God."[117] While this does not seem objectionable, Marshall's meaning is made plain in the next paragraph: "What it said here about masters and salves is *not the last word* on the matter."[118] In other words, Paul got slavery wrong, so why should one expect him to get the sexes right?

Happily, egalitarians seem to be moving away from the most radical form of the trajectory hermeneutic. For example, Ronald Pierce and Mary Conway adopt a modified form of the hermeneutic: "This is similar to William J. Webb's model. . . However, we are not suggesting that this movement need go beyond the New Testament to arrive at gender equality for men and women in Christ."[119] Thus, there is still some emphasis placed on the "redemptive movement meaning" within Scripture, but not without going *beyond* Scripture. Perhaps for this reason a new chapter by Stanley Porter has replaced Marshall's essay in the third edition of *Discovering Biblical Equality*.[120] This is a positive development.

---

[116] I. Howard Marshall, "Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage: Colossians 3:18–19 and Ephesians 5:21–33," in Pierce, Groothuis, and Fee, *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 187.

[117] Marshall, "Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage," 189.

[118] Marshall, "Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage," 189, emphasis added.

[119] Ronald W. Pierce and Mary L. Conway, "The Treatment of Women Under the Mosaic Law," in Pierce, Westfall, and McKirkland, *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 54.

[120] See Stanley E. Porter, "Gender Equality and the Analogy of Slavery," in Pierce, Westfall, and McKirkland, *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 327–50.

Nevertheless, Porter still contends that "the analogy of slavery is in fact an appropriate one for gender equality" and that "the Bible, and especially the New Testament, has analogous liberating views of both slavery and gender equality."[121]

The particular problem with such an approach to the gendered instruction of the New Testament is that, whether there is a "redemptive movement" for slavery is entirely beside the question of whether there is such a movement for the biblical vision of the sexes. Indeed, many of the biblical texts that interpret sexual distinction as significant for the relation of the sexes explicitly ground their teaching in God's *prelapsarian* designs (i.e., Gen 1–2).[122] Hence, Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16, 14:34–35; Ephesians 5:22–33, and 1 Timothy 2:8–15 directly quotes or summarizes the paradigmatic account of creation, ascribing to it enduring significance for men and women in the new covenant. No such exegetical move is *ever* employed by the biblical authors to justify (or excuse) slavery. In other words, Porter's central thesis—that the Scriptures contain redemptive-movement for slavery as well as gender—is incorrect. Whether the Bible contains such a trajectory for slavery is a separate question, for the Scriptures manifestly do not show any signs of trajectory for the relation of the sexes. On the contrary, everywhere that the biblical authors might have overturned male headship, they instead affirm it. And they do so by appealing to God's design in Genesis 1–2 and its reaffirmation in Genesis 3.

Preliminary Conclusion Regarding the Framing of Intra-Christian Debates

I have shown that a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 has significant implications for the framing of the intra-Christian debates about the sexes. In the first

[121] Porter, "Gender Equality and the Analogy of Slavery," 333.

[122] For an extended discussion of the prelapsarian presence of hierarchy and headship, see Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 30–41; cf. 102–30. I am not including Grudem's tenth argument here ("the parallel with the Trinity"). See also Raymond C. Ortlund Jr., "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship: Genesis 1–3," in Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 119–42; and John M. Frame, "Men and Women in the Image of God," in Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 295–306.

place, the conclusions borne out by such a reading confirm the traditional view of the sexes, the core of which is sexual asymmetry with male headship in appropriate relationships. Though one can say more about the meaning of maleness and femaleness,[123] one cannot say *less* than this. As I said at the start, Moses's paradigm in Genesis 1–3 contains, *in seed form*, the essence of maleness and femaleness as seen in patterned relationships that are upheld, expounded, and applied by biblical authors across the canon.[124] This perspective is most closely represented by the view that is now known as "broad complementarianism." Second, I have shown that a paradigmatic reading of Genesis 1–3 demonstrates that the traditional view of the sexes is *not* constructed through sparse prooftexts but by a biblical-theological reading of the Scriptures. Finally, I have shown that such a reading directly undermines a trajectory hermeneutic, which seeks to remove headship from the husband-wife relationship by appeals to "redemptive movement" in the Scriptures. Instead, the biblical authors embrace and develop the paradigm that Moses established in Genesis 1–3.

Genesis 1–3 and the Theo-Cultural Issue of Our Time

Michael Haykin argues that "what it means to be human and questions of human sexuality" are the most pressing issues today, saying, "Ours is an anthropological moment."[125] He insists that the church has faced similar struggles before, citing the apocryphal Gospel of Philip, with its conception of humanity's origin as an androgynous person and its conception of salvation as overcoming sexual differentiation.[126] Others are not so sure. Historian William Manchester writes, "The erasure of the distinctions between

[123] See my interaction with Patrick Schreiner in the following section.

[124] See "Thesis Statement" in chap. 1.

[125] Michael A. G. Haykin, "This Anthropological Moment," *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 6.

[126] Haykin, "This Anthropological Moment," 7.

the sexes is not only the most striking issue of our time, it may be the most profound the race has ever confronted."[127]

Manchester wrote those words in 1993. In the decades since, cultural confusion about the nature (and purpose) of the sexes has only become more aggravated in ways that were all but inconceivable to his early-1990s readers. For example, Americans have done a total about-face in their views of homosexual marriage since that time.[128] Today, nearly 1 in 4 (24.3 percent) members of Generalization Z (i.e., those born after 1997) identify as something other than heterosexual.[129] These trends are worsening, with nearly double the number in Generation Z embracing LGBTQ identification (20.8 percent), compared with 10.5 percent of the generation before them (i.e., the Millennial generation, born between 1981–1996).[130] Finally, with the explosion of transgenderism and so-called "sex-affirming surgeries," the situation has deteriorated to the point where even secular scholars are raising the alarm about the serious damage of the "transgender craze."[131]

In other words, we live in desperate times. Perhaps this sounds like alarmist hysteria, but alarms are not alarmist *if they are true*. Indeed, the Scriptures teach that

---

[127] William Manchester, "A World Lit Only by Change," *US News and World Report*, October 25, 1993, 6, as cited in Colin J. Smothers, "Creation and Discrimination: Why the Male-Female Distinction Makes a Difference," *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 9.

[128] In 1993, for example, 70 percent of Americans said that same-sex relations were "always" (66%) or "almost always" (4%) wrong. See Karyln Bowman and Bryan O'Keefe, "Attitudes about Homosexuality and Gay Marriage," *American Enterprise Institute in Public Opinion*, December 31, 2004, https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/20080603-Homosexuality.pdf?x91208. As of July 2023, however, only 21 percent of Americans oppose same-sex marriage—a nearly fifty-point swing in the other direction. See "Cross-Tabs: July 2023 Times/Sienna Poll of the 2024 Race and national Issues," *New York Times*, August 1, 2023. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/08/01/us/elections/times-siena-poll-registered-voters-crosstabs.html.

[129] Specifically, 20.8 percent of Generation Z identify as "LGBT," with 3.5 percent identifying as something other than "straight/heterosexual." See Jeffrey M. Jones, "LGBT Identification Ticks Up to 7.1%," *Gallup*, February 17, 2022. https://news.gallup.com/poll/389792/lgbt-identification-ticks-up.aspx.

[130] Jones, "LGBT Identification Ticks Up to 7.1%."

[131] See Abigail Shrier, *Irreversible Damage: The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 2020). As the subtitle indicates, the entire book addresses the "transgender craze." For a technical definition of the phrase "transgender craze," see Shrier, *Irreversible Damage*, 27.

Christians should be alarmed whenever they find themselves in a society that calls what is evil "good" and calls what is good "evil" (Isa 5:20). People are now forced—it is not too strong a word—to accommodate and affirm the self-identifications of those who believe their bodies do not match their age, their gender, or even their species.[132] To be sure, Christians have biblical warrant to expect hatred from the world (John 15:18–21). Yet the type of persecution now observed in the West issues not from a heart that recoils at the doctrines of sin, the futility of good works to merit salvation, and the insistence that only conscious faith in Jesus Christ can reconcile souls to God. These belong to the category of "grace," and the gospel of grace has been scandalous since it was first announced (1 Cor 1:22–23).[133] "But the world is changed," as British scholar Rhys Laverty has observed: "We no longer live in a world which simply hates grace; we live in a world which hates nature—and understanding this fact is one of the most urgent priorities in Christian discipleship today."[134] In other words, an hour is coming, and now is, when Christians will be hated not because of what they believe about Jesus, but because of what they believe about the natural world—basic truths that, until very recently, enjoyed near-universal affirmation.[135]

Unfortunately, confusion about God's created order is spreading like a cancer among the very people who have the divine resources to expose and resist it (i.e., the church). Yet the Scriptures are not unclear on these points—as the consensus of the church through the ages has shown. Nor has the Lord changed his mind (Num 23:19), nor can he

---

[132] For example, a Virginia teacher was fired for refusing to use a transgender student's "preferred pronouns" on religious grounds. See Daniel Wiessner, "Virginia Top Court Revives Lawsuit by Teacher Fired Over Pronoun Use," *Reuters*, December 14, 2023. https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/virginia-top-court-revives-lawsuit-by-teacher-fired-over-pronoun-use-2023-12-14.

[133] Rhys Laverty makes this case in "What Did You Plan to Be Hated For?," *The New Albion*, October 20, 2023. https://thenewalbion.substack.com/p/what-did-you-plan-to-be-hated-for.

[134] Laverty, "What Did You Plan to Be Hated For?"

[135] Laverty highlights truths like "women haven't got a penis" and other observations related to natural law, which, by definition, are truths that human beings can know about God's world without regenerate hearts. See Laverty, "What Did You Plan to Be Hated For?"

contradict his designs, which would be a denial of himself (1 Tim 2:13). Even so, it appears that many Christians are poised to unwittingly sow seeds of destruction at precisely this point,[136] not by embracing openly rebellious views of gender and sexuality, but by ignoring or downplaying the scriptural significance of mankind's nature as male and female.

Anticipating a potential objection on this point, let me state that gender and sexuality are *not* the most important teaching in Scripture. As Mark Dever rightly says, "There are issues more central to the gospel than gender issues."[137] Yet he quickly adds, "However, there may be no way the authority of Scripture is being undermined more quickly or more thoroughly in our day than through the hermeneutics of egalitarian readings of the Bible."[138] Indeed, Colin Smothers has written of the established connection between accepting women's ordination and the slide toward other anthropological errors, like the affirmation of homosexuality.[139] For while it is true that not all egalitarians believe

[136] I am limiting my argument here to those who unintentionally downplay God's design for the sexes, instead of dealing with those who claim to be Christians while openly denying it. The latter are in a desperate way, while the former would seem to be more open to persuasion if the error of their ways can be demonstrated.

[137] Mark Dever, "Young vs. Old Complementarians," *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 13, no. 1 (2008): 23. Wayne Grudem has argued the same. See Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006).

[138] Dever, "Young vs. Old Complementarians," 23.

[139] As Colin Smothers notes, barely a decade after its founding the first "evangelical feminist" organization, the Evangelical Women's Caucus (EWC), embraced homosexuality using the same hermeneutic that justified their egalitarianism. This led to the formation of Christians for Biblical Equality (CBE) in 1987. Colin Smothers, "Is the Slippery Slope Actually Slippery? Egalitarianism and the Open-and-Affirming Position," *9Marks Journal*, November 23, 2019, https://www.9marks.org/article/is-the-slippery-slope-actually-slippery-egalitarianism-and-the-open-and-affirming-position/. Similarly, Mark Dever and Ligon Duncan, reflecting on fifty years of ministry, issue the "sober conclusion" that "this issue of egalitarianism and complementarianism is increasingly acting as the watershed distinguishing those who will accommodate Scripture to culture, and those who will attempt to shape culture by Scripture." Dever, "Young vs. Old Complementarians," 24.

that the Bible affirms homosexuality, it is also true that churches that *do* affirm homosexuality are invariably egalitarian.[140]

Standing against all this, Christians who hold the traditional view of the sexes have something significant to offer the world. For while biblical truths about men and women may not possess the heart-transforming power of the gospel, they do possess the life-altering power of God's commands, which can revive weary souls, instruct foolish minds, rejoice discouraged hearts, enlighten blind eyes, and warn the destructively wayward (cf. Ps 19:7–11). The particular message of the church on this point can be readily discerned in Genesis 1–3 and traced through the rest of the Scriptures. It is the message that sexual identity is real, non-interchangeable, and meaningfully significant.

