

## Introduction to Chapter 8

Unlike with Adam and Eve, the Lord neither interrogated the serpent nor allowed him an opportunity to explain his behavior (Gen 3:6–13).<sup>1</sup> Instead, the one who was crafty (*arum*) became cursed (*arur*) (Gen 3:1, 14–15).<sup>2</sup> By forcing the serpent to crawl on his belly and eat dust, God reined in the snake’s aggression and hinted at his demise.<sup>3</sup> The serpent and his seed would engage in battle with the seed of the woman,<sup>4</sup> corporately and—eventually—in single combat.<sup>5</sup> Both champions would receive mortal wounds.

## An Anguishing Process

**1) Gen 3:16:** The Lord told Eve, “I will increase greatly your anguish (*itsabon*) and your conception (*herayon*). With pain you shall bear children.” Notably, God did not curse Eve but instead spoke of the outcome of her foolish choice (Gen 3:1–6). He cursed only the snake and the ground (Gen 3:14, 17).<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, the arrival of the seed which the woman would conceive would cause her agony (Gen 3:15).<sup>7</sup>

Moses likely chose the word for pain used here (*etseb*) for its resemblance to the word for a tree (*ets*), rather than using the typical term. Ultimately, a tree led to her trauma,<sup>8</sup> hardship, pain, and distress (Gen 2:16–17).<sup>9</sup> The consequences of sin produced difficult labor for both Eve and Adam, for *itsabon* occurs in both verdicts of judgment (Gen 3:17).<sup>10</sup> Although the only other Old Testament use of *itsabon* appears in Gen 5:29, nouns using the same Hebrew root connote agony, difficulty, grief, and anxiety.<sup>11</sup> Childbirth itself involves the pain and toil associated with strenuous work.<sup>12</sup> However, emotional anguish accompanies the physical pain.

Commentators disagree whether the correct translation is “conception” or “pregnancy,” as the Hebrew term *herayon* can refer to either one.<sup>13</sup> Even conception can evoke pain, for attempting to conceive can certainly produce misery and anxiety. Most likely, this is another example of merism, where the entire process from conception to childbirth causes emotional travail and/or physical pain. Walton paraphrases Gen 3:16a as, “I will greatly increase the anguish you will experience in the birth process, from the anxiety surrounding conception to the strenuous work of giving birth.”<sup>14</sup> Without the blessing of modern medicine, people in the ancient world deemed the pain accompanying childbirth the worst of agonies (Mic 4:9–10; Isa 13:6–8; Isa 21:3).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Waltke and Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary*, 93.

<sup>2</sup>Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1–17*, 196.

<sup>3</sup>Walton, *Genesis*, 225.

<sup>4</sup>Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1–17*, 198.

<sup>5</sup>Waltke and Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary*, 93.

<sup>6</sup>Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 81.

<sup>7</sup>Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1–17*, 200.

<sup>8</sup>Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 81.

<sup>9</sup>Holladay, “עֲצָבֹן” (*itsabon*), *CHALOT*, 280.

<sup>10</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “עֲצָבֹן” (*itsabon*), *BDB*, 781,

<https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/780/mode/2up>.

<sup>11</sup>Walton, *Genesis*, 227.

<sup>12</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “עֲצָבֹן” (*etseb*), *BDB*, 780,

<https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/780/mode/2up>.

<sup>13</sup>M. Ottosson, “הֵרָה” (*herayon*), *TDOT*, 3:436,

<https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/248/mode/2up>.

<sup>14</sup>Walton, *Genesis*, 227.

<sup>15</sup>Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 81.

Due to the high rate of miscarriage, stillbirth, and infant mortality in Mesopotamia, people considered expectant mothers and newborns prime targets for attack by the demons Lamashtu and Pazuzu. In the later months of pregnancy, many women wore an amulet depicting the head of Pazuzu, often inscribed with an incantation. Lamashtu appears as a hideous nude woman with long talons, the head of a bird or lion, and dangling breasts. This demon slithered through a small crack into a house and, upon finding an unattended infant, would suckle the baby to kill it.<sup>16</sup> People also attributed the pain of childbirth to her.<sup>17</sup>

The second half of verse 16 says, “and for (*el*) your husband your longing (*teshuqah*) shall be,<sup>18</sup> and he will rule (*mashal*) over you.” A recent revision of the ESV has ignited controversy by departing from all other major translations in translating *el* as “contrary to,” rather than depicting movement from the woman toward her husband. While Eve longed to reestablish their relationship of equality and partnership,<sup>19</sup> Adam would seek to rule over his wife (Cf. Gen 2:18–24). The verb *mashal* means simply “rule, have dominion, reign” without any sense of tyrannical behavior.<sup>20</sup> It describes how the sun and moon govern the day (Gen 1:17–18), while also depicting how God and people can have dominion over humanity (Judg 8:23; Ps 89:8–9).<sup>21</sup>

No longer reigning in unity as co-equals over creation (Gen 1:26–28), fierce disputes would characterize their marriage.<sup>22</sup> Eve’s subordination to her husband resulted from a broken creation,<sup>23</sup> rather than as a punishment from her creator.<sup>24</sup>

**a) Read Gen 3:16.** How did Moses express similarities between what the man and the woman experienced? Why did he likely choose an unusual word to express the woman’s pain? How was the experience of childbearing altered? What does this verse imply about Adam and Eve’s prior interactions?

### A Renewed Covenant

**b) Gen 3:20:** Moses wrote, “Now, the man called the name of his wife “Eve,” for she became the mother of all the living.” People in the Ancient Near East associated giving someone a name with the one in authority making a covenant with a subordinate, either for protection or exploitation (Gen 17:1–5; 2 Ki 24:17, 20).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>16</sup>Erle Lichy, “Demons and Population Control,” *Expedition*, vol. 13, issue 2, Winter 1971: 23–4, <http://www.penn.museum/documents/publications/expedition/PDFs/13-2/Lichy.pdf>. This includes a sketch.

<sup>17</sup>Matthews, Chavalas, and Walton, *IVPBBOT*, Gen 3:16.

<sup>18</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “לָשׁוֹן” (*el*), *BDB*, 38–40, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/38/mode/2up>, and “תְּשׁוּקָה” (*teshuqah*), *BDB*, 1003, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/1002/mode/2up>.

<sup>19</sup>Janson C. Condren, “Toward a Purge of the Battle of the Sexes and ‘Return’ for the Original Meaning of Gen 3:16b,” *JETS* 60, no. 2 (April 1, 2017): 227–45, 245, [https://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/60/60-2/JETS\\_60-2-227-245\\_Condren.pdf](https://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/60/60-2/JETS_60-2-227-245_Condren.pdf).

<sup>20</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “*mashal*”, *BDB*, 605, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/606/mode/2up>.

<sup>21</sup>Philip J. Nel, “*mashal*”, *NIDOTTE*, 2:1137.

<sup>22</sup>Hamilton, *Genesis, Chapters 1–17*, 202.

<sup>23</sup>Howard N. Wallace, “Eve (Person),” *ABD* 2:676–7, 677.

<sup>24</sup>Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (IBC; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010), 51.

<sup>25</sup>Smith, *Micah–Malachi*, 232.

Not until after the fall of humanity did Adam name his wife. Previously, he identified her as his true counterpart (Gen 2:18, 23–24).<sup>26</sup> In Hebrew, the term “woman” (*ishah*) is simply the feminine form of the word “man” (*ish*).<sup>27,28</sup> This emphasizes the shared identity and equality of this couple.<sup>29</sup> By calling her “Eve” (*khaiah*), Adam noted her identity in keeping with her destiny as the mother of all “the living” (*khaiy*).<sup>30</sup>

**Read Gen 3:20.** Why did naming the woman indicate that Adam’s relationship with her had changed? Do you think his renewed covenant with her reflected his desire to protect her or to exploit her? Why? How do you relate to people with whom you have made a covenant?

### Slaves and War Brides

**2) Exod 21:10–11 and Deut 21:10–14:** Slavery and war captivity were facts of life in the Ancient Near East. These laws from God protected those most vulnerable to exploitation. As a result, married former slaves and war brides shared the rights of free Israelite women.<sup>31</sup> If their husbands failed to meet their moral and legal obligations and divorce occurred, these women received freedom without a reduction of their status.<sup>32</sup>

Since women seized in war typically suffer sexual assault, forbidding consummation for a month and making the women unattractive discouraged men from taking them.<sup>33</sup> An unmarried woman captured in this way could mourn the loss of her people before being forced into a new community.<sup>34</sup> Shaving her head and allowing new hair to grow, trimming her nails, and changing her clothing also signified the shedding of a former life and taking on a new status as a member of the nation of Israel.<sup>35</sup> This reminded her spouse not to treat her as a foreigner or slave.<sup>36</sup> Deuteronomy 21:14 says, “You shall not deal tyrannically (*amar*) with her.”<sup>37</sup> By the time of Christ, rabbis taught that these obligations also applied to free women and to men (*m. Ketuboth* 5:6–8).<sup>38</sup>

**Read Exod 21:10–11 and Deut 21:10–14.** What were the rights of slaves and war captives, women who were highly vulnerable to exploitation? Why would this regulation prevent battlefield rape? How does this express God’s concern for all women and men?

<sup>26</sup> Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall: A Theological Exposition of Genesis 1–3*, 97.

<sup>27</sup> Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “אִשָּׁה” (*ishah*), *BDB*, 61, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/60/mode/2up>.

<sup>28</sup> Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “אִישׁ” (*ish*), 35, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/34/mode/2up>.

<sup>29</sup> Hamilton, *Genesis, Chapters 1–17*, 180.

<sup>30</sup> Waltke and Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary*, 95.

<sup>31</sup> Matthews, Chavalas, and Walton, *IVPBBOT*, Deut 21:10–4.

<sup>32</sup> Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10–34:12* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 2002), 475.

<sup>33</sup> Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10–34:12*, 475.

<sup>34</sup> Block, *Deuteronomy*, 496.

<sup>35</sup> Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 281.

<sup>36</sup> Block, *Deuteronomy*, 496.

<sup>37</sup> Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “עָמַר” (*amar*), *BDB*, 771, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/770/mode/2up>.

<sup>38</sup> Instone-Brewer, David, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context*, 196, <http://www.sacred-texts.com/jud/etm/etm124.htm>.

