

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis
Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Theology Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1994

Marriage and the Image of God as it is Reflected in
Paul's Understanding of Women and the Ministry
in Four Passages: 1 Cor. 11:2-16; 14:33b-36; Eph.
5:22-33; 1 Tim. 2:11-15

Lane Burgland

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, laburgland@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.csl.edu/thd>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burgland, Lane, "Marriage and the Image of God as it is Reflected in Paul's Understanding of Women and the Ministry in Four Passages: 1 Cor. 11:2-16; 14:33b-36; Eph. 5:22-33; 1 Tim. 2:11-15" (1994). *Doctor of Theology Dissertation*. 8.
<http://scholar.csl.edu/thd/8>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Theology Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

MARRIAGE AND THE IMAGE OF GOD AS IT IS REFLECTED IN PAUL'S
UNDERSTANDING OF WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY IN FOUR

PASSAGES: 1 COR. 11:2-16; 14:33b-36;

EPH. 5:22-33; 1 TIM. 2:11-16

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

by

Lane A. Burgland

May 1984

Approved by: Louis Brighton
Advisor

Charles Arand
Reader

Robert Rosin
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION iv

Chapter

1. 1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16 1

 1 Corinthians 11:2 2

 1 Corinthians 11:3 6

 κεφαλή 7

 The New Creation 12

 Headship and Superiority 15

 1 Corinthians 11:4-6 19

 Verse 4 21

 κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων 25

 Verse 5 32

 Verse 6 37

 1 Corinthians 11:7-9 43

 Verse 7 44

 Image of God 46

 Glory 57

 Verse 8 63

 Genesis 2:23 64

 Verse 9 71

 Genesis 2:18-23 72

 1 Corinthians 11:10-12 84

 ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν 87

 For the Sake of the Angels 94

 Verses 11 and 12 104

 Jesus Christ, the Image of God 106

 1 Corinthians 11:13-16 114

 Verse 13 115

 Verses 14 and 15 117

 Verse 16 123

 Summary 126

2. EPHESIANS 5:22-33 129

 Ephesians 5:21 133

 Ephesians 5:22-24 136

 ὑποτάσσω 139

 Paul's Instructions in Light of

 Galatians 3:27-28 142

 The Image of the Church as a Bride 144

 Hosea 144

 Jeremiah 148

 Ezekiel 149

 Isaiah 150

 2 Corinthians 11:2-3 152

Eschatology155
Ephesians 5:25-28156
ἀγαπάω156
Baptism161
Verse 27169
Verse 28170
Ephesians 5:29-33174
σάρξ and σῶμα175
Genesis 2:24180
Mystery186
Paul's Point189
3. 1 CORINTHIANS 14:33-36192
A God of Order193
Verses 34 and 35 as an Interpolation195
Structure204
Verses 33b-34215
Verse 35223
Verse 36227
4. 1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15235
Verse 8238
Verses 9 and 10240
Verses 11 and 12249
"Woman" or "Wife?"250
In Quietness or Silence?252
ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ255
ἀθεντεῖν256
To Learn and To Teach259
Verses 13 and 14266
Genesis 2:7269
Genesis 3273
She Became a Transgressor277
Verse 15279
σωθήσεται280
διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας284
If They Remain290
In Faith and Love and Holiness with Self-restraint293
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	
1 Corinthians 11:2-16298
Ephesians 5:22-33302
1 Corinthians 14:33b-36305
1 Timothy 2:11-15307
Conclusions311

INTRODUCTION

What role(s) may a woman fulfill in service to her Lord? The debate over women in the ministry continues to attract the attention of Christian authors.¹ The question many of these authors address, often on the basis of selected Pauline texts, is framed by Alvera Mickelsen:

Does the Bible, properly interpreted, restrict women from serving God in ways that men are not restricted? Should some positions in the church have a "men only" sign on them? Are the spiritual gifts of God to women essentially different from the gifts that God gives men?²

Mickelsen's questions are derived from the more general question of what the Bible says about mankind and marriage. The answer to her three questions depends on the reader's understanding of mankind and how the two genders of mankind

¹Three examples may be cited. Arguing for an egalitarian interpretation of the pertinent New Testament passages on the subject are the contributors to the volume by Alvera Mickelsen, ed., *Women, Authority & The Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1986). Another collection on the subject by John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds., *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), supports a more traditional viewpoint. A third example, edited by Bonnidell Clouse and Robert G. Clouse, *Women in Ministry: Four Views* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1989), seeks to set forth four distinct understandings of relevant New Testament sections with responses to each essay from the authors of the other three.

²Alvera Mickelsen, "An Egalitarian View: There Is Neither Male nor Female in Christ," *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, 173.

relate to each other. This is particularly evident in four Pauline passages.³ Yet interpretations of the Bible, particularly of these four passages (1 Corinthians 11:2-16; 14:33b-36; Ephesians 5:22-33; and 1 Timothy 2:11-15)⁴ vary widely. Readers often miss Paul's intertextuality as he responds to specific problems within the framework of his Christology and his understanding of Genesis 1-2. New interpretations of these passages have arisen in the last

³It is possible simply to reject what Paul (and the Bible) says about women. For example, Roger Nicole, "Biblical Authority & Feminist Aspirations," *Women, Authority & The Bible*, identifies five ways in which feminists approach the Pauline texts: as enemy, as wrong, as non-Pauline, as circumstantial or cultural and as transculturally significant. (42-46) The first three approaches simply reject the pericopes. The fourth approach, as Susan Foh, *Women and the Word of God: A Response to Biblical Feminism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), observes, represents those who believe that "since the Bible was written in a patriarchal culture, the biblical writers are prejudiced by that culture against women's rights. Therefore, patriarchal ideas in the bible are not to be considered authoritative for all times and places." (2) The fifth approach tries to maintain Biblical authority and yet permit an egalitarian stance in the church.

⁴Stephen 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: Servant Books, 1980), 165, lists six major New Testament texts which "directly address the question of the roles of men and women: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, 1 Corinthians 14:33-38, 1 Timothy 2:8-15, Ephesians 5:22-33, Colossians 3:18-19, and 1 Peter 3:1-7." Colossians 3:18-19 closely resembles Ephesians 5:22-33; 1 Peter 3:1-7 falls outside of the scope of this study, which is limited to Paul's works. Fritz Zerbst, *The Office of woman in the Church: A Study in Practical Theology* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), undertakes to study only 1 Corinthians 11:2-16; 14:34-36; and 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Ephesians 5:22-33 should, however, be included because of the contribution it makes to identifying the basis for Paul's comments on women elsewhere.

several years which understand any gender-based role differences as unjust discrimination.⁵ This study proposes to examine the Pauline texts which bear most directly upon the subject of women and their involvement in the ministry of word and sacrament. Several evangelical feminist⁶ writers will be engaged in the study at specific points in the interpretation.⁷ The primary goal of this paper, however, is to produce an exegesis of these four passages which identifies the basis of Paul's comments and demonstrates their unity. This work is intended to answer the question: "how does what Paul's says about women in four

⁵John Piper and Wayne Grudem state: "Many evangelical Christians have defended this position in writing. They include Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (1974), Paul Jewett of Fuller Seminary (1975), Richard and Joyce Boldrey of North Park College (1976), Patricia Gundry (1977), Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen of Bethel College and Seminary (1979), Catherine Clark Kroeger (1979), E. Margaret Howe of Western Kentucky University (1982), Gilbert Bilezikian of Wheaton College (1985), Aida Spencer of Gordon-Conwell Seminary (1985), Gretchen Gaebelin Hull (1987), and many others, in articles, lectures, and classroom teaching. Although they have disagreed on details, their common theme has been the rejection of a unique leadership role for men in marriage and in the church." John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds., *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, xiii.

⁶An "evangelical feminist" is defined as a scholar who gives an interpretation other than the traditional understanding of these passages and yet claims to adhere to the principle of Biblical authority. As Piper and Grudem state: "We may call them 'evangelical feminists' because by personal commitment to Jesus Christ and by profession of belief in the total truthfulness of Scripture they still identify themselves very clearly with evangelicalism." (Ibid.)

⁷E.g., Gordon Fee at 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 and Catherine Clark Kroeger at 1 Tim. 2:11-15.

passages reflect his understanding of the image of God and Christology?"

The contribution this paper strives to make to New Testament scholarship is three-fold. First, that Paul bases his understanding of women in ministry in the identity of mankind as the image of God (Genesis 2) and the order or structure inherent in it. Second, that a human being is restored to his identity in Jesus Christ as the image of God, and thereby restored to the structure of humanity revealed in Genesis 2. Thus, there is more continuity than discontinuity between the "order of creation" and the "order of redemption."⁶ Finally, Paul sees in marriage a pattern which not only represents the structure of humanity but the relationship of Christ and the church, so that the

⁶These terms were popularized by Emil Brunner in *The Divine Imperative*, trans. Olive Wyan (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947), 208-33. They are also used by the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in a pamphlet produced in September, 1985 which defines them as:

1. *The Order of Creation.* This refers to the particular position which, by the will of God, any created object occupies in relation to others. God has given to that which has been created a certain definite order which, because it has been created by Him, is the expression of His immutable will. These relationships belong to the very structure of created existence.

2. *The Order of Redemption.* This refers to the relationship of the redeemed to God and to each other in the new creation established by Him in Jesus Christ (Gal. 6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17). This new creation constitutes participation in a new existence, in the new world that has come in Christ. It is a relationship determined by grace. (21)

relationship between Adam and Eve in Genesis 2 becomes the model for marriage, for union with Christ as his bride, and for order within the church. As Mary Hayter has explained:

Misunderstanding of biblical teaching relevant to the subject of women's ordination involves a misconstruction of biblical teaching about God, priesthood, the *Imago Dei*, sexuality, the effects of Christ's incarnation and redeeming work upon men and women, as well as a misconception of the nature of the Bible and its authority. It is my hope that this book will play some part in the expunction of such misconceptions. . . .⁹

So also is the goal of this study.

⁹Mary Hayter, *The New Eve in Christ: The Use and Abuse of the Bible in the Debate about women in the Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 3. She argues for the egalitarian position in favor of women's ordination into the (Anglican) priesthood.

CHAPTER ONE

1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16

Paul's first letter to the Corinthians was occasioned by reports of divisions within the church (1 Cor. 1:11) and by receiving a letter which contained a number of questions (1 Cor. 7:1).¹ Relations within the church (factionalism), marriage, questions about food all arise as subjects Paul addresses in the chapter leading to chapter 11. Wherever possible Paul has struck a positive note (e.g., 1 Cor 1:4-9), even where their doctrine or practice must be corrected. Having concluded his treatment of foods (1 Cor. 11:1), Paul takes up a different issue beginning with 1 Cor. 11:2 and running through 14:40. He instructs them in the conduct of public worship, addressing abuses of the Lord's Supper (11:23-34) and the appropriate use of spiritual gifts (12:1-31a) exercised in love (12:31b-13:13). He discusses the issue of glossolalia (14:1-25), summarizes and concludes his instructions (14:26-40) and moves on to the subject of the Resurrection (15:1-58). Paul begins this section (11:2-14:40) with a discussion of women in the

¹Paul writes, *περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε*. The genitive plural neuter relative pronoun, *ὧν*, indicates that more than one issue or question was raised in the letter he received.

public worship service and concludes it with a final word of direction at the end (14:33b-35).

1 Cor. 11:2

Paul begins with a word of praise for his Corinthian readers² because they have remembered him in all things³ and have faithfully adhered to his instructions.⁴ The

²ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς. A variant reading adds ἀδελφοί (supported by D F G K L Ψ and others) which, as Bruce Metzger notes, "was to be expected . . . at the beginning of a new section and following ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς." (Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971], 561 [hereafter *TCGNT*]). The older manuscripts support the absence of ἀδελφοί and the omission of ἀδελφοί would be "inexplicable" (Ibid., 562; Metzger directs the reader to 1 Cor. 15:31 where the inclusion of ἀδελφοί is also in doubt). Thus, *TCGNT* does not rate the variant and it does not appear as a variant in *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993), fourth revised edition [hereafter *UBSGNT* (4th)]. That Paul is serious about his praising of the Corinthians in this verse may be demonstrated by his refusal to praise them in 11:17 (οὐκ ἐπαινῶ) when he begins to address the abuse of the Lord's Supper.

³πάντα μου μέμνησθε. F. Blass, A. Debrunner and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) §154 [hereafter *BDF*] discuss this verse under "the simple accusative of content (cognate accusative)" and note that adjectives and pronouns are often used alone instead of a modified substantive, usually in the neuter as is πάντα here. They translate πάντα with "in all things, in every connection." (85)

⁴The term τὰς παραδόσεις can denote the oral transmission of religious instruction. William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957: revised, 1979) [hereafter *BAGD*] s.v. παραδόσεις, offers as a second definition "tradition, of teachings, commandments, narratives et al. . . ." (615) Paul uses the word in Col. 2:8 in a negative sense to signal the Colossian heresy. He

Corinthians continue to hold onto Paul's directives⁵ and yet they have also departed (or have threatened to depart) from his teaching regarding the public worship service.⁶ Stephen

uses it also in Gal. 1:14 to denote the Jewish teaching he received in the past, particularly the oral teachings of the Pharisees. He uses παραδόσις in a positive sense to refer to his own teachings in 2 Thess. 2:5; 3:6 and here.

The verb Paul uses in this verse (παρέδωκα, a first person singular aorist active indicative form of παραδίδομι) can also be used as a technical term to denote a faithful and reliable transmission of instruction or information. (Cf. BAGD s.v. παραδίδομι, 3 [615].) Paul uses παραδίδομι again with this intention in 1 Cor. 11:23a and 15:3. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988) [hereafter Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*] list both παραδίδομι and παραδόσις under the domain of "communication" and the subdomain of "teach" (2:33.237 and 33.239, respectively).

Paul does not restate the content of the παραδόσις which he imparted to the Corinthians. The modern reader does not know whether it was doctrinal or practical or a combination of both. Kenneth T. Wilson, "Should Women Wear Headcoverings?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148 (1991): 444 notes: "Yet Paul used this word . . . with reference to his oral teachings as well as his letters, which contained both practice and doctrine (cf. 2 Thess. 2:15). . . . Whatever the case, these are authoritative teachings and Paul commended the Corinthians for obeying them. With the positive foundation set by this commendation, Paul then rebuked the Corinthians for violations in their worship (11:2-14:40)."

⁵κατέχετε, a second person plural present active indicative (or imperative) verb, denotes "to hold fast, keep in one's memory, retain faithful." (Cf. BAGD s.v. κατέχω, 1.b.α and β, 422-23.) It appears with the same meaning in 1 Cor. 15:2 and 1 Thess. 5:21.

⁶Some have denied Pauline authorship to this section. Representative of this approach is W. O. Walker (who wrote for the first time on this subject in 1975), summarizing his 1989 article: "This examination of the vocabulary of 1 Cor. 11.3-16 has shown: (1) that very little, if any, of the vocabulary is 'distinctively Pauline'; (2) that much of the vocabulary is 'characteristically but not distinctively Pauline'; (3) that

Clark interprets verses 3-16 in light of verse 2 and suggests:

The passage begins with Paul's commendation of the Corinthian church for following the custom in which he is about to instruct them. The following section, beginning with verse 17, concerns a matter in which Paul cannot commend the Corinthian Christians. The likeliest meaning of Paul's commendation is that the Corinthians were following the custom under consideration. Therefore, Paul was not dealing with active opposition over this issue, nor with a widespread refusal to follow an imported custom, as some have held. On the other hand, he must have had a reason for giving the instruction contained in 1 Cor 11:2-16. The reason might well have been that reports had come to him about some Corinthians who were questioning the practice of wearing headcoverings.¹

some of the vocabulary is 'otherwise non-Pauline but not identifiably post-Pauline'; and (4) that significant features of the vocabulary appear to be 'distinctively post-Pauline' and, in fact, pseudo-Pauline. Thus . . . I conclude that the evidence provided by the vocabulary of 1 Cor. 11.3-16 strengthens the case against Pauline authorship of this passage. Indeed, all other things being equal, this evidence would, in my judgment, be sufficient to 'tip the scales' toward viewing the passage as a non-Pauline interpolation." "The Vocabulary of 1 Corinthians 11.3-16," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (1989): 82. Several criticisms may be noted: first, no textual evidence supports the interpolation theory; second, stylistic arguments tend to be very subjective, seldom proving anything other than the author's initial thesis; third, vocabulary is only one portion of style and an insufficient base for any decision on the subject of authorship; fourth, vocabulary can change according to the topic addressed; fifth, words which are "characteristically" Pauline are distinguished from those which are "distinctively" Pauline to provide evidence of authorship but such a division seems artificial at best. The rejection of 11:2 (or 3)-16 as non-Pauline cannot be supported on the basis of the stylistic or textual evidence.

¹Stephen 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: Servant Books, 1980), [hereafter *Man and Woman in Christ*] 167. Susan Foh, *Women & The Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House,

Paul's commendation in verse 2 need not, however, imply the Corinthians were doing *all* things correctly, so that his readers may be commended for what they were doing right in verse 2 and corrected in verses 3-16.⁸ As Thomas Schreiner remarks:

It is probably the case, then, that 11:2 functions as a complimentary introduction before Paul begins to criticize the Corinthians on certain practices. Indeed, 11:2 is most likely the introductory statement for all of chapters eleven through fourteen. Even though the Corinthians are not following the traditions regarding women (11:3-16), the Lord's Supper (11:17-34), and spiritual gifts (12:1-14:40), the situation of the church is not bleak in every respect.⁹

It may not be possible to determine beyond doubt whether the problem of uncovered female heads was present or merely potential. The force and length of Paul's comments may support the position that such improper behavior was actually occurring, but his remarks indicate strong feeling

1979), 101, makes the same point: "So any wrongs in verses 3-16 could be hypothetical."

⁸Walter Liefeld has made this observation and suggests that what they were doing right is "allowing women to prophesy." Walter Liefeld, "Women, Submission and Ministry in 1 Corinthians," *Women, Authority & The Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), edited by Alvera Mickelsen, [hereafter *Women, Authority & The Bible*], 137.

⁹Thomas Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway, 1991) [hereafter *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*], 124. Schreiner does not discuss the function of 1 Cor. 11:17, which stands in contrast to 1 Cor. 11:2 as introducing a subject concerning which Paul cannot praise his readers.

on the subject in either case. Having praised his readers, Paul then moves to lay the foundation for the correction he offers.

1 Cor. 11:3

In verse three, Paul writes: "But¹⁰ I want you to know that of every man the head is Christ, and the head of woman (is) man, and the head of Christ (is) God."¹¹ He

¹⁰The post-positive conjunction δέ frequently denotes a general contrast (as distinct from the conjunction ἀλλά, signalling that which is directly contrary). It is thus a "weak" adversative conjunction (so *BDF* §447 [231]). So also Kenneth Wilson, "Should Women Wear Headcoverings," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148 (1991): 444-45. Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 501, agrees that δέ is adversative and adds that it "suggests that some things are not quite as the Corinthians had portrayed them." Fee's position is unnecessarily strong at this point. It would seem more likely from the text that Paul commends his readers in general but wants to clarify his instructions so that their practice will be fully in line with his sound instruction. δέ in v. 3 does not imply fraud or deceit on the part of the Corinthians but it does signal a shift from the positive approval in v.2.

¹¹The movement within this verse is striking. *BDF* §493, discussing "figures involving repetition," comment on this verse as an example of the figure "climax." The author takes the key word and repeats it, moving the reader to the climactic end. This is a rhetorical device that is characteristic of *Kunstprosa*, or Attic "artistic prose," created at the end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth centuries before Christ. The authors note that Paul generally does not use artistic prose except in Romans and 1 Corinthians where "the author has taken special pains in conformity with the type of persons he is addressing. . . ." (*BDF* §485 [257]) Paul consciously avoided rhetorical eloquence (cf. 1 Cor. 2:1-5) so that the Gospel would clearly be the source of conversion, not his oratorical skill.

H. Wayne House argues that the progression in this verse also forms an *inclusio*, beginning with Christ and ending

introduces the verse with the phrase θέλω δε ὑμᾶς εἰδέναί, indicating to the readers something of the importance of what he is about to share with them.¹²

κεφαλή

A remarkable amount of debate has been generated by the word κεφαλή and whether it denotes "source" (as headwaters are the source of a river) or "ruler" (one who exercises leadership and authority over another). Feminists have generally argued for the former¹³ and traditionalists

with him. Three pairs appear (Christ/man, man/woman, God/Christ) and the following verses treat the center pair. (H. Wayne House, "Should a Woman Prophecy or Preach before Men?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 [1988]: 145 n.11. House did his Th.D. dissertation at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis in 1986 on the topic: "An Investigation of Contemporary Feminist Arguments on Paul's Teaching on the role of Women in the Church.")

¹²Paul uses two phrases to alert his readers to important communication. By far the most frequent is οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (as in 1 Cor. 10:1; cf. also 1 Cor. 12:1; 2 Cor. 1:8; Rom. 1:13; and 11:25). He prefers the present tense θέλω with the negative particle οὐ and the infinitive ἀγνοεῖν but does use the positive θέλω δε ὑμᾶς εἰδέναί here and at Col. 2:1. Its appearance at 1 Cor. 11:3 may be explained as a stylistic variation introduced between the two uses of the negative phrase in 10:1 and 12:1. Paul's emotion and the importance of what appears following the phrase are both indicated by this rhetorical device.

¹³A fair representative of this approach is Alvera Mickelsen's "What Does *Kephale* Mean in the New Testament?" *Women, Authority & the Bible* (Downer's Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1986), 97-132. Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, *All We're Meant To Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation* (Waco: Word Books, 1974), 30-31, follow the same line of interpretation and argue that "priority of time neither necessarily nor irreversibly leads to priority in rank." (31)

for the latter.¹⁴ It is the most common word used to translate $\Psi\lambda\gamma$ in the Septuagint when that refers to a physical head.¹⁵ $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ also appears in a metaphorical sense in the Septuagint.¹⁶ This use seems to be particularly helpful in determining Paul's intention. In 2 Kingdoms (2 Samuel) 22:44 David praises Yahweh for delivering him from the attacks of the people and preserving him as the "head of nations" ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\nu\ \epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$). The remainder of verse 44 and the two following verses spell out what "headship" means in verse 44, indicating a people as

¹⁴Cf. Thomas R. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity," *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: a Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper & Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1991) [hereafter *Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*] 124-39. Grudem authored a 1985 article based on an extensive survey: "Does $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 85-112. He responded to criticism of that article with "The Meaning of $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3-72.

¹⁵The semantic field of $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ is quite broad. It is used by the authors of the Septuagint to translate five different words ranging from "skull, head" to "life" (*nephesh*), "horns," "head" (*ro'ash*). It may be used in the expression "at the head place" (as in 1 Kings 19:6). Cf. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1897, reprinted 1987) [hereafter Hatch & Redpath, *Concordance*], 2:760-63. In the vast majority of appearances, $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ translates *ro'ash*. As such it most commonly denotes the physical head of a man or beast (or even of an idol, *Epistle of Jeremiah*, 8); cf. Gen. 3:15; 28:11; 40:16; 48:14; Ex. 12:9; 29:10.

¹⁶Used figuratively, the term can refer to the head of a clan (Num. 1:2) or by extension to the whole person (1 Chron. 23:3). When used to translate "horn" (*qeren*) it can denote "power" (2 Esdras 6:2; Ps. 39 [40]:7; Ezra 2:9; 3:1, 2, 3).

yet unknown will serve (ἑδοῦλευσαν)¹⁷ him. David cannot logically be the "source" of the nations but is the "leader" of the nations, occupying a position of authority over them and to which they must submit in fear. A very similar use appears in Ps. 17[Heb. 18]:43-44. In Isa. 7:9, κεφαλή also denotes "head" in the sense of "leader" or "one who is in authority over" someone else. As Samaria is the "head" of Ephraim, so the son of Ramaliah is "head" of Samaria.¹⁸

The word κεφαλή occurs in the New Testament within a fairly narrow range of meanings but with both a literal and

¹⁷The form of this verb is aorist indicative. It translates ']]]]', a qal imperfect. The aorist can express an action that is valid for all time and thus carry a future meaning. *BDF* §333 discuss this use and identify two reasons for its validity: ". . . either because the aorist indicative serves for a non-existent perfective present . . . or because (originally at least) the author had a specific case in mind in which the act had been realized." [171]

¹⁸Wayne Grudem identifies these three Septuagintal examples as the clearest of some fifteen or sixteen passages which support κεφαλή as "leader, one in authority." "The Meaning of κεφαλή ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 20. He also cites Hermas, *Similitudes* 7.3, where a man is told that his family "cannot be punished in any other way than if you, the *head* of the house, be afflicted." (Ibid.)

Heinrich Schlier, "κεφαλή," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965) [hereafter *TDNT*] 3:673-78, discusses the use of κεφαλή in secular Greek sources and in the Septuagint. He concludes that the Septuagint uses κεφαλή in much the same way as secular Greek writings. This includes the physical as well as the figurative, and denotes "prominent, outstanding, determinative." (Ibid., 674.) The one difference is that "in secular usage κεφαλή is not employed for the head of a society. This is first found in the sphere of the Gk. OT." (Ibid.)

a figurative sense.¹⁹ Of nineteen appearances of κεφαλή in the Pauline corpus, thirteen may be categorized as figurative.²⁰ Of these nineteen occurrences, ten fall with 1 Cor. 11:2-16, evenly divided between literal and figurative meanings. Outside this paragraph, the most helpful use of κεφαλή describes Jesus Christ who is the "head" over all things for the sake of the church (Eph. 1:22)²¹ and in whom believers grow and increase in all things (Eph. 4:15). Christ is the head of the Body, the church (Col. 1:18) and is the head of all rulers and authorities (Col. 2:10).²² Only at Eph. 5:23 and 1 Cor.

¹⁹Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 8.10 [1:95-96] list the noun under two domains: first, under "body parts" where it denotes the physical head. They list it also under the domain of "status" where it conveys "superiority, supremacy," 87.51 [1:739]. They list this usage for 1 Cor. 11:3. Colin Brown, "Head," *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), [hereafter *NIDNTT*] 159, notes that the noun appears 75 times in the New Testament "primarily in its basic meaning of the head of a man (Matt. 14:8), of an animal, or of demons (Rev. 17:3)."

²⁰W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897, latest impression 1989), 545-46, list the following as literal: Rom. 12:20; 1 Cor. 11:4, 5, 7, 10; 12:21. They mark 1 Cor. 11:3 (three uses), 4 (one of two uses), 5 (one of two uses); Eph. 1:22; 4:15; 5:23 (twice); Col. 1:18; 2:10, 19 as "metaphorical."

²¹This interpretation understands the dative case in the phrase τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ to be a dative of advantage (cf. *BDF* §188 on the *dativus commodi et incommodi*).

²²It is not clear whether earthly or heavenly "rulers and authorities" are intended in Col. 2:10. For Paul there would be little material difference and his statement would be true in either case. Certainly κεφαλή most clearly denotes here "occupy a position of authority"

11:2-16, however, is a man said to be "head" over a woman and only in 1 Cor. 11:3 is God said to be "head" over Christ.

Paul describes three relationships in 1 Cor. 11:3, each of which is distinct from the others. What each has in common with the others, however, may be described by the word κεφαλή. The relation of the Father to the Son is different from the relation of Christ to man, for the Father and Son are one Essence, both divine Persons. Man, on the other hand, is a creature, not divine. Likewise, the relation of man to woman cannot be described as "one essence" although it is "one flesh." Further, if κεφαλή denotes "source," the Father is the source of the Son in a far different way than Christ is the source of man. If κεφαλή is "source," the reader may understand that there was a time when Christ was not, just as there was a time when the woman was not.²³ The reader, if κεφαλή is "source," may

over something, both over the church and over all created powers and authorities, as Paul also demonstrates in Phil. 2:8-11.

²³Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 137, seems to miss this point when he writes of κεφαλή: "The concept might be better served by the expression *fountainhead* or *life-source*. Thus, in the perspective of creation it makes sense to say that Christ is the fountainhead of man's life, and that man is the fountainhead of woman's life. Likewise, from the perspective of the incarnation, God is the fountainhead of Christ's life." Yet when Luke describes the conception of Jesus he specifically refers to the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:34) and when Paul uses θεός he most often refers to the Father. Murray Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos*

also misunderstand Paul and claim divinity for man, since man was drawn from Christ. An additional problem becomes apparent in describing the relation between man and woman. With the exception of the first man, Adam, all other men have come from women, through conception and birth. If κεφαλή meant "source," Paul should have said "and the woman is the κεφαλή of the man."²⁴

The only meaning of κεφαλή which serves to describe all three relationships in 1 Cor. 11:3 is that of "occupy a position of authority over, lead." Wayne Grudem concludes:

The meaning "ruler, authority over" is found quite clearly in forty-one ancient texts from both biblical and extra-biblical literature, and is possible in two or more other texts. In addition, there are six texts where κεφαλή refers to the literal head of a person's body, and there are two texts which are similes where a ruler or leader is said to be like a head. . . . it appears to be a well-established and valid meaning during the NT period.²⁵

in Reference to Jesus (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 45, states: "On no fewer than 33 occasions Paul directly links the terms θεός and πατήρ to form a single compound appellative." He adds that "another clear indication that for Paul ὁ θεός designated the Father is provided by the embryonic trinitarian formulations found in his letters. Second Corinthians 13:13 is the classic instance." (Ibid.) He cites Rom. 8:11; 15:30; 1 Cor. 12:4-6; 2 Cor. 1:21-22; and Eph. 4:4-6 as additional examples.

²⁴It is helpful to note that when Paul does mention the fact that men come from women (through the birth process) in 1 Cor. 11:12, he avoids the use of κεφαλή, even though he also mentions that woman is from man. When Paul uses κεφαλή, it is apparent (in light of v. 12) that he does not mean "source" or "fountainhead."

²⁵Wayne Grudem, "κεφαλή," 71. He admits that four of his previous examples have been shown to be illegitimate by subsequent studies.

The New Creation

Paul writes these verses to Christians, people who have received faith in Jesus Christ and the full complement of spiritual gifts necessary for their service to Him (1 Cor. 1:4-9). These are the people he will remind later (at 2 Cor. 5:17) that "if someone (is) in Christ, (he is) a new creation [καινή κτίσις]."²⁶ Paul does not use a past tense verb in 1 Cor. 11:3, so that he says Christ *was* the Head of man and man *was* the head of woman, but a present tense verb (ἐστίν).²⁷ Paul makes a theological statement in 1 Cor. 11:3 which he will apply, explain and illustrate in the following verses and that theological statement is based on the present relationship of God and Christ, man and woman, Christ and man. The connection between the past events of Genesis 2 and the present relationship of Christians to one another and to Christ Jesus may be supplied by observing that the "new creation" is ordered along the same lines as the original creation. Believers are united with Christ Jesus, the image of God incarnate and the head over all

²⁶The conditional sentence is formed with εἰ in the protasis and an indicative (ἐστίν by ellipsis) in the apodosis. *BDF* §371 describe this syntax as denoting "a simple conditional assumption with emphasis on the reality of the assumption (not of what is being assumed): the condition is considered 'a real case.'" (188)

²⁷The verb ἐστίν is provided once (in the first clause) and omitted in the next two, to be supplied by the reader. *BDF* §127 note that "as in classical Greek, the most common form of the copula, the 3rd sing. ἐστίν, is by far the most frequently omitted." (70)

creation (Col. 1:15-18), and in Him are restored to the structure designed by God as revealed in Genesis 2. Marcus

Maxwell remarks:

Paul's reply is to affirm both creation and redemption as the word of the one God, who in redemption brings to fruition what is already implicit in the created order. . . . The old creation is seen to carry within it the pattern of the new. Thus we see that no matter how radical the eschatological transformation of creation, it does not obliterate the basic patterns of creation.²⁸

The same God who designed and created humanity in His image restores believers to that image in Christ Jesus.²⁹ Roger

²⁸Marcus Maxwell, "Creation, Redemption and Sexuality in 1 Corinthians," *Women in the Biblical Tradition*, edited by George J. Brooke (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 277. He adds: "We might speculate that Paul sees the present order as providing a basic blue-print for the new creation, one which will be enhanced and embellished, but which will still be faithful to the original ground-plan." (Ibid.)

²⁹The relationship expressed in the phrase "and the Head of Christ (is) God" may be seen in Paul's Christological statements. Murray J. Harris, 45-46, writes: "most remarkable are the three passages in 1 Corinthians which not only distinguish Christ from God but also subordinate Christ to God the Father: 3:23 ('Christ is God's'), 11:3 ('God is the head of Christ'), and 15:28 (after delivering the kingdom 'to God the Father' [v. 24], 'the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put everything under him')." Paul also calls Jesus $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Rom. 9:5 and Tit. 2:13. This plurality in unity and the order of the plurality are both reflected in humanity as God's image, although with obvious differences. God created male and female (a plurality different from that within God) but one species ($\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$, Gen. 1:27-28, a unity which also differs from the unity of God).

The relationship in the preceding clause, "and the head of the woman (is) the man," may be drawn from Genesis 2. It forms the theological basis for the remainder of Paul's comments in 1 Cor. 11:4-16. The relationship described first in the series, "the head of every man is Christ," will be discussed in the next chapter on Eph. 5:22-33 where that subject is handled more extensively by Paul.

Gryson observes:

Contrary to the Gnostic contention, God the Creator is not different from God the Savior. God the Savior did not destroy his first work by redeeming it but raised it to a new perfection. Therefore the chief characteristics of the first work remain in the new creation as long as the "glory of the sons of God" has not been fully revealed; and, in particular, the difference between man and woman evident in the order of creation is not abolished in the order of redemption.³⁰

Thus, the Christology of Paul does not abolish the way in which God structured humanity in Genesis 2. Rather, as Mary Evans has commented regarding "the head of the woman is the man" in 1 Cor. 11:3, "the anthropological statement is firmly placed between the Christological brackets, and these must govern our understanding of its meaning; but this statement is to be seen not as a temporal illustration but as a clear and definite theological principle."³¹

Headship and Superiority

Susan Foh states bluntly: "Headship does not involve superiority."³² She proceeds to equate "superiority" with the quality of intrinsic worth and defends her position with

³⁰Roger Gryson, *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church*, translated by Jean Laporte and Mary Louise Hall (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1974), 5-6.

³¹Mary Evans, *Woman in the Bible* (Greenwood, SC: The Attic Press, 1983), 85. She writes from an evangelical feminist perspective and argues the women occupied leadership positions in the church in the first century (Ibid., 132-33).

³²Susan Foh, *Women & The Word of God: A Response to Biblical Feminism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 102.

the rejoinder: "This fact is proven by the inclusion of 'the head of Christ is God.'"³³ Something of this same concern is reflected by Gail Paterson Corrington:

The only member of this hierarchy who does not serve as "head" of anything else is the woman. . . . Since *kephale* may also stand by metonymy for the whole person, the lowest member of the hierarchy, the wife, is further "de-personalized"; that is, she stands in relationship to her husband as his "body."³⁴

It may be noted that superiority does not necessarily reflect intrinsic worth and that headship is not the measure of personhood. Thomas Schreiner comments:

Paul did not see such subjection of the Son to the Father as heretical because the Son was not essentially inferior to the Father. . . . This point is often missed by evangelical feminists. They conclude that a difference in function necessarily involves a difference in essence; i.e., if men are in authority over women, then women must be inferior. The relationship between Christ and the Father shows us that this reasoning is flawed.³⁵

³³Ibid.

³⁴Gail Paterson Corrington, "The 'Headless Woman': Paul and the Language of the Body in 1 Cor 11:2-16," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 18 (1991): 225.

³⁵Thomas Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 128. Schreiner argues that the "Son has a different function or role from the Father, not an inferior being or essence." (Ibid.) A certain amount of caution must be exercised in describing the relationship of the Godhead within Himself, particularly when discussing the relationship of man to woman within humanity. Both may be described as a plurality within a unity, yet clear differences exist. The Persons of the Trinity are distinguished by more than function, yet remain one Being. Men and women are individual beings, yet form one race. Schreiner remarks could be misunderstood to distinguish the Persons of the Trinity only functionally.

Paul's theological statement of 1 Cor. 11:3 concerns structure, the ordering of a plurality within a unity.³⁶ To raise the question of value or worth of the persons mentioned in this verse is to inject into it a theme foreign to the text. The Corinthians have begun to question the practice of women covering their heads when performing certain activities in worship services.³⁷ This has most

³⁶It may be noted that Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 270, states flatly "v 3 is not a series." Murphy-O'Connor suggests that the "bracketing" of the central phrase, "and (the) head of woman (is) the man," reflects Paul's "vision of the man-woman relationship based on the first creation had been modified in the new creation inaugurated by Christ." (Ibid.) He translates ἀνὴρ in v. 3 as "believer" in the first pair ("man-Christ") and as support cites 2 Cor. 5:17 (Cf. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 [1980]: 494).

The "new creation" does play a role in this section, but not as Murphy-O'Connor suggests. The noun ἀνὴρ does not appear in 2 Cor. 5:17 and if Paul intended the reader to understand that "believer" (both man and woman would be included) is what he meant, he had access to a noun or a participle of πιστεύω. He could also have chosen ἄνθρωπος, a term which can denote a human being regardless of gender (cf. Rom 1:18, 23; 2:1, 3, 9, 16, 29 and throughout the Pauline corpus.) He uses ἄνθρωπος generically in 1 Cor. 1:25; 2:5, 9, 11, 14; 3:3, 4, 21; 4:1, 9; 6:18; 7:23, 26; 9:8; 11:28; 13:1; 14:2, 3; 16:19, 21, 32, and 39. The noun ἄνθρωπος refers to the "first man," Adam, in 15:45, 47 and refers to the male of the human species in 7:1 (and possibly 7:7). On the other hand, Paul uses ἀνὴρ to refer to a male, usually a married man, in 1 Corinthians at 7:2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 34, 39; 11:3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14; 13:11; 14:35. These are the only appearances of ἀνὴρ in 1 Corinthians. 1 Cor. 11:3 presents a series of three paired relationships in which Paul has placed the controverted relationship as the central pair.

³⁷Some have argued that Paul has more than women's behavior on his mind in these verses. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor believes that Paul develops two lines of argument

likely arisen from an "over-realized eschatology" held by some of the members of the church, already addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 7.³⁸ As Anthony Thiselton points out, "the discussion about women turns precisely on the contrast between eschatological status and life lived amidst the continuing conditions of the world."³⁹ In 1 Cor. 11:3 Paul establishes the Biblical basis for his correction of their practice, albeit in a very concise form. L. Ann Jervis notes:

Paul's goal is to correct behavior based on a mistaken soteriology. His concern is to distinguish his previous exposition of Genesis 1, in which he had asserted that in Christ men and women are one,

here, the first that men should not wear their hair in elaborate styles and the second that "the recreated woman has an authority equal to that of the man. . . ." "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 498. The text indicates that women's behavior alone caused problems at worship (in 1 Cor. 11:2-16); references to men are made to clarify the relationship which underlies the difference in head-dress.

³⁸The "over-realized eschatology" of some Corinthian believers, particularly some of the women, may be deduced from Paul's comments in 1 Corinthians 7. Anthony C. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology at Corinth," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 512, has also offered his observations based on 1 Corinthians 15 and concludes, "in specific terms, *an over-realized eschatology leads to an 'enthusiastic' view of the Spirit*" which is also apparent in 1 Corinthians 12-14. [emphasis original]

³⁹Ibid., 521. He adds (on the same page): "Paul is concerned to show that the eschatological status of the Christian does *not* raise him above everyday questions about particular times and particular places. The sense of propriety of a first-century Christian Jew, or the practice of the time embraced by other Christian congregations, remain relevant factors; for *as well as* being a new creation the believer still belongs to the natural order." [emphasis original]

from a Jewish-Hellenistic understanding of salvation as the restoration of a genderless divine image. Paul's appeal to the Genesis 2 creation story is, then, made in accordance with this primary concern.⁴⁰

1 Cor. 11:4-6

Having stated the theological basis for what he will next write, Paul applies his understanding of the relationship between man and woman under Christ in the next three verses.⁴¹ Alan Padgett has raised the question of

⁴⁰L. Ann Jervis, "'But I Want You to Know. . .'; Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshippers (1 Cor 11:2-16), *Journal of Biblical Literature* 11 (1993): 239. She believes that Philo's doctrine of creation, specifically the distinction between the "molded man" (the male of Gen. 2:7) and the man made "after the image" (the creation of the genderless man in Gen. 1:27), forms the background for the Corinthian misunderstanding. (Ibid., 236-37) This approach faces the difficulty of finding no direct support in the text of 1 Corinthians. Rather, the problem which occasioned 1 Corinthians 7 and which lies behind the behavior censured in 1 Cor. 11:3-16 seems to be an over-realized eschatology.

⁴¹There may be an undercurrent of concern regarding homosexuality in these verses. Paul has elsewhere aired his views on this subject (e.g., Rom. 1:26-27; 1 Cor. 6:9) and it is possible that short hair on women might have a cultural connection with lesbianism and long hair on men with male homosexuality. The fact that Paul does not specifically mention this as the problem, particularly in light of his willingness to discuss the subject, indicates that it is not his primary concern in 1 Cor. 11:2-16. Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972): 297, mentions the possible role of Paul's anti-homosexual feelings. He describes the passage (vv. 2-16) as "hardly one of Paul's happier compositions. The logic is obscure at best and contradictory at worst. The word choice is peculiar; the tone, peevish. All these difficulties point to some hidden agenda, hidden probably to the Apostle himself as well as his readers. If one had to guess what this might have been, as good an answer as any would be a fear of homosexuality" Amateur psychologizing and an over-reading of the text offer nothing to the serious interpreter. Paul's logic

whether these verses represent Paul's position or that of his opponents. On the basis of what he considers to be a contradiction between 1 Cor. 11:4-7 and 1 Cor. 11:10-12, Padgett believes verses 3-7b contain a complaint filed with Paul by conservative Corinthians.

For whatever reason, the Corinthians complained to Paul that some men and women were not wearing their hair in a dignified Greek manner in church. they explained to him at length basically what we read in vv. 3-7b, namely, that a man or woman shames his or her head (or is ugly) when he or she stands before a large group of people with an improper hairstyle. After all, Paul himself had taught them that God is the head of Christ, Christ is the head of man, and man is the head of woman (v.3). The Corinthians argued that if a woman does not wish to wear her hair properly bound up, let her cut it off. But since it is a shame to cut off a woman's long beautiful hair, long hair being a woman's glory (v. 15), she should properly adorn it and beautify it when she comes to church (v. 6). After all, a man is the image and glory of God, and should not wear long feminine hair (v. 7); but since man is the head of woman, a woman should be willing to beautify her long hair for him.⁴²

Several objections may be raised against Padgett's interpretation. The first is that verse 3 opens with a statement by Paul informing his readers of the importance of what follows. Verse 3 serves as the theological basis for the entire section. A second objection may be noted when

is clear, as demonstrated this study, and his word choice is entirely appropriate to the subject matter.

⁴²Alan Padgett, "Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11.2-16," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 77. That Paul speaks of veiling or covering a woman's head rather than wearing a particular hairstyle will be demonstrated below. It will also be observed that vv. 10-12 do not conflict with vv. 4-6 or v. 7.

Padgett refers to verse 15 as part of the position of the Corinthians when that comes from a section he believes Paul wrote in opposition to their opinion. The careful reader will also observe that when Paul refers to the question or opinion of the Corinthians which has been brought to his attention, he marks the text (e.g., 1 Cor. 7:1 and 8:1). Further, when Paul cites his opponents he does so very briefly and immediately corrects the misunderstanding inherent in the citation (e.g., 1 Cor. 10:23, twice). Since 1 Cor. 11:4-6 serve well as a practical application of verse 3 (which reflects an important Pauline theological understanding of God, man and salvation), Padgett's line of reasoning must be rejected as alien to the text.

Verse Four

Paul states that every man (άνήρ, an adult male) who is praying or prophesying κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων shames his "head" (κεφαλή).⁴³ The modern reader asks what Paul means by "praying and prophesying," what the prepositional phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων signals, and whether to take κεφαλή literally (he shames his own physical head) or to understand

⁴³"Every man praying or prophesying, covering his head [κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων] shames his head. And every woman praying or prophesying with an unveiled [ἀκαταλύπτῳ] head shames her head; for one it is also the same (as) one shaved. For if a woman (is) not veiled, also let her be shorn; and if it is shame for a woman to be shorn or shaved, let her be veiled." (11:4-6) Only one textual variant occurs in these verses. In v. 5, the pronoun αὐτῆς is replaced by the reflexive pronoun, ἑαυτῆς, supported by B D2 6. 629. 945.

κεφαλή in verse four in light of verse three, where Paul has identified the κεφαλή of man as Christ.

The verb προσεύχομαι, "to pray," appears for the first time in 1 Corinthians at this verse⁴⁴ and seldom in Paul's writings outside of this section (1 Cor. 11:2-14:40).⁴⁵ The term προσεύχομαι signals the act of praying without reference to its content or urgency.⁴⁶ It always denotes a calling on God by man,⁴⁷ even though humanity does not know what to pray (Rom. 8:26). From the context in 1 Corinthians 11 and 1 Corinthians 14, Paul wants the reader to understand that public prayer is in focus. Every man⁴⁸

⁴⁴The nominal form, προσυχή, occurs in 1 Cor. 7:5.

⁴⁵Rom. 8:26; Eph. 6:18; Phil. 1:9; Col. 1:3, 9; 43; 1 Thess. 5:17, 25; 2 Thess. 1:11; 3:1; 1 Tim. 2:8. The nominal form occurs three times in Romans, twice in Ephesians, once in Philippians, twice in Colossians, once in 1 Thessalonians and twice each in 1 Timothy and Philemon. The only appearance of the noun in 1 Corinthians is noted above, at 1 Cor. 7:5. Paul does not use the verbal form outside of this section (1 Cor. 11:4, 5, 13; 14:13, 14, 15). This seems to be in contrast to a frequent appearance in the New Testament (e.g., fifteen times in Matthew, eleven times in Mark, thirty-six times in Luke-Acts). Hebrews uses it once, James five times and Jude once.

⁴⁶Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, note that προσεύχομαι differs from δέομαι in that δέομαι exclusively denotes urgent prayer. (1:409 n.33) Heinrich Greeven, "εύχομαι," *TDNT* 2:807, comments that προσεύχομαι "is preferred if the fact of prayer is to be denoted with no narrower indication of its content."

⁴⁷As noted by Greeven, "εύχομαι," *TDNT* 2:807.

⁴⁸πάς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος. The form of the verb is a present middle participle in the masculine nominative singular. *BDF* §275.3 note that "πάς before an anarthrous substantive means 'everyone' (not 'each one' like ἕκαστος, but 'anyone'). . . ." (143)

who prays in a public worship setting κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων dishonors his "head."

This is true of every man who prophesies⁴⁹ κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων as well. Like προσεύχομαι, προσητεύω appears for the first time in 1 Corinthians at this point and similarly appears in 1 Corinthians (and in the Pauline corpus) only in this section.⁵⁰ In secular Greek the word-group was "marked both by solemnity and also by lack of content; it simply expresses the formal function of declaring, proclaiming, making known."⁵¹ In the New Testament, the prophet is one who declares a particular

⁴⁹προσητεύων, a present active participle.

⁵⁰1 Cor. 11:4, 5; 13:9; 14:1, 3, 4, 5, 24, 31, 39. προσητεύω occurs nowhere else in Paul's writings and infrequently in the New Testament (four times in Matthew, twice in Mark, six times in Luke-Acts, once in John and Jude, twice in Revelation). The nominal form, προφήτης, "a prophet," is much more frequently used in the New Testament but appears sparingly in Paul. It is used in 1 Cor. only in the section of 11:2-14:40 (12:28, 29; 14:29, 32, 37) and outside of 1 Corinthians only in Rom. 1:2; 3:21; 11:3; Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11; 1 Thess. 2:15 and Tit. 1:12. The cognate noun προφητεία, "prophecy," also appears in 1 Corinthians only in this section (12:10; 13:2, 8; 14:6, 22). In the rest of the Pauline corpus, it is used in Rom. 12:6; 1 Thess. 5:20; 1 Tim. 1:8 and 4:14 only. προφητεία is rare in the remainder of the New Testament (only once in Matthew, twice in 2 Peter and seven times in Revelation).

⁵¹Helmut Krämer, "προφήτης," *TDNT* 6:795. He investigates the use in extra-biblical Greek on pp. 784-96. It denotes an oracle and is attested from the fifth century B.C. onwards. He summarizes the uses of the word in relation to the Greek oracle as designation men and women who receive a revelation from a god, proclaims this message (especially when asked), are chosen by men for this task, enjoys social status, and may address directly the god they represent. (791-92) He adds "for every prophet declares something which is not his own" (795)

message.⁵² This message may be a prediction of imminent events (Agabus and the famine, Acts 11:28; Paul and his fate in Jerusalem, Acts 21:10-11) or a pronouncement on contemporary events (Paul and Barnabas dedicated to missionary work by prophecy, Acts 13:1-3). It may even be used of a non-Christian, as Paul does in Tit. 1:12 of Epimenides, a Cretan poet. A woman could prophesy (as in the prophecy of Joel cited by Peter in Acts 2:17-18 and of Philip's four virgin daughters, Acts 21:9) and could be called προφήτις ("prophetess") as was Anna in Luke 2:36.⁵³

⁵²Of 144 occurrences in the New Testament, προφήτης most commonly designates an Old Testament prophet (e.g., Matt. 1:22; 2:5, 15, 17, 23, passim) or as part of the expression "the Law and the Prophets," referring to the whole Old Testament (e.g., Matt. 5:17; 7:12; 22:40). Jesus is called a "prophet" (e.g., Matt. 21:11) as is John the Baptist (e.g., Matt. 21:26, 46). The word appears in Matthew 37 times, 29 times in Luke, 30 times in Acts, 14 times in John and six times in Mark. Paul uses it 14 times (Rom. 1:2; 3:21; 11:3; 1 Cor. 12:28, 29; 14:29, 32 [twice], 37; Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11; 1 Thess. 2:15; and Tit. 1:12). He applies it to the Old Testament prophets (Rom. 1:2; 11:3), designates the whole Old Testament ("the law and the prophets," Rom 3:21), and identifies a New Testament office (all 1 Corinthians references; Eph. 4:11) by the term προφήτης. Gerhard Friedrich, "προφήτης," *TDNT* 6:829 notes that the activity of this office is represented by the verb προφητεύω (of its 28 New Testament occurrences, 11 are in Paul's letters and all are in 1 Cor. 11-14: 1 Cor. 11:4, 5; 13:9; 14:1, 3, 4, 5 [twice], 24, 31, 39). Friedrich defines the verb as "to proclaim the revelation of God as a prophet." Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 33:459 (1:440) agree, noting that a message may be defined as prophetic "with or without reference to future events." They cite Luke 22:64 where the guard demands of Jesus an identification of who hit Him (based on a sense of smell).

⁵³While Anna is given the title in Luke 2:36, the temptress "Jezebel" gives herself the title in Rev. 2:20. These are the only two appearances of the feminine nominal in the New Testament. It may be significant that while

The significant event which marks a turning point for prophecy is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost ushers in the fulfillment of Joel 2:23 (as noted above in Acts 2:17-18). Within this larger context, however, individuals were either called to the office of "prophet/prophetess" or given a particular message to share with the church.⁵⁴

While the term προφήτης can signal very broadly the whole work of proclaiming the messages of God (cf. 1 Cor. 12:28-29; 14:1; Eph. 4:11), the verb προφητεύω can denote more narrowly the act of transmitting a particular message which is judged by others to determine whether the source is the Holy Spirit or not. Friedrich notes this connection between praying and prophesying:

In primitive Christianity, too, there is a direct connection between prayer and prophecy, for both are in a special sense works of the Spirit 1 C. 11:4 deals with prayer (i.e., public prayer in the congregation) and prophecy in relation to men, 1 C. 11:5 with prayer and prophecy in relation to women. It is certainly no accident that prayer and prophecy are brought together in 1 Th. 5:17-20 The interrelation between prayer and prophecy is apparent in 1 C. 14 Prophecy and prayer are not the same, but they belong very closely together.⁵⁵

women could prophesy in New Testament times, the title was not used. (So noted by Friedrich, "προφήτης," *TDNT* 6:829.)

⁵⁴Friedrich also comments that the New Testament "prophet does not enjoy such unlimited authority as the Jewish prophet." "προφήτης," *TDNT* 6:849. The one who prophesies is judged by one who has the gift of discernment (1 Cor. 12:10) and by other Christians (1 Cor. 14:29).

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 852-53.

κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων

The phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων describes a state or condition which, in the case of a man praying or prophesying in a public worship service, dishonors his "head." Κατά with the genitive case occurs far less frequently than with the accusative.⁵⁶ When used with the genitive, "it most often means 'against someone' (in a hostile sense). It does not appear often in a local sense,"⁵⁷ so that 1 Cor. 11:4 exhibits something of an unusual application of κατά with the genitive. The phrase may be translated "hanging down from the head, on the head,"⁵⁸ but to the modern reader it may be unclear whether this refers to hair or to a head-covering. Archaeological discoveries (particularly busts and statues and coins) reveal that Roman men kept their hair short.⁵⁹ Further, if Paul had wanted the reader to understand long hair, he would most naturally have mentioned

⁵⁶BAGD s.v. "κατά," note that κατά with the genitive occurs 73 times in the New Testament and with the accusative 391 times. When used with the genitive, κατά may signal a place or be used figuratively ("down upon, toward, against someone or something").

⁵⁷BDF §225 (120). They cite as places where κατά with the genitive is used in a local sense Matt. 8:32; Acts 9:31, 42; 10:37; Luke 4:14; 23:5; 2 Cor. 8:2; and 1 Cor. 11:4 (and others).

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Cynthia L. Thompson, "Hairstyles, Head-coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth," *Biblical Archaeologist* 51 (1988): 99-102, reproduces photographs of several busts and statues of men from Roman Corinth as well as Rome itself. They show men who keep their hair quite short.

the word *ῥίξ* ("hair")⁶⁰ or used the verb *κομάω* (to wear the hair long") as he does in 1 Cor. 11:14, 15.⁶¹ As Gordon Fee observes, "if Paul had intended long hair, this idiom is a most unusual way of referring to it."⁶²

Yet some commentators argue that *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* means "wearing long hair." Jerome Murphy-O'Connor observes the absence of the noun *κάλυμμα* and suggests that a "downward motion" is inherent in the preposition *κατὰ*, referring to verse 14 to supply what is "hanging downward."⁶³ Underlying Paul's attitude towards long hair on males, he proposes, is an anti-homosexual bias evidence

⁶⁰*ῥίξ* may be used to denote the hair of animals (e.g., Matt. 3:4; Mark 1:6; Rev. 9:8) or of human beings (Matt. 5:36; Luke 21:18; Acts 27:34; Rev. 1:14). Paul never uses this term.

⁶¹*BAGD* s.v. "*κομάω*," 442, note that Greek men do not wear their hair long and cite Herodotus 1, 82, 7 and Plutarch. This verb occurs in the New Testament only at 1 Cor. 11:14, 15. The nominal *κόμη* (the "long hair" of women), occurs only at 1 Cor. 11:15.

⁶²Gordon Fee, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 506. He argues there is little or no evidence that men in Roman or Greek societies covered their heads. Fee does admit two notable exceptions (507, n.61) but Richard Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11.4," *New Testament Studies*, 34 (1988): 481-505, demonstrates an extensive use of headcoverings for men in Roman and Greek society at this time. He responds to Fee's comments by stating simply "it is a pity that Prof. Gordon Fee has dismissed the possibility of a Roman context to 1 Cor 11.4"

⁶³Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 42 (1980): 484. He admits that Plutarch, *Apophthegmata regum* 200E, uses the prepositional phrase to indicate a head covering for a man. (*Ibid.*, n. 11)

also in Pseudo-Phocylides and Philo.⁶⁴ He then concludes: "The real issue was the way hair was dressed. The slightest exaggeration was interpreted as a sign of effeminacy; it hinted at sexual ambiguity."⁶⁵

Paul, however, does not mention homosexuality or homosexuals in this section. In verse 3 Paul lays the foundation for his comments in verses 4-16, yet says nothing about sexual orientation or preference (as opposed to Rom. 1:26-27).⁶⁶ Joël DeLobel criticizes Murphy-O'Connor for linking Paul's comments in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 with the anti-homosexual statements of other Jewish and Hellenistic authors and lists three reasons for rejecting Murphy-

⁶⁴He dates the former to somewhere between 30 B.C. and A.D. 40 and cites advice to parents: "If a child is a boy, do not let locks grow on his head. Braid not his crown nor make cross-knots on the top of his head. Long hair is not fit for men, but for voluptuous women. . . . Guard the youthful beauty of a comely boy, because many rage for intercourse with a man" (vv. 210-14). (Ibid., 485) Murphy-O'Connor adds that Philo disdained long hair on men in a "tirade of emotionally charged invective which Philo directed against homosexuals he criticized 'the provocative way they curl and dress their hair'. . . .(Spec. Leg. 3:36)." (Ibid.)

⁶⁵Ibid., 487.

⁶⁶In Rom. 1:18-32 Paul argues that Gentiles are condemned under God's law, even though they lacked the Mosaic law. He uses homosexuality to illustrate the depravity and guilt of Gentiles who have departed from the relationship of men and women as God designed it in Genesis 2. When Paul uses Genesis 2 to condemn homosexuality, he does so clearly. His concern in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 may be related to his remarks in Rom. 1:18-32, and he may draw from the same source (Genesis 2), but the problems he faces are different in each passage and his theological point in each is distinctive.

O'Connor's understanding of the passage. He first notes that the prepositional phrase *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* appears in Plutarch with reference to a head covering (and this is supported by 1 Cor. 11:7). DeLobel then discusses 1 Cor. 11:14 and observes that Paul mentions long hair but does not speak of "an unmasculine, elaborate hairdo" proposed by Murphy-O'Connor. He adds:

If v. 14 as such is used as a parallel to interpret v. 4, then v. 4 also means «long hair» (an nothing else on the basis of v. 14). The opposite then in v. 5 can only be «short hair», but this would lead to a nonsense interpretation in v. 6: «if the woman has short hair (*εἰ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται*), than [*sic*] she shall cut off her hair (*κεῖράσθω*)». Our point is that v. 14 is not sufficient to provide v. 4 with a meaningful reference to the hair rather than to headgear.⁶⁷

DeLobel's third argument against taking *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* as a reference to long hair (as Murphy-O'Connor does) involves an appreciation for how *κεφαλή* is used in the context of 1 Corinthians 11. He points out that if *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* refers to long hair, then a third meaning for *κεφαλή* has been introduced (i.e., "hair"). He asks if it is "probable that in a context where *κεφαλή* is a very central concept and where it already has a metaphorical meaning (v. 3 cf. *infra*)

⁶⁷Joël DeLobel, "1 Cor 11,2-16: Towards a Coherent Interpretation," *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère*, edited by A. Vanhoye (Leuven: University Press, 1986), 372. He adds that Pseudo-Phocylides mentions homosexuality and long hair separately "in two subsequent but distinct maxims. without clearly combining them himself; whereas Philo does not mention long hair at all when reacting against homosexual behaviour." (Ibid., 372-73)

and a literal meaning (v. 4a) a third meaning would have been introduced?"⁶⁸

It may be further noted that Paul's expression κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων closely resembles the prepositional phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς which occurs in Esther 6:12. There Haman returns to his house, "mourning and with his head covered."⁶⁹ Richard Oster, at the end of his study of Roman devotional practices, writes:

In conclusion, the Corinthian issue of whether a man may cover his head when he prays and prophesies emerged from a particular matrix of mores that were totally indigenous to Roman pietistic and devotional ethos, and had spread, as archaeology proves, to the urban centres of the Mediterranean basin, Corinth included, decades prior to the advent of Christianity. Accordingly, one should not be surprised to discover that a segment of the Christian fellowship at Corinth was continuing to manifest this particular pietistic gesture, one of the many stemming from the Etruscan period of its Italian heritage.⁷⁰

Paul therefore is saying that when an adult male is praying or prophesying in the public worship of the church

⁶⁸Ibid., 373. He adds that a literal or metaphorical meaning would be possible in v. 4b. "Even a deliberate ambiguity combining both meanings is not unlikely: «each man praying or prophesying with a covered head, behaves shameful [*sic*] with respect to his (literal and/or metaphorical) head»." (Ibid., 373-74).

⁶⁹So noted by Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 506. He also cites Plutarch's reference to Scipio the Younger who wore a head-covering on a journey through Alexandria (506-07). Fee concludes, "almost certainly, therefore, by this idiom Paul is referring to an external cloth covering." It is the nature and details of this covering which Fee denies is recoverable.

⁷⁰Richard Oster, 505.

and is wearing a head-covering, he dishonors⁷¹ his "head." Fee summarizes the arguments for taking the word κεφαλή (at this point) in a figurative sense, looking back to verse three, as Christ.

The "head" that would be shamed is man's metaphorical "head," Christ. Several things make that clear: (1) the asyndeton (no joining particle or conjunction) gives the sentence the closest possible tie to v. 3; (2) Paul uses the personal pronoun "his" rather than the reflexive "his own"; (3) to refer to himself in this way compounds metaphorical usages without warning; (4) otherwise the preceding theological statement has no place in the argument whatever.⁷²

Paul had established the relationship between God and Christ, Christ and man, man and woman in verse three.⁷³

⁷¹καταισχύνει, a third person singular present indicative active form of the verb καταισχύνω. Paul uses the verb in Rom. 5:5; 9:33; 10:11; 1 Cor. 1:27 (twice); 11:4, 5, 22; 2 Cor. 7:14; and 9:4. The verb appears outside the Pauline corpus only at Luke 13:17; 1 Pet. 2:6 and 3:16. Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 25.194 (1:310) list it under the subdomain of "shame, disgrace, humiliation" and define it as "to cause someone to be much ashamed." BAGD s.v. "καταισχύνω," gives three definitions: "to dishonor, disgrace; to put to shame, be humiliated; to cause to be ruined or lost, to disappoint." They cite 1 Cor. 11:4-5 under the first definition, the only New Testament use of the term with that denotation.

⁷²Gordon Fee, 506.

⁷³It is a violation of Paul's intended meaning to understand a devaluation of anyone in verse three due to their relationship to a "head." In her article on this passage, Gail Paterson Corrington inappropriately transfers one metaphorical meaning for κεφαλή into the passage, producing both chaos and misunderstanding. She writes: "since *kephale* may also stand by metonymy for the whole person, the lowest member of the hierarchy, the wife, is further 'de-personalized'; that is she stands in relationship to her husband as his 'body.' G. P. Corrington, "The 'Headless Woman'; Paul and the Language of the Body in 1 Cor 11:2-16," *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 18

When he uses the key term from that verse in verse four, without marking the text in any way, the reader most naturally would understand that Paul intends the meaning of κεφαλή to be brought forward to verse four. When a man is praying or prophesying with his head covered by anything, he dishonors Jesus Christ because he wears a cultural marker which identifies him as a woman.⁷⁴ Paul then turns to the conduct of the Corinthian women in worship.

Verse Five

"And (ὁ) every woman praying or prophesying with an

(1991): 225. She argues that Paul "de-personalizes" the woman because the woman is not explicitly described as κεφαλή in relation to anyone, creating an inappropriate totality transfer of meaning.

⁷⁴David W. J. Gill, "The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Tyndale Bulletin* 41 (1990): 253, refers to a Roman wedding scene inscribed on a marble sarcophagus, probably found at Rome and dating from A.D. 170-180 that depicts the men bareheaded and the women with heads covered. It was not that a woman could not appear in public with an uncovered head, but rather that a married woman reflected her identity by means of wearing a head-covering. Social convention favored a head-covering for women. Gill states: "The wearing of the veil said something about the wife's position in society: the lack of it at a meeting such as this would have been a poor reflection on her husband." (254) Cynthia L. Thompson, "Hairstyles, Head-coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth," *Biblical Archaeologist* 51 (1988): 113 makes the same observation of Jewish wives: "Judaism is another element of Paul's experience that was influenced by customs of the eastern Mediterranean. The evidence of Jewish rabbis (from Palestine and Babylonia), who wrote considerably later than Paul, suggests that Jewish women were expected to wear head-coverings, some even within their own homes. It is possible that these Jewish customs originated earlier and were part of Paul's background in writing to the Corinthians"

uncovered head (ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ) shames her⁷⁵ 'head;' it is one and the same as shaved." Extending the application begun in verse 4, Paul states that any and every woman⁷⁶ who engages in either of these activities ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ, (is shaming her "head"). He adds the comment that a woman in such a state is "one and the same" (ἓν γὰρ ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ)⁷⁷ as one who has had her

⁷⁵The only textual variant which occurs in this verse appears here. The pronoun αὐτῆς is replaced by the reflexive pronoun, ἐαυτῆς, supported by B D2 6. 629. 945. The *UBSGNT* does not note the variant which seems to have developed to eliminate the ambiguity of the pronoun αὐτῆς. The variant signals to the reader that Paul is thinking of a married woman shaming her husband (if "head" is metaphorical) or that he is thinking of a woman (married or not) shaming her own physical head (if "head" is literal) rather than taking v. 5 in the sense of v. 3. The pronoun αὐτῆς extends the application of v. 4 to the woman, so that any woman who prays or prophesies with an uncovered head shames every man (the singular represents the category, as Paul does in Rom. 2:17-19 and 3:1 of "the Jew;" cf. *BDF* §139 [77]).

⁷⁶As cited above, *BDF* §275.3 note that "πᾶς before an anarthrous substantive means 'everyone' (not 'each one' like ἕκαστος, but 'anyone'). . . ." (143) Kenneth T. Wilson, "Should Women Wear Headcoverings," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148 (1991): 448-49, summarizes the thematic arguments for taking this reference as a reference to all women, not just married women: "this is a reference to all women because (a) marriage is not mentioned in this passage, (b) the principles seem to illustrate the fact that men in general are the head of women in general, and (c) the issue involves male-female distinctiveness."

⁷⁷*BDF* §131, discussing agreement in gender, observe that "when the predicate stands for the subject conceived as a class and in the abstract, not as an individual instance or example, then classical usage put the adjectival predicate in the neuter sin., even with subjects of another gender" The phrase ἓν γὰρ ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ "is identical in meaning but not in person, hence the fem. is inconceivable." (73)

head shaved (τῆ ἐξυρημένη).⁷⁸ The phrase ἀκατακαλύπτω τῆ κεφαλῆ stands in parallel to κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων in v. 4.⁷⁹ The term ἀκατάκαλυπτος occurs in the New Testament only here and in 1 Cor. 11:13.⁸⁰ The verb without the alpha-privative, κατακαλύπτω ("to cover, veil"), appears in the New Testament only in the two following verses (11:6-7, used three times). Both terms seem to derive from κάλυμμα, a "covering" of the face, worn by Moses (2 Cor. 3:13), and used figuratively of those who do not perceive Christ in the Scriptures (2 Cor. 3:14). The simple verb καλύπτω refers to the act of covering or concealing⁸¹ and the preposition

⁷⁸The verb ἐξυρημένη is a perfect passive participle in the dative singular feminine, from ξυράω. The phrase τῆ ἐξυρημένη reflects the associative use of the dative case, used also of adjectives and adverbs of identity. (Cf. *BDF* §194.1 [104].) The woman with her head uncovered, prophesying or praying in the public worship services, creates the same identity for herself as would a woman with a shaved head.

⁷⁹An attributive adjective or participle, used with an arthrous substantive, must participate in the force of the article by either being placed between the definite article and the nominal or, if placed after the nominal, have its own definite article. *BDF* §279.1, commenting on the attributive and predicate adjective, point out that the phrase ἀκατακαλύπτω τῆ κεφαλῆ is equivalent to ἀκατακάλυπτον ἔχουσα τὴν κεφαλὴν. [142]

⁸⁰It appears in the Septuagint only at Lev. 13:45, where it translates וְגַב, in the context of regulations concerning people with skin diseases. Such a one is to uncover his head. A synonym, ἀκάλυπτος, is used to translated the same Hebrew term in Tobit 2:10 and the Epistle of Jeremiah 31. It appears in adverbial form (ἀκαλύπτως) in 3 Macc. 4:6.