The Reality of Sexual Identity

Moses tells us, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen 1:1). As the crowning glory of his creative work (cf. Ps 8:5), God made man in his image: "God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion . . . over all the earth. . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them" (Gen 1:26–27). From the outset of the Genesis narrative, Moses emphasizes the importance of man's nature as male and female. Roberts writes, "The difference between the sexes is a central and constitutive truth about humanity, related to our being created in the image of God. Humanity has two distinct kinds: a male kind and a female kind. Sexual dimorphism, the fact that we come in these two distinct kinds, is a fundamental fact about humanity."[141]

[140] The reason for this is partly hermeneutical. Trajectory hermeneutics are a particularly easy way to affirm homosexuality. Furthermore, the egalitarian tendency to privilege isolated prooftexts, especially Gal 3:28 with its language of "no male and female," make the affirmation of homosexuality a natural conclusion. The second factor at work here is the mounting cultural insistence that a woman can do anything a man can do. In other words, the sexes are interchangeable at a functional level. Smothers notes, "But this *functional* interchange paved the way for a *formal* one. If a woman can do anything a can [do], why the need for a man. . . at all? Would not two women suffice? Would not two men?" Smothers, "Is the Slippery Slope Actually Slippery?"

[141] Alastair Roberts, "The Music and Meaning of Male & Female," *Primer* 3 (2016): 36.

Furthermore, it is significant that the maleness of the man and the femaleness of the woman were created *by* God. This means the reality of the sexes is a fundamental feature of his design to be received as a "good and perfect gift from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change" (Jas 1:17). In other words, as Burk explains, "A person's maleness or femaleness isn't socially constructed or self-constructed, but God-constructed. Sex is not something that is assigned at birth. It is something that is revealed by God in His special distinct design of male and female bodies."[142]

These truths were once so plain that they might have been regarded as self-evident. That is no longer the case. Following the advent of critical theory in the early-to-mid-twentieth century, the late 1970s saw the emergence of a new field of studies known as "gender theory." As scholar Craig Carter explains, the goal of this movement was to "detach" gender "from its biological basis in sex in the name of liberation."[143] Carter continues, "The very idea of the sexual binary was challenged, and the concept of gender fluidity came to the fore. The whole idea of . . . attacking the sexual binary was to force acceptance of the idea of gender fluidity and undermine the concept of 'maleness' and 'femaleness' as universals."[144] In other words, "The essence of modern gender theory is

---

[142] Denny Burk, "Mere Complementarianism," *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 36. For a fuller discussion of this point, Burk directs the readers to Denny Burk, "Transgenderism and Three Biblical Axioms," in *God's Glory Revealed in Christ: Essays on Biblical Theology in Honor of Thomas R. Schreiner*, ed. Denny Burk, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Brian Vickers (Nashville: B & H, 2019), 214–17.

[143] See Craig Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," *Eikon* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2020): 35. Note that if gender is distinct from sex in any sense, then it is distinct in this way: sex is one's biological constitution, whereas gender is the social manifestation of that *same* biological sex. For more on this point, see Ryan T. Anderson, *When Harry Became Sally: Responding to the Transgender Moment* (New York: Encounter, 2018), 2. Yet note that even while gender may be "distinct" from sex in this specific sense, it is not *detached* from sex, as it is in gender theory.

[144] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 35. On this point, Burk helpfully anticipates an increasingly common objection:

> Sometimes people ask if intersex persons have bodies that are "lying" to them. I address this question at length in one chapter of my book *What Is the Meaning of Sex?*. I argue that for many intersex persons there still remains an underlying chromosomal binary based on the presence or absence of at least one Y chromosome. Intersex conditions result from living in a fallen world east of Eden. In

the teaching that sex is merely incidental to identity."[145]

The implications of Genesis 1–3 for debates about the reality of sex and its relation to gender are evident. Yet, Carter notes a particular way in which the creation account comes into view: "The highest value in modernity is the same one that motivated first Eve, and then Adam, to eat of the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden: the autonomy of the self."[146] Against the backdrop of the garden, the sexual revolution is rightly seen as an extension of the fundamental problem that plunged humanity into ruinous despair, namely, "the self-righteous conviction that the highest good for the human being is freedom defined as *freedom from constraint*."[147] In other words, the underlying drive to see sex as "incidental" to one's identity stems from the more basic desire to escape all limitations. Once "liberated" from limitations imposed on an individual, including sexual or biological realities, the self would be "free" to determine its own identity and course in life.

In this way, Carter argues that denizens of the West have become "Gnostic-like"[148] (referring to the heresy rejected by the early church for its denigration of the physical, especially the body). For these "gender Gnostics" have adopted "the same attitude toward the body as the old Gnosticism did. And so, it is just as much the enemy of the Christian church as the old Gnosticism was."[149] Leaving no doubt about where he stands on the matter, Carter states,

---

> other words, the fall has obscured in some people what would otherwise be clear about biological sex. This doesn't disprove a sexual binary. It shows that the fall is pervasive in the human condition, even sometimes obscuring the binary norm. Nevertheless, the sexual binary norm remains and will be renewed in the new creation. (Burk, "Mere Complementarianism," 36n24)

[145] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 37.

[146] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 36.

[147] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 36, emphasis added.

[148] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 33.

[149] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 37.

> These two views of the human body cannot coexist, and the sworn enemies of the Christian church understand this better than many Christians do. The end game is not sexual diversity and tolerance. All the libertarian rhetoric of letting people choose their own way of life is just a way of carving out space and gaining time for the sexual revolution to gain strength. The end game is the complete destruction of the sexual binary, which would mean the end of natural marriage and the end of the organization of society around the family. These are people who think that Huxley's *Brave New World* is a manual for the ideal society rather than a dystopian novel. So, if you intend to defend the continued existence of the sexual binary and the natural family in any form, you might as well fight now as later.[150]

By "fight" Carter means speaking and acting "to defend the continued existence of the sexual binary and the natural family," urging all to "receive our sexuality as a gift from our creator with gratitude and not presume to abuse our bodies as if they were not part of our very being as men and women in the image of God."[151] Unfortunately, this is something many Christians fail to do, driven in large part by their confusion about the non-interchangeability of the sexes.

The Non-Interchangeability of the Sexes

Moses's paradigm establishes an asymmetrical (complementary) vision of the sexes, in which the man and the woman are not only created differently (cf. Gen 2:7, 22) but also entrusted with different callings (cf. Gen 2:15, 18). This means the sexes are *not* interchangeable; that is, a man can neither take the place of a woman, nor carry out callings primarily given to woman in the same way or to the same degree a woman could do the same (and vice versa). Disagreement with this point is integral to the egalitarian perspective, which is happy to affirm sexual differentiation, but refuses to confer on that differentiation any "unique and perpetual prerogatives," especially prerogatives related to (male) headship.[152]

---

[150] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 38.

[151] Carter, "The New Gender Gnostics," 39.

[152] Mimi Haddad writes, "The sexual differences that exist between men and women do not justify granting men unique and perpetual prerogatives of leadership and authority that are not shared by women. Biblical equality, therefore, denies that there is any created or otherwise God-ordained hierarchy *based solely on* sexual difference." Mimi Haddad, introduction to Pierce, Westfall, and McKirkland, *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 2.

Having already defended the non-interchangeability of the sexes,[153] I want to focus on a new wave of "post-complementarian" innovationists that are (perhaps unwittingly) guilty of a similar error.[154] These innovationists, while rejecting the sort of "gender equality" essential to egalitarianism, are primarily driven by a desire to shift the conversation about the sexes away from the category of headship. For example, Rachel Green Miller's *Beyond Authority and Submission* reflects the author's desire to affirm male-only ordination in the church and the husband's servant-leadership in marriage while situating the conversation about what it means to be male and female in a category other than "authority" (as the title clearly shows).[155] Similarly, Aimee Byrd writes,

> The framework of authority and submission between men and women can be very harmful. My femininity is not defined by how I look for and nurture male leadership in my neighbors, coworkers, or mail carriers. I am not denying the order needed in both my personal household and in the household of God, but I do not reduce the rights and obligations in a household to mere authority and submission roles.[156]

Byrd's comment about nurturing male leadership among her "neighbors, coworkers, and mail carriers" is in response to an article by John Piper, where he applies his definition of masculinity (from *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*) in various cultural settings.[157] Specifically, Piper defines masculinity in this way: "At the heart of mature masculinity is a sense of benevolent responsibility to lead, provide for and protect women in ways appropriate to a man's differing relationships."[158] This

---

[153] See "The Asymmetry of the Sexes" in chap. 4. See also "The Use of Genesis 1–2 in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16" and "Man and Woman in Marriage" in chap. 3.

[154] The term "post-complementarian" is borrowed from Steven Wedgeworth, "A New Way to Understand Men and Women in Christ? A Review of Rachel Green Miller's *Beyond Authority and Submission*," *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 103.

[155] Rachel Green Miller, *Beyond Authority and Submission: Women and Men in Marriage, Church, and Society* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2019).

[156] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 105.

[157] See John Piper, "Ask Pastor John: Should Women Be Police Officers?," *Desiring God* (blog), August 13, 2015, https://www.desiringgod.org/interviews/should-women-be-police-officers.

[158] John Piper, "A Vision of Biblical Complementarity: Manhood and Womanhood Defined According to the Bible," in Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 41.

definition is not without its faults, and recently Patrick Schreiner has highlighted a few ways Piper's definition can be improved; for example, by accounting for biblical texts where women do the sorts of activities Piper assigns to the male sex[159] and by broadening his definition to include aspects of masculinity (and femininity) that go beyond the husband-wife relationship to include their roles as fathers, sons, and brothers (so also mothers, daughters, and sisters).[160]

I have already dealt with some of the texts Schreiner highlights in the first of his critiques.[161] The second of his aforementioned critiques is worthy of consideration, especially as regards the move by Miller and Byrd to push the conversation about manhood and womanhood away from categories like authority and submission. Schreiner points out that, in Piper's definition, "every relationship is defined by an authority relation, but there is more to say about manhood and womanhood."[162] Unlike Byrd and Miller, however, Schreiner acknowledges, "Authority-submission seems to be *part* of what it means in certain relationships as male and female, but other relationships should be considered as well."[163] For example, he notes that brothers and sisters do not have an authority-submission relationship.[164] Later, after interacting with J. Budziszewski's work

[159] Patrick Schreiner cites the fact that women sometimes lead (Jdgs 4; 1 Sam 25; Exod 2; Esth 4; Ruth 3; Prov 31; Luke 8:43–48; Matt 15:21–28; Acts 16:14–15) , sometimes provide (Ruth, Rachel, Zipporah, Prov 31), and sometimes protect (Exod 1:15–21; 2:1–10; 4:24–26; 1 Sam 25; Esther, Josh 2). Women also bear *some* kind of authoritative ownership over their husband's body, even as he does of hers (1 Cor 7:4). See Patrick Schreiner, "Man and Woman: Toward an Ontology," *Eikon* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2020): 80.

[160] Schreiner, "Man and Woman," 81.

[161] See chap. 4, especially the section, "The Non-Priestly Prophetess."

[162] Schreiner, "Man and Woman," 82, emphasis added.

[163] Schreiner, "Man and Woman," 82.

[164] Schreiner, "Man and Woman," 82. This point is entirely appropriate, and I am glad Schreiner made it. However, I wish that he further addressed the nature of brother-sister relations, which common experience shows that some element of protection element, usually—though not universally—involves the brother protecting and the sister being protected. This asymmetry would reinforce Schreiner's otherwise salient points.

on gender and sexuality,[165] Schreiner offers his improved definition for each of the sexes: "The fundamental meaning of masculinity is sonship, brotherly love, and potentiality toward paternity," and "the fundamental meaning of femininity is daughterhood, sisterly love, and potentiality toward maternity."[166]

What Schreiner does *not* do, to his credit, is insist that broadening the conversation about the sexes "beyond authority and submission" entails *the evisceration* of authority and submission in its appropriate contexts; that is, husband-wife relations and (male) pastor-congregant relations. This is distinct from Miller and Byrd, who insist upon the "mutual submission" of men and women, including husband and wife.[167] In their attempts to modify the definitions of masculinity and femininity, both Miller and Byrd lack any *positive* description of male headship entails, even when discussing biblical texts where it is explicitly described.[168] Such an error could be avoided if one were to begin, not with abstractly defined concepts of mutuality, reciprocity, or servant-leadership as Miller and Byrd do,[169] but with the actual descriptions of Adam and Eve and their respective callings in Eden's paradigmatic setting (i.e., Gen 2).

---

[165] J. Budziszewski, *On the Meaning of Sex* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2014).