### God Hates Violence

**3) Mal 2:13–16:** As a result of the sins of these men, God refused to accept their offerings, leading them to weep and to wail. Despite this, they failed to truly exhibit a broken spirit or a contrite heart.<sup>39</sup> Through the prophet Malachi, the Lord called for marital faithfulness, noting that a marriage covenant exists between three parties: the husband, the wife, and God.<sup>40</sup>

Malachi announced, “The Lord God of Israel said he hates divorcing (*shalakh*) and covering over the garment with violence (*khamas*),<sup>41</sup> ... so guard yourselves on peril of your life, and you shall not deal treacherously” (*bagadh*).<sup>42</sup> In Hebrew, “violence” can refer to an attitude which oppresses others as well as to physical destruction.<sup>43</sup>

An official statement of the theologically conservative Presbyterian Church of America says:

“The Committee believes that when there are words and actions on the part of one spouse that threatens the life of the other spouse and/or children, that the one(s) threatened should be counseled by the [elders], or representative thereof, to remove themselves from the threatening situation and the abuser should be urged to seek counsel. Such a procedure will protect those threatened. When the abuser does not cease these words and actions, the [elders] should investigate whether these words and actions are in effect breaking the one-flesh relationship by ‘hating’ the abused spouse and not ‘nourishing and cherishing’ this one (Eph 5:28-29). In counseling the abuser, the reality of his Christian faith should be ascertained. When it is determined by the [elders] that the abuser does not appear to them to be Christian and the abuse continues, the Pauline teaching about an unbeliever leaving a believer should be applied [1 Cor 7:12–16].<sup>44</sup>

God holds accountable those who break their marriage covenants, causing a divorce.<sup>45</sup> This passage does not apply to someone who discovers a spouse’s treachery and responds to those broken vows by filing for divorce.<sup>46</sup>

Since one of the terms in 1 Cor 6:9–11 means “reviler, abusive person” (*loidoros*),<sup>47</sup> Paul recognized that such behavior is incompatible with the presence of the Holy Spirit (Gal 5:19–24). In fact, he advised the church to remove abusive people from their fellowship (1 Cor 5:9–13).<sup>48</sup> Domination and cruelty violate God’s order. He regards them as deplorable, hateful, and completely unacceptable within a marriage.<sup>49</sup> The National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence produced an Equality Wheel and a Power and Control Wheel to help

<sup>39</sup>Pieter A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 273.

<sup>40</sup>Smith, *Micah–Malachi*, 325.

<sup>41</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “חָמָס” (*khamas*), *BDB*, 329, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/328/mode/2up>.

<sup>42</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “בָּגַדְתָּ” (*baghadh*), 93, <https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/92/mode/2up>. I cover the topic of divorce extensively in four consecutive posts on 1 Cor 7:10–16.

<sup>43</sup>H. Haag, “חָמָס” (*khamas*), *TDOT* 4:480–7, 480–1.

<sup>44</sup>PCA Digest, “Report of the Ad-Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage.” (To the Twentieth General Assembly, 1992), Appendix 0, 291–2, <http://www.pcahistory.org/pca/divorce-remarriage.pdf>.

<sup>45</sup>Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context*, 57.

<sup>46</sup>Richard A. Taylor and E. Ray Clendenen, *Haggai, Malachi* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004), 359.

<sup>47</sup>Danker et al., “λοιδορος” (*loidoros*), *BDAG*, 602, <https://archive.org/stream/greekenglishlex00liddrich#page/902/mode/2up>.

<sup>48</sup>Danker, et al., “λοιδορος” (*loidoros*), *BDAG*, 602.

<sup>49</sup>David W. Baker, *Joel, Obadiah, Malachi* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 260.

people differentiate between healthy and abusive relationships.<sup>50</sup> See pp. 85–86 for a summary.

**Read Mal 2:13–16.** How does God depict treachery and violence in this passage? Have you ever experienced people entering a room as if they wore a cloak of violence? Compare the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence’s Equality Wheel to the Power and Control Wheel. How can you identify a healthy relationship? What constitutes abusive behavior?<sup>51</sup> What does the Lord’s refusal of the offerings of these men tell us about his heart toward those in abusive relationships? What can you do to align yourself with God’s concern?

### Effects of the Fall Reversed

**4) Rom 5:12–21:** An important key to understanding this text involves the corporate solidarity of patrimonial headship within Ancient Near Eastern societies. The head of a family represented every member of his clan, both for good and for ill (2 Sam 21:1–9; Jer 35; Dan 6:24).<sup>52</sup> Thus, this passage focuses upon the contrasting effects of the lives of Adam and of Christ.<sup>53</sup>

Due to this theological reality, death comes to all people, for we all sinned collectively in the first transgression of Adam (Gen 2:16–17; Gen 3:1–7).<sup>54</sup> Unlike most writers of his era, Paul blamed neither Eve nor Satan for sin’s entry into the world.<sup>55</sup> The sin of the first Adam plunged us into ruin by representation and imputation. Likewise, the obedience of the Second Adam redeemed us by representation and imputation (1 Cor 15:21–22). On the cross, Jesus took my place and paid the penalty for my sin. Similarly, God charged his righteousness to me (2 Cor 5:21).<sup>56</sup>

Consequently, when the Father looks at me, he sees Jesus, for the blood of Christ covers all my sin (Ps 103:10–13). Consider the great magnitude of this promise: we can travel to the top of the North and visit the bottom of the South of our planet, but we can never reach the end of the East or the West. By his one act of sacrifice following a blameless life, Christ has reversed the effects of the fall (Gen 3:16).<sup>57</sup>

<sup>50</sup><http://www.ncdsv.org/images/EqualitywheelNOSHADING.pdf>;

<http://www.ncdsv.org/images/PowerControlwheelNOSHADING.pdf>. Used with the permission of the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence ([http://www.ncdsv.org/ncd\\_about.html](http://www.ncdsv.org/ncd_about.html)).

<sup>51</sup><http://www.ncdsv.org/images/EqualitywheelNOSHADING.pdf>;

<http://www.ncdsv.org/images/PowerControlwheelNOSHADING.pdf>. Used with the permission of the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence ([http://www.ncdsv.org/ncd\\_about.html](http://www.ncdsv.org/ncd_about.html))

<sup>52</sup>Niehaus, *Ancient Near Eastern Themes in Biblical Theology*, 138.

<sup>53</sup>Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 316.

<sup>54</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. 1 (ICC; New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 277–8.

<sup>55</sup>James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1998), 272.

<sup>56</sup>R. C. Sproul, *The Gospel of God: An Exposition of Romans* (Great Britain: Christian Focus, 1994), 107.

<sup>57</sup>Moo, “Nature and the New Creation: New Testament Eschatology and the Environment,” 458.

[http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/49/49-3/JETS\\_49-3\\_449-488\\_Moo.pdf](http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/49/49-3/JETS_49-3_449-488_Moo.pdf).

Now Jesus reigns in the place of Adam and calls us to rule over creation with him (Gen 1:26–28).<sup>58</sup> As Christians in Rome heard this letter for the first time, they could see a prime example of the effects of this new era in front of them. Paul wrote, “I commend to you Phoebe, our sister, being a deacon of the church in Cenchreae, that you might receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and that you might put yourselves at her disposal in any task in which she might have need, for she has been a patron of many and also to me” (Rom 16:1–2).

The apostle employed the word translated as “deacon” (*diakonon*) to describe himself and his coworkers in 2 Cor 6:4 and in his charge to church leaders in 1 Tim 3:8–13.<sup>59</sup> Note that the first word in 1 Tim 3:11 can be translated as “Women” or “Wives” (*gynē*). Most scholars hold to the first option.<sup>60</sup> Due to the form of the noun and the lack of a possessive pronoun in the Greek text, the translation “Their wives” requires grammatical gymnastics. Furthermore, both “women” and “deacons” (1 Tim 3:8) appear in the same noun case (accusative plural).

In Paul’s greetings to the church of Rome in Rom 16:1–12, seven of the twenty-seven people he greeted by name were women.<sup>61</sup> They served as “a deacon,” his “fellow workers” (*synergos*),<sup>62</sup> “those who work hard (*kopiaō*) in the Lord,” women who “worked very hard” for the Lord or for the church,<sup>63</sup> and a woman who was “outstanding (*episēmos*) among (*ev*) the apostles.”<sup>64</sup>

In five of the seven times the New Testament mentions Paul’s co-workers Priscilla and Aquila, her name comes before his (Cf. Acts 18:1–3, 18–20, 24–26; 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Tim 4:19).<sup>65</sup> That was quite rare in the Greco-Roman era, pointing to Priscilla’s prominence in ministry.<sup>66</sup> John Chrysostom (347–407) wrote concerning Junia, “How great is the devotion of this woman, that she should be even counted worthy of the appellation (name) of apostle!”<sup>67</sup>

Regarding those who had “devoted themselves to the service (*diakonia*) of God’s people,”<sup>68</sup> Paul charged the church in Corinth.<sup>69</sup> He told them “to submit to such as these and to everyone who joins in the work, and labors at it” (1 Cor 16:15–16).<sup>70</sup> Concerning this last passage, some translations add the word “men,” possibly due to the masculine plural form found in “such as these.” However, in Greek, a masculine plural can apply to either men alone or include women in a group of mixed gender.<sup>71</sup>

The Greco-Roman patronage system consisted of asymmetrical relationships between two parties. One person provided food, money, hospitality, advice, and/or introductions to

<sup>58</sup>N. T. Wright, “Excursus on Paul’s Use of Adam,” in *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2–3 and the Human Origins Debate* (John H. Walton; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2015), 170–80, 174.

<sup>59</sup>A. J. Gordon, “The Ministry of Women,” in *The Missionary Review of the World* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1894), 910–21, 916–7,

<http://www.biblesnet.com/AJ%20Gordon%20The%20Ministry%20of%20Women.pdf>.

<sup>60</sup>William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 2000), 202–3.

<sup>61</sup>Stanley J. Grenz and Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 85.

<sup>62</sup>Danker, et al., “συνεργός” (*synergos*), *BDAG*, 969.

<sup>63</sup>Danker, et al., “κοπιᾶω” (*kopiaō*), 558.

<sup>64</sup>Danker, et al., “ἐπίσημος” (*episēmos*), 378.

<sup>65</sup>Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 651.

<sup>66</sup>Walter L. Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 301.

<sup>67</sup>John Chrysostom, *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (trans. J. B. Morris; Oxford; London: Parker; Rivington, 1841), 489, <https://archive.org/stream/homiliesofsjohn07john#page/488/mode/2up>.

<sup>68</sup>Danker, et al., “διακονία” (*diakonia*), 230.

<sup>69</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *Rev. ed.*, 918.

<sup>70</sup>Danker, et al., “συνεργός” (*synergos*), *BDAG*, 969. This is the same verbal root used for “fellow-worker.”

<sup>71</sup>Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1998), 297.

powerful people in exchange for public praise and loyalty.<sup>72</sup> Almost certainly the carrier of this letter,<sup>73</sup> Paul’s commendation of Phoebe indicates that she functioned as his envoy.<sup>74</sup> Thus, Phoebe publicly read Paul’s epistle to the congregation, provided commentary,<sup>75</sup> and answered any immediate questions raised by the book of Romans.<sup>76</sup>

**Read Rom 5:12–21 and Rom 16:1–12.** What was the result of Adam’s sin? Why does the death and resurrection of Jesus reverse the effects of the fall? How does God view you? Why did Phoebe’s task provide an object lesson for Paul’s teaching about life after Christ’s victory? What is the significance of the greetings at the end of Romans? How should these passages impact our churches today?

### Unity in the Spirit

**5) Eph 5:18–21:** Paul had already enjoined the church community in Ephesus to “make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” through humility, gentleness, patience, and tolerance (Eph 4:2–3). Since “being filled” (*plēroō*) expresses unity with God and the wholeness his salvation brings, Paul called all believers to make ourselves available as vessels for the presence and power of God.<sup>77</sup>

The Greek text of this passage begins with two imperatives (commands). Paul then employed a string of verbal nouns called participles to delineate the result of being Spirit-filled:<sup>78</sup>

Do not be intoxicated with wine...but be filled with the Spirit,  
     speaking to one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs;  
     singing and praising  
         in your hearts to the Lord;  
 being thankful always for all [things]  
     in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to God,  
         even as to the Father;  
 being submissive (*hypotassō*) to one another  
     in reverence of Christ.