⁸¹As in Luke 23:30 of a person; Matt. 8:24 of a boat. It may be used figuratively to denote "remove from sight," as in 1 Pet. 4:8; James 5:20 or to "hide" as in 2

κατά, when added to it,⁸² may indicate that the covering hangs "down" from the head.⁸³ Paul does not discuss hair-styles at this point, nor does he describe "loosed hair" or "hair that hangs loose" by ἀκατάκαλυπτος.⁸⁴ Rather, his use here and his argument in 1 Cor. 11:2-16, as well as his use of cognate terms elsewhere, indicate that Paul intended his readers to understand by ἀκατάκαλυπτος one who has no head-covering.

Such a woman is "one and the same" as one who has her head shaved (τῆ ἐξυρημένῃ). The word ξυράω appears very

Cor. 4:3. It may also refer to the "veiling" of the heart, denoting (willful?) non-understanding by the disciples (Luke 24:32).

⁸²BDF §116 discuss the formation of compound Greek words by adding a prepositional prefix. They note that "Koine has an fondness for composite verbs where the classical language was content with the simple forms." (63) These prepositions may retain something of their own meaning in the compound or they may simply serve to intensify the action of the second element, usually a verb (verbal substantives and adjectives).

⁸³BAGD s.v. "κατά," list this definition first, noting that κατά with the genitive (73 times in the New Testament) denotes "down from someth." (405) They list 1 Cor. 11:4 under I.1.a., "lit. hanging down fr. the head, as a veil."

⁸⁴Gordon Fee discusses the proposal that unbound, long hair is intended by Paul and concludes that head-coverings are meant, primarily on the basis of 1 Cor. 11:15, "which implies that long hair is a woman's glory and therefore a good thing, and with the imperative 'let her be covered' in v. 6 (cf. v. 7; the men should 'not be covered'), which does not easily lend itself to the connotation of putting her hair up. It is also true that this does not appear to be the precise opposite of the man's activity in v. 5" (509-10)

rarely in the New Testament⁸⁵ and denotes a literal shaving of the head.⁸⁶ For a woman to have her head shaved indicated in Jewish, Greek and Roman societies great shame. Fee notes:

The fact that a shaved head for a woman constituted shame is found in such diverse texts as Deut. 21:12 (although in this case it is probably also a sign of mourning); Aristot., *Thes.* 837 (the mother of unworthy children should have her hair shorn); and Tacitus, *Germ.* 19, where the husband of an adulterous wife drives her from the house shaved and naked.⁸⁷

Annie Jaubert has asked, "why should the woman cover her head?"⁸⁸ She answers by pointing out that for both Jewish and Hellenistic cultures, a woman covered her head as a sign of her relationship to her husband.⁸⁹ She adds that

⁸⁵It is used in the middle voice in Acts 21:24, in A B2 C D* Ψ and the Majority text as a third person plural aorist middle deponent subjunctive, and in P47 Ξ B* Dc and others as a third person plural future middle deponent indicative. The context involves four men who have taken a vow and, as part of their vow, will have their heads shaved. This is the only place outside 1 Cor. 11:5-6 where the term ξυράω appears in the New Testament.

⁸⁶BAGD s.v. ξυράω, 549.

⁸⁷Gordon Fee, 510-11 n.79. He adds that the Romans did not themselves shave the heads of their adulterous women but that Tacitus is commenting on the practice of the Germanic tribes.

⁸⁸«Pourquoi la femme doit-elle se couvrir la tête?» Annie Jaubert, «Le Voile des Femmes (I Cor. XI.2-16),» *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971-72): 424. She asks the question as the subtitle for the text of 424-27.

⁸⁹She cites *m. Kethuboth* 72a-b; *m. Gittin* 90a; and mentions that the sole example which shows that the covered head is a sign of marital dependence is *m. Sanhedrin* 58b. («Le seul exemple qui montrerait que la tête couverte est un signe de dépendance maritale est en Sanh 58b.») (*Ibid.*, 425)

there is some indication in Talmud that a head covering recalled the original fall into sin of Genesis 3 (as a sign of mourning or a way to hide the fault of Eve), but that Paul makes no such allusion in 1 Cor. 11:2-16.⁹⁰ The distinction between men and women is not merely social.⁹¹ The distinction between men and women evidenced in Genesis 2 constitutes part of their identity as the image of God.

⁹⁰«En deux autres passages la tête couverte des femmes, opposée à la tête découverte des hommes, est considérée comme un signe de deuil ou une manière de se cacher à cause de la faute d'Eve. Mai préciseément chez Paul il n'est pas fait allusion à la chute originelle.» She cites Gen. Rabba 17.8 and Pirqa Rabbi Eliezer 14. (Ibid., 425)

Herman Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament also Talmud und Midrasch* (C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuch Handlung: Munich, 1954), 3:423-443 cite numerous Jewish references in 1 Cor. 11:4-16. They note that practical reasons sometimes affected men's headcovering: "man bedeckte den Kopf mit dem Turban im Winter der Kälte wegen u. man ließ ihn im Sommer unbedeckt der Hitze wegen." (3:423) They cite *pBerakah* 2, 4c, 11.

⁹¹David W. J. Gill, "The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Tyndale Bulletin* 41 (1990): 245-60, misses the point when he suggests that head-coverings indicated a *social* distinction rather than a gender distinction. He pictures Paul's concern as division within the church over social-status markers worn at worship, stating that "Paul may be attempting to say that if certain men adopt the form of dress suitable for a select band of people at a religious act, then division would occur." (248) Several objections may be offered. The first and foremost problem with Gill's thesis is that Paul does not say what Gill would have him say. Paul does not raise the issue of divisions in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 nor does he comment on gold and jewelry, frequent insignias of wealth (as in 1 Tim. 2:9). Further, the problem Paul confronts is that women are praying and prophesying with heads uncovered, not that men are actually covering their heads. Men are discussed because the relationship between men and women forms the basis for Paul's directives in this pericope.

Paul had described the relationship between men and women in verse 3. In verses 4-6 he proceeds to apply the theology statement of verse 3 to the situation in Corinth. As Jervis reports, "Paul is saying in vv. 4-6 that, when one is praying and prophesying, gender symbols are significant and should be in accordance with God's gift in Christ of a redeemed, dual-gender humanity."⁹²

Verse Six

"For if⁹³ a woman does not have [her head] covered

⁹²L. Ann Jervis, 242. William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *1 Corinthians* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 260, point out that "among the Jews of the New Testament period a virgin or maiden was permitted to go about without a covering on her head or face; but when she became married she was required to have a covering that bound up her hair and reached around her chin. Custom required that she must never go outside her house with an uncovered head. This was so shameful that her husband could use it as ground for divorce without return of the marriage dowry." Strack and Billerbeck make this claim and cite *Kethubah* 7.6. They add that *pSotah* 1, 16b, 28 discusses a bare-headed women under Deut. 24:1. By going about bare-headed, a woman "exposes" herself to the public. (*Kommentar*, 3:428-429).

Colin Brown adds a helpful note when he states: "Therefore women should be veiled in worship. Again it may be said that, whilst the guiding principles for Paul's recommendation hold good, the continued application of it depends upon the continued acceptance of all the premises of the argument. In a culture where the significance of veiling is no longer understood in the same way, the argument no longer has the same force." Colin Brown, "Head," *NIDNTT*, 161-62.

⁹³*BDF* §372.2a cite this verse as an example of the use of εἰ with the indicative (κατακαλύπεται is a present passive indicative) to denote a simple conditional assumption with emphasis on the reality of the assumption, a "real case." Here there is no causal or restrictive implication (i.e., "if such and such is true"), merely a disjunctive deduction (as also in 1 Cor. 3:14-15). (189)

(κατακαλύπεται), then (καὶ)⁹⁴ let [her] be shorn (κείρασθω);⁹⁵ and if [it is] a shame for a woman to have been shorn or be shaved,⁹⁶ let [her head] be covered."

The verb κείρω ("to cut the hair short") may be distinguished from the verb ξυράω ("to shave"). Fee points to a quotation from Tiberius (cited by Dio Cassius in his *History of Rome*): "I want my sheep shorn (κείρεσθαι), not shaven (ἀποξύρεσθαι)."⁹⁷ The word κείρω thus refers to a close cutting but does not mean a shaving. It appears in both secular and intertestamental sources for the "shearing"

⁹⁴BDF §442.7 states: "The use of καὶ to introduce an apodosis is due primarily to Hebrew, although it appears as early as Homer (e.g., Il. 1.478). . . ." (227)

⁹⁵A third person singular aorist middle imperative from the word κείρω.

⁹⁶The form is an arthrous substantivized infinitive, τὸ κείρασθαι ἢ ξυράσθαι, aorist and present passive infinitives (respectively). BDF §399.1, discussing the nominative and accusative of the substantivized infinitive without the preposition, note that the definite article is anaphoric and serves to indicate, for the reader, that these substantives are the same as the one(s) mentioned previously. (205)

BAGD s.v. "ξυράω," discuss the conjugation of the term ξυράσθαι. They argue that the accent markings should be altered to ξύρασθαι, an aorist middle infinitive. (549) They cite BDF §101 which notes that ξυρ- verbs in the present and imperfect are unattested in the New Testament but cite the accentuation ξύρασθαι as an aorist middle (specifically stating "not -ἀσθαι." (53) Also relevant, in the opinion of BAGD, is BDF §317, "the middle in the sense of 'to let oneself be . . .'" (cf. German *sich lassen*) (causative . . .)," again citing 1 Cor. 11:6. (166) No significant difference of meaning is involved.

⁹⁷Dio Cassius, *History of Rome*, 15.10.5; cited by Gordon Fee, 511, n.82.

of sheep⁹⁸ (as also in Acts 8:32) and in Acts 18:18 of Paul cutting off his hair on account of a vow he took. The word is used only in these two places in Acts and in 1 Cor. 11:6 in the New Testament. Paul's use of ξυράω and κείρω in the second half of this verse indicates that both a shaven head and a closely shorn head carry the same stigma and convey the same shame.⁹⁹ If it is a shame for a woman to shave or closely shear her hair, then she should cover her head while in the public worship service. Paul argues, therefore, that all women who leave their heads uncovered fall into the same category as the shaved or cropped-hair woman, with the same resultant shame to her "head."¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸BAGD s.v. "κείρω," cites Artemidorus 4,51 (second century A.D.); Babrius 51,3 (ca. A.D. 200); Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6.297; *Testament of Judah*, 12:1. (427)

⁹⁹Gordon Fee cites two texts in Lucian that illustrate how short hair was considered "mannish." A "fugitive wife in the company of three runaway slaves, 'a woman with her hair closely clipped (κεκραμένην) in the Spartan style, boyish-looking and quite masculine' (*fug.* 27; Loeb, V, 85); and of a Lesbian woman Megilla, who after pulling off her wig revealed 'the skin of her head which was shaved close (ἀποκεκραμένη), just as on the most energetic of athletes' (*dial. het.* 5.3; Loeb, VII, 383)." (511, n. 81) He believes that the homosexuality involved with a woman's short hair is the cause of shame for a woman who has a shaved or closely shorn head.

¹⁰⁰Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 51, argues that Paul intends both a metaphorical and a literal meaning for "head" in this context. He writes: "Does one dishonor his anatomical head or his social head? The answer is both. The word *head* in this context is an intentional *double entendre* and serves as the *Stichwort*, the crucial term about which the rest of the argument is constructed." Several comments may be made regarding Waltke's thesis. First, the headship of verse three is more than "social." The word

Paul has twice used the compound verb καταισχύνει (once in verse 4 and once in verse 5). In verse 6 he employs the nominal, αἰσχρὸν.¹⁰¹ "Shame" is, for Paul, much more than mere embarrassment or an emotional state. Rudolf Bultmann explains:

The verb αἰσχύνω, fully interchangeable with ἐπ- and esp. καταισχύνω, is often found act. in the sense of "to shame" or "to bring to shame" (mostly for ὁ Θεός). Most frequently God is the subject, and the shame to which He brings is His judgment. . . . The mid. is relatively uncommon, and has the common Greek sense of "being ashamed" (i.e., of doing something, 2 Esr. 8:22 etc., or of having done something, 2 Ch. 12:6). Mostly αἰσχύνεσθαι denotes experience of the judgment of God; and it is usually difficult to decide whether the form is mid. or pass., i.e., "to be shamed or confounded," or "to be ashamed" in the sense of "having to be ashamed." What is in view is not so much the state of soul of the αἰσχυνθείς but the situation into which he is brought and in which he is exposed to shame and thus to be ashamed.¹⁰²

The disgrace which a woman brings upon the man and upon herself by praying or prophesying with an uncovered head is the state resulting from God's judgment upon her rebellion.

"head" in this context is relational, describing the one to whom a person submits and the one who has authority over a person. As the Father, God is more than a "social" Head over Christ Jesus who, in turn, is more than a "social" Head over mankind. Second, Paul does not intend to convey the idea of a literal, physical head in verses three and four when he uses κεφαλή. 1 Cor. 11:4-5 applies 1 Cor. 11:3 and draws the denotation of κεφαλή from verse three. Thus, Paul has in mind only the metaphorical use of κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3-6.

¹⁰¹The noun αἰσχρός appears in 1 Cor. 11:6; 14:35; Eph. 5:12; and Tit. 1:11 in the New Testament. The cognate noun αἰσχρότης occurs in Eph. 5:4 (a hapax). Words ending in -της denote the *nomina agentis*. (Cf. *BDF* §109.8.)

¹⁰²Rudolf Bultmann, "αἰσχύνω," *TDNT* 1:189.

When a woman refuses to wear a headcovering while performing these activities in worship, she rejects her identity as assigned by God and rebels against His will. This inevitably brings her into a situation where she is exposed to the judgment of God: in short, αἰσχρὸν. Bultmann adds:

From the root αἰσχ- we also find αἰσχρὸς in the NT in the sense of "that which is disgraceful" in the judgment of men (1 C. 11:6; 14:35), especially as expressed in words (Eph. 5:12; cf. Herm. v., 1, 7) or in relation to filthy lucre (Tt. 1:11).¹⁰³

Shaving a woman's head, shearing her hair and praying or prophesying with an uncovered head in worship services all have in common a rebellion by woman against the woman's identity and role as given by God. She makes a non-verbal statement by such activities that she opposes God's will for her and the man's headship over her, thus failing to fulfill the purpose for which she was created and bringing herself into a situation where she is exposed to God's judgment and the judgment of God's people.

In the society of first century A.D. Greco-Roman Corinth, wearing a headcovering served to communicate acceptance of her God-given identity as the glory of man and all that it entails.¹⁰⁴ Paul next explains his application.

¹⁰³Ibid., 190.

¹⁰⁴Colin Brown suggests that this application "depends upon the common understanding of certain premises which were valid in the context of Paul's culture. Where these no longer obtain, the conclusions also no longer obtain, even though the motivating principle of maintaining the liberty of the spirit with due regard to the order of nature and society still holds." (162)

1 Cor. 11:7-9

In 1 Cor. 11:7-12 Paul's comments recall the creation account of Genesis 1:26-27 and 2:4-24 and introduce into his discussion the "Image of God" theme and the term $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$. Jervis writes:

In vv. 7-10 Paul makes clear that the creation stories are the warrant for his injunctions. The first injunction is to the male (vv. 7-9). The reason Paul gives as to why the male should not $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ his head is a midrashic recombination of the two Genesis creation stories. The introduction of the word *doxa* into the interpretation of the first creation story (v. 7a) is, as many have remarked, a typical Jewish interpretation of what it means that Adam is the image of God.¹⁰⁵

It is important to understand that this is not a new point in the discussion, as Morna D. Hooker has suggested: "Paul's argument in this section is based upon the creation stories of Gen. i and ii, and must therefore differ from his previous argument, where the scheme of relationships included Christ."¹⁰⁶ Rather, Paul's Christology does not eliminate the structure of mankind which God created in

¹⁰⁵L. Ann Jervis, 242. She cites E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957): 63; M. D. Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of I Cor. XI.10," *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964): 411; and Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972), 299, as well as his work, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 27 and 49. (242, n. 45)

¹⁰⁶M. D. Hooker, 411. She adds: "Whatever Paul's understanding of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in Gen. i.27, the essential point for his argument is the contrast which he sees in $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ between man and woman: it is on this contrast that the different regulations regarding head-coverings are based."

Genesis 1 and 2. It is precisely in Christ that mankind is restored to the image of God (cf. Col. 1:15-20). Verse 7 does not introduce a new point but explains verses 4-6 in light of verse 3.

Verse Seven

"For, on the one hand,¹⁰⁷ a man (άνηρ) should¹⁰⁸ not have the head covered,¹⁰⁹ being¹¹⁰ the image (εἰκὼν) and glory

¹⁰⁷ *BDF* §447 discuss the adversative conjunctions μὲν . . . δὲ which appear here, as in classical Greek, as correlatives.

¹⁰⁸ ὀφείλει, a third person singular present indicative active form of the verb ὀφείλω. The verb can denote an "owing" of debts to someone (as in Matt. 18:28; Luke 16:5) and may serve as a synonym for "to sin" (as in the Lucan version of the Lord's Prayer, Luke 11:4. Cf. Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 88.298 (2:774). The verb appears in 1 Cor. 11:7 with a figurative or moral intention, signalling that which is required or forbidden by some moral or legal requirement, as in John 19:7; Rom. 13:8. Cf. Louw & Nida, *Lexicon* 71.25 (2:671). It may refer to that which is "necessary or indispensable, with the implication of a contingency. . . ." Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 71.35 (2:672), who also cite 1 Cor. 5:10 for this sense. *BAGD* s.v. "ὀφείλω," 2.a.β. note that the verb may be translated "be obligated," and with a following infinitive (such as in 1 Cor. 11:7), "one must, one ought." (598) They cite 4 Macc. 11:15; 16:19; and in 1 Corinthians, 1 Cor. 7:36; 9:10; 11:10. The verb appears with the infinitive following and with a negative particle in Acts 17:29 and in 1 Cor. 11:7.

¹⁰⁹ κατακαλύπτεσθαι, a present passive infinitive.

¹¹⁰ ὑπάρχων, a present active participle in the masculine nominative singular form of ὑπάρχω. *BDF* §414 note that ὑπάρχω serves to "express a modified sense of to be" and signals "to be already in existence, to exist originally." (213) The term ὑπάρχω occurs seldom in Matthew (three times) and much more often in Luke's works (fifteen times in Luke, twenty-five times in Acts). Paul does not use it often (Rom. 4:19; 1 Cor. 7:26; 11:7, 18; 12:22; 13:1 [as a substantive] 2 Cor. 7:17; 12:16; Gal. 1:14; 2:14; Phil. 2:6; 3:20). The word ὑπάρχω may be distinguished from

(δόξα) of God; and on the other hand, the woman is the glory of man."

The words "image" (εἰκὼν) and "glory" (δόξα) are not synonymous.¹¹¹ In this verse, Paul identifies the man (ἄνθρωπος) as God's image and glory but describes the woman as the "glory" (δόξα) of the man. He does not intend to say that she is not the image of God along with the man, but that her

εἶναι in some contexts by understanding in ὑπάρχω an emphasis on the reality of the existing; thus, BAGD s.v. "ὑπάρχω," 1. translate "exist (really) . . ." as in 1 Cor. 11:18. (838)

¹¹¹Contrary to William O. Walker, Jr., "The Vocabulary of 1 Corinthians 11.3-16: Pauline or Non-Pauline?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (1989: 79, who states: "A further example of vocabulary in 1 Cor. 11.3-16 that is neither characteristically Pauline nor characteristically post-Pauline is the juxtaposition of *eikōn* ('image') and *doxa* ('glory') in the phrase *eikōn kai doxa Theou* ('image and glory of God') in v. 7. Although each of the two terms is fairly common, both in the Pauline letters and elsewhere in early Christian literature, nowhere except in this passage are they juxtaposed as apparent synonyms." As will be demonstrated below, the two terms are not synonymous. Walker's conclusion that the vocabulary of 1 Cor. 11:3-16 supports a non-Pauline theory of authorship may be criticized on several grounds. First, the sample of vocabulary in 1 Cor. 11:3-16 is too small to validate such a study. Second, the terms which Walker claims to be "non-Pauline" appear in texts he accepts as Pauline. Third, Paul deals with a subject matter in these verses which require this vocabulary. Walker's conclusion require that Paul have been a man of very limited intellect and ability, which is not the case. L. Ann Jervis notes that Walker's hypothesis "has been effectively countered by J. Murphy-O'Connor ("The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?" *JBL* 95 [1976] 615-21). As G. Fee writes, given that interpolation is postulated for this text chiefly on the basis of its 'alleged non-Pauline character,' this effectively amounts to 'a counsel of despair, (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 492 n.3)." (231, n.2) That this comment is made by Fee seems ironic in view of his theory that 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 is an interpolation.

relationship with the man may be described with the same term used to describe, in part, the man's relationship to God, "glory" (δόξα). Paul's use of δόξα reflects a semantic range that is broad enough to express the relationship of God and man on the one hand and woman and man on the other. The term εἰκὼν, however, he reserves to describe the relationship of the man (άνηρ) to God, as DeLobel observes:

Here, Paul is rather selective in applying the εἰκὼν-theme from the first creation account (Gen 1,27) to man only, and in using the second creation account (Gen 2) exclusively to determine woman's place. This somewhat arbitrary biblical allusion again permits him, in line with v. 3 but more explicitly, to ground man's priority on the order of creation. Woman's relationship with God is not expressed.¹¹²

It may be said more accurately that Paul seems to understand Gen. 1:27 in light of Genesis 2.¹¹³ This allows him to use the second account to interpret the first, a midrashic intertextuality. Jervis argues that Paul's "initial teaching had relied on an exposition of the Genesis 1 creation account. His strategy for correcting the Corinthians' misunderstanding is to combine the second creation account with the first."¹¹⁴

¹¹²Joël DeLobel, 381.

¹¹³L. Ann Jervis notes that not all of Paul's contemporaries believed Gen. 1:27 and Gen. 2:7 referred to the same person(s). She writes: "For Philo there were two original males: the 'molded man,' which refers to the creation of the male in Gen 2:7, and the man made 'after the image,' referring to the creation of the male in Gen 1:27 (*Opif. Mundi* 134)." (236)

¹¹⁴L. Ann Jervis, 231-32.

Image of God

Paul draws his explanation from the earliest appearances of εἰκὼν, in Gen. 1:26-27. The Septuagint at that point reads, "And God said, Let us make man according to our own image (κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν) and likeness (ὁμοίωσιν),¹¹⁵ and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and the creatures and all the earth and all of the crawlers who are crawling upon the earth. (27) And God made man, according to the image (κατ' εἰκόνα) of God He made him, male and female (ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ) He made them."

The Hebrew word translated by εἰκὼν is עֲלֵם, "image, representation". Used 17 times in the Old Testament (the Aramaic is used in Daniel 2, 3), the most common meaning is that of an idol, particularly the idol as representation of the god, whether three-dimensional (Amos 5:26; 2 Kings 11:18; 2 Chron. 23:17; Ezra 7:20; Num. 33:52)¹¹⁶ or two-dimensional (Ezra 23:14).¹¹⁷ Twice it refers to copies of

¹¹⁵ The Hebrew for "in/as our image, according to our likeness" reads וְנַעֲמָדָם כְּעִמּוֹתֵינוּ.

¹¹⁶ Not all sculpture was idolatrous, e.g., the golden cherubim in Exodus 25-26.

¹¹⁷ It is helpful to note that the עֲלֵם is not considered inanimate. By manufacture and by a rite of consecration the עֲלֵם actually "becomes" the living god. F. J. Stendebach, in his article "עֲלֵם," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1989) 6:1050, writes: "Die Statue eines Gottes ist nicht nur Vertretung des Gottes, sonder sie ist der lebendige Gott. . . . Beim Herstellen und Konsekrieren der Götterstatuen wurden besondere Riten wie die Mundöffnung beachtet. . . ."

tumors and mice (1 Sam. 6:5, 11). Twice it appears to be used non-materially, Pss. 39:7 and 73:20. Ps. 39:7 reads:

אך-בצלם יתהלך-איש

אך-הנל יהם'ון יצבר ולא-רע מ'-אספם

and may be translated

"Surely as¹¹⁸ a צלם man walks about;

surely (as) הנל they are in turmoil. He heaps up wealth and knows not who will gather."¹¹⁹

According to F. J. Stendebach, the point made by the psalmist is that man may well be real and solid while he is alive, but that death ends this reality. Like a man waking from a dream, the dream-images fade away in the same way the morning fog fades away by mid-day. If he is correct, the meaning of צלם does not change. The term still retains the

He then cites examples from the Mesopotamian myth of Enkidu to support his statement.

¹¹⁸Taking the ׀ as the *beth essentiae*.

¹¹⁹An individual lament, this Psalm contains a mixture of sad reflection and prayer. The psalmist observes the fleeting nature of human life, its transitory character, and existential meaninglessness. Yet the psalmist relies upon the LORD God and turns to Him, possibly in old age. From a perspective reminiscent of Qoheleth, he reduces man's stature to merely that of an "image" (צלם) and his impact to "vapor" (נל). It has been suggested that a second root for צלם is here apparent, derived from a homonym denoting "to become dark, to darken" so that צלם represents a "shadow-figure" or a "fleeting shadow." As Stendebach notes, "this is in no way certain." (6:1052.) He writes:
 "Schwierigkeiten bereiten Ps 39,7; 73,20 so daß vorgeschlagen wurde, an beiden Stellen eine Wurzel *slm* II 'schwarz werden, dunkel sein' anzunehmen und *saelaem* als "Schattenbild, vergänglicher Schatten" zu deuten. Dies ist in keiner Weise gesichert. . . ."

idea of a physical representation, but the temporary nature of the life of the עֲלֵם is in focus.¹²⁰ As Stendebach summarizes: "Intended is the immediate and severe fall of the godless."¹²¹

Ps. 73:20 $\text{כַּחֲלוֹם מִהִקִּיץ אֲרַנִּי בַעִיר צִלְמִם תִּנְזֶה}$

Ps. 73:20 "Like a dream when one awakens, (so) when you rouse yourself, O Lord, you will despise them as mere images."¹²² The psalmist has asked the question: why do the wicked prosper and the righteous suffer? Verse 20 is part of the solution to the problem, looking at the Judgment of God upon all humanity and reminding the reader that the wicked enjoy the same status under the Judgment of God that idols do. As dreams fade away upon waking, so will the wicked when God rouses Himself in Judgment.¹²³ In neither

¹²⁰Stendebach, 6:1052, offers this line of interpretation. He suggests: "In Ps 39,7 ist *saelaem* als "Traumbild" zu verstehen. . . . In Ps 73,20 ist der Text unsicher. Es ist wohl zu übersetzen: 'Wie ein Traum beim Aufwachen sind sie nicht mehr, beim Aufstehen wird sein Bild verschmahl.'" On the difficulties of the text in Ps. 73:20, cf. below.

¹²¹Ibid., "Gemeint ist der unmittelbare und schwere Sturz der Gottlosen. . . ."

¹²²Peter Craigie's translation, preserved by Marvin Tate, *Psalms 51-100* (Waco: Word, 1990), 227. Here the point of comparison between the wicked and the *tselem* is that both are despised by God.

¹²³The Psalmist takes the viewpoint of the end of time, looking back on history and thus achieving a more accurate perspective for evaluation. It should be noted that virtually all other authors on the subject think the referent in Ps 39:6[7] and 73:20 for *tselem* is "shadow, fantasy." These include H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* (Baker Book House: Grand Rapids, 1969), 317, 529; Van

case is it necessary to construct a homonym for ׀לץ which means "a dark thing"¹²⁴ or change the intended meaning of ׀לץ from "image" to "unsubstantial phantom, fantasy, dream-image." Claus Westermann notes:

The meaning is more that of concrete representation If ׀לץ is understood primarily as image or representation, then the two difficult passages Pss 39:7 and 73:20 (shade, outline) are accounted for and there is no need to derive the word from another root. . . . The meaning "representation" holds for all places independent of the root, which remains uncertain.¹²⁵

The range of use in the Old Testament for ׀לץ may then be summarized as: ten times for various types of physical image, pictures of men or idols; two passages in the Psalms which emphasize the transitory nature of the (wicked) man's life; and five times in Gen. 1:26,27; 5:3; 9:6. By comparing these appearances, the reader may identify several common ideas present in the term ׀לץ. These include "physical object" and "representational."¹²⁶

Gemeren, *Psalms* (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, 1991), 314, 481; Keil-Delitzsch (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1982), 29-30, 319; they note Luther translates it "So machstu HERR jr Bilde in der Stad verschmect", ["So dost Thou, Lord, make their image despised in the city"]. This could also be taken as a question, "So do you, Lord, make their image despised in the city?"

¹²⁴D. J. A. Clines, "Image of God", *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968): 74, n.100 notes that Friedrich Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament*, (Heinrich: Leipzig, 1886): 139, n.4 suggests a homonym from ׀לץ, "to be dark."

¹²⁵Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11, A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984, reprinted 1990), 146.

¹²⁶Identified by James Voelz, "Theological Forum", 1.

Paul does not use εἰκὼν often. It occurs in Rom. 1:23, referring to "idols" crafted in the shapes of human beings. Human beings in this age have born the "image" (εἰκὼν) of the earthly (man), the prototype, Adam,¹²⁷ in 1 Cor. 15:49a. The Christian, having been reborn and renewed in Baptism (Tit. 3:4-8), is being renewed in the image (κατ' εἰκόνα) of the Creator in Col. 3:10. He may therefore look forward to bearing the image of the heavenly (Man, Jesus Christ), on the day of the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:49b). This can take place because the believer is made one body, together with all other believers, as the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12-27) with Christ as the Head (1 Cor. 11:3; Eph. 5:23; Col 1:18). Christ is the εἰκὼν of God (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:14) and the believer (male and female), by virtue of a personal union with Christ through the Holy Spirit, is being conformed to the image of Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:29) from glory to glory (2 Cor. 3:18). Humanity's sin had made it impossible to reflect the glory of God (Rom. 3:23); God's grace in Jesus Christ, through faith worked by the Spirit (Eph. 2:8-9), restores that capacity to the believer, male and female, because the believer is *in* Christ Jesus who *is* the image of God.

What then can be said about the image of God?

First, that it is not only the "spiritual" aspect of

¹²⁷Paul uses the expression τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, reflecting the Septuagint at Gen. 2:7 where God shapes Adam from the dust (χοῦν) of the ground.

humanity. One of the components of meaning for אָלָם is "representational," that is, something visible.¹²⁸

Stendebach identifies two basic models (*Grundmodelle*) for understanding the image of God. One emphasizes the functional aspect of this image by defining it as representational: man is the image of God as he relates to non-human creation and rules it in God's stead.¹²⁹ The other

¹²⁸This point is made by Stendebach, who notes that the theologically significant use of אָלָם in Gen. 1:26 cannot be limited to "soul" or such powers as intellect and free will. He says: "Die theologisch bedeutsamsten Belege von *saēlaēm* find sich in der Urgeschichte der P Gen 1,26f.; 5:3; 9:6. Zunächst sei festgestellt: Alle Deutungen, die die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen in seiner "Geistseele" und deren Kräften wie Intellekt und freier Wille finden wollen, werden der Anthropologie des hebr. AT nicht gerecht Das gleiche gilt für die Auffassung, die die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen einseitig in der leiblichen Ähnlichkeit sieht. . . ." (1052)

¹²⁹Claus Westermann, 149-54, discusses this view. It seems to be based on a "democratization" of the Mesopotamian and Egyptian belief that the king was divine and, as such, represented the gods to the rest of creation. Victor Hamilton defends this interpretation, writing: "It is well known that in both Egyptian and Mesopotamian society the king, or some high-ranking official, might be called 'the image of God.' Such a designation, however, was not applied to the canal digger or to the mason who worked on a ziggurat. Gen. 1 may be using royal language to describe simply 'man.' In God's eyes all of mankind is royal. All of humanity is related to God, not just the king. Specifically, the Bible democratizes the royalistic and exclusivistic concepts of the nations that surrounded Israel." *The Book of Genesis, chapters 1-17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 135. Westermann cites Gerhard von Rad as an adherent of this position. He argues against this understanding on the basis of three points.

1) The Mesopotamian and Egyptian parallels are concerned with the individual relating to a community, not a species to all of creation. In Genesis, dominion over the rest of creation is the consequence of the image and likeness of God, not the essence of it.

2) This "democratization" of the royal "image of God"

basic model pictures man "face-to-face" with God so that a dialogue is possible between God and man (. . . *das zweite Modelle versteht den Menschen als Gegenüber Gottes, so daß ein dialogisches Verhältnis zwischen Gott und Mensch möglich ist*),¹³⁰ an existential model. However, it may be noted that the two models are not mutually exclusive. Westermann says:

all exegetes from the fathers of the church to the present begin the presupposition that the text is saying something about people, namely that people bear God's image because they have been created in accordance with it. The whole question therefore centers around the image of God in the person: what is intended, in what does it consist, what does it mean.¹³¹

Stendebach suggests that the second model is the one intended by the author of Genesis 1:26-28. He emphasizes the phrase *וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים* ("and God said to them. . .") in 1:28 and states that "with that the man is shown to be

does violence to the theology of P. Accepting Hamilton's position requires that one be able to say, "wherever a human being appears, there God appears." P holds the holiness of God in high regard and would not replace God with man on earth.

3) The parallels are not concerned with the creation of humanity in the image of God. Both cultures had creation stories but none of those creation stories related to the divinity of the king nor of his status as "image of God."

A fourth point may be made against this suggestion. It assumes that Mesopotamia and Egypt developed the idea and only later, as Israel created a monotheistic faith and invented the Genesis stories, did they "democratize" the idea of a divine king acting as the gods' representative. Perhaps the most that can be said is that other cultures have retained only an echo of the accurate account preserved in Genesis 1-2. (Cf. the example of the Maoris of New Zealand in Westermann, 154.)

¹³⁰Ibid.

¹³¹Ibid., 155.

the "speaking-partner of God."¹³² Westermann agrees, arguing that the phrase "image of God" does not describe something which was added to humanity but serves as a description of humanity. He writes:

This means that the creation of human beings in the image of God is not saying that something has been added to the created person, but is explaining what the person is. There is no essential difference between the creation of humans in 1:26 and Gen 2; the person is also created by God as his counterpart in Gen 2 so that something can happen between creator and creature. . . . it is humanity as a whole that is created as the counterpart of God; the intention is to render possible a happening between creator and creature. And this for P is directed toward the holy event in which history reaches its goal, as indicated in Gen 2:1-3.

There is an important theological consequence to this understanding of Gen 1:26. If it is a question of human existence as such and not of something over and above it then it is valid for all people. God has created all people "to correspond to him," that is so that something can happen between creator and creature. This holds despite all differences among people; it goes beyond all differences of religion, beyond belief and unbelief. Every human being of every religion and in every place, even where religions are no longer recognized, has been created in the image of God.

Seen from another point of view, the sentence means that the uniqueness of human beings consists in their being God's counterparts. The relationship to God is not something which is added to human

¹³²"Damit wird der Mensch als Ansprechpartner Gottes angezeigt." Stendebacher, 1054. Humanity is the "counterpart" (Gegenüber) of God who was created to be a dialogue-partner with Him, as the son born to Adam was (Gen. 5:1-3) and as humanity continues to be (Gen. 9:6). Stendebach contends that the creation of humanity in Gen. 1:26-27 creates the basis for God's later interaction with the Patriarchs. He writes: "In Gen 1,26f. wird auf der Ebene der Gesamtmenschheit das ermöglicht, was dann in der Geschichte Gottes mit den Vätern und mit Israel von Gen 17 P an verwirklicht wird." (1055-56)

existence; humans are created in such a way that their very existence is intended to be their relationship to God.¹³³

Westermann's interpretation may be criticized at a number of points. First, it is apparent that humanity as a whole may be described as the image of God only because it is derived from the one individual, Adam, who was created in the image of God. Gen. 1:26-28 serves as a "preview" of Gen. 2:7-24 where the reader learns the sequence of events in the creation of אָדָם, both male and female. The individual human being is created "in the image of God" which cannot be ascribed only to the whole of humanity. The prohibition of Gen. 9:1-6 applies to individuals and not only to genocide.

Second, if man is created to be in relationship with God, the issue of faith (belief and unbelief) is of crucial importance. As the reader discovers in Genesis 3, a rebellion against God as God, which constitutes unbelief, destroys the relationship. A human being cannot be what he was created to be without faith in the Creator.

It is striking that although אֱלֹהִים plays such a pivotal role, the author does not define it nor does he expand on the term. And even though it is unlikely that the *beth* should be taken as a *beth essentiae*,¹³⁴ it may be said

¹³³Claus Westermann, 157-58.

¹³⁴While the somewhat rare use of] as *beth essentiae* is well attested, there is no corresponding *kaph essentiae*. By taking the] here as intentionally ambiguous, the] can

that אֱלֹהִים is the image of God because he was created in the image of God. Using the illustration of a cookie cutter cutting dough in its own shape, the reader may understand that אֱלֹהִים was shaped in the image of God and the resulting outline was that image. Because humanity is the image of God, he represents God. Because he represents God, he manages creation. What may be said at this point is described by Paul Raabe:

Man and woman resemble God, which distinguishes them from animals. How do they resemble God?

- A. Each individually is a person with all that that entails. Each one can address God and God addresses each one, unlike animals. Each one can think and will like God. It is perhaps relevant that when God appears, He appears in the form of a human person and not an animal or plant. . . .
- B. Each individually is in a right relationship with God. Each is called to obey God, to let God determine what is good and what is evil

be understood to function as it does elsewhere, not requiring a unique definition. Further, it seems the *beth essentiae* is used only when revealing something of the subject, not the object. The classic use of the *beth essentiae* is Ex. 6:3 where God says that He had revealed Himself as אֱלֹהִים El Shaddai. Such a use parallels the Greek *en*. Yet three points can be made against it here: 1) there is no other instance of אֱלֹהִים + accusative + אֱלֹהִים where the *beth essentiae* is intended (cf. Ex. 25:40; 30:32); 2) the interchangeability of אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים, where אֱלֹהִים has no equivalent sense of *kaph essentiae*, particularly if 5:1,3 & 9:6 are kept in mind; 3) as mentioned above, the *beth essentiae* seems to be used when the author wants to reveal something of the subject, not the object. For arguments in favor of *beth essentiae*, cf. D. J. Clines, "Image of God," *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968,): 53-103; for the opposing opinion, cf. Barr, "Image of God," *Biblical Journal of Religious Literature* 51 (1968-69): 11-26.

- C. Man and woman join to each other and become one, plurality in a unity, just as God is a plurality in a unity. (Gen 1:26a, 27; 5:2)¹³⁵

This picture of mankind does not reveal, however, *how* the individual members relate to each other within the unity. As James Hurley suggests, "because the text of the chapter is nowhere concerned to speak of hierarchies *within* species, it would be an abuse of the verses 26-28 to cite them *either for or against* the 'headship' of one partner or the other."¹³⁶

Glory

Paul's use of εἰκὼν is informed by Gen. 1:26-27 but δόξα does not appear in the Septuagint of Genesis 1 or 2.¹³⁷ Yet Paul's use of this word differs significantly from secular Greek use, as Gerhard Kittel explains:

Even a cursory survey of the position in the NT reveals a totally different picture. The old meaning a., "opinion," has disappeared completely. There is not a single example in either the NT or the post-apostolic fathers. . . . The meaning b., "repute" or "honour," is still found. . . Lk. 14:10 . . . 1 C. 11:15. . . 1 Th. 2:6; also Eph. 3:13; 1 Th. 2:20; Phil. 3:19 etc. There has been added the meaning c., "radiance," "glory," which is not found in secular Greek but is already present in Jos. . . . In the NT, however, the word is used for the

¹³⁵Paul Raabe, cited from private correspondence to this writer, dated April 30, 1993. Emphasis original.

¹³⁶James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 172. Emphasis original.

¹³⁷The Hebrew word most often translated by δόξα in the Septuagint is ׀׀׀׀. The first appearance of δόξα in the Septuagint or ׀׀׀׀ in the Masoretic Text is in Gen. 31:1.

most part in a sense for which there is no Greek analogy whatever and of which there is only an isolated example in Philo. That is to say, it denotes "divine and heavenly radiance," the "loftiness and majesty" of God, and even the "being of God" and His world.¹³⁸

Paul uses δόξα extensively¹³⁹ and in a variety of contexts. In 1 Cor. 11:7, he uses the term twice and both times with a genitive, describing man as the image and glory of God (θεοῦ) and woman as the glory of man (ἀνδρός).¹⁴⁰ Paul uses the phrase δόξα θεοῦ (or τοῦ θεοῦ) in Rom. 1:23; 3:23; 5:2; 15:7; 1 Cor. 10:31; 11:7; 2 Cor. 4:6, 15; Phil. 1:11; 2:11; 1 Tim. 1:11; and Tit. 2:13. Of these, Rom. 1:23 indicates a loss of this δόξα θεοῦ through sin and Rom. 3:23

¹³⁸Gerhard Kittel, "δόξα," *TDNT* 2:237. He also notes that δόξα can mean "reflection" in the sense of "image" (εἰκὼν) but this is overly simplistic. Image (εἰκὼν) and glory (δόξα) are not synonyms, as is obvious from 1 Cor. 11:7. Man is described as the "image" and "glory" of God and the reader would expect woman therefore to be described as the "image" and "glory" of man, but she is not so described. Her relationship to the man cannot be expressed by the term "image" but can be described by "glory."

¹³⁹He uses δόξα fifteen times in Romans, eight times in 1 Corinthians, seventeen times in 2 Corinthians (eight of which are found in 2 Cor. 3:7-18), once in Galatians and Titus; eight times in Ephesians, six times in Philipians, three times in Colossians, 1 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy; and twice in 2 Thessalonians and 2 Timothy. His usage accounts for roughly one-third of its New Testament appearances.

¹⁴⁰Both genitives may be categorized as genitives of origin and relationship. *BDF* §162 discuss this use of the genitive case and identify it as classical, employed often to identify a person by his father (e.g., James, the [son] of Zebedee, Matt. 4:21). The relationship indicated by the genitive may be of a mother by her son (Mark 15:47), a wife by her husband (John 19:25), slaves of a family (Rom. 16:10) and others as well (1 Cor. 15:23; Rom. 8:9; Acts 1:7). (89)

affirms that this loss is universal. Jesus, on the other hand, may be described as the δόξα θεοῦ (Tit. 2:13; cf. 1 Tim. 1:11). Heinrich Schlier discusses the use of δόξα θεοῦ in the context of defining identity through relationships and demonstrates that εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα denotes "image and reflection" in this context. Within the relationship of Christ and humankind, humanity is subjected to Christ because He is κεφαλή to mankind's εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα. Within humanity, man relates to woman (γυνή) as κεφαλή who in turn relates to man as δόξα (δόξα ἀνδρός). Her "origin and *raison d'être*" are found in her relationship with the man, as humanity's origin and reason for being may be found in Christ.

Hence man is the image and reflection of God to the degree that in his created being he points directly to God as Creator. Woman is the reflection of man to the degree that in her created being she points to man, and only with and through him to God. In this relation of man and woman we are dealing with the very foundations of their creaturehood. In formal terms, we have a determination of their being and not just the mode of their historical manifestation. This may be seen from the reference to Adam in v.7ff., from the reference to the Christian life in the appendix in v.11f., and from the reference to the mode of historical existence in v.12. . . .¹⁴¹

The social distinction between man and woman derives from their identity as that identity is defined by creation

¹⁴¹Heinrich Schlier, "κεφαλή," *TDNT* 3:679-80. Schlier comments about Paul's use of the term: "He is using the term κεφαλή as it is familiar to him, and in respect of one element at least its root is in the LXX. κεφαλή implies one who stands over another in the sense of being the ground of his being. Paul could have used ἀρχή if there had not been a closer personal relationship in κεφαλή."

and being. Paul expresses this distinction with relational terms in order to make it obvious to his readers that this distinction maintains even for (or *especially* for) Christians. Schlier continues:

We may thus understand the passage. Paul presupposes that man and woman are distinct by nature. This is rooted in the fact that woman is by nature referred to man as her basis (in a twofold sense). This distinction is expressed in the veiling of her κεφαλή, in the non-exposure of her head before God and Christ, whose presence in worship is indicated by angels. It would be for Paul an abandonment of the foundations of creation if charismatically gifted women—the reference is to such in contrast to 1 C. 14:33ff.—were to pray or prophesy with their heads uncovered like men. It would be an offence against their head (in the twofold sense) if they were not to cover themselves. As the Corinthians themselves may see, the necessity of covering is indicated by nature or custom (ᾠσεις), which regards long hair as suitable in women for a covering.¹⁴²

As the δόξα θεοῦ, Christ Jesus perfectly reflects God. Within humanity the woman (γυνή) reflects the man. More than a role they play, man and woman are identified by their relationships to God, to each other, and to the world. Werner Neuer comments on the subject of gender-specific behavior as role theory:

The concept of role is a theatrical concept and denotes the part given to an actor. The role given to an actor is usually something foreign to him with which he identifies only in the play. . . . the inappropriateness of role theory for understanding sexuality is obvious. A person does not play the role of a man or a woman, but he is a man or she is a woman. Sex is no role, that can be changed at will like stage roles, but is a fundamental aspect of human existence from which no one

¹⁴²Ibid. He notes that the reference to "angels" in 11:10 indicates the presence of God, not as a signal that they guard order and definitely not as hostile powers. (680 n.18)

can escape. It carries with it quite definite tasks and modes of conduct. And language must reflect this state of affairs. It is therefore sensible to speak of 'being a man', 'being a woman' or 'being a father' or 'being a mother', of 'masculinity, femininity, fatherhood or motherhood' and of the tasks that flow from these states. This terminology makes it clear that sex is concerned with being and not with roles that are played at the dictate of external constraints such as society. The concept of sexual roles is meaningful, though, in the case of homosexuality, where men play the role of women and women play the role of men. The very fact that the concept of role fits perverted sexual behaviour shows how unsuitable it is to describe the natural created relationships of men and women. . . . Role theory is a one-sided sociological theory which overemphasizes the significance of society and fails to recognize the significance of created reality.¹⁴³

Since the man exists as the image and glory of God, he should not cover the head. The woman, conversely, is the glory of man. When she covers her head in worship she honors her "head," the man and thus through the man honors Christ.¹⁴⁴ It is a sign of respect (ὄβος; cf. Eph. 5:33) and an act of submission (ὑποτάσσειν; cf. Eph. 5:22-24). This distinction between the sexes¹⁴⁵ does not negate the

¹⁴³Werner Neuer, *Man & Woman in Christian Perspective* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), 29-30.

¹⁴⁴It is apparent that Christ is the Head of the woman as well as the man. This may be observed in two ways: Christ is her head through the man; and Christ is the head of the whole church, of which the female believer is a part.

¹⁴⁵This distinction was obvious throughout the Old Testament period. For example, God had forbidden men to wear women's clothes and women to wear men's clothes, expressing His displeasure very strongly with נָשִׂימָה, a fem. sing. noun in the construct state that is also used of God's attitude toward homosexuality (Lev. 18:22-30; 20:13), idolatry (Deut. 7:25), human sacrifice (Deut. 12:31) and the like, denoting "that which is aesthetically and morally repulsive . . ." (Ronald Youngblood, "נָשִׂימָה," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by R. Laird Harris,

unity all Christians have by virtue of their Baptism into Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:27-28), but reflects their identity as God has created them and to which the Spirit has restored them by faith. The issue in these verses is not so much about head-covering *per se*,¹⁴⁶ but about how Christians signal their identity. Thomas Schreiner points out:

We must distinguish between the fundamental principle that underlies a text and the application of that principle in a specific culture. The fundamental principle is that the sexes, although equal, are also different. God has ordained that men have the responsibility to lead, while women have a complementary and supportive role. More specifically, if women pray and prophesy in church, they should do so under the authority of male headship. Now, in the first century, failure to wear a covering sent a signal to the congregation that a woman was rejecting the authority of male leadership. Paul was concerned about head coverings only because of the message they sent to the people in that culture. . . . The principle still stands that women should pray and prophesy in a manner that makes it clear that they submit to male leadership.¹⁴⁷

In verse seven Paul gives the first of three reasons why a man should not cover his head during worship services

Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980) 2:977 [hereafter *TWOT*].)

¹⁴⁶Bruce Waltke argues that women should continue to wear some type of head-covering today. He writes: "In this writer's judgment, however, it would be well for Christian women to wear head coverings at church meetings as a symbol of an abiding theological truth." "1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 57.

¹⁴⁷Thomas Schreiner, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), 138. He adds that a demeanor of humility and submission is necessary if a woman wants to pray or prophesy today, that dress should be gender-specific and that femininity includes the proper submission of women to men.

but a woman should do so. He understands Gen. 1:27-28 in light of Gen. 2:4-24 so that the first reason he advances for the application of 1 Cor. 11:4-6 relates to the identity of men and women in relation to each other without commenting on the relation of mankind to God or to creation. His focus in verse seven is the relative identity of man and woman, as Hurley describes:

The chapter is concerned for authority relations: social, functional relations in which God is head, Christ is head, and men are head. Paul has not been discussing personal dignity or worth (ontological value). Man, in his authority relation to creation and to his wife, images the dominion of God over the creation (a central theme in Gn. 1) and the headship of Christ over his church (Eph. 1:20-22; 5:22-23, etc.)[sic] The woman is not called to image God or Christ *in the relation which she sustains to her husband*. She images instead the response of the church to God and Christ by willing, loving self-subjection (Eph. 5:22-23). In *this particular sense* of authority relationships, the main topic of 1 Corinthians 11, it is absolutely appropriate to say that the man images God and that the woman does not.¹⁴⁸

In verse eight he offers the second reason based on priority of creation.

Verse Eight

"For man (ἀνὴρ) is not from woman, but woman (γυνή) from man." In this verse Paul uses the language and theme of Gen. 2:23 (with 2:18-20 in the background).¹⁴⁹ The

¹⁴⁸James Hurley, 173. Emphasis original.

¹⁴⁹Gordon Fee, 517, makes this observation. He believes that verse eight relates to both verse seven and verse three, understanding κέφαλή as "source," an interpretation which fits neither the context of 1 Cor.

Septuagint at Gen. 2:23 reads: "And Adam said, 'This [is] now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she will be called woman (γυνή), for from her man (ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς) she was taken."

Genesis 2:23

Genesis 2:23 stands as a poetical exclamation amidst the prose narrative of the section.¹⁵⁰ At the end of 2:22 God had "brought her to the man" (בָּרַךְ אֱלֹהִים לְאִשׁוֹ).¹⁵¹ The

11:3 nor the history of the word.

¹⁵⁰Gordon Wenham outlines the verse, noting that it is composed of a two-beat tricolon and a three-beat bicolon: "In these five short lines many of the standard techniques of Hebrew poetry are employed: parallelism (lines 2-3; 4-5), assonance and word play (woman/man); chiasmus. . . (lines 4-5, 'this . . . called woman' // 'man . . . taken this'); and verbal repetition: by opening the tricolon and bicolon with 'this' and then by concluding with the same word the man's exclamation concentrates all eyes on this woman." (*Genesis 1-15* [Waco: Word Books, 1987], 70. Claus Westermann observes the same poetic features. He says that the only other poetic section in Genesis 2-3 is in the pronouncement of the punishments beginning at 3:14. These poetic prose sections provide a marker for the reader that a climax has been reached and tension relieved. Westermann believes there is a more important point: "That may well be the case, but it does not touch what is essential, namely that the ancient narratives which arose in the period of oral tradition distinguish even more clearly the two basic forms of speech, ordinary language and the cry." (231)

¹⁵¹A hiphil form of אָלַץ appears here. אָלַץ occurs frequently and with a widely diversified range of definition. Cf. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906, reprinted 1951), 97-100 [hereafter *BDB*]; Elmer Martens, "אָלַץ," *TWOT* 1:93-95; Horst D. Preuss, "אָלַץ," *TDOT* 2:20-49. Preuss counts 1969 uses of אָלַץ in the qal and 539 in the hiphil and 24 in the hophal. The range of meaning is so wide that the Septuagint uses over 150 words to translate it. It carries the "idea of entering into and moving within that realm of activity

picture presented by this short phrase could well match the practices of many (most?) cultures, where the bride is brought to the groom, often by the father of the bride.¹⁵² The dramatic flow of this scene makes its crescendo in verse 23 as marriage is instituted by God. Regarding the meaning of the exclamation, Gordon Wenham writes:

The first three lines are a poetic formulation of the traditional kinship formula. For example, Laban said to his nephew Jacob, "You are my bone and my flesh" (29:14; cf. Judg 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:13-14[12-13]). Whereas English speaks of blood relationships, Hebrew spoke of relatives as one's "flesh and bone." It is often suggested that the story of woman's creation from man's rib illustrates the meaning of this traditional kinship formula.¹⁵³

John Sailhamer believes the plurals in verse 23 were

which affects destiny" in Wisdom Literature (26) which is "characterized by a concept of order" (25), perhaps similar to Genesis 2.

¹⁵²Cf. Walter Trobisch, *I Married You* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971). Throughout this record of four lectures in Africa, Trobisch outlines marriage customs on three continents: Africa, Europe & America. Bringing the bride to the grooms house is often all that is required in some more primitive cultures to legally establish wedlock. The practice behind the parable of the Ten Virgins (Matt. 25:1-13) was the bridegroom's journey to the bride's father's house, final negotiations on the bride price, and return to his home where she became his wife. God's bringing the woman to man would be easily understood by readers of many or most societies as a formal contract, or part of the practice of formally contracting, marriage.

N. P. Bratsiotis, "וְיָבִיֵאֵל", *TDOT* 1:227, makes something of the same point: "God brought the 'ishshah to the man as a father gives away his daughter to her husband (-> אִלְיָ] bo' is also used elsewhere of bringing a girl to her husband; cf. Jgs. 12:9), which is apparently intended to indicate that God himself is responsible for establishing marriage."

¹⁵³Gordon Wenham, 70.

anticipated by ל'תלצח, a plural, in verse 21. Both bone and flesh would have been removed, laying the foundation for the formula in v. 23. He notes:

In the mention of "one of the ribs" ('*achat mitstsal'otayw*), the narrative anticipates the words of the man—"bone of my bones [*me'atsamay*]"—by the wordplay between "ribs" and "bones" (*mtsl'* reverses '*tsm*'). Such a wordplay explains why the rib is first called "one of the ribs" ('*achat mitstsal'otayw*) and not simply "the rib" as in the next verse. Moreover, in the mention of the closing of the "flesh" (*basar*) over the rib, the narrative further anticipates the response of the man in 3:23: "flesh [*basar*] of my flesh." It appears, then, that in the mention of the rib from which the woman was created, no particular meaning is to be attached to the rib as such but rather to "the rib and the flesh" as showing the woman to be in substance the same as the man.¹⁵⁴

Even though God is the prime character in the narrative of 2:21-25, it is the woman who is the focus of verse 23. She becomes the object of God's particular creative activity. In addition, the stage is set for the central narrative of this section (3:1-6) by introducing the main character in that sequence. Westermann observes that two basic functions of human speech, the naming and the cry, occur in the narrative of 2:21-25. He also notes that the three-fold use of the demonstrative pronoun marks this focus on the woman for the reader:

The word תאי occurs three times, at the beginning of the first line and at the beginning and at the end of the second. It refers to the woman in each case and is the feminine demonstrative pronoun, "this," "the one here." This pronoun has greater force in Hebrew than in our modern languages; it is

¹⁵⁴John Sailhamer, "Genesis," *Genesis - Numbers* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 47.

much more vital in its point of reference and much more existential, as well illustrated here.¹⁵⁵

The poetic quality of the prose, the three-fold repetition of the demonstrative pronoun and the place of 2:23b in the structure of this scene all point to the importance of the naming of the woman. N. P. Bratsiotis comments:

In addition to the external differentiation of man from God and beasts, the OT also speaks of an internal distinction within mankind, but only with regard to the sexual difference between $\Psi \aleph$, "a male," and an $\aleph \Psi \aleph$, "a female." Gen. 2:18,20bff. develop this distinction. The well-thought-out choice of words (cf. in 2:7a *min ha'adhamah-'adham*, "from the ground-man"; v.23b, *me'ish-'ishshah*, "from the man-woman") in the entire narrative (2:4bff.) must be interpreted by theological exegesis. Thus, 2:23 is of fundamental importance, because on the one hand here *'ish* is used for the first time in this narrative, and on the other hand *'ishshah* is explained, indeed one may even say, is defined here. In 2:23, *'ish* and *ishshah* appear only once apiece (in all likelihood this is deliberate), and both words are spoken by *'adham*, "man," himself. . . . Therefore, it is worthy of note that *zakhar*, "male," and *neqebhah*, "female," which serve only to denote a person's sex, are not used here, as they are in 1:27, but rather *'ish* and *'ishshah*. While these words also mean "husband" and "wife" respectively, they also indicate their position in creation as well as their relationship to and with each other.¹⁵⁶

Beginning in 2:7 the reader encounters the creation of man from the dust, a personal act of life-giving by Yahweh Elohim. For his sake God built a woman as a corresponding helper and presented her to him, establishing

¹⁵⁵Claus Westermann, 231. He points out that the word $\aleph \aleph \aleph$ "too has the article with demonstrative force. . . as in Gen 29:34,35 where it is used in a similar way. . . ." (Ibid.)

¹⁵⁶N. P. Bratsiotis, 1:236.

marriage. The literary tension as well as that first man's anxiety was released in the joyful cry of 2:23. She is of his own nature (2:23a) and, as he had done with the animals, he names her.¹⁵⁷ Distinct from the animals, however, is the name which reflects both the human nature of woman and the relational aspect of that nature. Bratsiotis explains:

Therefore, he is *'ish*, and she is *'ishshah*. To express it more precisely, according to 2:23a *'adham*, "the man," characterizes the creature who stands before him as *zo'th*, "this (one, feminine)," apparently in order to establish a blood relationship and thus to emphasize that they are of the same nature, i.e., by using *zo'th* he recognizes that she is a fellow creature. Now for him *zo'th* is an *'ishshah*. But at the same time he also recognizes their mutual relationship (*'ishshah me'ish*,

¹⁵⁷It should be noted that the first man says in 2:23ba, "to this one it will be called woman." The Hebrew of the verb, אָרַךְ, is niph'al, a passive, in the third person masculine singular imperfect form. From that moment on, she will be called "woman" (אִשָּׁה) because her source was אִשָּׁה. The use of the passive in 2:23ba does not indicate a naming done by someone other than Adam; rather the passive indicates that others will call her by this name which Adam has given her.

It has been argued that naming a person does not reflect authority on the basis of Is. 7:14. There the Messiah will receive the title "Immanuel" from His mother, for she will call Him (אִשָּׁה אֵלֹהִים, *gal* perfect third person feminine singular) that Name. However, Is. 7:14 rather proves the very point that the one who names another exercises a basic authority over the one named. A mother has authority over her child. That child lives in submission to its mother (as well as to its father). The child is not asked its opinion, but because it is not good that the couple should be childless ("be fruitful and multiply," Gen. 1:28), the child is conceived and born. So even the Messiah, a genuine human being, is born into a family, under the authority of His mother and father. Ps. 110:1 contains the same Messianic point.

The parallel to the first woman is obvious. She is not asked her opinion and her needs and wants are not considered. The focus is upon the first man and the lack of a suitable companion. For his sake she is built and he, exercising his authority, names her.

"woman from man"), as well as the position of both in creation. . . . While these words also mean "husband" and "wife" respectively, they also indicate their position in creation, as well as their relationship to and with each other.¹⁵⁸

Wenham notes that "frequently Hebrew folk etymologies offer a word-play on the circumstances of the person's birth (cf. 4:1,25; 17:17,19; 29:32-30:24. etc.)."¹⁵⁹ The name she bears and the act of naming are both significant in 2:23b, "a name etiology in the purest form."¹⁶⁰ Westermann writes:

There is a deliberate subtlety in the giving of the name, which is the goal of v. 23; it is in the third person and is meant to be a direct continuation of the naming of the animals in v.20. The three-fold "this" is at the same time a "jubilant welcome" and a cry of joy to the creator that he has given the man a helper fit for him. This use of the third person does not mean that there is some sort of gap, as is shown in the descriptive praise of God where he is praised in the third person.¹⁶¹

As the reader encounters Gen. 2:18-25, he finds the man acting as God's אֱלֹהִים, in naming the animals. Within the

¹⁵⁸N. P. Bratsiotis, 1:226.

¹⁵⁹Gordon Wenham, 70. He argues that "it is doubtful whether there is any etymological connection between אִשָּׁה וְאִישׁ . . . and אִשָּׁה וְאִישׁ . . ." (Ibid.)

¹⁶⁰Claus Westermann, 323. He adds: "It is firmly fixed in the narrative and has been prepared by vv.19-20. There, God wanted the man to name the animals which were led before him and to express by the name the significance that each had for him. The same occurs in the naming in v.23, though the man does not need to be asked to do it; it happens spontaneously. The naming of the woman is an essential part of the narrative which ends in v.23."

¹⁶¹Claus Westermann, 231.

relationship of man and woman, the man continues to act in the capacity of God's אל , naming the woman. G. Wenham summarizes the significance: "Though they are equal in nature, that man names woman (cf. 3:20) indicates that she is expected to be subordinate to him, an important presupposition of the ensuing narrative (3:17)."¹⁶² It is important to note, however, that the woman is fully human, truly of the same nature as the man, recipient of the same personal attention by God in her creation. She, along with the man, is designated God's אל and אדם in Gen. 1:27. In Gen. 9:6 the penalty for murdering a man is the same as the penalty for murdering a woman. Both are the אל of God, together and individually. Within the unity of humanity, however, the two genders are distinguished. The man acts in the capacity of God's אל in relation to the woman when he names her (as he had named the animals). This is the climax of 2:19-23 and highlights both the unity of humanity (one family) and the distinction of persons (male and female). When Paul writes to the Corinthians, he strives to avoid confusion in either direction. He wants to avoid any denial that man and woman are different from each other while at the same time recognizing woman as a human being, created in God's image and likeness. His choice of vocabulary reflects

¹⁶²Gordon Wenham, 70. He also understands the connection between naming the animals and naming woman: "Here the first man names the first woman in a similar fashion." (Ibid.)

his efforts to maintain both the distinctiveness and the unity of man and woman under God, in Christ Jesus.¹⁶³ Gen. 2:23 provided the basis for the second of Paul's explanations in 1 Cor. 11:7-9. As Paul continues his letter to the Corinthians, Gen. 2:18-20 offers the rationale for Paul's third point in 1 Cor. 11:9.

¹⁶³Paul's choice of κεφαλή and δόξα may be approached with this in mind. N. P. Bratsiotis, 232, offers a helpful insight into this discussion. He remarks: ". . . God is represented in the OT not only anthropomorphically, but also andromorphically, i.e., as a male. The same thing is also true of his angel. Furthermore, his servants are predominantly men; it is true that in the Yahweh religion there are some prophetesses, but there are no priestesses this idea of God is made clear by the general view of man in the OT, i.e., his physical and psychic characteristics which distinguish him from the woman and her characteristics. In this regard, the general OT idea of God is different from that of other ancient Near Eastern cultures. Moreover, the deeper theological meaning of this OT idea and its religio-historical interpretation continue on as a fundamental theological belief."

Four pairs of terms may be recognized: "male and female" refers to primary and secondary sexual characteristics; "man and woman" refers to male and female human beings, respectively; "husband and wife" refers to a man and woman in a marital relationship (in Hebrew אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה and אִשָּׁה וְאִישׁ can carry both these meanings because the marital relationship is the original "man-woman" relationship). Yet there is also "masculine and feminine" which refers to an aspect of identity, where an individual occupies the position of husband/man or the position of wife/woman. God is masculine in relationship to humanity which is feminine in relation to Him. Humanity may then be said to "reflect" God and serve as His "glory" (כְּבוֹד), a "visible manifestation" of God whom humanity resembles; cf. John Oswalt, " כְּבוֹד ," *TWOT* 1:426-27; *BDB* 458-59). Oswalt: "The bulk of occurrences where God's glory is a visible manifestation have to do with the tabernacle (Ex 16:10; 40:34; etc.) and with the temple in Ezekiel's vision of the exile and restoration (9:3, etc.). These manifestations are directly related to God's self-disclosure and his intent to dwell among men. . . . But nowhere is the reality and the splendor of his presence and his character seen as in his son (Isa 4:2). Here the nearblinding quality of his glory is fully portrayed." (427)

Verse Nine

". . . for since¹⁶⁴ man was not created for¹⁶⁵ the sake of the woman but woman for the sake of the man."¹⁶⁶ Once again, Genesis 2 forms the background for Paul's argument. He does not cite the passage, but it is evident that Gen. 2:18-23 provides the Old Testament basis for Paul's remarks in 1 Cor. 11:9.

Genesis 2:18-23

Gen. 2:18-23 is preceded by a prolepsis. This, the second "scene" in Gen 2:4-3:24, records the creation of woman for man and parallels the fifth "scene", 3:14-21, where the consequences of sin upon this relationship are spelled out. Gen. 2:18 consists of a deliberation, much like that of 1:26, prior to God's acting; in both cases there was a need to be filled (in 1:26-28 for someone to manage creation and in 2:18-25 for a suitable helper).

¹⁶⁴BDF §452.3, on the subject of causal co-ordinating conjunctions, note that γάρ is very common in the New Testament outside of John's writings. They cite 1 Cor. 11:9 as an example of a double conjunction, καὶ γάρ, in which both particles retain an individual force (and = ἐπειδὴ γάρ, "for since," which occurs in 1 Cor. 1:21; 15:21). They disagree that καὶ γάρ may be taken as simply "for," in the sense of *etenim* in this passage. (236)

¹⁶⁵BDF §222, discussing δὲ with the accusative, indicate that this construction often denotes the reason or purpose (Latin, *propter*), and may be translated "because of, for the sake of." They list as examples Mark 2:27; John 11:42; 12:30; and 1 Cor. 11:9.

¹⁶⁶P46, from ca. A.D. 200 (part of the Chester Beatty papyri collection) reads ἀνθρώπων rather than ἀνδρα, which appears in all other textual traditions.

Seven times in Gen. 1:1-2:3 God had said that it was "good" or "very good" (Gen. 1:3, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31). At Gen. 2:18, for the first time, it is "not good." The reason that it is "not good" is that man is alone. In this verse, as Padgett remarks, "the creation of woman out of man (v. 8) rectifies the man's situation as 'not good.'"¹⁶⁷ Jerome Walsh outlines the structure of this section:

The second scene begins with a deliberation preliminary to the narrative action (v.18). The narrative is in two parts (vv. 19-20, 21-24), each comprising acts of God, an act of man, and a non-narrative line. V. 25 concludes the scene.

(i) 2:18. The opening verse presents the situation of imperfection whose rectification will be the theme of the entire scene. The divine deliberation is in poetic prose; its gravity is emphasized by the ponderous 4+4 meter and the marked dominance of long \hat{o} sounds.

(ii) 2:19-20. The acts of God are presented as a complex unity . . . ; the narrative flow is broken after the divine acts by a nominal clause (v.19b) and after the man's response . . . (v.20b).

(iii) 2:21-24. Here, the acts of God are detailed in two parts. . . . The only interruptive element is the single word *wayyishan* in v.21a. V.22's rather involved word order throws into strong relief the single word

¹⁶⁷Alan Padgett, "Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11.2-16," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 81. He adds: "This points to the *doxa* of woman, as the succor of man, and to her at least equal standing with man." (Ibid.) At points, Padgett reads more into the text than is warranted. For example, he writes: "Man was not made because woman needed his help, but woman was made because man needed her help (v. 9)." (Ibid.) The text does not say that. Rather, it states that being alone was simply "not good." A second example is the relationship of woman to man reflected in Paul's use of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$. He states that serving as "the succor of man" and being identified as his "glory" makes woman of "at least equal standing with man." This is simply a *non sequitur*.

'ishshah, which appears here for the first time.¹⁶⁸

In this prose section,¹⁶⁹ God proposes to build a suitable helper for man (2:18b). Gen. 1:26-28 revealed that humanity, male and female, is created *in* the Image of God (and thus *are* the Image of God). Yet within humanity there is a distinction, already identified as "male and female," about which 2:18-25 tells the story.

The noun לִישָׁה, a "help,"¹⁷⁰ is positively connotated. It does not reflect the status of the one who renders the help. Wenham comments:

Elsewhere לִישָׁה "helper/help" usually refers to divine assistance, but it is used in three prophetic passages of military aid (Isa 30:5; Ezek 12:14; Hos 13:9). To help someone does not imply that the helper is stronger than the helped; simply that the latter's strength is inadequate by itself (e.g. Josh 1:14; 10:4,6; 1 Chron 12:17,19,21,22).¹⁷¹

The type of help is not specific in 2:18. Westermann

¹⁶⁸Jerome Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 2 (1977): 163-64.