[166] Schreiner, "Man and Woman," 85.

[167] See Miller, *Beyond Authority and Submission*, 120. See also Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 105, 231–34.

[168] For example, Miller says that men, as the head, are called to lead in their families, but instead of describing what this means, she immediately says what it does *not* entail: "He doesn't lord it over his wife or attempt to enforce her submission." Miller, *Beyond Authority and Submission*, 177. Every adherent of the traditional view of the sexes that I have ever read would agree with this claim. Unlike Miller, however, they offer a positive definition of what headship *does* mean. Byrd does the same, acknowledging the priestly headship of the man in Gen 2:15 without giving any description of what this means. See Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 105n17.

[169] For example, Miller stresses "unity, interdependence" and the "call to mutual service." Miller, *Beyond Authority and Submission*, 36. Similarly, Byrd begins with her book not with a reference to Adam's representative authority, but by stating, "Adam had to sacrifice for [Eve]." Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 19. Byrd does not comment further on exactly how or what Adam was intended to sacrifice for Eve.

Unfortunately, both Miller and Byrd repeatedly emphasize the sameness of the sexes, despite their occasional affirmations of human sexual differentiation. For example, Byrd says that men and women are "two distinct ways of being human."[170] Similarly, she explicitly rejects androgyny, transgenderism, and other sex-based confusions.[171] At the same time, Byrd argues it is wrong to sharply distinguish between feminine and masculine expressions of virtue.[172] She explains,

> Do men and women have separate aims with a common adjective—biblical manhood and biblical womanhood? In Scripture we don't find that our ultimate goal is as narrow as biblical manhood or biblical womanhood, but complete, glorified resurrection to live eternally with our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. . . . We find that men and women are called together in the same mission: eternal communion with the triune God. Both men and women are to pursue the same virtues as we await our ultimate blessedness, the beatific vision—to behold Christ![173]

To be sure, Byrd is not wrong about the Christian's "ultimate" goal. I know of no scholar who holds to the traditional view of the sexes who has argued that a man's ultimate goal is to be a man, or that a woman's ultimate goal is to be a woman. Yet the writings of Scripture make it plain that the Christian life is no unisex pursuit. By overlooking the ways men and women follow Christ *as men and women*, Byrd has little to say about what masculinity or femininity are, much less why they matter. By the end of the book, she has only said what men and women are *not*—peeling away the "yellow wallpaper" of gender stereotypes—instead of saying what the sexes actually *are*, beyond their shared status as human beings. One would think that if, as Byrd says, men and

---

[170] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 124.

[171] Byrd writes, "All those who hold to the authority and inerrancy of Scripture will agree that in creation we find equality of value between the sexes, as well as distinction. We wouldn't even be talking about equality if there were no distinction." Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 111, cf. 19, 104.

[172] Byrd writes, "Christ lays these virtues out for us in the Sermon on the Mount, which is surprisingly not a gendered pursuit." Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 105, cf. 106–9.

[173] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 109.

women are "two distinct ways of being human,"[174] she might have something constructive to say about those differing modes of being. By the time she concludes her book with its call to "reciprocity,"[175] she cannot meaningfully comment on *how* a man or a woman would "differently" carry out the tasks she describes.

Miller's error is even worse. She explicitly argues against anything like an identifiably "masculine" or "feminine" nature: "If God made you a woman, you are feminine."[176] Likewise, "If God made you a man, you are masculine."[177] In other words, to speak of masculine and feminine natures is, for Miller, tautological. But this is not the way the Bible speaks about the sexes. Indeed, the Scriptures rebuke men who are effeminate: "Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals . . . will inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor 6:9–10 NASB). The Greek term translated as "effeminate" in older translations (cf. Young's Literal Translation; KJV) is μαλακός, a word whose literal (i.e., non-metaphorical) meaning is "soft" (cf. Matt 11:8; Luke 7:25). When used in conjunction with the Greek word ἀρσενοκοίτης, the meaning of μαλακός is probably "passive homosexual partner."[178] Even so, the idea of effeminacy is not entirely lost. For in the homosexual act, the ἀρσενοκοίτης still penetrates, as a man would in heterosexual intercourse, whereas the μαλακός—the "soft" man—is the one who is penetrated, playing the woman's part in heterosexual intercourse.

---

[174] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 124.

[175] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 231–34.

[176] Miller, *Beyond Submission and Authority*, 148.

[177] Miller, *Beyond Submission and Authority*, 149.

[178] Hence the glosses in modern translations: "men who have sex with men" (1 Cor 6:9 CSB) or "men who practice homosexuality" (1 Cor 6:9 ESV). For an extended defense of this view, see Steven Wedgeworth, "What Is Effeminacy? A Survey of Scripture and History," *Desiring God* (blog), October 17, 2023, https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/what-is-effeminacy.

In other contexts, a woman is forbidden from wearing "a man's garment," while a man is forbidden from wearing a "women's cloak," with both actions being condemned as "an abomination to the Lord your God" (Deut 22:5).[179] Verses like this are unintelligible unless there is possibility of knowing what is identifiably masculine or feminine. To be sure, what one culture considers masculine or feminine may change from time to place. Kilts may be masculine in Scotland, but donning a plaid skirt in America was a great way to get yourself beat up in the 1990s. Only a fool would argue that something intrinsic to the shape of the cloth was essentially masculine or feminine. But also, only a fool would deny the connection between Bruce Jenner's "cleavage-boosting corset, sultry poses, thick mascara, and the prospect of regular 'girls' nights' of banter about hair and makeup"[180] and some identifiably feminine customs *in this culture*. Indeed, the entire transgender project rests entirely on the existence of identifiably masculine or feminine customs. Otherwise, Jenner could have declared himself a woman *and changed nothing* about his appearance, dress, mannerisms, habits, preferences, etc.

Stating this fact does not commit one to the view that, say, makeup or dresses are *intrinsically* feminine. Rather, this is an argument that maleness and femaleness are such important facets of what it means to be human that every culture has found ways of expressing these realities in various identifiable ways. This is similar to the argument Paul makes in 1 Corinthians 11:14, where, after grounding sexual differentiation in the creation account (1 Cor 11:7–9), he asks, "Does not nature itself teach that you if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory?" (1 Cor 11:14–15). In his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11, Calvin equates Paul's use of "nature" with custom, arguing that customs which enjoy "universal consent" can be said

[179] For an extended discussion on this text, including its assumption of the gender binary as well as identifiable categories of masculine and feminine, see Jason DeRouchie, "Confronting the Transgender Storm: A Sermon on Deuteronomy 22:5," Jason DeRouchie, November 5, 2015, https://jasonderouchie.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Sermon-Deut-22v5-Confronting-the-Transgender-Storm-iPad.pdf.

[180] Elinor Burkett, "What Makes a Woman," *New York Times*, June 6, 2015, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/07/opinion/sunday/what-makes-a-woman.html.

to derive from "nature"; that is, from principles related to natural law.[181] Elsewhere, in a sermon on the same passage, Calvin argues, "When there is an accepted custom, and it is a good and decent one, we must accept it. And whoever tries to change it is surely the enemy of the common good."[182] In other words, Calvin argues that things like "custom" are not divine commands, binding on all in an absolute sense. Yet nor are they irrelevant cultural expressions with no bearing on one's conduct or manner of inhabiting the world. Instead, customs represent culture-bound attempts to affirm and promote important social *realities*— in this case, the differentiation of male and female. To get rid of the concepts of masculinity and femininity—as Miller does when she argues that masculinity and femininity mean nothing more than "being" a man or a woman—ultimately reduces the meaning of male and female to a single chromosomal variance, one that does not exert itself in any recognizably masculine or feminine capacity.

It is almost certain that neither Byrd nor Miller would agree with the implications of their views as I have traced. But the implications of their views matter, especially in the late modern West, which is warring against the sexual binary and any attempts to identify traits, features, customs, habits, or callings as characteristically—much less, exclusively—masculine or feminine. For example, not even women can be said to have babies anymore; we are told instead to speak of "pregnant people" and "birthing persons."[183] In such a context, Byrd's and Miller's project—to rid complementarianism of gender stereotypes and unbiblical conceptions of the sexes[184]—is unwittingly primed to aid the "gender Gnostics" in their destructive goals. For example, Byrd writes, "Christian men and women don't strive for so-called biblical masculinity or

[181] Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, 361–62.

[182] John Calvin, *Men, Women and Order in the Church: Three Sermons*, trans. Seth Skolnitsky (Dallas: Presbyterian Heritage, 1992), 57.

[183] See Emma Green, "The Culture War Over 'Pregnant People,'" *The Atlantic*, September 17, 2021, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2021/09/pregnant-people-gender-identity/620031/.

[184] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 172.

femininity, but Christlikeness. Rather than striving to prove our sexuality, the tone of our sexuality will express itself as we do this."[185] Not only do such statements fail to consider the particular problems of the cultural moment, as I said, but also Byrd (and Miller likewise) appears to be entirely unaware of the possibility for men and women to fall short of God's design for each. Unless, that is, Byrd (or Miller) is prepared to say that God has *no design* for the sexes. Otherwise, they must account for the possibility of sin interfering with a man or woman's efforts (or lack thereof) to embrace and embody the vision of the sexes begun in Genesis 1–3 and borne out across the Scriptures.

The Significance of Sexual Distinction

The discussion in the previous section concerning "customs" relates to the category of sex-based tendencies and traits. Joe Rigney argues that these "built-in tendencies and traits" both "emerge from and serve" the fundamental facts of one's nature as male or female.[186] In other words, a man is basically (that is, substantially) male, while a woman is basically female. These are the "fundamental facts" of their nature. However, God's design for the sexes appears to come preloaded with certain tendencies and traits that not only arise from fundamental nature but also are intended (by God) to serve as beneficial expressions of that nature. For example, the average man has roughly 90 percent more upper-body strength and roughly 65 percent greater lower-body strength than a woman.[187] The result is that the average man is stronger than all but one-in-a-thousand (99.9% of) women.[188] To give another example of a tendency or trait, women have been found to be more generous and altruistic than men, possessing brains that appear to be

[185] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 114.

[186] Joe Rigney, "Indicatives, Imperatives, and Applications: Reflections on Natural, Biblical, and Cultural Complementarianism," *Eikon* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2022): 30.

[187] W. D. Lassek and S. J. C. Gaulin, "Costs and Benefits of Fat-Free Muscle Mass in Men: Relationship to Mating Success, Dietary Requirements, and Native Immunity," *Evolution and Human Behavior* 30, no. 5 (2009): 322.

[188] Lassek and Gaulin, "Costs and Benefits of Fat-Free Muscle Mass," 322.

hard-wired for prosocial behavior.[189] Other sexually differentiated traits and tendencies have been identified in various studies.[190]

The point here is *not* that all men or all women will exhibit such tendencies and traits at all times or to the same degree. One must account for individual decisions (cf. Pss 73:4; 109:24; 1 Cor 9:27), as well as the corruptions of a fallen world, including biological distortions (Lev 21:18; 22:25; Rom 8:21).[191] Even so, sexually differentiated tendencies and traits are scripturally affirmed (1 John 2:14b; 1 Pet 3:7) and statistically prevalent. As such, one cannot brush them off, as Byrd does, saying, "Not all women have soft, curvy bodies. We are built differently."[192] Such comments point to outliers as evidence that masculinity or femininity are not substantive categories, instead of regarding said outliers as exceptions that prove the general rule of God's design (while still allowing for the realities of sin and the various manifestations of abnormality in a fallen world).

The prevalence of sexually differentiated traits and tendencies establishes masculinity and femininity as meaningful facets of humanity. The *origin* of these tendencies and traits is another matter, however. It could be that human males and females evolved in different ways, for a variety of reasons, such that the net result is now seen in the ways men and women tend to differ from each other. For Christians who accept the historicity of Adam and Eve—and Jesus and Paul did (cf. Matt 19:4–5; 1 Tim 2:8–15)—this account for the origin of sexual traits and tendencies is not an option. Another

---

[189] See Alexander Soutchek et al. "The Dopaminergic Reward System Underpins Gender Differences in Social Preferences," *Nature Human Behaviour* 1 (October 2017): 819–27.

[190] The scientific and psychological literature supporting these sexually differentiated tendencies and traits is vast and easily accessible. See, for example, R. Croson and U. Gneezy, "Gender Differences in Preferences," *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (2009): 448–74; and D. G. Rand et al., "Social Heuristics and Social Roles: Intuition Favors Altruism for Women but Not for Men," *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 145 (2016): 389–96.