“Being submissive” (*hypotassomenoi*) appears in masculine plural form. In New Testament (NT) Greek, that can encompass either men or a group of both genders.<sup>79</sup> Consequently, Paul declared that Spirit-filled people submit to each other.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 289.

<sup>73</sup> Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2:780.

<sup>74</sup> Colin G. Kruse, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 553.

<sup>75</sup> Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing*, 202.

<sup>76</sup> Allan Chapple, “Getting Romans to the Right Romans: Phoebe and the Delivery of Paul’s Letter,” *TynBul* 62, no. 2 (1 November 2011): 195–214, 213–4, [Http://www.tyndalehouse.com/Bulletin/62=2011/03\\_Chapple.pdf](http://www.tyndalehouse.com/Bulletin/62=2011/03_Chapple.pdf).

<sup>77</sup> Snodgrass, *Ephesians*, 290.

<sup>78</sup> Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, 639. Wallace and Black both note that—based upon the grammar—one cannot separate v. 21 from the preceding verses.

<sup>79</sup> Longenecker, *Galatians*, 297.

<sup>80</sup> David Alan Black, *It’s Still Greek to Me: An Easy-to-Understand Guide to Intermediate Greek* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 37.

a) **Read Eph 5:18–21.** How can you tell if you are being filled with the Spirit and exhibiting reverence for Christ?

### Submissive to One Another

b) **Eph 5:21–24:** This section continues Paul’s discussion of how we can tell if we are living in the power of the Holy Spirit (Eph 5:18–21). It opens with, “Being submissive (*hypotassō*) to one another in reverence for Christ.” Verse 22 states, “wives to your own husbands, as to the Lord.”

Therefore, when a Bible translator separates verses 21 and 22 into different paragraphs, it leaves verse 22 without a verb.<sup>81</sup>

“Being submissive” (*hypotassomenoi*) appears in masculine plural form. In New Testament (NT) Greek, that can encompass either a group of men or both genders.<sup>82</sup> As a result, one cannot accurately interpret this phrase as applying to only women. We cannot separate Paul’s exhortation to wives to submit from his charge to husbands (Eph 5:25–30).<sup>83</sup>

In the NT, subordination involves placing oneself under someone else. Yet, it does not necessarily imply obedience.<sup>84</sup> Accounts from the book of Acts indicate that Paul would not have condoned women following their husbands into sinful practices (Acts 5:1–11, 27–29). The apostle also never advocated that women subject themselves to abuse.<sup>85</sup>

Regarding verse 24, R. C. Sproul wrote this:

“There is a teaching which has gone widely through evangelical Christianity which says that for a woman to be obedient to this passage, she must obey her husband no matter what he tells her to do. This is not true. For example, if her husband tells her to live a life of prostitution, she is to show her obedience to Christ by disobeying her husband’s wicked commands. That woman must disobey her husband, because her husband is commanding her to do something that God forbids. Similarly, if the husband forbids her to do something that God commands, she must disobey her husband.”<sup>86</sup> Our allegiance to the Lord trumps our loyalty to our spouses (Acts 4:16–20).

In all five NT usages of “head” (*kephalē*) concerning Christ and the church, the word depicts Jesus as the nurturer who provides for our growth and well-being (Eph 1:22–23; Eph 4:15–16; Col 1:18–20; and Col 2:18–19). Scripture does not describe him as one who wields authority over his people. Thus, Christ does not hold headship over the church—but for it—as our servant-provider.<sup>87</sup> This counter-cultural attitude meshes with Jesus’s command to his disciples when they sought positions of preeminence (Mark 9:33–35; Mark 10:42–45).<sup>88</sup>

<sup>81</sup>Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, 651.

<sup>82</sup>Longenecker, *Galatians*, 297.

<sup>83</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 374.

<sup>84</sup>Gerhard Delling, “υποτάσσω” (*hypotassō*), *TDNT* 8:39–46, 41.

<sup>85</sup>Arnold, *Ephesians*, 380.

<sup>86</sup>R. C. Sproul, *The Purpose of God: Ephesians* (Scotland: Christian Focus, 1994), 135–6.

<sup>87</sup>Gilbert Bilezikian, “The Issue I Can’t Evade: The Headship of Husbands is a New Testament Teaching,” *Priscilla Papers* 17, no. 2 (1 April 2003): 5–6,

[https://www.academia.edu/35109479/The\\_Issue\\_I\\_Cant\\_Evade\\_The\\_headship\\_of\\_husbands\\_is\\_a\\_New\\_Testament\\_teaching](https://www.academia.edu/35109479/The_Issue_I_Cant_Evade_The_headship_of_husbands_is_a_New_Testament_teaching).

<sup>88</sup>Arnold, *Ephesians*, 356.

**Read Eph 5:21–24.** How does the masculine plural form of the verb meaning “being submissive” affect your understanding of this passage? Why should a wife submit to her husband? How do the NT texts depict Christ’s headship? What does this mean for husbands?

### Sacrificial Love

**c) Eph 5:25–30:** We cannot separate Paul’s exhortation to wives to submit from his charge to husbands (Eph 5:18–24).<sup>89</sup> As with fathers and slave owners, he instructed husbands not to abuse their authoritative position (Eph 6:1–4, 9; Col 3:19).<sup>90</sup> Such reciprocity in household codes was unheard of in the Greco-Roman milieu. Typically, they regulated the behavior of women, children, and slaves toward husbands, parents, and masters.<sup>91</sup>

Greco-Roman men would have expected Paul to command husbands to rule over their households.<sup>92</sup>

For example, the first century BC author Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote:

“This custom still remains...[Roman] law obliged both the married women, as having no other refuge, to conform themselves entirely to the temper of their husbands, and the husbands to rule their wives as necessary and inseparable possessions. Accordingly, if a wife was virtuous and in all things obedient to her husband, she was mistress of the house to the same degree as her husband was master of it.”<sup>93</sup>

In contrast, Christian husbands could no longer emulate the harsh, oppressive rule which their fathers practiced as they led their families (Eph 6:1–4).<sup>94</sup> When Jesus came to earth, he adopted a position of extreme abasement diametrically contrasted with his preexistent condition (Phil 2:5–11).<sup>95</sup> During his ministry, humiliation, suffering, and death, Christ assumed the role of a slave for the sake of the church, his bride (Eph 5:31–32; Rev 19:6–9).<sup>96</sup>

<sup>89</sup> Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 374.

<sup>90</sup>Fitzgerald, “Haustafeln,” *ABD* 3:80.

<sup>91</sup>Balch, “Household Codes,” *ABD* 3:318.

<sup>92</sup>Arnold, *Ephesians*, 380.

<sup>93</sup>Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, Vol. 1 (trans. Earnest Cary and Edward Spelman; LCL; Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press; Heinemann, 1937), 2.25, 383, <https://archive.org/stream/romanantiquities01dionuoft#page/382/mode/2up>.

<sup>94</sup> An official statement of the theologically-conservative Presbyterian Church of America states, “The Committee believes that when there are words and actions on the part of one spouse that threatens the life of the other spouse and/or children, that the one(s) threatened should be counseled by the [elders], or representative thereof, to remove themselves from the threatening situation and the abuser should be urged to seek counsel. Such a procedure will protect those threatened. When the abuser does not cease these words and actions, the [elders] should investigate whether these words and actions are in effect breaking the one-flesh relationship by ‘hating’ the abused spouse and not ‘nourishing and cherishing’ this one (Eph. 5:28–29). In counseling the abuser, the reality of his Christian faith should be ascertained. When it is determined by the [elders] that the abuser does not appear to them to be Christian and the abuse continues, the Pauline teaching about an unbeliever leaving a believer should be applied [1 Cor 7:12–16].” (PCA Digest, “Report of the Ad-Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage.” (To the Twentieth General Assembly, 1992), Appendix 0, <http://www.pcahistory.org/pca/divorce-remarriage.pdf>, 291–2).

<sup>95</sup> J. Behm, “μορφή” (*morphē*), *TDNT* 4:750.

<sup>96</sup>Alan G. Padgett, *As Christ Submits to the Church: A Biblical Understanding of Leadership and Mutual Submission* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 55.

Therefore, Paul called Christian husbands to follow the example of Jesus (Mark 9:33–35; Mark 10:42–45; John 13:1–5, 12–17).<sup>97</sup> He charged them to apply the gospel to their cultural context.<sup>98</sup> The proper exercise of headship consists of loving self-sacrifice, not self-assertion (Eph 4:15–16).<sup>99</sup> Ironically, Paul later directed the women of Ephesus “to rule the house and family” (1 Tim 5:14).<sup>100</sup> He used a term of strength (*oikodespotein*) which many translations weaken to mean “keep house.” In Greco-Roman households, homeowners expected their wives to oversee their children, their slaves, and crops growing on their estates.<sup>101</sup>

Like most other ancient writers, Paul did not specifically mention husbands loving their wives, yet his intent remains clear.<sup>102</sup> Believers cannot insist on getting what we want but must love our neighbors as ourselves (Lev 19:18; Luke 6:31; Gal 5:13–26; Phil 2:1–8). Therefore, Paul taught that a Christian husband must exhibit this type of attitude with his wife, putting her interests before his own.<sup>103</sup> Paul described this kind of love in 1 Cor 13:4–8a.

The Stoic philosopher Musonius Rufus (30–102 AD) provides us with the closest Greco-Roman parallel to Paul’s admonition to Christian couples. He wrote this: “But in marriage there must be above all perfect companionship and mutual love of husband and wife, both in health and in sickness and under all conditions, since it was with desire for this as well as for having children that both entered upon marriage. Where, then, this love for each other is perfect and the two share it completely, each striving to outdo the other in devotion, the marriage is ideal and worthy of envy, for such a union is beautiful. “But where each looks only to his own interests and neglects the other, or, what is worse, when one is so minded and lives in the same house but fixes his attention elsewhere and is not willing to pull together with his yoke-mate nor to agree, then the union is doomed to disaster and though they live together, yet their common interests fare badly; eventually they separate entirely or they remain together and suffer what is worse than loneliness.”<sup>104</sup>

**Read Eph 5:25–30.** Why is this passage counter-cultural? What did Jesus do for the church? How can a man emulate Christ’s expression of love for his wife? What happens in a marriage when a couple practices self-sacrificial love, submission, and respect?

<sup>97</sup>Arnold, *Ephesians*, 380.

<sup>98</sup>Gordon D. Fee, “The Cultural Context of Ephesians 5:18–6:9,” *Priscilla Papers* 31, no. 4 (1 September 2017): 6, <https://www.cbeinternational.org/resources/article/priscilla-papers/cultural-context-ephesians-518%E2%80%9369>.

<sup>99</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 374.

<sup>100</sup>Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, “οἰκοδεσποτέω” (*oikodespoteō*), *NIDOTTE*, 2:49.

<sup>101</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 68–9.

<sup>102</sup>Snodgrass, *Ephesians*, 296.

<sup>103</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 366.

<sup>104</sup>Musonius Rufus, *Musonius Rufus, the Roman Socrates*. Translated by Cora Lutz (YCS; New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1947), 13a, 89, <https://archive.org/details/MUSONIUSRUFUSSTOICFRAGMENTS/page/n27/mode/2up>.