¹⁶⁹Walsh has called it "poetic prose" because he sees some of the markers of Hebrew poetry (assonance and meter), but it is clearly prose rather than poetry. That there were efforts to blend poetical features into prose in the ancient world may be demonstrated from the development by sophists and rhetoricians of the Attic *Kunstprosa* at the end of the fifth and beginning of the fourth centuries B.C. *BDF* §485, cite assonance and the use of parallels as examples. They note: "These devices have obvious affinities with that which elsewhere constitutes the characteristic distinction of poetry from prose and have special affinities with the old Hebrew *parallelismus membrorum*."

¹⁷⁰It is abstract for the concrete, as noted by Horace Hummel, "The Image of God," *Concordia Journal* (1984): 87. The phrase לִישָׁה לִישָׁה is unique to Gen. 2:18-25.

¹⁷¹Gordon Wenham, 68.

observes:

The majority of interpreters. . . have stressed correctly that the meaning is not just help at work . . . nor is it concerned merely with the begetting of descendants (Augustine and the older interpreters. . .); it means support in a broad sense. . . . The man is created by God in such a way that he needs the help of a partner; hence mutual help is an essential part of human existence (Tob 8:6, "a helper and support," βοηθὸν στήριγμα).¹⁷²

The noun ׀׀׀׀׀¹⁷³ is based on the root ׀׀׀, which can operate in several semantic fields.¹⁷⁴ Leonard Coppes notes that "It is this connotation [*sic*] of prominence (being conspicuous) that distinguishes the root from its synonyms, e.g. *mul*, *nokach* (straight in front of), *'umma* (corresponding to), *lipne* . . . ["before the face of"]."¹⁷⁵ Thus the term ׀׀׀׀׀ conveys that which is opposite the man, differentiated from him but complementary to him.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷²Claus Westermann, 227.

¹⁷³The word consists of the preposition ׀ and the third masculine singular suffix with the root, ׀׀׀, between.

¹⁷⁴Cf. *BDB* 616-18; Leonard Coppes, "׀׀׀," *TWOT* 2:549-550. The verb ׀׀׀ appears only in the hiphal and hophal with the semantic value "tell, make known, make conspicuous." The preposition, used in 2:18, locates the object spatially, "before" the subject. The derivative ׀׀׀ may denote a leader in various fields, usually the man at the top of a hierarchy of some sort.

¹⁷⁵Leonard Coppes, "׀׀׀," *TWOT* 2:550.

¹⁷⁶So noted by Gordon Wenham, "It seems to express the notion of complementarity rather than identity. As Delitzsch. . . observes, if identity were meant, the more natural phrase would be "like him," ׀׀׀׀׀." (68) Victor Hamilton states similarly, "It suggests that what God creates for Adam will correspond to him." (*The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 175.

Westermann summarizes: "Together with the mutual help is the mutual correspondence, the mutual understanding in word and answer as well as in silence, which constitutes life in common. These two phrases describe in an extraordinary way what human community is; it has to do primarily with man and woman, and determines human existence for all times."¹⁷⁷

The drama of the story is heightened in verses 19 and 20 as the animals are brought to Adam and he names them.

Sadly, no ׀׀׀׀ ׀׀׀ was found. Both verse 18 and verse 20 end with this phrase, placing it in prominence and signifying to the reader that the solution to the problem, stated in verse 18, will take place in verse 21. The state of "not good" has not been altered in spite of the parade of animals.¹⁷⁸ Consequently, God will make (׀׀׀) a helper, like Adam and yet unlike him.¹⁷⁹ As Horace Hummel puts it, "Man and woman belong together in a qualitatively different way over against all other creatures."¹⁸⁰

In verses 19 and 20 the man names the animals at

¹⁷⁷Claus Westermann, 227.

¹⁷⁸This heightens the tension produced in the reader or listener. As Claus Westermann, 229, writes: "The tension which began in v.18a is intensified."

¹⁷⁹Gordon Wenham notes: "The compound prepositional phrase 'matching him,' ׀׀׀׀, literally, 'like opposite him' is found only here. . . . The help looked for is not just assistance in his daily work or in the procreation of children, though these aspects may be included, but the mutual support companionship provides." (68)

¹⁸⁰Horace Hummel, 87.

God's direction.¹⁸¹ Westermann comments on the significance of this passage.

The creator wants the man to name the animals. This means first and foremost that the man is autonomous within a certain limited area. The creator has formed the animals; the man can do nothing about this, but must accept them as God presents them to him. This is the point where the man begins to exercise his capabilities. He names the animals and with the name determines the relationship they have to him. . . . The exercise of dominion does not begin with the use of exploitation of the animals for human ends. The meaning is not, as most interpreters think, that man acquires power over the animals by naming them. . . . But rather that man gives the animals their names and thereby puts them into a place in his world.¹⁸²

The second part of this scene is the section comprised by verses 21-25. It describes how Yahweh Elohim built the woman who became man's suitable helper.¹⁸³ The account of her creation establishes her as a person in her own right, created with the same kind of personal attention

¹⁸¹ Gordon Wenham explains why the list of animals is shorter here than in chap 1: "Compared with the comprehensive lists of animals in chap. 1, these short summaries must mention those that might be considered possible companions for man—(wild) animals and birds in v 19 and called (i.e., domesticated animals), bird, and wild animals in v 20. Fish obviously do not qualify as man's helpmeet. It would seem that the addition of "cattle" in v 20 is deliberate: probably they are simply included in the wild animals in the previous verse. But they are specially mentioned in v 20 because they are the most likely candidates for man's companion and yet they are sadly inadequate." (68-69)

¹⁸²Claus Westermann, 228.

¹⁸³It is interesting to note that Genesis 1-11 is written against the background of pagan myths and yet differs at a number of points. Victor Hamilton remarks: "None of Israel's neighbors had a tradition involving a separate account of the creation of the female." (177)

and care with which Adam was created, and reveals her relationship to God as His image as well as her relationship to Adam.

God causes Adam to fall (*hiphil* of לָבַד) into a deep sleep.¹⁸⁴ William White notes:

In I Sam 26:12, "a deep sleep" is sent upon Saul and his army when pursuing David. The same connotation of "insensitivity" to danger is presented in Isa 29:10 and Job 4:13; 33:15. All of these texts present "sleep" as the profundity of divine intervention. It is God who casts such sleep or sleeplessness upon his chosen servant. *tardema* occurs also in Prov 19:15, "Slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep."¹⁸⁵

This sleep not only enriches the air of reality in which the story is played out but signals divine intervention. The creation of woman does not come at man's request, but is Yahweh Elohim's initiative and it is He who acts to bring her into being. While Adam was sleeping (יָשָׁן, *yashen*), God began the building process by taking from Adam's side (צַד) and closing up the flesh underneath.

The noun צַד, "side, rib," occurs here and in 2 Sam. 16:13, perhaps of a "rib" or "side" of a hill. Elsewhere it is used as an architectural term for the side of a building or an object and it can refer to a board that is used for a

¹⁸⁴רָדַם, *terdemah*, is derived from רָדַם, *radam*, "be asleep, be unconscious". While the verb does not appear in the Pentateuch (and only seven times elsewhere in the Old Testament), the noun *tardemah* occurs twice in Genesis (and five times in the rest of the Old Testament), in 2:21 and in 15:12 where Abram had his vision of God

¹⁸⁵William White, "רָדַם," *TWOT* 2:834.

wall or a floor.¹⁸⁶ The author of Genesis 1-3 has demonstrated a careful attention to word choice and structure. In light of this careful attention, he seems at this point to create a play on words. Adam is the אָדָם from which the אִשָּׁה is taken to build the woman. Wenham, commenting on בָּנָה, the opening word's root in verse 22, writes:

The LORD God then built the rib . . . into a woman." "Built" (בָּנָה): only here and in Amos 9:6 is this verb used of God's creative activity, though in Akkadian and Ugaritic it is the regular term for creation.¹⁸⁷

The word בָּנָה most often means "to build, rebuild," and is found in contexts where the object ranges from a house and cities to a tower and altars.¹⁸⁸ It differs from עָשָׂה, "do, fashion, accomplish,"¹⁸⁹ which had been used in Gen. 1:26

¹⁸⁶BDB 854; John Hartley, "אִשָּׁה," *TWOT* 2:768.

¹⁸⁷Gordon Wenham, 69.

¹⁸⁸Used 288 times in the Old Testament (217 verbally), the word seldom conveys the picture of "bringing into being" and often signifies preparation, as of a meal (Gen. 43:16) or an army (Josh. 8:4); it can also represent the activity of establishing or guaranteeing something (such as royal descendants or even of Messiah, Isa. 9:6 [7]) and finally, the sense of confidence that comes when one's heart is fixed on God. (John Oswalt, "בָּנָה," *TWOT* 1:433-34) Used 387 times in the Qal and Niphal stems in the Old Testament, the verb may take as subject either God or man. Synonymous are יָסַד, "establish, prepare, make ready/certain/right."

¹⁸⁹Generally this word refers to "doing, making" but it can take on specialized senses: ethical obligations (Ex. 23:22), making war (Gen. 14:2), dealing kindly (Judg. 1:24), showing faithfulness (Gen. 32:11) and so forth. It appears in Gen. 8:6 with reference to the ark that Noah made. The word can signal God's activity in history as well (Deut. 29:1; Josh. 23:3; 1 Kings 8:39) and can represent the signs and wonders God does (Josh. 24:17; Ps. 98:1; Isa. 25:1).

regarding the creation of humanity.¹⁹⁰ While הָשָׂא and אָרַן are used of man and woman's creation in Gen. 1:26-28, those two terms appear in chapter two only in verses 2-3, which mark the end of 1:1-2:3 and in verse 4, which serves as the title sentence for 2:5-5:1. In Gen. 2:5-24, neither הָשָׂא nor אָרַן appear. Instead, the author chose בָּרָא to describe God's act of forming the man,¹⁹¹ using a word which was commonly used to describe the fashioning of a בְּלִילִי . To describe the making of the woman, the author used architectural terminology. God took from the man's side (עֲלֵצָה , an architectural term) to make (בָּרָא , an architectural verb) a woman. Siegfried Wagner notes:

Several nouns can be traced back to the root *bnh*, viz., *binyan* ("structure, building"), *binyah* ("building, temple"), *mibhneh* (the "work," the "building"), which occurs only in Ezekiel, and *tabhnith* ("pattern, copy, figure, representation, ground plan"). . . . There are

(Cf. Thomas McComiskey, " הָשָׂא ," *TWOT* 2:701-02; *BDB* 793-95.)

¹⁹⁰The verb appears throughout Genesis 1 of God's creative activity, e.g., Gen. 1:7, 16, 25, 31; 2:2, 3. McComiskey describes the distinction between הָשָׂא and אָרַן , a word which also occurs frequently in Genesis 1: "The word occurs with great frequency in the Genesis account of creation, which is the first great act of God in history. The significant interchange between the words *bara* "create" and 'asa is of great interest. The word *bara* carries the thought of the initiation of the object involved. It always connotes [*sic*] what only God can do and frequently emphasizes the absolute newness of the object created. The word 'asa is much broader in scope, connoting primarily the fashioning of the object with little concern for special nuances." (701)

¹⁹¹The same verb opens 2:19. Westermann notes that the use of בָּרָא (2:7). . . בָּרָא (2:19) . . . בָּרָא (2:22) gave direction to the literary unit (which he believes was independent at one time; 227).

29 different substantival constructions involving nouns built from the root *bnh* in the OT. . . . Along with these we must also add the proper names and place names . . . which indicate various nuances of meaning contained in the root *bnh*, both literal and figurative. → ׀] *ben*, "son," and → ׀] *bath*, "daughter," must also be listed among the derivatives of *bnh/bny*.¹⁹²

The word ׀]] seems to anticipate the generations of Adam and Eve (Gen. 5:1).¹⁹³ God built from the side of the man a woman, ׀]א, a word which stands out structurally¹⁹⁴ and precedes the first use of א] (which occurs in vv.23, 24). By himself, א] is merely א] but when ׀]א, derived from him, is built, he becomes א] in relationship to her. Relationships have been important throughout Genesis one and two and can be distinguished on two levels: the narrative level of character and the ongoing personal relationships created in these chapters. Walsh notes:

Firstly, characters are principal, secondary, tertiary, etc. The criteria for such an identification are essentially formal: e.g., the principal character is the one who acts or speaks first or most in a given

¹⁹²Siegfried Wagner, "׀]]," *TDOT* 2:167. Through the man and the woman God would grant the fulfillment of Gen. 1:28, expanding the household (א]') of Adam and Eve by means of sons (in the singular, ׀]) and daughters (in the singular, א]).

¹⁹³*Ibid.*, 166-81, esp. 173. This is the first use of ׀]] in Scripture; the only other uses in Gen. 1-11 occur with reference to the ark (8:20) and the city of Babel (11:4). The fulfillment of God's building activity, especially in light of 2 Sam. 7, is Messiah and in Him, His people. The dual form of God's Name, *Yahweh Elohim*, occurs twelve times in 2:4-25; the twelfth and final time it is the subject of ׀]] in 2:22.

¹⁹⁴As noted above from Jerome Walsh: "V. 22's rather involved word order throws into strong relief the single word ׀]א, which appears here for the first time." (164)

scene. Secondly, characters may be related to one another as equals or as superior and inferior (in the broadest possible acceptation). Here the criteria are material: the nature of the character's actions is more to the point than their number. The two levels often coincide; indeed, making a character the principal in a scene is a standard device for establishing his superiority over other characters present. But the contrary is conceivable, and the distinction must be kept in mind.¹⁹⁵

In 1 Cor. 11:8, Paul argues that the woman was created¹⁹⁶ for the man, not man for the woman. Covering her head served to signal an acceptance of her identity (1 Cor. 11:6), her origins (1 Cor. 11:7) and her purpose (1 Cor. 11:8). It is striking that in Gen. 2:4-24, no attention seems to be given to the woman's needs nor does the text focus on her. Man's solitary state requires a solution which God provides. Man is to serve the Garden (Gen. 2:15) and his purpose is that service.¹⁹⁷ Woman is to complement

¹⁹⁵Ibid., 174.

¹⁹⁶ἐκτίσθη, a third person singular aorist passive form of κτίζω. The verb appears only here in 1 Cor. 11:9 and only ten times in Paul's writings (also in Rom. 1:25; Eph. 2:10, 15; 3:9; 4:24; Col. 1:16 [twice]; 3:10; 1 Tim. 4:3). It is the most common verb used by the New Testament for God's creative activity. (Cf. Werner Foerster, "κτίζω," *TDNT* 3:1028; *BAGD* s.v. "κτίζω," 455.)

¹⁹⁷Man has a place (in the Garden, 2:8) and he is called to rule over creation (וַיְרִדְהוּ, 1:26) and subdue it (וַיִּשְׁמְרֵהוּ, 1:28). This is to be carried out by serving and tending the garden (וַיִּשְׁמְרֵהוּ וְלָעֲבָדָה, 2:15). Jacobs-Horning comments:

His task is to till and to keep this garden. The OT, then, does not represent Paradise as a place of blissful enjoyment. This must be stated unconditionally, for there are commentators who, because of a false, or at least nonbiblical understanding of man, have regarded v.15aβ as a

man. Together they are the image of God on earth, but within that identity, each may be distinguished from the other. He is her "head," and she, as his "glory," is subordinate to him. In relationship to the God who created them both, and in relationship to the earth which both are called to manage, there is a unity of the human species, male and female. Yet there is nevertheless a clear distinction within this image of God. The headcovering she wears in public worship service reflects this relationship, honoring man as her "head" and proclaiming her place in their partnership under God.

Throughout verses 7-9 Paul has relied upon his understanding of the Old Testament to correct the doctrine and practice of the Corinthians. Jervis notes:

later insertion. The work of man is a task which he is given by God, not service of God. On the other hand, man's work is not related to God mythically; it grows out of the environment in which God has placed him. According to Gen. 2, man's relationship to his creator is determined by the command which he is given (vv.16f.). This command of God defines the paradisiacal relationship of man to his creator. In Paradise, man lives in such close communion with God that he simply does what God wills. ("]", " *TDOT* 3:38.)

Claus Westermann points out that the Koran may depict a blissful paradise in Eden, but the Old Testament reveals something quite different. He writes: "It is of the utmost significance that the Old Testament knows nothing of such an idea of paradise. . . . The 'blissful enjoyment' in paradise comes from an understanding of humanity which undervalues manual work over against the activities of the spirit and mind, because it is too closely bound to material objects. But this is completely foreign to Gen 2-3." (220)

Given that Paul's original declaration of the unity of man and woman in Christ relied on an exposition of Gen 1:27, when Paul commends his readers for holding onto his traditions (v. 2) he is referring to the appropriation (albeit in a mistaken fashion) of his interpretation of the first Genesis creation story. Paul's corrective strategy is typically midrashic: that is, in order to solve an exegetical and practical difficulty he combines another scriptural text with the one that is at the root of the problem. And so what Paul wants his readers to know (v. 3) is that the second creation account elucidates the real meaning of the first and thereby clarifies what the Corinthians need to understand about the nature of their redemption.¹⁹⁸

The distinction between man and woman is God-given and should be maintained among God's people. Exactly how that distinction will be maintained may vary somewhat from place to place and time to time. However, "the unity of man and woman in Christ has not obliterated the distinction between the genders. . . ." ¹⁹⁹ Having explained his application of the theological statement in verse 3 (based on Genesis 2), Paul proceeds to re-emphasize the need for Christians to distinguish between man and woman in public worship. Jervis writes: "God created the genders in separate ways and their distinction must be symbolized when the redeemed worship."²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁸L. Ann Jervis, "'But I Want You to Know. . .'" Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11:2-16)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 235. She refers to Gen. 1:27 as the subtext in Gal. 3:27 (235, n. 17) when she writes "Given that Paul's original declaration of the unity of man and woman in Christ lied on an exposition of Gen 1:27. . . ."

¹⁹⁹Ibid., 245.

²⁰⁰Ibid., 243.

1 Cor. 11:10-12

In verse 10 Paul states his conclusion and confirms it with the prepositional phrase διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. He then moves in verses 11-12 to affirm the unity of mankind and the interdependence of men and women. It will be helpful to keep in mind the relationship of verse 10 to verse 7, noticed by Thomas Schreiner:

Verses 7 and 10 are substantially parallel. Paul begins the passage by saying that men "ought not" (*ouk oopheilei*) to wear head coverings (11:7), and he concludes it by saying that women "ought" (*oopheilei*) to wear head coverings (verse 10). The reasons given in verses 8-9 support both commands.²⁰¹

A man is not obligated to wear a head covering but a woman is obligated to do so. This distinction reflects a pattern that is present in the original creation as well as in the new creation in Christ Jesus. The obligation is defined in verse 7 as κακτακαλύπτεσθαι and is described in verse 10 as ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς. The reason man is not obligated κακτακαλύπτεσθαι is that he is the image and glory of God. The woman is also the image of God. Yet in relationship with the man, she is the glory of man (verse 7), and because of her identity, is obligated ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς when praying or prophesying in worship services, an explanation consistent with and confirmed by the phrase διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

²⁰¹Thomas Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," chapter in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 134.

Verse Ten

"Because of this (διὰ τοῦτο)²⁰² the woman should (ὀφείλει) have an 'authority' (ἐξουσίαν²⁰³ ἔχειν) upon the head because of the angels (διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους)."²⁰⁴ Paul calls to the reader's mind the previous discussion and concludes that the woman, unlike the man (1 Cor. 11:7),

²⁰²διὰ τοῦτο looks backward to the previous verses. The phrase occurs frequently in Paul's writings (Rom. 1:26; 4:16; 5:12; 7:15 (twice); 13:6; 14:9; 1 Cor. 4:17; 11:10, 30; 2 Cor. 4:1; 7:13; 13:9; Eph. 1:15; 6:13; Col. 1:9; 1 Thess. 2:13; 3:5, 7; 2 Thess. 2:11; 1 Tim. 1:16; 2 Tim. 2:10; Phm. 15). Paul usually uses it to signal to the reader that he should recall what has just been said.

Douglas Moo identifies four uses for this phrase. The most common is where διὰ is causal and τοῦτο is retrospective (e.g., Rom. 1:26; 13:6; 15:9; 1 Cor. 11:30; 2 Cor. 4:1; 7:13; Eph. 1:15; 5:17; 6:13; Col. 1:9; 1 Thess. 3:5, 7). When Paul wants the reader to anticipate what follows, the διὰ is causal and the τοῦτο prospective (e.g., 1 Thess. 2:13). The τοῦτο may be prospective and the διὰ may indicate final cause ("for this reason. . . namely, with the purpose that. . .") as in Rom. 4:16; 2 Cor. 13:10; 2 Thess. 2:11; 1 Tim. 1:16; 2 Tim. 2:10; Phm. 15. Finally, τοῦτο may be retrospective and διὰ states final cause, as in Rom. 5:12 ("in order to accomplish what has just been said. . ."). *Romans 1-8* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1991), 363-64. Moo indicates doubt as to whether διὰ τοῦτο in 1 Cor. 11:10 is causal and retrospective (the most common use) or causal and prospective (the second use listed).

²⁰³A number of translations read κάλυμμα, "veil," in place of ἐξουσίαν. This variant reading lacks Greek manuscript support but is presumed to be the word behind several Vulgate manuscripts, several Boharic (Coptic) manuscripts, Ptolemy (according to Irenaeus), Tertullian, Jerome and Augustine. Metzger, *TCGNT* and the *UBSGNT* [4th ed.] give ἐξουσίαν an {A} rating and explain the gloss as arising from efforts to make the difficult ἐξουσία understandable.

²⁰⁴διὰ with the accusative is discussed in *BDF* §222, as noted above. Beside indicating location (e.g., Luke 17:11 in the sense of "through" a region), this construction denotes reason or purpose, "because of, for the sake of."

should indicate her identity, origin and purpose by having an ἐξουσίαν on the head. He adds a second reason for this practice, διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν

The phrase ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν appears in Rom. 9:21; 1 Cor. 7:37, 9:4, 5, 6; 11:10; and 2 Thess. 3:9 in the Pauline corpus.²⁰⁵ In all but 1 Cor. 11:10 the verb is finite, occurring in the first person plural (1 Cor. 9:4, 5, 6) or the third person singular (Rom. 9:21; 1 Cor. 7:37) or plural (2 Thess. 3:9) present indicative active forms. Only at 1 Cor. 11:10 does the verb appear in the infinitive. Werner Foerster notes that the history of the word ἐξουσία may be traced back to ἔξεστιν, which conveys "'ability to perform an action' to the extent that there are no hindrances in the way, as distinct from δύναμις in the sense of intrinsic

²⁰⁵The phrase also appears in Matt. 7:29; 9:6; Mark 1:22; 2:10; 3:15; Luke 5:24; 12:5; 19:1; John 10:18 (twice); 19:10 (twice), 11; Acts 9:14; Heb. 13:10; Rev. 9:3; 11:6 (twice); 14:18; 16:9; 18:1; 20:6. In the Gospels, the phrase is used to describe the distinctive teaching style of Jesus, who differed from the rabbis in that He taught as "One who has authority" (Matt. 7:29; Mark 1:22). The idea seems to be that Jesus was His own "authority," and He did not depend on other people. Jesus also "has authority" to forgive sins (Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24) and cast out demons (Mark 3:15). In Rom. 9:21, Paul refers to the potter who "has the authority" to do what he wants with the clay. The author of Hebrews 13:10 states that those in Christ have an altar from which those who serve at the tabernacle "have no authority" to eat, contrasting the Jewish Christian standing before God with that of the Old Testament people. In Acts 9:14, Ananias says that Paul has come to Damascus and "has authority" from the chief priests to arrest believers.

ability."²⁰⁶ Foerster identifies three bases for the New Testament concept of ἐξουσία: the power which decides; the "legally ordered whole, especially in the state and in all the authoritarian relationships supported by it;" and finally, "this ἐξουσία which is operative in ordered relationships, this authority to act, cannot be separated from its continuous exercise, and therefore thirdly ἐξουσία can denote the freedom which is given to the community."²⁰⁷ Louw and Nida list most uses of ἐξουσία under the domain of "control, rule."²⁰⁸ They list 1 Corinthians 11:10 in the subdomain of "symbol of authority," noting: "a woman should have on her head a symbol of authority (over her)"²⁰⁹

A number of commentators, however, have taken ἐξουσία to refer to a woman's "right" or "authority" to act on her own. Gordon Fee understands ἐξουσία in a "active" sense so that it denotes the "freedom or right to choose" and this part of verse 10 may then be translated: "For this reason the woman ought to have the freedom over her head to

²⁰⁶Werner Foerster, "ἐξουσία," *TDNT* 2:562. He adds that it "is also the possibility granted by a higher norm or court, and therefore 'the right to do something or the right over something. . . .'" (Ibid.)

²⁰⁷Ibid., 2:566. He notes that God's will is done through the granting of ἐξουσία.

²⁰⁸They include several subdomains: "authority to rule, jurisdiction, symbol of authority, ruler, control." The exceptions are "power" (Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 76.12), "supernatural power" (12.44, used of the evil angels), and "right to judge" (30.122, listing 1 Cor. 8:9).

²⁰⁹Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*. 37.37 (1:476).

do as she wishes."²¹⁰ Fee's approach may be criticized on three grounds: the context of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is a discussion of the identity of woman who, in relation to man, is required to reflect her identity in her behavior and dress at public worship. That is, the context reveals the limitations within which godly women worship, rather than setting forth the "rights" or "freedom to choose" that a Christian woman may exercise. A second objection to Fee's understanding is that ἐξουσία does not mean "freedom to choose" or "right" in an autonomous sense in the New Testament. This is particularly true of the use of ἐξουσία in the five passages he cites for support.²¹¹ A third

²¹⁰Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 520.

²¹¹Fee cites Luke 19:11 (an error; the actual verse is v. 17); Rev. 11:6; 14:18; 16:9; 20:6 as examples of ἐχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐπί (520, n. 29). In none of these passages does the infinitive appear and in each passage ἐξουσία denotes permission given by a superior to someone under his authority to carry out certain tasks within particular limits. In Luke 19:17 the master in one of Jesus' parables gives a faithful servant permission to manage ten cities for him. In Rev. 11:6 the reference is to the two witnesses (i.e., the church) who have the authority of the keys of heaven, a commission given by Jesus to proclaim the Gospel (cf. John 20:19-22). In Rev. 14:18, an angel has charge (ἐξουσία) over the fire at the altar of sacrifice, certainly indicating his management is subservient to the Son of Man (vv. 14-16). The reference in Rev. 16:9 comes closest to what Fee would understand in 1 Cor. 11:10, with the exception that ἐξουσία refers to God who is responsible for the various plagues upon the world. Unless Fee wants to make woman equal to God, the use of ἐξουσία will have to vary in the two passages. Finally, Rev. 20:6 refers to the fact that the "second death" (i.e., eternal damnation) has not authority (ἐξουσία) over those who have a share in the "first resurrection" (faith). Again, the reader is reminded that ἐξουσία is given by God for service within specified

objection to taking ἐξουσία in an "active" sense, referring to a woman's "right" to exercise her own will in worship services, is that the phrase ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπί parallels κατακαλύπτεσθαι in 1 Cor. 11:7. The thesis supported by Fee is impossible to support textually or contextually.

Morna Hooker follow a related line of interpretation when she writes:

her head must be covered, not because she is in the presence of man, but because she is in the presence of God and his angels—and in their presence the glory of man [that is, the woman] must be hidden. If she were to pray or prophesy with uncovered head, she would not be glorifying God, but reflecting the glory of man, and in God's presence this must inevitably turn to shame. The glory of man must therefore be covered, lest dishonour is brought upon the woman's 'head'. Although Paul's argument is based upon theological premises, it may perhaps reflect practical expediency; it is likely that it was the men of Corinth, rather than the angels, who were attracted by the women's uncovered locks, and that it was in this way that attention was being diverted from the worship of God.²¹²

It should be noted that Paul does not state that men are tempted to lust by women's uncovered heads. Joel DeLobel lists three problems involved with Hooker's interpretation

bounds.

²¹²Morna Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11:10," *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963-64:), 415. She had proposed that it is a sign of *her* authority, along with man, over creation. (Ibid., 413) Thus, Hooker understands the "authority" as the woman's authority to prophesy and pray. This is similar to Jaubert's own approach: "En portant unde coiffure, la femme a sur la tête le signe de sa capacité à participer à l'assemblée de prière; c'est en remplissant cette obligation qu'elle respecte la sainteté du culte signifiée par les anges." "Le Voile des Femmes (I Cor. IX. 2-16), *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971-72): 420.

and proposes his own.

First . . . we think that the general tendency of vv. 3-9 is to underline the secondary place of women, and through διὰ τοῦτο v. 10 has to be in agreement with this tendency.

Second, «a sign of authority» is not attested for ἐξουσία elsewhere.

Third, the whole construction is so complicated and so much explication of unexpressed presuppositions is needed that one wonders if the original readers would have been so creative. . . .

Starting from the (correct) opinion that the pericope treated the question of woman's head-covering, the commentators have perhaps too quickly read this idea itself into v. 10. thus ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς gets a material sense of «wearing on the head» and ἐξουσία has to represent in some way that head-covering. But, should one not pay more attention to the expression as a whole: ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ with genitive, which normally means «have authority over», «exercise control over». . . . V. 10 would mean the: «Therefore (=because of the creation order), *the woman has to exercise control over her head*, because of the angels (who are present in worship watching the observance of that order)». Instead of «shaming her head» (v. 5) (by unusual shocking behaviour) she has to keep a control over it (by covering her head according to the συνήθεια, v. 16) Of course, v. 10 has to do with the wearing of the head-covering, because according to v. 5 this covering is the concrete way in which woman behaves correctly as far as her head is concerned, the actual way in which she «exercises control over her head».²¹³

The authority is not that authority granted to humanity to rule over the earth nor is it a woman's authority to pray and prophesy publicly. It is not a sign of the old order abolished by the new order, as Robin

²¹³Joël DeLobel, 386-87. Thomas Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," chapter in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 134-35, gives seven arguments against Hooker.

Scroggs suggests: "Since in the created order man had assumed (or been given—Gen. 3) a dominating role based on his priority in creation, but since in the eschatological age there is no such priority, woman must show by the head covering that she has left that old order and now lives in the new." ²¹⁴ First, Paul bases his comments in these verses on humanity's identity and organization (Genesis 2) reflected in 1 Cor. 11:3), not the fall into sin (Genesis 3) Second, this thesis would better represent the mistaken understanding of the Corinthians who worked within an over-realized eschatology. What Paul requires of the believing woman who prays or prophesies in a public worship service is an outward testimony of her submission to man.²¹⁵ Joseph

²¹⁴Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972): 301. He admits that the logic behind a woman wearing a veil to signify her freedom from the old order fails the test of logic: "Today no real sense can be made out of they whys of the logic, why the head covering, why such a 'symbol' is necessary." (Ibid.)

²¹⁵As do F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), 256-58 and Joseph Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angles of I Cor. XI.10," *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957-58): 52-53. Fitzmyer approves the suggestion of Gerhard Kittel who, in 1920, took "authority" as an equivalent to an Aramaic word (ܐܘܬܘܪܝܬܐ) which indicated a "veil, ornament of the head," and which occurs in the Talmud (*Sab* vi.8b). Kittel conjectured that the underlying stem, ܐܘܪܝܬܐ, "to conceal," had been linked with its homonym, meaning "to rule." Foerster reminds the reader that this suggestion, while appealing, is merely conjecture and is without support. (Werner Foerster, "ἐξουσία," *TDNT* 2:574; cf. also *TWOT* 2:1080.) The biggest obstacle to this understanding, Fitzmyer notes, is that ". . . the Greeks of Corinth would never have understood what Paul meant by it." (53)

Fitzmyer cites Theophylactus as one who uses ἐξουσία as a symbol of authority (by metonymy), quoting τὸ τοῦ ἐξουσιάζεσθαι σύμβολον.²¹⁶ Thus the authority is not that of the woman,²¹⁷ but the authority of the man who is her "head."²¹⁸ Foerster argues that two points make the meaning of the phrase clear.

As concerns the context first of all, there is no shift until v. 13, and therefore v. 10 forms part of the discussion of veiling from the one main standpoint, namely, that of the relation of woman to man. That this is still true in v. 10 is made evident by the πλὴν of v. 11, which introduces a concluding limitation of the declared subordination

²¹⁶Joseph Fitzmyer, 50. He references the citation to *Expos. in Ep. I ad Cor.* (P. G. cxxiv, 697c); the symbolical meaning has been proposed by Theodoretus (P.G. lxxxii, 312d); Chrysostom (P.G. lxi, 218). He adds, "It must be admitted that this sense of the word fits the context well. . . ." (50-51)

²¹⁷Contrary to Kenneth T. Wilson, "Should Women Wear Headcoverings?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148 (1991): 453, who claims: "Thus it seems appropriate to understand 'authority' here to refer to the woman's freedom or authority and not the man's. Specifically it is her authority to participate in the worship of the church." David R. Hall, "A Problem of Authority," *The Expository Times* 102 (1990): 39-42 argues similarly. The issue in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 isn't her participation, but her showing respect for her "head" by covering her head. Further, if Paul had meant "her" authority, the most natural way to signal that to the reader would have been to mark the text with a possessive pronoun ("her authority"). Further, if a woman should have a head-covering to indicate her right or authority to pray and prophesy, a man should also wear a head-covering. He also has the authority or right to pray and prophesy, yet Paul specifically excludes the adult male from a head-covering in 1 Cor. 11:7. Paul's intent is that the woman should acknowledge her submission (a function of her identity, origin and purpose) by covering her head in worship.

²¹⁸So Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 37.37 (1:476), translate, "a woman should have on her head a symbol of authority (over her). . . ."

of woman to man. Thus v. 10, as may be seen already from the διὰ τοῦτο with which it opens, presents no other standpoint than that of the preceding and the two following verses. Secondly, regard should be had to the choice of the verb ὀφείλει, for in Paul this does not imply external compulsion but obligation (except in 1 C. 5:1, and perhaps 7:36). It is thus very probable that in this verse Paul is referring to the moral duty of a woman and not to any kind of imposed constraint. . . . the veil is a sign of woman's subordination to man, i.e., that man is the κεφαλή τῆς γυναικός. For this there are Rabbinic parallels which treat the veil as a sign of the married woman.²¹⁹

For the sake of the angels

Paul adds διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους as a second reason for wearing a head covering, balancing διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of the sentence. It has been suggested that Paul believed women invited possession by evil angels if their heads were uncovered.²²⁰ Gail Corrington combines Paul's desire that the Corinthians not afford social scandal with

²¹⁹Werner Foerster, "ἔξουσία," *TDNT* 2:573-74. So also Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 53. He adds, "accordingly, the veil serves two different function: for the man it would his glory, even as it did for Moses (2 Cor. 3:13), and for the woman it symbolizes her subordination to the man. By wearing a covering she preserves the order of creation while exercising her priestly and spiritual right." (Ibid.) Waltke concludes that "it would be well for christian women to wear head coverings at church meetings as a symbol of an abiding theological truth." (Ibid., 57) However, Paul states that a woman should wear a head covering only when she prays or prophesies. He does not specify the wearing of the head covering throughout the worship service if the woman does not pray or prophesy.

²²⁰E.g., Gail Paterson Corrington, "The 'Headless Woman,'" *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 18 (1991): 230. She refers to Gen. 6:1-2 and believes the ancients thought the head was "particularly vulnerable to the entrance of spirit."

this explanation.

Paul's anxiety about a form of *exousia* over this part of the anatomy in worship thus has two dimensions: first, head-covering and "wrapping" of the hair preserve an acceptable decorum in a religious rite that might be "open" to the public "gaze." Second, no "invading" and illegitimate spirit can "penetrate" and congregation and disrupt its "order" during the dangerous moments of "inspiration," especially prophecy. Paul thus proves himself in 1 Cor 11:2-16 to be a person of his time, a propagandist for a new religion that nevertheless will not seem subversive to the old order.²²¹

Corrington does not explain how a "wrapping" on the head would prevent angelic invasion nor does she mention why only women were vulnerable to (lustful?) possession at the "dangerous moment" of inspiration. If this was Paul's concern, the reader would expect Paul to advise the men to cover their heads as well. The custom of men covering their heads for worship was not unknown in Roman society²²² but there was no apparent connection between this practice and

²²¹Gail Patterson Corrington, 231. She believes Paul, a child of his times, understood Gen. 6:1-2 to refer to sexual relations between threatening angels and human women.

²²²Cf. Richard Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11.4," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 481-505. He concludes: ". . . the Corinthian issue of whether a man may cover his head when he prays and prophecies emerged from a particular matrix of mores that were totally indigenous to Roman pietistic and devotional ethos, and had spread, as archaeology proves, to the urban centres of the Mediterranean basin, Corinth included, decades prior to the advent of Christianity. Accordingly, one should not be surprised to discover that a segment of the Christian fellowship at Corinth was continuing to manifest this particular pietistic gesture, one of the many stemming from the Etruscan period of its Italian heritage." (505)

the desire to avoid demonic possession. It has also been suggested that angels would be tempted to lust after women if they bared their heads in worship.²²³ First, there is no indication that angels are present in worship services without also being present elsewhere.²²⁴ Since these women were, no doubt, bare-headed at home (where angels were also present), how would bare headed women protect themselves there? Second, the requirement for covering the head is restricted to prophesying and praying. There is no information provided to the reader which would lead him to conclude that women's heads were particularly able to arouse

²²³Mentioned by BAGD, s.v. "ἄγγελος," 2.c., the category "evil spirits." (8) This viewpoint depends on taking the reference οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (אֱלֹהִים - בָּנָי) in Gen. 6:2 as angelic or demonic beings. What is sometimes overlooked by those who follow this line of thought is that marriage is envisioned in Gen. 6:2, presumably with all of the social obligations that marriage entails. This makes it very unlikely that angels or demons are in view in Gen. 6:2. As James Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 175, observes: "The sons of God are better understood as men faithful to God."

²²⁴Angels are present in a wide variety of places and on many different occasions in the Scriptures. A מַלְאָכִים (or אֱלֹהִים) appear in Gen. 19:1 to Abraham during his siesta. Angels descended and ascended a ladder in Jacob's dream in Gen. 28:12. An angel delivered the punishment to Jerusalem following David's census in 2 Sam. 24:16. Angels figure prominently in Daniel (3:28; 6:22) and Zechariah (1:9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19; 2:3, passim). Angels are charged also with protection of believers (Ps. 91:11-12) and frequently appear at critical stages in the history of salvation (Matt. 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19; Luke 1:27, 28, 30, 34-35, 38; 2:9-15; 24:23; John 20:12). The point is that the Scripture consistently speaks of angels as present at places and times other than worship services. Gerhard Kittel summarizes: Thus to early Christianity the action of the angels is essentially action for Christ and in the service of His history." "ἄγγελος," *TDNT* 1:85.

the prurient interests, if any, of angelic or demonic beings.

A number of commentators have suggested that διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους refers to human beings. Padgett believes these would be female messengers.

However, it might be possible that by *angelous* Paul means human messengers. To fit the context, these would be female messengers, which Paul was known to use. For example, Paul used the deacon Phoebe (Rom. 16.1) to deliver the letter to the Romans. Priscilla, an important co-worker with Paul, was with him in Corinth. Perhaps it was female church leaders like these whom Paul had in mind.²²⁵

In Rom. 16:1 Paul does not state that Phoebe is carrying the letter to the Romans nor does he refer to her as his "messenger" (ἄγγελος). He merely recommends (συνίστημι) Phoebe to the church at Rome and identifies her as a διάκονον. Priscilla (Πρίσκα, a variant of Πρισκίλλα) appears in Rom. 16:3 along with Aquila and are labelled "my co-workers" (τοὺς συνεργούς μου) in Christ Jesus. They were in the same trade (cf. Acts 18:2-3) and were active in the church. Yet Paul does not use titles with either of them which would suggest an official leadership role.

Murphy-O'Connor defends a reading of τοὺς ἀγγέλους which takes this as a reference to human messengers of either sex. He writes:

This is well-attested in the NT (Matt 11:10; Luke 7:24; 9:52; Jas 2:25) and in Josephus, and it suits the context here. In line with 1 Cor 10:32 and

²²⁵Alan Padgett, "Paul on Women in the Church," 81-82.

14:23, Paul would be concerned that practices at Corinth should not shock envoys from other churches. That a new twist should suddenly appear in an argument should surprise no one who knows Paul's style, and here it can be seen as an anticipation of v 16. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that the problems that Paul is dealing with in 1 Corinthians 11 were not raised in the Corinthian's letter (1 Cor 7:1), but were reported to him by Chloe's people, who were scandalized by what they saw going on in the Corinthian liturgical assemblies.²²⁶

Two arguments may be made against such an approach. The first is that the text does not speak about visiting members of other congregations. When Paul refers to other churches, he does so in order to confirm the universal Christian recognition of the application that he is making in 1 Cor. 11:4-6. The second piece of evidence which stands against taking τοὺς ἀγγέλους as "human messengers" is made by Fitzmyer: "but though the word ἄγγελος is found in the New Testament in the sense of a human messenger (Luke vii. 24; ix. 52; Jas. ii. 25), it is never used thus by Paul."²²⁷

²²⁶Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 271-72. He gives credit to J. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (4 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University, 1859) 4:238, for first proposing this interpretation.

²²⁷Joseph Fitzmyer, 53. Murphy-O'Connor acknowledges that Paul never uses ἄγγελος for a human messenger but points out Gal. 1:8 where Paul qualifies ἄγγελος with the prepositional phrase "from heaven," indicating "at the very least . . . that Paul was fully aware that *aggelos* could mean a human messenger." ("1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again," 272, n.19) This is far from convincing in his argumentation that Paul means "human messengers" without any other textual hints in 1 Cor. 11:10.

A defense of "human messengers" is made by J. Winandy, "Un Curieux Casus Pendens: 1 Corinthiens 11.10 et son Interprétation," *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 628. He argues that Paul avoided the term "apostle" because of its

A fourth suggestion is based on Leviticus 21:17-23 where persons with defects are forbidden to serve as priests. J. Fitzmyer writes:

We are invited by the evidence from Qumran to understand that the unveiled head of a woman is like a bodily defect which should be excluded from such an assembly, 'because holy angels are present in their congregation'.²²⁸

technical use elsewhere. The Corinthians would not have understood he meant every human messenger but would have read "apostle" as referring only to a very select group. He explains:

Il est vrai que là où il parle clairement de délégués d'une Église, Paul les appelle ἀπόστολλοι (2 Co 8.23; Ph 2.25) et que pour lui les ἄγγελοι sont habituellement des êtres célestes (Rm 8.38; 1 Co 4.9; 6.3; 13.1; Ga 1.8; etc.). Mais, ailleurs dans le Nouveau Testament, le mot est, de fait, employé pour désigner des hommes envoyés en mission, en ambassade (Mt 11.10 par. citant Ml 3.1 et appliquant ce texte à Jean-Baptiste; Lc 7.24; 9.52; Jc 2.25). Et, dans la Bible grecque, les cas sont si fréquents de l'emploi de ce mot pour signifier de simples envoyés humains qu'on s'explique aisément qu'il ait pu être employé par Paul, de préférence à ἀπόστολους, qui eût été ambigu, sans qu'il sentît le besoin d'en prédiser le sens. Il ne s'agit d'ailleurs pas nécessairement, dans le cas qui nous occupe, de personnages bien déterminés. L'Apôtre a pu penser à des visiteurs éventuels, délégués cependant par telle ou telle Église. (628)

Paul was not, however, limited to one word. Had he wanted his readers to understand that he meant "human messengers," it seems unlikely that he would have simply used ἄγγελοι without any qualifiers. The term ἀπόστολλοι would have confused the Corinthians but the word ἄγγελοι would have not communicated Paul's idea either, unless he modified it somehow to designate *human* messengers.

²²⁸Joseph Fitzmyer, 57. He recognizes the fact that angels are not mentioned in Lev. 21:17-23 and that there is a gulf between Roman Corinth and the Qumran community but believes it is the best solution to the problem. His own interpretation is based on the mention of angels who gather when Israel prepares to go to war (1 QM 7.4-6; 1 QSa. 2.3-11). Men with physical defects are excluded from battle because angels are present in their assembly. Fitzmyer's argument depends on an equivalency between Israel preparing for war and Christian public worship. His interpretation

A more plausible suggestion is that the angels, who cover their faces in the presence of God (Isaiah 6:2), serve as a model for the women in worship.²²⁹ Fitzmyer objects:

Likewise to be rejected is the interpretation, 'in imitation of the angels', or 'because the angels do so'. Support for this opinion has been sought in Isa. vi.2, where the angels covered their faces and loins with their wings in the presence of the Lord. So a woman in prayer should cover her head. Just as the angels, who are subordinate to God, veil themselves in his presence, so should woman "als unterhauptetes Wesen" follow their example. But we may ask, with J. Huby, why this imitation of the attitude of the angels during divine worship should be prescribed for women only. Moreover, what evidence is there for understanding $\delta\iota\acute{\upsilon}$ in this sense?²³⁰

Much more likely is the proposal that the reference to angels is connected with Paul's understanding of creation and his reading of Genesis 1-2. Waltke cites Moffat in developing a solution with this in mind:

Moffatt offered the explanation that Paul refers to the angels because they were regarded as guardians of the created order. He wrote: "Paul has in mind the midrash on Gn. 1:26ff., which made good angels not only mediators of the law (Gal. 3:19), but guardians of the

also requires that a woman be considered physically defective and that covering the head replaces expulsion. No such equivalencies can be established in the text. Fitzmyer wonders why only women are to wear a head covering in Paul's instructions, a question Paul answers in 1 Cor. 11:3. One may also ask of Fitzmyer's position the question of "why only women?" His argument requires that Paul add physically defective men (which included the aged) to those who must wear head coverings, specifically forbidden by the text of 1 Cor. 11:3-10.

²²⁹Werner Foerster, "ἐξουσία," *TDNT* 2:574, n.73, cites J. Messacasa and K. Rösch for this opinion.

²³⁰J. Fitzmyer, 53. He cites a number of authors who propose this interpretation, the most recent in 1945 (cf. 53, n.6).

created order. . . ." Consequently, a woman should wear a covering out of respect for those rational beings who were present at the creation and are concerned with the maintenance of that creation.²³¹

Yet this approach is not without problems. Wilson notes:

However, Genesis 1:26-27 does not refer to the presence of angles in creation at all. Rather the midrash was a Jewish misunderstanding of the plural form used for God in the beginning chapters of Genesis. If this view is accepted on the basis of Paul's understanding of the midrash, then he was basing his argument on something that was not true. This is incompatible with a high view of Scripture. . . . Angels are presented elsewhere as spectators of the affairs of humans (1 Cor. 4:9; Eph. 3:10; 1 Tim. 3:16). Thus the meaning is, "If a woman thinks lightly of shocking men, she must remember that she is also shocking the angels, who of course are present at public worship. The angels would be shocked not because they are the guardians of creation, but simply because they have knowledge of the order of creation and what it involves (Job 38:7)."²³²

A criticism of Wilson's objection is that Paul does not write about men being shocked by the women's behavior. What is at issue is conduct and apparel which reflects the distinction between man and woman.²³³

²³¹Bruce Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 53. Jerome Murphy O'Connor takes the reference in exactly the opposite sense: "In Paul's view women had full authority (ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν) to act as they were doing, but they needed to convey their new status to the angels who watched for breaches of Law. the guardians of an outmoded tradition had to be shown that things had changed." "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 497. It would be strange indeed that the angels of God would be "behind the times!"

²³²Kenneth Wilson, 454-55.

²³³It may be added that it is difficult to imagine an angel (or a group of angels) experiencing shock over the sight of a bare-headed woman. Certainly bathrooms are not off-limits to angels and bedrooms are included in their purview.

Angels serve God and at His direction serve His people (Hebrews 1:14). Any conduct which denies the identity of man (or woman), particularly within the context of worship, may be taken as a rebellion against God's plan and the service of the angels. Thus, the disrespectful behavior of the women at worship is a rejection of God's design and plan, represented by the very existence of angels. This line of interpretation seems to be supported by the use of "glory" to describe the angels who surround God, as Gerhard Kittel explains.

In Ezekiel the cherub is the bearer of ׀׀׀׀ (9:3; 10:4, 18, 22; cf. Sir. 49:8). Similarly in Judaism the concept of divine δόξα can sometimes be transferred to the angelic powers around God. Directly linked with Ez. is Hb. 9:5. . . . A further step is taken in Jd. 8 = 2 Pt. 2:10, where the angelic powers are described as δόξαι. It was by the same process that the divine → δύναις became a designation for angels. In both Philo and Test. XII both terms were revitalized in this sense.²³⁴

As angels reflect the glory of God, women reflect the glory of man. As angels cover themselves in the presence of God, so women are called to cover their heads in worship when they pray and prophesy. In doing so, they act properly and (at least in part) they do so on account of the angels. The brevity of the reference, διὰ τοῦς ἀγγέλους, resembles the abruptness of Paul's reference to a "baptizing for the dead" in 1 Cor. 15:29b and reminds the modern reader that the Corinthians were in a far better position to understand all

²³⁴Gerhard Kittel, "δόξα," *TDNT* 2:251. He cites Phil Spec. Leg., I,45 & Test. Judah 25:2.

that Paul meant by such short comments.²³⁵ Reference to the angels also serves to remind Paul's readers that God is the One who created and structured mankind in His image.²³⁶ L. Ann Jervis concludes that

Paul's appeal to the angels is a reminder of God as creator . . . and of God's beneficent and revelatory presence with the worshipers. . . . Since women do not worship God as genderless beings, the authority which they have over their heads appears to be that of garbing their heads in a feminine way. Verse 10 is not, as some have suggested, a response to male chauvinism at Corinth. For Paul has just dealt with men in a similar fashion. Farther in v. 10, just as in his previous injunction to the men, Paul seeks to correct his readers' conviction that redemption has accorded them an asexual divine image.²³⁷

²³⁵Annie Jaubert, "Le Voile des Femmes (I Cor. IX. 2-16)," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971-72): 428, notes that Paul's reference here (διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους) is supplementary and suggests that it refers to some teaching outside of Jewish-Christian tradition to which Paul (enigmatically) refers. She writes: "Le second *dia* introduit un motif supplémentaire qui ne peut être que d'origine judéo-chrétienne. C'est une sorte de citation, une opinion courante que rappelle Paul."

²³⁶James Hurley has also seen here a reference to "judging angels" (1 Cor. 6:1). Although he believes the reference is to hair-style rather than head-covering, he makes the point that proper attire (that which reflects her identity as a woman) "marked her as one possessing authority, as vicegerent [*sic*] of creation, one who would join in the judgment of rebellious angels, rather than be judged with them (1 Cor. 6:1) Paul's cryptic remark about angels, thus interpreted, is related to the remark in Ephesians 5:28-31 about the unions of husbands and wives and to the stress in 1 Peter 3:7 on the two as fellow-heirs." *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 177. If Paul wanted his readers to make that connection, he failed to provide any clues in the text to do so.

²³⁷L. Ann Jervis, 243-45. She refers to the angel (the cherubim) who "guarded Adam and Eve from approaching the tree of life (Gen 3:24)." (243) It seems doubtful that such a specific reference is in Paul's mind in 1 Cor. 11:10.

Schreiner sums up:

In verse 10, Paul also gives a new reason for wearing the coverings: 'because of the angels.' What does he mean? We don't know for sure. The best solution is probably that the angels are good angels who assist in worship and desire to see the order of creation maintained.²³⁸

This order of creation, it may be added, is the order to which believers are restored in Christ. This relationship between men and women should be reflected in the appearance and behavior of Christians in worship.

Verses Eleven and Twelve

"In any case (πλῆν),²³⁹ neither [is]²⁴⁰ woman apart from man nor man apart from woman in [the] Lord (ἐν κυρίῳ)²⁴¹; for just as the woman [is] from the man (ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ

²³⁸Thomas Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 136.

²³⁹The term πλῆν appears in Paul to signal to the reader that he is ready to conclude the discussion and wants to point out some essential fact. (Cf. *BDF* §449, who translate the term "only, in any case.") (234)

²⁴⁰The most common form of the copula, the third person singular ἐστίν, is frequently omitted. *BDF* §127 discusses this facet of Greek (true for classical as well as Koine) and state that a "preference for omission may be observed in (1) proverbs, (2) impersonal constructions, especially those expressing possibility or necessity. . . ." (70) In 1 Cor. 11:11-12 Paul expresses himself in proverbial language, reflect by the absence of the verb, ἐστίν.

²⁴¹This prepositional phrase occurs also in Rom 16:2, 8, 11, 12 [twice], 13; 1 Cor. 1:31; 4:17; 7:22, 39; 9:1, 2. The same phrase w/ the gen. form of "Jesus" added appears in Rom. 14:2. Murray Harris points out that a noun in a stereotyped or familiar phrase (such as idiomatic prepositional phrases), even when anarthrous, has a tendency

τοῦ ἀνδρός), so also the man [is] through the woman (διὰ τῆς γυναικός); and all things [are] from God." Paul reminds the reader of the unity of man and woman, a prophylactic corrective for someone who has read 1 Cor. 11:3-10.

Schreiner notes:

Paul anticipates the problem that could arise if one stressed his argument in verses 3-10 too rigidly. Male and female could almost be construed as different species, and men as more valuable than women. That is not Paul's point at all. There is a profound interdependence and mutuality present in the male-female relationship, and neither sex can boast over the other because the sexes are interdependent. Ultimately "everything comes from God."²⁴²

Verses eleven and twelve preserve the unity of humanity.

The woman is not subordinated to the man in an absolute sense, as though they had little or nothing in common.²⁴³

Neither are independent (χωρῖς)²⁴⁴ of the other, but are together in the Lord. Ethelbert Stauffer explains:

to be definite. (304) Gordon Fee believes "it refers most likely to the 'sphere' of their existence in the new age. God has called them to be 'in the Lord,' and in that new relationship they live our the life of the future, awaiting its consummation." (523)

²⁴²Thomas Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 136.

²⁴³A point made by Foerster, who notes that πλὴν "introduces a concluding limitation of the declared subordination of woman to man." (Werner Foerster, "ἑξουσία," *TDNT* 2:573.)

²⁴⁴χωρῖς, an adverb, may be translated "separately, apart, by itself." *BAGD* s.v. "χωρῖς," 1. (890) Used with the genitive of the person, it denotes "separated from someone, without someone" or "without, apart from someone's activity or assistance."

This unity of the Church does not imply uniformity. It is organic unity. Within it there are differences between the rich and the poor, freemen and slaves. These are transcended but not removed. Men and women are both members of this organism, but in their own way. It is precisely in the Church that the distinction of sexes acquires its final seriousness from the biological and practical standpoint. Woman is to be silent in the Church, not because she has no gifts or is perhaps too eloquent, but simply because she is woman (1 C. 14:34 f.). The "subjection" of woman to man is established rather than overthrown in the Church.²⁴⁵

Woman and man together are "in the Lord," interdependent rather than independent of each other. This statement reflects the unity created by the Holy Spirit through Baptism, as Paul points out in Gal. 3:26-28. Jervis records the relationship between these verses and the third verse.

The unity of man and woman in Christ has not obliterated the distinction between the genders (v. 12a, b). The differentiation of the genders established at creation (γυνή ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, v. 12a; cf. v 8) is still clearly seen in the process of reproduction and birth (v. 12b). Paul closes this section of the passage by referring again to God's role as creator of all (v. 12c), thereby reaffirming his statement of v. 3c.²⁴⁶

Jesus Christ, the Image of God

Paul recognizes the impact of sin upon the ability of humanity to reflect God (Rom. 3:23). Any discussion of the image of God, therefore, must include Jesus Christ. And if it is true that a race may be represented by its head,

²⁴⁵Ethelbert Stauffer, "εἰς," *TDNT* 2:440-41. He cites 1 Cor. 7:36ff.; 11:3ff.; 14:34f.; and Rom. 7:2 in support of his statement about men and women in the church.

²⁴⁶L. Ann Jervis, 245.

then it is possible to see the logic behind Paul's statements that the Church has been comprehended in Christ Jesus (ἐν κυρίῳ, 1 Cor. 11:11).²⁴⁷ Herman Ridderbos writes:

As the Pre-existent One, too, the Son of God is the Christ, the object of God's election (Eph. 1:4), and as such the one in whom the grace of God has been given to the church before times eternal (2 Tim. 1:9; cf. Eph. 1:9); likewise the one in whom the church itself had already been comprehended, chosen, and sanctified (Eph. 1:4; 2:10; cf. Rom. 8:29).

In this connection those pronouncements are to be mentioned in particular which describe Christ as the Image of God:

. . . Christ, who is the Image of God (2 Cor. 4:4).
 . . . who [Christ] is the Image of the invisible God (Col. 1:15).
 . . . who, being in the form of God (Phil. 2:6).²⁴⁸

The relevant relative clause in 2 Corinthians 4:4 reads, ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ. In Colossians 1:15 the relative clause reads, ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου. In both passages, the word εἰκὼν reflects the Septuagint's use in Genesis 1:26,²⁴⁹ 28; 5:1; 9:6. In Philippians 2:6, however, the text reads ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. Does Paul have a different meaning in mind here? Or has he adapted a hymn which uses μορφῇ to represent the semantic field of

²⁴⁷This relationship will be explored more fully under the discussion of Eph. 5:22-33. The image of "head" and "body" closely relate to the metaphor of "husband" and "wife" in that passage.

²⁴⁸Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1975), 69.

²⁴⁹Gen. 1:26 reads ὁμοίωσιν as a translation of הָיוּ אֱלֹהִים but εἰκόνα, used in Gen. 1:26 to translate אֱלֹהִים, is the more common word and can be used to translate either הָיוּ אֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִים.

tselem and *demuth*? Ralph Martin summarizes:

The first thorough investigation of $\mu\omicron\pi\theta\eta$ in the light of the Old Testament terms זָלָה and דְמוּת goes to the credit of J. Héring. In a series of articles and in his book *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue* he took up a hint dropped by Lohmeyer that the LXX often uses $\mu\omicron\pi\theta\eta$ to translate the word זָלָה in its [*sic*] meaning of 'image, likeness'. A Good example of this usage is in Daniel iii.19 where the Aramaic equivalent זָלָה is rendered into the Greek as $\eta \mu\omicron\pi\theta\eta$. . . : 'the form of his (*sc.* the king's) countenance' was changed. An even more interesting comparison of the Hebrew and the LXX is in the Creation story of Genesis i.26 ff. where the divine pronouncement runs: 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.' It seems clear that the two concepts, 'image', 'likeness' must be taken as synonyms. . . . thus by a simple equation of terms Héring came to the solution of the curious expression in Philippians ii. 6: 'Si l'on traduit $\eta \mu\omicron\pi\theta\eta$ par "image", tout s'éclaircit.'²⁵⁰ This simple expedient, which cuts through a veritable jungle of complexity by opening up a strait path, was welcomed enthusiastically by those who examined it.²⁵¹

The weakness of Héring's suggestion in light of Gen. 1:26-27 is that $\mu\omicron\pi\theta\eta$ does not appear in that passage. Rather, Phil. 2:5-11 contrasts Christ, truly God, humbling Himself by His death on the cross as One truly human. Concerning 2 Corinthians 4:4 and Colossians 1:15, Ridderbos notes:

²⁵⁰"If one translates $\mu\omicron\pi\theta\eta$ by "image," everything becomes clear." (my translation)

²⁵¹Ralph Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), 106-07. N. T. Wright, "ἀρπαγμός and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5-11," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 37 (1986): 321-52 argues that Paul composed this hymn "in order to give Christological and above all theological underpinning to the rest of Philippians, especially chaps. 2 and 3. . . ." (352) His focus is ἀρπαγμός which, he suggests, is part of an idiomatic expression that can best be translated "something to be taken advantage of."

Some scholars deny any direct connection between 2 Corinthians 4:4 and Colossians 1:15 on the one hand, and Genesis 1:27 on the other. But it has rightly been observed that both 2 Corinthians 4:4 and Colossians 1:15 are in all sorts of ways directly reminiscent of the creation story. So far as 2 Corinthians 4:4 is concerned, Genesis 1:3 is cited in 2 Corinthians 4:6. Further, in this context there is repeated mention of "glory" (*doxa*; 3:18; 4:4,6), an idea that both in later Judaism and by Paul himself is closely linked with Genesis 1:26ff. (cf. 1 Cor. 11:7; Rom. 1:23; 3:23; 8:29ff.). Furthermore, in the context of 2 Corinthians 4:4 the image (of God) is attributed not only to Christ but also to the church (2 Cor. 3:18), which is obviously reminiscent of Genesis 1:27. And with respect to Colossians 1:15 . . . the whole of the so-called hymn in that passage speaks of the creation. The expression Image of God is here clearly rooted in Genesis 1:27. This is further corroborated by the fact that Christ is here likewise called the Beginning . . . and the Firstborn . . . and is set forth as World Ruler, an idea to be met with as well in the late Jewish Adam-theology. The conclusion is: "We have before us [in Col. 1], therefore, a christological interpretation of Genesis 1."²⁵²

The Incarnation at Bethlehem, the birth of Jesus, fulfills the role of *tselem* inaugurated in Genesis 1:26-28. Jesus is the last Adam (1 Cor. 15:45), the perfect image of God. Paul's remarks indicate that he believes a man must be brought into Christ Jesus to find his own role of *tselem* restored.²⁵³ He comments in 1 Corinthians 15 on the relationship of man in the post-Resurrection age to Jesus Christ:

If there is a physical [*ψυχικόν*] body, there is also a spiritual (body). So also it has been written: the

²⁵²Herman Ridderbos, 70-71.

²⁵³It is possible to ask whether Christ might not have been the heavenly pattern (*Urbild*) after which man was created as representative (*Abbild*), taking the] of Genesis 1:26-27 as the *beth normae*.

first man, Adam, became a living being [εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, as in the Septuagint of Gen. 2:7], the last Adam making alive spiritually. But not first the spiritual but the physical, then the spiritual. The first man (is) from earthly dust [χοϊκός], the second man (is) from heaven. Of such kind (is) the dust, these also (are) "dusty (ones)," and of such kind the One from heaven, these also (are) the ones from heaven. And just as we bore the image [εἰκόνα] of the dust, we will also bear the image [εἰκόνα] of the heavenly.²⁵⁴

These are the only occurrences of χοϊκός in the New Testament.²⁵⁵ The term is derived from χοῦς, denoting dust.²⁵⁶ The only time that χοῦς occurs in Torah is in

²⁵⁴1 Cor. 15:44b-49. The translation is intentionally "wooden" to reflect Paul's consistent use of χοϊκός ("dust") with its cognates and its antonym, ἐπουράνιος ("heavenly") and its cognates. The only textual question of note involves v.49 where external support strongly favors the aorist subjunctive, ὀρῆσωμεν, against the future indicative favored by Nestle's 26th edition of the New Testament, ὀρῆσομεν. The former is read by P46 & A C D F G Ψ 075. 0243 M latt bo, Clement, Origen and Epiphanius of Constantia; the latter is read by B I 6. 630. 945 v.l. 1881, others and the Sahidic versions. Bruce Metzger, *TCGNT*, 569, reports that exegetical considerations ("i.e., the context is didactic, not hortatory") moved the committee to chose the future indicative. A theological point may be involved as well inasmuch as the hortatory could be misunderstood to mean that Christians will bear the Image of the Heavenly through moral conduct rather than hearing in this verse the promise that God will restore believers to this Image of the Heavenly at the Resurrection.

²⁵⁵Once in 1 Cor. 15:47, twice in 15:48, once in 15:49.

²⁵⁶It appears in the semantic domain of natural substances. (Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 2:22.) They list it under the subdomain of "earth, mud, sand, rock." It also appears in 1.42 under the domain of "geographical objects and features," subdomain "earth's surface." This is the use in 1 Cor 15:47, "coming from the earth." Louw and Nida suggest that it "may also refer to dirt or soil" due to its use in 1 Cor. 15:47 since dry dust cannot be formed into anything. Yet that seems to be the point of Gen. 2:7—the shaping is miraculous, something out of the ordinary, reflected by the fact that the material shaped (לֶפֶס) cannot

Genesis 2:7 where it translates תְּבִילָה .²⁵⁷ Ridderbos draws the following conclusions:

It is true that the words "image of the earthy" (*ton eikona tou choikou*) do not here allude so much to the glory of the first man as image of God, but rather to his having been taken from the earth; it first of all reflects Genesis 2:7 . . . and not Genesis 1:25ff. Even so, it is difficult to think of the expression "image" here apart from the manner in which the first man is called the image (of God) in Genesis 1ff. He bore this image as the earthy man, the man taken from the earth. But he nevertheless bore the "image," and it can be said of him as bearer of the image of God that he begot his descendants after his own likeness and his own image (Gen. 5:1 . . . the passage to which 1 Cor. 15:49 perhaps also refers). In any case—and this is for us the most important thing—Christ's image as the Heavenly is here spoken of in the closest relationship to the image of the first man. The "image" that Christ represents and which he gives to his own is thus very clearly thought of here as parallel to the image of the first man and to that which he communicated to his descendants. In this context such passages as Ephesians 4:24 and Colossians 3:10 also come to stand in a clearer light.²⁵⁸

When an individual is brought into Christ by means of Baptism (Romans 6, Galatians 3) the relationship between God and mankind (and within mankind, between men and women) is restored and he is literally a "new creation." (2 Corinthians 5:17). As Scroggs writes:

Paul does not use the term 'new creation' as a metaphor. Man in Christ will be, indeed already is, a truly new creature. The literal reference of Paul's language here has often been noticed, but it needs to be reiterated to avoid any suggestion that Paul is speaking simply of

be shaped.

²⁵⁷Although it can translate two other Hebrew words, the vast majority of times it appears it translates תְּבִילָה ; cf. Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, 2:1473-74.

²⁵⁸Herman Ridderbos, 72-73.

some emotional, intellectual, or decisional experience of the natural man. Paul's language implies further that the reality of this new nature is nothing more nor less than a restoration to that truly human reality, God has always desired for man.²⁵⁹

In the present age such restoration is partial (cf. Romans 7)²⁶⁰ but it is present already (Romans 8:28-30).²⁶¹

Restoration to the image of God has begun and will be completed on the day of Christ's return to judge the living and the dead. As Martin writes:

II Corinthians iii. 18 uses closely corresponding language for the believer's present spiritual conformity to the image of his Lord. 'We all, with unveiled faces, reflecting as a mirror the δόξα of the Lord are transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα) into the same image (τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα), from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord.' The difficult phrase, ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, we may interpret, with Héring, to mean: 'from His glory to our being like Him in the final state'. This process of inward renewal and increasing approximation to the

²⁵⁹Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 63-64.

²⁶⁰D. B. Garlinton comments: "God, then, is in the process of making his people what Adam, as his image, should have been. But until the process is complete, the Christian, like Christ himself, must labor and persevere amidst circumstances which are far from favorable. It is, in consequence, precisely because he anticipates better things that the believer cannot be content with his present attainments in grace. In view of what he longs to be hereafter, he can only cry out with the apostle Paul, 'Wretched man that I am.' Yet the bottom line, from which our truest comfort in this life is taken, is the one drawn from Paul by Luther. As those who live in the era of overlapping and conflicting creations, we are *simul iustus et peccator*." "Romans 7:14-25 and the Creation Theology of Paul," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 234-34.

²⁶¹John, quoting Jesus, phrases this distinction in terms of life and death; cf. John 5:24-29 where the dead are hearing and possessing eternal life during the earthly ministry of Jesus while those in the grave await the Resurrection.

pattern of Christ is elsewhere spoken of as a 'taking shape' of Christ in the believer (Gal. iv. 19: the verb is $\mu\omicron\pi\theta\omega\theta\eta\grave{\iota}$). It seems clear in these references that the final 'image' into which the Christian is being transformed is nothing else than the 'glory' of the heavenly Man; and the verb which denotes this change is that which comes from the root $\mu\omicron\pi\theta\omega$.²⁶²

Scroggs notes:

The image of God is the goal of man's renewal, and Christ as the Last Adam is the image to which man will conform. Even so, however, man does not become an image of Christ, but the image of God, conformable to Christ who now already exists as that image. For Paul, then, man will one day be restored to the image of God. The Apostle uses the concept essentially as an eschatological term and looks ahead, rather than to primeval time, for its realization. Christ plays the essential role, as we shall see in detail later, of being the mediator of this eschatological humanity; it is for this reason that Paul speaks of man as image of God only in terms of Christ.²⁶³

In 1 Cor. 11:11-12, Paul affirms that together in the Lord ($\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$) man and woman remain distinct and yet united. In Genesis 2 the woman was built from material taken from Adam's side;²⁶⁴ since then however, man has come from the woman through conception and birth.²⁶⁵ Man and

²⁶²Ralph Martin, 115.