[191] Concerning individual decisions, a man may have the *potential* to be stronger than 99.9 percent of women, but he may lead an egregiously slothful lifestyle that prohibits him from obtaining this trait. Concerning the corruptions of a fallen world, some people are born with defects (e.g., Trisomy 21) or other abnormalities, but these do not eviscerate the norms.

[192] Byrd, *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 108.

possibility is that men and women behave differently because of cultural expectations. While there is some merit to the notion that socio-cultural expectations have a shaping effect on behavior,[193] this does not seem to be the origin of sexually differentiated traits, given the prevalence of similar tendencies across vast stretches of time and geographical distance.[194] This leaves the third option, namely, that sexually differentiated tendencies and traits are a meaningful reflection of God's design for the sexes.

Given that God's creative work reflects his wisdom and understanding (Prov 3:19), there are good grounds for concluding that there is consonance between sexually differentiated traits or tendencies and the sex-specific callings of a man and a woman (whether as husbands, father, brother, and son, or as wife, mother, sister, and daughter, respectively). Not only this, but because God is not divided in his intentions, his commands "fit" his creation. That is to say, God commands that humans do only that which aligns with what he has created them to be as men or women. Rigney explains, "God's commands conform to the pattern that he has established in creation, nature, and redemption."[195] Put another way, scriptural imperatives address humans in their fallen nature by reordering them to their original (i.e., prelapsarian) created nature. Apart from this sort of consonance between one's constitutions and callings, either God's commands or God's creative design would be arbitrary and meaningless.

---

[193] This is not necessarily a negative effect. See Calvin's comments in the previous section regarding the propriety of adhering to near-universally-accepted "customs" as a cultural expression of natural law.

[194] For example, Steve Stewart-Williams, drawing on the anthropological research of Laura Betzig, writes, "In all the ancient civilizations of the world—including those of the Aztecs, the Babylonians, the Chinese, the Egyptians, the Incas, the peoples of the Indian subcontinent, and the Zulus—powerful men accumulated large harems of nubile young women. Equivalently powerful women, such as Cleopatra, did *not* accumulate large harems of nubile young men. They could have, but they didn't." Steve Stewart-Williams, *The Ape That Understand the Universe: How the Mind and Culture Evolve*, rev. ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2019), 82. See also Laura Betzig, *Despotism and Differential Reproduction: A Darwinian View of History* (Piscataway, NJ: Aldine, 1986).

[195] Rigney, "Indicatives, Imperatives, and Application," 32.

But, of course, God's works and words are not arbitrary and meaningless. Therefore, making the connection between what God requires in his Word and what God has made in his world is, or should be, among the top priorities for Christians who hold to the traditional view of the sexes. Rigney writes, "It's incumbent upon pastors and teachers to instruct the church of God, not only what the Scriptures require, but to point to the *reasons beneath the rules* that make God's written laws intelligible and reasonable."[196] In other words, "our view of men and women and marriage and sexuality is not simply the product of Bible verses, but is itself natural, normative, and universally binding on all people because we live in the world God made."[197]

This is what I mean by the *significance* of male and female; namely, masculinity and femininity are real facets of humanity, and because these realities were designed by God, they have real impact, both for theology (how one conceives of male and female) and ethics (how one lives as a man or woman). Take the paradigmatic realities of the man's headship and the woman's "helper-ship" in Genesis 2, for example. Since Adam and Eve existed in a husband-wife relationship, it would be easy to dismiss these facets of the narrative as relevant only to marriage. Yet this overlooks the fact that before God placed Adam and Eve in marriage, he first created them as male and female and tailored their natures to their respective callings. The same goes for other aspects of humanity's sexually differentiated constitutions and callings in Scripture. Commenting on the connection between humanity's constitutions and callings, Denny Burk points out that Paul appeals to the creation account not simply in passages about marriage (e.g., Eph 5:22–33) but in passages dealing with male headship in the church (e.g., 1 Cor 11:2–16; 1

[196] Joe Rigney, "With One Voice: Scripture and Nature for Ethics and Discipleship," *Eikon* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 37, emphasis added. For an analysis of what happens when evangelicals do not make this connection, see G. Shane Morris, "Rules without Reasons: Why the Culture Is Eating Evangelicals for Lunch," *Troubler of Israel*, June 19, 2018, https://www.patheos.com/blogs/troublerofisrael/2018/06/rules-without-reasons/.

[197] Rigney, "With One Voice," 37.

Tim 2:8–15).[198] The implication is that there is something "fitting" about a man having headship both in his household and in the household of God.

Similarly, the institution of the (all-male) priesthood in the old covenant is instructive. After seeing the rebellion of Israel in the incident with the golden calf (Exod 31:15ff), Moses stands at the head of the camp and asks all those on the Lord's side to rally to him (Exod 31:26). When the sons of Levi answer the call, Moses instructs them to take up their swords and go throughout the camp, slaying the guilty as they go, even their own brothers, friends, and neighbors (Exod 31:27). The sons of Levi did as they were commanded, felling three thousand men that day. In response to their faithfulness, the priesthood was born: "And Moses said, 'Today you have been ordained for the service of the LORD" (Exod 31:29). Commenting on this remarkable event, Alastair Roberts writes,

> The great priestly leaders of the people of God were marked out by their preparedness to employ sacred violence without pity in the service of God's holiness. The tribe of Levi was already marked out as one of the two violent tribes in Genesis. The Levites were set apart for service after slaying 3,000 of their brethren after the golden calf incident. Phinehas thrust the spear through the Midianite and the Israelite and was given an everlasting priesthood as a result. Samuel was the one who hacked Agag in pieces, when Saul failed to do so. The Israelite army temporarily has a sort of priestly status when called together for holy war, which suggests that the priests were regarded as a sort of standing army.[199]

Moreover, this pattern of priestly aggression is not an old covenant relic. Roberts goes on to point out,

> Paul, Peter, James, and John all seem to have been men characterized by a sort of avenging zeal, zeal which was broken and harnessed for God's service. Peter, the one who cut off the High Priest's servant's ear, later became the one proclaiming the divine death sentence on Ananias and Sapphira. Paul was the former persecutor of the Church, who called for the ecclesiastical death sentence of excommunication to be applied without pity or pause in the case of continued sexual immorality (note the allusion to the OT death penalty in 1 Corinthians 5:13).[200]

These cases present the same options as before: either these tendencies and traits are arbitrary and meaningless phenomena, or they are purposeful features of God's design.

---

[198] Burk, "Mere Complementarianism," 40.

[199] Roberts, "Some Lengthy Thoughts."

[200] Roberts, "Some Lengthy Thoughts."

Given what I have discussed about the consonance between human constitutions and callings, there are good reasons to conclude that something about the priestly nature of the pastoral office demands a priestly man (Gen 2:15) to fulfill it. Yes, pastors must be also "gentle" among their people, as Paul was when he compared himself to a nursing mother taking care of her children (1 Thess 2:17).[201] But they must also "hold firm to the trustworthy word as taught," not only to give instruction in sound doctrine, but also "to rebuke those who contradict it" (Titus 1:9). They must also "act like men" (ἀνδρίζομαι) (1 Cor 16:13), possessing manful courage in the face of opposition, like the apostles before them, whose own boldness was the defining mark of their having been with Jesus (Acts 4:13). In other words, various facets of the pastoral calling seem to entail characteristically masculine tendencies and traits, all of which makes sense if there is consonance between a man's constitution and his calling(s). Therefore, to get this—or any gendered aspect of humanity—wrong is not simply a matter of violating a few commands (as if that were not bad enough) but also a matter of undermining God's design.

This does not mean that all important work, whether in the home or the church, is "men's work"—far from it. The Lord has given mankind two sexual modes of being, each for the respective good of the other. Whereas men tend to excel in activities that require aggression, competition, dominance, physicality, tenacity, and/or indifference to the subjective feelings of others, women tend to excel in relational arenas closely connected with the life-communion of various social groups (families, friends, churches, etc.). As Roberts explains, "Every woman, by virtue of her sex—irrespective of whether she is married or has children—is the bearer of a maternal form of identity. The very form and basic processes of her body declares this meaning and everything that she does

[201] Though it is telling that Paul did *not* say, "We were gentle among you, like a good father taking care of his own children." In other words, some connection between gentleness and motherhood made the maternal metaphor more fitting.

and is . . . inflected and elevated by the fact that she represents this reality."[202] That is to say, "It is within her body that the marriage bond is consummated. It is within her body that the bond between parents and children are forged. It is within her body that the child grows and upon her body that it feeds."[203]

In other words, uniquely feminine activities (e.g., bearing children, breastfeeding) reflect a divinely-ordained consonance between a woman's constitution and callings. The same goes for the aforementioned observed traits and tendencies that are characteristic of women generally. The nurturing nature of the woman is built into her very body, even as the man's potentiality for strength is built into his. This suggests that women occupy an ecclesial calling that is unifying, nurturing, bond-forming, and utterly vital for the life and continuance of the church. While such emphases do not rule out the possibility that some women may indeed be gifted to teach in appropriate contexts (e.g., Acts 18:26; cf. 1 Tim 2:12–14), it would seem that the more primary—and genuinely necessary!—work of most women normally entails the sort of activities Paul highlights in 1 Timothy 5:9–11, namely, bringing up children, showing hospitality, washing the feet of the saints, and helping the afflicted. Elsewhere Paul instructs older women to "train the young women to love their husbands and children" (Titus 2:4), which includes being "submissive to their own husbands" (Titus 2:5). Evidently, Paul is familiar with the sexual paradigm established in Genesis 1–3. For even when he does not cite those chapters (unlike 1 Cor 11:2–16; 1 Tim 2:8–15; Eph 5:22–33), Paul relies on the pattern Moses establishes there. Specifically, Paul recognizes woman as man's glorious, God-given, necessary helper (Gen 2:18), one with the power to compel the creation of social bonds (Gen 2:24) and to nurture the life that is formed from such unions (Gen 3:20).

---

[202] Alastair Roberts, "Why a Masculine Priesthood Is Essential," *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), August 30, 2014, https://alastairadversaria.com/2014/08/30/why-a-masculine-priesthood-is-essential/.

[203] Roberts, "Why a Masculine Priesthood Is Essential."

Conclusion

Debates about the nature of the sexes, their relation to each other, and the ways in which members of either sex can—or should—inhabit the world impact the frontlines of ministry in virtually every local church in the West. On the one hand, this calls for careful thinking about the total witness of the Scriptures to the nature of the sexes in God's design, remembering the grave warnings given to those who would speak on God's behalf (Jas 3:1). On the other hand, the significance of the sexes and the destructive consequences of contravening God's design also call for the kind of courage that "cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard" (Acts 4:20), especially that which was from the beginning (i.e., Gen 1–3).

In other words, the sexual confusion of the present is far too great to ignore or deny. Christians do so only to their own judgment and the world's peril. Yet perhaps this cluster of issues is not the theological battleground that some would have chosen had the choice been left up to them. In more arenas than this, it must be remembered that one's preferences do not alter reality. Here Christians who hold to the traditional view of the sexes may feel some sympathy with Frodo Baggins of the Shire, who lamented the course that was set before him by forces beyond his control: "I wish the Ring had never come to me," he said. "I wish none of this had happened." "So do all who live to see such times," his friend Gandalf replied. "But that is not for them to decide. All we have to decide is what to do with the time that is given to us."[204] To that end, may all those who hold to the traditional view of the sexes be found faithful (1 Cor 4:2).

---

[204] Peter Jackson, dir., *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring,* theatrical version, (New Line Cinema, 2001), 1:50:58–1:51:15. (Speaking of the inability for preferences to alter reality, this lovely piece of dialogue is not original to Tolkien's book, as much as this author wishes it were.)

APPENDIX 1

HEAD TO HEAD: THE MEANING OF ΚΕΦΑΛΗ

Traditionally, scholars have understood κεφαλὴ "to designate hierarchy and to imply authoritative headship,"[1] with man as the head having authority over woman. Foremost among the defenders of the traditional view are Wayne Grudem and Joseph Fitzmyer.[2] Grudem bases much of his argument on a survey of 2,336 instances of κεφαλὴ in the writings of thirty-six Greek authors in *Thesaurae Linguae Graecae* from the eighth century BC to the fourth century AD. Of these, 2,004 uses denote "the actual physical head of a man or animal."[3] Of the 302 metaphorical uses, Grudem says 49 denote "person of superior authority or rank, or 'ruler,' 'ruling part,'" while zero instances of the meaning "source" (or "origin") were discovered.[4]

Fitzmyer notes that in the LXX κεφαλὴ translates the Hebrew רֹאשׁ ("head") 281 times.[5] Of those, a subcategory meaning "leader" occurs a few times in Exodus and

[1] David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 514. Cf. Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," in *The Text and the Times: New Testament Essays for Today* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 89, 91–92; Murphy-O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in 1 Cor 11:2–16," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 92 (1980): 490; and Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), 503.