### Three Heads

**6) 1 Cor 11:3:** This verse begins a detailed section of Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians concerning the proper appearance of a person’s head when praying and prophesying in church (1 Cor 11:3–16).<sup>105</sup> Just prior to this, the apostle commanded that no one give offense to Jewish people, gentiles, or others within the congregation (1 Cor 10:31–11:2).<sup>106</sup>

In that time and place, people considered a woman’s failure to cover her hair a provocative act which stimulated male lust.<sup>107</sup> Within Judaism, the public display of a woman’s hair constituted grounds for divorce (*m. Ketubah* 7:6).<sup>108</sup> Consequently, Paul argued that the attire of one’s physical head reflected upon the glory or shame of one’s symbolic head.<sup>109</sup> The misuse of newfound individual liberty for Christian women without regard for cultural propriety affected relationships within the congregation.<sup>110</sup>

Therefore, Paul wrote, “But I want you to know that Christ is of every man (*anēr/andros*) the head, and a man [is the] head of a woman, and God [is the] head of Christ.” While the arrangement within each word pair suggests precedence, their overall order refutes any notion of subordination.<sup>111</sup> Instead, the apostle extolled the order of creation and the continued interdependence of men and women in the new creation (Gen 1:26–28; Gen 2:18–25; Luke 1:26–33; 2 Cor 5:16–17).<sup>112</sup> By maintaining gender distinctions, women could fully utilize their gifts and callings in the church (Rom 16:1–12).<sup>113</sup>

The controversy surrounding this verse centers upon the specific meaning of the word “head” (*kephalē*).<sup>114</sup> In secular usage, the term referred to something which was supreme, exhibited prominence, or occurred first.<sup>115</sup> It did not refer to a chief or leader until the Byzantine Era (330–1453).<sup>116</sup> How we translate *kephalē* greatly affects our understanding of the relationships within each of the three pairs.<sup>117</sup> Typically in Paul’s letters, a metaphorical use of the word “head” connects it to a metaphorical body.<sup>118</sup>

*Kephalē* can refer to a chief or a leader in the Greek translation of the Old Testament (LXX). Yet, it occurs in only six of the 171 times when the Hebrew term *rosh* refers to a ruler (Cf. Judg 11:11; 2 Sam 22:44; Ps 18:43; Isa 7:8–9; and Lam 1:4–5. Typically, the Greek translators used *kephalē* as the word for a physical head—in 226 of 239 total occurrences in the LXX—rather than for a symbolic one.<sup>119</sup>

Within the New Testament, *kephalē* could depict relationships between a person and an entire community.<sup>120</sup> It does not connote a sense of authority over one individual over

<sup>105</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 503.

<sup>106</sup>Verbrugge, “κεφαλή” (*kephalē*), *TDNTWA*, 302–4, 303.

<sup>107</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT*, 1 Cor 11:2–16.

<sup>108</sup>Sola and Raphall, trans., *Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna, m. Ketubah* 7:6, 259, <http://www.sacred-texts.com/jud/etm/etm126.htm>.

<sup>109</sup>Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 208.

<sup>110</sup>Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry*, 108.

<sup>111</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 513.

<sup>112</sup>Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, 236.

<sup>113</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 503.

<sup>114</sup>Padgett, *As Christ Submits to the Church: A Biblical Understanding of Leadership and Mutual Submission*, 66.

<sup>115</sup>Heinrich Schlier, “κεφαλή” (*kephalē*), *TDNT* 3:673–81, 673–4.

<sup>116</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, “κεφαλή” (*kephalē*), in *A Greek-English Lexicon, 9th Ed.* (rev Sir Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie; Oxford: Clarendon, 1940),

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3Dkefalh%2F>.

<sup>117</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Rev. Ed.*, 553.

<sup>118</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 508.

<sup>119</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 554–5.

<sup>120</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 514.

another.<sup>121</sup> The only unequivocally similar usages of the term in the New Testament (NT) occur in Eph 1:22–23 and Col 2:9–12,<sup>122</sup> where Paul referred to Jesus and the church. In all five NT usages of “head” (*kephalē*) concerning Christ and the church, the word depicts Jesus as the nurturer who provides for our growth and well-being (Eph 4:15–16; Col 1:18–20; and Col 2:18–19). Christ does not hold headship over the church—but for it—as our servant-provider.<sup>123</sup> Therefore, Paul called for all believers to submit to each other, following Christ’s example (Mark 9:33–35; Mark 10:42–45; John 13:1–5, 12–17; Eph 4:15–16; Eph 5:18–30).<sup>124</sup>

Furthermore, within 1 Cor 11, the word “authority” (*exousia*) appears only once. It refers to a woman’s own prerogative to prophesy (*prophēteuō*) (1 Cor 11:5, 10).<sup>125</sup> In the NT, this involved proclaiming God’s plan of salvation and delivering authoritative instruction to others based upon the Word of God.<sup>126</sup> Concerning 1 Cor 11:3, John Chrysostom (347–407) wrote, “Had Paul meant to speak of rule and subjection, as thou sayest, he would not have brought forward the instance of a wife, but rather of a slave and a master.”<sup>127</sup>

Some scholars assert that *kephalē* in this verse connotes prominence, as it does in the first appearance of the term in the Greek translation of Isa 7:8 and in Jer 31:7.<sup>128</sup> Given the patriarchal cultural context, viewing the husband as the preeminent member of a couple has some merit.<sup>129</sup>

However, the primary controversy within this verse concerns whether *kephalē* carries the meaning “source,” as in 1 Cor 11:8 and Eph 4:14–15.<sup>130</sup> The Hebrew term “head” (*rosh*) can refer to the first in a series, the beginning of something, or the origin of a river (Cf. 1 Chron 12:9; Isa 40:21; Gen 2:10).<sup>131</sup> Paul explicitly noted the creation order of humanity later in this chapter (1 Cor 11:8–12).<sup>132</sup> When taken in the context of the entire passage, the meaning “source” or “origin” provides the best fit.<sup>133</sup>

The Greek historian Herodotus (ca. 484–425/413 BC) used the term in this way. He wrote, “From the sources (*kephalē*) of the river Tearus flows the best and fairest of all river waters; hither came...the best and fairest of all men, even Darius... king of Persia and all the mainland.”<sup>134</sup>

<sup>121</sup>Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 815.

<sup>122</sup>Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 67.

<sup>123</sup>Gilbert Bilezikian, “The Issue I Can’t Evade: The Headship of Husbands is a New Testament Teaching,” *Priscilla Papers* 17, no. 2 (1 April 2003): 5–6, [https://www.academia.edu/35109479/The\\_Issue\\_I\\_Cant\\_Evade\\_The\\_headship\\_of\\_husbands\\_is\\_a\\_New\\_Testament\\_teaching](https://www.academia.edu/35109479/The_Issue_I_Cant_Evade_The_headship_of_husbands_is_a_New_Testament_teaching).

<sup>124</sup>Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women, and Wives: Marriage and Women’s Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 157–8.

<sup>125</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 532.

<sup>126</sup>Gerhard Friedrich, “προφήτης” (*prophētēs*), *TDNT*, 6:781–861, 848, 851.

<sup>127</sup>John Chrysostom, “Homily 26,” in *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the First Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* (trans. Hubert Kestell Cornish and John Medley; Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1839), 348–68, 352, <https://archive.org/details/thehomiliesofchr01chryuoft/page/352>.

<sup>128</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 516.

<sup>129</sup>Alan F. Johnson, “A Review of the Scholarly Debate on the Meaning of ‘Head’ (Κεφαλή) in Paul’s Writings,” *ATJ* 41 (2009): 35–57, 54, [https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/ashland\\_theological\\_journal/41-1\\_035.pdf](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/ashland_theological_journal/41-1_035.pdf).

<sup>130</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Rev. Ed.*, 554.

<sup>131</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “רֹשׁ,” (*rosh*), *BDB*, 910–1, 911, <https://archive.org/details/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft/page/910>.

<sup>132</sup>Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 208–9.

<sup>133</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Rev. Ed.*, 555–6.

<sup>134</sup>Herodotus, *Herodotus, with an English Translation, Vol. 2* (trans. A. D. Godley; LCL; London; New York: Heinemann; Putnam, 1920), 4.91, 293, <https://archive.org/details/herodotuswitheng02herouoft/page/292>.

According to the Orphic Fragment 21A (ca. 3rd–2nd century BC), “Zeus is the head (*kephalē*), Zeus the middle, and by Zeus all things were fabricated.”<sup>135</sup>

The Jewish philosopher Philo (ca. 20 BC–40 AD) reported, “And of all the members of the clan here described Esau is the progenitor, the head (*kephalē*) as it were of the whole creature.”<sup>136</sup> Jacob’s twin brother served as the source of his entire clan.<sup>137</sup> Elsewhere, Philo employed wordplay to capture three meanings of *kephalē*. He wrote, “For as in an animal, the head (*kephalē*) is the first and best part...so too the virtuous one, whether single man or people, will be the head (*kephalē*) of the human race and all the others like the limbs of a body which draw their life from the forces in the head (*kephalē*) and at the top.”<sup>138</sup>

Therefore, we can translate this verse as “But I want you to know that of every man, Christ is the source; and of a woman, the man [is the] source; and of Christ, God [is the] source.” As the one through whom all things were created, Jesus originated every man (1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15–18; John 1:1–4).<sup>139</sup> The derivation of a woman from a man refers to God’s fabrication of Eve from Adam (1 Cor 11:11–12; 1 Tim 2:13).<sup>140</sup> When Christ became human, he came to Earth from the perfect fellowship of the Trinity (John 14:26; John 17:1–5; 1 Cor 3:18–23; 1 Cor 8:6; 1 Cor 11:12; 1 Cor 15:26–28).<sup>141</sup> Thus, the source of Christ is God.<sup>142</sup> Their relationship exemplifies unity, love, and bringing glory to one another (John 1:18; John 10:17–18, 30; John 17:24–26).

The great theologian Athanasius (296–373) asserted it was “the Father who generated Him as His beginning; for ‘the Head of Christ is God.’”<sup>143</sup>

Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 315–386) attested, “As I have said many times, He did not bring the Son from nothing into being, nor take him who was not into sonship, but the Father, being eternal, eternally and ineffably begat one only Son...the Father is the head of the Son; one is the beginning, for the Father begat his Son, Very God, called Emmanuel, and Emmanuel, being interpreted is God with us.”<sup>144</sup>

Cyril of Alexandria (ca. 375–444) addressed all the elements of 1 Cor 11:3. He wrote, “Thus we say that ‘the head of every man is Christ.’ For he was made by him...as God; ‘but

<sup>135</sup>Isaac Preston Cory, trans., “Orphic Fragments,” in *Ancient Fragments of the Phoenician, Chaldaean, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and Other Writers* (London: William Pickering, 1832), 289–300, 209, <https://archive.org/details/ancientfragments00coryrich/page/290>.

<sup>136</sup>Philo, “On the Preliminary Studies,” in *Philo in Ten Volumes* (LCL; trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press; Heinemann, 1932), 458–551, 61, 489, <https://archive.org/stream/PhiloSupplement01Genesis/Philo%2004%20Tongues%2C%20Migration%20of%20Abraham%2C%20Divine%20Things%2C%20Preliminary#page/n497/mode/2up>.