²⁶³Robin Scroggs, 70.

²⁶⁴As Wilson notes, "a clear reference to verse 8 and to Genesis 2:21." Kenneth T. Wilson, "Should Women Wear Head Coverings," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148 (1991): 455.

²⁶⁵ $\Delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ with the genitive ($\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$) may indicate the originator (as in Rom. 11:36; 1 Cor. 1:9; Gal 1:1). (Cf. *BDF* §223.2.) This is distinct from the purely instrumental sense of $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ with the genitive, Oepke notes: "the causal usage in relation to persons, is undoubtedly found of men (or angels) in Mk. . . 1 C. 11:12. . . ." (Albrecht Oepke, " $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$," *TDNT* 2:68.) So also Wilson, "the man is said to be 'through [$\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$] the woman,' a reference to his birth through her. As in Genesis 2, man and woman

woman are interdependent, designed to work together as the image of God, restored in Christ Jesus.

With the phrase "and all things (are) from God" (1 Cor. 11:12) Paul returns to the theme sounded in 1 Cor. 11:3, that God is the Head of Christ who is the Head of man who is the head of woman. God is the Creator of all. With this statement, Paul puts the argument into its proper perspective.²⁶⁶ He is then ready to move the argument forward, asking the Corinthians to confirm it by experience.

1 Cor. 11:13-16

Paul appeals to the experience of the Corinthians themselves, and to their understanding of nature and the distinction between men and women which they have learned in their lives is natural and proper. This experience supports the argument from Scripture, which Paul wants his readers to understand for themselves. Jervis remarks:

In Paul's final address to the problem at Corinth (vv. 13-16) he changes both his manner and the basis of his appeal, shifting to an appeal to nature and culture and the practice of other churches. Since he does not continue to rely on the creation subtexts, these verses are not germane to the present discussion. Verses 13-16 contribute to our analysis of this passage only insofar as they confirm that Paul considered his practical directives accorded with gender-appropriate practice.²⁶⁷

complete and need each other." (455)

²⁶⁶A point made by Gordon Fee, 524.

²⁶⁷L. Ann Jervis, 245.

Verse Thirteen

"Judge among yourselves (ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς)²⁶⁸; is it proper (πρέπον)²⁶⁹ for an unveiled (ἀκατακάλυπτον)²⁷⁰ woman

²⁶⁸αὐτός, a intensive pronoun, may designate the "self," used in the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς to emphasize the personal experience of Paul's readers, as "you, yourselves have understood this to be the case." (Cf. BAGD s.v. "αὐτός," 123.) For the distributive sense of ἐν with the dative, cf. BAGD s.v. "ἐν," I.4., where it denotes "a rather close relation—a. among, in. . . ." (258)

²⁶⁹The language in these verses resembles Stoic philosophical language, using some of the same terminology but without incorporating the assumptions or conclusions. This may be due, in part, to the nature of Paul's audience and his desire to address them in terms with which they are familiar.

It seems more likely that this vocabulary comes into Paul's use through the Septuagint, as Otto Michel notes: "With the transition from Aram.-Hbr. to Greek and the acceptance of the LXX as Holy Scripture, primitive Christianity had more opportunity to use and develop teachings from the world of philosophy. Concepts and ideas that had had a definite history in philosophical physics and ethics are repeatedly found in the NT, although one cannot say precisely in a given instance how far the NT authors knew the derivation and philosophical significance." (Otto Michel, "φιλοσοφία," TDNT 9: 185.) He refers to this verse (among others) as examples of "expressions and notions familiar from philosophical anthropology and ethics [which] are found in missionary preaching when it is interwoven into accusation and the intimation of judgment, e.g., §. 1:20, 28; 2:15. We also find them in exhortation, e.g., 1 C. 9:24; 11:13-15. . . . Yet adoption of philosophical terms does not mean unqualified acceptance of their content." (Ibid.)

The impersonal construction πρέπον ἐστίν occurs in 1 Macc. 12:11 and 3 Macc. 7:13 with the dative case and a following infinitive. The use of the accusative case in place of the dative may occur in impersonal expressions, even when those expressions normally take the dative case. This indicates the subject of the infinitive, especially when that subject differs from the object of the impersonal expression. (Cf. BDF §409.3 [211].)

Paul does not use πρέπω often; it appears only here and in Eph. 5:3; 1 Tim. 2:10; and Tit. 2:1.

(γυναῖκα) to pray (προσεύχεσθαι)²⁷¹ to God?"

Paul does not mean to say that they should decide the matter, however it turns out (as though it were a matter for them to decide). He says only that an honest investigation will reveal to them the truth of his earlier statements. As Fee puts it: "Once they have thus 'judged for themselves,' of course, Paul expects them to see things his way."²⁷² While each individual may be expected to reach this same conclusion, Paul has in mind the church as a whole coming to see things his way.²⁷³ Kenneth Wilson notes:

Paul raised questions the Corinthians should be able to answer without any help from him. The first deals with the matter at hand, that is, head-coverings. In light of the reason he put forth as this point the Corinthians should decide that it was not proper for a woman to pray with her head uncovered (v.13). . . . From what they now knew, they should see that women worshipping without a headcovering was not appropriate.²⁷⁴

²⁷⁰ἀκατακάλυπτον is a feminine accusative singular adjective which occurs only here and 1 Cor. 11:5 in the New Testament.

²⁷¹προσεύχεσθαι is a present middle/passive deponent infinitive, middle or passive in form but with an active meaning.

²⁷²Gordon Fee, 525.

²⁷³Contrary to Kenneth T. Wilson, who argues that "since Paul appealed to the teaching of 'nature' (v. 14), it would seem that the appeal here is to individuals." (456) It is difficult to see why an appeal to nature would require the reader to understand ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς as referring to individuals.

²⁷⁴Kenneth T. Wilson, 457. He believes this appeal demonstrates an element of cultural conditioning in the passage.

Paul can expect them to agree because the source to which he next appeals is available to all: the nature of man as a creature of God and the customs which have developed from that nature. He believes an honest appraisal of this will confirm his argument from Scripture.

Verses Fourteen and Fifteen

"Does²⁷⁵ not nature (φύσις)²⁷⁶ itself teach you that a man, if he wears long hair (μὲν ἐὼν κομᾶ), is a dishonor to himself (ἀτιμία αὐτῷ ἐστίν)²⁷⁷, but a woman (γυνὴ δὲ),²⁷⁸ if

²⁷⁵A textual variant occurs at the beginning of this verse. The conjunction ἢ, "or," is read by D1 and the Majority text as well as two translations. The addition of the conjunction is an attempt to relieve the asyndeton of the passage. *BDF* §494 note that "the resolution of a sentence into unconnected components produces a more powerful effect than would the periodic form proper. . . ." (262) Asyndeton strengthens the impact of the author's point and appeared in popular Greek oratory and Attic comedy, "both of which were produced in the lively style of colloquial speech. . . ." (*Ibid.*) Kenneth T. Wilson, 456-57 also discusses the use of asyndeton at this point.

²⁷⁶The noun φύσις appears under the domain "nature, class, example" and can function to convey "the nature of something as the result of its natural development or condition" Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 58.8 (1:586) as well as "a class of entities based on physiological and genetic similarity." (58.28 [1:589])

²⁷⁷The verb εἶναι may be used with the dative and a predicate noun to designate the person concerned (cf. *BDF* §190.1). The construction is similar to the use of εἰς with the accusative in place of a predicate nominative, a Semiticism which reflects the use of -וֹ (Cf. *BDF* §145.1.)

²⁷⁸On the correlation of μὲν . . . δὲ, cf. *BDF* §447.1-4. The correlation establishes a general contrast between the two categories under discussion. *BDF* §466.1 also discuss vv. 14b and 15a as an example of Hebrew parallelism (*parallelismus membrorum*) where "two ideas set over against each other with a pause between and a reference in the

she wears long hair (ἐὼν κομᾶ), is a glory to herself (δόξα²⁷⁹ αὐτῇ ἐστίν)? For the long hair is given [to her] as a covering (περιβολαίου)."

Paul asks his readers to consider the natural covering of the woman's head and the glory that she brings to herself by wearing it. In contrast, a man with long hair brings only dishonor on himself. His long hair acts like a head-covering, identifying him as female (in that culture). Paul uses the natural covering to support his argument for the artificial covering about which he has written in 1 Cor. 11:3-13.²⁸⁰ By way of analogy, his readers should see in the long hair of a woman that head coverings are appropriate in

second to the first; they are given more weight individually because of the loose grammatical connection between them." (244)

²⁷⁹The term δόξα serves here as an antonym for δτιμία and, as Fee remarks, "must mean something like 'distinction' or 'honor.'" (527) He cites Achilles Tatius 8.6, commenting on Leucippe, "She has been robbed of the beauty of her head; you can still see where her head was shaved." (Ibid., n.19; Fee cites the Loeb translation and offers his own, more literal translation, of the Greek phrase "the beauty of her head.") It is not unusual for Paul to move from one conceptual to another using the same signifier, e.g., νόμος in Rom. 7:2-8:7.

²⁸⁰Gordon Fee remarks: This seems to be the point of the final clause, which is tied to the rhetorical question with a causal conjunction. Long hair is the woman's glory *because* it has been given to her in the place of a covering. The natural meaning of these words is that her long hair, let down, functions for her as a natural covering. (528) He notes in regards to *anti*: "Since there is sufficient evidence that *anti* can also mean "that one thing is equivalent to another," there is no need to force the rigid concept of replacement onto this sentence." (529) He cites BAGD, 2.

worship, and that short hair for a man confirms the propriety of his uncovered head when praying or prophesying in public worship.

Several commentators understand $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as denoting the contemporary culture of the Corinthians. Fee defines $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as "the natural feelings of their contemporary culture"²⁸¹ and Wilson points out the custom of Jews, Greeks and Romans was for men to wear their hair short. He concludes: "This again points to Paul's grounding in the culture of his day in making this special appeal about covering or not covering one's head."²⁸² Cynthia Thompson has illustrated the short hair styles of men in Greco-Roman culture²⁸³ but it may be asked whether this was due to cultural custom or more deeply rooted in human nature. Schreiner argues that $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ denotes something more than custom. He writes:

²⁸¹Gordon Fee, 527. He argues that since short hair is short because it is cut, short hair cannot be "natural" in the sense that it arises from the nature of man. (Cf. 527, n.15.)

²⁸²Kenneth T. Wilson, 458. It is fallacious to argue that because a practice occurs in several cultures, it is culture-specific and not grounded in natural law. In fact, his data argue *against* his conclusions. He states that "not all felt that long hair was a shame" and points out the Spartan warriors. (457) This may be true, but a deviant practice does not invalidate the natural law. Further, the long hair of the Spartans may well have been remarkable because it was so unusual.

²⁸³Cynthia L. Thompson, *Hairstyles, Head-coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth*, *Biblical Archaeologist* 51 (1988): 99-115.

What is the meaning of the word *nature* (*physis*) here? Is Paul simply saying that *human tradition and customs* have made a distinction between the hair length of men and women? The use of the word *practice* (*sunētheia*) in 11:16 could support this interpretation. But Paul's use of *nature* elsewhere and the use of *teach* suggest that he is referring to the natural and instinctive sense of right and wrong that God has planted in us, especially with respect to sexuality. This sense of what is appropriate or fitting has been implanted in human beings from creation. Romans 1:26-27 is an illuminating parallel because the same word is used. Women and men involved in a homosexual relationship have exchanged the natural function of sexuality for what is contrary to nature, i.e., they have violated the God-given created order and natural instinct, and therefore are engaging in sexual relations with others of the same sex. . . . Paul's point, then, is that how men and women wear their hair is a significant indication of whether they are abiding by the created order.²⁸⁴

Paul uses φύσις consistently with the denotation "nature" rather than "custom," referring to that which is part of one's identity, describing that person.²⁸⁵ In 1 Cor. 11:14 he uses the term in the nominative, in an absolute

²⁸⁴Thomas Schreiner, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 137. He points out that some of the ways in which men and women are distinguished from each other are developed and shaped by the culture and society.

²⁸⁵He uses φύσις in Rom. 1:26 to describe the "natural" sexual relation of man and woman; and in 2:14, 27 φύσις is used to describe Gentiles who "by nature" do the things of the law and will be judged as those who are uncircumcised "by nature." Paul uses φύσις in Rom. 11:21, 24 as he discusses the Gentiles and Jews in the analogy of the olive tree and the grafted branch. The term φύσις appears in 1 Corinthians only at 11:14 but occurs in Galatians twice, at 2:15 to describe those who are "by nature" Jews and at 4:8 to denote those idols who are "by nature" not gods. The last occurrence in the Pauline corpus of φύσις is in Eph. 2:3 where all humanity is described as "children of wrath by nature." The word occurs in the New Testament elsewhere only at Jas. 3:7 ("by nature animals") and 2 Pet. 1:4 of the Divine "nature." In no place does φύσις denote that which is culturally conditioned or customary.

sense. Helmut Köster explains the significance:

The only passage in which Paul has φύσις in the nominative and absolute is 1 C. 11:14. Here, of course, "nature" is personified as the teacher of men. Nevertheless, it simply represents the general order of nature and its only task is to remind us of what is seemly and becoming. . . . The argument is a typical one in popular philosophy and is not specifically Stoic. The fact that nature bears witness to what is fitting in the matter of hair-styles reminds us that in the diatribe the same question was a favourite illustration in discussing what is "natural". . . . ²⁸⁶

Thus, Paul appeals to man's identity and the distinction within humanity to support and illustrate his directions about headcoverings in 1 Cor. 11:3-13. He appeals also to the sense of propriety they already have because they recognize that a woman has long hair as a covering for her head. This lends support to Paul's contention that a woman should cover her head when praying or prophesying.

In 1 Cor. 11:15b he makes this point explicitly when he states that long hair²⁸⁷ is given²⁸⁸ to her²⁸⁹ as (ἀντὶ) a

²⁸⁶Helmut Köster, "φύσις," *TDNT* 9:272-73.

²⁸⁷The noun κόμη, denoting the "long hair of women" (cf. *BAGD* s.v. "κόμη," 442), appears only here in the New Testament. The cognate verb, κομάω, occurs in the New Testament only at 1 Cor. 11:14-15.

²⁸⁸The verb is δέδοται, a third person singular perfect indicative passive form of δίδωμι. Two points may be made here. First, the passive voice is occasionally used to denote something God does, a "divine passive." *BDF* §313, discussing "passives with intransitive meaning," comment that "Aram. generally uses the pass. for actions of a celestial being" and offer as examples of this "divine passive" Acts 9:24; 1 Cor. 8:3; Rom. 10:20; and 2 Pet. 3:14. Therefore it may be said that the woman has long hair for a headcovering because *God* gave it to her for a covering. A second point may also be made. The tense of the verb

covering (περιβολαίου). Denoting "covering, wrap, cloak, robe" or other article of clothing,²⁹⁰ περιβόλαιον here appears as a synonym of κάλυμμα. Women's long hair serves as (ἀντὶ)²⁹¹ a covering. This serves as an analogy to a

δέδοται is perfect, an *Aktionsart* which indicates a past action with continuing results. *BDF* §342, discussing "the perfect used to denote a continuing effect on subject or object," write that this extensive perfect can also be used "to avoid the divine name. . . ." and cite 1 Cor. 15:3-4. (176) Therefore, God has given woman long hair for a headcovering and intends that she continue to cover her head. It was not only appropriate in the past, it is fitting in the present as well.

²⁸⁹Two textual variants occur at the pronoun αὐτῆ, which is enclosed in brackets in the 26th edition of the Nestle-Aland Text as well as the *UBSGNT* [4th]. The pronoun is omitted entirely by P45 D F G Ψ, the Majority Text and Ambrosiaster. It occurs before the verb (δέδοται) in C H P 630. 1175. 1241. and others, Ambrose and Pelagius. It is included after the verb in ⋈ A B 33. 81. 256. 263. 365 and others, Philo-Carpasia, Chrysostom and Cyril. The *UBSGNT* [4th] gives the inclusion of the pronoun after the verb a {C} rating, indicating serious doubt but maintaining a preference for its inclusion at that point. While external evidence favors inclusion, the more difficult reading would occur if it were omitted. The point would be the same in either case, but is more clear with the pronoun than without it.

²⁹⁰Cf. *BAGD* s.v. "περιβόλαιον," 646. The term appears only here and at Heb. 1:12, where it is part of a translation of Ps. 102:27 and denotes a "cloak." The component of meaning common to both uses is "covers."

²⁹¹The second definition of ἀντὶ listed by *BAGD* s.v. "ἀντὶ," 73, is "in order to indicate that one thing is equiv. to another *for, as, in place of*" and 1 Cor. 11:15 is cited as an example of this use. For a discussion of this preposition, cf. Gordon Fee, 528-29. The preposition ἀντὶ carries this signification also in Matt. 5:38; Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15; and 1 Pet. 3:9.

Alan Padgett, "The Significance of 'Anti in 1 Corinthians 11:15," *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994): 182-87, argues that the choice of meanings for ἀντὶ is not significant to the interpretation of the passage. He disagrees with Fee who

head-covering so that a woman's long hair "in itself points to their need to be 'covered' when praying and prophesying."²⁹²

Verse Sixteen

"But if someone is disposed²⁹³ to be contentious (φιλόνηκος),²⁹⁴ we have no such (τοιαύτην)²⁹⁵ practice (συνήθειαν), nor the churches of God."

"finds an 'analogy' between verse 15 and verses 5-6, when in fact what we find is a *contradiction*. The argument in verses 5-6 implies that women need a covering of some kind, while verse 15 implies that they do not; instead they have its equivalent (*i.e.*, hair)." (187; italics original)

Padgett believes that Paul quotes certain adversaries at Corinth who argue for women's head-coverings and that Paul writes to prove them wrong. This approach misreads the text, misunderstands the intertextuality with Gen. 2, and disregards the style and extent of Paul's citation of his adversaries' positions.

²⁹²Gordon Fee, 529.

²⁹³The verb is a third person singular present indicative active form of δοκέω, which may be translated "think, believe, suppose, consider" and refer to a subjective opinion (*BAGD* s.v. "δοκέω," 201). It appears here, followed by an infinitive with a nominative (an adjective), a construction which also occurs in 1 Cor. 3:18; 14:37; and Gal. 6:3. *BAGD* offers "is disposed" for 1 Cor. 11:16 (*Ibid.*).

²⁹⁴The term φιλόνηκος occurs only here in the New Testament. The only appearance of the cognate noun is at Luke 22:24 where it is also negative, denoting the "disagreement" among the disciples over who was greatest. Outside the New Testament it may have either a positive or negative connotation. (Cf. *BAGD* s.v. "φιλόνηκος," 860.)

²⁹⁵τοιαύτην is a feminine singular accusative form of the correlative adjective αὐτή (the masculine form is τοιοῦτος), which may appear with or without the definite article. Without the article (as here), τοιοῦτος also appears in Matt. 9:8; Mark 4:33; John 9:16; Acts 16:24; 2 Cor. 3:4, 19. (Cf. *BAGD* s.v. "τοιοῦτος," 821.)

Paul envisions a real situation when he states the protasis.²⁹⁶ By opening the apodosis with the first person plural pronoun (ἡμεῖς), Paul expresses not only his own opinion but reflects the collective practice of the whole people of God. Stauffer observes that "where ἡμεῖς is used, it is usually with a special nuance. Sometimes the wider circle gives added authority (1 C. 11:16)."²⁹⁷ The wider circle in 1 Cor. 11:16 consists of the congregations of the Christian church.²⁹⁸

The "practice" (συνήθειαν)²⁹⁹ of the churches is uniform, adding a final argument to the point Paul has been making from the start of the section. He had begun by

²⁹⁶Εἰ with indicative (here, εἶναι) is labelled the "indicative of reality" by *BDF* §372. They refer it to a present reality and translate "if . . . really" and note that it is close to the causal "since." (189) Fee notes that this is one of four such sentences in 1 Corinthians, each of which "picks up one of the Corinthians bywords: σοφία, γνώσις, πνευματικός." Gordon Fee, 529, n.27; the other three sentences occur at 1 Cor. 3:18; 8:2; 14:37.

²⁹⁷Ethelbert Stauffer, "ἔγώ," *TDNT* 2:356. He notes that Paul prefers the first person singular when the matter is private (e.g., Philemon, Philippians).

²⁹⁸The various congregations (ἐκκλησίαι) of God form one church (ἐκκλησία) in Christ Jesus. Paul varies from the use of the singular to the plural (cf. 2 Cor. 11:8; 12:13; and Phil. 4:15). K. L. Schmidt observes, however, that "this juxtaposition is not the decisive point. The decisive point is the integration of the 'congregations' into the 'congregation.'" ("ἐκκλησία," *TDNT* 3:506.)

²⁹⁹συνήθειαν occurs in John 18:39; 1 Cor. 8:7; 11:16. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 41.25 (1:507), list it only under "behavior and related states," defining it as "a pattern of behavior more or less fixed by tradition and generally sanctioned by the society--'custom, habit,'" and synonymous with *ethos*.

praising his Corinthian readers for holding on to the teachings and practices he had handed down to them (1 Cor. 11:2) and concludes his argument with a practical note. The practice of women covering their heads while praying or prophesying, based on Scripture and experience, forms part of the apostolic tradition to which the churches of God (including those at Corinth) were bound.³⁰⁰

It is important to distinguish between Paul's appeal to nature and the cultural practice of men wearing short hair and women wearing long hair. His argument in verses 13-16 encourages the Corinthians to recognize the validity of his teaching by examining nature itself. Nature teaches (and people should be able to perceive that it teaches) a distinction between men and women. Many (or most) cultures reflect that distinction in the length of hair considered appropriate for each gender. The length of hair by itself, however, is not mandated by Scripture. There is a close connection between nature and culture, as Jervis notes: "nature is the origin and guarantor of culture."³⁰¹ The cultural practice of a particular people is generated by nature as observed and understood by that people. Fee comments on verse 16:

³⁰⁰A point made by Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 56.

³⁰¹L. Ann Jervis, 245, n.59. She notes that "'Nature' and 'culture' are not necessarily distinct categories."

By appealing finally to their own sense of propriety, as "nature" by way of analogy helps them to see that, Paul brings to a close his argument over the "rightness" of the women maintaining the "custom" of being covered. But Paul is never quite comfortable concluding an argument in this fashion. Hence he draws the whole together with a final appeal to what goes on in the "churches of God." That he is dealing strictly with "custom" (church "custom," to be sure) is now made plain, as is the fact that this argument, for all its various facets, falls short of a command as such.³⁰²

Fee overemphasizes the separation between "nature" and "custom," but his point is well taken. The outward evidence of the natural distinction between men and women may be classified as "custom," which can and does vary from culture to culture. For Paul, Scripture teaches what nature confirms and what custom (or culture) reflects in varying ways: the man is the head of the woman who is the glory of the man. The woman who would pray or prophesy in a public worship service demonstrates her faith and her faithful acceptance of the identity and role God has given her by wearing a headcovering during those activities. The fact that women normally wear their hair long confirms Paul's point. Further, this is the uniform practice of the churches of God.

Summary

1 Cor. 11:2 - Paul praises the Corinthian Christians for their faithful adherence to the teaching (doctrine and practice) which he handed down to them.

³⁰²Gordon Fee, 529.

1 Cor. 11:3 – He sets forth the theological statement which presents the basis for the remainder of the section.

1 Cor. 11:4-6 – Paul applies the theological statement of verse 3 to the deviant practice which was taking place at Corinthians worship services.

1 Cor. 11:7-9 – He explains his application of the theological statement by means of an appeal to the identity of humanity, the origin of the woman, and the purpose of man and woman.

1 Cor. 11:10 – He concludes his explanation with an echo of verse 7 and a reference to the angels as a supplemental support of his instruction.

1 Cor. 11:11-12 – Paul indicates a limit to the woman's subordination to the man and points out the unity which man and woman share in Christ Jesus.

1 Cor. 11:13-16 – He asks his readers to confirm by their experience and by the uniform practice of the rest of God's people that women should cover their heads when praying and prophesying.³⁰³

Jervis concludes:

In 1 Cor 11:2-16 Paul is concerned to correct the Corinthians' interpretation of his preaching on liberty in Christ and its consequent reprehensible

³⁰³Stephen Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences*, 174, and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again," 274, offer alternative outlines.

practice. On the basis of their Jewish-Hellenistic approach to Paul's earlier teaching on the unity of man and woman in Christ, the Corinthian spirituals considered that they had been transformed into the image of the one who is beyond gender. Accordingly, they believed that customary gender-specific hairdressing and apparel no longer expressed the new life. Thus in pneumatic worship they disregarded the related cultural norms.

Paul's midrashic intertextual strategy for dealing with the practical issue at Corinth is to retextualize the first account of creation, which had formed the basis of their misunderstanding, with the second. This strategy allowed Paul, through illuminating the original text, to clarify his proclamation and thereby to address the problematic situation. Through a midrashic recombination of the two creation stories Paul interprets their meaning in the context of the situation at Corinth. What he highlights through his midrash is that God intended there to be two distinct genders who would live in harmony in the Lord.³⁰⁴

This relationship between men and women, particularly in public worship, will be addressed again at the end of the section which runs from 1 Cor. 11:2-14:40. To gain a clearer picture of this relationship, the interpreter can turn to Paul's treatment of this subject in Eph. 5:22-33. Written somewhat later than 1 Corinthians, Paul reveals more of his understanding of the relationship between Christian men and women and the relationship of Christ and the church. Paul can develop a mutual analogy in Ephesians 5 because of his view concerning the image of God and marriage. This section also reflects his Christology and the unique relationship between Christ and the body of believers.

³⁰⁴L. Ann Jervis, 246.

CHAPTER TWO
EPHESIANS 5:22-33

Paul stated his theological position for the stand he takes in 1 Cor. 11:4-16 in verse three of that chapter. In that section, his references indicate that he works with the Genesis 1 and 2 narratives in mind. The image of God appears explicitly in 1 Cor. 11:7 as part of this theological framework. 1 Cor. 11:8-9, drawn from the creation story of Genesis 2, reveal that marriage also forms part of the matrix from which Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians. Paul treats the subject of marriage more extensively in Eph. 5:22-33, which will be studied prior to examining the conclusion of Paul's remarks to the Corinthians on worship (1 Cor. 14:33b-36). In Ephesians 5, Paul treats two of the three relationships referenced in 1 Cor. 11:3, writing about Christ and the church on the one hand and wives and husbands on the other hand. The relationship of husband and wife and the relationship of Christ and the church form a mutual analogy in Paul's theology. It becomes apparent that both the image of God and marriage form the "larger picture" from which Paul draws to write about women and ministry. He states:

Submit¹ to one another in the fear of Christ;²
 the wives to their own husbands³ as to the Lord, for
 a man is the head of the woman as also Christ is the
 Head of the church, Himself the Savior of the Body;
 but as the church submits to Christ, so also the
 women to men in all things.

¹ὕποτασσόμενοι, a participle, is here translated as an imperative. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), Third Impression 1967 [hereafter *BDF*], §468.2, discuss Paul's frequent use of the participle with imperatival force. They comment: ". . . the peculiar use of a participle in place of a finite verb and without any connection to one, usually in a long series and in an imperatival sense. . . ." is common in Paul and Peter.

²The so-called "Western Text," D, reads "Christ Jesus" at the end of v. 21 in place of "Christ;" "Jesus Christ" appears in the manuscripts F and G, both ninth century works. For a discussion of the reliability of Codex D, Bezae Cantabrigiensis, cf. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), especially pp. 68-69. They conclude: "The text found in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D) of the fifth century, however, represents (in its exemplar) the achievement of an outstanding early theologian of the third/fourth century. In its day it attracted only a limited following; what the nineteen/twentieth century has made of it is incredible." (*Ibid.*, 69)

³A number of manuscripts insert a main verb here. ὑποτασσεσθεσαν, a third person plural imperative, appears in \aleph A I P and a number of other witnesses. ὑποτάσσεθε, a second person plural middle imperative, is read by the Majority text and, in a different sequence, by D F G. Omission of the finite verb occurs in P46 and B as well as several church fathers. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971) [hereafter *TCGNT*] companion to the third edition of the *United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* [hereafter *UBSGNT* 3rd], writes: "A majority of the Committee preferred the shorter reading, which accords with the succinct style of the author's admonitions, and explained the other readings as expansions introduced for the sake of clarity, the main verb being required especially when the words Αἱ γυναῖκες stood at the beginning of a scripture lesson." (609) The *UBSGNT* 3rd rates the omission of the main verb with a {C}; the fourth edition upgrades the rating to {B}.

Husbands, love the wives,⁴ just as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her, so that she might be pure, cleansed by the washing with water in the Word, so that He might present (her) to Himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any of these things, but so that she might be holy and blameless. So also men also ought to love their own wives as their own bodies. The one loving his own wife loves himself. For no one at any time his own flesh hated, but he feeds and cares for it, just as also Christ⁵ the church, for members we are of His Body. "For this a man will leave his father and mother and join with his wife, and the two will be one flesh."⁶ This mystery is great; but I speak about Christ and about the church. In any case,⁷ you also, each one, each his own wife so let him love as himself, and the wife should fear the husband.

Most of the variants in this section do not significantly affect the passage.⁸ One variant, however,

⁴ὁμῶν appears at this point in F G and some versions. ἐαυτῶν is supported by D Ξ and the Majority Text. Both are attempts to clarify the meaning. The terse style in this section supports the shorter reading, as do the majority of manuscripts.

⁵κύριος is read by D2 and the Majority Text.

⁶Two minor variations occur in this verse. The definite articles which modify "father" and "mother" are absent in some witnesses and the preposition πρὸς is replaced by the definite article in the dative, τῆ, before "his wife." Neither directly affects the meaning. The text read by Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979) [hereafter N26] is closer to the Septuagint in both variants.

⁷πλὴν is a Pauline marker that he is concluding one topic and preparing to move on to another. *BDF* §448 note that πλὴν "means more nearly 'only, in any case,' in Paul, used to conclude a discussion and emphasize what is essential." He uses πλὴν with this meaning also in 1 Cor. 11:11. Along with Phil. 1:18; 3:16 and 4:14, these five appearances are the only place in the Pauline corpus where πλὴν occurs.

⁸In addition to those discussed above, it may be noted that Codex Vaticanus (B) and other witnesses invert the words ἐστὶν κεφαλή in v. 23. Vaticanus and Ξ with

appears at the end of verse 30 that adds Gen. 2:23

(according to the Septuagint).⁹ Bruce Metzger writes:

"although it is possible that the shorter text. . . may have arisen by accidental omission occasioned by homoeoteleuton (αὐτοῦ. . . αὐτοῦ), it is more probable that the longer readings reflect various scribal expansions"¹⁰

Peter Rogers disagrees, suggesting that the words were original ". . . but were omitted by someone caught up in the Gnostic controversy of the second century"¹¹ He believes it serves as something of a "bridge" in the flow of the argument. While this suggestion is appealing, it must be said that the weight of the textual evidence favors the exclusion of this phrase. Andrew Lincoln adds:

". . . the longer reading raises problems for the consistency of the use of 'body' imagery in the letter as well as problems of sense (what does it mean to be members of Christ's bones?). The longer reading is most plausibly

Ambrosiaster omit the comparative adverb ὡς in v. 24. A number of sequence variations occur in v. 28, none of which affect the sense of the passage.

⁹Several manuscripts insert part of Gen. 2:23 in the Septuagint in anticipation of Paul's quotation of Gen. 2:24 in v. 31. The addition is supported by the second hand of \aleph D F G (K) Ψ and the Majority text, the Old Latin and some of the Syriac versions. The shorter reading appears in \aleph^* A B 048. 6. 33. 81. 1739*. 1881. 2464 and the Vulgate manuscripts.

¹⁰Bruce Metzger, *TCGNT*, 609.

¹¹Peter R. Rodgers, "The Allusion to Genesis 2:23 at Ephesians 5:30," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990): 93.

explained as a later addition under the influence of the OT citation in v 31."¹²

While Christians are to submit to one another generally, the submission of wives to their own husbands is particular and resembles the submission of the church to Christ. The husband is to his wife as Christ is to the church, and for this reason the wife is subject to the husband as the church is to Christ. Lincoln explains:

[At this point] in Ephesians mutual submission coexists with a hierarchy of roles within the household. Believers should not insist on getting their own way, so there is a general sense in which husbands are to have a submissive attitude to wives, putting their wives' interests before their own, and similarly parents to children and masters to slaves. But this does not eliminate the more specific roles in which wives are to submit to husbands, children to parents, and slaves to masters.¹³

Ephesians 5:21

Verse 21 serves as a "hinge verse," uniting the previous section with that which follows. It summarizes and

¹²Andrew Lincoln, *Ephesians* (Waco: Word Books, 1990): 351, n.d. It should also be noted that Gen. 2:24 is one of the most quoted passages in the New Testament (four times: Mt. 19:5; Mk. 10:7; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:31) and in no case is Gen. 2:23 included.

¹³Andrew Lincoln, 366. Paul offers an abbreviated version of this passage in Colossians 3:18-19 where he calls wives to submit to their husbands, as is fitting (ἀνῆκεν) in the Lord and for men to love (ἀγαπάτε) their wives and not embitter them. The term ἀνῆκεν occurs in the domain of "proper, improper" and is defined: "to be fitting or right, with the implication of possible moral judgment involved." (Cf. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989) [hereafter Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*] 66.1.)

points forward at the same time. There are three possible solutions: group verse 21 with verse 20 (as *UBSGNT* 3rd did); set verse 21 apart as a separate paragraph by itself (as the *Textus Receptus* and New Revised Standard versions have done); or attach it to verse 22 (as *UBSGNT* 4th and *N26* have done). Verse 21 concludes the section comprised by 4:17-5:20, where Paul has called his readers to think and live in the light, differently from the way of the world. It serves as a link, joining the theme of the previous section to that which follows, a concrete application of 4:17-5:20. Lincoln observes:

5:21-33 can be seen as a unit. Its first verse acts as a link, completing the thought of 5:18-20 about being filled with the Spirit and at the same time introducing a new topic, submission, which is to be developed in the rest of the passage. Its introductory function is twofold. Not only does the admonition of v 22 depend on the participle of v 21 for its sense, but the notion of fear in the latter verse also provides the opening element of an *inclusio* which will be completed in v 33.¹⁴

Verse 21 serves as a transition to the entire section on household duties (Eph. 5:22-6:9). The first section concerns wives (5:22-24) and husbands (5:25-33); the second, children (6:1-3) and fathers (6:4); the third, slaves (6:5-8) and slave-owners (6:9). Paul opens his remarks to children (6:1) and to slaves (6:5) with the imperative ὑπακούετε followed by the object in the dative. Children are told to obey their parents (τοῖς γονεῦσιν) "in the Lord"

¹⁴Andrew Lincoln, 352.

(ἐν κυρίῳ).¹⁵ Slaves are instructed to obey their "masters according to the flesh" (τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις) "as Christ" (ὡς τῷ χριστῷ). If this pattern is read at 5:22, then the ellipsized verb is not "submit" (drawn from v. 21, a participle with imperatival force) but rather "obey" (ὕπακούετε).¹⁶ This would present a three-fold pairing of the pattern: wives—children—slaves are directed to obey someone in a position of authority over them: husbands—parents—masters. They are told that this obedience is to be rendered in the same manner as obedience is given to the Lord, Jesus. Paul may have omitted the verb ὑπακούετε in Eph. 5:22, at least in part, so as to form an

¹⁵The prepositional phrase ἐν κυρίῳ is enclosed in brackets by N26 and is given a {C} rating by UBS [4th]. Although it is not discussed by Metzger, *TCGNT*, it is well supported by P46 & A D1 Ψ 075 0150 6 133 81 104 256 263 365 *et alia*, including some old Latin, the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Coptic, the Armenian; Origen, Basil, Chrysostom and others. The phrase is omitted by B D* F G, some old Latin, Marcion, Cyprian and Ambrosiaster.

¹⁶The two semantic fields of ὑποτάσσω and ὑπακούω overlap extensively and appear together in 1 Peter 3:5-6 where Christian wives are encouraged to adorn their lives by submitting (ὑποτασσόμεναι) themselves to their own husbands as Sarah obeyed (ὑπήκουσιν) Abraham, calling him "lord" (κύριον). Cf. Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 36.15 and 36.18, both under the subdomain of "obey, disobey." Recognizing that Paul omitted ὑπακούω rather than ὑποτάσσω, however, makes it more difficult to argue that Paul does not see any hierarchy in marriage. The egalitarian approach which emphasizes v. 21 and claims mutual submission as the focus of v. 22 then misses the point, as represented by Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 158, who writes: "Yes, the wife should submit to her husband; but the husband, following Christ's example of self-sacrificial service for his wife, also must submit himself to his wife."

inclusio with 5:24, where the church submits to Christ. This, then, becomes a model for wives to (submit to) their husbands in everything.¹⁷ Verse 21 brings before the reader the idea of mutual submission and sets the tone for the household table of duties which follows, as George Knight has observed: "The mutual submission to which all are called and that defines the larger context and sets the tone does not, therefore, rule out the specific and different roles and relationships to which husbands and wives are called in the verses addressed to them."¹⁸

Ephesians 5:22-24

The first problem encountered by the reader in this paragraph is the identity of γυναίκα and ἀνὴρ. Does Paul mean "wife" and "husband" or does he mean "woman" and "man?" The semantic range of these term includes both domains.¹⁹

¹⁷George W. Knight III, "Husbands and Wives as Analogues of Christ and the Church: Ephesians 5:21-33 and Colossians 3:18-19," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1991), [hereafter *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*], 170, explains that "the phrase is all-encompassing: submission must encompass all aspects of life." He also suggests that the "one-flesh unity" is in view and while this is possible for 5:22-33, it is unlikely for the child-parent relationship of 6:1-4 or the slave-master relationship of 6:5-9.

¹⁸George W. Knight III, 168.

¹⁹For ἀνὴρ, cf. Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 9.24 ("man") and 10.53 ("husband"). ἀνὴρ may also denote "human being" (9.1), serving as a synonym for ἄνθρωπος (as in Rom. 4:8; Mt. 14:35). Louw & Nida comment: "It is not uncommon in languages for a term which is often used to refer to an adult male to be employed also in a generic sense of

Context usually makes clear which sense is intended and the marker appears in verse 22 when Paul uses the definite article and adjective combination τοῖς ἰδίος with ἀνδράσιν. However, in verse 23 the nouns γυνή and ἀνὴρ appear absolutely, without any markers to indicate the domain of "husband and wife." Paul does, however, use the definite article with γυναικός. It may be that he uses the definite article anaphorically to refer back to verse 22. The objection to taking the article anaphorically is that the noun γυναῖκες in verse 22 is in the plural, whereas γυναικός in verse 23 is singular. If not anaphoric, an articular noun may be generic. Murray J. Harris describes the generic use of the articular noun as "specifying (in the singular) a class or species as represented by an individual or (in the plural) a class as such and not as an aggregate of individuals."²⁰

'person.' This is especially true when such terms are used in the plural form." (1:104)

The word γυνή may indicate a "woman" (Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 9.34) or more specifically, a "wife" (10.54). Louw & Nida remark: "The distinctions in meaning of γυνή 'woman' (9.34) and γυνή 'wife' parallel those involving ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος (see 10.53). A number of languages, however, employ essentially the same usage as Greek in that a wife is simply called 'his woman,' 'my woman,' etc. The contexts normally indicate clearly which meaning of γυνή is involved." (1:119)

²⁰Murray J. Harris, *Jesus as God, The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 303. In Appendix I he discusses the definite article in the Greek New Testament, including the Canon of Apollonius and Colwell's "Rules" (301-13).

This understanding of the definite article makes possible a consistent reading of these verses. "The wives" of v. 22 represents the class of married women. They are to submit to "their own husbands" because the relationship between "woman" (the singular of v. 23 specifying the class "adult female") and the "man" (an adult male) requires it. Paul explains that this is true because man, in relation to the woman, is her "head" even as Christ, in relation to the church, is her "head."²¹

Christian wives submit to their own husbands because the identity of the "woman" in relation to the "man," true of every woman and every man whether married or single,

²¹ἐκκλησία, a feminine noun, is represented in these verses as a bride, the only feminine image of the church in the New Testament. The term ἐκκλησία is applied to God's New Testament people by Jesus in Matt. 16:18; 18:17 and occurs throughout Acts, the Pauline corpus and Revelation (as well as Hebrews, James and 3 John). F. F. Bruce summarizes its use, commenting on 1 Thessalonians 1:1. "The noun ἐκκλησία, 'church, assembly' would not have any sacral association in the minds of recent converts from paganism: hence it is qualified by words which declare plainly whose 'assembly' it is to which the converts now belong. Gk. ἐκκλησία was quickly specialized among Gentile Christians to designate a company of believers in Jesus; its synonym συναγωγή, 'synagogue' was increasingly reserved to denote a Jewish congregation. The phrase ἐκκλησία κυρίου is found occasionally in Septuagint to denote the people of Israel as 'the assembly of the LORD' (Heb. אֲסֶפְתָּהּ יְהוָה)--repeatedly so in the early part of Deut 23. But God's ἐκκλησία in the New Testament age has no national frontiers; it comprises Jewish and Gentile believers without distinction." 1 & 2 Thessalonians Waco: Word Books, (1992), 7. William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) [hereafter BAGD], 240-41, cite Deut. 31:30; Judg. 20:2; 1 Sam. 17:47; 1 Kings 8:14 as additional Septuagintal uses of ἐκκλησία for the assembly of God's people.

necessitates submission. Four questions need to be answered: What does Paul mean by "submit"? Why is this true of Christian women in light of Gal. 3:27-28? What is the source of Paul's principle in verse 23, an explanation of verse 22 introduced by the conjunction ὅτι? From where does Paul draw the image of the church as the bride of Christ, which makes the mutual analogy in this section possible?

ὑποτάσσω

Paul's use of ὑποτάσσω reveals an ability to move from one meaning to another (often rapidly).²² In 5:21, Paul uses ὑποτάσσω to convey an attitude of humility and service inherent in the command to love the neighbor as the self.²³ Paul does not want the reader to understand in 5:21 that every Christian is obligated to carry out the wishes of every other Christian. His point is that the Christian's

²²In the active, ὑποτάσσω occurs always in relationship to Christ (with the background of Ps. 8:6) with one exception: Rom. 8:20 where all creations "became subject" to vanity on account of Adam. (Cf. Gerhard Delling, "ὑποτάσσω," *TDNT* 8:41.) ὑποτάσσω appears in the middle voice in a variety of contexts: submission to God (James 4:8), to the discipline of God (Heb. 12:9) and of Jesus to His parents (Luke 2:51). It marks the distinctive relation of women to men and is frequently used by Paul for that: Col. 3:18; Eph. 5:22-24; Tit. 2:5; 1 Cor. 11:3; 14:34; cf. 1 Pet. 3:1,6. It can convey submission to governing authorities (Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13-14) and those for whom the Christian works (Tit. 2:9; 1 Pet. 2:18; Eph. 6:5-9. It appears twice in admonitions to mutual submission (Eph. 5:21; 1 Pet. 5:5).

²³Cf. Leviticus 19:18, which is echoed in 5:33 as well. Paul expands this in Philippians 2:1-11 and Peter repeats it in 1 Peter 5:1-7.

life is a life of service to the Lord Jesus through service to those around him, particularly fellow Christians.²⁴ This is the broad context in which the entire table of household duties (5:22-6:9) is discussed. In humility (stressing obedience to the will of the other rather than the self)²⁵ each Christian is to look not only to himself but also to others (cf. Philippians 2:3,4).²⁶

Paul shifts within the semantic field of ὑποτάσσω as he moves to the subject of marriage. He seems to have in mind the idea of "obey" as the shift to the verb ὑπακούετε indicates in 6:1 (considering child-parent relationships) and 6:5 (regarding slave-master relationships).²⁷ On the question of whether the verb ὑποτάσσω includes "obedience", Lincoln remarks:

²⁴The same point is made by Jesus as He commands His followers to obey the injunction of Lev. 19:18; cf. Matt. 19:19; 22:39; compare Matt. 25:31-46.

²⁵For this emphasis, cf. Walter Grundmann, "ταπεινώω," *TDNT* 8:1-26, esp. 21-22.

²⁶As Gerhard Delling notes in his article on ὑποτάσσω in *TDNT* 8:27-48: ". . . the general rule demands readiness to renounce one's own will for the sake of others . . . and to give precedence to others." (45)

²⁷A. T. Lincoln offers a helpful insight when he suggest that these relationships are examined as the smallest constituent parts of a larger whole. He cites Aristotle who worked with these same three relationships as the starting point for a discussion of the state (357). He comments: "The religious dimension of this situation was also crucial. In Greco-Roman culture, wives, children, and slaves were expected to accept the religion of the male head of the household, the *paterfamilias*, and so religious groups that attracted women and slaves were particularly seen as potentially subversive of societal stability." (358)

But does the fact that there are varieties of subordination and that the subordination is willing mean that a distinction should be made, as is done by some . . . between subordination and obedience? In support of such a distinction, it is pointed out that the verb used for the attitude required from wives is ὑποτάσσεσθαι, "to submit, be subordinate," while that employed in the case of children and slaves is ὑπακούειν, "to obey." But this is to drive a wedge between terms that are frequently synonymous. To be sure, "to submit" is the broader term, but to subordinate oneself to another may well entail being willing to obey that person, and such obedience would certainly have been seen as part of a wife's role in relation to her husband in most parts of the ancient world. Certainly also, the Church's subordination to Christ, on which the wife's subordination to her husband is based in v 24, would be seen as involving glad obedience. . . . There is obvious a difference between willing submission and imposed obedience but hardly a major distinction between voluntary subordination and voluntary obedience. . . . Elsewhere in the NT, in 1 Pet 3:5,6, submission of wives to husbands and obedience of wives to husbands are explicitly paralleled.²⁸

Paul has already connected ὑποτάσσω and the believer's relationship with the Lord in verse 21,²⁹ and he

²⁸A. T. Lincoln, 367-68. Cf. also Louw & Nida, 36.18 and 37.41.

²⁹What Paul means by the phrase "in the fear of the Lord" is explained by Lincoln, 366-67: "'Fear' need not involve fright or terror but conveys a more serious sense of reverence and obligation of a creature to the Creator, producing obedience to his will (cf. also H. R. Balz, 'φόβος' TDNT 9:189-219). In Paul's writings 'fear of the Lord' or 'fear of Christ' is virtually interchangeable with 'fear of God.' 2 Cor 5:11 sounds an eschatological note, 'knowing the fear of the Lord, we persuade people,' while 2 Cor 7:1 exhorts that holiness should be made perfect in the fear of God (cf. also Phil 2:12). Col 3:22 had talked about 'fearing the Lord' as a motivation for slaves, but here it is the attitude all believers are to take. Just as in the OT the guiding principle for wise living within the covenant was the fear of Yahweh, so now the writer of Ephesians indicates that the overriding motivation for wise living (cf. v 15) and relationships within the new community must be the fear of Christ."

does so again as he compares the submission she renders to her husband to the submission the church gives to the Lord, Jesus Christ. He does not imply that they are identical, for submission to Christ Jesus overrides all other obligations. The submission she offers her husband is: 1) done in faith in Jesus Christ and in response to the Gospel; 2) as extensive of her submission to Jesus (there is no part of her life reserved from him); 3) as full as that given to the Lord (no half-hearted, grudging submission but submission from the heart).

Paul's instructions in light of Gal. 3:27-28

"For whoever is baptized into Christ, you have put on Christ. There is³⁰ neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither 'male and female;' for you are all³¹ one in Christ Jesus."

A number of variant readings have developed towards the end of verse 28, apparently because copyists felt a certain awkwardness at this point and attempted to make it more smooth.³² The reader is struck, however, by a break in

³⁰ἐνι, noted by *BDF* §98 as an example of transition to the deponent inflection. The term ἐνι appears in place of ἐνεσθιν and appears in the New Testament denoting "there is," always with a negative.

³¹*N26* and *UBSGNT* 4th both accept πάντες here rather than the variant reading, ἅπαντες, supported by Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and the second hand of Vaticanus. There is no difference in meaning, but *BDF* §275 does not that πάντες more regularly follows vowels (as is the case here) and ἅπαντες follows consonants.

³²The variety of variant readings coupled with the support of Vaticanus establish the genuineness of the text as in the body of *N26* and *UBSGNT* 4th, the latter of which

the pattern of conjunctions in verse 28. Paul uses οὐδὲ, "nor," for the first and second pairs; in the third pair, however, he writes καὶ.³³ A second unusual feature of the third pair is that Paul avoids ἀνὴρ and γύνη in favor of ἄρσεν and θήλυ.

This is the reading of the Septuagint at Gen. 1:27.

F. F. Bruce explains:

There is a slight change of construction here (with no substantial change in meaning): Paul does not say, following the precedent of the two companion clauses, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν οὐδὲ θήλυ. The reason for the change is probably the influence of Gn. 1:27, ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, 'he made them male and female' (cf. Mk. 10:6). In Christ, on the contrary, 'there is no "male and female".'³⁴

It would seem that Paul has intentionally used Gen. 1:27 to emphasize the unity of all Christians, baptized into one Baptism, clothed with the Image of God, Jesus Christ.³⁵ Throughout the third chapter of Galatians, Paul is concerned to show the unity of God and His plan for man's salvation. The Word of God is not self-contradictory because the Gospel

gives it an {A} rating.

³³BDF §446 notes the use of καὶ in this verse and comment "It is never strictly disjunctive, but is just as much copulative. . . ." Thus, translating καὶ as "nor" would seem to be inappropriate.

³⁴F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 189. He goes on to cite evidence from Gnostic writers who believed that mankind would be reunited at the end of time into the original androgenous state.

³⁵Cf. Col. 1:15 and the discussion on Jesus as the Image of God, *par excellence*, below.

promise to Abraham came before the command to circumcise. God's plan always had been to become the curse of the Law in the Person of His Son, Jesus (3:13-14). God's covenant of grace, established with Abraham and his descendants, predates not only circumcision but also the Law (which was never intended as a means for salvation—there simply cannot be any saving righteousness based on the Law, for that is a contradiction in terms; 3:15-18). God is One (3:21) and the Law's pedagogical job is now over (3:3:23-25). In Christ Jesus, man is now as he was intended to be, unified through Baptism by the One Spirit. Paul does not address distinctions between men and women in relation to each other.³⁶ He does proclaim the Gospel for all people, regardless of any distinction, and their unity in Jesus Christ.

The Image of the Church as a Bride

Paul works with the image of the church as Christ's bride in 5:22-24 and expands it in 5:26-27. This image was not original to Paul, but is found in several of the Old Testament prophets.

Hosea

In Hosea the bride image represents Israel in her

³⁶Paul discusses this in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 where he writes, "Now I want you to know that of every man, the head is Christ, and the head of woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." (1 Cor. 11:3)

relationship with Yahweh. Hosea marries Gomer, at God's command. She is described as "a woman/wife of fornications" (אִשָּׁה זָנוּוֹת, Hos. 1:2)³⁷ with whom Hosea is to produce "children of fornications" (בְּנֵי זָנוּוֹת) because the land of Israel has "fornicated." (זָנוּהוּ אֶרֶץ הָאֱרֶץ).³⁸ The image of Israel as a bride in Hosea is a negative image, used to picture the reprehensive nature of Israel's idolatry and immorality.³⁹ Hosea's use of this image extends beyond the account of his marriage in the first three chapters, as Richard Batey explains.

For Hosea the complex of preparatory events became focused at the Exodus, for here Yahweh dramatically revealed his choice and love of Israel (Hos. 12:9;

³⁷Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990) [hereafter *Hebrew Syntax*], 121 note that the plural form may be used to denote "a repeated series of actions or a habitual behavior" and that it may have an abstract sense. They translate the phrase אִשָּׁה זָנוּוֹת in Hos. 1:2 as "adulterous wife."

³⁸זָנוּהוּ אֶרֶץ הָאֱרֶץ is a qal infinitive absolute verb followed by a qal imperfect third person feminine singular verb. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, 581, state that an infinitive absolute may intensify a finite verb (as well as serve as a word of command and function as a finite verb). This seems to be the intent in Hos. 1:2 and is captured by the New International Version [hereafter *NIV*], "the land is guilty of the vilest adultery."

³⁹It may be noted that Gomer is not chosen because she is exceptionally wicked. Rather, the point is that she comes from the mainstream and represents Israel as it is on the average. Douglas Stuart writes: "Israel's waywardness and infidelity constitute a national 'prostitution'; Gomer, as a citizen of that thoroughly wayward nation is described, just as any Israelite woman could be, as אִשָּׁה זָנוּוֹת precisely because she is a *typical* Israelite, and this is an indictment in itself." (Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah* [Waco: Word Books, 1987], 26.)

13:4-5). With this historical act and the giving and receiving of the covenant at Sinai, the Lord married his people. Israel had "honeymooned" with Yahweh in the desert wanderings and it is with a note of pathos that Hosea represented the Lord as saying, "It was I who knew you in the wilderness . . ." (Hosea 13:5). Israel's faithfulness, as also the fidelity of Hosea's wife, Gomer, was transient. "Like a morning cloud, like the dew that goes early away," her love vanished.⁴⁰

The image of Israel as Yahweh's bride in Hosea is not uniformly negative, however. In Hosea 2:16-25 [Eng. 2:14-23], the prophet pictures Yahweh as a husband who brings his bride back into the wilderness (יַדְבָּר, 2:15) to reprise their relationship, a kind of "second honeymoon."⁴¹ She will call Him her "husband" (אִישׁ, 2:18) and never again (לֹא . . . יִקְרָא) will she call Him her "baal" (בַּעַל). He promises to betroth her (אָרַשׁ)⁴² forever (לְעוֹלָם) in righteousness (צְדָקָה), justice (מִשְׁפָּט), covenant love (חֶסֶד), faithfulness (אֱמוּנָה) and she will acknowledge (תִּשְׁבַּח) Yahweh.

⁴⁰Richard A. Batey, *New Testament Nuptial Imagery* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), 4-5. He also notes Hosea's condemnation of Israel's immorality (Hos. 4:13; 9:1) and the irony of Israel as a heifer seeking Baal's bullish attentions (Hos. 4:16; cf. Hos. 13:2). The word translated by Batey as "fidelity" is חֶסֶד. Israel's חֶסֶד fails while Yahweh's חֶסֶד remains.

⁴¹So labelled by Richard A. Batey, 6.

⁴²Stuart notes: "The betrothal metaphor is expressed dramatically via the decisive threefold repetition of the verb אָרַשׁ "to betroth" in the first person common singular form. . . . The verb אָרַשׁ (piel) refers to the ancient Israelite practice of settling the marriage contractually by the groom's payment of the bride-price to the bride's father. This was the final step in the courtship process, virtually equivalent in legal status to the wedding ceremony. After the betrothal, cohabitation would follow at an arranged time." (Douglas Stuart, 59)

This cluster of terms, pregnant with salvation-history meaning,⁴³ reflects the hope that Yahweh will not abandon His faithless bride. The promise is that He will someday bring her back fully to Him. Batey discusses the nature of this hope.

Within the marriage metaphor Hosea draws together various strands of Israelite faith, but preeminently the image is one of love—frustrated love. God's love has taken the initiative, he has sustained the covenant bond, he has pursued his people, but they will not respond. In distinction to the Canaanite emphasis on the cycle of nature, Hosea viewed the marriage of Yahweh to Israel in terms of a linear history. In the unrepeatable events of the past Hosea perceived the dynamic interplay of the Lord and his people. The metaphor also contains an emphasis on the holiness of God, who like a rejected husband will not be indifferent. The jealousy of Yahweh uniquely combines the attributes of love and justice. Therefore, the metaphor also has the capacity to express alienation, wrath, and judgment; but, because Israel is the wife of Yahweh there is implicitly the element of hope as well. . . .⁴⁴

The bridal image is capable of carrying both judgment and hope. Because of its ability to do so, later prophets were able to use the bride language as well, particularly in the covenant context.

⁴³Several of these terms appear together in other parts of Hosea. Negatively, covenant love (לֶחֶם), faith (אֱמוּנָה) and the acknowledgement (יָדָעַתְּ) of Yahweh are lacking in the land of Israel in 4:1. Positively, Yahweh expresses His preference for covenant love (לֶחֶם) and the acknowledgement (יָדָעַתְּ) of God. Similarly righteousness and covenant love (לֶחֶם) appear in 10:12, in God's call for repentance. In presenting the same call repentance, Hosea calls for covenant love (לֶחֶם) and justice in 12:7 [Eng. 6].

⁴⁴Richard A. Batey, 6. He notes that this hope becomes more explicit in other sections of the work, which he labels "later additions."

Jeremiah

Jeremiah delivers the message of Yahweh to his people in 2:2 in bride language: "I remember the covenant love (אָהַבָה) of your youth (בְּעִוְנוֹתַי), the love (אָהַבָה)⁴⁵ at the time of your betrothal."⁴⁶ In words reminiscent of Hosea 6:4, Yahweh files His complaint against His bride, Israel, who has violated her marriage vow at Sinai. She was reserved for Yahweh and set apart (שָׁרְיָה, Jer. 2:3) for Him alone. Yet she has given herself to other gods (Jer. 4:6-13). Peter Craigie elaborates.

The focus of the language is not so much the evocation of the "desert ideal" . . . as it is an elaboration upon the Sinai Covenant. The covenant, metaphorically speaking, has been the marriage of Israel and God, born and nourished in youthful love that could not be diminished or weakened by the experience of wilderness. . . . The later expansions of the theme of love, both in this chapter and elsewhere in Jeremiah, will make it clear that love and marriage are more than metaphors in v 2. The essence of the Sinai covenant had been

⁴⁵אָהַבָה, a feminine singular noun in the construct state, is definite even though anarthrous. On the construct state, cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, 138-40.

⁴⁶The nominal is אָהַבָה, the feminine noun אָהַבָה in the plural with the second person singular feminine suffix, ׀-. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, 7.4.2 note that an abstract noun is frequently expressed by a plural and may refer to states or conditions (as is the case here). The noun אָהַבָה occurs six times in the Song of Solomon (4:8-5:1) for "bride" and signals the idea of "reserved" or "closeted" (cf. Joel 2:16). The abstract noun אָהַבָה occurs only here in the Old Testament. The emphasis is on the exclusive nature of the covenant relationship. As a bride is reserved exclusively for her husband, so Israel is exclusively for Yahweh. Cf. John N. Oswalt, "אָהַבָה," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), [hereafter *TWOT*] 1:442.

a relationship of love between God and Israel, but that relationship had implications for both religion and politics.⁴⁷

Hosea had been commanded to marry a woman of extremely loose morality; Jeremiah was commanded not to marry at all (Jer. 16:1-9), living out the state of Yahweh whose bride had deserted Him for others (Jer. 3:1-4). Judah refused to learn the lesson of her older sister, Israel, whom Yahweh had divorced and sent away (Jer. 3:6-10). The negative use of this bride image extends also to Ezekiel, whose own wife died, leaving him alone (Ezek. 24:16-25).

Ezekiel

Ezekiel combines the images of bride and child, picturing Judah as a foundling who is rescued by Yahweh in the desert and later wedded to Him (Ezek. 16:4,15). Batey continues:

The Lord had compassion on her and nurtured her to full maidenhood. He loved her and plighted to her his troth in granting the covenant (Ezek. 16:8; cf. Mal. 2:14; Prov. 2:17). On her he lavished gifts: dainties, silk, fine linen, jewelry, silver and gold; her beauty became renowned among the nations. "But you trusted in your beauty, and played the harlot because of your renown, and lavished your

⁴⁷Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley and Joel F. Drinkard, Jr., *Jeremiah 1-25* (Waco: Word Books, 1991), 24, commenting on Jer. 2:2. The forward in this volume makes plain that Dr. Craigie was the sole author of the commentary on 1:1 through 8:3, completed prior to his death.

Craigie points out that Jeremiah is not "idealizing" the desert experience (contra to Richard A. Batey, 6). As a time of testing, the desert experience bonded Israel to God, as often happens in the difficult first years of marriage between husband and wife (noted by Craigie, 24).

harlotries on any passer-by" (Ezek. 16:15). . . .
For her the Lord would make the punishment fit the
crime.⁴⁸

The punishment is identified as a "handing over" of Yahweh's bride to her lovers (Ezek. 16:35-39), resulting in her humiliation and destruction. However, as with Hosea and Jeremiah, the destruction is not complete. The prophet sounds a note of hope within this image of God's people as His bride. Yahweh remains faithful to His covenant (א'ן), His "wedding vows" (Ezek. 16:60).

Isaiah

This note of hope reaches its climax with the prophet Isaiah.⁴⁹ John Oswalt summarizes:

Isaiah sees redeemed Israel as God's chosen bride, responsible to him alone, decking herself with jewels and a robe of righteousness in preparation for his coming (49:18; 61:10). In that day, says Isaiah, God will delight over her as a bride-groom over a bride (62:5).⁵⁰

Yahweh calls back the bride He had rejected earlier (Is. 54:6). His motives for doing so are spelled out in Is. 54:7-9 where a cluster of theologically significant words

⁴⁸Richard A. Batey, 7-8. He also discusses the figure in Ezekiel 16 of Oholah and Oholibah and the shameful practices in Ezekiel 23 with the pursuant consequences. Yet all hope was not lost (Ezek. 23:49).

⁴⁹It may be noted that of these four prophets, only Isaiah seemed to have a good marriage not interrupted by death or desertion.

⁵⁰John N. Oswalt, "א'ן," *TWOT* 1:442. He states: "It is evident that this imagery provides the prototype for the figure of the Church as the Bride of Christ in the New Testament (Rev. 21:2)." (*Ibid.*)

occur. Yahweh promises that with an everlasting covenant love (עוֹלָם וָעֶד) He will have compassion on her (רַחֲמֵיךָ) and identifies Himself as "your Redeemer Yahweh" (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ), Is. 54:8).⁵¹ Of particular importance is the appellative אֱלֹהֵיךָ.

The term אֱלֹהֵיךָ appears in both secular and religious contexts with a common component of meaning, "to restore, repair."⁵² It is possible that the use of אֱלֹהֵיךָ in reference to Yahweh in Exodus (Ex. 6:6; 15:13; cf. also Ps. 106:10 where אֱלֹהֵיךָ appears with וְשָׁחַט in the hiphil) conveys the idea of restoration as well. God had made a covenant with the patriarchs and in the Exodus fulfilled that covenant, restoring the people to the right relationship which He had had with their forebearers (cf. Ex. 6:3, 4, 8). The One who redeems (אֱלֹהֵיךָ) restores His people to what they once had but have since lost. Helmer Ringgren summarizes the use of אֱלֹהֵיךָ in Isaiah 40-54.

The ptcp. *go'el*, "redeemer," appears as an epithet of God nine times in Deutero-Isaiah. In seven of these cases it is used as an expansion of the messenger formula. . . "Thus says Yahweh," and twice it appears in connection with . . . "Fear not" (41:14; 54:5) Once this epithet is connect with . . . "savior" (49:26). Otherwise its connection with the context is rather loose: Yahweh, the "Redeemer," helps his people (41:14; 49:7f.), defeats Babylon (43:14; 47:4), is king and

⁵¹The noun אֱלֹהֵיךָ, "redeemer," has a second person singular feminine suffix, ךָּ-, "your."

⁵²Suggested by Helmer Ringgren, "אֱלֹהֵיךָ," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren [hereafter *TDOT*], 2:351. He points out that "secular" and "religious" were not distinguished clearly by ancient man.

everlasting God (44:6), teaches and leads (48:17). Isa. 60:16 is dependent on 49:26. An overall view of the use of *go'el* in Deutero-Isaiah shows that it is used as a stereotyped divine epithet, which can even be used without any direct connection with a specific redemption mentioned in the context.⁵³

The relation of לָאֵל to Yahweh as the "husband" or "bridegroom" of Israel appears most clearly in Is. 54:5. There Yahweh refers to Himself as Israel's husband (יְיָ לְעַלְלֵי)⁵⁴ in parallel structure with "redeemer" (יְיָ לָאֵל). This close connection between the figure of a redeemer and the figure of a bridegroom extends back as far as the book of Ruth, where Boaz acts as the "kinsman-redeemer" (לָאֵל , Ruth 4) and marries Ruth, through which union David, ancestor of the Messiah, is born (Ruth 4:18-22). The figure of the bridegroom in Isaiah and Ruth is therefore eschatological, pointing forward to the rescue which Yahweh will accomplish for His people. The figure of the bridegroom communicates hope to the reader. This is particularly true in Isaiah, where the prophet writes about restoration through the coming Messiah and Messianic Age.

In the New Testament Paul extends the use of this image of bride and groom. In 2 Cor. 11:2-3 he writes:

For I am jealous for you with a divine jealousy, for

⁵³Helmer Ringgren, " לָאֵל ," *TDOT* 2:354-55.

⁵⁴ יְיָ לְעַלְלֵי is a qal act participle in the plural with a second person singular feminine suffix, לְ -. Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, 123, observe that Hebrew use the plural honorifically, particularly with participles which refer to God. A number of such participles occur in this verse.

I betrothed⁵⁵ you to one husband, a pure virgin to present to Christ; but I am afraid lest,⁵⁶ as the snake deceived Eve by its trickery,⁵⁷ your minds⁵⁸ would be seduced⁵⁹ from⁶⁰ the sincerity⁶¹ [and

⁵⁵ἡρμοσάμην, a first person singular aorist verb in the middle voice from the root ἀρμόζω. this root can denote "to fit, fit together, join or give in marriage" and serves as a technical term for betrothal in Pindar and Herodotus (fifth century B.C.). The middle voice is used for the active "in one isolated case" (*BAGD*, s.v. ἀρμόζω, 107; cf. also *BDF* §316.1) . The word occurs only here in the New Testament.

⁵⁶μή may be used in an expression of apprehension in which the anxiety is directed towards warding off something. It is combined in classical with the subjunctive if the outcome is still dependent on the will and with the indicative if directed towards something which has already taken place. Thus, Paul uses the indicative mood for ἐξηπάτησεν (the deception has already taken place) and the subjunctive mood for ὀθαρῆ (a ruination which may or may not yet occur). The enclitic πως is added to strengthen the expression. Cf. *BDF* § 370.1.

⁵⁷πανουργία, denoting "(evil) cunning, craftiness, or trickery" appears in Luke 20:23; 1 Cor. 3:19; 2 Cor. 4:2 and here in the New Testament. The adjective, πανούργος, literally "ready to do anything," occurs in Gen. 3:1 of the serpent in the Septuagintal editions of Aquila and Symmachus. Cf. *BAGD* s.v. πανουργία, 608.

⁵⁸τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν, "your (plural) minds" (cf. *BAGD* s.v. νοήμα, 540). The neuter plural functions as a singular with the verb ὀθαρῆ.

⁵⁹ὀθαρῆ, a third person singular aorist passive subjunctive verb from the root ὀθεῖρω. This word is used to denote the seduction of a virgin in Euripides (fifth century B.C.), Diodorus Siculus (first century B.C.) and Josephus, *Antiquities* 4.252. Cf. *BAGD* s.v. ὀθεῖρω 1.c.

⁶⁰ἀπό here designates separation or alienation, a use not paralleled directly from classical Greek. Cf. *BDF* §211.

⁶¹ἀπλότης, which Paul uses again in Eph. 6:5 to characterize the attitude of slaves to their masters. The same expression which occurs in Eph. 6:5 appears in Col. 3:22, a closely parallel treatment of Christian relationships (3:18-25).

purity]⁶² which (is) in Christ Jesus.