[2] See Wayne Grudem, "Does Kephalē (Head) Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59; Wayne Grudem, "The Meaning of Κεφαλή: A Response to Recent Studies," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3–72, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Another Look at Κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 503–11; and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Kephalē in 1 Cor. 11:3," *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 32–59.

[3] Grudem, "Does Kephalē (Head) Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over?,'" 49.

[4] Grudem, "Does Kephalē (Head) Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over?,'" 52.

[5] Fitzmyer, "Another Look at Κεφαλή," 506.

at least eleven times in Judges (e.g., Judg 10:18; 11:8, 9, 11).[6] Furthermore, 2 Samuel 22:44 is a clear text in which רֹאשׁ / κεφαλὴ (LXX) carries the meaning "ruler." Speaking to the Lord (2 Sam. 22:1) David says, "You delivered me from strife with my people; you kept me as the *head* of the nations; people whom I had not known served me" (2 Sam. 22:44 ESV). Even authors who prefer the meaning "source" in 1 Corinthians 11:3 concede the indisputability of an authoritative sense in 2 Samuel 22:44.[7] On top of all this, Schreiner correctly notes that the term κεφαλὴ "never bears [the meaning of "source"] in the Septuagint."[8]

For all these reasons, recent commentators increasingly cast doubt on the viability of 'source' as a translation for κεφαλὴ, both generally,[9] and especially in 1 Corinthians 11:3ff.[10] As Grudem summarizes, "The paucity of lexicographical evidence" for the meaning "source" seems to make this meaning for κεφαλὴ "highly suspect."[11] Though it is frowned upon to psychologize (by attributing motive to) one's interlocutors, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that reasons driving the preference for "source" are theological rather than exegetical. Indeed, Garland notes, "Many recent interpreters who prefer this option" have explicitly mentioned their desire "to eliminate any hint of women's subordination."[12]

---

[6] Fitzmyer, "Another Look at Κεφαλή," 506.

[7] See Murphy-O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in 1 Cor 11:2–16," 492.

[8] Thomas R. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne A. Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991), 119.

[9] D. G. Horrel, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*, Studies of the New Testament and Its World (Edinburgh: Clark, 1996), 171.

[10] Andrew Perriman points out that nowhere "do we find anything like the idea of material origin that 'source' must imply in this context (woman created out of the body of man)." See Andrew Perriman, "The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of Κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3," *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994): 621.

[11] Grudem, "Does Kephalē (Head) Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over?,'" 53.

[12] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

Nevertheless, in recent years scholars have identified certain problems with Grudem's (and thus Schreiner's) argument for κεφαλή as denoting "authoritative head." Garland lists four specific challenges. First, the word "head" was rarely used to describe the relationship of one individual *to another individual*.[13] Garland seems to be following Hans Conzelmann here, who noted, "Head does not denote sovereignty of one person over another, *but over a community*."[14] (Note that the previous example from 2 Samuel 22:44 fits this description.) Thiselton concurs with this assessment,[15] leaning especially on the writings of Chrysostom. The patristic author writes, "We are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof (1 Cor 12:27) *and in this way He is our head*."[16] Shortly thereafter, Chrysostom also casts doubt on the use of "head" in this context as denoting a strict hierarchy: "[H]ad Paul meant to speak of rule and subjection… he would not have brought forward the instance of a wife, but rather of a slave and a master."[17]

Second, Garland notes that Andrew Perriman and Richard Cervin have alleged that Grudem mishandles some of the lexical evidence. For example, Cervin notes that fourteen ancient Greek lexicans lack "authority (over)" as a possible meaning for κεφαλή, suggesting that Grudem's preferred meaning was a later development.[18] Instead, Cervin suggests that in each case where Grudem asserts "authority" as the meaning for the metaphorical use of κεφαλή, a sense denoting "prominence" or "preeminence" better fits

---

[13] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 514, emphasis added.

[14] Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. J. W. Leitch. Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 183n21, emphasis added.

[15] Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 815–16.

[16] John Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," in *Homilies on First Corinthians*, trans. Talbot W. Chambers, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, Series 1, vol. 12, *Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 148, emphasis added.

[17] Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," 150.

[18] Richard S. Cervin, "Does *Kephalē* Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Rebuttal," *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 107–11.

the context.[19] Building on Cervin's case, Perriman reexamines the lexical texts cited by Grudem and Fitzmyer in instances where κεφαλή is said to mean 'authority' and/or 'leadership,' claiming that the texts do not refer to 'ruler' or 'leader' for said metaphorical uses.[20] Instead, Perriman argues that the sense of the term is closer to prominence, eminence, representation, or preeminence (cf. LXX Deut. 28:44; Lam. 1:5; Isa. 7:8–9; 9:13; Jer. 38:7).[21] Thiselton follows Perriman on this, noting that "(a) the overwhelming majority of [κεφαλή] refer to physiological head in contrast to body; and (b) a substantial number of occurrences [are] synecdoche, where heads denotes persons or animals (e.g., "head of cattle," or "counting heads")."[22] Such usage has theological significance, too, for Christ is said to stand for (i.e., represent) man, just as Adam is the head of humanity apart from Christ (1 Cor 15:21–24; cf. Rom 5:12–21).[23]

Thirdly, Garland highlights arguments that suggest Grudem's interpretation "projects anachronistic physiological notions onto the meaning of 'head.'"[24] Specifically, Perriman notes Plutarch's fable (Agesilaus 2.3) about a serpent whose tail rebels against his own head, taking the lead with disastrous consequences. Perriman argues that this fable was not taken to mean that the head (of the serpent) had authority over the tail, but that the head was specially designed to go first in the order.[25] The final challenge Garland lists is from Perriman again. He writes, "The question of authority is irrelevant to a discussion of the proper manner in which men and women should pray and prophesy; nor

[19] Cervin, "Does *Kephalē* Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over,"' 112. Grudem responded to this critique saying that even if "prominent part" were a valid sense for κεφαλή in some contexts, the meaning must still include some sense of "authority over" when applied to *persons* who are designed as the "head." Grudem, "The Meaning of Κεφαλή," 54–55.

[20] Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 610.

[21] Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 618.

[22] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 816.

[23] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 816.

[24] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

[25] Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 610n20.

is it a valid deduction from the idea that man has authority over the woman that she should veil herself in worship, an activity directed not towards the man but towards God."[26]

Thiselton summarizes the debate in this way: "Grudem's critique of the proposals about 'source' seems convincing, but his attempts to insist that the sense of 'head' used by Paul necessarily carries with it notions of authority rather than prominence, eminence, representation, or preeminence is less conclusive, especially when he concedes that some 2,000 of 2,336 occurrences presuppose the semantic contrast between physical head and physical body."[27] Hence Thiselton sides with Cervin and Perriman, contra Grudem and Fitzmyer (and Schreiner), in accepting that κεφαλή most common denotes that which is preeminent or foremost, or else is a synecdoche in a representative role. Thiselton writes, "This proposal has the merit of *most clearly drawing interactively on the metaphorical conjunction between physiological head* (which is far and away the most frequent, "normal" meaning) and the notion of *prominence*, i.e., the *most* conspicuous or *top-most* manifestation of that for which the term also functions *as synecdoche for the whole*."[28] Thiselton concludes, "These aspects feature more frequently and prominently in first-century Greek texts than either the notions of *ruler* or *source*."[29]

The point here is not that Cervin, Perriman, and Thiselton are *certainly* correct, such that those who follow Grudem and Fitzmyer are hopelessly left without any room for rejoinder. In fact, Perriman concedes that "head [κεφαλή] denotes one who is preeminent, and… it may result in authority and leadership [depending on the

[26] Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 620.

[27] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 813–14.

[28] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 821, emphasis original.

[29] Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 821.

connotations of the context]."[30] For this reason, I am arguing that Grudem, Schreiner, and other complementarians would stand on firmer ground if they did not stake their arguments on the lexical meaning of κεφαλή as "authority (over)" but looked to the context instead.[31] For it is at least plausible, if not likely, that the term does not carry this denotation. Furthermore, insisting that the term *does* carry such a meaning invites a range of interpretive difficulties when it comes to the Trinity.

Headship and Trinitarian Troubles

Even here, space does not permit a full accounting of the Trinitarian controversy that has erupted over the last couple decades.[32] The essence of the discussion concerns whether it is valid to derive gender roles from the Trinity. Generally, complementarians have favored doing so, while egalitarians have resisted a similar move. Those who argue for the life of the Trinity as a model for male-female relations have adopted terminology such as the eternal subordination of the Son (ESS), eternal relations of authority and submission (ERAS), or eternal functional subordination (EFS). Each of these is meant to convey, in Schreiner's words, that "the Son willingly submits Himself to the Father's authority… The Son has a different function or role from the Father, not an inferior being or essence."[33]

---

[30] Perriman, "The Head of a Woman," 616. Nevertheless, he insists that authority "is not its [κεφαλή] basic denotation."

[31] Schreiner writes, "Paul is saying that Christ is the authority over every man, man is the authority over woman, and God is the authority over Christ." See "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 120.

[32] Alastair Roberts provides a helpful summary (with links) in Alastair Roberts, "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy: The Debate So Far," *Reformation21* (blog), June 16, 2016, https://www.reformation21.org/blogs/the-eternal-subordination-of-t.php. Roberts also provides a thorough list of books and academic articles from both sides of the debate in "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy: Survey of Some Recent Material," *Reformation21* (blog), June 17, 2016, https://www.reformation21.org/blogs/the-eternal-subordination-of-t-1.php.

[33] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 120.

Egalitarians have been sharp critics both of such conceptions of the Trinity and of any attempts to apply such conceptions to male-female relationships.[34] One of their main critiques is the charge that ESS/ERAS/EFS is an innovative conception, a novelty formulated to support the complementarian view of gendered relationships. Against this charge, it should be noted that both Charles Hodge and A. H. Strong advocate some form of the subordinationist position, even if it was milder than some of its modern proponents.[35] The second charge leveled by egalitarians asserts that any form of ESS/ERAS/EFS, including one like Schreiner's above, intrinsically and inescapably entails the inferiority of the one who submits.[36] Yet advocates (including Schreiner) repeatedly insist that they do *not* make a distinction in the essence of the Trinity, only in the function or role or relations of the Trinitarian persons.[37]

Alastair Roberts notes, "In certain instances, defenders of ESS don't seem to be asserting much more than the claim that there is a correspondence between the taxis of the immanent Trinity (relating to eternal generation), the 'priority' of the Father as the one sending the Son, and the obedient form of Christ's life lived out in the form of a servant."[38] As one such example of this "mild" or "soft" form ERAS, Kyle Claunch's essay in a book arguing *for* ERAS prefers to set aside speaking of the "eternal

---

[34] See Kevin Giles, *The Trinity & Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God & the Contemporary Gender Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002); R. C. and C. C. Kroeger, "Subordinationism," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 1058; and G. Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 241.

[35] See Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (1871; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975) 1:462; and A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology: A Compendium Designed for the Use of Theological Students* (1903), 619–20, accessed January 20, 2024, http://www.ntslibrary.com/PDF%20Books%20II/Strong%20-%20Systematic%20Theology.pdf.

[36] See Catherine C. Kroeger, "Appendix III: The Classical Concept of Head as 'Source,'" in Gretchen Gaebelein Hull, *Equal to Serve: Men and Women in the Church* (London: Scripture Union, 1989), 267–83.

[37] Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity," 120–23.

[38] Roberts, "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy."

subordination of the Son," while still holding that "the one eternal will of God is so ordered that it finds analogical expression in a created relationship of authority and submission."[39]

Roberts notes that such a view is "very far removed" from the sort of 'subordination' advocated by the Arians (contra the complaints of modern egalitarians). Yet he also suggests that Claunch's conception "contrasts sharply with the 'subordination' of someone such as Grudem, who questions eternal generation, rejects inseparable operations (see Grudem's opening essay in *One God in Three Persons*), and speaks of eternal divine self-differentiation in terms of authority, submission, and subordination."[40] In other words, Grudem appeals to early uses of the language of subordination (in Hodge, Strong, et al.) to defend his *peculiar* form of ESS, which is not only marginal to Trinitarian tradition, but which also has substituted—or at least elevated—the terminology of subordination, authority, and submission to historically unknown and biblically dissonant levels. By way of contrast, Roberts notes that terms such as "love," "revelation," "sent," "gift," "word," and "image" are far more prominent in the biblical account of the Trinity that of authority and subordination.[41]

None of this should be taken as affirmation of the egalitarian view of the sexes. In fact, there is a valid argument to be made that the incarnate Christ's submission—for he was no less fully God during his incarnation—rebuts egalitarian claims that all acts of submission *necessarily* entail inequality for the submissive one. Still, Roberts sees "a great gulf" between "occasional appeals" to the Trinity that correct egalitarian misconceptions of submission and the "determined advocacy of ESS as a disputed

---

[39] Kyle Claunch, "God Is the Head of Christ: Does 1 Corinthians 11:3 Ground Gender Complementarity in the Immanent Trinity?," in *One God in Three Persons: Unity of Essence, Distinction of Persons, Implications for Life*, ed. Bruce A. Ware and John Stark (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2015), 91.