<sup>137</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Rev. Ed.*, 555, note 46.

<sup>138</sup>Philo, “On Rewards and Punishments,” in *Philo, Vol 8* (trans. F. H. Colson; LCL; Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1939), 312–389, 125, 389, <https://archive.org/stream/PhiloSupplement01Genesis/Philo%2008%20Special%20Laws%20IV%2C%20Virtues%2C%20Rewards#page/n411/mode/2up>.

<sup>139</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

<sup>140</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Rev. Ed.*, 556.

<sup>141</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

<sup>142</sup>Keener, *Paul, Women, and Wives: Marriage and Women’s Ministry in the Letters of Paul*, 33–4.

<sup>143</sup>Athanasius, *De Synodis* (ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace; trans. John Henry Newman and Archibald Robertson, rev. Kevin Knight; NPNF2–04; Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature, 1892), 1.26.2, [Http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2817.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2817.htm).

<sup>144</sup>Cyril of Jerusalem, “Lecture 11: On the Son of God as Only-Begotten, Before All Ages, and the Creator of All Things,” in *The Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem* (trans. Richard William Church and John Henry Newman; Oxford; London: Parker; Rivington, 1839), 110–122, 117, <https://archive.org/details/a566189200cypruoft/page/n169>.

the head of the woman is the man,' because she was taken out of his flesh....Likewise, 'the head of Christ is God,' because he is of him by nature."<sup>145</sup>

In this chapter, Paul focused upon the glory and shame in relationship with one's source, rather than upon who had authority over whom (1 Cor 11:7–9).<sup>146</sup>

**a) Read 1 Cor 11:3.** Why was Paul concerned about the proper attire for a person's head in the church? What makes the arrival of Adam, Eve, and Jesus a logical sequence? How did secular Greeks use the word *kephalē* until the fourth century AD? Why does Christ's relationship with the church fail to promote viewing the term "head" as someone in authority over another person? What did Paul's use of the typical term for "authority" (*exousia*) enable women to do? Which nuance of the term "head" did early theologians use? How does translating *kephalē* as "source" affect your understanding of this verse?

### Women Praying and Prophesying

**b) 1 Cor 11:4–6 and 1 Cor 14:34–35:** In 1 Cor 11, Paul did not differentiate between acceptable ministry activities for men and for women. Instead, he addressed their physical appearance while participating in spiritual leadership.<sup>147</sup> People living in the eastern Mediterranean of that era considered a woman's failure to cover her hair as an act provoking male lust,<sup>148</sup> just as in many areas of that region and the Middle East today.

A Greco-Roman statue in the Louvre portrays a man removing his new wife's veil in the privacy of their bridal chamber (ca. 150–100 BC).<sup>149</sup> Going out with her head uncovered constituted grounds for divorce in Jewish marriages (*m. Ketubah* 7:6).<sup>150</sup>

Apuleius, a writer from the second century AD, described a Roman householder's seduction of a maidservant. By undressing and unbinding her hair, she "transformed herself to an image of Venus rising from the waves."<sup>151</sup>

<sup>145</sup>Cyril of Alexandria, *de recta fide ad Arcadium et Marinam*, 5.6 in Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Rev. Ed., 556, note 49.

<sup>146</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Rev. Ed., 556.

<sup>147</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 504.

<sup>148</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT*, 1 Cor 11:2–16.

<sup>149</sup>Jastrow, "File: Couple Bridal Bed Louvre Myr268.Jpg,"

[https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Couple\\_bridal\\_bed\\_Louvre\\_Myr268.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Couple_bridal_bed_Louvre_Myr268.jpg).

<sup>150</sup>Sola and Raphall, trans., *Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna*, *m. Ketubah* 7:6, 259, <http://www.sacred-texts.com/jud/etm/etm126.htm>.

<sup>151</sup>Lucius Apuleius, A. S. Kline, trans., *The Golden Ass* (2013), 2.17,

[http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/TheGoldenAssII.htm#anchor\\_Toc347223998](http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/TheGoldenAssII.htm#anchor_Toc347223998).

This stems from the ancient Greek view that the heads of both men and women produce semen which flows through hollow spaces in their hair.<sup>152</sup> According to the fifth century BC physician Hippocrates:

“As to the growth of hairs, it is as follows. They grow longest and most numerous where the epidermis is most porous and where the hair has a due amount of fluid for its nourishment. Also, where the epidermis becomes porous later, there the hairs grow later too, namely, on the chin, the pudenda, and wherever else they grow. For at the age when the semen is formed, the flesh becomes porous as well as the epidermis, and the veins open up more than before. For in boys, the veins are tiny and the semen does not flow out through them. In girls, the same holds true with regard to the menses. At the same age, a way is opened for the menses and for the semen, and in both the case of the boy and the girl, the pudenda become hairy...Those who are castrated in their childhood have neither hair on their pudenda nor on the chin and are smooth all over for the reason that no passage is opened up for the semen.”<sup>153</sup>

This concept explains the rationale behind Paul’s bewildering question, “Does not nature itself teach you that if a man lets his hair grow long, it is a dishonor to him?” (1 Cor 11:14). In both Jewish and Greco-Roman society, a woman in public with unbound hair conveyed sensual impropriety.<sup>154</sup>

Prophesying (*prophēteuō*) in the early church primarily involved proclaiming the salvation plan of God and delivering authoritative instruction based upon the Word of God to others. It did not usually refer to predicting future events.<sup>155</sup> Thus, those who prophesy proclaim inspired revelation.<sup>156</sup>

Later in the same letter, Paul delivered a seemingly contradictory command that, “Women in the churches should be silent...even as the law says” (1 Cor 14:34–35). Such a prohibition occurs nowhere in the Old Testament.<sup>157</sup> Typically, when Paul made such a pronouncement, he cited the verse in question (Cf. 1 Cor 9:8–9; 1 Cor 14:21–22).<sup>158</sup>

Thus, “law” here most likely refers to the Jewish oral tradition, as in this from the Babylonian Talmud,<sup>159</sup> “Our Rabbis taught, ‘All are qualified to be among the seven [who read], even a minor and a woman, only the Sages said that a woman should not read in the Torah out of respect for the congregation’” (*b. Megilah 23a*).

In Greco-Roman society, a married woman conversing with another woman’s husband constituted a scandal.<sup>160</sup> For example, the influential author Plutarch (46–122 AD) wrote of a woman who suffered great embarrassment:

“In putting her cloak about her [she] exposed her arm. Somebody exclaimed, ‘A lovely arm.’ ‘But not for the public,’ said she. Not only the arm of the virtuous woman, but her speech as well, ought to be not for the public, and she ought to be modest and guarded about saying

<sup>152</sup>Troy W. Martin, “Paul’s Argument from Nature for the Veil in 1 Corinthians 11:13–15: A Testicle Instead of a Head Covering,” *JBL* 123, no. 1 (1 January 2004):75–84, 77, <http://www.michaelsheiser.com/TheNakedBible/1%20Cor11%20head%20covering%20testicle.pdf>.

<sup>153</sup>Hippocrates, *On Intercourse and Pregnancy: An English Translation of On Semen and on the Development of the Child* (trans. Tage U. H. Ellinger; New York: Schuman, 1952), 68–70, <https://archive.org/details/HippocratesOnIntercourseAndPregnancy/page/n33>.

<sup>154</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 517.

<sup>155</sup>Gerhard Friedrich, “προφήτης” (*prophētēs*), *TDNT*, 6:781–861, 848, 851.

<sup>156</sup>Danker, et al., “προφητεω” (*prophēteuō*), *BDAG*, 890.

<sup>157</sup>David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 672.

<sup>158</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, *Rev. Ed.*, 791.

<sup>159</sup>Walter C. Kaiser Jr., “Correcting Caricatures: The Biblical Teaching on Women,” *Priscilla Papers* 31, no. 4 (1 September 2017):9–14, 13, <https://www.cbeinternational.org/resources/article/priscilla-papers/correcting-caricatures>.

<sup>160</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 725.

anything in the hearing of outsiders, since it is an exposure of herself; for in her talk can be seen her feelings, character, and disposition.”<sup>161</sup>

Greco-Romans regarded a woman’s disclosure of her thoughts as unseemly as physical immodesty. Since Paul’s preaching offended both Jews and gentiles, he considered it imperative to avoid bringing shame to the gospel (1 Cor 1:22–23; 1 Cor 10:31–33; Tit 2:3–8).

Another possibility involves the practice of inquirers asking questions about the future to the oracle at Delphi (Pythia), who resided close to Corinth. Plutarch also wrote, “It seems that our beloved Apollo finds a remedy and a solution for the problems connected with our life by the oracular responses which he gives to those who consult him.”<sup>162</sup> Seeing God speaking through women in Corinth likely prompted their peers with pressing questions to interrupt the church service.<sup>163</sup> Such behavior promoted disorder, a condition which Paul rejected (1 Cor 14:26–40).

**Read 1 Cor 11:4–6 and 1 Cor 14:34–35.** Why would a woman’s uncovered head have given offense while she prayed and spoke in church services? How should we observe Paul’s command in our culture? Why would Paul give instructions for women to pray and prophesy in church and then command their silence?

### Having Authority on Her Head

**c) 1 Cor 11:7–10:** These verses concern propriety in worship, not family relationships.<sup>164</sup> However, Paul asserted that a link does occur between our fidelity in marriage and our worship of the Lord.<sup>165</sup> He wrote, “Indeed a man is not obligated to cover the head, for he is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of man. For a man is not from a woman but a woman from a man. For indeed man was not brought into existence for a woman but a woman for a man.”

In this passage, Paul alluded to Gen 1:26 and Gen 2:18–24. He noted the lack of any contribution of humanity in the creation of Adam (Gen 2:7), but the necessary aspect of the man in forming Eve.<sup>166</sup> He never asserted that the Lord created the woman in the man’s image, for God made both in his image (Gen 1:27).<sup>167</sup> Later in this letter, Paul claimed that all the Corinthians bore the image of the earthly man and would soon bear the image of the

<sup>161</sup>Plutarch, *Advice to a Bride and Groom (Conjugalia Praecepta)* (trans. Frank Cole Babbitt; LCL; Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press; Heinemann, 1928), 31,

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0181%3Asection%3D31>.

<sup>162</sup>Plutarch, “The E at Delphi,” in *Moralia in 15 Volumes, Vol. 5* (LCL; trans. Frank Cole Babbitt; Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1936), 199–253, 201,

<https://archive.org/stream/moraliainfiftee05plut#page/200/mode/2up>.

<sup>163</sup>Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, 235.

<sup>164</sup>Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, 235.

<sup>165</sup>Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 211.

<sup>166</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 524.