In this passage, Paul presents a treatment of the subject addressed in Eph. 5:22-33 with one obvious difference: in 1 Cor. 11:2-3 Paul plays a role. Batey comments:

Assuming the role of a father's agent who has been delegated to betroth the father's Son, Paul uses betrothal customs to clarify the interrelationships between God, Christ, the Corinthians and himself. . . . Just as Eve had aspired to be like God, knowing good and evil, and had revealed only her nakedness, so the Corinthians were in danger of being seduced by false promises of *gnosis*.⁶³

Two elements in these verses are significant for understanding Paul's use of bride imagery for the church. First, Paul sees the church as the continuation of the Old Testament people of God, Israel. He also believes that Jesus is the bridegroom of the church as Yahweh was the bridegroom of Israel.⁶⁴ Second, the narrative of the fall

⁶²[καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος] Some confusion exists in the textual tradition at this point. Better manuscripts contain the bracketed words (P45, א*, B, and 33) but the shorter reading is more difficult. The original hand of Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D*) contains both objects of the preposition but inverts the sequence. Metzger, *TCGNT*, 581-82, proposes that the phrase καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος was added in the margin by a copyist in order to make more plain the marriage metaphor. It then became introduced into the text, either before or after ἀπλότητος. Sufficient doubt exists, however, that the phrase καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος received a {C} rating from both the *UBSGNT* third and fourth editions.

⁶³Richard A. Batey, 12. It is not necessary to conclude, as does Batey, that Paul alludes to the legend that Eve engaged in sex with the serpent, a phallic symbol in some pagan cults.

⁶⁴A point made by Philip Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962; reprinted 1992), 375.

into sin (Gen. 3:1-6) plays a role in the application and expansion of this image.

The use of the bride metaphor in the Old Testament implied hope for Israel. Yahweh, a faithful husband, does not forsake His bride in spite of her faithlessness. Thus, as noted before, the hope is eschatological. The figure of bridegroom and bride looks forward to the time when Yahweh will fulfill His promise. The faithlessness of God's people is a real threat also in the New Testament, as Paul makes clear in 2 Cor. 11:2-3. The significant difference between the bride of the Old Testament and the bride of the New Testament is that the bridegroom has come and the Messianic Age has dawned. The hope of the Old Testament has been realized (although not yet fully realized). Batey writes:

Paul's metaphor of the church as Bride implies that the End has begun. The church is the eschatological community whose betrothal is a past fact, effected by the acceptance in faith of Jesus as Christ and Lord. Betrothal in Israel, as among other nations, was a far more serious contract than are present-day engagements. During the approximate year between the betrothal and nuptial ceremonies, the betrothed girl was legally the man's wife even though she was still a virgin, since the marital relation did not begin until the nuptial ceremony To conceptualize the church as the Bride of Christ is to maintain the tension between the ethical and the eschatological—the prophetic and apocalyptic—message of the early church. Paul believes that the church lives *zwischen den Zeiten*, during which she experiences the presence of her Lord and yet hopes for a future consummation.⁶⁵

⁶⁵Richard A. Batey, 13-14. He credits C. H. Dodd with emphasizing the arrival of the *eschaton* with the ministry of Jesus but criticizes him for painting a picture of over-realized eschatology and thus losing the tension of

Ephesians 5:25-28

The relationship of individual husbands and wives, men and women, within the church during the Messianic Age, is to mirror that of Christ's relation with the church. Paul had treated this from the wife's perspective in verses 22-24 and in verses 25-28 addresses the husband's responsibilities. He sums up these duties in the simple command, ἀγαπάτε.⁶⁶

ἀγαπάω

The signifier ἀγαπάω with its cognate noun and adjective appears under the domain of "attitudes and emotions."⁶⁷ The term φιλέω (along with its noun and adjective) often serves as a synonym for ἀγαπάω with one distinction, as Louw and Nida note:

There is, however, one significant clue to possible meaningful differences in at least some contexts, namely, the fact that people are never commanded to love one another with φιλέω or φιλία, but only with ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη. Though the meanings of these terms overlap considerably in many contexts, there are probably some significant differences in certain contexts; that is to say, φιλέω and φιλία are likely to focus upon love or affection based upon interpersonal association, while ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη focus upon love and affection based on deep appreciation and high regard. On the basis of this type of distinction, one can understand some of the

the "now/not yet."

⁶⁶A second person plural present indicative active verb from the root ἀγαπᾶν.

⁶⁷According to Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 1:288. They list it in the third subdomain, "love, affection, compassion."

reasons for the use of ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη in commands to Christians to love one another.⁶⁸

We may ask at this point whether the love commanded of husband for wife is different in any respect from the love commanded of Christian for Christian. Paul makes a similar movement in Eph. 5:21 when he moves from the general, mutual submission of all Christians in verse 21 to the particular submission of wife to husband which. This latter submission he explains in verse 22 is to be "as to the Lord." It is possible, then, that there is also a difference between the general, mutual love of Christians and the love of husbands to wives. Paul explains this difference by the phrase, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς⁶⁹ and by his reference to a husband's love for his own flesh (verse 29). A husband's love for his wife seems to be much more personal than the general love of one Christian for another.

⁶⁸Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 1:294. They add, "It would, however, be quite wrong to assume that φιλέω and φιλία refer only to human love, while ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη refer to divine love. Both sets of terms are used for the total range of loving relations between people, between people and God, and between God and Jesus Christ."

⁶⁹The textual variant noted above, which reads the second person plural possessive pronoun after τὰς γυναῖκας, is more easily explained as a later addition to clarify the relation of the wives to the husbands. Husbands are to love *their own* wives (as the reverse is given in v. 22) and not just anybody's wife in this particular way. The lack of the possessive pronoun may be explain by noting the lack of personal possessive pronoun in the next colon with "the church." Christ loves the church, husband love the wives. Both "husbands" and "Christ" are arthrous in this parallel structure.

The history of ἀγαπάω seems to have begun with the Septuagint.⁷⁰ There the verb ἀγαπάω translates nineteen different Hebrew words⁷¹ and the adjective ἀγαπητός five Hebrew words. Used substantively, however, the noun ἀγάπη translates only אַהֲבָה.⁷² In Ezekiel 16 and 23 the word group emphasizes sexual desire.⁷³ Hosea and Jeremiah use the word group to denote the same concept.⁷⁴ Gottfried Quell remarks:

But even where there is no emphasizing of its unrestricted nature, the love of man and woman, and particularly of husband and wife, is generally recognised quite simply as a given natural reality, and the fact that in Israel, too, it contributed to the ennoblement of life may be seen from its elevation to the theme of poetic glorification. The

⁷⁰Gerhard Schneider, "ἀγαπάω," *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), [hereafter *EDNT*] 1:8-12 discusses this word and its cognates. He notes, "Thus far it remains disputed whether ἀγάπη is attested in literature prior to the appearance of the LXX. . . ." (9)

⁷¹Cf. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1897), fourth printing 1989, [hereafter *Hatch & Redpath, Concordance*] 1:5-6. By far the Hebrew word most frequently translated by ἀγαπάω is אַהֲבָה.

⁷²The older form of the noun, ἀγάπησις, translates both אַהֲבָה and אַהֲבָה. Cf. *Hatch & Redpath, Concordance*, 1:7.

⁷³Almost always in the piel; cf. Ezek. 16:37 for the one instance of the gal. Otherwise, cf. Ezek. 16:33, 36, 37; 23:5, 9, 22. So noted by Gottfried Quell, *TDNT*, "ἀγαπάω," 1:23, n.17.

⁷⁴Hos. 2:7; 3:1; 4:18; 9:10; Jer. 22:20, 22; 30:14. Quell assembled this list and noted that אַהֲבָה appears in the imperative in Hos. 3:1 as a euphemism for the sexual act itself. Gottfried Quell, "ἀγαπάω," *TDNT* 1:23, notes 18 and 19.

most forceful expression of the passion of love, almost hymnic in style, is to be found in the Song of Solomon 8:6. . . .⁷⁵

In contrast to this narrower use of ἀγαπάω, "when Paul speaks about love, his starting point is the love of God (Rom. 5:8; 8:37; 9:13; 2 Cor. 9:7; 13:11, 13; 1 Thess. 1:4) which he has shown in Christ. . . ."⁷⁶ The cross is the place where God brings His love to His people (Rom. 5:5). Within the people of God, this love is shared and modelled (1 Corinthians 13). Ethelbert Stauffer reveals the connection between this brotherly love and the *eschaton*.

Decisive definition is given to brotherly love, however, by the cosmic, historical καιρός (cf. Gl. 6:10; R. 13:11) which demands it. Brotherly love is the only relevant and forward-looking attitude in this time of decision between the cross and the τέλος. It stands under the sign of the cross. It is a readiness for service and sacrifice, for forgiveness and consideration, for help and sympathy, for lifting up the fallen and restoring the broken, in a fellowship with owes its very existence to the mercy of God and the sacrificial death of Christ.⁷⁷

Even the love for husband and wife is redefined by the cross, which Paul makes explicit in Eph. 5:25 (καθὼς καὶ

⁷⁵Gottfried Quell, "ἀγαπάω," *TDNT* 1:24. He cites Gen. 29:18, 20, 30, 32; 34:3; Judg. 16:4; 1 Kings 11:1-3 and refers to 1 Sam. 1:5, 8 as an example of the particular use of ἀγαπάω to signal the love of husband for wife.

⁷⁶Gerhard Schneider, *EDNT*, "ἀγαπάω," 1:10.

⁷⁷Ethelbert Stauffer, "ἀγαπάω," *TDNT* 1:51. Gottfried Quell completed the first half of the article in *TDNT* on "ἀγαπάω" and Ethelbert Stauffer wrote the latter part. He cites Galatians 5, Romans 12, and 1 Corinthians 13 (1:51, n.143).

ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν⁷⁸ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς). While it is true that gifts were exchanged at the time of betrothal and marriage, Paul's point is not that the betrothal with the church is ratified by Christ's suffering and death⁷⁹ but rather that the love a husband owes to his wife is just as complete, just as far-reaching, just as fully self-giving as Jesus' love for the church is. The cross measures the height and breadth of Christ's love for the church and becomes the standard by which husbandly love for the wife is measured. Lincoln observes the connection between the love of Christ, brotherly love and the natural love of husband to wife.

The parallel to the love of Christ for the Church means, of course, that the husband's love is one that will make even the ultimate sacrifice of life itself. In the marriage relationship this love demanded in terms of the most profound self-sacrifice is not separate from, but takes place in and through, natural affection and sexual love.⁸⁰

A husband's love for his wife is not merely an application

⁷⁸The aorist tense may indicate Paul was thinking specifically of the crucifixion at this point. Certainly παρέδωκεν points the reader in that direction.

⁷⁹Contrary to Richard Batey who states: "As betrothal was effected by the giving and receiving of a valuable gift, so Christ has given himself—a gift the value of which reveals the magnitude of his love." The gift does reveal the magnitude of Jesus' love but the illustration of the betrothal gift falls somewhat short of the reality of the cross. The betrothal gift was not the means by which the union was effected but only a part of the contract. The contract as a whole was itself the means whereby the marriage was effected.

⁸⁰Andrew Lincoln, 374. He observes the similarities and differences between Eph. 5:22-33 and Col. 3:18-19.

of Christian brotherly love but a unique relation redefined by Christ's love for the church. Husband and wife are to love one another in Christ, as are all Christians. Husband and wife are to submit to one another in Christ, as are all Christians. But the submission of wife to husband and the love of husband for wife is different from the mutual love and submission of Christians. It is different precisely in that it reflects Christ's love for the church and her responsive submission to Him. The relationship between a man and his woman, as given in Gen. 2:4-24, operates with a natural love absent between a man and his neighbor. Just as that relationship between neighbors changes when brought into the love of God in Christ Jesus, so also does the natural love of husband for wife come to reflect the love of Christ for His bride, the church.⁸¹

Baptism

In verses 26-27 Paul focuses on the relationship between Christ and the church. Although he uses language that frequently appeared in connection with brides, it is apparent that what Christ does for the church in these verses is unique. A husband cannot do for his wife what Jesus does for His bride: provide salvation.

Verse 27 begins with ἵνα, denoting the goal of the

⁸¹Gerhard Schneider, "ἀγάπη," *EDNT* 1:10, notes that five out of the ten uses of the noun ἀγάπη refers to the love of the husband for the wife.

self-sacrifice of Jesus on the cross.⁸² Jesus dies on the cross so that He might purify (ἀγιάση) His bride, the church. This connection between sacrifice (atonement) and the resultant state of purity may be clearly seen in Exod. 29:33, 36.⁸³ In verse 36 the altar of sacrifice (τὸ θυσιαστήριον) is cleansed (καθαρίζω) by purifying (ἀγιάζω) it.⁸⁴ The means of purification for the church is the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ.⁸⁵ The vehicle by which this purification is applied is described with a participial phrase, καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.

⁸²*BAGD* s.v. ἵνα, notes that this conjunction can denote purpose, aim, or goal in a final sense. It may also serve without this final meaning (or with a very weakened final sense) in an ecbatic or consecutive sense. The editors state: "In many cases purpose and result cannot be clearly differentiated, and ἵνα is used for the result which follows according to the purpose of the subj. or of God. As in Jewish and pagan thought, purpose and result are identical in declarations of the divine will. . . ." (378) It normally appears at the beginning of the clause.

⁸³So noted by Otto Procksch, "ἀγιάζω," *TDNT* 1:111. He observes that in the Septuagint, ἀγιάζω "is the usual rendering of the root וָיָץ, so that we are everywhere concerned with a cultic state. . . ."

⁸⁴The command reads: ἐν τῷ ἀγιάζειν σε, a causal or instrumental use of ἐν with the dative case. *BDF* §219, discussing the instrumental ἐν, notes that "the use of ἐν owes its extension especially to the imitation of Hebrew constructions with ׀." (117-18) Cf. also *BAGD* s.v. "ἐν," III.1.

⁸⁵Otto Procksch, "ἀγιάζω," *TDNT* 1:111-12, discusses the connection between the atonement of Christ and the purification of believers in Hebrews (e.g., 2:11, 14; 10:29; 13:12). He comments: "In Paul the thought of justification overshadows sanctification (ἀγιάζειν) as a function of God. He applies the concept passively rather than active, speaking of the sanctified." (112)

Paul uses the verb καθαρίζω only three times in the Pauline corpus.⁸⁶ In 2 Cor. 7:1 Paul encourages his readers to cleanse themselves (καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοῦς) from every defilement (μολυσμός, appearing only here in the New Testament) of flesh and spirit, producing sanctification (ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην) in the fear of the Lord. Aside from Eph. 5:26, the only other use Paul makes of the verb is in Tit. 2:14. There Paul discusses the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, "our great God and Savior,"⁸⁷ Paul continues: ". . . who gave Himself for us, so that He might redeem us from every lawlessness and cleanse (καθαρίσῃ) for Himself a chosen (περιούσιον) people.

The word περιούσιος appears only here in the New Testament but is used of Israel in Exod. 19:5; 23:22;⁸⁸ Deut. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18 and appears in the Hermetic Writings 1.19 to denote a "married man."⁸⁹ The emphasis in Exod. 19:5 seems to be on faithful obedience to Yahweh; in the

⁸⁶Understanding that Hebrews was not written by Paul. This verb appears four times in Hebrews alone (9:14, 22, 23; 10:2), more than in the thirteen Pauline epistles put together.

⁸⁷For a full treatment of Tit. 2:13 and a defense of this translation, cf. Murray J. Harris, 173-186.

⁸⁸The Septuagint at this point contains several clauses which are not in the Masoretic text, among which is "you will be a chosen people to me from all of the nations." Several of these clauses may have come into the Septuagint at Exod. 23:22 under the influence of Deut. 7:6.

⁸⁹Cf. BAGD s.v. "περιούσιος," 648; Hatch & Redpath, *Concordance*, 2:1125.

Septuagint of Ex. 23:22 and in Deut. 7:6 and 14:2, the focus is on God's act of election in the Exodus and the Sinai covenant. The two come together in Deut. 26:18 where the people are reminded that they are Yahweh's chosen people, as He has declared to them, and that in consequence they are to keep all of His commands. Two observations may be made. First, from the perspective of the chosen people, their identity as Yahweh's chosen people calls for submission to His will. Second, from the perspective of Yahweh, choosing His people is an act of love which is ultimately accomplished through the death of Jesus Christ on the cross.

Paul's use of καθαρίζω reflects this distinction, from the perspective of submission to the Savior in 2 Cor. 7:1 and from the perspective of Christ's loving choice of His bride in Tit. 2:14 and Eph. 5:26. The means whereby this cleansing is effected⁹⁰ is described as καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι. The aorist participle may be explained as a complexive aorist,⁹¹ indicating that from the viewpoint of the bridal presentation, at the end of the waiting period, all baptisms are viewed as one act. Batey explains:

⁹⁰This line of interpretation takes the dative in this participial phrase as an instrumental dative; cf. *BDF* §193.

⁹¹This use of the aorist is described in *BDF* §332. It denotes "linear actions which (having been completed) are regarded as a whole. The external indication that the action is conceived as a whole is usually a temporal adjunct. . . ." (171)

As a bride was bathed in preparation for the wedding, so the church has submitted to the purification of her Lord provided by baptism. Numerous individual baptisms are viewed as a single cleansing act for the whole church, just as a straight line may become a point by perspective. Negatively, baptism is the cleansing from the old nature enthralled by the forces of evil and destined for death under the law. Positively, baptism is the cleansing for the freedom of the new nature "created after the likeness of God, in true righteousness and holiness" (Eph. 4:22-24).⁹²

Three points in time appear in these verses. There was a time prior to the choosing of the bride, a time when the bride was chosen and prepared, and the time of the wedding. Paul envisions, in Eph. 5:25-28, the end of the interval between the preparation (thus, the aorist tense of καθαρίσας) and fulfillment. The perspective is that of a bride ready to be presented to her bridegroom as a result of what He has done for her and to her. Until that day arrives, the church "lives *zwischen den Zeiten*, where she both experiences through faith the Lord's presence while also anticipating the promised fulfillment."⁹³

⁹²Richard A. Batey, 28-29. Lincoln discusses the pre-nuptial baths. "This would reflect both Jewish marital customs with their prenuptial bath and the marital imagery of Ezek 16:8-14 which stands behind this passage. In Ezek 16:9 Yahweh, in entering his marriage covenant with Jerusalem, is said to have bathed her with water and washed off the blood from her." (375)

⁹³Richard A. Batey, 29. He adds: "Feminine beauty was highly esteemed and in Jewish circles; defects which rendered a girl unfit for marriage were carefully listed. Christ has made possible the liberation of the church from all disfigurements which would disqualify her from her position at his side (Eph. 2:6). Death, sin, and the law have lost their power to jeopardize her election as the Bride of Christ (Eph. 2:1, 2, 15)." (Ibid.)

That the prepositional phrase τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι refers to (water) baptism may be demonstrated in two ways. Paul uses λουτρόν only twice in his letters (the only two occurrences in the New Testament). In Tit. 3:5 Paul writes about the changes which have occurred to believers when they were brought to faith, in terms of their relationship with God and also in terms of their conduct in life. He states, "But when the goodness and love for man (φιλανθρωπία) appeared of our Savior, God, not by works which we had done in righteousness but according to his own mercy, he saved us through the washing of regeneration (λουτρῷ καλιγγενεσίας)⁹⁴ and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, whom he has poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, so that, being justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life." (Tit. 3:4-7)

The term λουτρόν most commonly refers to a washing of the body.⁹⁵ It appears rarely in the Septuagint, twice in the Song of Songs (4:2; 6:6) where the beauty of the beloved bride's teeth is compared to sheep coming up from

⁹⁴λουτρῷ καλιγγενεσίας is definite even though it is anarthrous. (Cf. Murray Harris, 304) The noun καλιγγενεσία occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only at Matt. 19:28 where Jesus uses it to refer to the post-resurrection age. Through Baptism the believer reigns with Christ Jesus in the age to come.

⁹⁵Albrecht Oepke, "λούω," *TDNT* 4:295-307. He distinguishes it from πλύειν (the washing of clothes) and νίζειν and νίπτειν (the washing of face, hands and feet). (295)

the "washing."⁹⁶ A. Oepke explains the uniqueness of Paul's use of λουτρόν.

As the NT sees it, there is no possibility of comparing the λούεσθαι of believers, which stands at the very heart of NT religion, with the external washings of paganism or Judaism. Any sacral and magical or ritualistic and legalistic over-evaluation of external cleansing would be a relapse from the basic NT position. Even the moralising view that baptism is a symbol of the sinner's resolve to break with the past and to begin with a new life, on which basis he is cleansed before God, misses the true point and content of the NT message. The proper starting-point is the understanding of the remission of sins in the OT. . . . This is orientated to the holy and gracious person of God Full cleansing from sin will come only in the consummation. The eschatological fulfillment which is nevertheless a present reality in Christ is the true theme of the NT witness. It is compressed in the crucifixion (and resurrection) of Christ Baptism, which constitutes the community, is for individuals the actualisation of this relation to salvation history.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ λουτρόν also occurs in "Sir. 34:25 of purification after contact with the dead. . . ." Albrecht Oepke, "λούω," *TDNT* 4:301.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 304. Lincoln disagrees that the End is in view here. He writes: "There are no grounds for deducing from the wording of this verse that Christ's presentation of his pure bride to himself awaits the parousia, though many commentators have assumed this. . . . This ignores the fact that later in v 32 the 'one flesh' marriage union is applied to the present relationship between Christ and the Church and that throughout the passage the past and present relationship between Christ and his Church is the model for husbands and wives to follow in their marriages. Here, in line with this writer's more realized eschatology, glory and holiness are seen as present attributes of the church, and Christ's activity of endowing the Church with these qualities is a present and continuing one. . . ." (377) Lincoln resolves the tension in this section by eliminating the future fulfillment implicit in this image but explicit in the "wedding feast" of Matt. 22:2-14 and Rev. 19:7-9. The eschatological dynamic is more clearly developed in the parable of the Ten Virgins (Matt. 25:1-13; cf. also John 5:24-28). The eschatology of this section is more

The phrase τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι seems to denote one act.⁹⁸ Paul uses the neuter noun ῥήμα only infrequently (Rom. 10:8 (*bis*). 9, 17, 18; 2 Cor. 12:4; 13:1; Eph. 5:26; 6:17). It never appears elsewhere in any New Testament document with the preposition ἐν. The closest parallel to Paul's expression τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι is John's expression ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος (John 3:5) which also may refer to baptism.⁹⁹ Paul's only other use of ῥήμα in Ephesians is 6:17 where the believer is called to take up "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word (ῥήμα) of God." Thus the Spirit and ῥήμα stand in close relationship to one another in this epistle, and τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι is most naturally understood as a reference to Christian baptism.¹⁰⁰

accurately described as "now/not yet" rather than merely realized.

⁹⁸It is possible that ἐν ῥήματι modifies the participle, καθάρισας. If that is the case, Lincoln suggests the idea that "the writer would then be saying that, as well as being cleansed through baptism, the Church is cleansed through the purifying word of the gospel." (376) The distance of ἐν ῥήματι from καθάρισας would argue against this line of interpretation as would the most natural reading of the text, which makes τοῦ ὕδατος the referent of the prepositional phrase ἐν ῥήματι.

⁹⁹The fact that both nouns are governed by one preposition and joined by καὶ may indicate a hendiadys (cf. *BDF* §442.16). This would then argue against taking the phrase to refer to two separate baptisms, one natural and one spiritual.

¹⁰⁰This matches Paul's theology of baptism elsewhere. In Rom. 6:1-4 the believer is buried with Christ by means of his baptism and raised again to new life in that baptism. Baptism thus marks the cleansing of the sinner and his new life in Christ. Tit. 3:4-7 supports this interpretation of Paul's doctrine of baptism as does also Col. 2:11-12.

Verse Twenty-seven

The goal of Christ's sacrifice on the cross was explained in verse 26 as the church's purification by means of baptism. In verse 27 Paul moves the metaphor of the church as Christ's bride forward by one more step. The church has been purified and is now presented by Christ Jesus to Himself, presented (παρίστημι)¹⁰¹ as a "glorious church" (ἐνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν), not having stain or spot or any of these things so that she might be holy and blameless.

Paul describes the church with a rare adjective, ἐνδοξος. Aside from two uses by Luke,¹⁰² only Paul employs the word and then only here and in 1 Cor. 4:10.¹⁰³ When used in the marriage metaphor the δόξα word-group is used to

¹⁰¹παρίστημι does not occur often in Paul's writings. Seven times in Romans (Rom. 6:13 [*bis*], 16, 19 [*bis*]; 12:1; 14:10; 16:2), at 1 Cor. 8:8; 2 Cor. 4:14; 11:2; Eph. 5:27; Col. 1:22, 28; 2 Tim. 2:15; 4:17. It is noteworthy that Romans 6, a chapter in which Paul discusses baptism and its consequences in the life of the believer, should contain five of Paul's sixteen uses of the verb. He uses it in 2 Cor. 11:2 of the church presented as a pure virgin to Christ, very close to Paul's use in Eph. 5:27.

¹⁰²The compound adjective, ἐνδοξος, appears in Luke 7:26 with reference to "fine clothes" such as rich people wear (in contrast to the clothes of John the Baptist). Luke uses it again in 13:17 to capture the delight of the people who witness Jesus' miracles, those "glorious happenings" which were being done by Him.

¹⁰³Paul's use in 1 Cor. 4:10 is unrelated to its appearance in Eph. 5:27. In 1 Corinthians Paul is (sarcastically?) contrasting his readers with himself and those who suffer with him, stating that "we are fools on account of Christ, but you are wise in Christ; we are weak, but you are strong; you are honorable (ἐνδοξοί), but we are dishonored (ἄτιμοι)."

describe the relationship of one person to another, indicating subordination.¹⁰⁴ Batey summarizes:

The Bride image underlies in a fresh way certain basic truths of the church's life which may be summarized here. (1) The Church-Bride has been graciously elected to be the fulfillment of God's purpose for the universe. . . . (2) Christ in his love for the church gave himself in order to establish the covenant relationship of betrothal between himself and his *one* Bride. (3) Christ's giving of himself as the betrothal gift is an expression of atonement prompted by spontaneous love. . . . (4) Having established the covenant-betrothal, Christ's love has proceeded to cleanse the church in baptism of all defilements which would render her defective and is making her worthy to be his Bride. (5) The Bride image is an excellent expression of realistic eschatology, for the church has been sanctified unto the Lord and yet lives in hope of the future parousia.¹⁰⁵

Verse Twenty-eight

In the same way and to the same degree as (οὕτως)¹⁰⁶ Christ loved the church (to the point that he gave himself for her), so also husbands are obligated (ὀφείλουσιν) to love (ἀγαπᾶν) their own wives. The verb ὀφείλω most

¹⁰⁴As seen in 1 Cor. 11:2-16.

¹⁰⁵Richard A. Batey, 29-30.

¹⁰⁶οὕτως is a comparative adverb which most commonly means "in this manner, thus, so." It functions as a correlative word and refers to what precedes. Cf. *BAGD* s.v. "οὕτως," 597. It could be used in classical Greek to summarize the content of a preceding participial construction and occurs in this sense in Acts 20:11; 27:17. *BDF* §425.6 note that these are the only appearances of οὕτως with this function. It denotes degree when used before adjectives and adverbs (a classical usage) and when used before a verb (as here and 1 John 4:11) it may be translated "so intensely." *BAGD*, s.v. "οὕτως," 598.

Christ loved the church (to the point that he gave himself for her), so also husbands are obligated (ὀφείλουσιν) to love (ἀγαπᾶν) their own wives. The verb ὀφείλω most frequently refers to a debt of some sort.¹⁰⁷ The verb ὀφείλω appears in the New Testament in the Gospels as well as in Paul's writings. Man owes God more than he can possibly repay (as in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant, Matt. 18:24). He can plead only for forgiveness (as in the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6:12). Having received this forgiveness through the death and resurrection of Jesus, the believer becomes indebted to those around him (Rom. 1:14-15). His debt is the debt of love (Rom. 13:8) and is paid in the coin of compassion, upholding the weak (Rom. 15:1) and financial support (Rom 15:27) with thanksgiving (2 Thess. 1:3; 2:13). The debt is exercised specifically within families, of parents in 2 Cor. 12:14 and in Eph. 5:28 of husband to wife. Friederich Hack explains:

with this function. It denotes degree when used before adjectives and adverbs (a classical usage) and when used before a verb (as here and 1 John 4:11) it may be translated "so intensely." *BAGD*, s.v. "οὕτως," 598.

¹⁰⁷As in Matt. 18:28 and Philemon 18. Louw & Nida give this as the first definition of the term and list it under the domain of "possess, transfer, exchange" and the subdomain of "owe, debt, cancel." They describe the verb as signalling "to be under obligation to make a payment as the result of having previously received something of value." (57.219 [1:582]) Friederich Hauck, "ὀφείλω," *TDNT* 5:559-60, notes that the etymological derivation is obscure but that the word is especially "common in relation to revenge and law." It is common in secular Greek but rare in the Septuagint, becoming more frequent in the Apocrypha. Cf. Hatch & Redpath, *Concordance*, 2:1039.

These verses clearly reflect a certain shift as compared with the teaching of Jesus. Whereas Jesus the Lord speaks in imperatives, apostolic preaching, though it contains these, unfolds the obligations which follow from the basic Christian facts and total Christian thinking. In the main the obligation in these apostolic references is an obligation towards men which is deduced and which follows from the experienced or preceding act of God the Saviour. In many instances the sentence construction indicates the connection between human obligation and the experienced act of salvation.¹⁰⁸

Because the believer has experienced the benefit of Christ's self-sacrifice on the cross, his relationships with others are redefined by the cross. The connection between the salvific crucifixion of Jesus and the marital bond has been described by Ethelbert Stauffer, who writes: "Jesus sees in marriage the original form of human fellowship. It has its basis and norm in God's act of creation. It has a history which divides into three periods. It has its time, and will end with this aeon."¹⁰⁹ The original form of human

¹⁰⁸Friederich Hauck, "ὁφείλω," *TDNT* 5:564. He points out that ὁφείλω does not lead to legalism but "develops out of salvation already known." (Ibid.)

¹⁰⁹Ethelbert Stauffer, "γαμέω," *TDNT* 1:649. The command in Lev. 19:18 to "love your neighbor as yourself" begins within the marriage relationship. The Hebrew word translated "neighbor" (רֵעֵךְ) in Lev. 19:18 appears with a singular possessive suffix 'רֵעֵךְ in the Song of Songs and is translated "my companion." It serves as an appellative of the bride by the groom in Cant. 1:9, 15; 2:2, 10, 13; 4:1, 7; 5:2; 6:4 and, in a slightly different form, by her of him in 5:16. The Septuagint uses πλουσίον throughout. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, reprinted 1991), 391. In Luke 10:25-37 Jesus answer the question, "who is my neighbor (πλουσίον)?" He indicates by the parable of the Good Samaritan that the "neighbor" is everyone, including enemies. Loving the neighbor as yourself may begin at home, within the marital union and within the

fellowship, according to Genesis, is this union of husband and wife (Gen. 1:26-27; 2:4-24). That fellowship was drastically altered due to sin (Gen. 3:1-6), which may be seen in the man's attempt to shift blame to the woman in Gen. 3:12. This is Stauffer's second period. His third period begins when salvation is experienced and a new creation comes into being.¹¹⁰ Stauffer's third period involves both creation and redemption, an interrelationship about which George Knight writes:

Paul does all this while applying the general commandment of Leviticus 19:18, "love your neighbor as yourself," in a very direct way to the love the husband should have for his nearest and dearest neighbor, his wife. In so doing, Paul ties together the creation ordinance about marriage (Genesis 2:24), the great commandment about loving one's neighbor (Leviticus 19:18), and the sublime pattern of Christ's love for His bride, the church. No greater combination could be conceived of than the combination of God's sanctions in creation, commandment and redemption.¹¹¹

Paul adds an adverbial phrase to establish a comparison which he will support with a citation from Gen. 2:24 in Eph. 5:31. The phrase ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα parallels

family, but it extends outward to all people.

¹¹⁰As Paul had written only a few years earlier, 2 Cor. 5:17. The determinative factor is being "in Christ," understood from Rom. 6:1-4 and Gal. 3:27-28 as happening when one is baptized.

¹¹¹George W. Knight III, "Husbands and Wives as Analogues of Christ and the Church: ephesians 5:21-33 and Colossians 3:18-19," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 173. Yet this original form of human fellowship will end with the end of this age and the initiation of the coming age (Matt. 22:30).

the previous τὰς ἐαυτῶν γυναῖκας and prepares the reader for the movement from "wife" (γυνή) to "body" (σῶμα) which is made possible by the Gen. 2:24 quotation. The use of parallel structure is extended by the next sentence in which Paul states that "the one who loves his own wife loves himself (ἐαυτὸν)." Batey summarizes:

The author sees in the "one flesh" concept where husband and wife become one body a key for understanding the unity maintained by Christ and his Body, the church. In verse 25 the author admonishes husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the church. After a brief elaboration of Christ's love using bridal imagery, he again exhorts husbands to marital love. But now he states that husbands should love their wives as their own bodies; ὡς answers both the questions "why?" and "how?" (1) The husband is to love his wife as *being* his own body, since husbands and wives become one flesh by virtue of their union in marriage (vs. 28b). (2) Because the wife is one body or one flesh with her husband, he should love and care for her as he would his own flesh (vs. 29a). In fact, he who loves his wife loves his own self, or better the single personality which together they compose.¹¹²

Eph. 5:29-33

Paul emphatically states that no one ever¹¹³ hated his own flesh (σάρκα)¹¹⁴ but nourishes and cares for it.¹¹⁵

¹¹²Richard A. Batey, 30-31. He adds: "The logic is that since husband and wife become one body by virtue of their marriage union, their relationship illumines the relationship sustained by Christ and his Body, the church." (Ibid., 31)

¹¹³The enclitic particle ποτε, when occurring after a negative, translates "ever, never." Cf. BAGD s.v. "ποτε," 1c, 695.

¹¹⁴Richard A. Batey observes that "the substitution of σαρξ for σῶμα in verse 29, though not unusual, is obviously made in preparation for the quotation from Genesis

In the same way, Christ provides for the Church.¹¹⁶ Paul explains the reason for Christ's nourishing of the church in verse 30, "because (ὅτι)¹¹⁷ we are members of his body." He then cites Gen. 2:24 for support and concludes in verse 32 with a statement regarding the nature of this mutual analogy between marriage on the one hand and Christ and the church one the other. A final exhortation appears in verse 33.

σάρξ and σῶμα

Paul alternates between "bodies" (σώματα) in Eph. 5:28 to "flesh" (σάρξ) in verse 29, back to "body" in verse 30 and finally to "flesh" in verse 31. The interpreter may

2:24 in which the μία σάρξ concept occurs." (31, n.2)

¹¹⁵Lincoln observes the recurrence of ἐκτρέθειν ("to nourish") in the table of household duties in Eph. 6:4 (in regards to raising children). The verb θάλπειν ("to cherish") occurs in 1 Thess. 2:7, again in the context of caring for children. BAGD s.v. "ἐκτρέθω," 1. note that these two verbs appear together in *Vitae Aesopi* Ic.9 (ed. by A. Eberhard, 1872), 250. (246) These two verbs (in reverse order) also are used to establish the husband's duties to his wife in a marriage contract of the era. This is also noted by A. Lincoln, 379-80. He cites Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, 1:460.

¹¹⁶Jesus promises His disciples that He will not leave them as orphans (John 14:18) but provide for them the Holy Spirit. It is possible that the Holy Spirit is in the forefront of Paul's mind here and other gifts are secondary. Cf. Rom. 8:14-16; Gal. 4:6; Eph. 4:4, where "body" σῶμα and "Spirit" (πνεῦμα) appear closely connected with the unity of the church; and 1 Thess. 4:8.

¹¹⁷As a conjunction, ὅτι can serve to show the cause of an action, subordinating the clause. BDF §456, regarding "causal conjunctions," note that this subordination is "often very loose . . . so that it must be translated 'for'." (238) Cf. BAGD s.v. "ὅτι," 3.b., 589.

ask what Paul means by the two terms and whether they are entirely synonymous. The most striking distinction between the two terms is that Paul does not call the church the "flesh" (σάρξ) of Christ.¹¹⁸ It is possible to conclude, therefore, that the two terms (σάρξ and σῶμα) are not entirely synonymous.¹¹⁹ Paul can say (as he will when citing Gen. 2:24) that man and woman become one "flesh" (σάρξ) in marriage but he avoids σάρξ when describing the union of Christ and his bride, the church.¹²⁰ Authors outside the New Testament had already made the connection between woman and "flesh" (σάρξ). For example, the subject in Sirach 25:24-26 is woman, particularly the evil woman. In the final verse, the reader is instructed to separate from a disobedient and rebellious wife with the phrase ἀπὸ τῶν σαρκῶν¹²¹ σου ἀπότρε¹²² αὐτήν. Further, a wife is called her husband's

¹¹⁸As noted by Eduard Schweizer, "σῶμα," *TDNT* 7:1079, n. 509.

¹¹⁹They operate in the same semantic field but do not denote exactly the same thing. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 1:94, state that "it is possible that σάρξ differs in meaning from σῶμα (8.1) in focusing somewhat more upon the physical nature." The domain is "body, body parts, and body products;" the subdomain is "body."

¹²⁰As in 1 Cor. 12:12-31; Eph. 1:23, where the church is identified as Christ's "body;" 2:16; 4:4, 12, 16; Col. 1:18; 2:17, 19.

¹²¹Here the "self" is described by the plural τῶν σαρκῶν even though the individual (σου) is clearly in view.

¹²²A second person singular present active imperative verb from ἀποτέμνω, "to cut off." Cf. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1843, ninth ed., reprinted 1990), [hereafter Liddell

"own flesh" in *Vita Adam et Evae* 3.¹²³ Paul's remarks concerning wives and the one flesh union resemble these extra-biblical passages but he stops short of using the same noun, σάρξ, when describing Christ and His bride. Paul's distinctive use of these terms may be demonstrated mostly clearly in Col. 1:20-24.¹²⁴

In Col. 1:20 Paul writes that Jesus has reconciled (ἀποκαταλάξει)¹²⁵ the whole of everything (τὰ πάντα) to himself (εἰς αὐτόν). In Col. 1:22, Paul states that Jesus has reconciled (ἀποκατήλλαξεν)¹²⁶ the readers (ὑμᾶς, at the

& Scott, *Lexicon*] 2:222.

¹²³This is a Latin work from Jewish-Christian sources who wrote about Adam, book three, contained in E. Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (1901) and cited by Eduard Schweizer, "σάρξ," *TDNT* 7:119. The Greek manuscripts of this work lack this reference but it is present at *Vita* 3.2, when Adam responds to Eve's suggestion that he kill her. Translated by M. D. Johnson, it reads "How is it possible that I should let loose my hand against my flesh?" "The Life of Adam and Eve," chapter in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 2:258. Johnson refers Gen. 2:23 at this point in the margin.

¹²⁴Paul uses σάρξ to denote several other aspects of corporality. In Rom. 1:3 he describes Jesus as "from the seed of David according to the flesh (σάρξ)." Here, σάρξ denotes the Incarnation and accepts the real humanity of Jesus. Yet σάρξ appears very negatively in Rom. 7:14-25, where it represents that which is opposed to God.

¹²⁵An aorist active infinitive from ἀποκαταλάσσω, a word which appears only in Christian writings and occurs in the New Testament only at Eph. 2:16; Col. 1:20, 22. It is translated, "to reconcile." Cf. *BAGD* s.v. "ἀποκαταλάσσω," 92.

¹²⁶A third person singular aorist indicative active form of ἀποκαταλάσσω. Bruce Metzger discusses the variant readings and suggests that only the passive variant accounts

beginning of verse 21 for emphasis) "in his body (σώματι) of flesh (σαρκός) through death"¹²⁷ so that he may present believers holy and blameless and without reproach. The parallel with verse 20 indicates that when Paul writes "his body of flesh," he refers to the Person of Jesus. While this section of Colossians resembles Eph. 5:22-33 in many respects, it differs in that σῶμα denotes the Person of Jesus rather than the church.¹²⁸

for the development of the other readings (*TCGNT* 621-22). The United Bible Societies Committee, however, kept the active verb in the body of the text due to superior support and the good sense it makes in the context. The *UBSGNT* [3rd] rates it with a {D} which is upgraded to a {C} in the *UBSGNT* [4th].

The aorist most likely refers to the crucifixion of Jesus. Peter O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon* (Waco: Word Books, 1982), 67, finds this aorist "rather surprising" in light of the fact that this reconciliation occurred before the Gospel was preached to the Colossians. However, if Paul refers to the objective reconciliation achieved at the time of the crucifixion, his sense is clear: the reconciliation which was won by Christ on the cross is personally their own at the time they come to faith in Jesus.

¹²⁷All three of the nouns are arthrous, referring to something discussed previously or something familiar to his readers. Cf. Murray Harris, 303. Peter O'Brien notes that "his body of flesh" seems to be a Hebraism which means "physical body" and notes that it "has an exact verbal equivalent in the Qumran literature (1 QpHab 9:2: 'And they inflicted horrors of evil diseases and took vengeance upon his (*sc.* the wicked priest's) body of flesh' . . .)." (68)

¹²⁸Both σῶμα and σάρξ can be used negatively. In Rom. 8:10 Paul contrasts the "body" (σῶμα) that is dead because of sin and the spirit which is life because of righteousness. In v. 11 he says that the "dead bodies" of the readers will be made alive by this indwelling Spirit of life. σῶμα is similarly negative, closely associated with sin and its consequences, in v. 13 as well. Cf. Rom. 7:24 and the phrase "body of death".

Paul's use of σάρξ and σῶμα indicates a certain flexibility. Although he can use both to denote something negative, he shows a marked preference for σάρξ when referring to man as sinner and when he uses σῶμα in a similar context, he marks the term with qualifiers to indicate the negative intention. Further, he never uses σάρξ to denote the Body of Christ (although Jesus seems to do so in John 6:51-59), even though it might seem most natural in light of Gen. 2:24 and the role that verse plays in Paul's theology. Lincoln summarizes:

The notion of husbands loving their wives as their own bodies reflects the fact that in the Christological model Christ's love for the Church can also be seen as his love for his body (cf. v 23 and also v 30). It also anticipates and is dependent on the idea spelled out more fully later in the writer's citation of Gen 2:24 in v 31. It is because of the claim of the Genesis text that the act of marriage makes husband and wife one

The word σάρξ appears frequently in Paul's writings to denote the sinful man or "Old Adam;" cf. Rom. 7:5, 18, 25; 8:3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13. The diversity of conceptually signified by σάρξ may be illustrated by its use in Romans. Paul uses it of Jesus' humanity in Rom. 1:3 and of physical descent from Abraham in 4:1. He intends σάρξ to signal the whole human being in 3:20.

James D. G. Dunn argues that σάρξ always carries a negative denotation, even when used of Jesus in Rom. 1:3. He believes that this term represents a continuum of meaning from the "very negative" to the "mildly negative" and that all uses of σάρξ fall somewhere along this continuum. Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, "Jesus--Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans 1.3-4," *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1973): 40-68; *Romans 1-8* (Waco: Word Books, 1988), 13. Two arguments against taking σάρξ in a consistently negative manner are the use of the nominal in Gen. 2:24, prior to the Fall into sin in Genesis 3 and the use of σάρξ precisely at Rom. 1:3. Paul's high Christology and belief in Jesus' absolute sinlessness (2 Cor. 5:21) would prohibit Paul's use of a negative term to describe Jesus' humanity.

flesh that he can make the comparison of the wives to their husbands' bodies. The quotation in v 31 has the term σάρξ, "flesh," but σάρξ and σῶμα, "body," are equivalent in the writer's purposes here, as the shift to σάρξ in v 29a before the citation indicates (cf. also the interchangeable relation between these two terms when Paul cites Gen 2:24 in 1 Cor 6:16). Since from the Gen 2 perspective marriage declares that husband and wife are, in fact, one body, the husband can be said to be under the obligation to love his wife as his own body.¹²⁹

Paul shifts from σάρξ to σῶμα and vice versa in Eph. 5:28-31 to make his point clear. Both σάρξ and σῶμα may be used to denote the individual's physical self. Further, σάρξ may refer to the union of husband and wife (as in Gen. 2:24 and extra-biblical literature). Paul can then use σῶμα to describe the union of Christ and His bride, the church, on the basis of Gen. 2:24 since σάρξ and σῶμα overlap in meaning.

Genesis 2:24

Paul cites Gen. 2:24 as a proof-text in Eph. 5:33, supporting his treatment of the bride and body metaphors for the church. Batey explains:

The logic is that since husband and wife become one body by virtue of their marriage union, their relationship illumines the relationship sustained by Christ and his Body, the church. The author then quotes Genesis 2:24 from the LXX as a proof-text for the μία σάρξ concept which has become the focal point of his paraenesis. The "one flesh" experience of human marriage is taken as a key for unlocking the mystery of the divine *henosis* shared by Christ and his church.¹³⁰

¹²⁹A. T. Lincoln, 378.

¹³⁰Richard A. Batey, 31.

In Genesis 2, verse 24 does not continue the man's remarks in verse 23 but applies "the principles of the first marriage to every marriage."¹³¹ One of the most quoted verses in the New Testament,¹³² 2:24 is an etiology which interrupts the story's flow to explain to the audience one aspect of marriage today. Such a device (narrator remarking to his audience during a story) still occurs today in virtually every medium.¹³³

The verse begins with]-7, perhaps "in realization

¹³¹Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Waco: Word Books, 1987), [hereafter, *Genesis 1-15*] 70. Claus Westermann notes: "There is a change of speaker between vv.23 and 24. It is not the man who is speaking. . . . It is clear then that v.24 is but an addition to the narrative which is complete without it, ending with v.23. . . . It has been pointed out correctly . . . that in the foregoing narrative it is always ׀ךך; װך is first used again in v.23 for the word play; v. 24 resumes װך, but from v.25 on it is ׀ךך again." *Genesis 1-11* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974, reprinted 1990), 233.

¹³²Matt. 19:5; Mark 10:7; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:31. It is interesting to note that in two of these passages Gen. 1:27b is also quoted (Matt. 19:4; Mark 10:6).

¹³³Gen. 2:24 offers the interpreter an clear example of Discourse vs. Narrative analysis. Narrative analysis focuses on the two features most important to a narrative: "narrative action, or plot, and the major roles that participants can assume in narrative action." Robert C. Culley, "Exploring New Directions," *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, edited by Douglas A. Knight (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 171. Discourse analysis, still somewhat new to Biblical studies, deals with larger elements than words or phrases within the story. In Discourse analysis, the interpreter identifies beginnings, endings, episodes, high points, the cast of participants and the author's viewpoint. It is this last feature which appears in Gen. 2:24, an interruption of the narrative but part of the discourse. (Ibid., 169-170)

of this,¹³⁴ which refers to the kinship or family formed by the husband and wife (2:23). The verb ׀׀ׂ', appearing in construct with ׀ׂׂׂ, has occasioned some misunderstanding.¹³⁵ "Forsaking" here is relative, not absolute.¹³⁶

Further, Israel practiced patrilocal marriage where the wife left her family to join her husband's family and become part of that house. As G. Wenham notes:

On marriage a man's priorities change. Beforehand his first obligations are to his parents: afterwards they are to his wife. In modern Western societies where filial duties are often ignored, this may seem a minor point to make, but in traditional societies like Israel where honoring parents is the highest human obligation next to honoring God, this remark about forsaking them is very striking.¹³⁷

¹³⁴John Oswalt, "׀׀ׂ'," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), [hereafter *TWOT*] 1:434 notes that the second definition of ׀׀ׂ as "thus, so" expresses the realization of something previously spoken and is often coupled with various prepositions (including 'al). Cf. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906, reprinted 1951), [hereafter *BDB*] 485-87.

¹³⁵The homonym signals "restore, repair" and is found in Neh. 3:8 only (although possibly also Ex. 23:5); otherwise, the verb conveys three pictures: 1) to depart, abandon or to loose; 2) to entrust, expose or to permit; 3) figuratively, when man apostatizes or abandons virtuous qualities. Cf. Carl Schultz, "׀׀ׂ'," *TWOT* 2:657-58; *BDB* 737-38.

¹³⁶In light of the fourth commandment in Exod. 20:12. It is not unusual to cast relative imperatives as absolutes, possibly for emphasis, as in Hos. 6:6 where God, who has commanded sacrifice and burnt offering, says "I desire mercy and not sacrifice;" or in Luke 16:26 where Jesus speaks of hating one's mother and father, wife and children as a requirement for salvation. Cf. Gordon Wenham, 71.

¹³⁷Gordon Wenham, 71.

The author recognizes that the new "flesh and bone" bond supersedes that of any other, excepting for his relationship with the LORD God; one relationship is forsaken and another begun. The word דָּבַק , *dabaq*, appears 55 times in Hebrew and once in Aramaic in the Old Testament, used with *be*, *le*, *'el*, *'im* and *'achare*. It rarely refers to physical sticking together (e.g., of wet clods in Job 38:38) and most often occurs in contexts of human relationships, either friendly or hostile.¹³⁸ It lacks a specific sexual element (e.g., it is used of Ruth's affections toward Naomi, Ruth 1:14; also it refers to her physical proximity to the gleaners in Boaz's field, 2:21). Perhaps "stick with" may work as a translation (a derivative noun refers to "joints, soldering").¹³⁹ On the phrase, "they¹⁴⁰ shall become one flesh," Wenham writes:

¹³⁸The term refers to affectionate and loyal adherence (of Israeleites to the Lord) in Deut. 10:20; 11:22; 13:4 [Heb. 5]; 30:20; Josh. 22:5; 23:8. It denotes a "sticking" closely of one person to another, as of Ruth to Boaz's female servants (Ruth 2:8, 21). It may be negative, indicating hostile pursuit, as when Laban overtake Jacob in Gilead (Gen. 31:23) or when Micah overtakes the children of Dan (Judg. 18:22). Cf. Earl Kalland, " דָּבַק ," *TWOT* 1:178.

¹³⁹Gerhard Wallis, " דָּבַק ," *TDOT*, 3:79-84; Earl Kalland, " דָּבַק ," *TWOT* 1:177-78; *BDB* 179-80.

¹⁴⁰The third person common plural suffix in לְאִשְׁתּוֹ may permit the reader to misunderstand an acceptance of polygamy; a man and all his wives become one family unit, one "flesh." Yet the noun אִשָּׁה is singular, "to his wife." Two explanations may be proposed. Either the translators of the Septuagint had a different Hebrew text before them at the time or by the third century B.C. polygamy was in such disfavor the Septuagint translators rendered it $\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\omicron$, "the two shall become."

This does not denote merely the sexual union that follows marriage, or the children conceived in marriage, or even the spiritual and emotional relationship that it involves, though all are involved in becoming one flesh. Rather it affirms that just as blood relations are one's flesh and bone . . . so marriage creates a similar relation between man and wife. They become related to each other as brother and sister are. The laws of Lev 18 and 20, and possibly Deut 24:1-4, illustrate the application of this kinship-of-spouses principle to the situation following divorce or the death of one of the parties. Since a woman becomes on marriage a sister to her husband's brothers, a daughter to her father-in-law, and so on, she cannot normally marry any of them should her first husband die or divorce her. . . . The kinships established by marriage are therefore not terminated by death or divorce.¹⁴¹

In this "one-flesh" unity, the plurality of God is reflected in the structure of humanity. Westermann observes that ". . . [בָּשָׂר] does not stand in opposition to spirit or soul, like the Greek σάρξ, but describes human existence as a whole under the aspect of corporeality."¹⁴² Marriage forms a familial bond that is as much "flesh and bone" as birth-

¹⁴¹Gordon Wenham, 71. It is possible that the ancient reader would understand that this "one flesh" union between husband and wife was established through sexual intercourse. Two points in support may be observed. First, other uses of *bashar* reflect blood-relations (e.g., Gen. 29:14; 2 Sam. 19:13-14[12-13]; Judg. 9:2) into which the individual was born. Second, the term *bashar* can signify "pubic region," "genitals" (Exod. 28:42; cf. Lev. 6:3[10]; 16:4), and specifically the male (Lev. 15:2,3,7; Ezek. 16:26; 23:20) and female (Lev. 15:19) sex organs. Cf. N. P. Bratsiotis, "[בָּשָׂר]," *TDOT* 2:319. What can be safely said is that [בָּשָׂר] ". . . is probably the most comprehensive, most important and most frequently used anthropological term for the external, fleshly aspect of man's nature, and when used in this sense it can be translated by the two man meanings of this word, 'flesh' or 'body,' depending on the context." (Ibid., 325)

¹⁴²Claus Westermann, 233.

relationships.¹⁴³ When Adam and Eve come together, the man is no longer alone but he is (with his wife) one¹⁴⁴ flesh. Victor Hamilton comments: "What is being pinpointed is solidarity. Man by himself is not one flesh. A woman by herself is not one flesh."¹⁴⁵ Eduard Schweizer adds:

The author finds in Gn. 2:24 not merely the command which underlies his exhortation to married couples but also the saving fact on which it is based, the christologically understood indicative the ethical imperative can only follow. . . . in the case of Christ as Head of the Church we do not merely have a superordination which may be explained by the order of creation of by custom but also a relation in which all life comes to the body from the Head¹⁴⁶

As people are brought to faith by the Gospel, they are brought into Christ Jesus. They become a unity, one new creation, the Body of Christ which draws its life from its Head. Nourished and fed by her bridegroom, the bride becomes "one flesh" with him. Every individual marriage within this *henosis* reflects it, just as every relation between woman and man reflects the relation of the Body of

¹⁴³This may be illustrated by the fact that sexual relations between people closely related by marriage as forbidden as are those between people closely related by birth (within prohibited degrees of affinity as well as consanguinity). For example, Lev. 18:14 prohibits relations between a man and his uncle's wife and 18:16 and 18 forbid sexual contact with one's sister-in-law.

¹⁴⁴ἓν, a word which can encompass a plurality in its unity, as noted above.

¹⁴⁵Victor Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 181.

¹⁴⁶Eduard Schweizer, "σῶμα," *TDNT* 7:1079-80.

Christ to its Head. Marriage appropriately serves as a model for the relationship of believers to the Savior.¹⁴⁷

Mystery

Following the quotation Paul writes τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. The question may be asked whether Paul wanted to designate the relationship between Christ and the Church by μυστήριον or whether he intended the reader to understand that marriage itself was (a) μυστήριον.¹⁴⁸

Andreas Kostenberger writes:

μυστήριον consistently denotes a divine truth which was once hidden but has now been revealed. Ephesians contains the largest number of references to μυστήριον in the NT. This term occurs throughout the letter (1:9;

¹⁴⁷George W. Knight III, "Husbands and Wives as Analogues of Christ and the Church, Ephesians 5:21-33 and Colossians 3:18-19," *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 175-76, suggests that marriage was "designed by God from the beginning to be a picture or parable of the relationship between Christ and the church. Back when God was planning what marriage would be like, He planned it for this great purpose: it would give a beautiful earthly picture of the relationship that would someday come about between Christ and His church." (Emphasis original) His point would be strengthened if this were more explicitly revealed in Scripture. As it is, he builds his case on the single word, "mystery," too slim a foundation for such an ornate edifice.

¹⁴⁸The term occurs under the domain of "know," in the subdomain of "not able to know, secret." Cf. Louw & Nida, *Lexicon*, 28.77 (1:344). It may be defined as "the content of that which has not been known before but which has been revealed to an in-group or restricted constituency. . . ." (Ibid.) It is not that those who know the μυστήριον want to keep it secret nor that certain tests must be passed before that knowledge may be communicated; rather the μυστήριον is to be proclaimed to all nations (Matthew 28:18-20). The English word "mystery" conveys something else, "a secret which people have tried to uncover but which they have failed to understand." (Ibid.)

3:3,4,9; 5:32; 6:19) and consistently refers to God's eschatological purpose in Christ. It is usually related to aspects of ecclesiology.¹⁴⁹

For Paul, "the term μυστήριον is firmly connected with the *kerygma* of Christ."¹⁵⁰ The cross is the definition of the μυστήριον of God (the message of the cross in 1 Cor. 1:18-31 is referenced in 1 Cor. 2:1 as the "mystery of God"). The term μυστήριον has, in the Pauline corpus and particularly in Ephesians, a variety of meanings. Yet each usage has in common this cross of Christ. For Paul, the cross is at the center of μυστήριον.¹⁵¹ Such a μυστήριον has to be revealed to be seen and understood. Günther Bornkamm explains the relationship between μυστήριον and revelation.

The mystery is not itself revelation; it is the object of revelation. This belongs constitutively to the term. It is not as though the mystery were a presupposition of revelation which is set aside when this takes place. Rather, revelation discloses the mystery as such. Hence the mystery of God does not disclose itself. At the appointed time it is in free grace declared by God Himself to those who are

¹⁴⁹Andreas Kostenberger, "The Mystery of Christ and the Church: Head and Body, 'One Flesh'," *Trinity Journal* 12 (1991): 82-83.

¹⁵⁰Günther Bornkamm, "μυστήριον," *TDNT* 4:819.

¹⁵¹In 1:9 the "mystery of his [God's] will" appears in a discussion of predestination of believers in Christ and him crucified. In 3:3 and 4 the "mystery" is the content of the Gospel, personally revealed to Paul by Jesus. He explicitly defines this mystery in 3:6, that Gentiles are included in the cross of Christ as are Jews. In 6:19 (taking the genitive τοῦ εὐαγγελίου as an epexegetical genitive), Paul asks for prayers on his behalf so that he may boldly make known "the mystery, which is the Gospel." Cf. also Raymond E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term 'Mystery' in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), 1968.

selected and blessed by Him. Hence *μυστήριον* is mostly used with terms for revelation¹⁵²

Paul can refer to the text of Gen. 2:24 as a *μυστήριον* because the relationship of husband and wife in Genesis 2 pre-figures something of the relationship of Christ and the church.¹⁵³ Andreas Kostenberger writes: "The *μυστήριον* is the ground for the restored relationship between husband and wife, much like it is the ground for the restored relationship between Jews and Gentiles (cf. Gal 3:28)."¹⁵⁴ Paul can treat marriage within the topic of salvation because for Him there is a fundamental and essential unity between creation and redemption.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵²Günther Bornkamm, "*μυστήριον*," *TDNT* 4:820-21. He cites Rom. 16:25; Eph. 3:3; 1 Cor. 2:10; Eph. 3:5; Rom. 16:26; Eph. 1:3; Col. 1:27 and others.

¹⁵³As Bornkamm writes: "Eph. 5:32 is valid because the eschatological mystery of Christ and the Church is mysteriously pre-figured in Gn. 2:24." He cites the application in 5:32b to support his argument that the *μυστήριον* is not the institution of marriage but rather the text of Gen. 2:24. Günther Bornkamm, "*μυστήριον*," *TDNT* 4:823.

¹⁵⁴Andreas Kostenberger, "Mystery," *Trinity Journal* 12 (1991): 84. For a discussion of *μυστήριον* in LXX and Qumran, cf. this article. He concludes: "Yet it is important to recognize that Paul's teaching on headship and submission is given in the larger framework of his theology of the breaking down of old barriers and the restoration of united relationships. In that sense, then, 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female' in God's new community. The marriage relationship shares in God's *μυστήριον* as it is revealed through Paul: the 'heading up again' of all things under Christ." (94)

¹⁵⁵A point made by James Voelz in a presentation entitled "A Theological Forum on Women and the Office of Pastor."

Paul's Point

Paul introduces his (unusual) conclusion drawn from Gen. 2:24 with the phrase ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω in verse 32b. The phrase prepares the reader for what follows¹⁵⁶ and at the same time implies the existence of opposing interpretations.¹⁵⁷ The use of this phrase in Matt. 5:22, 28, 34, 39 and 44 indicate that the statement which follows differs from previous interpretations but reveals the underlying (and previously obscured) true intention of the text. Paul expresses his interpretation succinctly: εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς¹⁵⁸ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, "with reference to¹⁵⁹ Christ and with reference to the church."

¹⁵⁶Lincoln observes that "the emphatic ἐγὼ and the particle δὲ in v 32b make clear that the writer is stressing that this particular interpretation of Gen 2:24 as a reference to the profound mystery of the union between Christ and the Church is his own. If, in fact, it also originated with him, then presumably he reached it through a typological exegesis, resting on a correspondence between creation (Gen 2:24) and redemption (Christ and the Church)." (382)

¹⁵⁷So noted by Bornkamm, "The interpretation introduced by ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω is in express opposition to other interpretations which also find a μυστήριον in the text but differ from Eph. in exposition." (G. Bornkamm, "μυστήριον," *TDNT* 4:823.) Lincoln says that "it is difficult to decide" whether Paul expresses a polemical tone here or not. (382.)

¹⁵⁸The second εἰς is omitted by B, K, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian and Epiphanius of Constantia. Its omission is easily explained as a desire for a smoother text, removing the pleonastic εἰς.

¹⁵⁹For the use of εἰς to denote reference to a person or thing, cf. *BAGD* s.v. "εἰς," 5. (230) which offers "for, to, with respect or reference to." This use appears in Luke 14:35; 2 Tim. 4:11; 2 Cor. 9:8; Col. 1:12; Matt. 5:13; Rom. 8:28 and elsewhere.

Paul then summarizes in verse 33: each is to love his wife just as he loves himself¹⁶⁰ and each wife should¹⁶¹ fear her husband. On the definition of "fear," Lincoln writes:

Many translators and interpreters attempt to make the writer less patriarchal and more palatable to modern readers by substituting "respect" for "fear" in the command to wives. . . . As in the earlier instructions, the wife's attitude to her husband is to be modeled on the Church's attitude to Christ. Her fear of her husband reflects the fear of all believers for Christ (cf. v 21). This fear certainly includes having respect, but is stronger than this, though not the fear of a slave. . . . In the case of human relations, as we noted with the notion of subordination also, fear involves observance of the appropriate authority structures, whether of citizens toward the state (cf. Rom 13:3,4,7), children to parents (*Barn.* 19.5; *Did.* 4.9), slaves to masters (Eph 6:5; 1 Pet 2:18; *Did.* 4.11), or, as here, wives to husbands (cf. also 1 Pet 3:2).¹⁶²

The original relationship between man and woman,

¹⁶⁰Lincoln observes: "Neither the command to love one's neighbor as oneself nor the command to love one's wife as oneself involves a further command, namely, to love one's self. Therefore, neither anticipates modern psychological theories that people must first learn to accept themselves in order to be able to accept others. Both simply assume that love of self is present in all (cf. v 29) and then demand that this be transcended by a love that is directed to another in the same way." (384)

¹⁶¹ Lincoln makes the point that $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ with the subjunctive is equivalent to the imperative. (384) *BDF* cite this use and passage under paragraph 389, noting that it is extremely old and common in Homer. It appears only twice in the New Testament, both Pauline and both without subject.

¹⁶²Andrew Lincoln, 384-85. Horst Balz, " $\phi\omicron\beta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$," *TDNT* 9:215, writes that this is appropriate for the Christian who believes that "the day is at hand" and states, Horst Balz concludes: "What is at issue, then, is not respect in principle for the institutions or persons who wield power but obedience through perception of the relationships of power and order that God Himself has willed."

presented in Genesis 2, defines the relationship between husband and wife and serves for Paul as a model of the organization of men and women in the church. The plurality of male and female within the unity of mankind as the image of God may be most clearly understood in marriage, the original structure of men-women relationships. Paul reveals in Eph. 5:22-33 the reasoning behind 1 Cor. 11:3, regarding the first two of the three paired relationships: the head of every man is Christ and the head of woman is the man. Eph. 5:22-33 also illuminates Paul's remarks in 1 Cor. 11:7, that man is the image and glory of God and the woman is the glory of man. The mutual analogy between marriage (the order of creation) and Christ with the church (the order of redemption) reveals that both "orders" are organized identically.¹⁶³

¹⁶³George W. Knight concludes: "But if this is so, then the order Paul is speaking of here (submission and love) is not accidental or temporary or culturally determined: it is part of the *essence of marriage*, part of God's original plan for a perfect, sinless, harmonious marriage. This is a powerful argument for the fact that Christlike, loving headship and church-like, willing submission are rooted in creation and in God's eternal purposes, not just in the passing trends of culture." (176; emphasis original)

CHAPTER THREE

1 CORINTHIANS 14:33-36

At 1 Cor. 11:17 Paul shifts from the topic of women's conduct in worship to the subject of abuses at the celebration of the Lord's Supper in Corinth. He deals with these problems through verse 34 and in chapter twelve discusses various spiritual gifts. Paul emphasizes the unity of the church, using the metaphor of the body, which is united even though it is composed of many different members. In chapter thirteen he encourages his readers to love one another with the same love which they have received, resolving their conflicts and difficulties in that spirit. He addresses tongues and prophecy in chapter fourteen, establishing a priority of the two and setting forth some worship regulations. Paul writes in this section that the reason for his instructions lie in the nature of God: "for God is not a God of disorder but of peace."

(14:33a)¹ This serves as something of a "hinge verse,"

¹The only textual variant to occur in 14:33a is the absence of the definite article \acute{o} at $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ in P46 F G. The entire unit, \acute{o} $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, is missing in Ambrosiaster. As Murray J. Harris has shown, "in NT usage \acute{o} $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ are often interchangeable." *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 37. Therefore, the intention of the author would be the same whether or not the definite article appears with $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.

summarizing the reason for his preceding instructions and laying a foundation for the application that follows. In these verses Paul returns to the topic addressed in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 (i.e., women's conduct in worship services) but with a different concern. In 1 Cor. 11:2-16 the problem he faced was bare-headed women prophesying and praying. In 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 he confronts women who participate in judging prophecies during the worship service. In both places Paul refers to the nature of God and the nature of mankind in his handling of the Corinthian practice. If mankind is created and organized in the image of God, and if God is a "God of order," then the distinction between men and women must be maintained in Christian worship. In Christ Jesus the community of believers are returned to the order God intended mankind to have.

A God of Order

The genitives ἀκαταστοίας and εἰρήνης describe qualities of God,² the former describing what He is not and the latter reflecting what He is. Paul's word order³

²F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) [hereafter *BDF*] §165 discuss the genitive of quality which "in many combinations [provides] an attributive which would ordinarily be provided by an adjective. . . . Hebrew usage is thus reflected, in that this construction compensates for the nearly non-existent adjective." (91)

³The negative particle οὐ stands first; the genitive form of the feminine singular noun, ἀκαταστοίας, occurs before the subject.

emphasizes what God is not, namely, a God who is pleased by chaos in worship and divisions among His people. He is not, in brief, a "God of disorder (ἀκαταστοία)." The nominal ἀκαταστοία occurs only rarely in the New Testament.⁴ It may denote political turmoil (Luke 21:9) or personal unrest (2 Cor. 6:5),⁵ but more often means a "disruption of the peace of the community either by disputes . . . or orgiastic impulses in the gatherings of the congregation. . . ." as in 2 Cor. 12:20; here at 1 Cor. 14:33; and at James 3:16.⁶ It serves as the antonym of εἰρήνη in 1 Cor. 14:33, a word informed by the Hebrew עִלְוּ, as Werner Foerster observes.

In the NT the meaning of εἰρήνη is much the same as that of the Rabbinic עִלְוּ. This may be seen first in its use in greetings and similar expressions, where it has the sense of well-being or salvation. . . . That it is not the Gk. sense which

⁴Luke 21:9; 1 Cor. 14:33; 2 Cor. 6:5; 12:20 and Jas. 3:16. In Luke the term is used in parallel with πολέμους ("wars") and denotes "revolutions, insurrections." In 2 Cor. 6:5 it signifies "disturbances, riots," referring to civil disorders. Paul uses the term in 2 Cor. 12:20 in a "vice list" of terms which characterize a church in conflict and upheaval, indicating "disorder, unruliness." James uses it in 3:16 to describe the external consequences of jealousy and strife, namely ἀκαταστοία and every worthless practice. James uses the adjectival form of the term in 1:8 and 3:8, the only two occurrences in the New Testament. Cf. Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), [hereafter BAGD] s.v. "ἀκαταστοία," 30.

⁵Both meanings also appear in secular literature as Albrect Oepke notes, "καθίστημι," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), [hereafter TDNT] 3:446.