[40] Roberts, "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy."

[41] Roberts, "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy." Roberts goes on to say, "Characterizing a relationship as *involving* subordination is one thing; defining the relationship as subordination is quite another."

doctrine that grounds the submission of women to men upon the submission of the Son to the Father."[42] The particular problem is that the second approach (i.e., ESS/ERAS/EFS) "unhelpfully entangles our doctrine of the Trinity with our account of relations between the sexes and overloads isolated texts like 1 Corinthians 11:3—a slender bridge that must now support heavy theological traffic—in the theological formulation of both of these positions."[43]

These errors are the sort that Chrysostom seemed to have in mind, when he spoke of the multivalence of the word "head' in 1 Corinthians 11:3. He writes,

> If the superiority of the Son compared with us be the measure of the Father's [superiority] compared with the Son, consider to what meanness you will bring Him. So that we must not try all things by like measure in respect of ourselves and of God, *though the language used concerning them be similar*; but we must assign to God a certain appropriate excellency, and so great as belongs to God. For should they not grant this, many absurdities will follow. . . . Therefore if we choose to take the term, head, *in the like sense in all the clauses*, the Son will be as far removed from the Father as we are from Him.[44]

In other words, Chrysostom is keen to maintain a distinction between the headship of God over Christ and that of man over woman in order to safeguard the equality of the Son with the Father. He adds a similar caution from the other end of the analogy, saying, "Do not therefore strain the example of the man and the woman to all particulars."[45] Furthermore, Chrysostom stresses that "the Son is of the same substance with the Father. . .

---

[42] Roberts, "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy."

[43] Roberts, "The Eternal Subordination of the Son Controversy."

[44] Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," 150, emphasis added. In other words, Chrysostom argues the word "head" is used in two senses here, otherwise a theological absurdity would result. For there is no ontological distinction between God and Christ, so far as divinity is concerned. Meanwhile, the ontological distinction between Christ (who is the Son of God) and man is infinitely greater than any difference between man and woman. And yet, Paul uses the term "head" throughout.

[45] Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," 150. Ambrosiaster similarly says, "God is the head of Christ because he begat him; Christ is the head of the man because he created him, and the man is the head of the woman because she was taken from his side. *Thus one expression has different meanings, according to the difference of person and substantive relationship*." See Ambrosiaster, *Commentaries on Romans and 1–2 Corinthians*, ed. and trans. Gerald Bray, Ancient Christian Texts 1 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), 171.

[and] "the Son has the same honor with Him that begot Him."[46] Here he explains that this equality of being means the "governance" [i.e., headship] of the Father over the Son entails "no disparagement" but is owing to "the Economy,"[47] that is, the actions of the Trinity in creation and redemption. In other words, Chrysostom knows that God and Christ are equal in substance while assuming distinct *economic* roles, and he defends Paul's application of this analogy to man and woman so long as it is not taken to imply the Son's ontological inferiority to the Father.[48] Here Chrysostom sounds like advocates of ESS/ERAS/EFS at their best (including Schreiner), though he displays more concern for the "absurdities" that would result from a monovalent reading of κεφαλή in the context of 1 Corinthians 11:3.[49]

In conclusion, I have argued that complementarians like Schreiner and Grudem have staked too much on the lexical argument for the meaning of κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3. The consequence of such an approach is twofold. First, it inadvertently invites Trinitarian confusion among interpreters who are less than careful with their doctrinal confession of the divine relations *ad intra* and *ad extra*. Second, and more to the point for the present argument, such an approach leaves complementarians vulnerable to recent arguments that have cast some doubt on Grudem's (and Fitzmyer's) view that the denotation of κεφαλή entails "authority (over)." This need not be so, especially when there is a simple solution. Namely, instead of relying so heavily on lexical studies,[50] one

[46] Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," 150.

[47] Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," 150.

[48] Indeed, Chrysostom says that is the way of "heretics," who "rush upon us with a certain declaration of inferiority, which out of these words [1 Cor. 11:3] they contrive against the Son." See Chrysostom, "Homily XXVI on First Corinthians," 150.

[49] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

[50] Once more, I am not saying that the lexical data does not matter at all. Rather, my aim to liberate the exegesis from, in the words of Roberts,

> being blown off course by the crosswinds of the gender debates . . . [which] increasingly come to focus upon the questions concerning the meanings, not just of particular proof-texts, but of isolated words and phrases. . . . Slight differences in translation are used to justify remarkably different

can better discern the meaning of κεφαλή by exploring Paul's use of Genesis 2–3, both in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 and Ephesians 5:22–33, just as chapter 3, "Paradigm Explained: The Apostolic Use of Genesis 1–3," sought to establish.

---

accounts of appropriate relations between the sexes. Different sides of the debates can construct vast theological edifices upon the slender pinnacles of terms such as כנגדו עזר in Genesis 2:18 or התשוק in Genesis 3:16, for instance. This can occur for various reasons. For some, it accompanies the attempt to kick the debate into the long grass of hopelessly contestable exegesis, thereby preventing Scripture from playing a deciding role in our conversations. When so many interpretations are floating around, Scripture can no longer arbitrate and personal choice—with its tendentious, eccentric, and often wilful [*sic*] readings of particular texts and terms—steps in to take its place." See Alastair Roberts, "Subordination in Scripture: κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3," Reformation21, November 22, 2016, https://www.reformation21.org/blogs/subordination-in-scripture-in.php.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, T. Desmond. *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic, 2011.

Ambrose. *Paradise*. In *St. Ambrose: Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*. Translated by John J. Savage, 287–356. Fathers of the Church 42. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1961.

August, Jared. M. "What Must She Do to Be Saved? A Theological Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:15." *Themelios* 45, no. 1 (2020). https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/what-must-she-do-to-be-saved-a-theological-analysis-of-1-timothy-215/.

Augustine. *Confessions* 13.47. Translated by Sarah Ruden. New York: Modern Library, 2017.

_____. "Extract from Augustin's [sic] 'Retractions' 2.42." Translated by Peter Holmes and Robert Ernest Wallis. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Philip Schaff, Series 1, Vol. 5, *Saint Augustin's Anti-Pelagian Works*, 116. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Ayers, David J. "The Inevitability of Failure: The Assumptions and Implications of Modern Feminism." In *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 371–96. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021.

Barr, Beth Allison. *The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How the Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth.* Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2021.

Barth, Karl. *The Doctrine of Creation*, Part 1. Vol. III/1 of *Church Dogmatics*. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Translated by J. W. Edwards, O. Bussey, and H. Knights 1956. Reprint, London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Barth, Markus. *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 4–6*, Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 34. Garden City, NY: Double Day, 1974.

Bartlett, Andrew. *Men and Women in Christ: Fresh Light from the Biblical Texts.* London: Inter-Varsity, 2019.

Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.

Bavinck, Herman. *The Christian Family*. Translated by Nelson D. Kloosterman. Grand Rapids: Christian's Library, 2012.

_____. *Prolegomena*. Vol. 1 of *Reformed Dogmatics.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.

Beale, G. K., ed. *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

_____. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.

Beck, James R., ed. *Two Views on Women in Ministry*. Counterpoints. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Beckwith, Roger. "Formation of the Hebrew Bible." In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by M. J. Mulder and Harry Sysling, 39–86. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.

Bennett, William Henry. *The Books of Chronicles.* Expositor's Bible. New York: A. C. Armstrong, 1894. Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Accessed July 16, 2022. https://ccel.org/ccel/bennett/expositor10/expositor10.i.html.

Berlin, Brent, and Paul Kay. *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution.* Berkeley: University of California, 1969.

Betzig, Laura. *Despotism and Differential Reproduction: A Darwinian View of History*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine, 1986.

Bilezikian, Gilbert. *Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.

Bowman, Karlyn, and Bryan O'Keefe. "Attitudes about Homosexuality and Gay Marriage." *American Enterprise Institute in Public Opinion*, December 31, 2004. https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/20080603-Homosexuality.pdf?x91208.

Budziszewski, J. *On the Meaning of Sex.* Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2014.

Burk, Denny. "Is Complementarianism a Man-Made Doctrine?" *Eikon* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2021): 23–29.

_____. "Mere Complementarianism." *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 28–42.

_____. "Transgenderism and Three Biblical Axioms." In *God's Glory Revealed in Christ: Essays on Biblical Theology in Honor of Thomas R. Schreiner*, edited by Denny Burk, James M. Hamilton Jr., and Brian Vickers, 214–17. Nashville: B & H, 2019.

Burkett, Elinor. "What Makes a Woman." *New York Times*, June 6, 2015. https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/07/opinion/sunday/what-makes-a-woman.html.

Byrd, Aimee. *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2020.

Calvin, John. *The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.* Vol. 21 *of Calvin's Commentaries*. Translated by William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

_____. *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.* Vol. 20 of *Calvin's Commentaries*. Translated by John Pringle. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

_____. *Harmony of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.* Vol. 2 of *Calvin's Commentaries*. Ada, MI: Baker, 1974.

_____. *Men, Women and Order in the Church: Three Sermons.* Translated by Seth Skolnitsky. Dallas: Presbyterian Heritage, 1992.

Carson, D. A. Series preface to *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, by G. K. Beale. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.

Carson, D. A., and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testamen*t. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Carter, Craig. "The New Gender Gnostics." *Eikon* 2, no.1 (Spring 2020): 28–39.

Cassuto, Umberto. *From Adam to Noah.* Vol. 1 of *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis.* Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 2000.

Cervin, Richard S. "Does *Kephalē* Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Rebuttal." *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 85–112.

Childs, Brevard. *New Testament as Canon*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Chrysostom, John. "Homily IX." In *Homilies on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.* Translated by C. Marriot. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Philip Schaff. Series 1, Vol. 13, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon,* 435–437. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

_____. "Homily XX." In *Homilies on Ephesians*. Translated by Gross Alexander. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Philip Schaff, Series 1, Vol. 13, *Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, 143–52. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

_____. "Homily XXVI." In *Homilies on First Christians*. Translated by Talbot W. Chambers. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church,* edited by Philip Schaff, Series 1, Vol. 12, *Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, 148–57. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Clark, Elizabeth A. *Women in the Early Church*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1983.

Clark, Stephen B. *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences.* Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980.

Claunch, Kyle. "On the Improper Use of Proper Speech: A Response to Ronald W. Pierce and Erin M. Heim, 'Biblical Images of God as Mother and Spiritual Formation.'" *Eikon* 5, no. 1 (Fall 2023): 69–77.

Clouse, Bonnidell, and Robert Clouse, eds. *Women in Ministry: Four Views*. Spectrum Multiview. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1989.

Cochran, Pamela. *Evangelical Feminism: A History*. New York: NYU, 2005.

Cohick, Lynn H. "Loving and Submitting to One Another in Marriage." In *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural and Practical Perspectives*, edited by Ronald W. Pierce, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, 185–204. 3rd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2021.

Collett, Don C. *Figural Reading and the Old Testament: Theology and Practice*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2020.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1999.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Translated by J. W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. "The Danvers Statement." November 1988. https://cbmw.org/about/danvers-statement/.

Croson, Rachel, and Uri Gneezy. "Gender Differences in Preferences." *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (2009): 448–74.

"Cross-Tabs: July 2023 Times/Sienna Poll of the 2024 Race and national Issues." *New York Times*, August 1, 2023. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/08/01/us/elections/times-siena-poll-registered-voters-crosstabs.html.

Cyprian. *St. Cyprian Letters 1–81*. Translated by Rose Bernard Donna. Fathers of the Church 51, 202–15. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1964.

Daly, Mary. *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*. Boston: Beacon, 1973.

Davids, Peter H. "A Silent Witness in Marriage: 1 Peter 3:1–7." In *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural and Practical Perspectives*, edited by Ronald W. Pierce, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, 228–46. 3rd ed. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2021.