<sup>167</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Rev. Ed.*, 570.

heavenly one (1 Cor 15:49). The Lord created only Adam directly in his image. Everyone else inherits God’s image from him and from our biological parents (Gen 5:3; Gen 9:6).<sup>168</sup>

Throughout the Ancient Near East, people placed an image of a god in a temple. It represented not only the authority of the deity but also its luminous glory.<sup>169</sup> For this reason, craftsmen made such idols from precious metals to reflect the light of the gods they represented (Cf. 2 Cor 3:18; 2 Cor 4:3–6).<sup>170</sup> Consequently, Paul contended that Eve completed both Adam’s and God’s creation (Cf. Gen 2:19 with Gen 1:27–31).<sup>171</sup> The Greek term “glory” (*doxa*) connotes “reflected radiance.”<sup>172</sup>

Ancient Greeks believed that hair contained semen.<sup>173</sup> Therefore, in the Greco-Roman culture, a woman’s uncovered head produced shame (1 Cor 11:4–6).<sup>174</sup> However, God intended her to mirror the honor of a man,<sup>175</sup> as the Greek translation of Prov 11:16 indicates. Contrary to how many people today understand these verses, they contain no hint of a woman’s subordination.<sup>176</sup>

As suggested by 2 Cor 3–4, Paul wanted women to cover their heads to prevent others from focusing upon the grandeur of men during church services.<sup>177</sup> Nothing should prevent all glory being directed to God during worship.<sup>178</sup> It should go neither to women nor their husbands.<sup>179</sup> Bolstering the idea that Paul intended the word “head” (*kephalē*) in 1 Cor 11:3 to refer to the source of women, the apostle argued that the first woman was created from a man for his sake.

Greek manuscripts of this section say, “For this reason, a woman ought to have authority over her head” without mentioning any kind of symbol.<sup>180</sup> Typically, the phrase “authority over” (*exousian epi*) conveys having “the right over something” (Matt 9:6; Rev 11:6; Rev 14:18).<sup>181</sup> When Paul used the word “authority” in the context of the church, he emphasized freedom balanced with moderation (1 Cor 6:12; 1 Cor 8:9; 1 Cor 10:23).<sup>182</sup>

The puzzling phrase “because of the angels” likely refers to the Old Testament injunction against indecent exposure in worship (Exod 20:24–26; Exod 28:40–43).<sup>183</sup> According to a Dead Sea Scroll, “No man shall go down with them on the day of battle who is impure because of his ‘fount,’ for the holy angels shall be with their hosts. And there shall be a space of about two thousand cubits between all their camps for the place serving as a latrine, so that no indecent nakedness may be seen in the surroundings of their camps” (1QM).<sup>184</sup>

<sup>168</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 524.

<sup>169</sup>Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, 88.

<sup>170</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 526.

<sup>171</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 523.

<sup>172</sup>Arndt et. al., “δόξα” (*doxa*) *BDAG*, 3rd ed., 256–8, 257.

<sup>173</sup>Hippocrates, *On Intercourse and Pregnancy: An English Translation of On Semen and on the Development of the Child*, 68–70, <https://archive.org/details/HippocratesOnIntercourseAndPregnancy/page/n33>.

<sup>174</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 522–3.

<sup>175</sup>Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 211.

<sup>176</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 523.

<sup>177</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 526.

<sup>178</sup>Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, 237.

<sup>179</sup>Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 523.

<sup>180</sup>Also note that the word is *exousian*, a form which reflects a direct object. This means “authority,” not “of authority.”

<sup>181</sup>Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 212.

<sup>182</sup>Werner Foerster, “ἐξουσία” (*exousia*), *TDNT* 2:560–74, 562, 570.

<sup>183</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 530.

<sup>184</sup>Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 4th Ed.*, 132, [https://archive.org/stream/pdfy-Uy\\_BZ\\_QGsaLiJ4Zs/The%20Dead%20Sea%20Scrolls%20%5BComplete%20English%20Translation%5D#page/n209/mode/2up](https://archive.org/stream/pdfy-Uy_BZ_QGsaLiJ4Zs/The%20Dead%20Sea%20Scrolls%20%5BComplete%20English%20Translation%5D#page/n209/mode/2up).

Impropriety in worship offends both the Lord and the angels who stand in his presence.<sup>185</sup> By respecting the proper decorum expected in the presence of God and his angels, women in Corinth could pray and speak words of encouragement and exhortation in worship without shame or disgrace,<sup>186</sup> just as the men of the congregation did (1 Cor 11:4–6).<sup>187</sup>

**Read 1 Cor 11:7–10.** How do women reflect the glory of men? Why did Paul command that the women of Corinth should cover their heads during worship? What does wielding authority over her own head enable a woman to do? How do you or the women in your life practice this?

### Interdependence

**d) 1 Cor 11:11–12:** In this instance, “woman” can be translated as “wife” (*gynē*),<sup>188</sup> while “man” (*anēr*) can also be translated as “husband.”<sup>189</sup> Note that the Greek words used here for a male (*anēr* and *andros*) differ from the more common term “*anthrōpos*.” That word can be translated as “man” but usually refers to all of humanity, both male and female.<sup>190</sup> Unfortunately, a failure to recognize this distinction has resulted in an unnecessary furor over some Bible translations.

Paul proclaimed the fundamental interdependence of husbands and wives, as well as of men and women. Procreation mitigates the order of creation. Since everything originates from God—our ultimate authority—he significantly restrains any sense of hierarchy (1 Cor 11:3–10; Gal 3:26–28).<sup>191</sup>

Therefore, in this new era of life in Christ, men and women cannot function without depending upon each other. While distinctions remain between the genders, there is no subordination.<sup>192</sup> Furthermore, in the age to come, marriage shall no longer exist (Mark 12:25).

**Read 1 Cor 11:11–12.** What are the implications of the first woman coming from a man and all subsequent men coming from women?

### Partners in Ministry

**6) Acts 18:1–3, 18–20, 24–26 and 2 Ki 22:11–23:4:** Paul used the formal name Prisca to depict this woman in his letters, while Luke informally called her Priscilla.<sup>193</sup> In five of the

<sup>185</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 530.

<sup>186</sup>Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 531.

<sup>187</sup>Timothy J. Harris, “Why Did Paul Mention Eve’s Deception? A Critique of P. W. Barnett’s Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2,” *EvQ* 62: 335–52, 343–4, [https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1990-4\\_335.pdf](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1990-4_335.pdf).

<sup>188</sup>Danker, et al., “*γυνή*” (*gynē*), *BDAG*, 208–9.

<sup>189</sup>Danker et. al., “*άνηρ*” (*anēr*), 79–80.

<sup>190</sup>Danker et. al., “*άνθρωπος*” (*anthrōpos*), 81–2.

<sup>191</sup>Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 212–3.

<sup>192</sup>Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 523–4.

<sup>193</sup>F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 348.

seven times the New Testament mentions Priscilla and Aquila, her name comes before his (Cf. Rom 16:3–4; 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Tim 4:19).<sup>194</sup> That was quite rare in the Greco-Roman era, pointing to her prominence in ministry.<sup>195</sup>

In 1894, A. J. Gordon wrote, “Here a woman is actually taking the lead as a theological teacher to Apollos, an eminent minister of the gospel, and so far setting up her authority as to tell him that he is not thoroughly qualified for his work!”<sup>196</sup>

The Bible cites another “power couple.” Huldah and Shallum provide a sterling example of a wife and husband both serving the Lord in the Old Testament era. Here, too, her ministry garnered greater attention by the biblical author than that of her husband.

While repairing the temple, the high priest Hilkiah discovered the long-lost scroll of the Book of the Law,<sup>197</sup> which was most likely Deuteronomy (Deut 31:9–13).<sup>198</sup> He read it to the king. In anguish, Josiah directed him “Go inquire of Yahweh on my behalf.”

To accomplish that task, Hilkiah led a delegation to the female prophet Huldah, even though Shallum’s nephew Jeremiah and Zephaniah actively ministered during that time (Jer 1:2–3; Jer 32:7; Zeph 1:1).<sup>199</sup> She pronounced God’s judgment upon Jerusalem in keeping with Deut 28:58–68, but promised that the Lord would relent until after the king’s death.<sup>200</sup> In response, Josiah enacted immediate reforms which applied to both the civil and religious arenas of life in Judah.<sup>201</sup>

**Read Acts 18:1–3, 18–20, 24–26 and 2 Ki 22:11–23:4.** How did Priscilla and Aquila work together to serve the Lord? What did Huldah do? How did King Josiah respond to her pronouncement? What encouragement does these examples of faithful ministers give to you?

### The Cult of Artemis

**7) False Teaching in Ephesus:** After considering spousal and congregational relationships as Christians should engage in them (Acts 18:1–3, 18–20, 24–26; Rom 16:1–12; 1 Cor 11:3–12; and Eph 5:18–30), we will now examine how New Testament writers sought to resolve difficult relational situations. Since the Bible is a historically-oriented revelation, we must consider the socio-cultural context of each passage to avoid misinterpretation.<sup>202</sup> For example, the Cult of Artemis had a huge impact upon Ephesus, resulting in great tensions for the church in that city (Acts 19:17–34).<sup>203</sup>

<sup>194</sup>Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 651.

<sup>195</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 301.

<sup>196</sup>Gordon, “The Ministry of Women,” 917,

<http://www.biblesnet.com/AJ%20Gordon%20The%20Ministry%20of%20Women.pdf>.

<sup>197</sup>Roger W. Uitti, “Hilkiah (Person),” *ABD* 3:201.

<sup>198</sup>August H. Konkel, *1 & 2 Kings* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 635.

<sup>199</sup>T. R. Hobbs, *2 Kings* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1985), 327.

<sup>200</sup>Paul R. House, *1, 2 Kings* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 385.

<sup>201</sup>Konkel, *1 & 2 Kings*, 635–6.

<sup>202</sup>Douglas K. Stuart, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors, 4th Ed.* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 52.

<sup>203</sup>Wikimedia Commons, “Ephesos,” <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Ephesos>. This site has some good photos. All that remains of the temple of Artemis is one marble column.

The shrine dedicated to the goddess Artemis was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world.<sup>204</sup> According to Pliny the Elder (23–79 AD), “The entire length of the temple is four hundred and twenty-five feet, and the breadth two hundred and twenty-five. The columns are one hundred and twenty-seven in number, and sixty feet in height.”<sup>205</sup> Four times larger than the Parthenon in Athens,<sup>206</sup> it covered twenty-one times the area of Solomon’s temple.

Early in the history of the cult of Artemis, religious prostitution with a priestess comprised an important feature of worship.<sup>207</sup> However, the Roman government abolished those practices throughout their empire by the time of Paul.<sup>208</sup> Once an Anatolian fertility goddess,<sup>209</sup> Artemis of Ephesus morphed into a tomboy virgin,<sup>210</sup> pure and inviolable with a retinue of dancing nymphs.

Depicted in Ephesus as a “multi-mammary grotesque,”<sup>211</sup> people considered Artemis the protector of human children. Nevertheless, the goddess Hera lambasted her as “a lion among women,” with the right to kill them at will.<sup>212</sup> Presumably this occurred while they gave birth.<sup>213</sup>

Ancient inscriptions indicate that young virgins from elite families served as priestesses for one-year terms.<sup>214</sup> According to an account of one of these women: “When we came to the age of fourteen years, by the law—which calls such as us to the office of priesthood—I was maid priest to Artemis...But, as this honor lasts but for a year and our time was expired, we prepared to go to Delos with our sacred attire, and there to make certain games of music and gymnastic, and give over our priesthood.”<sup>215</sup>

Some proponents of this cult spoke of the first woman as the conduit of light and life who brought divine enlightenment to humanity. They asserted that Eve existed before creation, consorting with celestial beings.<sup>216</sup> Consequently, these priestesses wielded tremendous power, were considered superior to men, and dominated over them.