⁶Ibid.

predominates in the NT is particularly plain when we consider that the principal meaning is salvation in a deeper sense. We are also brought into the Rabbinic sphere by its frequent use for concord between men (Ac. 7:26; Gl. 5:22; Eph. 4:3; Jm. 3:18; cf. 1 Pt. 3:11). . . . In 1 C. 14:33 Paul opposes to the confusion caused by prophecy at Corinth the consideration: ["For God is not of disorder but of peace."] In contrast to ἀκαταστοία, εἰρήνη is the normal state of things. We need not think of this in narrowly ethical terms, but along the lines of the Rabbinic use of וְשָׁלוֹם . But the fact that in this sense εἰρήνη is linked expressly and emphatically with God displays the connexion between the inward and the outward noticeable elsewhere in the NT.⁷

God is a God of peace, of unity and wholesomeness. His will for the churches of the Gospel is that they reflect this peace, effecting unity in doctrine and practice by correcting their errors in the public worship service (1 Cor. 11:2-14:40). They are to restrict the exercise of glossolalia within the worship services and regulate those who bring forth prophecies, applying the principle that "God is not a God of disorder and confusion but a God of peace and unity."⁸ This summarizes his instructions on

⁷Werner Foerster, "εἰρήνη," *TDNT* 2:411-12. He identifies three conceptualls in the New Testament for εἰρήνη: peace as a feeling of peace and rest, peace as a state of reconciliation with God and peace as the salvation of the whole man in an ultimate eschatological sense. He states: "All three possibilities are present, but the last is the basis. This confirms the link with OT and Rabbinic usage." (*Ibid.*, 2:412)

⁸D. A. Carson believes that "the sentence can be salvaged only by understanding an additional phrase, such as: '*and this principle must be operative in your church, as in all the congregations of the saints.*'" "'Silent in the Churches': On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35," *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Gruden (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), [hereafter *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*] 140-41.

glossolalia and prophecy and provides the basis for his directions regarding women's activities in the worship service. Paul continues:

As in all the churches of the saints, let the women (αἱ γυναῖκες)⁹ keep silent (σιγάτωσαν) in the churches; for I do not permit (ἐπιτρέπεται)¹⁰ them to speak (λαλεῖν), but let them submit (ὑποτασέθωσαν),¹¹ just as also the law says. And

⁹In v. 34, D F G and the Majority text, along with Cyprian and possibly Ambrosiaster, read ὑμῶν after αἱ γυναῖκες at the beginning of the verse. This could denote "your wives" rather than the more general "women," potentially restricting the command to silence to married women. Two points may be made. Paul could still have in mind "your women," meaning the women who belong to the churches. Further, the textual support for inclusion is weak. All three major Uncials lack it (⋈ A B) as well as Ψ 0243. 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1241. 1739. 1881. 2464 and others, including the Old Latin. Bruce Metzger and the United Bible Societies committee consider it "probably a scribal addition, and preferred the shorted text, which is strongly supported. . . ." *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971), [hereafter *TCGNT*] 566.

¹⁰A second variant in v. 34 occurs at the word ἐπιτρέπεται. The present passive is supported by A B (D F G) K 0243. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1739, and the Old Latin. However, ἐπιτρέπεται, a perfect passive form, is read by Ψ and the Majority text as well as Epiphanius. The variant may be explained as a scribal effort to strengthen Paul's statement, expressing a practice which he has consistently urged for some time.

¹¹A third variant is read at ὑποτασέθωσαν, third person plural active imperative, and supported by ⋈ A B 33. 81. 365. (1175). 1241. 2464 and Epiphanius. The variant ὑποτασέθωαι, a present middle infinitive, is read by (D F G) Ψ 0243. the Majority text, the Old Latin and the Syriac. No distinction in meaning is intended, since the infinitive would also have an imperatival force. Cf. *BDF* §389, who note that "the imperatival infinitive is extremely old and is especially common in Homer. . . ." (196) They comment that this use of the infinitive seems to be preferred when no subject is explicitly stated, which is the case in the colon in which it appears in 1 Cor. 14:34.

if they want to learn (μαθεῖν)¹² something (particular), at home let them ask their own husbands; for it is a shameful (thing) for a woman to speak (λαλεῖν) in church. Or from you did the Word of God come, or among you only did it dwell? If someone thinks to be a prophet or spiritual, let him recognize what I write to you that, of the Lord it is a command (κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή);¹³ and if someone is ignorant, he is ignorant (ἀγνοεῖται).¹⁴

A fourth variant in v. 34 occurs immediately after the third variant. τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, supported only by A, is added, giving the sense "let them [the women] submit to (their) husbands." The weak textual support and the logic behind the addition suggest it was a scribal addition.

¹²A variant reading occurs in v. 35 at μαθεῖν, an aorist active infinitive of μανθάνω, supported by P46 K2 B (D F G) Ψ 0243 and the Majority text. μανθάνειν, a present active infinitive of μανθάνω, is read by K* A 33. 81. 104. 365. 1241. 2464. 2495. There is little difference in meaning, with a possible stress on the ongoing learning in the present infinitive. It may be noted that P46 and B with 81 omit the verb ἐστὶν at the end of v. 35.

¹³A variant appears in v. 37 at the phrase κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή. The three words are arranged 1-3-2 by K* and, perhaps, by 81. Only the first two appear in D (F G and Ambrosiaster. κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολαί, reading the plural, is read by D2 Ψ the Majority text, the Old Latin, the Syriac and others. Metzger suggests this is "a copyist's assimilation to the previous ᾶ." (TCGNT, 566) A and 1739. (1881). substitute θεοῦ for κυρίου. Finally, the text as read by Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and the editorial committee headed by Kurt Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979, twenty-sixth edition), [hereafter N26] is supported by P46 K2 B 048. 0243. 33. 1241. 1739* and Vulgate manuscripts.

¹⁴The variant ἀγνοεῖτω, an imperative, appears in place of the indicative ἀγνοεῖται. Support for the imperative is impressive: P46 B K Ψ 81. 614. Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopic versions and others. It is internally easier to read as well. However, as Metzger notes, "several important representatives of the Alexandrian, the Western, and the Palestinian texts unite to support the indicative," listing K* A*[vid] D 33. 1738. Old Latin, Palestinian versions of the Syriac and the various Coptic versions as well as Origen. He continues, "The alteration between active

So then, my brothers, seek to prophesy and to speak, not forbidding tongues; and let all things decently (εὐσχημόνως) and in order (κατὰ τάξιν) be done. (1 Cor. 14:33b-40)

Verses 34-35 as an Interpolation

Of the many textual questions which have arisen in this section, none bears more directly on Paul's intended message than the question of whether verses thirty-four and thirty-five are original or a later interpolation. Bruce Metzger writes:

Several witnesses, chiefly Western, transpose verses 34-35 to follow ver. 40 (D F G 88* it[d.g] Ambrosiaster Sedulius Scotus) ; in codex Fuldensis they were inserted by Victor of Capua in the margin after ver. 33, without, however, removing them from their place farther down. Such scribal alterations represent attempts to find a more appropriate location in the context for Paul's directive concerning women.¹⁵

No manuscript omits these verses entirely. What some commentators question is whether the varying placement of the verses indicates an interpolation.¹⁶ Gordon Fee argues

and passive forms of the same verb accords with Paul's usage in 8.2-3, whereas the use of the imperative form may have been suggested by Re 22.11. In any case, the imperative gives a less forceful meaning. . . ." (TCGNT, 566)

¹⁵Bruce Metzger, *TCGNT*, 565. The UBS committee assigned the majority reading a rating of {B}. It should be noted that no manuscripts omit these verses and that the transposition can readily be explained by a failure on the part of Western copyists to understand the intrinsic link between the statement "for He is not a God of disorder but of peace" and the directive to women's silence.

¹⁶One such commentator is Gordon Fee, who states: "Although these two verses are found in all known manuscripts, either here or at the end of the chapter, the

that this section is an interpolation and on the matter of transcriptional probability, says:

Bengel's first principle must rule: That form of the text is more likely the original which best explains the emergence of all the others. In this case there are three options: Either (1) Paul wrote these words at this place and they were deliberately transposed to a position after v. 40; or (2) the reverse of this, they were written originally after v. 40 and someone moved them forward to a position after v. 33; or (3) they were not part of the original text, but were a very early marginal gloss that was subsequently placed in the text at two different places. Of these options, the third is easily the one that best fits Bengel's first principle.¹⁷

Fee's conclusion is not supported by the evidence, which may be presented on the basis of the manuscript evidence and on intrinsic probability.

The manuscript evidence heavily favors inclusion at the traditional point, supported by both the Imperial Byzantine and Alexandrian text types. Those manuscripts which move verses 34-35 to a position after verse 40 represent the so-called "Western" text-type,¹⁸ a type whose

two text-critical criteria of transcriptional and intrinsic probability combine to cast considerable doubt on their authenticity." (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699.

¹⁷Gordon Fee, 699.

¹⁸Fee makes the statement about the traditional location of vv. 34-35 that "most MSS (including P46 A B K Ξ 0243 33 81 1739 Maj) include these verses here; they are found after v. 40 in D F G 88* a b d f g Ambrosiaster Sedulius-Scotus, thus the entire Western tradition." (699, n. 1) His statement leaves the reader with the impression that the so-called "Western tradition" carries considerable "weight" and balances the rest of the textual evidence. Therefore, Fee implies, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D) stands as the most reliable textual witness.

reliability has been seriously questioned by the Alands.

They write in summary:

Consequently the theory of a special "Western" type of the text is improbable from the outset, and even its most passionate proponents never refer to it as "Western" without using quotation marks. No important personality can be identified at any time or place in the early Western church who would have been capable of the singular theological achievement represented by the text of the Gospels and Acts in the ancestor of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D). The Western church in the early period may possibly, or even probably, have had a special local text, but its deviations from the "normal" text were no greater than elsewhere. The text found in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D) of the fifth century, however, represents (in its exemplar) the achievement of an outstanding early theologian of the third/ fourth century. In its day it attracted only a limited following; what the nineteenth/ twentieth century has made of it is incredible.¹⁹

The textual evidence which favors displacement of verses 34-35 is therefore very weak. As Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis does so often,²⁰ a difficulty apparent to the editor or author of the exemplar is removed by altering the text. (The difficulty faced by that author or editor is the reconciliation of Paul's directives in vv. 34-35 and his remarks in 1 Cor. 11:2-16.)

Of the three possible explanations offered by Fee on the basis of Bengel's principle, the second suggestion (that

¹⁹Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 68-69.

²⁰The classic examples are the "Western non-interpolations" in Luke and the "Western interpolations" in Acts; cf. Bruce Metzger, *TCGNT*, 191-93 and 259-72; Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, 15, 33, 37, 236, 311.

vv. 34-35 were original at the point following v. 40) may be safely discarded. These two verses, therefore, were either original in the traditional position or an interpolation. Arguing against taking them as an interpolation, D. A. Carson observes that no manuscript omits these verses. He writes:

If Fee's reconstruction of events is correct, the gloss must have been extraordinarily early to have managed to find its way into every manuscript. This because rather unlikely under the assumption that the gloss was inserted at the *end* of the first century, by which time this epistle had been circulating for four decades. It is hard to believe that none of the earliest copies had any influence on the second- and third-century textual traditions to which we have access. Most commentators are rightly reluctant, therefore, to postulate an original omission where no manuscript that has come down to us attests the omission. Moreover, most glosses of substantial size, like this one, seek to explain the text, or clarify the text, or elucidate the text (e.g. John 5:4; Acts 8:37; 1 John 5:7b-8); they do not introduce major problems of flow into the text. The difficulty is so great in this case that we are asked to believe in a glossator who is Biblically informed enough to worry about harmonization with 1 Timothy 2 but who is so thick he cannot see that he is introducing a clash between 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Corinthians 11. In short, unless there are overwhelming reasons for rejecting both of the other two options, this third choice should be dismissed as both weak and speculative. Bengel's first principle is convincing; Fee's application of it is not.²¹ [emphasis original]

Fee's second argument against the authenticity of verses 34-35 is based on intrinsic probability.²² He believes the

²¹D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 142.

²²He defines intrinsic probability as "what an author is most likely to have written." (701, n. 12) He admits it is a subjective criterion and says that it can

structure is improved by deleting verses 34-35, removing the contradiction with 1 Cor. 11:2-16. He also argues that the vocabulary that appears in verses 34-35 differs from Paul's normal usage.

The argument based on structure depends, in Fee's analysis, on Paul moving from the end of his comments on glossolalia and prophecy in verse 33 to an *ad hominem* condemnation of those who claim to be "spiritual" but lead God's people astray (verses 36-38). Paul then concludes all of chapters 12-14 with 14:39-40. Fee overlooks the connection which verses 30-35 have with verse 29, a structure Wayne Grudem discusses:

First, he gave a general statement: "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said" (v 29). Then in vv 30-33a he gave additional instructions about the first half of v 29 and then in vv 33b-35 he gave additional instructions about the second half of the verse. This structure for the passage is not clear at first glance because the comments in vv 30-33a grew quite long as Paul wrote. But the comments on v 29a are a unified whole, no part of which can be removed. So there was no earlier opportunity for Paul to have introduced this section about women.²³

Fee's second argument under "intrinsic probability"

"seldom stand on its own." Only because he believes Bengel's principle demonstrates vv. 34-35 to be an interpolation does he argue on the basis of intrinsic probability. "The transcriptional question comes first, and has always been the primary reason for thinking it an interpolation." (Ibid.)

²³Wayne Grudem, "Prophecy--Yes, but Teaching--No; Paul's Consistent Advocacy of Women's Participation Without Governing Authority," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 21-22 [hereafter, "Prophecy--Yes, but Teaching--No," *JETS* 30 (1987)].

claims that the contradiction with 1 Cor. 11:2-16 would be removed by the omission of verses 34-35. It may first be observed that inclusion of verses 34-35 is the more difficult reading (as evidenced by the fact that the so-called "Western" tradition developed a variant at this point), a criterion Fee does not discuss.²⁴ If it can be shown that 1 Cor. 11:33-36 does not contradict 1 Cor. 11:2-16, Fee's second argument vanishes.

In his third argument in this category, Fee suggests the word usage in verses 34-35 varies from Paul's norm. This argument must be met on a verse by verse basis, examining each of the terms in its context. However, it may be said that two verses are a very small sample by which to measure whether a text is "Pauline" or not and it may also be said that "many passages that all concede are Pauline contain one or more *hapax legomena* (expressions that occur only once, whether one in the Pauline corpus, or once in the New Testament)."²⁵

²⁴So noted by D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 143, who writes: "Clearly, on intrinsic ground inclusion of verses 34-35 after verse 33 is the *lectio difficilior*, the 'harder reading.' Methodologically, the only time the *lectio difficilior* should be overthrown by appealing to 'intrinsic probability' occurs when the external evidence is strongly against the *lectio difficilior*."

²⁵Ibid. A variation on the interpolation theory has been proposed by Robert Allison, "Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36): What did Paul Really Say, and What did it Mean?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 27-60. He believes that this section was from a different letter of Paul and was interpolated at

Structure

Grudem has suggested that verses 33b-35 expand Paul's instruction in verse 29b, as verses 30-33a explain his directive in verse 29a.²⁶ Following his suggestion, the structure of 1 Cor. 14:26-40, dealing with the orderly conduct of worship, may then be outlined:

14:26-36, Final instructions on orderly worship

- v. 26, exercise each gift for the edification of all
- v. 27, two or three speak in tongues & interpret
- v. 28, if no interpreter, let him keep silent
- v. 29, two or three prophets speak & are judged

vv. 30-33a, the order in which the prophets are to speak

vv. 33b-36, only men may judge the prophets

14:37-38, Warning

14:39-40, Summary²⁷

this point (48-49). He proposes that Paul originally intended vv. 34-35 to be taken as "ironic sarcasm" to confront those traditionalists who would keep women from full and egalitarian participation in church leadership. (51) He proposes that the "linguistic similarity with the immediately preceding section" led the unknown editor to make such a mistake. (48) That editor would have to have been incredibly incompetent as he made Paul say the opposite of what Paul intended to say. Even many of those who take an egalitarian position agree that the verses are authentic; cf. Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 74-75; also Mary Evans, *Woman in the Bible* (Greenwood: Attic Press, 1983), 95-96; finally, Walter L. Liefeld, "Women, Submission & Ministry in 1 Corinthians," chapter in *Women, Authority & the Bible*, edited by Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), 149.

²⁶Wayne Grudem, "Prophecy--Yes, but Teaching--No," 21-22, as noted above.

²⁷This outline resembles D. A. Carson's outline:
Order in public Worship (14:26-36)
Tongues (14:27,28)

Grudem's proposal clarifies the context of Paul's instructions regarding women in verses 33b-36. Paul does not forbid women to pray or prophesy, having permitted them to do so in 1 Cor. 11:2-16. He does restrict them from judging prophecies which is an exercise of authority over the one who prophesied, whether man or woman.

In 1 Cor. 14:29 Paul wrote: "But let two or three prophets speak (λαλείτωσαν) and the others (οἱ ἄλλοι)²⁸ let judge (διακρινέτωσαν)." Paul refers judgment of the prophecies delivered in worship services to "the others" who make up the larger group. He does not intend to restrict judgment of the prophecies to other prophets, as though this constituted a particular "church within a church." He does instruct the Corinthians that authoritative evaluation of the prophecies (presumably including doctrinal content)

Prophecy (14:29-33a)
 Restrictions on Women (14:33b-36)
 Warning (14:37-38)
 Summary (14:39-40)
 Concluding Reflections.

D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 107. For a more detailed outline, following Grudem's suggestions, cf. James B. Hurley, *Man and woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 188-89. He acknowledges his indebtedness to Grudem (188, n. 13; Grudem's work was not published at the time) and identifies two specific issues under the general topic of v. 26: speaking in tongues (14:27-28) and prophets (14:29-35).

²⁸οἱ ἄλλοι is a substantivized adjective in the nominative plural. The term denotes ἄλλος denotes someone who is "different fr. the subject who is speaking or who is logically understood. . . ." BAGD s.v. "ἄλλος," 1.a. (39)

should be done by the others in the worship service. Fee argues that had Paul intended to say that only other prophets should judge the prophecies, he would have written differently. Commenting on οἱ ἄλλοι, he states:

This word basically means "others different from the subject." whereas it could mean "the rest," had Paul intended that idea the more correct term would have been οἱ λοιποὶ (cf. 9:5, οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι). to put that another way, the use of οἱ λοιποὶ would almost certainly have meant "the rest of the same class," i.e., prophets. Paul's word could mean that but ordinarily does not, referring simply to "someone else" or, in the plural, "the others that make up the larger group."²⁹

Paul addresses the entire church, evident especially in 1 Cor. 14:12 where Paul encourages the entire community of faith to seek to use their spiritual gifts to build up the church. In 1 Cor. 14:24, he goes so far as to envision the situation where every member of that church would prophecy and his instructions in verse 31 reflect that possibility.³⁰ The only other use of the plural λοιποὶ in this section (11:2-14:40) is in 14:19 where it refers to the entire congregation (as it does here). By using οἱ λοιποὶ, Paul distinguishes between one class or group of church members and the membership at large. That one class or group are to

²⁹Gordon Fee, 694, n. 30.

³⁰Points made by Gordon Fee in support of his argument that the entire church, not just the prophets, are to judge prophecies. (694) It is precisely this position that requires Paul to add vv. 33b-36, restricting οἱ λοιποὶ to men.

judge (διακρινέτωσαν)³¹ those who share a prophecy. The rest of the congregation is to distinguish between the prophecies offered by the prophets, assessing³² them to see if they build up the church or not. Two points may be made regarding this "judging." First, it would entail an exercise of authority over those who prophesied. Second, it would require doctrinal evaluation of the prophecy. Paul began this sections (11:2-14:40) with a comment praising his readers for holding on the doctrines and practices he gave them (11:2). He then presented a theological statement drawn from Scripture (11:3) which he applied and explained. Elsewhere he points out that such edification is possible only when based on Christ Jesus and the teaching He has

³¹διακρινέτωσαν is a third person plural present active imperative form of διακρίνω. Paul uses διακρίνω only rarely, in Rom. 4:20; 14:23 (both in the middle voice with the sense of "make a distinction"); 1 Cor. 4:7; 6:5; 11:29, 31; 14:29. In 1 Cor. 4:7 Paul asks rhetorically, "who are you (singular) to judge?" In 1 Cor. 6:5 he uses διακρίνω (and κρίνω in v. 6) to refer to legal decisions (urging settlement of disputes among Christians within the church without going to secular courts). In 1 Cor. 11:29, 31, Paul uses the term διακρίνω in the context of instructions on the Lord's Supper, calling for his readers to "discern" the body and "examine" themselves. These are the only appearances of διακρίνω in the Pauline corpus. His use of the simple verb, κρίνω, is much more common but occurs in 1 Cor. 11:2-14:40 only at 11:13, 31, 32.

³²Friedrich Büschel, "κρίνω," *TDNT* 3:946-47 commenting on διακρίνω, defines the term as denoting "'to distinguish between persons' [which] gives the further sense 'to judge between two. . .'" The word may denote an assessment of a thing or a person (as in 1 Cor. 11:31). *BAGD* s.v. "διακρίνω," note that it served as a legal technical term ("render a decision") in secular literature, citing Xenophon (fourth century B.C.) and Appianus (second century A.D.).

given to His church (Eph. 4:1-17). The parallel between the list of offices given to the church which is given in 1 Cor. 12:28 and Eph. 4:11 demonstrates the connection in Paul's mind between the authoritative office of διδάσκαλος and the activity described in 1 Cor. 14:29. Karl Rengstorf remarks:

In 1 C. 12:28 f. the διδάσκαλοι come after the ἀπόστολοι and προφήται in a list of those who discharge specific functions in the community; in Eph. 4:11 they come fourth [*sic*] in a similar list after the ἀπόστολοι, προφήται and εὐαγγελισται, being classified with the ποιμένες. . . . In Ac. 13:1 they are mentioned together with the προφήται. It should be noted that the men mentioned in Ac. 13:1 are all of Jewish origin, and are thus closely connected with the Law. Since the προφήται and the διδάσκαλοι are obviously not identical, and since the προφήται are "pneumatics" (1 C. 14:29 ff.), it is likely that the διδάσκαλοι are "non-pneumatics" who edify the congregation by means of their own clearer understanding.³³

Prophets and teachers both serve to build up the church, but each in their own way. Paul had already given permission for women to prophecy if they did so with their heads covered, but he intends in these verses to bar them from judging prophecies. Gerhard Friedrich explains:

Prophets and teachers (→ II, 157, 30 ff.) are frequently mentioned as the most significant preachers of the Word in the community, Ac. 13:1; 1 C. 12:28 f.; Eph. 4:11; R. 12:6 f. The prophets, too, mediate knowledge, so that one can learn from them, 1 C. 14:31; Rev. 2:20; cf. Did., 11:10 f. Yet prophecy is not the same as teaching. Whereas teachers expound Scripture, cherish the tradition about Jesus and explain the fundamentals of the catechism, the prophets, not bound by Scripture or tradition, speak to the congregation on the basis of revelations → 853, 14 ff. διδασκαλία is instruction, προφητεία deals with specific

³³Karl Rengstorf, "διδάσκαλος," *TDNT* 2:157-58.

situations → 848, 33 ff.; 855,4. The teacher considers the past, and gives direction for the present on the basis of what took place or what was said then. The gaze of the prophet is directed to the future, and he fixes the path of the community from the angle. The correctness of doctrine depends on agreement with Scripture and tradition.³⁴

Paul comments on the orderly presentation of prophecies in verses 30-33 and summarizes with verse 33a. The principle which sums up his comments on the orderly presentation of prophecies also serves as his springboard for verses 33b-36. He needs to make those comments since his readers will take οἱ ἅλλοι inclusively, an impression he does not want to give them.

Failure to perceive the relation of verses 33b-36 to verse 29b has led to a number of efforts to explain the prohibition in 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 and the permission granted in 1 Cor. 11:2-16. Carson identifies seven explanations.³⁵

(1) 11:2-16 speaks to small house gatherings and 14:33b-36 speaks to the church gathered together. There is no indication in the text, however, that Paul envisions a different setting for 1 Cor. 11:2-16 than what he has in mind in 1 Cor. 14:33b-36. The setting of both is the church assembly, the place where prophecy was spoken and judged. The whole issue of head coverings would have been moot were 11:2-16 a private gathering.

³⁴Gerhard Friedrich, "προφήτης," *TDNT* 6:854.

³⁵These are listed and discussed by D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 145-53. The last is his own proposed solution.

(2) Paul contradicts himself. It seems highly unlikely that a man of Paul's abilities would contradict himself in such a short space of time.

(3) Paul wants women to submit to the ecclesiastical order, not men. Yet why would Paul then omit mention of men, for are not men also subject to the ecclesiastical order?³⁶

(4) Paul is simply being chauvinist and compelling wives (only) to be silent in church with their husbands.³⁷ Dismissing Paul as a chauvinist avoids a serious engagement of the text.³⁸

(5) The problem (and thus the solution) are local and not to be applied to the rest of the church or to modern

³⁶Carson identifies this as the view of E. Käehler and Karl Barth. (Ibid., 489, n. 17.)

³⁷The view of Elisabeth S. Fiorenza. Carson comments: "Here we have Paul not only strapped into a bourgeois mentality but also guilty of the worst sort of religious jingoism: knowing what he says is preposterous and preparing for the backlash by appealing to the Lord's authority! I confess I cannot help entertaining the suspicion that Fiorenza's exegesis tells us more of her than it does of Paul." (Ibid., 146) For a more detailed critique of Fiorenza, cf. Winsome Munro, "Women, Text & the Canon," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 18 (1988): 18-30. Mary Evans, *Woman in the Bible*, prefers this interpretation. She suggests that Paul forbids "wives taking part in the public discussion of prophecies made by their own husbands." (100)

³⁸The attitude towards Scripture which is reflected by many is expressed by Winsome Munro who writes: "Canon is a shared body of texts that preserves for a community its past with which it can still interact. Canon is a text we are to quarrel with, laugh with and at, as well as respond to with yea and amen." (30) If such is the case, it is surprising that Jesus never laughed at the Old Testament and Paul felt such authority inhered in the Scriptures.

times. J. Keir Howard, advocating a form of this view, writes:

Such a situation was clearly a local problem and just as Paul can affirm that a prophet must be silent under certain circumstances, so he orders the Corinthian feminists to be silent without affecting their basic right of taking an audible part in congregational worship in an orderly fashion. As he does consistently throughout the Corinthians correspondence, Paul is once again insisting on propriety and order in the conduct of the gatherings of the local church. The translators of the Jerusalem Bible put the phrase neatly and capture the real purpose of the Pauline admonition in their rendering, the women 'must not raise their voices in meeting'. Such unseemly behaviour was a disgrace (*aischron*).³⁹

The first objection is that Paul does not say that they should not raise their voices; he says they should be silent (*σιγάτωσαν*).⁴⁰ Further, if Paul warns against noisy women, why not mention noisy men? And why say it in such a way as to ban *all* women if only noisy women were meant?⁴¹

(6) Paul is quoting his adversaries when he writes: "let the women keep silent."⁴² Munro offers three

³⁹J. Keir Howard, "Neither Male nor Female," *Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983): 38-39. Walter L. Liefeld takes this position and argues: "Paul is giving normative teaching. But the normative teaching is not women's silence, it is how God's people are to behave in the world of the first-century church and therefore in any other similar circumstance." "Women, Submission and Ministry in 1 Corinthians," in *Women, Authority & the Bible*, 153.

⁴⁰Cf. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 33.120 and 33.121 (1:402).

⁴¹These last two objections are Carson's, "Silent in the Churches," 147.

⁴²Proponents are listed by Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 489, n. 28. Included are Walter Kaiser, Gilbert Bilezikian and Jerome Murphy-O'Conner.

objections.

First, there is nothing in the text to indicate that the disjunction is between the prescription to be silent and the view of the writer. . . . Next, if the word in 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 are a quotation of what others were mistakenly saying, why would not the historical Paul have said so, as in 1 Corinthians 1:12, 15:12 and 2 Corinthians 10:10, instead of obscuring his own point of view? But most damaging of all for this thesis is the fact that the passage closely resembles the thought patterns, style,⁴³ and use of vocabulary of the Pastoral epistles. . . .

(7) 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36 can be reconciled through an understanding of the word "prophecy" and its distinctive place in the Christian church in the first century.⁴⁴

Carson sketches this viewpoint:

Paul has just been requiring that the church in Corinth carefully weigh prophecies presented to it. Women, of course, may participate in such prophesying; that was established in chapter 11. Paul's point here, however, is that they may *not* participate in the oral weighing of such prophecies. That is not permitted in any of the churches. In that connection, they are not allowed to speak—"as the law says." . . . Paul in this chapter has already appealed once to "the law" (cf. 14:28), by which he means the Old Testament Scriptures. By this clause, Paul is probably not referring to Genesis 3:15, as many suggest, but to the creation order in Genesis 2:20b-24, for it is to that Scripture that Paul explicitly turns on two other occasions when he discusses female roles (1 Corinthians 11:8, 9; 2 Timothy 2:13). The passage from Genesis 2 does not enjoin silence, of course, but it does suggest that because man was made first and woman was made for man, some kind of pattern has been laid

⁴³Winsome Munro, 28. D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 147-51, discusses the cluster of interpretations that have this approach in common. He notes that a trend has developed in the last 15 years to see Paul quoting his opponents more and more, usually wherever the "commentator doesn't like what Paul is saying!" (148)

⁴⁴D. A. Carson advocates this view and lists M. E. Thrall and Wayne Grudem as others who do as well (Ibid., 489-90, n. 42).

down regarding the roles the two play. Paul understands from the creation order that woman is to be subject to man—or at least that wife is to be subject to husband. In the context of the Corinthian weighing of prophecies, such submission could not be preserved if the wives participated; the first husband who uttered a prophecy would precipitate the problem.⁴⁵

Craig S. Keener has recently proposed another interpretation. He believes the prohibition against women speaking arises from the slower pace that less-educated women might require for instruction.⁴⁶ In his view, Paul forbids only irrelevant questions⁴⁷ which women may ask. Keener concludes:

Paul's point is that those who do not know the Bible very well should not set the pace for learning in the Christian congregation; they should instead receive private attention to catch them up to the basics of Christian instruction that the rest of the congregation already knows. In Corinth, the issue had come to a head with uneducated women interrupting the Scripture exposition with questions. Paul suggested a short-range and a long-range solution to the problem in his instructions on how to bring order back to the Corinthians' church services. The short-range solution was that the women were to stop interrupting the service; the

⁴⁵Ibid., 151-52.

⁴⁶Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 83, gives the reason for a lack of relevant questions by women: "Why would the women in the congregation have been more likely to have asked irrelevant questions than the men? Because, in general, they were less likely to be educated than men. Most Jewish women knew less of the law than most Jewish men, and most Greek women were less accustomed to public lectures than were their husbands."

⁴⁷He writes: "Paul's words merely *limit* speech in public settings; Paul is opposing only the irrelevant questions some women have been asking during the teaching part of the church service." (85) (emphasis original)

long-range solution was that they were to learn the knowledge they had been lacking.⁴⁸

If Paul had wanted to make the point Keener suggests, he would certainly have commented on the pace of instructions, mentioned interruptions, and encouraged the women to speak up once they had "caught up" to the knowledge of the rest of the congregation. Paul's blanket directions would mean, if Keener's approach is correct, that *all* women in Corinth were ignorant. And how does "what the law says" (v. 34) relate to the pace of instruction? The strongest objection to this understanding is that if Paul had wanted to say this, he would have written differently.

It may be noted that husband and wife relationships are not the specific focus of Paul's directions in 14:33b-36 but that the husband-wife relationship (marriage) serves as the model for how men and women relate to one another, particularly in the Church and most particularly in public worship. Women may certainly pray and prophesy since neither of those activities involve leadership of the congregation or authoritative functioning at worship services.⁴⁹ Paul then proceeds to make his application.

⁴⁸Craig S. Keener, 88.

⁴⁹On the subject of "prophecy," Carson writes: "Elsewhere I have argued at length that "prophecy" in the New Testament is an extraordinarily broad category, extending all the way from the product of the pagan Muse (Titus 1:12) to Old Testament canonical prophecy. In common church life, it was recognized to be Spirit-prompted utterance, but with no guarantee of divine authority in every detail, and therefore not only in need of evaluation

Verses 33b-34

"So (ὥς)⁵⁰ in the churches of the saints let the women (αἱ γυναῖκες) be silent (σιγάτωσαν) in the churches; for it is not permitted (ἐπιτρέπεται) for them to speak (λαλεῖν), but let them be submissive (ὑποτασθήτωσαν), just also the law says."

As in 1 Cor. 11:16, Paul does not want to base his argument on simple observation or mere uniformity of practice. The churches are together one church, as K. L. Schmidt observes: "The decisive point is the integration of the 'congregations' into the 'congregation.'"⁵¹ Uniformity

(1 Corinthians 14:29) but necessarily inferior in authority to the deposit of truth represented by the Apostle Paul (14:37-38). In certain respects, then, it is perfectly proper for Paul to elevate teaching above prophecy, especially if the teaching is considered part of the non-negotiable apostolic deposit that serves in part as one of the touchstones enabling the congregation to weigh the prophecies that are granted to the church, and especially if the prophecies themselves, unlike that apostolic deposit, are subject to ecclesiastical appraisal." D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 153; cf. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 130-31. H. Wayne House applies this more broadly when he writes: "So then any public speaking other than a divine utterance would be in violation of Paul's prohibition in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36." "The Speaking of Women and the Prohibition of the Law," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 310.

⁵⁰ὥς may function "as a conjunction denoting comparison, as. This 'as' can have a 'so' expressly corresponding to it or not, as the case may be; further, both sides of the comparison can be expressed in complete clauses, or one or even both may be abbreviated." BAGD, s.v. "ὥς," II. (897)

⁵¹K. L. Schmidt, "καλέω," *TDNT* 3:506. Individual congregations stand with one another (as in 2 Cor. 11:8; 12:13; Phil. 4:15) but their unity is more than mere

of practice, however, reflects a unity of doctrine (καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει). Three points require the modern reader's attention: what Paul intends when he directs the women to be "silent" in worship assemblies (αἱ γυναῖκες . . . σιγάτωσαν); what the short phrase ἀλλὰ ὑποτασέθωσαν signals; what he means by καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει.

Paul uses the verb σιγάτωσαν in the singular in 1 Cor. 14:30 (σιγάτω), instructing the one who is speaking to cease if a second person receives a prophecy during the discourse of the first speaker. He has used σιγάτω also in 1 Cor. 11:28, directing those who speak in tongues to be silent in church if there is no interpreter available. They are to keep their glossolalia private.⁵² Aside from his use of the term in 1 Cor. 11:28, 30 and 34, (and an appearance in Rom. 16:25), σιγάω does not occur elsewhere in Paul's writings.⁵³ Since the word normally means "to say nothing,

juxtaposition, Schmidt points out. He cites the singular in reference to "all churches" at Rom. 16:23; 1 Cor. 14:23; and the plural at Rom. 16:4, 16; 1 Cor. 7:17; 14:33; 2 Cor. 8:18; 11:28. The ease with which Paul moves from singular to plural and vice versa is evidenced by the "cleavage in textual readings at 1 C. 14:35." (Ibid.)

⁵²It may be noted at this point that a parallel exists between this comment in 1 Cor. 11:28 and that of 1 Cor. 11:35. The one who speaks in tongues is to keep his gift private if there is no interpreter and the women are to keep their discourse private, bringing questions to their own husbands at home.

⁵³Paul's use of σιγάω in Rom. 16:25 is in the perfect passive form, referring to the mystery of the Gospel which had been "kept silent" in past ages but is revealed now through Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Paul never uses the substantive, σιγή.

keep silent,"⁵⁴ it is apparent that Paul does not intend total and absolute silence on the part of the three groups of people enjoined to silence in verses 28, 30, and 34. Those who would speak in tongues are forbidden to speak in tongues but could join in prayer, hymn singing, prophesying and so forth. Those directed to stop prophesying when another received a revelation are not prohibited from praying, interpreting tongues, singing and the like. So also with the directive to women in verse 34. They are instructed to be silent with reference to a particular type of activity, identified in verse 29 as the judging of prophecies. The women in the church must "keep silent" when prophecies are being judged, for they are "not permitted to speak."

Paul writes as an apostle of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 1:1) and with that authority explains why the women should be quiet in the churches when prophecies are evaluated. God forbids them to do so.⁵⁵ This is apparent from the use of the passive voice of ἐπιτρέπω in 1 Cor. 14:34 and from its other two appearances in the Pauline corpus. In 1 Cor. 16:7 Paul uses it with an active voice and ὁ κύριος is explicitly

⁵⁴Cf. BAGD s.v. "σιγάω," 749.

⁵⁵He writes οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπται, a third person singular present passive indicative form of ἐπιτρέπω. As noted above, BDF §313, discussing passives with intransitive meanings, note that "Aram. generally uses the pass. for actions of a celestial being." When Paul writes "for it is not permitted," he intends the reader should understand that it is God who forbids it.

stated as the subject. There he expresses his desire to remain with the Corinthians for a time "if the Lord permits."⁵⁶ His final use of ἐπιτρέπω occurs in 1 Tim. 2:12 where he writes "I do not permit a woman to teach or have authority over a man. . . ."⁵⁷ Thus, Paul uses the verb in both the active and the passive voices with the same intent. Since he believes he is called by Christ Jesus to evangelize the Gentiles (cf. Rom. 1:1), the prohibition originates with the Lord. The women in Corinth are specifically forbidden "to speak" (λαλεῖν) and are specifically instructed to be subordinate (ἀλλὰ⁵⁸ ὑποτασσεσθωσαν).⁵⁹ Grudem defends this limited understanding of Paul's restriction:

"For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate." "But" represents *alla*, indicating a strong contrast between speaking and being subordinate. Thus the kind of speaking Paul has in mind is specifically speaking that involves insubordination. Not every type of speech would fit this description, but evaluating prophecies aloud certainly would. It would involve assuming the possession of superior authority in matters of

⁵⁶The form is ἐπιτρέψῃ, a third person singular aorist active subjunctive.

⁵⁷The form is first person singular present active indicative. Cf. chapter four of this study for an exegesis of this verse.

⁵⁸*BDF* §447.3; cf. Rom 10:16. It indicates a strong contrast with the preceding.

⁵⁹The form of the verb is third person plural present passive imperative. This word group occurs under the domains of "guide, discipline, follow" (where the idea of control is minimized) and "control, rule." It may be used to signal submission to the orders or directives of someone, to obey them (Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 36.18) or "to bring something under the firm control of someone" (37.14).

doctrinal or ethical instruction especially when it included criticism of the prophecy.⁶⁰

Paul intends λαλεῖν to be taken as "to speak independently, of one's own authority." For the woman to take the lead (whether in marriage or in the church) is a reversal of God's design (Gen. 2:18-24) similar to the leadership displayed by Eve when she took the fruit from the tree of knowing good and evil, ate and gave some to her husband who, following her lead, ate also (Gen. 3:1-6).

The word ὑποτάσσω sums up the reason for the prohibition stated by Paul. She is to be submissive (to the man). Gerhard Delling points out that the relationship between husband and wife, the norm for the relationship between men and women in the church, reflects a structure and an order present also in parent-child relationships. He writes:

Lk. 2:51 stresses that the growing Jesus subordinated Himself to His parents, cf. v 40 and 8:21. Within His special mission the earthly Jesus adapts Himself to the earthly orders. As in the right relation of sons or daughters to parents, for which ὑποτάσσομαι is not used elsewhere . . . so also in the commonly required subjection of wife to husband according to the biblical understanding (Col. 3:18; Eph. 5:22-24; 1 Pt. 3:1; Tt. 2:5) the issue is keeping a divinely will order, cf. 1 Cor. 11:3; 14:34. . . . According to Paul this position of the wife should also be maintained in the church assemblies in the prevention of self-willed speaking (as distinct from 1 C. 11:5). . . .⁶¹

⁶⁰Wayne Grudem, "Prophecy--Yes, but Teaching--No," *JETS* 30 (1987): 22.

⁶¹Gerhard Delling, "ὑποτάσσω," *TDNT* 8:43.

As Paul prepares to draw the entire section of 11:2-14:40 to a close, he states "just as the law says" (καθὼς⁶² καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει). Fee believes the brevity of Paul's reference to the law creates a problem and argues:

Real problems for Pauline authorship lie with the phrase, "even as the Law says." First, when Paul elsewhere appeals to "the Law," he always cites the text (e.g., 9:8; 14:21), usually to support a point he himself is making. Nowhere else does he appeal to the Law in this absolute way as binding on Christian behavior. More difficult yet is the fact that the Law does *not* say any such thing.⁶³

Several points may be made in response. Paul uses ὁ νόμος infrequently in 1 Corinthians. It appears in 1 Cor. 9:8 to refer back to a list of comments he has made regarding the right of the evangelist to make a living preaching the Gospel. Although he then cites Deut. 24:4 in support (1 Cor. 9:9), he seems to refer back to verses 1-7 when he asks in 1 Cor. 9:8, "Am I speaking about these things from a

⁶²καθὼς is a comparative conjunction and subordinates the clause which follows it to the main clause. Cf. *BDF* §453.

⁶³Gordon Fee, 707. He cites a similar saying in Josephus, "The woman, says the Law, is in all things inferior to the man. Let her accordingly be submissive." *Contra Apion* 2.200-201. (707 and n. 35) Fee's citation of Josephus may sound harsher than it actually is. Josephus is explaining marriage laws (2.199) which forbids marriage of two men or two women, not to marry for money or acquire a wife deceitfully or violently (2.200). Rather, a man is to seek her in marriage from the one who has authority over her (the nearest kin), "for, saith the Scripture, 'A woman is inferior to her husband in all things.' Let her, therefore, be obedient to him; not so, that he should abuse her, but that she may acknowledge her duty to her husband; for God hath given the authority to the husband." 2.201; cited from *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*, translated by William Whiston (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1987), 806.

human point of view or does the law not also say these things (καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει)?" The law, of course, does not specifically say the things Paul says in verses 1-7. The closest he can come is a verse which instructs Israel to let the ox feed from the produce it is grinding. That Paul looks backward in 9:1-7 rather than forward to the citation in verse 8 is supported by the fact that he introduces the citation in verse 8 with the formula, "for in the law of Moses it is written." In Paul's mind there is a distinction between what "the law says" and the citation, the former being much more broad than the citation itself.⁶⁴ When Paul writes ὁ νόμος in 1 Cor. 14:34, he understands that Torah is the means by which God has made known this prohibition.⁶⁵ Walter Gutbrod writes:

Finally, the Law is also used by Paul as the place where he can find instructions for the concrete life of the community, i.e., in διδασχῆ. In 1 C. 9:8 f.; 14:21, 34 the Law is expounded allegorically to provide the answers (or to support answers already given) to questions relating to the life of the community. It is worth noting in this connection that the proof from the Law is not adduced as the decisive argument, but as confirmation of what is already known to be right on other grounds.⁶⁶

Paul uses ὁ νόμος figuratively, personifying it. Paul uses

⁶⁴The only other uses of ὁ νόμος in 1 Corinthians occur in 1 Cor. 9:20 and 14:21; and 15:56. The term does not appear in 2 Corinthians.

⁶⁵Gerhard Kittel, "λέγω," *TDNT* 4:110 notes that ὁ νόμος can serve as a subject for the verb λέγω (as in 1 Cor. 9:8 and 14:34). He refers the reader to the Midrash on Exod. 23:7 and *Sifre Numbers*, 115, on Num. 15:38 for the expression אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ (n. 167).

⁶⁶Walter Gutbrod, "νόμος," *TDNT* 4:1077.

ἡ γραφὴ similarly in Gal. 3:8. There he writes that ἡ γραφὴ, knowing ahead of time that God would justify the Gentiles faith, pre-evangelized Abraham. Fee errs when he claims Paul does not evidence this use of ὁ νόμος elsewhere (he misunderstands 1 Cor. 9:1-9 and fails to grasp Paul's intent when he personifies Torah, using both ὁ νόμος and ἡ γραφὴ). Fee also fails to understand the application Paul makes of Genesis 2, about which Carson comments:

The passage from Genesis 2 does not enjoin silence, of course, but it does suggest that because man was made first and woman was made for man, some kind of pattern has been laid down regarding the roles the two play. Paul understands from this creation order that woman is to be subject to man. . . .⁶⁷

As Paul had explained in 1 Cor. 11:2-16, the woman submits to the man because of identity, order and purpose. Paul does not need to repeat that at 1 Cor. 14. As he did in 14:28 and 14:30, Paul writes succinctly and expects his readers to maintain the context of the section (11:2-14:40) throughout. Grudem explains, "the command to be silent just meant to be silent with respect to the particular kind of speech under discussion. . . ."⁶⁸ James Hurley summarizes:

If we accept the conclusion that 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 refers to the evaluation of prophets, we must then go on to consider the actual instructions given by Paul about the matter. He did not see this as insignificant. All the churches of God, he said, were uniform in this practice (14:33b). Verse 34b provides his rationale: 'They (women) are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, even

⁶⁷D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 152.

⁶⁸Wayne Grudem, 23.

as the Law says.' The issue at hand is once again that of subordination. The speaking in view constituted some sort of exercise of authority and was therefore inconsistent with the subordinate or submissive role which Paul believed women should play in the assembled church body. It is hard to see how this could be applied to just any form of speech; it is not difficult to understand if the evaluating of the message of a prophet is in view. The participation of women in an activity which involved a judgment of male and female prophets within the context of the church is certainly an exercise of authority.⁶⁹

Verse 35

"But if they want to learn (μαθεῖν θέλουσιν) something (τι), let them ask (ἐπερωτάτωσαν) their own husbands (τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρες) at home (ἐν οἴκῳ);⁷⁰ for it is a shame (αἰσχρὸν) for a woman to speak (λαλεῖν) in church (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ)."

Paul addresses a real situation.⁷¹ He does not forbid women to learn but recognizes that women will want to learn, and what they want to learn will vary. Whatever⁷²

⁶⁹James B. Hurley, 191.

⁷⁰The word order of the last colon is emphatic: "at home, their own husbands, let them ask."

⁷¹He begins the protasis with εἰ and the verb, θέλουσιν, is in the indicative mood. This construction "denotes a simple conditional assumption with emphasis on the reality of the assumption (not of what is being assumed): the condition is considered 'a real case'." *BDF* §371; cf. also §372 (188-89).

⁷²Paul uses the enclitic τι, the neuter singular accusative indefinite pronoun (the nominative is identical in form). The specific subject of their inquiry is not relevant; whatever they want to learn, they are to learn at home from their husbands. Cf. also *BDF* §131.

they⁷³ want⁷⁴ to learn, they should ask their husbands at home. In verse 31 Paul had instructed the Corinthians about the order of presenting prophecies. He indicated that he gave these directives so that they may all learn (μανθάνωσιν)⁷⁵ and be encouraged. Paul wants them to learn appropriately, at home from their husbands.⁷⁶ The phrase ἐν οἴκῳ⁷⁷ begins the apodosis⁷⁸ and balances with ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ⁷⁹

⁷³The subject is αἱ γυναῖκες, explicitly mentioned at the beginning of v. 34.

⁷⁴The verb θέλουσιν (a third person plural present indicative active form) frequently denotes the motive of desire. Paul uses it for this purpose also in Gal. 4:20; 2 Cor. 12:20; 1 Cor. 14:5. Gottlob Schrenk comments: "this activity of wishing is strong in the NT. For an urgent, demanding θέλειν which takes the form of a request, cf. Jn. 9:27; 12:21; Mt. 5:42; 12:38; Mk. 6:22, 25 . . . 1 C. 14:35." Gottlob Schrenk, "θέλω," *TDNT* 3:45, n. 8.

⁷⁵Karl Rengstorf believes that 1 Cor. 14:31 reflects the "disciplinary nature of early Christian prophecy," and that 1 Cor. 14:35 belongs to this context. He argues that v. 35 may be more narrowly focused on moral questions but that in general, "prophecy serves the clear proclamation of the will of God, not the satisfaction of curiosity. The community needs it when it, or one of its members, needs guidance in a particular situation and does not find it in Scripture (cf. e.g., 1 Tm. 4:14)." Karl Rengstorf, "μανθάνω," *TDNT* 4:409.

⁷⁶Grudem points out that unmarried women would have had a man in the family to whom they could go: "Of course some women were unmarried and would not have had a 'husband' to ask. But there would have been other men within their family circles, or within the fellowship of the church, with whom they could discuss the content of the prophecies. Paul's general guideline is clear, even though he did not make pedantic qualifications to deal with every specific case." Wayne Grudem, "Prophecy--Yes, but Teaching--No," *JETS* 30 (1987): 22, n. 16.

⁷⁷The use of ἐν with the dative case to signal location or place is very common in the New Testament. Cf. *BAGD*, s.v. "ἐν," I.1.a.

at the end of the verse. They should "ask" (ἐπερωτάτωσαν)⁸⁰ their husbands. The only two appearances of the verb ἐπερωτάω in the Pauline corpus is at Rom. 10:20 (a citation of Is. 65:1) and here.⁸¹ Its use in the Synoptics, especially Mark, shows that "sometimes it seems to suggest a more pressing question (Jn. 18:7)."⁸² The reader may wonder why Paul would restrict even a question asked by a women. Grudem responds:

Suppose that some women in Corinth had wanted to evade the force of Paul's directive. The easy way to do this would be to say, "We'll do just as Paul says. We won't speak up and criticize prophecies. But surely no one would mind if we asked a few questions. We just want to learn more about what these prophets are saying." Then

⁷⁸It also recalls the end of v. 28 where Paul had instructed those who speak at tongues to be silent in the worship service and speak privately to himself and to God.

⁷⁹In the phrase ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ the noun ἐκκλησίᾳ is anarthrous, due perhaps to Paul desire to balance with ἐν οἴκῳ. It is nevertheless definite, as Harris observes an anarthrous noun may be definite when used in familiar or stereotyped expressions, such as idiomatic prepositional phrases. Cf. Murray J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 304. Paul uses the phrase ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ with the definite article with the singular (1 Cor. 4:17; 6:4; 12:28) and in the plural (1 Cor. 7:17; 14:33, 34) and, as in 1 Cor. 14:35, in the singular without the definite article (1 Cor 11:18; 14:19, 28).

⁸⁰ἐπερωτάτωσαν is a third person plural present active imperative form of ἐπερωτάω.

⁸¹Paul uses the simple verb ἐρωτάω more frequently, at Phil. 4:3; 1 Thess. 4:1; 5:12; 2 Thess. 2:1.

⁸²Heinrich Greeven, "ἐρωτάω," *TDNT* 2:687. He adds that "it is used for judicial examination (Mk. 14:50 f. etc.), as also for investigation or counter-question (Mk. 14:44; Ac. 23:34) A special use is for the request for a decision in the disputed issue." (Ibid.)

such questioning could be used as a platform for expressing in none too-veiled form the very criticisms Paul forbids. Paul anticipates this possible evasion and writes: "If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak [that is, question prophecies] in church."⁸³

Paul concludes the sentence with the statement that it is a "shame" (αἰσχρὸν)⁸⁴ for a woman to speak (authoritatively) in church." Bultmann discusses the word:

From the root αἰσχ- we also find αἰσχρὸνός in the NT in the sense of "that which is disgraceful" in the judgment of men (1 C. 11:6; 14:35), especially as expressed in words (Eph. 5:12 . . .) or in relation to filthy lucre (Tit. 1:11).⁸⁵

It may be noted that Paul's concern is not so much the judgment of men but the judgment of God, who created men and women. The rhetorical question which follows (verse 36) asks the readers to recall their unity in the faith, doctrine and practice, which the Gospel effected.

Verse 36

"Or from you did the Word of God (ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ) originate (ἐξηγήθη), or for you alone did it arrive (κατήντησεν)?"

The Corinthians have been conducting worship services according to their own ideas of what was appropriate and what was not. They had permitted a number

⁸³Wayne Grudem, 22.

⁸⁴Paul is the only New Testament writer to use αἰσχρὸς (1 Cor. 11:6; 14:35; Eph. 5:12; Tit. 1:11).

⁸⁵Rudolf Bultmann, "αἰσχύνω," *TDNT* 1:190.

of activities which the rest of the church of Jesus Christ did not allow and had actually abused the Lord's Supper to the point that some had grown sick and others had died (1 Cor. 11:30). Paul asks in verse 36, perhaps sarcastically,⁸⁶ whether they really believe what their actions indicate: that they are the source and norm of theology and practice, the source of the Word of God and the exclusive purpose for its being.

The disjunctive particle ἢ⁸⁷ and the masculine plural adjective μόνους have been discussed by some commentators who would take verse 36 in the sense of "What! did the word of God proceed from you (males), or are you the only ones it has reached?"⁸⁸ In this approach, Paul argues for full female participation in the Corinthian worship services. He cites his opponents' in verses 33b-35 and then, by means of the disjunctive particle at the beginning of verse 36, states his shock at their prohibition of women speaking authoritatively in the services.⁸⁹ If this view is

⁸⁶Robert W. Allison, "Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36): What did Paul Really Say, and what did it Mean?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 27-60 argues that v. 36 is a "classic example of Paul's ironic sarcasm." (51)

⁸⁷The disjunctive particle ἢ occurs twice in this verse. Paul uses this construction in an interrogative sentence also in Rom. 4:9-10; 1 Cor. 1:13 (P46) 14:36; and 2 Cor. 3:1.

⁸⁸This translation is offered by Robert Allison, 51.

⁸⁹Paul may be quoting from the letter sent by the Corinthians or, as Allison suggests (47-48), a later editor inappropriately placed these verses in 1 Corinthians 14 because of linguistic similarities to the section on

adopted, then the "law" (νόμος) must refer to Jewish tradition rather than Torah. Carson lists four arguments against this line of interpretation. He first notes that the fact "only" appears in masculine form is irrelevant. The masculine form is the form used when referring to people who are a mixed group of men and women or when their sexual identity doesn't matter.⁹⁰ He then points out that verses 34-35 do not form a quotation of Paul's opponents since certain characteristics are present which are lacking here.

That Paul does quote from the Corinthians' letter no one disputes. But the instances that are almost universally recognized as quotations (e.g., 6:12 7:1b; 8:1b) enjoy certain common characteristics: (i) they are short (e.g., "Everything is permissible for me," 6:12); (ii) they are usually followed by sustained qualification . . . (iii) Paul's response is unambiguous, even sharp. The first two criteria utterly fail if we assume verses 34-35 are a quotation from the letter sent by the Corinthians.⁹¹

Carson also proposes that Paul never refers to Jewish traditions when he uses the word νόμος.⁹² He then discusses

prophecy and glossolalia. As noted above, such a hypothesis has no textual support whatsoever and requires the existence of an editor of tremendous incompetence. It further requires the rejection of 1 Cor. 11:2-16 (as Allison does, 53, n.2) and 1 Tim. 2:11-15 and a much different understanding of Eph. 5:22-33 than is natural.

⁹⁰D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 148. Both Hebrew and Greek (as well as English) can refer to men and women with a masculine noun or pronoun, as is obvious from Gen. 1:26-28 in the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and English translations.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²"Moreover, although Paul uses the word *law* in several ways, he *never* uses it to refer to Jewish tradition, and the full expression found here, "the law says," occurs

the disjunctive particle.

(d) Although it is true that the first word in verse 36 is probably a disjunctive particle, nevertheless the proffered explanation does not follow. . . . In other words, Paul allegedly cites the Corinthian view that women must be silent, and then replies with some exasperation, "What! Did the word of God originate with you?" He thereby *dismisses* the content of verses 34-35.⁹³

It is also apparent that the problem with the Corinthians was not that they were too rigidly following Mosaic law or Jewish traditions, but that they were moving in a radical, "spiritualizing" direction which ran contrary to both Scripture and tradition (e.g., sexual conduct in 1 Corinthians 5, lawsuits in the next chapter, marriage in the following chapter, and so on). The nature of the error at Corinth, evidenced in the rest of the letter, makes it highly unlikely that verses 34-35 represent the position of Paul's opponents.

only twice elsewhere in Paul (Romans 3:19; 1 Corinthians 9:8), both with reference to the Mosaic law, and the former, judging by the wealth of quotations that immediately precede it, to the Scriptures, to what we would refer to as the Old Testament." (Ibid.; emphasis original)

⁹³Ibid., 149. He adds: "To quote in full, Thayer [in his *Lexicon*] says that the disjunctive may appear "before a sentence contrary to the one just preceding, to indicate that if one be denied or refuted the other must stand. . . . In other words, Thayer does not say that the disjunctive particle in question is here used to *contradict* the preceding clause, and thus *dismiss* it, but that it is used to introduce a "sentence contrary to the one just preceding," *not* in order to dismiss the preceding, but in order "to indicate that if one be denied or refuted the other must stand." To put the matter another way, he is saying that the construction is a form of logical argument that is used to *reinforce* the preceding clause." (Emphasis original)

The phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ appears frequently in Paul's writings.⁹⁴ The content of this Word of God, as expressed by the missionary preaching of Peter and Paul, "is simply Jesus Christ . . . The Word of God is the Word about Jesus. . . . For [Paul] the λόγος (τοῦ θεοῦ or κυρίου) is the message proclaimed by him and accepted by his churches."⁹⁵ If the Word of God originated (ἐξῆλθεν)⁹⁶ with them, they are free to change it and conduct their worship services as it pleases them. If it did not originate from them but from God (as is evident in the phrase itself, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ),⁹⁷ then they are to submit⁹⁸ to it. If ὁ

⁹⁴Rom. 9:6; 1 Cor. 14:36; 2 Cor. 2:17; 4:2; Col. 1:25; 1 Thess. 2:13 [twice]; 1 Tim. 4:5; 2 Tim. 2:9; and Tit. 2:5. The nouns appear with and without the definite article in the verses.

⁹⁵Gerhard Kittel, "λέγω," *TDNT* 4:116. He adds, "That is to say, it is simply the message about Christ. The usage is already fixed in Th." (*Ibid.*)

⁹⁶The term ἐξῆλθεν aorist active indicative form of ἐξέρχομαι. Although very frequent in the Gospels, Paul uses it only rarely (Rom. 10:18; 1 Cor. 5:10; 14:36; 2 Cor. 2:13; 6:17; 8:17; Phil. 4:15; and 1 Thess. 1:8). Johannes Schneider, "ἐξέρχομαι," *TDNT* 2:678-79, points out that ἐξέρχομαι can denote "to issue from" and appears in the Septuagint in a figurative sense of fruit "coming out" of the earth or of what man "produces."

⁹⁷It is possible to take the genitive case in ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as a genitive of origin and relationship. (*BDF* §162)

⁹⁸Submission to God's will and His order has occurred several times within a few verses. The spirits of the prophets are to submit (ὑποτάσσεται) to the prophets in 1 Cor. 14:32 and wives are to be submissive (ὑποτασσέσθωσαν), a model for women's behavior in worship services.

λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ did not originate with them, neither was it proclaimed only for them (εἰς ὑμᾶς),⁹⁹ nor was it to benefit (κατήντησεν) only them.¹⁰⁰

Paul uses the word καταντάω sparingly. In 1 Cor. 10:11 he uses it as he describes the purpose of certain Old Testament events, which occurred for the benefit of the New Testament people, "for whom the end of the ages has arrived at its goal (κατήντηκεν)." In Eph. 4:13 it appears to refer to the goal for which the several gifts of 4:11 were given to the church, to build up the body of Christ "until we all should reach the goal (καταντήσωμεν) [which is] the oneness of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God. . . ." Paul's only other application of καταντάω is in Phil. 3:11 where Paul expresses the hope that he might reach the goal (καταντήσω) of the Resurrection. It is apparent, then, that Paul asks his readers in 1 Cor. 14:36 whether they are the origin and the goal of the Gospel. He implies his readers are guilty of arrogance and self-will, replacing God's will

⁹⁹The preposition εἰς with the accusative case indicates the purpose or direction of preaching. (*BDF* §206.4)

¹⁰⁰The term καταντάω assumes the goal is set and the end determined, and normally denotes "the meeting of this set goal and prescribed conclusion." Otto Michel, "καταντάω," *TDNT* 3:623. The word appears nine times in Acts, usually to signal the end of a journey (16:1; 18:19, 24; 20:15; 21:7; 25:13; 27:12; 28:13). The only departure from this use in Acts occurs at 26:7 where it means the "goal ordained or set for a man" (*Ibid.*). The only other author to use this term in the New Testament is Paul (1 Cor. 11:11; 14:36; Eph. 4:13; Phil. 3:11).

with their own, disregarding both what God has said and what the church universally practices. Otto Michel explains:

God establishes the goal by His Word and act, and He does not do things without end of purpose. In faith man embraces God's Word, fixing his hope on the goal set thereby. . . . In a surprising way visible only to faith the end of the old aeon and the dawn of the new has come upon the community (κατήντηκέν). From eternity. From eternity there thus comes to the community a divine action which carries within it a purpose and meaning for men (καταντάν). . . . There are older churches than Corinth, and others which live by the Word of God independently of it. Hence the church has a duty to listen to the word of its brothers and to test its own knowledge.¹⁰¹

Having concluded his final specific instruction, Paul summarizes in verses 37-40 before moving on to a new subject in 15:1 (marked by the phrase γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί). He writes

If someone considers (himself) to be a prophet or spiritual, let him recognize what I am writing to you that it is a command from the Lord.¹⁰² But if someone is ignorant, he is ignorant. So then, [my] brothers, seek to prophesy and to speak,¹⁰³ stop

¹⁰¹Otto Michel, "καταντάω," *TDNT* 3:624-25. Fee adds: "'Are you the only ones to whom it has come,' he asks further, 'so that you can carry on in your own individualistic way, as if there were no other believers in the world?' This is biting rhetoric, which flows directly from the (probably immediately) preceding clause, 'as in all the churches of the saints.' Who do they think they are anyway?" (710) The connection with v. 33 is obvious, as is the connection with v. 40. However, the tenor of vv. 29-33 is positive, which makes Paul's "biting rhetoric" difficult to understand if vv. 34-35 are omitted.

¹⁰²"From the Lord" translates the genitive κυρίου, understood here as a genitive of origin and relationship. Cf. *BDF* §162.

¹⁰³Both of the substantivized infinitives (which occur here with a preposition) are anaphoric, referring back to prophesying and speaking in verses 26-36. (*BDF* §399.1)

forbidding tongues;¹⁰⁴ and let all things be well ordered (εὐσχημόνος) and according to (God's) plan (κατὰ τάξιν).

Carson comments

Paul's chief aim in these verses is not to lay out an exhaustive list of necessary ingredients in corporate worship, but to insist that the unleashed power of the Holy Spirit characteristic of this new age must be exercised in a framework of order, intelligibility, appropriateness, seemliness, dignity, peace. For that is the nature of the God whom we worship.¹⁰⁵

With a final, comprehensive directive to do all things in a seemly and respectable way (εὐσχημόνως),¹⁰⁶ in accordance with God's design (κατὰ τάξιν),¹⁰⁷ Paul concludes

¹⁰⁴J. W. Wenham notes that "μη with the Present Imperative generally denotes a command to cease to do an action already begun, in accordance with the principle that the Present tense denotes action in progress." J. W. Wenham, *The Elements of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 165. (Emphasis original)

¹⁰⁵D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*, 136.

¹⁰⁶Paul uses εὐσχημόνως only three times: Rom. 13:13; 1 Cor. 14:40; and 1 Thess. 4:12 (the only appearances of this adverb in the New Testament). In all three cases Paul is in the process of summing up one section as he prepares to move to another and exhorts his readers to a new way of life in Christ, characterized by εὐσχημόνως, conforming conduct to faith.

¹⁰⁷The prepositional phrase κατὰ τάξιν recalls the ὑποτάσσειν of 1 Cor. 11:32 and 35. This is the only time τάξις occurs in 1 Corinthians. The term means "fixed succession or order; good order; position, post." BAGD s.v. "τάξις," 803. The only other time Paul uses τάξις is in Col. 2:5, where τάξις is specifically described as the "good order of your faith in Christ" and linked with στερέωμα ("firmness, steadfastness," a Biblical hapax). Both τάξις and στερέωμα are arthrous in Col. 2:5. The only occurrences of τάξις outside Paul's writings are once in Luke (1:8), referring to the rotation of priestly service at the temple, and five times in Hebrews (5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:11, 17), all of which refer to the "order" of Melchizedek.

his remarks on the worship services at Corinth (11:2-14:40) and moves to a discussion of the Resurrection. In 11:2-16 he argued that women should cover their heads when they pray or prophesy and in 14:33-36 he limited the right to judge prophecies to men. The theological basis for both passages is established in 1 Cor. 11:3. That set of relationships, based on the image of God and marriage, also serve as the basis for Paul's instructions to Timothy in 1 Timothy 2.

CHAPTER FOUR

1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15

Introduction

Paul (1 Tim. 1:1)¹ writes to Timothy (1 Tim. 1:2), a young man (1 Tim. 4:12) who travelled with Paul on his second and third missionary journeys.² Paul writes to him in Ephesus (1 Tim. 1:3) about certain false teachers.³ As

¹Craig S. Keener writes: "It should be noted in passing that the authorship of 1 Timothy is frequently debated in scholarly circles, and even more frequently simply assumed not to be Pauline. It is nearly impossible to be trained in biblical scholarship these days and not be forced to deal with this position, and my own training is no exception, although I stand among the minority of scholars who claim that 1 Timothy is Pauline." *Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 101. He concludes that "the issue of authorship is not ultimately critical." (Ibid.)

²Acts 16:1; 17:14, 15; 18:5; 19:22; 20:4. He is mentioned by Paul in Rom. 16:21; 1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10; 2 Cor. 1:1, 19; Phil. 1:1; 2:19; Col. 1:1; 1 Thess. 1:1; 3:2, 6; 2 Thess. 1:1; 1 Tim. 1:2, 18; 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:2; and Philemon 1. The author of Hebrews mentions him as well (Heb. 13:23).

³Indications of the nature of this false teaching appear in 1 Tim. 1:4 where "myths and genealogies" are mentioned and 1 Tim. 6:20, where their doctrine is summarized as "so-called knowledge." George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 27, comments on the use of γνῶσις in that passage: "But it is precarious to make too much of Paul's one use of γνῶσις in the PE [Pastoral Epistles] since he has used it so widely and frequently before (some 22x) where Gnosticism is not in view and has also from time to time warned against a false view of the significance of "knowledge" in earlier contexts (cf., e.g.,

he reminds Timothy about the importance of sound doctrine (1 Tim. 4: 13, 16) and holy conduct (1 Tim. 3:15), Paul also instructs him (and through him, the church in Ephesus) about worship services (1 Tim. 2:1-15) and ecclesiastical order (1 Tim. 3:1-16). Douglas Moo summarizes what may be deduced about the false teachers.

1. The false teachers sowed dissension and were preoccupied with trivialities (1 Timothy 1:4-6; 6:4-5; cf. 2 Tim. 2:14, 16-17, 23-24; Titus 1:10; 3:9-11).

2. The false teachers stressed asceticism as a means of spirituality. They taught abstinence from certain foods, from marriage, and probably sex generally (1 Timothy 4:1-3). In keeping with these ascetic tendencies, they may also have stressed physical training as a means of spirituality (4:8).

3. The false teachers had persuaded many women to follow them in their doctrines (1 Timothy 5:15; 2 Timothy 3:6-7).

4. The false teachers were encouraging women to discard what we might call traditional female roles in favor of a more egalitarian approach to the role relationships of men and women.⁴

1 Cor. 8:1, 2). Furthermore, the context of 'myths and genealogies' in the PE suggests not gnostic aeons but matters relating to Jewish speculations and given an erroneous religious significance. . . ."

⁴Douglas Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men? 1 Timothy 2:11-15," *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), 181. In support of his fourth point, he admits "this is not stated explicitly as a plank in the false teachers' platform anywhere in the pastoral epistles."

He offers four points in support. First, advice to abstain from marriage seems likely to be part of a negative view towards women. Second, Paul advises young widows to marry (1 Tim. 5:15). This may have been necessary because of false teaching to the contrary. Third, the error in Ephesus resembles the error in Corinth. Moo says "in both

Paul begins his second chapter with an admonition for Christians to pray for all those in authority so that people may live tranquil and quiet lives (2:1-3). This is pleasing to God because it facilitates the spread of the Gospel, the Good News that God wants all men (ἀνθρώπους, both men and women, v. 4) to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth. Paul then offers a short credal formula (verses 5-7), for which he was appointed (by God) a herald and apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles "in faith and truth (ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ)."⁵ Having laid that foundation, he proceeds to give worship directions.