Delobel, Joël. "1 Cor 11:2–16: Towards a Coherent Explanation." In *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du ministère*, edited by A. Vanhoye, 369–89. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 73. Leuven: Leuven University, 1986.

DeRouchie, Jason. "Confronting the Transgender Storm: A Sermon on Deuteronomy 22:5." Jason DeRouchie, November 5, 2015. https://jasonderouchie.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Sermon-Deut-22v5-Confronting-the-Transgender-Storm-iPad.pdf.

Dever, Mark. “Young vs. Old Complementarians.” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 13, no. 1 (2008): 23–26.

DeYoung, Kevin. *Men and Women in the Church: A Short, Biblical, Practical Introduction.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021.

Dickson, John. *Hearing Her Voice: A Biblical Invitation for Women to Preach*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet, 1952.

Doriani, Daniel. “Appendix 1: A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2.” In *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, 213–68. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1995.

du Mez, Kristin Kobes. *A New Gospel for Women: Katharine Bushnell and the Challenge of Christian Feminism*. New York: Oxford University, 2015.

Dudrey, Russ. “‘Submit Yourselves to One Another’: A Socio-Historical Look at the Household Code of Ephesians 5:15–6:9.” *Restoration Quarterly* 41 (1999): 27–44.

Earle, Ralph. *1 & 2 Timothy*. In *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 11, *Ephesians through Philemon*, edited by Frank E. Gaebelein, 333–90. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.

Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. 1872. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University, 1997.

Ellis, E Earle. Foreword to *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, by Leonhard Goppelt. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Engberg-Pederson, Troels. “1 Corinthians 11:16 and the Character of Pauline Exhortational.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 679–89.

Evans, Rachel Held. *A Year of Biblical Womanhood: How a Liberated Woman Found Herself Sitting on Her Roof, Covering Her Head, and Calling Her Husband “Master.”* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2012.

Fanning, Buist. “Returning to God’s Design: A Response to Stanley E. Porter, ‘Gender Equality and the Analogy of Slavery.’” *Eikon* 5, no. 1 (Spring 2023): 54–59.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987.

_____. *1 & 2 Timothy*. Understanding the Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011.

Finley, Thomas. “The Ministry of Women in the Old Testament.” In *Women and Men in Ministry: A Complementary Perspective*, edited by Robert L. Saucy and Judith K. TenElshof, 73–91. Chicago: Moody, 2001.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “Another Look at Κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3.” *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 503–11.

_____. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Sources for Biblical Study 5. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1971.

_____. *First Corinthians*. Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 32. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2008.

_____. "Kephalē in 1 Cor. 11:3." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 32–59.

Frame, John M. "Men and Women in the Image of God." In *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 295–306. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021.

France, R. T. *Women in the Church's Ministry: A Test Case for Biblical Interpretation*. Cumbria, England: Pasternoster, 1995.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.

Garris, Zacharay. *Masculine Christianity.* Ann Arbor, MI: Reformation Zion, 2020.

Giles, Kevin. *The Trinity & Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God & the Contemporary Gender Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002.

_____. "Women in the Church: A Rejoinder to Andreas Köstenberger." *Evangelical Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2001): 225–45.

Glahn, Sandra, ed. *Vindicating the Vixens.* Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017.

Gombis, Timothy G. "A Radically New Humanity: The Function of the *Haustafel* in Ephesians." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005): 317–330.

Green, Bradley. "The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How the Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth." *Eikon* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2022): 162–75.

Green, Emma. "The Culture War Over 'Pregnant People.'" *The Atlantic*, September 17, 2021. https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2021/09/pregnant-people-gender-identity/620031/.

Grenz, Stanley J., and Denise Muir Kjesbo. *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995.

Groothuis, Rebecca. *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.

Grudem, Wayne. "Does Kephalē (Head) Mean 'Source' or 'Authority over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples." *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59.

_____. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012.

_____. "The Meaning of Κεφαλή: A Response to Recent Studies." *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3–72.

Grudem, Wayne, and John Piper, eds. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991.

Gundry-Volf, Judith. "Gender and Creation in 1 Cor 11:2–16: A Study in Paul's Theological Method." In *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Jostein Ådna, Scott Hafemman, and Otfried Hofius, 151–71. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1997.

Gurry, Peter. "A Textual, Lexical, and Ethical Challenge to the 'Principle of Reciprocity': A Response to Lynn H. Cohick, 'Loving and Submitting to One Another in Marriage.'" *Eikon* 5, no. 1 (Spring 2023): 40–45.

Hamilton, James M., Jr. *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010.

_____. "The Intent of the Human Author." Theopolis Institute, July 23, 2020. https://theopolisinstitute.com/conversations/the-intent-of-the-human-author/.

_____. *Songs of Songs: A Biblical-Theological, Allegorical, and Christological Interpretation*. Fearn, Scotland: Christian Focus, 2015.

_____. *Typology—Understanding the Bible's Promise-Shaped Patterns: How Old Testament Expectations Are Fulfilled in Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2022.

_____. *What Is Biblical Theology? A Guide to the Bible's Story, Symbolism, and Patterns*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014.

Haykin, Michael A. G. "This Anthropological Moment." *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 6–8.

Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians.* Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.

Hess, Richard S. "Genesis 1–3." In *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, 2nd ed., edited by Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca M. Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, 79–95. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005.

_____. "The Roles of the Woman and the Man in Genesis 3." *Themelios* 18, no. 3. (April 1993): 15–19.

Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology.* Vol. 1. 1871. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975.

Holland, Tom. *Dominion: How the Christian Revolution Remade the World.* New York: Basic Books, 2019.

Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations.* 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Hopko, Thomas, ed. *Women and the Priesthood*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 1999.

Horrel, D. G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: Clark, 1996.

Hull, Gretchen Gaebelein. *Equal to Serve: Women and Men in the Church and Home*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1987.

Ignatius. *To the Magnesians*. In *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed., translated and edited by Michael W. Holmes, 202–13. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

_____. *To the Trallians.* In *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed., translated and edited by Michael W. Holmes, 214–23. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Jackson, Peter, dir. *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring*. New Line Cinemas, 2001.

James, Sharon. "Fresh Light or Less Light? A Review Article of Andrew Bartlett's *Men and Women in Christ*." *Eikon* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2020): 171–91.

_____. *God's Design for Women in an Age of Gender Confusion.* Welwyn Garden City, England: Evangelical, 2019.

Jewett, Paul K. *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*. Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 35A. New Haven, CT: Yale, 2001.

Jones, Mark. "Book Review: *Beyond Authority and Submission* by Rachel Green Miller." *Mere Orthodoxy* (blog), October 2, 2019. https://mereorthodoxy.com/book-review-beyond-authority-and-submission/.

_____. Review of Aimee Byrd's *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. The Calvinist International, May 11, 2020. https://calvinistinternational.com/2020/05/11/review-of-aimee-byrds-recovering-from-biblical-manhood-and-womanhood.

Jordan, James. "No. 86: Liturgical Man, Liturgical Woman—Part 1." Biblical Horizons, May 2004. http://www.biblicalhorizons.com/rite-reasons/no-86-liturgical-man-liturgical-women-part-1/.

Kass, Leon R. *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis.* New York: Free Press, 2003.

Keener, Craig S. *Paul, Women, and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.

Keller, Kathy. *Jesus, Justice, & Gender Roles: A Case for Gender Roles in Ministry*. Fresh Perspectives on Women in Ministry. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Kitchen, Martin. *Ephesians.* New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1994.

Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony." *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 48 (1996): 2–15.

Knight, George, III. *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992.

Köstenberger, Andreas. "Ascertaining Women's God-Ordained Roles: An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 7 (1997): 107–44.

_____. "Gender Passages in the NT: Hermeneutical Fallacies Critiqued." *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994): 259–83.

Köstenberger, Andreas, and Margaret Köstenberger. *God's Design for Man and Woman*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. and Thomas R. Schreiner, eds. *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, eds. *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

Kroeger, Catherine Clark. "Appendix III: The Classical Concept of Head as 'Source.'" In Gretchen Gaebelein Hull, *Equal to Serve: Women and Men in the Church and Home*, 267–83. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1987.

Kroeger, R. C., and C. C. Kroeger. "Subordinationism." In *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Walter A. Elwell, 1058. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Kroeger, Richard, and Catherine Kroeger. *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Lassek, William D., and Steven J. C. Gaulin, "Costs and Benefits of Fat-Free Muscle Mass in Men: Relationship to Mating Success, Dietary Requirements, and Native Immunity." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 30, no. 5 (2009): 322–28.

Laverty, Rhys. "What Did You Plan to Be Hated For?" *The New Albion*, October 20, 2023. https://thenewalbion.substack.com/p/what-did-you-plan-to-be-hated-for.

Leeman, Jonathan. "A Word of Empathy, Warning, and Counsel for 'Narrow' Complementarians." *9Marks*. February 8, 2018. https://www.9marks.org/article/a-word-of-empathy-warning-and-counsel-for-narrow-complementarians.

Leithart, Peter. "Proverbs 31 Woman, [Part] 1." *Theopolis*. March 13, 2018. https://theopolisinstitute.com/leithart_post/proverbs-31-woman-1/.

Lewis, C. S. *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics.* Edited by Walter Hooper. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2014.

_____. Introduction to *On the Incarnation*, by Athanasius. Translated by Penelope Lawson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 1993.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 42. Dallas: Word, 1990.

Luther, Martin. *The Estate of Marriage.* In Luther's Works 45, *The Christian in Society II*. Translated and edited by Walther I. Brandt, 17–18. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1962.

_____. *Lectures on Genesis 1–5*. Edited by Jaroslav Jan Pelikan. Translated by George V. Schick. Luther's Works 1. St. Louis: Concordia, 1958.

_____. *Reihenpredigten über 1. Mose (1523/24)*. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe 24. Edited by J. K. F. Knaake. Weimar, Germany: Böhlaus, 1883.

Manchester, William. “A World Lit Only by Change.” *US News and World Report*, October 25, 1993.

Marshall, I. Howard. “Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage: Colossians 3:18–19 and Ephesians 5:21–33.” In *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, 2nd ed., edited by Rondal W. Pierce, Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, 186–204. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005.

_____. *The Pastoral Epistles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999.

Mattox, Mickey L. “Luther on Eve, Women, and the Church.” In *The Pastoral Luther: Essays on Martin Luther’s Practical Theology*, edited by Timothy J. Wengert. Minneapolis, 251–70. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017.

McKirland, Christa L. “‘Huldah’ Malfunction with the Wardrobe Keeper’s Wife.” In *Vindicating the Vixens*, edited by Sandra Glahn, 213–34. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017.

McKnight, Scot. *The Blue Parakeet: Rethinking How You Read the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.

Meier, John P. “On the Veiling of Hermeneutics (1 Cor 11:2–16).” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 212–26.

Miller, Rachel Green. *Beyond Authority and Submission: Women and Men in Marriage, Church, and Society*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2019.

Moore, Russell. “After Patriarchy, What? Why Egalitarians Are Winning the Gender Debate.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theology Society* 49, no. 3 (September 2006): 569–76.

Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 46. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.

Mouser, William E., and Barbara K. Mouser. *The Story of Sex in Scripture*. Waxahachie, TX: International Council for Gender Studies, 2006.

Muddiman, John. *The Epistles to the Ephesians.* Black’s New Testament Commentaries. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.

Mulder, M. J., and Harry Sysling, eds. *Mikra*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.

Murphy-O’Connor, Jerome. “1 Cor 11:2–16 Once Again.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 265–74.

_____. “The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2–16?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1986): 615–21.

_____. “Sex and Logic in 1 Cor 11:2–16.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 92 (1980): 482–500.

Murray, David. *Jesus on Every Page*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2013.

Naselli, Andrew D. “Does Anyone Need to Recover from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood? A Review Article of Aimee Byrd’s *Recovering from Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.*” *Eikon* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2020): 109–51.

Neufeld, Thomas R. Yoder. *Ephesians.* Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 2002.

Neuer, Werner. *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective*. Translated by Gordan Wenham. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991.

Ortlund, Raymond C., Jr. “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship: Genesis 1–3.” In *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 119–42. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021.

Padgett, Alan. “Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11:3–16 and Its Context.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 69–86.

Payne, Philip B. *Man and Woman: One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Perriman, Andrew. “The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of Κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994): 602–22.

Pierce, Ronald W., and Mary L. Conway. “The Treatment of Women Under the Mosaic Law.” In *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural and Practical Perspectives*, 3rd ed., edited by Ronald W. Pierce, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, 53–69. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2021.