Plutarch (46–122 AD) affirmed Cato the Elder’s (234–149 BC) severe criticism of the prevalent domination by women by quoting him as saying, “All mankind rules its women, and we rule all mankind, but our women rule us.”<sup>217</sup> For example, Plancia Magna, a priestess

<sup>204</sup>Clinton E. Arnold, “Ephesus,” *DPL* 249–52, 250.

<sup>205</sup>Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* (trans. John Bostock and H. T. Riley; London: Taylor & Francis, 1855), 36.21,

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0137%3Abook%3D36%3Achapter%3D21>.

<sup>206</sup>Arnold, *Ephesians*, 31.

<sup>207</sup>Chris Church, “Fertility Cult,” *HolBD*, 566.

<sup>208</sup>S. M. Baugh, “Cultic Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal,” *JETS* 42, no. 3, September 1999: 443–60, 446, [http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460\\_JETS.pdf](http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460_JETS.pdf).

<sup>209</sup>Baugh, “Cultic Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal,” 452, [http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460\\_JETS.pdf](http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460_JETS.pdf).

<sup>210</sup>Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* (vol. 2 of *The Complete Greek Drama*; trans. Jr. Eugene O’Neill; New York: Random House, 1938), 115–9,

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0042%3Acard%3D101>.

<sup>211</sup>Hubert M. Martin Jr., “Artemis (Deity),” *ABD* 1:464–5, 464.

<sup>212</sup>Homer, *The Iliad* (trans. Samuel Butler; London: Longmans Green, 1898), 21.475–84,

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0134%3Abook%3D21%3Acard%3D468>.

<sup>213</sup>Martin Jr., “Artemis (Deity),” *ABD* 1:465.

<sup>214</sup>Baugh, “Cult Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal,” 456, [http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460\\_JETS.pdf](http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460_JETS.pdf).

<sup>215</sup>Heliiodorus, *An Aethiopian Romance* (trans. Thomas Underdowne, revised by F. Wright and S. Rhoads; London: New York: Routledge; Dutton, 2006), 1.34–5, <http://www.elfinspell.com/HeliiodorusBk1.html>.

<sup>216</sup>H. M. Conn, “The Effect of Sin upon Covenant Mutuality,” *NDT*, 258.

<sup>217</sup>Plutarch, *Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata* (trans. Frank Cole Babbitt; LCL; Cambridge: London: Harvard University Press; Heinemann, 1931), 81.3,

of Artemis in Perge during the reign of the Emperor Hadrian (117–138 AD), held the highest civic office in that city.<sup>218</sup>

In his last meeting with the Ephesian elders, Paul warned them that “savage wolves” would emerge, even from among them (Acts 20:28–30). Sure enough, within a few years false teachers gained significant influence upon the congregation, particularly among widows and wealthy women (1 Tim 5:14–15; 2 Tim 3:6).<sup>219</sup> Therefore, Paul sent Timothy there to restore health to this church, serving as his delegate (1 Tim 1:3–7).<sup>220</sup>

Paul never specifically described the nature of the false teaching. However, it appears to have involved a form of strict Jewish asceticism designed to promote ecstatic visions, much as in nearby Colossae (Col 2:16–23).<sup>221</sup> Internal evidence suggests these dissident leaders promoted abstention from marriage (1 Tim 4:3; 1 Tim 5:14) as well as a misreading of Old Testament texts regarding creation and the fall (1 Tim 2:13–14).<sup>222</sup>

a) How did the Cult of Artemis change by the time Paul arrived in Ephesus? What role did women play in that religion? How did false teachers affect the Ephesian church?

### Prayer without Anger

b) **1 Tim 2:8:** Paul wrote, “I desire that men in every place lift up holy hands free of anger and dispute.” Anger and dissension block effective prayer (Matt 5:21–24; Eph 4:29–32; 1 Pet 3:7).<sup>223</sup> As in Judaism and other Ancient Near Eastern cultures, people in the Greco-Roman world typically stood with their hands raised while praying (Exod 17:8–13; 1 Ki 8:22–26).<sup>224</sup>

Elsewhere in Paul’s letters, *anēr/andros* (“man, male, husband”) and *gynē* (“woman, female, wife”) usually occur together in the context of marriage (Rom 7:2–3; 1 Cor 7:1–4, 10–16, 32–34; 1 Cor 14:34–35; Eph 5:21–33; Col 3:18–19; Tit 1:6). The exception to this appears in 1 Cor 11:3–13.<sup>225</sup> Therefore, 1 Tim 2:8–15 may apply to spousal relationships, rather than to congregations.<sup>226</sup> Whichever is correct, the doctrinal disputes concerning women in Ephesus engulfed even the men in the church.<sup>227</sup>

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0193%3Achapter%3D81%3Asecti%3D3>.

<sup>218</sup>W. Ward Gasque, “Perge (Place),” *ABD* 5:228.

<sup>219</sup>Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 44.

<sup>220</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 220.

<sup>221</sup>Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, lxix-lxx.

<sup>222</sup>Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 198.

<sup>223</sup>I. Howard Marshall and Philip H. Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 445.

<sup>224</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT2*, 605.

<sup>225</sup>Result of Logos 8 word study on *gynē*.

<sup>226</sup>Gordon P. Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis. A Survey of Approaches to 1Tim 2:8–15,” *JETS* 35, no. 3, September 1992: 341–60, 354, <http://womeninthechurch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/hugenberger%20women%20in%20church%20office%20re%20husbands%20and%20wives%20issue%20in%201%20timothy%202.pdf>.

<sup>227</sup>Marshall and Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 446.

**b) Read 1 Tim 2:8.** What makes anger while praying inappropriate? Do you think this verse applies to marriage or to relationships within congregations? Why do you believe that?

### Adorned with Good Works

**c) 1 Tim 2:9–10:** Paul wrote this letter to his lieutenant serving in Ephesus, a city with one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, the Temple of Artemis. One description of a priestess of Artemis says, “Her apparel wrought with gold glistened against the sun, and her hair under the garland, blown about with the wind, covered a great part of her back. The thieves were greatly afraid...Some of them said indeed it was a goddess—Artemis or Isis—others declared it was a priestess of the gods.”<sup>228</sup>

The gospel inherently provoked Greco-Roman society (1 Cor 1:21–31). Therefore, Paul expressed great concern over how outsiders viewed the exercise of freedom by members of the church (1 Cor 10:23–33; Gal 5:13–14). This made modesty and sexual morality among believers especially critical.<sup>229</sup>

Wealthy women in the Roman Empire loved to display elaborately adorned hair, sometimes braided with gold.<sup>230</sup> Early congregations included fashionable women who could afford the costliest materials (1 Pet 3:3–4).<sup>231</sup> Due to the scarcity of pearls, some cost the equivalent of millions of dollars (Matt 13:45–46).<sup>232</sup> Such ostentation slighted the poor. Expensive embellishment also provided temptation for the men in the congregation.<sup>233</sup> Greco-Roman and Jewish authors equated the flaunting of wealth through external adornment with seduction.<sup>234</sup>

Regarding women, the Jewish philosopher Philo (ca. 20 BC–40 AD) wrote this: “For we confess that our sex is in danger of being defeated, because our enemies are better provided with all the appliances of war and necessaries for battle; but your sex is more completely armed, and you will gain the greatest of all advantages, namely the victory... “[W]ithout even a struggle, you will overpower the enemy at the first sight of you, merely by being beheld by him. When they heard this, they ceased to think of or to pay the very slightest regard to their character for purity of life...though during all the rest of their lives they had put on a hypocritical appearance of modesty, and so now they adorned themselves with costly garments, and necklaces, and all those other appendages with which women are accustomed to set themselves off, and they devoted all their attention to enhancing their natural beauty, and making it more brilliant (for the object of their pursuit was not an unimportant one, being the alluring of the young men who were well inclined to be seduced), and so they went forth into public.”<sup>235</sup>

Likewise, the Roman satirist Juvenal (ca. 115) charged:

“There is nothing that a woman will not permit herself to do, nothing that she deems shameful, when she encircles her neck with green emeralds, and fastens huge pearls to her

<sup>228</sup>Heliiodorus, *An Aethiopian Romance*, 1.10, <http://www.elfinspell.com/HeliiodorusBk1.html>.

<sup>229</sup>Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 213

<sup>230</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT2*, 605.

<sup>231</sup>Douglas R. Edwards, “Dress and Ornamentation,” *ABD* 2:232–8, 237.

<sup>232</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT2*, 81.

<sup>233</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT2*, 605.

<sup>234</sup>Marshall and Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 449–50.

<sup>235</sup>Philo, “On the Virtues,” in *The Works of Philo Judaeus, Vol. 3* (trans. Charles Duke Yonge; London: Bohn, 1855), 421–2, <https://archive.org/stream/theworksofphiloj03yonguoft#page/420/mode/2up>.

elongated ears: there is nothing more intolerable than a wealthy woman...Her lover she will meet with a clean-washed skin, but when does she ever care to look nice at home?"<sup>236</sup>

During the Greco-Roman era, people considered elaborate clothing, expensive jewelry, and intricate hair styles inconsistent with moral behavior.<sup>237</sup> Consequently, Paul exhorted the wealthy Christian women in Ephesus to exhibit the decorum appropriate for a follower of Christ.<sup>238</sup> He urged them to live in such a way that others associated them with good deeds, rather than with their physical appearance.<sup>239</sup> While nothing is inherently wrong with dressing nicely in our culture, God commands us to focus upon inner beauty, not external allure.<sup>240</sup>

**Read 1 Tim 2:9–10.** Why was Paul concerned about how Christian women appeared in public? What does adorning ourselves with good works mean? How can we practice this today?

### She Must Learn

**d) 1 Tim 2:11:** Earlier in this chapter Paul used the same word frequently translated here as “silent” (*hēsychia*) to mean “free of outward disturbance” (1 Tim 2:1–2).<sup>241</sup> He urged the entire congregation to pray so that they could lead lives characterized by a lack of noticeable agitation.<sup>242</sup>

Verse 11 contains the only command in all of 1 Tim 2:8–15,<sup>243</sup> where Paul ordered, “A woman...must learn” (*manthanō*).<sup>244</sup> This shocking admonition came from a man who had been thoroughly grounded in Pharisaic Judaism (Phil 3:4–6). While some rabbis taught that men should teach the Mosaic law to their daughters, others asserted that doing so amounted to debauchery (*m. Sotah* 3.4). The Jerusalem Talmud went further, contending, “Let the words of the law be burned rather than committed to women” (*y. Sotah* 3:19).<sup>245</sup>

Eve had not been created when Adam received the command to abstain from the forbidden fruit (Gen 2:16–22), nor had she been properly educated before she succumbed to deception (Gen 3:2–6). Paul taught against the prevailing culture of his era by insisting that women should receive religious instruction. Few Jewish women were trained in the law,<sup>246</sup> although they did acquire some basic instruction to enable them to teach their children. Prior to Jesus’s ministry, women in Israel could never travel with or even study under a religious instructor (Luke 8:1–3; Luke 10:38–42).<sup>247</sup>

<sup>236</sup>Juvenal, “Satire 6,” in *Juvenal and Persius* (trans. G. G. Ramsay; London; New York: Heinemann; Putnam, 1928), 6:457–68, 121, <https://archive.org/stream/juvenalpersiuswi00juveuoft#page/120/mode/2up>.