Verse Eight

"Therefore, I want (βούλομαι) the men (τοὺς ἄνδρας) to pray (προεύχεσθαι) in every place, lifting holy hands

situations, the problem arose from within the church, involved the denial of a future, physical resurrection in favor of a present, 'spiritual' resurrection (see 2 Timothy 2:18; 1 Corinthians 15, coupled with 4:8), and led to incorrect attitudes toward marriage and sex (1 Corinthians 7; 1 Timothy 4:3), toward food (1 Corinthians 8:1-13; 1 Timothy 4:3, although the specific issues are a bit different), and, most importantly, to a tendency on the part of the women to disregard their appropriate roles, especially vis-a-vis their husbands (see 1 Corinthians 11:2-18; 14:33b-36; 1 Timothy 2:9-15; 5:13-14; Titus 2:3-5)." (Ibid.)

⁵The prepositional phrase ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ may be taken as a hendiadys, describing one idea with two words. Cf. F. Blass, A. Debrunner and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), [hereafter *BDF*] §442.16. If this is Paul's intent, he is claiming in 1 Tim. 2:7 to be an authorized messenger for the "true faith" which he is to teach to the Gentiles.

without wrath or dissension (διλογισμοῦ)⁶." Up to verse 8, Paul had used ἄνθρωπος three times in chapter two (and all in the plural),⁷ referring to "all those in positions of prominence (ὑπεροχή),"⁸ that God wants to save "all men," and describing Jesus as the one mediator between "God and men." It is apparent that by ἄνθρωπος, as used in the plural in 1 Timothy 2, Paul intends the reader to understand "people," both adult males and adult females (as well as children). By shifting to ἀνὴρ⁹ in verse 8, Paul indicates a change in the focus of his comments. He begins to address adult males specifically (the same term occurs in v. 12 with

⁶A variant reading occurs at this point. The plural διλογισμῶν is read by \aleph^2 F G H 33. 81. 104. and others, in place of the genitive singular accusative masculine noun διλογισμοῦ, supported by \aleph^* A D Ψ the Majority text and the Latin. External support and internal probability (ὀργή is also singular) favor the singular διλογισμοῦ, but the meaning would be the same whichever reading was adopted.

⁷Neither ἄνθρωπος nor ἀνὴρ appear in chapter one.

⁸A term which occurs only here and in 1 Cor. 2:1, describing "superiority" of speech. Cf. Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the new Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), [hereafter BAGD] s.v. "ὑπεροχή," 841.

⁹Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), [hereafter Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*] 9.24 translate ἀνὴρ as "an adult male person of marriageable age. . . ." (1:107) They add that "it is possible that ἄνθρωπος differs somewhat from ἀνὴρ in connotation, since ἄνθρωπος would perhaps be somewhat more generic in implications." (Ibid., n. 6) When Paul intends for the reader to understand "husband" by ἀνὴρ, he marks the text (as in 1 Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9, the only other uses of ἀνὴρ in 1 Timothy; cf. also Tit. 1:6 and especially 2:5).

the same meaning).¹⁰

Paul writes "I want (βούλωμαι)" at the beginning of this paragraph. He uses the verb infrequently but his use reveals that he means more than "I would like, I prefer." In 1 Cor. 12:11 he uses it to refer to the "decision" of the Holy Spirit regarding the distribution of spiritual gifts. In 2 Cor. 1:15, 17, Paul uses the term to describe his "plans" to visit the Corinthians and quickly defends the serious intent behind making those plans.¹¹ Almost half of the uses of βούλωμαι in Paul's letters are in 1 Timothy and Titus,¹² demonstrating his earnest desire for a particular conduct in 1 Tim. 2:8; 5:14; and Tit. 3:8. When Paul uses this term, he uses it as an apostle of Jesus Christ. Gottlob Schrenk notes that "three times βούλωμαι is used in the Past. with reference to ordering by apostolic authority."¹³

¹⁰George W. Knight III comments: "Men are specified here because it is their particular responsibility to lead the church and its worship service (cf. v. 12; 3:2, 5; 4:11-16; 5:17). Paul thus gives specific instructions to men here just as he will give specific instructions to women in the verses that follow (vv. 9ff.)." (128)

¹¹He asks his Corinthian readers where he makes his plans "lightly" (ἐλαφρῶς, a Biblical hapax) or whether he plans (βούλωμαι) "according to the flesh" (κατὰ σάρκα) in 2 Cor. 1:17.

¹²Besides the citations in 1 and 2 Corinthians, βούλωμαι occurs in Phil. 1:12 and Philemon 13. Thus, of nine uses, four are in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 2:8; 5:14; 5:9; Tit. 3:8).

¹³Gottlob Schrenk, "βούλωμαι," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), [hereafter *TDNT*] 1:632. He adds that this is always with the accusative and infinitive

Verse eight functions as a "hinge verse," connecting Paul's comments in 2:1-7 (by means of the οὖν) with what follows (by supplying the verb necessary to verse 9).¹⁴ As Paul had directed the men in verse 8, so now he instructs the women in verse 9.

Verses Nine and Ten

"Similarly, women [also]¹⁵ in appropriate (κοσμίῳ)¹⁶

that this use of βούλομαι is particularly close to its use in the Septuagint and is close to the use of Josephus, "when the reference is to the disposition of the royal will or the lawgiver." (Ibid., n. 54)

¹⁴Such "hinge verses" occur also at Eph. 5:21 and 1 Cor. 14:33.

¹⁵The conjunction καὶ is enclosed in brackets in the 26th edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece*, edited by Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and the committee headed by Kurt Aland (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979), [hereafter *N26*] and the fourth edition of *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993) distributed by the United Bible Societies (hereafter, *UBSGNT* [4th]). Two variant readings appear at this point. The conjunction is omitted entirely by \aleph^* A H P 33. 81. 1175 and some of the versions. A second variant, καὶ τὰς (adding the accusative feminine plural definite article), is supported by D2 Ψ and the Majority text. καὶ is read by \aleph^2 D* F G 6. 365. 1739 and the Vulgate. The addition of καὶ may be easier to explain than the omission because Paul adds καὶ after αὐτῶς at Rom. 8:26; 1 Cor. 11:25; 1 Tim. 5:25. However, he uses αὐτῶς without καὶ at 1 Tim. 3:8, 11; Tit. 2:3, 6. The meaning would not be affected either way.

¹⁶κόσμιος appears only here and at 1 Tim. 3:2 in the New Testament. Hermann Sasse, "κόσμιος," *TDNT* 3:895, identifies it as denoting "an essential part of the Gk. ideal, namely, the element of the ordered, the controlled, the measured, or the balanced. . . ." It is, he points out, "not specifically Christian" but a virtue also recognized in non-Christian society. (Ibid., 896)

A variant reading occurs at this point, substituting κοσμίως for κοσμίῳ and supported by \aleph^2 D* F G H 33. 365. 1739. 1881, a reading which Sasse categorizes as "secondary."

clothing (καταστολή)¹⁷ with modesty (αἰδοῦς)¹⁸ and good judgment (σωφροσύνης)¹⁹ to adorn (κοσμεῖν) themselves, not in braided (hair) (πλέγμασιν) or gold or pearls or very expensive (πολυτελεῖ) clothing (ἱματισμῶ), but that which is fitting (πρέπει) for women professing (ἐπαγγελλομένας) godly religion (θεοσεβίαν), through good works (δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν)."

It is possible that Paul wants the reader to understand both the finite verb βούλομαι and the infinitive προσεύχεσθαι to carry forward. This would then mean that Paul is instructing women to adorn themselves modestly only

(Ibid.) κοσμίῳ is read by \aleph^* A D2 $\bar{\Psi}$ and the Majority text with some versions.

¹⁷The term καταστολή denotes "appropriate, ordered conduct." Karl Rengstorf, "καταστολή," *TDNT* 7:595. It can denote "clothing" as well because "the further sense of 'clothes, clothing' derives from the fact that decorum finds a first visible expression in clothing." (Ibid.) This word occurs only here in the New Testament. In favor of understanding καταστολή as a referent for "clothing" is the appearance of καταστολή at Is. 61:3, where those who mourn in Zion are given a καταστολήν δόξης (this is the only place in the Septuagint where καταστολή occurs).

¹⁸Rudolf Bultmann, "αἰδώς," *TDNT* 1:171, notes that "in the NT αἰδώς occurs for certain only in 1 Tim. 2:9" In the context of 1 Tim. 2:9, Paul describes a clothing which does not bring shame upon the woman but is "modest, appropriate."

¹⁹The term σωφροσύνη appears in the New Testament only at Acts 26:25; 1 Tim. 2:9, 15. In Acts 26:25, Paul defends the soundness of his witness to Festus by claiming what he has said is "true and makes sense" (ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης). The adverbial form appears in Tit. 2:12, a New Testament hapax. There Paul encourages Titus instructing Christians to deny the ungodly and the worldly passions and live "reasonably" (σωφρόνως) and δικαίως and εὐσεβῶς.

when praying publicly in the worship service. Against this interpretation three points may be made. The first is logical, noting that it would seem strange for Paul to teach women to dress modestly while praying but implying that immodest dress would be acceptable if she were not praying. The offense is in the appearance of the women in verse 9, not the deportment. The second point against carrying both the finite and the infinitive verbs into verse 9 from verse 8 is the syntax. The infinitive *προεύχεσθαι* in verse 8 depends on the verb *βούλομαι* and is balanced in verse 9 with the infinitive *κοσμεῖν*, also dependent on the verb *βούλομαι*. The structure of these three verses may be represented as follows:

V. 8 -- Main verb + infinitive + participial phrase

V. 9 -- (Main verb) + infinitive (*κοσμεῖν*)

V. 10 -- + finite verb (*πρέπει*) + participial phrase

The third point against reading the activity of prayer into verse 9 is the marker *ὡσαύτως*, a comparative adverb. George Knight comments on Paul's use of this term.

But it must be noted in this regard that the similarity that *ὡσαύτως* speaks of in the PE [Pastoral Epistles] in relation to groups of people (here and 3:8, 11; Tit. 2:3, 6; cf. also Rom. 8:26 and its context) is that the groups in view are to be "like" those mentioned before in having certain qualifications, though not necessarily the same qualifications and activities. In each case the emphasis is on "similarity" rather than "sameness."²⁰

²⁰George W. Knight III, 132.

There is a parallel statement in 1 Peter 3:1-5 and a different view in the *Testament of Reuben*. The author of the *Testament* reveals an entirely negative view of women.

For women are evil, my children, and by reason of their lacking authority or power over man, they scheme treacherously how they might entice him to themselves by means of their looks. . . . They contrive in their hearts against men, they by decking themselves out they lead men's minds astray, by a look they implant their poison, and finally in the act itself they take them captive. For a woman is not able to coerce a man overtly, but by a harlot's manner she accomplishes her villainy. Accordingly, my children, flee from sexual promiscuity, and order your wives and your daughters not to adorn their heads and the appearances so as to deceive men's sound minds.²¹

The author's attitude towards women contrasts sharply with Paul (e.g., Gal. 3:27-28; 1 Cor. 11:2-16) but there is in evidence in both (and in Peter) a sensitivity to what a woman communicates when she adorns herself with expensive jewelry and clothing.²²

²¹*Testament of Reuben* 5:1-5a, cited from the translation done by H. C. Kee and included in the anthology edited by James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1983), 2 vols., 1:784. Kee dates the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* to the second century B.C.

²²That such attitudes prevailed in Greek society as well as Jewish circles may be demonstrated by Plutarch's essay, *Advice to a Bride and Groom*, cited by Timothy J. Harris, "Why did Paul Mention Eve's Deception? A Critique of P. W [sic] Barnett's Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 338, which reads (in part) "It is not gold or precious stones or scarlet that makes her such [i.e., a woman adorned], but whatever betokens dignity, good behaviour, and modesty (26) . . . and most women, if you take from them gold-embroidered shoes, bracelets, anklets, purple, and pearls, stay indoors. . . . Not only the arm of the virtuous woman, but her speech as well, ought to be not for the public . . . For a woman ought to do her

The references to these costly trappings have led some to limit Paul's instruction to wealthy women only. Alan Padgett, for example, argues that verses 9-10 concern wealthy women who could afford fine clothing, gold and pearls. What Paul says in verses 11-15 would then be limited to those wealthy ladies, not applicable to the church at large. He also argues:

What is more, as rich women they would likely have churches meet in their homes. Such women would naturally aspire to leadership in the churches at Ephesus and thus they would need training in the Christian faith and the interpretation of Scripture. False teachers were the tutors they chose, in part because these false teachings were attractive to them (cf. II Tim. 4:3), in part because the false teachers saw themselves as career professionals who had to have students.²³

Padgett reconstructs a great deal from very little textual information and fails to support his conclusion (including his assertion that the false teachers were "career professionals" who "had to have students"). He then moves to restrict Paul's admonition to those wealthy women who are to submit to orthodox trainers (not their husbands) and learn "in peace" (so taking ἡσυχίᾳ). If this is what Paul intended the reader to understand in these verses, he did not say it very well.²⁴

talking through her husband . . . (30-32)."

²³Alan Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: I Timothy 2:8-15 in Social Context," *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 23.

²⁴That a similar exhortation appears in 1 Pet. 3:1-5 indicates a wider audience than merely wealthy women. It was not that wealthy women were directed to dress

Women (not just wives) are to dress modestly, in accord with their profession of faith.²⁵ Of course, wealthy women would have more with which to adorn themselves, but the principle would apply to all women. Whether a woman would wear one gold ring or many, one strand of pearls or several, she would be well-advised to focus her energies on living out her faith. Knight summarizes:

The ultimate adornment with which Christian women should be concerned is good works. ἀλλά contrasts good works with immodest attire. And since the preceding immodest practices are themselves already contrasted with modest apparel, we have a three-layered contrast (modest, immodest, good works). Therefore ἀλλά makes the ultimate emphasis fall on good works (cf. again 1 Pet. 3:1 ff., especially v. 4). Paul is advocating not just modesty in dress, but also that more time and energy be spent on spiritual adornment.²⁶

appropriately in these two passages, nor that wealthy women were called upon to be quiet; but that women were instructed to turn away from the decorations of the world (Paul may indicate a negative connotation with the two uses of κορμο-words in 2:9) to doing good works, living out their faith. A consequence of this was silence in the worship services.

²⁵Craig S. Keener adds: "Some women today may feel that it was unfair for Paul to pick on extravagantly dressed, well-to-do women but not on men; but Paul no doubt did so because they were the ones normally addressed by this particular issue in this congregation and more generally in antiquity. This does not mean, however, that Paul would not have addressed the same counsel to the men had they been creating a similar disturbance (difficult as this would have been in that culture). . . . After all, 1 Timothy 2:8 tells only men to avoid wrath and disputing when they pray, but Paul hardly wanted women to pray in wrath and disputing!" (107)

²⁶George W. Knight III, 136. He adds: "What emerges is a statement of principle about women's dress (v. 9a), and application to the current situation in hyperbolic form (v. 9b), and a refocus of the argument to an ultimate and more important concern for good deeds (v. 10): principle,

It is helpful to observe, before examining verses 11-15, that there is nothing in verses 8-10 which would limit Paul's directives to wealthy women alone²⁷ or to women in Ephesus alone²⁸ or women deceived by false teachers. Paul does not mention false teachers or false doctrine in 1 Timothy 2. When he does mention women in the context of false teaching (2 Tim. 3:6-7), he limits the reference by writing γυναικάρια, a diminutive plural form of γυνή.

Knight remarks:

Those whom the false teachers seek to capture are designated with γυναικάρια, a diminutive of γυνή (and a NT hapax used with similar significance in extrabiblical literature [see BAGD]), literally "little women," which is used here with a negative connotation. It is the immaturity and thus the weakness of these "childish women" that make them susceptible to the false teachers. Paul does not use the term to derogate women but to describe a situation involving particular women. That he uses a diminutive form shows that he is not intending to describe women in general.²⁹

The women of 2 Tim. 3:6-7 allow false teachers to lead them astray because they are overwhelmed by their sins. This is

application, reorientation." (Ibid., 138)

²⁷When Paul addresses the wealthy directly, he marks the text, as at 1 Tim. 6:17 where he addresses τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι.

²⁸Paul Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry (1 Timothy 2:11-15)," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 15 (1991): 324, writes, "It was by no means a narrow or local context since it appears in the writings of both Peter and Paul's. In Paul's case the paraenesis occurs as part of a generalized passage about the conduct of prayer within the churches."

²⁹George W. Knight III, 433.

a far different picture than 1 Tim. 2:8-15, where the context is public worship services and all women are in view. The view that Paul speaks only to female heretics who advocate a particular heresy³⁰ is not indicated in the text of 1 Tim. 2:8-15 whatsoever.

It may also be noted that while Paul's instructions apply specifically to worship services throughout this section, his directives have application in the daily life of the Christian as well. Knight writes:

Therefore, Paul's instructions to women, like the preceding instructions to men, are related to the

³⁰This approach is favored by Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger, "May women teach? heresy in the pastoral epistles," *Reformed Journal* 30 (1980): 14-18. They write: "2 Timothy 3:6-7 and 1 Timothy 5:11-15 indicate that women were involved in the errors which plagued the church at Ephesus, and both references seem to imply that wanton behavior was part of the problem with the female apostates. Is the prohibition [of 1 Tim. 2:12] directed against all Christian women everywhere teaching anything, or is it addressed to women heretics who taught certain doctrines?" (Ibid., 14-15)

The Kroegers have not read the texts very closely. 2 Tim. 3:6-7 does mention some women who fell prey to false teachers, but if those women are in view in 1 Tim. 2:8-15, Paul would have: (1) condemned the false (male) teachers who led them astray, as he does in 2 Tim. 3:6-7; (2) limited his reference to women in 1 Tim. 2:8-15, as he does in 2 Tim. 3:6-7, by marking the text (e.g., γυναικάρια). The women mentioned in 2 Tim. 3:6-7 follow, they do not lead. It is difficult to image that women who are so insecure and immature in their faith would suddenly function authoritatively, as is the case in 1 Tim. 2:8-15.

The reference to 1 Tim. 5:11-15 seems entirely irrelevant. Paul is directing young widows at that point to get married rather than take the vows of a church-supported widow so they don't have to break those vows if they later marry. Paul warns that some have already turned away after Satan (v. 15), that is, some younger widows who took the vows have broken them, left the faith, and pursued fleshly satisfactions.

context of the gathered Christian community but are not restricted to it. Men must always live holy lives that avoid wrath and dispute, particularly in connection with prayer for others; women are always to live in accord with their profession of godliness, dressing modestly and discreetly, and manifesting a proper relationship to men as regards the question of authority.³¹

Paul continues his instructions on the activities of believing women in the worship assembly in 2:11-15. When he has concluded his remarks he will turn to the qualifications a man must have to be considered for the office of "overseer" (ἐπίσκοπος, 1 Tim. 3:1). Between the admonitions to Christian women in verses 9-10 and the qualifications for the office of ἐπίσκοπος listed in 3:1-7, Paul describes the responsibilities and restrictions of women in verses 11-15.

Paul's remarks in these verses stem from his concern for Christian conduct at public worship and the connection this has to sound teaching, much as it was in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36.³²

³¹George W. Knight III, 131. While this is true, Paul directs his comments specifically to the worship service and any application is secondary.

³²So J. N. D. Kelley, *The Pastoral Epistles*, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1960): 65-67. He labels the worship services "prayer meetings." Cf. H. Wayne House, "The Speaking of Women and the Prohibition of the Law," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 310-11; Ralph Earle, "1 Timothy," *Expositors Bible Commentary* 11: 360; Douglas Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?", 182; Alan Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus," 22; Paul W. Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry: 1 Timothy 2:11-15," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 15 (1991): 321; Gloria Neufeld Redekop, "Let the women learn: 1 Timothy 2:8-15," *Studies in Religion*, 19 (1990): 237.

Verses Eleven and Twelve

"Let a woman (γυνή) learn (μανθανέτω) in quietness (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ) in all submission (ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ). And (δὲ) I do not permit (ἐπιτρέπω) a woman (γυναικὶ) to teach (διδάσκειν) nor (οὐδέ) to authorize (αὐθενεῖν) a man (ἄνδρος), but (ἀλλ') to be (εἶναι) in quietness (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ)."

Paul arranges verse 11 so that the reader encounters the subject (γυνή) first, followed by a prepositional phrase (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ), the verb (μανθανέτω) and a second qualifying prepositional phrase (ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ). The effect of Paul's structure is striking, presenting a balance of prepositional phrase - verb - prepositional phrase followed in verse 12 by infinitive (woman) - main verb - infinitive (man) - prepositional phrase (identical to verse 11a, forming an *inclusio*). It is apparent that Paul intends the reader to take verses 11-12 as a unit of instruction.

Ann L. Bowman identifies three general approaches to these verses:

Historical reconstructions generally fall into three categories. Some commentators suggest that the basic problem was one of women seeking improperly to assert authority over men in the worship assembly. Other commentators suggest that some women in the church were teaching heresy and that Paul sought to prevent them from using the worship assembly for that purpose. Still other interpreters suggest that Paul's prohibitions were given because women were doctrinally untaught and were thus more susceptible

to false teaching.³³

The position a reader takes on these verses depends on how he understands individual references in the text. Four of these will be examined next.

"Woman" or "Wife?"

By its position, γυνή is emphatic and requires the reader to decide whether Paul refers to a "wife" or a "woman" regardless of married state, an adult female. Either is grammatically possible. The singular noun may represent the entire class or category it signifies,³⁴ and it does so here. The question faced by the reader is whether that category or class is "wives" or "women."³⁵ Paul frequently uses γυνή to denote the category "women"

³³Ann L. Bowman, "Women in Ministry: An Exegetical Study of 1 Timothy 2:11-15," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (1992): 194. She cites James B. Hurley, Homer A. Kent Jr. and J. N. D. Kelly as examples of the first category; Bruce Barron, Catherine C. Kroeger, Philip B. Payne and David M. Scholer as advocates of the second; and Aida Besançon Spencer, Richard and Joyce Boldrey as adherents of the third. Craig Keener could be added to this third group as well.

³⁴*BDF* §139 discusses the "collective (generic) singular" which appears in the New Testament with persons. Paul uses the generic singular in Rom. 2:17-19; 3:1; 14:1; 1 Cor. 6:5. They state that "this usage is not unclassical" (77)

³⁵*BDF* §257.3, discussing the definitive article with nouns such as θάνατος, πνεῦμα, πατήρ, suggest that such nouns "may be anarthrous not only in formulae . . . but also when anaphora is ignored. . . ." They cite 1 Tim. 2:12 as an example of use in formulae and suggest γυναῖκι . . . ἀνδρός should be understood as substituting for "over her husband," taking γυναῖκι as denoting a "wife" and ἀνδρός, a "husband."

without reference to their marital status (e.g., 1 Cor. 7:1; 11:3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15; 14:34, 35; Eph. 5:23), particularly in the context of conduct in worship services (1 Cor. 11, 14). Ann Bowman develops three points which support "women" rather than "wives"

The group of individuals under discussion here is women generally; that is, this directive is not limited to wives. Three facts make this clear. First, in the preceding verses (2:8-10) Paul directed men (ἄνδρας) to pray and women (γυναῖκας) to adorn themselves properly. Since it is unlikely that these instructions are limited to husbands and wives, it is unlikely that verses 11-15 are limited to wives. Second, in this context Paul was viewing men and women as part of a worshiping community, not as family members. . . . Third, had Paul been speaking of the husband-wife relationship, a definite article or possessive pronoun before ἄνδρός in verse 12 might have been expected (as in Eph. 5:22-25, 28-29, 31, 33).³⁶

The immediate context (1 Tim. 2:8-15) contains five references to women, two in the plural (verses 9 and 10), two in the collective singular (verses 11 and 12) and once for Eve (verse 13). This may be intentional, narrowing the reader's focus from "women (plural)" to "woman (collective singular)" to "woman (the first woman, Eve, the prototype of all her daughters)."³⁷ The collective singulars in verses

³⁶Ann L. Bowman, 197.

³⁷This section (1 Tim. 2:11-15) seems to have been very carefully structured. As noted above, vv. 11-12 are balanced for effect and emphasis. As will be noted below, there is a progression in vv. 13-15 that not only follows Genesis 2 and 3, but may also be represented by "Adam/Eve (v. 13), Adam/the woman (the only appearance of the definite article with the noun γυνή, v. 14), the man and the woman (implied in the verbs, v. 15). Therefore the interpreter may well be justified in seeing the five references to women

11-12 would then serve to move the reader from the plurals in verses 9-10 to the (prototypical) singular in verse 14. If this is the case, the term γυνή most likely denotes "woman" as a category rather than only a "wife."³⁸

In Quietness or Silence?

The prepositional phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ appears at the beginning and at the end of this instructional unit.³⁹ Paul uses the noun in a prepositional phrase, μετὰ ἡσυχίας, in 2 Thess. 3:13 to describe the "quiet" lifestyle of the Christian who earns his daily bread through honest work. Luke uses ἡσυχίαν to describe the "quiet" which fell over the crowd when Paul addressed them in Aramaic (Acts 22:2). Paul characterizes both the manner in which the woman is to learn in the worship services (v. 11) and the general

as forming a progression from "all women" to "Eve" who is the prototype of "all women," the collective singulars in vv. 11-12 forming the "bridge" between "all women" and "Eve, the prototype."

³⁸It may be noted that "woman" is not without a connection to "wife" since Eve, the first woman, was created to be a wife for Adam. The relationship of husband and wife, particularly of Adam and Eve, serves as the model for the relationship of all women and all men in the church, particularly at worship services.

³⁹The noun ἡσυχίᾳ occurs under three domains: "quiet circumstances, silence, quiet living." (Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 2:117.) The first definition is that of "a state of undisturbed quietness and calm—quiet circumstances, undisturbed life." (22.42; 1:247); the second definition is "to main a state of silence, with a possible focus upon the attitude involve—to say nothing, to remain quiet." (33.119; 1:402) Luke has this meaning in mind in Luke 14:3-4 and Acts 22:2. The final definition is "to live in a quiet, peaceful, mild manner." (88.102; 1:754).

behavior of the woman (v. 12) with the same phrase. The reader may wonder whether Paul says that a woman should learn "in quietness," that is, without creating a disturbance,⁴⁰ or whether she is to learn "in silence," that is, without speaking.⁴¹ The key to understanding the meaning of the phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ in verse 11a is its use in verse 12b as a contrast (ἀλλά) to teaching or exercising authority over men, as Douglas Moo contends:

Although the point is much the same in either case, there is good reason to think that the word should be translated "silence" in this context, since its opposite is "teaching." Clearly, Paul is concerned that women accept the teaching of the church "peaceably"—without criticism and without dispute.⁴²

The woman is not forbidden to make any sounds at all, as evidenced by 1 Cor. 11:2-16. However, she is barred from activities (and offices) within the church which would let her function authoritatively over adult males in the

⁴⁰So C. H. Preisker, "ἡσυχία," *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 3 vols., [hereafter *EDNT*] 2:125 who writes, "The word group can imply more than silence, involving unusual attention (Acts 22:2) or assurance in eschatological expectations (1 Thess 4:11; 2 Thess 3:2), which makes one free for daily work. The request for quietness in worship (1 Tim. 2:11, 12) does not forbid questioning or speaking in general, but rather speaking that creates a disturbance." So also Ann Bowman, who believes this prepositional phrase describes an "attitude of heart that is to accompany learning." (198)

⁴¹*BAGD* s.v. "ἡσυχία," 349 list two definitions: "quietness, rest" and "silence." They refer to 1 Tim. 2:11-12 under the second definition.

⁴²Douglas Moo, "What Does It Mean to Teach or Have Authority Over Men? 1 Timothy 2:11-15," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 183.

congregation or as a leader in teaching. This use of ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ helps the reader to understand that Paul does not demand absolute silence from women in worship services but that a woman may not take the leadership role or task, similar to his instructions in 1 Cor. 14:33-36. "To be in quietness," εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, is the positive equivalent to what is stated negatively in the first part of verse 12, that a woman should neither teach (διδάσκειν) nor (οὐδέ) exercise authority over (αὐθεντεῖν) a man. The prepositional phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ is balanced in the syntax of verse 11 with ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ.

ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ

The phrase ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ occurs at the end of verse 11.⁴³ The noun is rare in the New Testament, occurring only in Paul's writings (2 Cor. 9:13; Gal. 2:5; 1 Tim. 2:11; 3:4).⁴⁴ As Paul had instructed the Ephesians

⁴³The use of ἐν with the dative may be identified as the "associative dative" which "is used more loosely to designate accompanying circumstances and manner (*modi*)," (BDF §198) The dative of manner appears frequently in Paul (1 Cor. 10:30; 11:5) and particularly in formulaic usages (Phil 1:18; 2 Cor. 7:15; 8:7). Cf. BDF §198.2, .3, .4 (106).

⁴⁴In 2 Cor. 9:13 Paul tells the Corinthians that as a result of their generous giving, people will glorify God, "for the submission of your confession for (the purpose of) the Gospel of Christ. . . ." They have "put their money where their mouth was," submitting to their confession in the sense that they subjected their living and giving to what they claimed to believe. In Gal. 2:5, Paul writes to the Galatians that Titus and he did not yield "(in) submission" for even an hour to the Judaizers. They had put pressure on Paul to circumcise Titus, a compromise of the Gospel in

(Eph. 5:22, 24) and the Corinthians (1 Cor. 14:34), so he instructs women in worship services at 1 Tim. 2:11. The model of a woman's behavior in worship is that of a wife to her husband, a model first cast by God who created Adam and Eve (Gen. 2:7-24) and which God's people are expected to fulfill. Paul directs women to adhere to this model, not grudgingly or in part, but "fully," denoting this highest degree of compliance.⁴⁵ Knight observes that "Paul is concerned that women's learning not become an occasion to overturn their role in relation to the authority role that men are to exercise in the church (as apparently in Corinth; cf. 1 Cor. 14:33ff., where Paul expresses the same concern)."⁴⁶ Gerhard Delling confirms the similarity of Paul's remarks here to what he had written in 1 Cor. 14:33-36. Commenting on ὑποταγή, he states that "along the lines of 1 C. 14:34 . . . it means 'submission' in the sense of renunciation of initiative (1 Tm. 2:11 par. ἡσυχία); ἐν ὑποταγῇ ἔχειν 'to have in subjection' (1 Tm. 3:4) refers to all sons and daughters living in the house. . . ."⁴⁷

those circumstances. By refusing to submit to their demands, Paul maintained the purity of the Gospel. His use in 1 Tim. 3:4 refer to the "submission" of the children to the father of the household, a sign that a man is capable of managing the household of God.

⁴⁵This use of πᾶς appears in 1 Tim. 4:9; 5:2; and Tit. 2:15. Cf. BAGD s.v. "πᾶς," 1.a.6, 631, who also list Acts 4:29; 5:23; 23:1; 2 Cor. 9:8b; 12:12; Eph. 4:2.

⁴⁶George W. Knight III, 139-40.

⁴⁷Gerhard Delling, "ὑποτάσσω," TDNT 8:46.

αὐθεντεῖν

Paul balances διδάσκειν . . . γυναικὶ in verse 12a with αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός in verse 12b. The verb αὐθεντεῖν appears only here in the New Testament and has been the object of much comment. It has been suggested that the meaning is negative, referring to a "domineering" or "overbearing" kind of control.⁴⁸ Knight completed a study of available references in answer to the question: "Is the concept in view in 1 Timothy 2.12 that of a negative and overbearing rule, 'domineer', or is it that of a positive and appropriate exercise of authority, 'have authority'?"⁴⁹ He analyzes the word as it appears in documents ranging from the first century B.C. to the twelfth century A.D. and concludes: "The 'authority' in view in the documents is understood to be a positive concept and is in no way regarded as having any overtone of misuse of position or

⁴⁸For example, in the *Lexicon* by Louw and Nida the word appears under the domain of "control" and is defined as "to control in a domineering manner." Idiomatic translations are offered: "to shout orders at," "to act like a chief toward," "to bark at." (37.21; 1:474). Cf. also Catherine Kroeger, "1 Timothy 2:12-- A Classicist's View," chapter in *Women, Authority & The Bible*, edited by Alvera Mickelsen, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), 225-244. Carroll D. Osburn, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (1 Timothy 2:12," *Restoration Quarterly* 25 (1982): 1-12, cites a 1979 article by Catherine Kroeger, "Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb," *Reformation Journal* 29 (1979): 12-15, in which she apparently argued that this verb meant "to engage in fertility practices."

⁴⁹George W. Knight III, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 143-157.

power, i.e. to 'domineer'.⁵⁰ Knight notes, in connection with the context of 1 Timothy 2:

Διδάσκω speaks objectively of a position or activity of teaching without any negative implication on the content or the manner. It would seem likely that the following verb, ἀθεντέω, would be used in the same way in that context as it has been found to be used in the documents of that era. Furthermore, the converse of ἀθεντέω seems to be referred to in the context of 1 Tim. 2 in verse 11 in the phrase ἐν πασῇ ὑποταγῇ. That concept as used in the NT is not regarded as cringing servility under a domineering person but as a willing submission to a recognized authority. It would seem that just as διδάσκω is related to πανθάνω (2.11), both being considered in an objective and positive sense, so also the nuance of ἀθεντέω in an objective and positive sense would be likely in view of its relation to ἐν πασῇ ὑποταγῇ.⁵¹

Leland Wilshire's work, based on the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae computer project, seems to support Knight's contentions. He writes:

In conclusion, the 314 literary citations of the TLG computer (plus the pertinent preferences in BAGD analysed by Knight along with others found in the papyri) may be of help in understanding the meaning of 1 Tim 2.12. Sometime during the spread of Koine, the word ἀθεντέω went beyond the predominant Attic meaning connecting it with murder and suicide and into the broader concept of criminal behaviour. It also began to take on the additional meanings of 'to exercise authority/power/rights' which became firmly established in the Greek Patristic writers to mean 'to exercise authority'.⁵²

Paul's intent, then, is not to describe a situation between husband and wife. He describes the relationship

⁵⁰Ibid., 150-51.

⁵¹Ibid., 152.

⁵²Leland Edward Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 131.

between all Christian men and women in worship, a relationship modelled by the first man and woman.⁵³

To Learn and To Teach

In verse 11 Paul commands⁵⁴ that a woman learn in quietness.⁵⁵ Paul uses the word $\mu\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ frequently in his writings,⁵⁶ usually to denote a "learning" of God's Word and revelation (as in 1 Cor. 14:31, 35; 2 Tim. 3:7, 14; Tit.

⁵³As Douglas Moo, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 187, writes: "Clearly, then, Paul's prohibition of women's having authority over a man would exclude a woman from becoming an elder in the way this office is described in the pastoral epistles. By extension, then, women would be debarred from occupying whatever position in a given local church would be equivalent to the pastoral epistles' governing elder. . . . This would be the case even if a woman's husband were to give her permission to occupy such a position, for Paul's concern is not with a woman's acting independently of her husband or usurping *his* authority but with the woman's exercising authority in the church over *any man*." Note that teaching women is not prohibited for a woman, Tit. 2:13.

⁵⁴The verb $\mu\alpha\upsilon\theta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omega$ is a third person singular present active imperative of $\mu\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$.

⁵⁵It is worth noting that Paul does want women to learn. Mary Evans, *Woman in the Bible* (Greenwood: Attic Press, 1983), 102, comments: "Christian women were required not only to sit back and listen, but also to learn." It is, however, difficult to see how "listening" could be so different from "learning." She overreads the text when she interprets Paul's comments to mean that "he was again refuting the contemporary social attitudes by implying that women's 'role as homemakers did not fulfil the ultimate priority for which they were created'." (Ibid.) The lesson of Mary and Martha with Jesus in Luke 10:38-42 presents a more balanced picture.

⁵⁶Rom. 16:17; 1 Cor. 4:6; 14:31, 35; Gal. 3:2; Eph. 4:20; Phil. 4:9, 11; Col. 1:7; 1 Tim. 2:11; 5:4, 13; 2 Tim. 3:7, 14; Tit. 3:14. Six occurrences out of fifteen uses appear in the Pastorals, a 40% ratio.

3:14) but also referring more broadly to "learning" duties (1 Tim. 5:4) and even "learning" what they should not (1 Tim. 5:13). In the context of the worship service (1 Tim. 2:8-15), Paul's intent is perhaps expressed most clearly in Eph. 4:20 where he contrasts the immoral lifestyle into which some have given themselves and the fact that the Ephesians "did not thus learn Christ."⁵⁷ Karl Rengstorf comments:

In Eph. 4:20 we find the phrase ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν. According to the context μανθάνειν has here more the sense of ἀκούειν than διδάσκεισθαι. It implies full acceptance of Christ and His work, even in respect of the direction of life. Its ethical character, in the broadest sense, is thus clear. Explicitly or implicitly there stands behind the expression opposition to the thesis that the way to an ordered life is only by μανθάνειν νόμον. The new man is nourished by the Gospel, in which Christ does His work according to the plan and purpose of God. μανθάνω seems to be used in the same sense in 2 Tm. 3:14 and R. 16:17, here with reference to the apostolic διδασχῆ. . . .⁵⁸

The one who learns (μανθάνειν) is the student (μαθητής).⁵⁹ The one who teaches (διδάσκειν)⁶⁰ is the

⁵⁷Paul uses a number of words from the same semantic field in the following verse, Eph. 4:21, as he develops a protasis: "If you heard (ἠκούσατε) Him and in Him you were taught (ἐδιδάχθητε), just as is (the) truth (ἀλήθεια) in Jesus. . . ." What the Christian learns is Christ, the truth signifying both the Person of Christ and the body of teachings which have come from Him. This, then, shapes the lifestyle of the believer.

⁵⁸Karl Rengstorf, "μανθάνειν," *TDNT* 4:410.

⁵⁹A word which Paul does not use.

⁶⁰The verb διδάσκειν appears in the Pastorals in 1 Tim. 2:12; 4:11; 6:2; 2 Tim. 2:2; Tit. 1:11. In 1 Tim. 4:11 Paul tells Timothy to "command and teach these things,"

teacher (διδάσκαλος).⁶¹ Paul understands that the relation between teacher and student was a relationship of authority. This is evident in the fact that the teacher could be addressed as "Rabbi" ("my great one")⁶² or "Master."⁶³

Stephen Clark observes:

Moreover, teaching occurred within a relationship in which the teacher had authority over the student. The focus of teaching in the New Testament was upon teaching a way of life and the truths which underlay that way of life. Students were expected to follow that way of life, and the teaching was passed on with authority.⁶⁴

referring to the instructions issued in the previous verses. In 1 Tim. 6:2 the phrasing is very similar, "These things teach and encourage," referring again to that which preceded (submission of slaves to masters). Only at 1 Tim. 2:12 in 1 Timothy does διδάσκειν appear in an absolute sense, without the accusative of thing following.

⁶¹The word διδάσκαλος occurs in the Pastorals in 1 Tim. 2:7, where Paul describes himself as a "teacher of the Gentiles," and 2 Tim. 1:11, where Paul writes of the Gospel in relation to himself, "for which I, I was appointed a herald and an apostle and teacher. . . ."

⁶²The title "rabbi" (ῥαββί) is used of John the Baptist (John 3:26) and of Jesus (Matt. 26:25, 49; Mark 9:5; 11:21; 14:45; John 1:49; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:9). In Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis at Mark 10:51 Jesus is addressed by the double appellative, κύριε ῥαββί. Cf. BAGD s.v. "ῥαββί," 733.

⁶³Jesus is addressed by Peter at the Transfiguration and each of the three Synoptics offers a different Greek term from the semantic field "status," and under the domain of "high status, rank" (as defined by Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 87.19-87.57). In Matthew's Gospel the term is κύριε (Matt. 17:4) and in Mark, ῥαββί (Mark 9:5) while Luke uses ἐπιστάτα (Luke 9:33; he is the only New Testament author to use this title, 5:5; 8:24, 45; 9:33, 49; 17:13).

⁶⁴Stephen 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: Servant Books, 1980), 196. Ronald W. Pierce, "Evangelicals and Gender

Rengstorf summarizes the meaning of διδάσκαλος in the Gospels as "one who indicates the way of God from the Torah."⁶⁵ This reflects a second element of "teaching" (διδάσκειν), the interpretation and application of the Word.

The most astonishing aspect of the NT use of διδάσκειν is at a first glance its comparative paucity in Paul. Yet this is easily explained when we realise how closely it is bound to Scripture even in the NT. In a setting where Scripture was not known, ["to teach the things concerning Jesus"] would be out of place, just as it was very much in place in the early community and in dealings with Jews. Thus, Paul speaks of διδάσκειν only with reference to his own instruction of the communities at the time of their foundation (2 Th. 2:15; Col. 2:7; Eph. 4:21) and in the sense of an internal function of Christianity. . . . When Paul in R. 12:7 summons the διδάσκων to serve ["by teaching"] of the community, he is not thinking of men who apply the Scriptures to Jesus, but of those who give from Scripture directions for Christian living, and he admonishes them to place their better knowledge wholly in the service of the congregation. The is the same kind of διδάσκειν with a view to the distinction between good and evil as we have learned to know from the synagogue and the usage of the Gospels.⁶⁶

Thus, to teach (διδάσκειν) is to do the job of a

Roles in the 1990s: 1 Tim 2:8-16: A Test Case," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 349, writing from an egalitarian approach, makes the same point. He states that the relationship between teacher and student "even went beyond authoritative proclamation of religious truth to include a mentoring relationship between teacher and student analogous to the master/disciple motif in the NT." (Ibid.) He argues that the "ban" against women teachers had been lifted in Gal. 3:28 but that Paul writes as he does in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 because there "needed to be a transitional period before kingdom blessings would be established more fully." (351)

⁶⁵Karl Rengstorf, "διδάσκω," *TDNT* 2:153.

⁶⁶Ibid., 2:146-47.

teacher (διδάσκαλος), to interpret the Scripture and "make possible a right fulfillment."⁶⁷ H. Wayne House observes that the word "to teach" contains, as a part of its meaning, authority.

[The] contention that teaching was open to all believers in general betrays a misunderstanding of the nature of teaching in the first-century church. Teaching in the first century involved more than conveyance of information. (Possibly this was part of what Priscilla and Aquila did to Apollos; the verb is ἐξέθευτο from ἐκτίθημι, "to set form or explain," not διδάσκω, "to teach," in Acts 18:26) Early Christian teaching, built on the Jewish model, involved more than imparting information or alternate views. The teacher gave his personal direction and exercised authority over the learner. The teacher expected the student to accept his teaching. Also the authority the teacher had over the learner came from a relationship of the two.⁶⁸

Two interpretations have been offered which seek to limit what Paul wrote in these verses. The first is that Paul's admonitions apply only to one time and place, as proposed by David Scholer: "1 Timothy 2:9-15 should be understood as a unified paragraph on the place of women in the church in Ephesus. It was limited to a particular situation of false teaching."⁶⁹ A second argument

⁶⁷Ibid., 2:157.

⁶⁸H. Wayne House, "The Speaking of Women and the Prohibition of the Law," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 314. His comments on Acts 18:24-28 answer the objection put forward by the Kroegers that female teachers were accepted as long as they were orthodox. They cite Priscilla, conveniently omitting reference to Aquila (Acts 18:26).

⁶⁹David M. Scholer, "Women in the Church's Ministry," *Daughters of Sarah* 16 (1990): 7-12. This article is a condensation of the 9th chapter *Women, Authority & the Bible*, edited by Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove: InterVarsity), 1986. So also Ronald W. Pierce,

understands Paul's remarks directed only to female heretics.

The Kroegers state:

It is tragic to disbar women from orthodox ministries to which they feel called of God by the use of 1 Timothy 2:12. There is a greater likelihood that the stricture refers to the heretical doctrines and practice of women and to their assertion that they have been given a special revelation which only they can impart to men. A vaunted superiority, an assumption that God could speak most authoritatively through an individual of a particular sex, does not accord with the economy of Jesus Christ, in whom there is neither male nor female.⁷⁰

The greatest obstacle to either of these interpretations is that Paul did not say it. What he says is applicable to the whole church, as he consistently points out (e.g., in 1 Cor. 4:17; 7:17; 11:16; 14:33, 34, 35; 2 Cor. 8:18; Eph. 3:10). Further, there is no evidence in the text to indicate that the women of verses 9-10 or the "woman" of verses 11-12 is a false teacher as opposed to women who are orthodox teachers. Paul's directives throughout these verses are an application of his teaching

"Evangelicals and Gender Roles in the 1990s: 1 Tim 2:8-15: A Test Case," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 343-355, who believes Paul's instructions are transitional until Christians overcome the "status quo." (355)

⁷⁰Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger, "May Women Teach? Heresy in the Pastoral Epistles," *Reformed Journal* 30 (1980): 18. Along with the example of Priscilla (ignoring the reference to Aquila in Acts 18:26), the Kroegers cite Lois and Eunice "who shared their faith with Timothy (2 Tim. 1:5)." (Ibid.) Yet 2 Tim. 1:5 does not say that they shared their faith with Timothy, only that the "unhypocritical faith" which dwells in Timothy also dwelt in Lois and Eunice.

to all Christian churches, throughout the New Testament age, as supported by his argumentation in verses 13-15 and by the fact that he bases his application in the image of God and the order evident in marriage.⁷¹

Paul prohibits a woman from occupying this position because she would exercise the authority and occupy a position in which she would be called upon to apply the Scriptures to the ethical life of the congregation and determine which is good and which is bad.⁷² Paul lays the foundation for the first reason in 2:13 and for the second in 2:14. Ann Bowman summarizes: "In verse 12, then, Paul explained that women are permitted neither to teach men nor to exercise authority over men in the worship assemble. Instead, as he had already directed in verse 11, they are to

⁷¹It has also been proposed that women may serve as pastors as long as they serve as assistant or associate pastors. E.g., Paul Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 15 (1991): 321-34. He cites John Stott as a supporter of this view and would permit a woman to serve as senior pastor of a single sex congregation. (Are there such congregations?) For a critique of Barnett's work from a much more liberal perspective, cf. Timothy J. Harris, "Why did Paul Mention Eve's Deception?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 335-52. He limits the restrictions to false teachers. Both miss Paul's point. A woman may not occupy any office which exercises authority over a man or which interprets Scripture. This is particularly true of leadership offices.

⁷² Another suggestion is that the pastoral office be opened to women because one does not exercise personal authority in the office; therefore the prohibition against "authoritizing" a man would not come into consideration. E.g., Walter Liefeld, "Women and the Nature of Ministry," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 49-61, esp. 59. The issue is not personal vs. official authority but authority itself.

receive instruction with an inner attitude of quietness and submission to the truth of God's Word (and His chosen teachers)."⁷³

Verses Thirteen and Fourteen

"For (γάρ)⁷⁴ Adam first was formed (ἐπλάσθη)⁷⁵, then (εἶτα)⁷⁶ Eve. And Adam was not deceived (ἠπατήθη),⁷⁷ but (δὲ) the woman, having been deceived (ἐξαπατηθεῖσα),⁷⁸ came (γέγονεν) into transgression (ἐν παραβάσει⁷⁹ γέγονεν⁸⁰)."

⁷³Ann L. Bowman, 203.

⁷⁴The conjunction γάρ usually comes second in the sentence (post-positive position) but may appear as third, fourth or even the fifth element, as discussed in *BDF* §475.2. The New Testament use of γάρ conforms to classical use and serves as a causal co-ordinating conjunction. *BDF* §452; cf. *BAGD* s.v. "γάρ," 2., which notes that γάρ is often explanatory, "for, you see." This is the case in Rom. 7:1, 2; 1 Cor. 16:15; Mark 7:3; Luke 9:14; John 3:16; 4:8-9; Heb. 3:4; 2 Pet. 2:8. (151).

⁷⁵The verb ἐπλάσθη is a third person singular aorist indicative passive form of πλάσσω.

⁷⁶The temporal adverb εἶτα ("then, next") appears without δὲ but does not constitute asyndeton. *BDF* §459.4; cf. *BAGD* s.v. "εἶτα," 233-34. Paul does not use εἶτα often, appearing only here, 1 Tim. 3:10 and 1 Cor. 15:5, 7, and 24. In each case Paul establishes a sequential or chronological order.

⁷⁷The verb ἠπατήθη is a third person singular aorist indicative passive form of ἀπατάω.

⁷⁸*N26* text reads ἐξαπατηθεῖσα, a nominative feminine singular aorist passive participle, supported by \aleph A D* F G P Υ 33. 81. 104. 1175. 1739. 1881. A variant reading, ἀπατηθεῖσα, is read by D2 and the Majority text. No material change in meaning would result from omitting the prepositional prefix, which merely intensifies the action of the verb.

⁷⁹A use of the dative of possession. *BDF* §189 notes: "The classical distinction, whereby the genitive is used when the acquisition is recent or the emphasis is on

Paul makes two references to the Old Testament which support his directives in verses 9-12. He states that Adam was formed first, then Eve. He then points out that Adam was not deceived but that the woman, being deceived, became a transgressor [of the Law]. Joachim Jeremias makes this same observation:

Adam (ΑΔΑΜ) as the first man is mentioned in 1 Tm. 2:13-14 in connection with the order of the community set out in 1 Tm. 2:1-3:16. In the section which deals with the right conduct of the woman in the service of God (2:9-15) the demand that she should be subordinate to man (2:12) is given a basis in early biblical history. This establishes the supremacy of man at creation by the fact a. that he was created first (2:13), and b. that Eve was first deceived (2:14). . . . The order of God at creation is still His will for the community (cf. Mk. 10:6).⁸¹

The verb πλάσσω appears only twice in the New Testament (Rom. 9:20 and 1 Tim. 2:13).⁸² The first

the possessor (e.g. R 14:8) and the dative when the object possessed is to be stressed, is customarily preserved." (102)

⁸⁰The verb γέγονεν is a third person singular perfect active indicative form of γίνομαι. The aorist verbs in verses 13-14 point to the actions of Adam and Eve recorded in Genesis 2-3 while the shift to the perfect tense at this verb may indicate Paul wants the reader to understand that the state of being "in transgression" continues to the present. Cf. *BDF* §318.4 on the *Aktionsart* of the perfect tense.

⁸¹Joachim Jeremias, "'Αδάμ," *TDNT* 1:141. He believes that "there is perhaps a hint of the legend that Eve was sensually seduced by the serpent," a legend contained in *Genesis Rabbah* 18 on 3:1; cf. 4 Macc. 18:7-8. (Ibid.)

⁸²Rom. 9:20 contains a quotation from Is. 29:16 according to the Septuagint. The citation concerns the relationship of the (created) human being to the (Creator)

appearances of the verb in the Septuagint are in the creation account (Gen. 2:7, 8, 15 [of the man], 19 [of the animals]).⁸³ Delling notes that the Septuagint translation of Genesis 2 does not use πλάσσω of the woman.

In 1 Tm. 2:13 the command that women should not teach or rule men, and that they should keep silence, is based on the fact that Adam was formed first, then Eve The LXX does not speak, as this v. does, of the πλάσσειν or πλασθήναι of the woman we find this first in Philo. . . . then Josephus. . . . In this matter the author is simply following an existing Jewish-Hellenistic tradition.⁸⁴

Paul may not have πλάσσω in mind for 1 Tim. 2:13b. He may expect his readers to be familiar with the creation account of Genesis 2 so that they would be able to supply the correct verb from that account.⁸⁵

God and pictures this relationship metaphorically as clay and potter, so that "that which is formed will not say to the one who forms (πλάσαντι), why have you made me thus?" The use of the clay/potter imagery signifies creation, as Benedikt Otzen, "לָצַק," *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), [hereafter *TDOT*] 6:259, notes: "It is striking that the passages listed rarely mention the potter in an everyday context; almost all employ the term in a theological context. The potter may symbolize the divine Creator and the forming of clay may symbolize creation; or the smashing of pottery may symbolize the execution of divine judgment through the destruction of Israel, the enemy, or the like. . . . Thus the Hebrew verb לָצַק by itself can refer to the creation of the human race."

⁸³In Gen. 2:7, 8 and 19 πλάσσω translates the Hebrew לָצַק. There is no Masoretic Text extant behind the Septuagint's use of πλάσσω in 2:15.

⁸⁴Gerhard Delling, "πλάσσω," *TDNT* 6:261.

⁸⁵The Septuagint uses the verb ἠκοδόμησεν (Gen. 2:22), a third person singular aorist indicative active form of οἰκοδομῶ, "to build," translating the Hebrew בָּנָה.

Genesis 2:7

The first reason Paul gives comes from Genesis 2:7 where God formed (ἐπλάσεν) man from the dust of the ground.

וַיִּצַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-אָדָם עֹפָר וְ-אֲדָמָה
וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נְשָׁמַח חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה,

"And Yahweh God formed the man (from) dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils breath of life and the man became a living being." Preceded by a prolepsis,⁸⁶ this verse introduces the man, a creature who has something in common with the animals and plants (which were also made from the ground, אֲדָמָה; cf. 2:9, 19) and yet has something special from God. Fritz Maass, writing on אָדָם, states:

אָדָם, meaning "man" or the proper name "Adam" (Gen. 4:25; 5:1-5; 1 Ch. 1:1), usually appears in prose texts with the article, and in poetic texts without the article. Predominantly, this word occurs as a collective singular designating a class (as "man" in English), and therefore can be translated by "mankind" or as a plural "men." At the same time, it is often used of individuals (e.g., in passages used "blessed" like Ps. 32:2, or in Ezk. 27:13; Prov. 28:17; Eccl. 5:18 [Eng. v.19]), and functions adjectivally ("human") or indefinitely ("someone"), but never appears in the plural or in the construct.⁸⁷

⁸⁶Jerome Walsh, "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 2 (1977): 163, defines a prolepsis as "a narrative technique found throughout the passage (cf. 2:18, 25; 3:8, 20). Structurally, a prolepsis stands at the end of the unit to which it belongs, and is relatively independent within that unit; the content of a prolepsis introduces a point of narrative tension which will be resolved only in a subsequent section.

⁸⁷Fritz Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:75. He counts 562 uses of the word in the Old Testament. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974), notes

Gen. 2:7 consists of the nominal element, אֱלֹהִים, and the verbal element, יָצַח, the latter of which appears first in the sentence.⁸⁸ Ancient man normally "fashioned" (יָצַח) his gods from some inanimate material. Here *God* shapes man as *His Image*, reversing the direction of the action.⁸⁹ Gordon Wenham expands on another facet of the verb:

"Shaping" is an artistic, inventive activity that requires skill and planning (cf. Isa 44:9-10). Usually the verb describes God's work in creation. God has "shaped: the animals (2:19), Leviathan (Ps 104:26), the

there are 555 occurrences of the word, of which 136 are in Ezekiel (95 in the "son of man" formula). Second in frequency are Genesis 1-11 (46 times) and Qohelet (48 times). Interestingly, it appears only once in Genesis 12-50 (in 16:12, describing Ishmael as "a wild ass of a man"). It appears 24 times in Genesis 2-3, supporting the observation that Gen. 2:4-3:24 is a literary unit. Westermann states: "The word is not used indiscriminately when speaking of humans. . . ." (201)

⁸⁸The word appears elsewhere in the context of fashioning images or idols, Isa. 44:9-10, 12. Cf. Hab. 2:18 where the noun, *yetser*, refers to the external shape of an idol.

⁸⁹There is one known example of a god fashioning man. Victor Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990), 157 writes: "We should note that neither the concept of the deity as craftsman nor the concept of man as coming from earth material is unique to the bible. For example, from ancient Egypt we have a picture of the ram-headed god Khnum sitting on his throne before a potter's wheel, on which he fashions the prince Amenhotep III (ca. 1400 B.C.) and his *ka* (an alter ego which protected and sustained the individual?). Referring to this particular painting, the Egyptologist John Wilson makes the interesting observation that Egypt lacked a specific account of mankind's creation. The reason for this lack, he argues, "is that there was no firm and final dividing-line between gods and men. Once a creation was started with beings, it could go on, whether the beings were gods, demi-gods, spirits, or men."

dry land (Ps 95:5), the mountains (Amos 4:13), and the future course of history (Isa 22:11, Jer 33:2). Preeminently, God's shaping skill is seen in the creation of man, whether it be from dust as here or in the womb (Isa 44:2,24) or in shaping human character to fulfill a particular role (Isa 43:21; 44:21).⁹⁰

The importance of Gen. 2:7 in beginning the narrative of 2:4-3:24 is established by 2:4b-6. The retardation of the flow of the narrative, as seen in chapter one when approaching verses 26-28, draws attention to what follows.⁹¹ The dramatic effect is intense as the narrative is slowed, man is brought to life, and the action moves inward to the center of the garden (towards the climax in 3:6-8).

Gen. 1:26-28 introduced the reader to mankind as the Image of God. Gen. 2:7 expands that brief summary. After the title (2:4a) and introduction (2:4b-6), God begins by fashioning a *living* אִלָּץ, made alive by blowing into its nostrils the breath of life: וַיִּפֹּחַ בְּאַפָּיו נְשֵׁם חַיִּים. The author of Genesis 1-11 summarizes 7a and 7b in the final clause, 7c: וַיֵּשֶׁב אֱדָם לַעֲרָב, "and the man became a living being." Paul understands this creation account as normative for the new creation in Christ (as noted in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16). Douglas Moo comments on these two Pauline treatments of Genesis 2:

⁹⁰Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Waco: Word, 1987), 59.

⁹¹Verses 7-8 form a unit marked by the use of the verb אִלָּץ and the noun אֱדָם. Jerome Walsh observes a further structural integration by the use of summary in 7c (it summarizes 7a, 7b) and a parallel in 8b which, to a limited extent, summarizes 8a and 7c. (162, n. 7.)

It is sometimes said in opposition to this line of reasoning that even an appeal to creation does not demand that the prohibition involved be permanent. This may be granted, in the sense that New Testament authors will sometimes appeal to creation, or to the Old Testament generally, to establish a principle on which a specific form of behavior is demanded. In these cases, while the principle always remains in effect, the specific form of behavior will not. This seems to be the situation, for instance, in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, where the appeal to creation grounds the headship of man, a theological principle, which is in turn applied to the specific issue of women's head coverings. But the difference between this and 1 Timothy 2:12-13 is simply this: in 1 Timothy 2:12-18[sic], the principle cannot be separated from the form of behavior. In other words, for a woman to teach a man or to have authority over a man is, by definition, to void the principle for which Paul quotes the creation account. Granted this and granted the complete absence of explicit temporal or cultural references in the whole paragraph, the prohibitions of verse 12 can be ignored only by dismissing the theological principle itself. . . . For any woman in any culture to engage in these activities with respect to men means that she is violating the Biblical principle of submission.⁹²

Genesis Three

For his second line of argumentation, Paul moves from chapter two of Genesis to chapter three, particularly, verses six and thirteen.⁹³ Ralph Earle notes:

Paul makes one further point. It was the woman who was deceived by Satan and who disobeyed God (cf. Gen 3:1-6). Since she was so easily deceived, she should not be

⁹²Douglas Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?" *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 191. More precisely, she rebels against God's gift of identity.

⁹³Gen. 3:6 records the eating from the tree and the giving of the fruit to Adam so that he would eat as well. The subject in Gen. 3:6 is ἡ γυνή, the signifier Paul uses in 1 Tim. 3:14b. The first time the verb ἀπατάω appears in the Septuagint is at Gen. 3:13, where the woman accuses the serpent and says it "deceived me (ἠπάτησέν με), and I ate."

trusted as a teacher.⁹⁴

Regarding this argument, it must be noted that Paul does not excuse Adam (cf. Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 15:22). Adam is fully responsible for his own actions and, as head of the family of man, bears the burden of having brought sin and death into the world.⁹⁵

Adam, however, was not deceived (ἠπατήθη). Eve was deceived (ἐξαπατηθεῖσα) and came into the category "transgression." Neither the simple verb ἀπατάω nor the compound ἐξαπατάω occur frequently in the New Testament. Paul uses the simple verb only at Eph. 5:6⁹⁶ and 1 Tim. 2:14. The compound verb, ἐξαπατάω, occurs slightly more often.⁹⁷ In 2 Cor. 11:3 Paul writes to warn his readers

⁹⁴Ralph Earle, "1, 2 Timothy," *Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978) 11: 362.

⁹⁵George Rekers, "Psychological Foundations for Rearing Masculine Boys and Feminine Girls," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 311, reminds us that those who would deny the traditional interpretation of 1 Timothy 2 often do so from a radically different understanding of man's identity. "It is interesting that the unisex mentality is based on the godless world view of relativistic humanism, which includes the radical feminist movement. Those who call for 'an end to all distinctions based on sex' are those who simultaneously endorse the 'right' to abortion, homosexuality, and divorce. The unisex mentality, therefore, is an assault against sex . . . the image of God in the human personality."

⁹⁶He uses an imperatival form of ἀπατάω in Eph. 5:6, warning his readers "let no one deceive you with empty words." James uses the term once, "but deceiving their own heart. . . ." (1:26)

⁹⁷Paul uses ἐξαπατάω in Rom. 7:11 to describe the effect of sin which, taking its opportunity through the law, "deceived me." In Rom. 16:18 he warns of false teachers who

about false teachers who would lead them astray even as the serpent "deceived" (ἐξηπάτησεν) Eve with his cunning. Eve thus becomes the model of the woman led astray, away from her bridegroom and into sin (1 Cor. 11:2).⁹⁸ Paul's reference is clearly to Gen. 3:6, as it is in 1 Tim. 3:14.

Gen. 3:6-8 forms the center of the unit comprised of chapters 2 and 3. These verses form an uninterrupted narrative unit with verse 8 serving as a transition to 3:9-16. And the center of this fourth scene is 3:6b, eight words telling how sin entered the world, explained by Walsh:

Metrically, the verses comprise a couplet (2+3, 3+3), a single line (3+4), and another couplet (3+3, 3+3); the concentric structure highlights the single line (v. 6b) wherein the sin is recounted. Further, the departure from the basic 3+3 meter tends to emphasize the final word of the line.

The full richness of v. 6b can be appreciated only in the context of the preceding vv. Scenes 3, 4, and 5 consist of an unbroken series of narrative *wayyiqtol*s. The tempo of the narrative, however, changes notably. Vv. 1-5 are in dialogue, a slow-moving narrative form; the subordinate nominal clauses of v.6a retard the action still more. Suspense is built up about the woman's reaction to the choice with which she was faced in v. 5

V. 6b releases the tension with a rush: first the woman, then her husband, eat of the fruit; the account of sin takes only 8 words. The actions of the woman are described with breathtaking rapidity: three *wayyiqtol*s

"deceive" people, a usage similar to that in 2 Thess. 2:3. He warns his readers in 1 Cor. 3:18 not to "deceive" themselves

⁹⁸Cf. also Albrecht Oekpe, "ἀπατάω," *TDNT* 1:384-85. He notes the word group occurs in the Septuagint to denote the "deception" or "enticement" of the wives of Samson (Judg. 14:15; 16:4) and the temptation of idolatry (Job 31:27).

in four words. Yet the extremely difficult pronunciation (six doubled consonants in four words, all of them voiceless plosives) forces a merciless concentration on each word. . . . Thus the sonant structure reinforces the metric effect noted above and puts the final critical deed—the man's acquiescence in sin—in a highly emphatic single word: wayyo'kal.⁹⁹

The woman saw that the tree was good (echoing the refrain in Genesis 1 that *God* saw that it was good) and takes the fruit (while it was *God* who took from the side of man in Genesis 2). Before this, God had provided for them; now they provide a covering for themselves. The אֱלֹהִים of God severed the connection at the point of eating¹⁰⁰. The אֱלֹהִים became independent, knowing good and evil, able to make choices without reference to or submission to the One who fashioned him. "Instead of obeying God as his image, they want to usurp God's position and become like God. Instead of ruling over the animals they let the serpent rule over them. Instead of comprising a plurality within a unity, Adam blames Eve."¹⁰¹

Paul's argument against women teaching and/or preaching, exercising authority over men, can then be summarized as: 1) it denies humanity's identity as Image of

⁹⁹Jerome Walsh, 166.

¹⁰⁰That they did not immediately die physically (and thus, eternally) is due exclusively to the grace of God. By permitting them a continued physical existence, God made possible the restoration of life and immortality to man through the Promise of a Savior.

¹⁰¹Paul Raabe, commenting on this passage in private correspondence.

God along with the structure inherent in it; 2) the first time a woman provided instruction and leadership it led to the Fall into sin. Ann Bowman adds:

It is important to note that Paul was not simply referring to two verses taken from Genesis 2 and 3. Instead he was using a common rabbinic method of referring to the Old Testament, a method known as summary citation. That is, he used the summary statement in 1 Timothy 2:13 to point the reader to the entire pericope describing the creation of man and woman (Gen. 2:4-24), and in 1 Timothy 2:24 he referred back to the entire pericope detailing the Fall (Gen. 3:1-25). Paul was not limiting his focus to two specific, isolated thoughts; rather, he was drawing on two complete narratives.¹⁰²

She Became a Transgressor

The consequence of the woman's teaching and exercising authority over the man in Gen. 3:6 is that she became a transgressor, literally, "became into transgression" (ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν). Paul's use of παραβάσις is not extensive.¹⁰³ Johannes Schneider defines

¹⁰²Ann L. Bowman, 204-05. She explains in a footnote: "If Paul had focused on specific verses taken from the Genesis 2 and 3 account, he would probably have quoted or closely paraphrased specific verses and likely would have used one of the common introductory formulas he used elsewhere." (204, n. 35) She then cites 1 Cor. 1:31; 2:9 15:45; 2 Cor. 8:15; 9:9; and 1 Tim. 5:18. She refers the reader to other examples of a "single statement recalling an entire pericope in Luke 17:32, 'Remember Lot's wife.' To understand Jesus' implied warning, one must recall the circumstances that caused Sodom's destruction (Gen. 18:22-19:11), the flight of Lot and his family from the city (19:12-25), and the sin of Lot's wife and its results (vv. 17, 26)." (Ibid.)

¹⁰³The term παραβάσις appears in Rom. 2:23; 4:15; 5:14; Col. 3:19; and 1 Tim. 2:14. The author of Hebrews uses it twice (2:2; 9:15).

the word:

In the NT the word denotes "sin in its relation to law, i.e., to a requirement of obligation which is legally valid or has legal force." Paul in R. 2:23 alleges that the Jew dishonours God by transgressing the Law. In R. 4:15 he declares that there is transgression only where there is law.¹⁰⁴

Woman was not created to lead and when she does so, it is away from God that she leads Adam and humanity.¹⁰⁵ Foerster comments:

For there [1 Tim. 2:14-15] Paul is alluding to Eve's receptivity to cunning arguments . . . which makes the woman unfit for teaching. She is thus referred to her natural sphere. . . . Paul is thus saying that Eve listened to the subtle arguments of the serpent instead of rendering simple obedience. He is warning the community against a similar course.¹⁰⁶

There is a unity between 1 Tim. 3:13 and 1 Tim. 3:14 which may be overlooked by the reader. Knight comments on the link between the identity of woman in relation to man and the fall into sin:

V. 14 thus shows by a negative example the importance of heeding the respective roles established by God in the creation of Eve from Adam. This adds to v. 13 (with καί) an example rather than a separate basis for Paul's argument. Thus Paul argues not from creation and fall but from creation, and then illustrates this argument, albeit negatively, from the fall. . . ."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴Johannes Schneider, "παράβασις," *TDNT* 5:739-40.

¹⁰⁵Adam, in turn, followed when he should have led. God says in Gen. 3:17, "because you have listened to the voice of your wife and ate from the tree. . . ." He obeyed her ("listened to the voice of" signals obedience) and consequently ate from the tree.

¹⁰⁶Werner Foerster, "ᾄσις," *TDNT* 5:581.

¹⁰⁷George W. Knight III, 144.

Knight may overstate the case slightly, but his point is well-taken. Eve leads humanity into sin because she is not created nor designed to exercise authority over a man, teaching him what God means when God speaks (e.g., the prohibition regarding the tree of knowing good and evil, Gen. 2:17). Women may not teach or exercise authority over a man, but not every man is qualified to do so, either. As Bowman observes: "Paul's point is that this role reversal that caused such devastation at the beginning must not be repeated in the church. The woman must not be the one who leads the man in obedience to her. Thus, when the teaching of the Word of God in the assembly occurs, a qualified male elder should fill the role of teacher."¹⁰⁸ Paul will describe the kind of man suitable for the teaching office in the church, but he will first make a concluding comment on this section.

Verse Fifteen

". . . but (δε) [he¹⁰⁹ or she] will be saved (σωθήσεται)¹¹⁰ through (διὰ)¹¹¹ the childbearing (τῆς

¹⁰⁸Ann L. Bowman, 206.