Pierce, Ronald W., Rebecca M. Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy.* 2nd ed. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005.

Pierce, Ronald W., Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, eds. *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural and Practical Perspectives*. 3rd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2021.

Piper, John. “Ask Pastor John: Should Women Be Police Officers?” *Desiring God* (blog), August 13, 2015. https://www.desiringgod.org/interviews/should-women-be-police-officers.

_____. “Headship and Harmony: Response from John Piper.” *The Standard* 74, no. 5 (May 1984): 39–40.

_____. “A Vision of Biblical Complementarity.” In *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem, 35–72. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2021.

Porter, Stanley E. “Gender Equality and the Analogy of Slavery.” In *Discovering Biblical Equality: Biblical, Theological, Cultural and Practical Perspectives*, 3rd ed., edited by Ronald W. Pierce, Cynthia Long Westfall, and Christa L. McKirkland, 327–50. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2021.

_____. *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*. Studies in Biblical Greek. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

Rand, David G., Victoria L. Brescol, Jim A. Everett, Valerio Capraro, and Hélène Barcelo. "Social Heuristics and Social Roles: Intuition Favors Altruism for Women but Not for Men." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 145 (2016): 389–96.

Ratner, R. J. "Garments of Skin (Genesis 3:21)." *Dor le Dor* 18, no. 2 (Winter 1989/1990): 74–80.

Rigney, Joe. "Indicatives, Imperatives, and Applications: Reflections on Natural, Biblical, and Cultural Complementarianism." *Eikon* 4, no. 1 (Spring 2022): 28–37.

_____. "With One Voice: Scripture and Nature for Ethics and Discipleship." *Eikon* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 26–37.

Roberts, Alastair. "A Closer Examination of Junia, the Female Apostle." Alastair's Adversaria, December 10, 2011. https://alastairadversaria.com/2011/12/10/a-closer-examination-of-junia-the-female-apostle/.

_____. "The Deception of Eve." Passing the Salt Shaker, April 3, 2015. https://passthesaltshaker.wordpress.com/2015/04/03/the-deception-of-eve/.

_____. "1 Corinthians 11: Biblical Reading and Reflections—Part 398." *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), July 11, 2020. https://audio.alastairadversaria.com/sermons/10570/.

_____. "Man, Woman, Deception, and Authority in 1 Timothy 2." *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), November 4, 2018. https://adversariapodcast.com/2018/11/04/video-man-woman-deception-and-authority-in-1-timothy-2/.

_____. "Miriam, Deliverer of Her People." Adversaria Videos and Podcasts, August 26, 2019. https://adversariapodcast.com/2019/08/26/miriam-deliverer-of-her-people/.

_____. "The Music of Male and Female." *Primer* 3 (October 2016): 1–18.

_____. "Realms and Manners of Experience/Deceiving Tyrants." *Passing the Salt Shaker* (blog), April 2, 2015. https://passthesaltshaker.wordpress.com/2015/04/02/realms-and-manners-of-experience-deceiving-tyrants/.

_____. "Some Lengthy Thoughts on Women in Leadership." *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), December 8, 2011. https://alastairadversaria.com/2011/12/08/some-lengthy-thoughts-on-women-leadership/.

_____. "Subordination in Scripture: κεφαλή in 1 Corinthians 11:3." R*eformation21* (blog), November 22, 2016. https://www.reformation21.org/blogs/subordination-in-scripture-in.php

_____. "What Is the Case Against Women's Ordination?" *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), December 5, 2019. https://adversariapodcast.com/2019/12/05/transcript-for-what-is-the-case-against-womens-ordination/.

_____. "Why a Masculine Priesthood is Essential." *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog). August 30, 2014. https://alastairadversaria.com/2014/08/30/why-a-masculine-priesthood-is-essential/.

Sailhamer, John. *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

Saucy, Robert L., and Judith K. TenElshof, eds. *Women and Men in Ministry: A Complementary Perspective*. Chicago: Moody, 2001.

Schaeffer, Francis. *Art in the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1973.

Scholer, "Galatians 3:28 and the Ministry of Women in the Church." *Covenant Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (August 1998): 2–18.

Schrage, Wolfang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 6, 12–11, 16).* Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7, part 2. Zurich, Germany: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn Verlang, 1995.

Schreiner, Patrick. "Man and Woman: Toward an Ontology." *Eikon* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2020): 68–87.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity." In *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited John Piper and Wayne A. Grudem, 117–32. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991.

_____. "*Paul and Gender*: A Review Article." *Themelios* 43, no. 2 (2018): 178–92.

_____. "'Praying and Prophesying in the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16' (Ch 8) by Gordon D. Fee." *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 10, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 17–21.

Schrenk, Gottlob. "βούλομαι." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, 1:630–32. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964.

Scroggs, Robin. *The Text and the Times: New Testament Essays for Today*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Sefaria. "Targum Jonathan on Micah 6." Accessed July 17, 2022. https://www.sefaria.org/Targum_Jonathan_on_Micah.6.4?lang=bi.

Shoemaker, Thomas R. "Unveiling of Equality: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17, no. 2 (April 1987): 60–63.

Smith, Claire. *God's Good Design: What the Bible Really Says about Men and Women*. Kingsford, Australia: Matthias, 2012.

Smothers, Colin. "Creation and Discrimination: Why the Male-Female Distinction Makes a Difference." *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 9–15.

_____. "Is the Slippery Slope Actually Slippery? Egalitarianism and the Open-and-Affirming Position." *9Marks Journal*, November 23, 2019. https://www.9marks.org/article/is-the-slippery-slope-actually-slippery-egalitarianism-and-the-open-and-affirming-position/.

Snodgrass, Klyne R. "The Ordination of Women—Thirteen Years Later: Do We Really Value the Ministry of Women?" *Covenant Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (1990): 39–41.

Soutchek, Alexander, Christopher J. Burke, Anjali Raja Beharelle, Robert Schreiber, Susanna C. Weber, Iliana I. Karipidis, Jolien ten Velden, Bernd Weber, Helene Haker, Tobias Kalenscher, and Philippe N. Tobler. "The Dopaminergic Reward System Underpins Gender Differences in Social Preferences." *Nature Human Behaviour* 1 (October 2017): 819–27.

Strong, A. H. *Systematic Theology: A Compendium Designed for the Use of Theological Students*. 1903. Accessed January 24, 2024. http://www.ntslibrary.com/PDF%20Books%20II/Strong%20-%20Systematic%20Theology.pdf.

Sumner, Sarah. *Men and Women in the Church: Building Consensus on Christian Leadership.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003.

Stewart-Williams, Steve. *The Ape That Understand the Universe: How the Mind and Culture Evolve*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2019.

Tertullian. "On the Apparel of Women." Translated by S. Thellwall. In *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and Cleveland Coxe, Vol. 4, *Fathers of the Third Century: Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Parts First and Second*, 14–25. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000.

Trompf, Garry. "On Attitudes Toward Women in Paul and Paulinist Literature: 1 Cor 11:3–16 and Its Context." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 196–215.

Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology.* Vol. 1, *First through Tenth Topics*. Translated by George M. Giger. Edited by James T. Dennison, Jr. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 1997.

Twomey, Jay. *The Pastoral Epistles through the Centuries*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Van Til, Henry R. *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture*. 1959. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.

Vermigli, Peter. In *Primum Librum Mosis* (1569). Quoted in *Genesis 1–11*, edited by John L. Thompson, Reformation Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament, vol. 1. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2012.

Vincent of Lérins. *A Commonitory for the Antiquity and Universality of the Catholic Faith Against the Profane Novelties of All Heresies*. Translated by C. A. Heurtley. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, Series 2, Vol. 11, *Sulpitius Severus, Vincent of Lerins, John Cassian*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Walker, W. O. "1 Corinthians 11:2–16 and Paul's View regarding Women." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 94–110.

Wallace, Daniel. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Ware, Kallistos. “Man, Woman, and the Priesthood of Christ.” In *Women and the Priesthood*, edited by Thomas Hopko, 5–54. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary, 1999.

Webb, William J. “A Redemptive-Movement Hermeneutic: Encouraging Dialogue among Four Evangelical Views.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005): 331–49.

Wedgeworth, Steven. “Good and Proper: Paul’s Use of Nature, Custom, and Decorum in Pastoral Theology.” *Eikon* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2020): 88–97.

_____. “A New Way to Understand Men and Women in Christ? A Review of Raachel Green Miller’s *Beyond Authority and Submission.*” *Eikon* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2019): 103–15.

_____. “What Is Effeminacy? A Survey of Scripture and History.” *Desiring God* (blog). October 17, 2023. https://www.desiringgod.org/articles/what-is-effeminacy.

Wellum, Stephen. *From Canon to Concept*. Vol. 1 of *Systematic Theology*. Brentwood, TN: B & H, 2024.

Wengert, Timothy J., ed. *The Pastoral Luther: Essays on Martin Luther’s Practical Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017.

Wenham, Gordan. *The Book of Leviticus*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979.

_____. *Genesis 1–15*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

Westfall, Cynthia. *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle’s Vision for Men and Women in Christ*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016.

Witherington, Ben, III. “Rite and Rights for Women—Galatians 3:28.” *New Testament Studies* 27, no. 5 (1981): 593–604.

Witt, William. *Icons of Christ: A Biblical and Systematic Theology for Women’s Ordination*. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2020.

Wright, N. T. *The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. In *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 10, *Acts–First Corinthians*, edited by Leander E. Keck, 394–770. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

Yabe, Yutaka, Yoshihiro Hagiwara, Takuya Sekiguchi, Haruki Momma, Masahiro Tsuchiya, Kenji Kanazawa, Masashi Koide, Nobuyuki Itaya, Shinichirou Yoshida, Yasuhito Sogi, Toshihisa Yano, Takahiro Onoki, Eiji Itoi, and Ryoichi Nagatomi. “Parents’ Own Experience of Verbal Abuse Is Associated with Their Acceptance of Abuse towards Children from Youth Sports Coaches.” *Tohoku Journal of Experimental Medicine* 4 (December 2019): 249–54.

Zamfir, Korinna. *Men and Women in the Household of God: A Contextual Approach to the Roles and Ministries in the Pastoral Epistles*. Bristol, CT: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

ABSTRACT

MALE AND FEMALE HE CREATED THEM: THE IMPLICATIONS OF A PARADIGMATIC READING OF GENESIS 1–3 FOR THE COMPLEMENTARIAN-EGALITARIAN DEBATE

Douglas Bent Ponder, DMin
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2024
Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Samuel C. Emadi

This DMin thesis argues that Genesis 1–3 contains, in seed form, the essence of maleness and femaleness as seen in patterned relationships that are upheld, expounded, and applied by biblical authors across the canon. Chapter 1 surveys various works representing three streams of thought on the nature and significance of male and female within the Christian tradition. Chapter 2 proves that a male-female paradigm is established in Genesis 1–3 and interprets its didactic significance. Chapter 3 defends such a reading of Genesis 1–3 in light of apostolic recognition and appropriation of the male-female paradigm established therein. Chapter 4 surveys scriptural narratives of men and women in various canonical contexts, examining how the biblical authors embraced and developed the paradigm established in Genesis 1–3. Chapter 5 explores the implications of a fully-formed scriptural vision of the sexes for the life of the church.

VITA

Douglas Brent Ponder

EDUCATION

BS, Liberty University, 2006
MDiv, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011
ThM, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019

PUBLICATIONS

"Why Did Jesus Walk on Water?" *Tabletalk Magazine*, March 9, 2020. https://tabletalkmagazine.com/posts/why-did-jesus-walk-on-water-2020-03/.

"Closed on Sunday: Celebrating Easter in the Shadow of Global Death." In *To Be Continued: The Unstoppable Mission of Jesus*, edited by Tony Merida, Christy Britton, and Amy Tyson, 104–8. Austin, TX: GCD, 2021.

"Eternal Life Chiasm in John's Gospel." *Theopolis* (blog), August 15, 2023. https://theopolisinstitute.com/eternal-life-chiasm-in-johns-gospel/.

ORGANIZATIONS

The Evangelical Theological Society

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Teaching Assistant, Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia, 2005–2006
Research Assistant, Docent Research Group, Austin, Texas, 2009–2012
Professor of Biblical Studies, Grimké Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, 2020–

MINISTERIAL EMPLOYMENT

Pastoral Intern, Greenridge Baptist Church, Roanoke, Virginia, 2005
Catalytic Church Planter, SBC of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia, 2011–2012
Content Editor, International Mission Board, Richmond, Virginia, 2019–2020
Teaching Pastor, Remnant Church, Richmond, Virginia, 2009–