¹⁰⁹The pattern of "Adam-Eve" in the previous two verses is carried into v. 15. "Adam," that is, man, will be saved through the particular and unique activity of "Eve," that is, woman, in that she will bear children and eventually, through the one woman Mary, bear the Christ-child. This understanding was suggested by James Voelz to this writer in private conversation.

¹¹⁰The form is third person singular future indicative passive of σώζω.

τεκνογονίας), if (ἐάν) they remain (μείνωσιν)¹¹² in faith (ἐν πίστει) and love (ἀγάπη) and holiness (ἀγιασμῶ) with common sense (σωφροσύνης)."

The interpreter faces three problems in the first part of this verse. He must first identify the subject of σωθήσεται. He must then determine the sense of the verb. Finally, he must find the meaning of διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας in the context of the subject and meaning of the verb.

σωθήσεται

The verb σωθήσεται one of two subjects: either the "man" or the "woman" of the previous verses "will be saved." In favor of understanding a masculine pronoun for this verb is the pattern Paul develops in verses 13-14. In these verses, "Adam" appears as the subject of the first verb and the woman is discussed next. If this is the author's intent, the pattern of verses 13-15 may be represented:

¹¹¹The preposition διὰ with the genitive denotes "'through' of space, time, agent." (BDF §223) In the New Testament, the classical use of διὰ with the genitive to signal the manner ("by way of. . .") also occurs (e.g., 2 Cor. 2:4; Rom 2:27; 14:20; Gal. 4:13). Paul uses διὰ with the genitive to indicate the originator rather than the agent at 1 Cor. 1:9; Gal. 1:1; cf. 1 Cor. 8:6 where the object of the preposition is a relative pronoun in the genitive, referring back to Christ.

¹¹²The verb μείνωσιν is a third person plural aorist active subjunctive form of μείνω. A conditional clause formed by ἐάν with the verb in the subjunctive mood "denotes that which under certain circumstances is expected from an existing general or concrete standpoint in the present: 'case of expectation' and 'iterative case in present time'." (BDF §371.4)

	V. 13	V. 14	V. 15
male:	Adam	Adam	(he)
female:	Eve	the woman	(her) childbearing ¹¹³

In favor of taking σωθήσεται with a feminine pronoun as the subject is that the subject of the immediately preceding colon is the woman, Eve.¹¹⁴ Stanley Porter outlines the exegetical options if this is what the author meant.

Since no explicit subject of the verb is designated, it makes best exegetical sense in a grammatical context to begin from the assumption that the subject of the verb corresponds in some way with the last mentioned possible antecedent, 'the woman' (ἡ γυνή) of v. 14. But who exactly is this woman? The solutions here have been at least five. In light of the mention of Adam and Eve in v. 13 and Adam against in v. 14, it has been proposed that ἡ γυνή in v. 14b is still Eve, 'the woman'. A second solution is that this is the consummate or ideal woman, Mary, the mother of Jesus. Several interpreters have combined the first two proposals in a grand theological synthesis, concluding that

¹¹³This interpretation has been proposed by Dr. James Voelz in private conversation. "Adam" represents all men in v. 15.

¹¹⁴Ann L. Bowman identifies six lines of interpretation of this verse if σωθήσεται has a feminine subject: "These include the following (1) Women will be delivered (physically) through childbirth. (2) Women will be saved (spiritually) even though they must bear physical children. (3) Women will be saved (spiritually) through the Childbearing (i.e., the birth of Christ). (4) Women will be saved (spiritually) equally with men through fulfilling their God-given role in the home just as men fulfill theirs in public church leadership. (5) Women will be kept safe from seizing men's roles in the worship assembly by fulfilling their God-given role in the home. (6) Women will be saved (spiritually, with the focus on eschatological salvation) through faithfulness to their proper role, exemplified in motherhood." (206-07) She lists supporters of each position.

the passage is stating that Eve will find her ultimate redemption or salvation in the birth of Christ. Thus 'the childbirth'. . . refers to the *protoevangelium* of Gen. 3.15 and the overcoming of the consequences of the fall. A third solution is that ἡ γυνή is any woman, or women in general. A fourth proposal is that 'the woman' is the representative woman of Ephesus, the city to which the letter is purportedly addressed. And a fifth solution is that she is the representative Christian woman. These proposals run a gamut from the general to the specific, and from the exalted to the mundane along the way raising issue warranting closer evaluation before being able to suggest an answer to the question of the subject of the verb, σωθήσεται.¹¹⁵

Determining the sense of σωθήσεται may help the interpreter understand Paul's intended subject. Knight observes that "essentially two views have been followed on the use here of σωθήσεται: The reference is to either (1) salvation in the spiritual sense or (2) salvation in the physical sense of preservation."¹¹⁶ Paul uses σώζω frequently in his letters,¹¹⁷ always with the sense of the eschatological rescue of believers by God through Jesus

¹¹⁵Stanley E. Porter, "What Does It Mean To Be 'Saved By Childbirth' (1 Timothy 2.15)?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 49 (1993): 90-91.

¹¹⁶George W. Knight III, 144-45.

¹¹⁷Rom. 5:9, 10; 8:24; 9:27; 10:9, 13; 11:14, 26; 1 Cor. 1:18, 21; 3:15; 5:5; 7:16; 9:22; 10:33; 15:2; 2 Cor. 2:15; Eph. 2:5, 8; 1 Thess. 2:16; 2 Thess. 2:10; 1 Tim. 1:15; 2:4, 15; 4:16; 2 Tim. 1:9; 4:18; and Tit. 3:5. He uses the verb in the passive voice throughout Romans (except at 11:14), in most of the occurrences in the Corinthians letters (excepting 1 Cor. 1:21; 7:16; 9:22), in every appearance in Ephesians as well as 1 and 2 Thessalonians. He uses the active voice in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 1:15; 4:16; 2 Tim. 1:9; 4:18; and Tit. 3:5, always with Christ or God (or the power of God) as the subject. He uses the passive voice in the Pastorals only at 1 Tim. 2:4, 15.

Christ. Foerster comments:

In Paul σώζω and σωτηρία are obviously limited quite intentionally to the relation between man and God. When Paul is referring to other dangers from which he asks God for deliverance, and receives this from him, he uses ῥύομαι. . . . Primarily, then, σωτηρία is for Paul, a future, eschatological term, cf. 1 C. 5:5. . . .¹¹⁸

While the verb can reflect other meanings,¹¹⁹ Paul's use is uniform. Porter writes:

In the light of the above cumulative evidence and in particularly in the context of 1 Tim. 2.15, σωθήσεται is virtually guaranteed a salvific sense (the passive voice is probably a divine or theological passive, that is, God is the agent of salvation). This is confirmed both by the verb being introduced by contrastive δέ, which puts v. 15 in juxtaposition to the sinful state of 'the woman' in v. 14, and by the use of the following ἐάν clause. . . .¹²⁰

With this in mind, the reader may then identify the subject of the verb σωθήσεται as ἡ γυνή of v. 14. Paul shifted from the name "Eve" (verse 13) to the common noun ἡ γυνή (verse 14) in preparation for verse 15. The term ἡ γυνή refers to

¹¹⁸Werner Foerster, "σώζω," *TDNT* 7:992. He adds: "The goal of Paul's missionary endeavours is also denoted by σώζω. . . ." (Ibid.)

¹¹⁹The verb can function in two domains: "to heal" (Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, 2:240.), clearly not the intended message here, and "to rescue, save" (Ibid., 21.18). In the world, filled with danger, the word σωθήσεται serves as a word of promise whether it is taken as "to rescue from danger and to restore to a former state of safety and well being" or in the religious sense, "to cause someone to experience divine salvation." (Ibid., 21.27).

¹²⁰Stanley E. Porter, 94. He adds that "the sense of 'be kept safe' . . . must be rejected as an accommodation to the apparently harsh theology of v. 15, a proposal which introduces a sense not clearly established for this word in the pastoral epistles." (Ibid.)

Eve (in verse 14), but its semantic range is broad enough to include every woman.¹²¹ The context of 1 Tim. 2:11-15 narrows the subject of the verb σωθήσεται to every *believing* woman.¹²² In summing up his comments of 1 Tim. 2:11-14 in verse 15 (a pattern observed in Eph. 5:33; 1 Cor. 11:11-12; and 1 Cor. 14:37-40), Paul returns to the plural with which he began in verse 11. The progression may be represented:

v. 9-10	v. 11-12	v. 13-14	v. 15
"women"	"woman"	"Eve, the woman"	"she, they"
(plural)	(singular)	(proper name and generic singular)	(generic sg. and plural)

διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας

The third problem facing the reader in verse 15 is the interpretation of διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας. The noun occurs only here, but a verbal form occurs in 1 Tim. 5:14

¹²¹As noted above, the singular may be taken as a collective or generic singular representing the entire category or class signified. (BDF §139) Porter argues against taking the subject of σωθήσεται as Eve. "Although it must be conceded that 'the woman' of v. 14 could be Eve, the inferring of Eve as the subject of the future verb in v. 15 does not carry great conviction. The attitudinal force of the future form of the verb in v. 16 is one of expectation, that is, it grammaticalizes or conveys emphatic expectation toward a course of events. Since Eve's fortunes have already been determined, they are beyond any further expectation, so this solution is unlikely." (92) The noun ἡ γυνή serves to connect Eve (v. 13) with the believing women of the Christian church (v. 15).

¹²²Believing women are represented by the plural in vv. 9-10, by the singular in vv. 11-12, and by the prototype, Eve, in vv. 13-14. V. 15, summarizing the entire section, refers to believing women with both singular (σωθήσεται) and plural (μείνωσιν).

(τεκνογονέω), referring to the bearing of children generally ("Therefore, I want younger women to marry, to bear children . . ."). Knight explains the two basic interpretative options: "It is a reference to either (1) the birth of the Messiah or (2) childbearing in general."¹²³ If Paul intended to designate the source of salvation by using διὰ with the genitive¹²⁴ and if he meant the reader to understand the definitive article anaphorically,¹²⁵ the meaning of τῆς τεκνογονίας is the birth of Christ. This position is not without difficulties, however. Porter argues against taking τῆς τεκνογονίας in this way:

¹²³George W. Knight III, 145. He adds, "Various combinations of these solutions have been suggested." (Ibid.)

¹²⁴As noted above, *BDF* §223 states that Paul uses διὰ with the genitive to indicate the originator rather than the agent at 1 Cor. 1:9; Gal. 1:1; cf. 1 Cor. 8:6 (where the object of the preposition is a relative pronoun in the genitive, referring back to Christ). He also uses διὰ with the genitive to signal the manner ("by way of. . .") in 2 Cor. 2:4; Rom 2:27; 14:20; Gal. 4:13.

¹²⁵Murray J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992, 303, states that "an articular noun may be:

- a. Anaphoric, alluding to someone or something previously mentioned (= 'the aforesaid') or familiar to the author (and his audience).
- b. Generic, specifying (in the singular) a class or species as represented by an individual or (in the plural) a class as such and not as an aggregate of individuals.
- c. An abstract noun concretely applied. . . .
- d. Possessive in meaning, where the article functions as a possessive pronoun or adjective.
- e. An indication of a reciprocating proposition, if the subject also is articular."

It first requires that there be a clear and logical progression in the argument from Eve to Mary, one not indicated in the text. Furthermore, it requires association of 'childbirth' with one particular childbirth, with stress upon the article to specify a particular instance. The word translated here 'childbirth' is not used elsewhere in the New Testament, much less to speak of Jesus' birth (an obscure reference at best). The *protoevangelium* of God. 3.15 does not use this language, and neither is Jesus' birth referred to in this way until much later (in the second century by Irenaeus). This highly theological view puts too much emphasis upon the particularizing function of the article, as well.¹²⁶

Porter has listed three objections: that there is no progression from Eve to Mary, that τῆς τεκνογονίας does not elsewhere signal Jesus' birth, and that the definite article may not be anaphoric.

Paul does not draw the reader's attention to Mary. Even if τῆς τεκνογονίας refers to the birth of Jesus, it is Jesus who is the source of the salvation denoted by the verb σωθήσεται. Mary's role is in the background. As for the second argument raised by Porter, it may be noted that Paul has discussed Jesus in 1 Tim. 2:5-6, describing Him as the "one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." More significantly, Paul had stated in 1 Tim. 1:15, "Faithful [is] the saying and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I

¹²⁶Stanley E. Porter, 92. He adds, "Although the article may be used to specify a particular item, and in fact does so on occasion in the pastoral epistles, this is only one of its several uses; it could be generic as well, as it probably is in v. 8 with reference to 'the' men in every place." (Ibid.)

am the first." Paul can expect the reader to make the connection between τῆς τεκνογονίας and the birth of Christ Jesus because of four reasons. First, he has written about the coming of Christ into the world (i.e., His birth), which He accomplished through His birth (τῆς τεκνογονίας). Second, that purpose was to save (σῶσαι, 1:15) people, the same verb as is at the beginning of 2:15. Third, the people He came to save are sinners (ἁμαρτολοῦς, 1:15), a category into which the woman came in 2:14c. Fourth, this is categorized by the statement, "This (is) a faithful saying," in 1:15 and repeated in 3:1a.¹²⁷ Four markers link τῆς τεκνογονίας in 2:15 with the coming of Jesus (His birth) in 1:15, sufficient to establish both Paul's intent and the reasonability of his expectation that his readers would understand what he intended. Knight comments:

Furthermore, this understanding fits the flow of Paul's argument. He points out that Eve (ἡ γυνή) brought herself into transgression by abandoning her role and taking on that of the man. But by fulfilling her role, difficult as it may be as a result of sin (Gn. 3:16), she gives birth to the Messiah, and thereby "she" (ἡ γυνή, fulfilled, of course, in Mary; cf. Gal. 4:4) brings salvation into the world. The conditional clause (ἐὰν μείνωσιν κτλ.) signifies that the previous statement is true only when conditions are met, and σωθήσεται, understood as referring to spiritual salvation, would seem to be the only understanding that fulfills that requirement. Thus deliverance from

¹²⁷Whether the phrase "faithful (is) the saying" belongs to 2:15 or 3:1 may be debated. The only point here is that, along with the other textual markers, this serves to remind the reader of Paul's statement in 1:15 which mentioned the coming of Christ into the world, i.e., His birth.

transgression comes to those who have a true and sincere faith, which points to the usual correlation between salvation and faith in Paul and the attendant and abiding manifestation of faith in a godly life (cf. Romans 6 and 8). there is thus a transition from Eve (ἡ γυνή, singular σωθήσεται) back to women in general (μείνωσιν, plural); in this way the passage serves to show women the importance of their role and of carrying out in an obedient way, the note on which the passage ends (ἀγιασμοῦ μετὰ σωθροσύνης; cf. Mary's words in Lk. 1:38).¹²⁸

The alternative approach takes τῆς τεκνογονίας as a reference to the distinctive role of women. If this is the intended meaning, then Paul appears to be saying that a woman can be saved eschatologically and eternally by bearing children or, if intended more generally, by living out her feminine identity. In either case, Paul is found to be advocating a salvation by works, contrary to his consistent teaching and his calling (e.g., 1 Tim. 1:8-17; 2:4-7).¹²⁹ As H. A. Moellering notes, "One thought must, because of the Pauline stress on salvation by grace alone, be immediately ruled out: Paul cannot mean that bearing children in any way atones for sin. He knows of only one atonement for sin: the

¹²⁸George W. Knight III, 146-47

¹²⁹It is possible to take τῆς τεκνογονίας as a model of feminine behavior if σωθήσεται signals "keep safe." Thus, a woman may be kept safe (from Satan's deceptions) through the dangerous journey of life if she adheres to the distinctively feminine identity which is given her. In this case "childbearing" becomes something of a code word or shorthand for the identity of woman as man's helpmeet (Genesis 2:18-25). Living true to her identity involves faith (in the Lord Jesus), love (for others) and good judgment (or self-control).

sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross (cf. Titus 3:5)."¹³⁰

Paul had previously written to the Christians in Ephesus about the mystery of Christ and His bride, the church (Eph. 5:22-33). The analogy of marriage may also be present in Paul's mind at 1 Tim. 2:15. Within marriage, as she lives out her identity as helpmeet or complement to her husband, she serves (as it were) as "co-creator" with God to bring children into the world. This provides the background for Paul as he directs the reader's attention to *the* childbirth, that is, the birth of Christ, which provides salvation for the woman (who has become a transgressor, 1 Tim. 2:14). The woman comes to her highest glory in this picture of her as the church under Christ, for whom generations of childbirths from Eve until Mary have culminated in the birth of Jesus, Savior of His body, His bride, the church.¹³¹

It may be that Paul also formulated his reference to the birth of Jesus in just this way so as to capture something of the essence of his instructions to women to

¹³⁰H. Armin Moellering, *1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*, 57-58. George W. Knight makes the same point. (145)

¹³¹I am indebted to Dr. Louis A. Brighton for this line of interpretation, conveyed in private correspondence. He also notes that this picture of the church as bride and mother appears in Revelation 12, especially vv. 1-2. There is an obvious fluidity in the picture which allows for the woman to serve as both mother and bride. However, Paul has demonstrated his ability to work with two pictures and blend them in Eph. 5:22-33, where the bride and body images unite.

submit to the men in the congregation. Salvation is found only in Jesus Christ, and Christians must remember that a rejection of their identity in Christ as men and women will inevitably lead to a loss of salvation. Or, put positively, if women remain in faith, love and self-restraint, submitting to the men and remaining quiet during instruction, they will be saved by the birth, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. They already have this salvation, but are in danger of losing it by their rebellious ways.

If They Remain

The protasis begins with ἐὰν μείνωσιν.¹³² It may be noted that Paul has inverted the normal order of protasis - apodosis in verse 15, apparently for the sake of the juxtaposition made possible by the inversion. He ends verse 14 with ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν and begins verse 15 with σωθήσεται διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, creating a strong contrast as sin and grace are placed side by side. She (that is, the woman) will be saved through the birth (death, and resurrection) of Christ Jesus if they (the believing women) continue in the faith (ἐν πίστει) and love (ἀγάπη) which

¹³²Cf. BAGD, s.v. "μείνωσιν," 802. The noun occurs in Acts 26:25 (of sound, well-reasoned speech), in 1 Tim. 2:9 (of modest or sensible adornment) and here in v.15. It's antonym is *mania* and Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, define its use here as: "to behave in a sensible manner, with the implication of thoughtful awareness of what is best -- 'moderation, sensibility.'" (88.93)

they have received, and holiness with self-restraint (ἀγιασμῶ μετὰ σωφροσύνης). Porter explores the relationship of the protasis to the apodosis.

The instance in 1 Tim. 2.15 of a so-called third class conditional, with the subjunctive in the protasis, makes no implication whether in fact 'they remain', only that 'they might remain'. Regarding the action of the apodosis in relation to the protasis, interpreters often take one of two approaches. Some are tempted on the strength of the future verb form to see the apodosis as action future to the protasis. Others are tempted on the strength of the aorist subjunctive to see the protasis as action antecedent to the apodosis. The temporal analysis that results from these two formulations is roughly the same but they leave unanswered the larger question of the logical relation between the protasis and the apodosis, considered much more important in light of recent research into conditional structures. A more plausible analysis here for the relation of the protasis and apodosis is either cause and effect or ground and inference. By the first, the understanding is that women abiding in faith and love and holiness constitute the necessary cause, with the effect that the woman in question will be saved by childbearing. By the second, the understanding is that the women abiding in faith and love and holiness form the ground, from which the legitimate inference can be drawn that the woman in question will be saved by childbearing.¹³³

Porter's primary problem in his exegesis is his misunderstanding of the "childbirth" in the apodosis. Paul intended the reader to understand "the childbirth" as the birth of the Christ, Jesus. With this understanding, the relationship between the protasis (verse 15b) as the ground

¹³³Stanley E. Porter, 100. He claims that "neither category is fully satisfactory, however, especially in light of the instrumental use of δὲ in the apodosis. This grammatical analysis indicates, however, that there is an intricate relationship between the protasis and the apodosis, a relationship that has been neglected." (Ibid.)

and the apodosis (verse 15a) as the inference becomes clear. Paul does not say that a woman contributes to her salvation by good works, but that a sanctified life lived according to the will of God is the path from Baptism to the resurrection to eternal life. It is consistent with his instructions in 1 Cor. 10:1-13 and Phil. 3:12-16. Something of the same thoughts occur in 2 Tim. 2:10-13, another of the "faithful sayings" in the Pastorals. Paul says that he endures (ὑπομένω) "all these things for the sake of the elect so that they also might gain that salvation (σωτηρίας) which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." He then goes on in verses 11-13 to talk about faithfully living for Christ and Christ's faithful response. The compound form of the verb μένω, the nominal form of the verb σώζω, the use of the formula πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, and the thematic connections all point to a similarity of thought between 2 Tim. 2:10-13 and 1 Tim. 2:15.¹³⁴ In both passages, salvation has come from Jesus Christ by grace through faith in Him. In both passages, the readers are encouraged to live a life consistent with their faith, a sanctified life that serves to guard them until they reach their goal, the resurrection

¹³⁴It may be noted that immediately preceding the formula πιστὸς ὁ λόγος in both 1 Tim. 2:15 and 2 Tim. 2:10, Paul concludes with a prepositional phrase beginning with μετὰ.

to eternal life.¹³⁵ Paul uses the verb μένω in 1 Tim. 2:15 to denote "abiding in a realm or sphere."¹³⁶ Knight comments:

The concept of "remaining" or "continuing" would also seem to tie the subject of this verb to the subject of the previous clause (γυνή); one does not talk about "continuing" with a new subject but with a continuation of the previous subject. The same emphasis on the need for permanence and perseverance is sounded in 1 Cor. 15:2, which speaks of salvation (σώζω) through (διὰ) Christ's work, if (εἰ) "you hold fast" (κατέχετε. . . .).¹³⁷

What they are to remain "in" is identified by three nouns in the dative (πίστει, ἀγάπη, ἀγιασμῶ) and a prepositional phrase (μετὰ σωφροσύνης). The plural form of the verb (μείνωσιν) brings the reader full-circle, back to verses 9-10, and denotes *all* Christian women.

In Faith and Love and Holiness with Self-restraint

The predicate of the protasis may be described as two prepositional phrases, the first beginning with ἐν and

¹³⁵Perhaps the fullest treatment Paul gives this subject is in Ephesians. He concentrates on salvation and how it comes to believers in the first three chapters, concluding with a note on the love of Christ (3:14-21). He then turns to application of this faith in the life of the believer in the next three chapters, concluding with the extended metaphor of "putting on the armor of God" (6:11). The Christian life, if lived according to the Christian faith, can serve (among other things) to protect the believer as he lives in this hostile world.

¹³⁶George W. Knight III, 148. This is the definition give by BAGD s.v. "μένω," 1.a.β., a figurative use "of someone who does not leave the realm or sphere in which he finds himself. . . ." (503). Paul uses μένω similarly in 2 Tim. 2:14; 1 Cor. 7:8, 11, 20, 24 and 40.

¹³⁷Ibid.

the second with μετὰ. The first preposition has three objects, πίστει, ἀγάπη, and ἀγιασμῶ while the second preposition has one, σωθροσύνης.

The noun πίστις can mean either "faith, trust" or "faithfulness, reliability."¹³⁸ Used absolutely, without an modifiers, πίστις reflects "true piety, genuine religion . . . which for our lit. means being a Christian. . . ."¹³⁹ Such is the author's intent in Rom. 1:5, 8, 12, 17a, 17b, 3:27, 30, 31; 4:5-20 ; 5:1, 2; 9:30, 32; 10:6 [and many more]; 1 Tim. 1:2, 4, 5, 19a, 19b; and so forth.¹⁴⁰ Bultmann observes that "the saving faith denoted by πίστις and πιστεύειν, whether in the abs. or with some qualification, can be considered either in respect of its origin or in respect of its continuation."¹⁴¹

Paul combines πίστις and ἀγάπη in 1 Tim. 1:14 (a

¹³⁸Cf. BAGD s.v. "πίστις," 662-64. Louw and Nida, *Lexicon*, list πίστις under two domains: "hold a view, believe, trust" and "communication." In the former, πίστις can denote "what can be believe" (31.43), "trust" (31.85), "trustworthiness" (31.88), "Christian faith" (31.102), "doctrine" (31.104), and in the second domain, "promise" (33.289). For the definition "Christian faith" they list Rom. 1:8 and Eph. 2:8. (31.102)

¹³⁹BAGD s.v. "πίστις," 2.d., 664. The definition of πίστις as "true religion" appears also in Sextus 7a and 7.

¹⁴⁰Cf. BAGD, s.v. "πίστις," 2.d.a. for the full listing. They add at the end of this entry, citing Gal. 1:23, "If Christianity is essentially faith, then π. can be understood as *the Gospel* in terms of the commitment it evokes. . . ." (663)

¹⁴¹Rudolf Bultmann, "πιστεύω," *TDNT* 6:212. He notes a number of passages combine πίστις and ἀγάπη: 2 Thess. 1:3; Eph. 3:7; 6:23; 1 Tim. 1:14; 2:15; 4:12. (212, n. 287)

further marker for the reader to recall 1:15 at 2:15) and 4:12, where Paul encourages Timothy to be a pattern for the believers (πιστῶν) among which he lives¹⁴² in word, in conduct, and in love. Paul's previous remarks in 1:14 help the reader to understand what he means by "faith and love" in 2:15. By itself, 2:15 does not indicate whether πίστις denotes "faith" or "faithfulness" and in what sense to take the word ἀγάπη. Informed by 1:14, the reader understands that Paul has in mind at 2:15 the "faith" of the believer. That faith is his trust in Christ and adherence to Christ's teaching.

The term ἀγάπη may denote the love which God has poured out on His people through Jesus Christ, the intent in 1:14. Yet this love from God cannot be divorced from the believer's response, a "love from a pure heart" (which is the goal of Paul's instructions to Timothy, 1 Tim. 1:5, along with a good conscience and a sincere faith). Certainly this latter definition appears in Paul's concluding exhortation to Timothy (1 Tim. 6:11, again with πίστις).¹⁴³ Ethelbert Stauffer describes the relationship between God's love for man and the Christian's love for God in Paul's writings:

God has the first word. He establishes the relationship. This is laid down once and for all in R. 8. His resolve, election and calling are

¹⁴²Cf. George W. Knight III, 205.

¹⁴³Cf. also 2 Tim. 2:22; 3:10; and Tit. 2:2.

decisive. From Him proceeds everything that may be called ἀγάπη. The love of the ἀγαπῶντος τὸν θεόν is nothing but the direct flowing back of the heavenly love which has been poured out upon the κλητός. More accurately, it is an act of decision, like the basic act of love itself.¹⁴⁴

The third object of the first preposition is ἀγιασμός. Much less frequent in Paul than the other two,¹⁴⁵ this term conveys purity of conduct in accord with the will of God.

Otto Proksch describes the term:

In ἀγιασμός we thus have a process which has as its presupposition the religious process of atonement. ἀγιασμός is the will of god (1 Th. 4:3), and it consists against in purity of physical life, so that marital fellowship is fulfilled ἐν ἀγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ (4:4). the opposite of ἀγιασμός is ἀκαθαρσία (4:7), except that ἀκαθαρσία is a moral state which cannot possibly be linked with calling . . . whereas ἀγιασμός is the moral form in which it is worked out. . . . If atonement is the basis of the Christian life, ἀγιασμός is the moral form which develops out of it and without which there can be no vision of Christ. The term ἀγιασμός is always distinguished from ἅγιος and ἀγιαζεῖν by the emphasis on the moral element.¹⁴⁶

The term ἀγιασμός recalls the "good works" with which the Christian women of 1 Tim. 2:10 were to adorn themselves, confirming the plural subject of μείνωσιν as the γυναῖκας of verses 9-10.

The second prepositional phrase, μετὰ σωφροσύνης,

¹⁴⁴Ethelbert Stauffer, "ἀγαπάω, *TDNT* 1:50.

¹⁴⁵ἀγιασμός appears in Rom. 6:19; 1 Cor. 1:30; 1 Thess. 4:3, 4, 7; 2 Thess. 2:13 and 1 Tim. 2:15. Outside of Paul's writings, it occurs only in Heb. 12:14 and 1 Pet. 1:2.

¹⁴⁶Otto Proksch, "ἀγιασμός," *TDNT* 1:113. He understands the reference at 1 Tim. 2:15 to be the children who are born into the Christian family.

modifies the third object of the first preposition, ἀγναισμός.¹⁴⁷ The term appears in 1 Tim. 2:9 as a description of the adornment of Christian women (another textual marker that the subject of the verb μείνωσιν is the women of verses 9-10). Knight comments:

μετά σωφροσύνης, "with self-restraint" (see v. 9), brings into perspective the need for this virtue in addition to the general call for ἀγναισμός. It probably refers not only to restraint and discretion in regard to clothing and adornment, but also, in connection with vv. 11-14, a woman's role vis-à-vis men and the church. It is thus a reminder that not only sin (vv. 9, 10) but also the creation order necessitates self-restraint and that true faith, love, and sanctity will manifest itself in a lifestyle and attitude that restrains itself from immodesty or ostentatiousness and from violating order of the Creator-Savior.¹⁴⁸

The word σωφροσύνη and its cognates occurs extensively in the Pastorals and seldom elsewhere in the New Testament.¹⁴⁹

Ulrich Luck describes the word-group:

As distinct from Gnostic scorn for the world Christ faith manifests itself in a proper attitude to it and its goods, 1 Tm. 4:3-5. This correct relation is marked by moderation and contentedness, 1 Tm.

¹⁴⁷While it could modify the entire preceding prepositional phrase, it seems unlikely on logical grounds. Paul does not elsewhere encourage his readers to remain "in faith" with self-restraint or to continue "in love" with sobriety. The practice of sanctification, applying faith to the moral conduct of the believer, however, requires self-restraint.

¹⁴⁸George W. Knight III, 149.

¹⁴⁹σωφροσύνη appears only at Acts 26:25; 1 Tim. 2:9, and 15. The verb, σωφρονίζω, occurs only at Tit. 2:4 and the noun, σωφρονισμός, only at 2 Tim. 1:7. The adverb, σωφρόνως, is used in the New Testament only in Tit. 2:12 and σώφρων, the adjectival form, only at 1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:8; 2:2, and 5.

6:6-10, 17-19. αἰδώς and σωφροσύνη (1 Tm. 2:9), i.e., a suitable restraint in every respect is expected of women, cf. 1 Tm. 2:15; 1 Cl., 1, 3. In Tit. 2:5 the reference is especially to chastity . . . and a disciplined life.¹⁵⁰

Having "come full circle," Paul is now ready to begin a new phase of the subject at hand. He has directed that women should be silent when it comes to authoritative activities, such as teaching, within the church. He has further instructed them to consider their calling as Christian women, applying their faith to their everyday lives, both in worship (verses 9-10) and beyond (verse 15). He has drawn on the institution of marriage as the model which Christians are to emulate in their conduct in the worship service. The relationship of Adam and Eve in Genesis 2 reveals the order of the plurality of mankind in the unity of humanity, part of what it means to be restored to the image of God in Jesus Christ. Unity in Christ does not confuse the identity of men and women who are one through baptism and yet distinct persons within the body of Christ.

¹⁵⁰Ulrich Luck, "σώφρων," *TDNT* 7:1103.

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Having examined the four passages in which Paul discusses women and the church (1 Cor. 11:2-16; Eph. 5:22-33; 1 Cor. 14:33b-36; and 1 Tim. 2:11-15), it is possible to summarize the findings of the investigation and draw conclusions. The purpose of this study has been to investigate the Pauline texts which bear directly upon the question women and their involvement in the ministry of word and sacrament and then to discover how his understanding of marriage and the image of God have shaped his comments. The findings of this investigation may be summarized as follows.

1 Corinthians 11:2-16

In 1 Corinthians, Paul speaks to specific problems and questions raised in a letter he received (1 Cor. 7:1). He discusses worship practices in 1 Cor. 11:2-14:40. Beginning on a positive note (1 Cor. 11:2), Paul states the principle upon which he will base his instructions (1 Cor. 11:3) and then applies it (1 Cor. 11:4-6). He explains his principle (1 Cor. 11:7-9), grounding it in the creation account of Gen. 2:4-24, and applies it in 1 Cor. 11:10. He then reminds the reader of the mutual dependence of man and

woman (1 Cor. 11:11-12) and appeals to the experience and observation of the Corinthians themselves for confirmation (1 Cor. 11:13-15). He concludes with a comment about the universality of his instruction (1 Cor. 11:16).

The theological statement in verse 3 involves a three-fold use of "head" (κεφαλή), a term which may be used figuratively to designate someone who is in a position of authority over someone else. It does not refer to a "source" in 1 Cor. 11:2-16, a definition inappropriate to the verse.¹ Use in the Septuagint and extra-biblical sources as well as in the remainder of the New Testament support "one who has authority over another" for the meaning of κεφαλή in verse 3.² Paul instructs the Corinthians about headcoverings, indicating the appropriate behavior is to leave a man bare-headed when praying or prophesying in worship services and to cover a woman's head when she does so. The headcovering³ symbolizes the woman's willing

¹English does sometimes use "head" to designate a source, such as "head-waters" of a river.

²The work done by Wayne Grudem was very helpful here. He defends this definition in "Does Κεφαλή ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 85-112 and responds to criticisms of that article with "The Meaning of Κεφαλή ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies," *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3-72.

³For Paul's culture, the natural distinction between men and women was reflected in the use of headcoverings and in short hair for men, long hair for women. The symbol of the distinction may vary from society to society but the need for a visual symbol of male headship and female submission remains constant.

submission to the man. If she prays or prophesies with an uncovered head, she dishonors her "head" (man) just as man dishonors his "Head" (Christ) when he covers his head during these activities. A woman with an uncovered head when praying or prophesying conveys the same meaning as a woman who shaves her head, that is, a rebellion against her identity as woman. The theological statement of 1 Cor. 11:3 provides a succinct summary of Paul's understanding of how the redeemed body of Christ, the church, is organized as a plurality within a unity. This order in which man and woman are distinguished from each other even as they are united in Christ reflects their new status as the image of God, restored to the structure evident in Genesis 2. Marriage represents the original relationship of woman to man and (as will be seen in Ephesians 5) also serves to depict the relationship of the church to Christ.

Paul explains the identity of woman (as well as man) in 1 Cor. 11:7-9. Humanity is created in the Image of God and thus, resembles and represents God as His Image (εἰκὼν) on earth. As God's Image, he is to reflect God in his relationship to God and to creation (δόξα). The woman came later, drawn from man (1 Cor. 11:8) and designed for man (1 Cor. 11:9), both statements are grounded in Gen. 2:18-23. Paul does not deny that the woman and the man are the Image of God (Gen. 1:26-27) but argues that each has a distinct identity within humanity. The man occupies a position of

authority over the woman by virtue of his identity and God's design. The woman reflects the man as his "glory" (δόξα) and submits to him as head and leader. Because of this, a woman should have a headcovering to signal her identity and willing acceptance of it under Christ (1 Cor. 11:10). This accords with good order (and God is a God of order, 1 Cor. 14:33a). Mention of the angels may be intended to establish an analogy between their self-veiling and the woman's headcovering in prayer and prophesy, but is more likely related to the understanding that the angels are charged with keeping good order, particularly among the people of God.

In 1 Cor. 11:11-12, Paul recalls the unity of humanity (reminiscent of Gal. 3:26-28) in Jesus Christ, the true and perfect Image of God. Restoration to humanity's identity as God's Image necessarily takes place through faith in Christ Jesus, a restoration which does not blur or eliminate the distinctions between man and woman in Gen. 2:4-24 but which affirms the unity which believers have from God (1 Cor. 11:12).

Paul appeals to the experience and observation of the Corinthians themselves in verses 13-15. They should be able to observe the principle of 1 Cor. 11:3 at work through the distinctions made by their culture and others in taking long hair as proper a woman but shameful for a man. Long hair is a natural marker for the woman, and for a man to

wear long hair (or a woman short hair or to shave her head) denotes a rebellion against their identity and against the design God has for proper relations between men and women. The practice of the church in making this distinction is universally consistent (1 Cor. 11:16).⁴

As was the case in Eph. 5:22-33, Paul bases his instructions and his theological underpinnings on the creation account of Gen. 2:4-24. This model of mankind is the standard to which the believer is restored in Jesus Christ, summarized in the designation "Image of God." Within humanity there remains a distinction of identity between Jesus Christ, man and woman. Men and women are to reflect this distinction. In first-century Corinth, this meant headcoverings for women while praying or prophesying in worship services. There is no indication in the text that the principle with which Paul works is to be limited to one place or one time.

Ephesians 5:22-33

Paul believes there is a mutual analogy between Christ and the church on the one hand and husband and wife on the other. The husband's duties may be summed up in the

⁴Paul makes his case in the context of Roman Corinth where the application of a visible symbol reflecting the male-female relationship is effected by the use of headcoverings and hair length. So it was throughout Paul's churches. However, the particular way in which this relationship is visibly confessed may vary through use of other symbols in other cultures.

command "love" (ἀγαπάω) and the wife's responsibilities with the verb "submit" (ὑποτάσσω). Christians are called to love one another as Christ has loved them (Eph. 4:31-5:2) and all believers are instructed to submit to one another (Eph. 5:21). When Paul moves to specific relations within the church, he employs the same terminology (ἀγαπάω, ὑποτάσσω) but intends the terms to be taken more narrowly, so that ἀγαπάω can denote the particular self-sacrificial concern for someone else that moved Christ to die for His bride, the church (Eph. 5:25). Similarly, ὑποτάσσω can be used to convey the attitude of a wife towards her husband (Eph. 5:22).⁵ Such distinctions are not addressed in Gal. 3:27-28. There Paul discusses the unity of all Christians, effected by the Holy Spirit in Baptism.⁶ Such unity does not invalidate distinctions within the unity, as may be seen in Paul's statements that believers are united with Christ (to the point that he can speak about Christ dwelling within the Christian and the Christian identified as the "members" of Christ, cf. Rom. 8:10; 1 Cor. 6:15; 10:16; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 3:17) and yet are distinct from Him.

⁵Other specific applications of ὑποτάσσω appear in Rom. 13:1, of Christians who are called to "submit" to the governing authorities; Tit. 2:9, of slaves to masters; Luke 2:51, of a child (Jesus) to his parents; and finally, in 1 Cor. 15:27-28, of all creation to Christ and in turn, to God.

⁶This unity (ἐνότης) of the Spirit is kept in the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3) and is grounded in the faith and knowledge of Jesus Christ (Eph. 4:13).

Paul develops his position regarding women in the church from the account of creation, particularly Gen. 2:4-24. He can therefore say in Eph. 5:23 that a man is the head of a woman as Christ is the Head of the church.⁷ Two points become apparent in this statement. First, the model for all relations between men and women in the church is the original relationship between man and woman, that of Adam and Eve, in Gen. 2:4-24. Second, "headship" denotes authority. One is to submit to one's head and render obedience.⁸ Paul's treatment in Eph. 5:22-33 reflects the use of the image in the Old Testament, especially in Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Isaiah. The metaphor is negative in the Old Testament, often appearing in the context of judgment and condemnation of Israel's unfaithfulness to her husband. Yet the fact that God does not destroy her (the Mosaic penalty for adultery was death, Lev. 20:10) evidences His (husbandly) love and grace. He promises to restore her to Himself in the Messianic Age.⁹ Paul pictures Christ as the eschatological Bridegroom, the Redeemer who has restored His bride, the church, to Himself, through the washing of Baptism (Eph. 5:26). Christ Jesus and His people now are

⁷A statement he had more fully treated in the earlier 1 Cor. 11:2-16.

⁸The connection between submission and obedience is explicit in 1 Pet. 3:1-6.

⁹Paul plays the role of the man who arranges the betrothal and delivery of the bride to her husband in 2 Cor. 11:2-3.

united, analogous to the union of husband and wife (Gen. 2:24), with Christ as the Head and believers together forming the body (Eph. 5:30). Paul does not indicate in the text an intention to limit this to one time (the Apostolic age) or one place (Ephesus). What he writes of Christ and the church is valid for the entire New Testament age, in every place and at every time.

1 Cor. 14:33b-36

1 Cor. 14:26-40 conclude Paul's directives regarding worship services at Corinth (a topic begun in 1 Cor. 11:2). The general principle for conduct within these services is that God is not a God of disorder, but of peace (1 Cor. 14:33a). Although Paul's instructions in 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 have sometimes been understood to contradict 1 Cor. 11:2-16, this is not the case. Paul gives permission for women to pray or prophesy in 1 Cor. 11:2-16, but they must do it in a submissive way. In 1 Cor. 14:33b-36, he forbids women from speaking in the sense that they are not to render judgment upon prophecies offered by members of the worshiping group, the subject raised in 1 Cor. 14:29 and discussed in 1 Cor. 14:30-36.

Failing to perceive the structural link that 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 has with 1 Cor. 14:29b, Gordon Fee proposes that 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 is an interpolation and does not belong to this section. He bases this on very weak textual evidence (which dislocates, not eliminates, 1 Cor. 14:33b-36) and on

a misapplication of Bengel's first principle.¹⁰ Wayne Grudem's work, supporting the suggestion that verses 33b-36 are Paul expanded comments on verse 29b, demonstrate the unity of the passage (1 Cor. 14:26-40) and the integral place verses 33b-36 have in it.¹¹ This approach also confirms the unity of 1 Cor. 11:2-14:40, as Paul returns to worship conduct. He had discussed praying and prophesying in 11:2-16 and concludes his instructions with directives on glossolalia, prophesying and the judgment of prophecy in 14:26-40. The woman is to be in submission (1 Cor. 14:34), a phrase which summarizes the attitude of someone to the one who has authority over him. In the context, the woman's subordinate position prevents her from acting authoritatively over those who prophesy in worship services. Such authoritative speaking is shameful, rejecting the identity of woman as God created and redeemed and sanctified her to be.

Paul identifies his source as "the Law" (ὁ νόμος, 1 Cor. 14:34), that is, *Torah*. The activity of every Christian woman in public worship should reflect her identity, established by God when He created the first

¹⁰That is, that the most likely form of a particular text is that which best explains the emergence of all others.

¹¹Cf. Wayne Grudem, "Prophecy—Yes, But Teaching—No; Paul's Consistent Advocacy of Women's Participation without Governing Authority," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 11-23.

woman. Once again, Paul grounds his instructions for all believing women on the identity of woman and the relationship of the first woman to the first man, a marriage relationship.

Some commentators believe that verse 36 indicates verses 33b-35 are the statements of Paul's opponents, repeated ironically by Paul and then rejected by him in verse 36. D. A. Carson offers four arguments against this interpretation, noting that the masculine $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ denotes the entire church, that Paul's citations of his adversaries' positions have common characteristics lacking in 1 Cor. 14:33b-35, that \acute{o} $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ never refers to Jewish tradition and that the disjunctive particle η does not deny the preceding but sets up an "either-or" choice.¹²

Paul's instructions in 14:33b-36 make eminent sense if understood as comments on 14:29b. This interpretation allows Paul to be consistent with himself (in light of 1 Cor. 11:2-16) and harmonizes with Paul's instructions in 1 Tim. 2:11-15, a passage which expands the underlying principle of 1 Cor. 14:33b-36.

1 Timothy 2:11-15

Paul offers instructions on worship practices in 1

¹²Cf. D. A. Carson, "'Silent in the Churches': On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossways, 1991), 140-153.

Tim. 2:1-15. He directs his comments to the entire congregation in vv. 1-7, to men in verse 8, and to women in verses 9-15. The structure of verses 9-15 reveals three succinct units, verses 9-10, verses 11-12, and verses 13-14 with a final verse summarizing the section of 1 Tim. 2:9-14 in verse 15. There is a movement from the first unit ("women") through the second ("woman") to the third ("the woman, Eve") which is inverted in verse 15 ("[Eve and] the woman, women").

Paul wants women to dress appropriately at worship (verses 9-10), not restricting his remarks to wealthy women but intending they should be followed by all women.¹³ Likewise, Paul does not instruct only wives to dress modestly, but wants all the Christian women to dress decently.

In 1 Tim. 2:11-12, Paul says that a woman must learn in quietness and all submission. He does not permit her to teach or exercise authority over a man. As in verses 9-10, Paul speaks to all women, not just wives (shifting from the plural *γυναῖκας* in verses 9-10 to the singular *γυνή* in verses 11-12). He directs a woman to learn quietly, reflecting the attitude of willing submission to God's design and intention for her. This design prohibits her

¹³Wealthy women would certainly have more jewelry and expensive clothing to wear than would poor women, but the principle is the same in both cases. Good works, not external appearance, adorn the believing woman appropriately.

from teaching a man, taking the lead from him, or exercising authority over him. Although some have suggested that Paul speaks only to female heretics, there is no evidence that the false teachers of Ephesus were exclusively female or, for that matter, that any of the false teachers were women. Paul would condemn all false teachers, not merely female ones, if false teachers were the subject in these verses.

The verb ἀυθεντέω, appearing only here in the New Testament, has occasioned debate. Catherine Kroeger has argued that it denotes a domineering or overbearing kind of control.¹⁴ However, this type of "lording it over" someone is forbidden to all Christians (Luke 22:25). Further, George W. Knight III¹⁵ and Leland E. Wilshire¹⁶ have demonstrated that ἀυθεντέω means "to exercise authority over" someone without the negative connotation. This authority is inherent in the office of "teacher" (διδάσκαλος) and a woman is therefore prohibited from the office or the function.

In 1 Tim. 2:13-14 Paul reveals the grounds for his comments: the sequence in which Adam and Eve were created

¹⁴Catherine Kroeger, "1 Timothy 2:12--A Classicist's View," *Women, Authority & The Bible*, edited by Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), 225-244.

¹⁵George W. Knight III, "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in Reference to women in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 143-157.

¹⁶Leland Edward Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 131.

(Gen. 2:7-23; again, the relationship of the original husband and wife is normative for the relationship of all Christian men and women) and the woman's role in the fall into sin (Gen. 3:1-6, 13). In verse 15 he contrasts her fall into sin (at the end of verse 14) with her salvation, which will be through the (femininely distinctive) birth of the Messiah, Jesus. She had led humanity into sin but through that which only she can do, woman will be the one through whom salvation also comes. In this act, distinctively feminine, she brings forth (by God's power) the Savior, and reaches the height of her glory.¹⁷ Yet Christian women must continue in faith, love and holiness with self-restraint if they are individually to be saved.

What Paul has to say to Timothy and the Ephesians in 1 Tim. 2:11-15 corresponds exactly with what he has written in Eph. 5:22-33, 1 Cor. 11:2-16, and especially 1 Cor. 14:33b-36. In all four passages he has based his comments on the creation account of Gen. 2:4-24 with one reference to Gen. 3:6, 13. He has demonstrated that the model for the behavior of Christian men and women, particularly in public worship, is the original relationship of man and woman, marriage. Paul has nowhere indicated that, in his mind, what he has written was applicable to one group of people only or to only one time. He wants all Christians

¹⁷Cf. the description of the church as a woman in Rev. 12:1-2.

everywhere (as in 1 Tim. 2:1) to follow his instructions, given as an apostle of Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 1:1), based on God's design and plan for mankind.

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from this study of these four Pauline passages. The first is that Paul is consistent in his teaching. What he writes to the Ephesians harmonizes with his instructions to the Corinthians which both match his directives to Timothy and his church(es). The second is that Paul draws his teachings from the Old Testament, relying most heavily on Gen. 2:4-3:6. The third conclusion which may be drawn from these passages is that Christians are restored in Christ Jesus to their identity as outlined in the Creation narratives. There is no "dividing wall" between the Order of Creation and the Order of Redemption. A fourth conclusion identified in this study is that Paul considered his doctrine valid for all the churches and did not indicate in any way a temporal limitation to his directives. In his own mind, what he had to say to the churches in Ephesus and Corinth, and what he wrote to Timothy was a valid interpretation of Gen. 2:4-3:6 for the entire New Testament era. Specific applications may vary somewhat from culture to culture, but the basic relationship between God and mankind and within mankind, between man and woman, would remain and should be reflected in the practice of the church.

Paul's understanding of man and woman, particularly in relationship with each other and in the context of the church, may be seen to contain the following elements:

1) Mankind was created in the image of God and is restored to that identity in Christ Jesus, the image of God *par excellence*.

2) Within the Godhead the Son is distinct from the Father (so also the Spirit).¹⁸ Within mankind, the woman is distinct from the man. Paul carefully delineates these relationships (1 Cor. 11:3) which identify woman as woman, submissive to man, her head. The specific submission of wife to husband particularly reflects the relationship of the church to Christ, her Head (Eph. 5:22-24).

3) Woman's identity, given to her by God, prohibits her from exercising authority over a man by judging prophecies (1 Cor. 14:33b-36) or interpreting and applying Scripture (1 Tim. 2:12). The highest glory of a woman in the order of creation may be seen in childbirth, through which the Savior becomes a man, born of a woman, born under the law to redeem those under the law (Gal. 4:4b-5a).

¹⁸Paul distinguishes between the Father and the Son in Rom. 1:7; 6:4; 15:6; 1 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:2, 3[twice]; 11:31; 1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2. He distinguishes the Person of the Holy Spirit in Rom. 1:4; 5:5; 8:15, 26-27; 1 Cor. 6:19; 12:3. He calls Jesus $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Rom. 9:5 and Tit. 2:13. The Unity of God is particularly important for his understanding of God's saving work in Jesus Christ, reflected in Gal. 3:15-29 and Rom. 3:21-31. The unity of God's people is effected through Baptism (Gal. 3:26-29) into the one true God (1 Cor. 8:6; 2 Cor. 6:18).

The picture of Paul's thinking on women which may be drawn from 1 Cor. 11:2-16; Eph. 5:22-33; 1 Cor. 14:33b-36; and 1 Tim. 2:11-15 reflects the high respect and regard for woman as the image of God (as is also the man). A believing woman becomes an heir of God and co-heir with Christ (Rom. 8:17), as does a believing man. Paul encourages women to rejoice in their salvation, continue to practice their faith, and live out their God-pleasing calling as believing women within the body of Christ, the church.

What does Paul have in his mind's eye when he writes to the Corinthians, to the Ephesians and to Timothy on the subject of women and teaching in the church? The following picture emerges. Based on Genesis 1-3, Paul understands that humanity is the image of God. He also recognizes that God is One, yet is three Persons within that unity. God's image may also be described as a plurality within a unity. "Image" includes the component "lesser" and so it is appropriate that the plurality of humanity be two rather than three. Within the unity of "one flesh," humanity (husband and wife) are two persons. The relationship between the two persons distinguishes them from each other and may be described by "head" and "glory." The husband ("head") should love his wife and the wife ("glory") should submit to her husband. The marriage relationship determines a woman's area(s) of service in the church which is, in turn, described by family ("one flesh") terminology: God is

our Father, Jesus is the first-born among many brothers, believers are brothers and sisters in Christ, and so forth. As Paul responds to various problems and questions in Corinth and Ephesus, he responds from his understanding of marriage and the image of God as he has derived it from Genesis 1-3. His Christology does not nullify this understanding. Rather, in his Christology Paul sees the fulfillment of the two persons in one flesh, the "head" (Christ) and his body (the church).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989.
- Allison, Robert W. "Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36): What did Paul Really Say, and What did it Mean?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 27-60.
- Arnold, Franz X. *Die Frau in der Kirche*. Nürnberg: Glock und Lutz, 1949.
- Barclay, William. *The Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.
- Barnett, Paul W. "Wives and Women's Ministry (1 Timothy 2:11-15)." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 15 (1991): 321-334.
- Barr, James. "The Image of God in Genesis - A Study in Terminology." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 51 (1968): 11-26.
- Barrett, C. K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Barron, Bruce. "Putting Women in Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 and Evangelical Views of Women in Church Leadership." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 33 (1990): 451-460.
- Batey, Richard. "Jewish Gnosticism and the 'Hieros Gamos' of Eph. V:21-33." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963): 121-127.
- _____. "The MIA ΣΑΡΕ Union of Christ and the Church." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966-67): 270-281.
- _____. *New Testament Nuptial Imagery*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979.

- Belser, J. E. "Die Frau in den neutestamentlichen Schriften." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 6 (1909): 321-351.
- Bilezikian, Gilbert. *Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. Translated by Robert F. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, David E. Green and John T. Willis. Six volumes to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974 -.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, und Helmer Ringgren. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Band 6, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1989.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Frau und Kirche*. Einsiedeln: Johannes-Verlag, 1977.
- Bowman, Ann L. "Women in Ministry: An Exegetical Study of 1 Timothy 2:11-15." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (1992): 193-213.
- Brooke, George, editor. *Women in the Biblical Tradition*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1992.
- Brown, Colin, editor. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1951.
- Brown, Raymond E. "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *Mysterion* (I)." *Biblica* 39 (1958): 426-448.
- _____. "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *Mysterion* (II)." *Biblica* 40 (1959): 70-56.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. *The New Century Bible Commentary—I and II Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

- Brueggemann, Walter. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (GN 2,23a)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 532-542.
- Brunner, Peter. "Das Hirtenamt und die Frau." In *Pro Ecclesia, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur systematischen Theologie*. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1962.
- Bush, Peter G. "A Note on the Structure of 1 Timothy." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 152-156.
- Carson, D. A. *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.
- Carson, D. A., Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Clark, Stephen B. *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of Scripture and the Social Sciences*. Ann Arbor: Servant Press, 1980.
- Clines, D. J. A. "The Image of God in Man." *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968): 53-103.
- Clouse, Bonnidell, and Robert G. Clouse. *Women in Ministry: Four Views*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1989.
- Cook, James I. "The Old Testament Concept of the Image of God." In *Grace upon Grace: Essays in Honor of Lester J. Kuyper*, edited by James I. Cook. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Corrington, Gail Paterson. "The 'Headless Woman': Paul and the Language of the Body in 1 Cor 11:2-16." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 18 (1991): 223-231.
- Collins, Raymond F. "The Bible and Sexuality: The New Testament." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 8 (1978): 3-18.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*. Waco: Word, 1983.
- Craigie, Peter C., Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard, Jr. *Jeremiah 1-25*. Waco: Word, 1991.
- Creager, Harold L. "The Divine Image." In *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers*, edited by Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Carey A. More. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1974.

- Culley, Robert C. "Action Sequences in Genesis 2-3." *Semeia* 18 (1980): 25-33.
- _____. "Exploring New Directions." In *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, edited by Douglas A. Knight. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985,
- _____. "Some Comments on Structural Analysis and Biblical Studies." *Vetus Testamentum*, Supplement 22 (1972): 129-142.
- Cumming, Alan. "The 'Eternal Enemy of Woman' Revisited: An Examination of St. Paul and the Status of Women." *Journal of Christian Education* 91 (1988): 35-46.
- Curtis, Edward Mason. "Man as the Image of God in Genesis in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Parallels." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation for the University of Pennsylvania, 1984.
- Dautzenberg, Gerhard. *Urchristliche Prophetie: Ihre Erforschung, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum, und ihre Struktur im ersten Korintherbrief*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1975.
- Dautzenberg, Gerhard, Helmut Merklein, and Karl-Heinz Müller, editors. *Die Frau im Urchristentum*. Freiburg: Herder, 1983.
- Dautzenberg, Gerhard, and Josef Schreiner, editors. *Gestalt und Anspruch des Neuen Testaments*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1969.
- Delling, Gerhard. *Worship in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.
- _____. *Paulus' Stellung zu Frau und Ehe*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1931.
- DeLobel, Joël. "1 Cor 11,2-16: Towards a Coherent Interpretation." In *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère*, edited by A. Vanhoye. Leuven: University Press, 1986.
- Detweiler, Richard C. *The Christian Woman's Head-Veiling: A Study of I Corinthians 11:2-16*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1959.
- Dion, Paul-E. "Ressemblance et Image de Dieu." *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément X (1981): 366-403.

- _____. "Image et Ressemblance en araméen ancien (Tell Fakhariyah)." *Science et Esprit* 34 (1982): 151-153.
- Donelson, Lewis R. "The Search for Apostolic Roots: Comments upon the New Testament and Ministry." *Insights* 106 (1991): 7-15.
- Douglas, J. D., editor. *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. 3 volumes. London: Tyndale, 1980.
- Dunn, James D. G. "Jesus—Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans 1.3-4." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1973): 40-68.
- Evans, Mary. *Woman in the Bible*. Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1983.
- Fee, Gordon. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fitzer, Gottfried. *Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde: Über den unpaulinischen Charakter der mulier-taceat-Verse in 1. Korinther 14*. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1963.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "A Feature of Qumrân Angelology and the Angels of I Cor. XI. 10." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957-58:) 48-58.
- Die Frau in Familie, Kirche und Gesellschaft, Eine Studie zum gemeinsamen Leben von Frau und Mann. Vorgelegt von einem Ausschuß der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1979.
- Gerberding, Keith A. "Women Who Toil in Ministry, Even as Paul." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 18 (1991): 285-290.
- Gill, David W. J. "The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians." *Tyndale Bulletin* 41 (1990): 245-260.
- Gössmann, Elizabeth. *Mann und Frau in Familie und Öffentlichkeit*. München: M. Hueber, 1964.
- Greeven, H. "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus: Zur Frage der 'Ämter' im Urchristentum." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44 (1952-53): 1-43.
- Grosheide, F. W. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

- Grudem, Wayne. "The Meaning of Κεφαλή ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies." *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3-72.
- _____. "Prophecy--Yes, But Teaching--No: Paul's Consistent Advocacy of Women's Participation Without Governing Authority." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 11-23.
- Gryson, Roger. *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1976.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Harris, Murray J. *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody, 1980.
- Harris, Timothy J. "Why Did Paul Mention Eve's Deception? A Critique of P. W. Barnett's Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 335-352.
- Hasler, Victor. *Die befreite Frau bei Paulus*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1993.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1897 (fourth printing, 1989).
- Hauke, Manfred. *Women in the Priesthood? A Systematic Analysis in the Light of the Order of Creation and Redemption*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988.
- Hauser, Alan Jon. "Genesis 2-3: The Theme of Intimacy and Alienation." In *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, edited by D. J. A. Clines, David M. Gunn, and Alan Hauser. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Supplement 19. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
- Hayter, Mary. *The New Eve in Christ: The Use and Abuse of the Bible in the Debate about Women in the Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Héring, Jean. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. London: Epworth Press, 1962.
- Hess, Richard. "Genesis 1-2 in its Literary Context." *Tyndale Bulletin* 41 (1990): 143-153.

- Hoch, Carl B. "The Role of Women in the Church: A Survey of Current Approaches." *Grace Theological Journal* 8 (1987): 241-252.
- Hoekema, Anthony A. *Created in God's Image*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Hooker, Morna. "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor. 11:10." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963-64): 410-416.
- House, H. Wayne. "The Ministry of Women in the Apostolic and Postapostolic Periods." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 387-399.
- _____. "Neither . . . Male nor Female . . . in Christ Jesus." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 47-56.
- _____. "Should a Woman Prophesy or Preach before Men?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 141-161.
- _____. "The Speaking of Women and the Prohibition of the Law." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145 (1988): 301-318.
- Howard, George. "The Head/Body Metaphors of Ephesians." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1975): 350-356.
- Howard, J. Keir. "Neither Male nor Female: An Examination of the Status of Women in the New Testament." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983): 31-42.
- Hugenberger, Gordon P. "Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis? A Survey of Approaches to 1 Tim 2 :8-15." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (1992): 341-360.
- Hughes, Phillip. *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962 (reprinted 1992).
- Hummel, Horace D. "The Image of God." *Concordia Journal* 10 (1984): 83-93.
- Hurley, James B. *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- Jaubert, Annie. "Le Viole des Femmers (I Cor. XI. 2-16)," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1990): 419-430.
- Jervis, L. Ann. "'But I Want You to Know. . .': Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11:2-16)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 231-246.

- Jobling, David. "The Myth Semantics of Genesis 2:4b-3:24." *Semeia* 18 (1980): 41-49.
- Jónsson, Gunnlaugur A. *The Image of God: Genesis 1:26-28 in a Century of Old Testament Research*. Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1988.
- Kähler, Else. *Die Frau in den Paulinischen Briefen: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Begriffes der Unterordnung*. Zurich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1960.
- Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rep. 1983.
- Keener, Craig S. *Paul, Women & Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Kerr, David. "Pauline Teaching on the Order of Creation and the Subordination of Women: Its Implication for Christian Education." *Journal of Christian Education*, 94 (1989): 41-52.
- Kimberley, David R. "1 Tim 2:15: A Possible Understanding of a Difficult Text." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (1992:) 481-486.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Knight, George W. III. "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ. in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 143-157.
- _____. *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Kosmala, H. "Von der Stellung der Frau im Judentum," *Judaica* 4 (1948): 225-232.
- Kostenberger, Andreas J. "The Mystery of Christ and the Church: Head and Body, 'One Flesh.'" *Trinity Journal* 12 (1991): 79-94.
- Kroeger, Catherine. "Ancient heresies and a strange Greek verb." *Reformed Journal* 29 (1979): 12-15.
- _____. "The Apostle Paul and the Greco-Roman Cults of Women." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 25-38.

- Kroeger, Catherine and Richard Kroeger. "May women teach? Heresy in the pastoral epistles." *Reformed Journal* 30 (1980): 14-18.
- Kürzinger, "Frau und Mann nach 1 Kor 11.11f.," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 22 (1978): 270-275.
- Lampe, Peter. "The Christian Worship Services in Corinth and the Corinthian Enthusiasm (1 Cor. 12-14)." *Affirmation*, 4 (1991): 17-25.
- Lazenby, Henry. "The Image of God: Masculine, Feminine, or Neuter?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 63-70.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus and Philemon*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1937.
- _____. *St. Paul's I & II Epistles to the Corinthians*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1937.
- Lerle, Ernst. *Eine Macht auf dem Haupte? Zur Auslegung von 1. Kor. 11,10*. Uelzen: Lutherisches Verlaghaus, 1959.
- Leupold, H. C. *Exposition of Genesis*. 2 vol. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1942.
- Liefeld, Walter L. "Women and the Nature of Ministry." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 49-61.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Waco: Word Books, 1990.
- Lock, Walter. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Lowery, David K. "The Head Covering and the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11:2-34." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 143 (1986): 155-163.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. "Women Holy in Body and Spirit: The Social Setting of 1 Corinthians 7." *New Testament Studies*, 36 (1990): 161-181.
- MacKenzie, R. A. F. *Sirach*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1983.

- MacDonald, Margaret Y. "Women Holy in Body and Spirit: The Social Setting of 1 Corinthians 7." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 161-181.
- MacKenzie, R. A. F. *Sirach*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983.
- Maly, Karl. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1971.
- _____. *Die Frau im Urchristentum*. Freiburg in Bressgau: Herder Verlag, 1986.
- Marquardt, G. "Die Stellung der Frau in den Evangelien," *Bibel und Kirche* 11 (1956): 2-10.
- Martin, Ralph. *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- McGlone, Lee. "Genesis 2:18-24; Ephesians 5:21-6:9." *Review and Expositor* 86 (1989): 243-247.
- Meier, John P. "On the Veiling of Hermeneutics (1 Cor 11:2-16)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 212-226.
- Menschick, Jutta, editor. *Grundlagentexte zur Emanzipation der Frau*. Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1977.
- Mercadante, Linda. *From Hierarchy to Equality: A Comparison of Past and Present Interpretations of 1 Cor 11:2-16 in Relation to the Changing Status of Women in Society*. Vancouver: G-M-H Books, 1978.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. "Abbild oder Urbild? »Imago Dei« in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 403-424.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York: United Bible Society, 1971.
- Mickelsen, Alvera, editor. *Women, Authority and the Bible*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986.
- Miller, J. Maxwell. "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 289-304.
- Moellering, H. Armin. *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1970.

- Moltmann-Wendel, Elisabeth. *Freiheit, Gleichheit, Schwesterlichkeit. Zur Emanzipation der Frau in Kirche und Gesellschaft.* München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1977.
- Morris, Leon. *I Corinthians.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Munro, Winsome. "Women, Text and the Canon: The Strange Case of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35." *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 18 (1988): 26-31.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 265-274.
- _____. "Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 482-500.
- Neuer, Werner. *Man and Woman in Christian Perspective.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991.
- O'Brien, Peter. *Colossians, Philemon.* Waco: Word, 1982.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (1 Timothy 2:12)." *Restoration Quarterly*, 25 (1982): 1-12.
- Oster, Richard. "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11.4." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 481-505.
- Padgett, Alan. "Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11.2-16." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 69-86.
- _____. "The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1-10." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (1987): 39-52.
- _____. "The Significance of 'Anti in 1 Corinthians 11:15." *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994): 182-187.
- _____. "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: I Timothy 2:8-15 in Social Context." *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 1:19-31.
- Pierce, Ronald W. "Evangelicals and Gender Roles in the 1990s: 1 Tim 2:8-15: A Test Case." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 343-355.
- Piper, John. "The Image of God: An Approach from Biblical and Systematic Theology." *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 1 (1971): 15-32.

- Piper, John and Wayne Grudem, editors. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. Wheaton: Crossways, 1991.
- Porter, Stanley E. "What Does It Mean to Be 'Saved by Childbirth' (1 Timothy 2.15)?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 49 (1993): 87-102.
- Porteous, Norman W. "The Image of God." *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Volume 2. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Redekop, Gloria Neufeld. "Let the women learn: 1 Timothy 2:8-15." *Studies in Religion*, 19 (1990): 235-247.
- Reidick, Gertrude. *Die hierarchische Struktur der Ehe*. München: K. Zink, 1953.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. *Apostolate and Ministry: The New Testament Doctrine of the Office of the Ministry*. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1969.
- _____. "Die neutestamentlichen Mahnungen an die Frau, sich dem Manne unterzuordnen." In *Verbum Dei Manet in Aeternum, Festschrift für O. Schmitz*. Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1953.
- Roberts, Mark D. "Woman shall be saved—a closer look at 1 Timothy 2:15." *Reformed Journal* 33 (1983): 18-22.
- Rodgers, Peter R. "The Allusion to Genesis 2:23 at Ephesians 5:30." *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990): 92-94.
- Ruether, Rosemary, editor. *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979.
- Sawyer, John F. A. "The Meaning of *בְּצַלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים* ('In the Image of God') in Genesis I-XII." *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1974): 418-426.
- Scanzoni, Letha, and Nancy Hardesty. *All We're Meant to Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation*. Waco: Word, 1975.
- Scholer, David M. "Women in the Church's Ministry." *Daughters of Sarah* 16 (1990): 7-12.
- Scroggs, Robin. "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972): 283-303.

- Schwarz, Günther. "Ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς (1 Korinther 11.21)." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979): 249.
- Speiser, E. A. *Genesis*. New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- Stitzinger, Michael F. "Genesis 1-3 and the Male/Female Role Relationship." *Grace Theological Journal* 2 (1981): 23-44.
- Strack, Hermann L., und Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Bände II und III, München: Beck, 1969.
- Stuart, Douglas. *Hosea - Jonah*. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Realized Eschatology at Corinth." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 510-526.
- Thompson, Cynthia L. "Hairstyles, Head-coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth." *Biblical Archaeologist* 51 (1988): 99-115.
- Trobisch, Walter. *I Married You*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Van der Jagt, Krijn A. "Women Are Saved Through Bearing Children (1 Timothy 2.11-15)." *The Bible Translator* 39 (1988): 201-208.
- Vriezen, Theodorus C. "La Création de l'Homme d'après l'Image de Dieu." *Oudtestamentische Studien* 2 (1943) 87-105.
- _____. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.
- Walker, William O., Jr. "The Vocabulary of 1 Corinthians 11.3-16: Pauline or Non-Pauline?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (1989): 75-88.
- Wall, Robert W. "Wifely Submission in the Context of Ephesians." *Christian Scholar's Review* 17 (1988): 272-285.
- Walsh, Jerome. "Genesis 2:4b-3:24: A Synchronic Approach." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 2 (1977): 161-177.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (1978): 46-57.

- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1990.
- Wifall, Walter. "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 237-240.
- Wilson, Kenneth T. "Should Women Wear Headcoverings?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 148 (1991): 442-462.
- Winandy, J. "Un Curieux Casus Pendens: 1 Corinthiens 11.10 et Son Interprétation." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 621-629.
- Winston, David. "Women and Priestly Ministry: The New Testament Evidence." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 608-613.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Wood, A. Skevington. "Ephesians." *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, edited by Frank E. Gæbelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- Wright, Norman T. "Ἀρπάγμος and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5-11." *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986): 321-352.
- Zerbst, Fritz. *The Office of Woman in the Church: A Study in Practical Theology*, translated by Albert G. Merkens. St. Louis: Concordia, 1955.