<sup>237</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy*, 95.

<sup>238</sup>Marshall and Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 450.

<sup>239</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy*, 96.

<sup>240</sup>Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 113.

<sup>241</sup>Verbrugge, “ἡσυχία” (*hēsychia*), *TDNTWA*, 235.

<sup>242</sup>Harris, “Why Did Paul Mention Eve’s Deception? A Critique of P. W. Barnett’s Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2,” 340, [https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1990-4\\_335.pdf](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1990-4_335.pdf).

<sup>243</sup>Nestle et al, *NA<sup>28</sup>*, 1 Tim 2:8–15.

<sup>244</sup>Danker, et al., “μανθάνω” (*manthanō*), *BDAG*, 615.

<sup>245</sup>Lightfoot, *From the Talmud and Hebraica: A Commentary on the New Testament*, 580, <https://www.ccel.org/ccel/lightfoot/talmud.vii.iii.html>.

<sup>246</sup>Keener, *IVPBCNT2*, 605.

<sup>247</sup>Ben Witherington III, “Women: New Testament,” *ABD* 6: 957–61, 957.

While praising one woman, the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BC–40 AD) claimed, “The minds of women are, in some degree, weaker than those of men and are not so well able to comprehend a thing which is appreciable only by the intellect...but she, as she surpassed all her sex in other particulars, so also was she superior to them in this, by reason of the pure learning and wisdom which had been implanted in her, both by nature and by study; so that, *having a masculine intellect*, she was so sharp sighted and profound.”<sup>248</sup>

In terms of basic education, women in Rome and in Asia Minor—where Ephesus is located—fared better than those in Judea or Greece.<sup>249</sup> The literacy rate for Greco-Roman women averaged 10% of that for men in the same social class.<sup>250</sup> Nevertheless, the primary rationale for educating Greco-Roman women appeared to be so they could teach their young sons.<sup>251</sup> Once children reached seven years of age, the influence upon them officially shifted to their fathers.<sup>252</sup>

Quintilian, a great scholar of rhetoric who lived from 35–100 AD, wrote: “I would, therefore, have a father conceive the highest hopes of his son from the moment of his birth. If he does so, he will be more careful about the groundwork of his education...Above all see that the child's nurse speaks correctly...Do not therefore allow the boy to become accustomed even in infancy to a style of speech which he will subsequently have to unlearn...As regards parents, I should like to see them as highly educated as possible, and I do not restrict this remark to fathers alone...And even those who have not had the fortune to receive a good education should not for that reason devote less care to their son's education.”<sup>253</sup>

However, many Greco-Roman men denounced highly educated women as promiscuous, for in their society, a bold demeanor in a woman implied her sexual availability.<sup>254</sup> In 115 AD, Juvenal satirized educated women by writing the following:

“But most intolerable of all is the woman who as soon as she has sat down to dinner commends Virgil, pardons the dying Dido, and pits the poets against each other, putting Virgil in the one scale and Homer in the other. The grammarians make way before her; the rhetoricians give in; the whole crowd is silenced...so torrential is her speech that you would think that all the pots and bells were being clashed together...She lays down definitions, and discourses on morals, like a philosopher...Let not the wife of your bosom possess a special style of her own...

“Let her not know all history; let there be some things in her reading which she does not understand. I hate a woman who...who observes all the rules and laws of language, who quotes from ancient poets that I never heard of and corrects her unlettered female friends for slips of speech that no man need trouble about: let husbands at least be permitted to make slips in grammar! There is nothing that a woman will not permit herself to do, nothing that she deems shameful, when she encircles her neck with green emeralds, and fastens huge pearls to her elongated ears: there is nothing more intolerable than a wealthy woman.”<sup>255</sup>

<sup>248</sup>Philo, “On the Embassy to Gaius,” in *The Works of Philo Judaeus*, Vol. 4 (Trans. Charles Duke Yonge; London: Bohn, 1855), 99–180, 169, <https://archive.org/stream/worksofphilojuda04phil#page/168/mode/2up>. Italics mine.

<sup>249</sup>Witherington III, “Women: New Testament,” 6:958.

<sup>250</sup>Keener, *IVPBBCNT2*, 605.

<sup>251</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 144.

<sup>252</sup>Craig S. Keener, “Family and Household,” *DNTB* 353–68, 358.

<sup>253</sup>Quintilian, *Institutes* (trans. Harold Edgeworth Butler; LCL; Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 1922), 1.1.1–7, 19–23, <https://archive.org/stream/institutioorator00quin#page/18/mode/2up>.

<sup>254</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 243.

<sup>255</sup>Juvenal, “Satire 6,” 6:434–61, 119–21, <https://archive.org/stream/juvenalpersiuswi00juveuoft#page/118/mode/2up>.

In Paul's era, instructors expected every male student to learn submissively and quietly.<sup>256</sup> Philo (30 BC–40 AD) asserted, "Silence, then, is a desirable thing for those who are ignorant, but for those who desire knowledge, and who have at the same time a love for their master's freedom of speech, is a most necessary possession...it is proper for those persons to be silent who can say nothing worthy of being listened to."<sup>257</sup>

**Read 1 Tim 2:11.** What makes Paul's command to the Ephesian church so surprising? Based upon what we have read, why would he order that women learn with deference to their teachers?

### Domineering Women

e) **1 Tim 2:12–14:** Priscilla, along with her husband Aquila, successfully taught Apollos in Corinth. Therefore, Paul did not endorse a universal ban on women teaching (Acts 18:24–28).<sup>258</sup> We must consider whether the low level of women's religious education prompted Paul's command for them to learn as well as the imposition of restrictions upon their ministry (1 Tim 2:11).<sup>259</sup>

The apostle's instructions elsewhere indicate that the issue arose with these specific women in Ephesus (Acts 18:26; 1 Cor 14:26; Tit 2:3).<sup>260</sup> When Paul reminded Timothy of what he already knew, he typically wrote "we know" (*eidon*) (1 Tim 1:8), referred to "a trustworthy statement" (*pistos ho*) (1 Tim 1:15), or pointed to Timothy's recollection of Paul's experience (2 Tim 3:10–11). Instead, the apostle's instruction indicates that Timothy was not already aware that the women of Ephesus should not teach others.<sup>261</sup> Paul wrote, "But to teach, I am not permitting a woman, nor to dominate a man, but to be in quietness."

The Ephesian women's ignorance of the Scriptures coupled with their social influence enabled teachers to spread false doctrines (1 Tim 4:3; 1 Tim 5:14; 2 Tim 3:6–7).<sup>262</sup> Paul had already compared the entire church in Corinth with Eve due to their potential for being misled (2 Cor 11:3–4).<sup>263</sup>

According to Greco-Roman mythology, the birth of Artemis occurred nine days before that of her twin brother. She then acted as her mother's midwife to deliver Apollo.<sup>264</sup> This may provide the rationale for Paul's reminder that "Adam first was formed, then Eve."

<sup>256</sup>Keener, *IVPBBNT2*, 605.

<sup>257</sup>Philo, "Who is the Heir?" in *The Works of Philo Judaeus*, vol. 2 (trans. Charles Duke Yonge; London: Bohn, 1854), 4, 96, <https://archive.org/stream/workspphilofudaeu02philuoft#page/96/mode/2up>.

<sup>258</sup>Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 123.

<sup>259</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 104.

<sup>260</sup>Marshall and Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 455.

<sup>261</sup>Keener, *Paul, Women, and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul*, 112.

<sup>262</sup>Keener, *IVPBBNT2*, 606.

<sup>263</sup>John Jefferson Davis, "First Timothy 2:12, the Ordination of Women, and Paul's Use of Creation Narratives," *Priscilla Papers* 31, no. 4 (1 September 2017): 17, <https://www.cbeinternational.org/sites/default/files/PP314-web.pdf>.

<sup>264</sup>Apollodorus, *The Library*, 2 Vols. (trans. James George Frazer; LCL; Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press; Heinemann, 1921), 1.4.1,

The verb typically used for “having authority” (*exousiazō*) appears four times in the New Testament (NT);<sup>265</sup> the related noun *exousia* has 103 occurrences.<sup>266</sup> One of these instances of the verb *exousiazō* concerns a wife’s authority over her husband’s body (1 Cor 7:4).<sup>267</sup> With the exception of 1 Tim 2:12, whenever “to teach” and “to have authority” appear together in the NT, the word employed for wielding authority is or *exousia* (Matt 7:29; Matt 21:23; Mark 1:22, 27; and Luke 4:32). However, in this passage Paul dictated the word *authentēin*, the infinitive of *authentēō*, a verb which occurs only here in the NT.<sup>268</sup> It has the connotation in extra-biblical sources from that era of domineering and violence,<sup>269</sup> such as “to murder” or “to perpetrate a crime.”<sup>270</sup>

For example, Philo (30 BC–40 AD) used a noun related to *authentēō* to describe someone who committed suicide, noting, “It is of yourself that you have become the *murderer* (*authentēs*).”<sup>271</sup> Josephus (<http://www.theopedia.com/josephus>) (37–100 AD) also employed the term when he wrote, “The Samaritans were the beginners of the disturbance, on account of that murder they had committed...Cumanus had given occasion to what had happened, by his unwillingness to punish the original *authors of that murder* (*authentas*).”<sup>272</sup>

According to the second century AD astrologer Ptolemy, “If Saturn alone is ruler of the soul and *dominates* (*authentēin*) Mercury and the moon...he makes his subjects lovers of the body, strong-minded, deep thinkers, austere, of a single purpose, laborious, dictatorial, ready to punish, lovers of property, avaricious, violent, amassing treasure, and jealous.”<sup>273</sup>

Leland Wilshire conducted important research which examined 314 references to *authentēin* and its cognates from the Classical Period (4th–5th century BC) into the Byzantine Era (4th–15th century AD). He discovered that not until after Paul’s lifetime did the term lose a violent, abusive aspect,<sup>274</sup> and come to mean “hold authority”.<sup>275</sup>

In a rigorous semantic study of *authentēō*, Cynthia Westfall identified the closest parallel to this verse. It appears in a homily from John Chrysostom (347–407).<sup>276</sup> Concerning Col 3:19, he wrote to husbands, “Do not therefore, because thy wife is subject to thee, act the

---

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0022%3Atext%3DLibrary%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D4>.

<sup>265</sup>Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek, 3rd Ed.*, 50.

<sup>266</sup> Result of Logos 8 word study on “ἐξουσία” (*exousia*).

<sup>267</sup> Danker et al., “ἐξουσιαζω” (*exousiazō*), *BDAG*, 353–4.

<sup>268</sup>Leland Edward Wilshire, “The TLG Computer and Further Reference to ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1Timothy 2:12,” *NTS* 34, no. 1 (January 1988):120–34, 130–1, <http://womeninthechurch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Wilshire-authentew-TLG.pdf>.

<sup>269</sup>Ben Witherington III, “Literal Renderings of Texts of Contention--1 Tim 2:8–15,” <http://benwitherington.blogspot.com/2006/02/literal-renderings-of-texts-of.html>.

<sup>270</sup>Wilshire, “The TLG Computer and Further Reference to ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1Timothy 2:12,” 130, <http://womeninthechurch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Wilshire-authentew-TLG.pdf>.

<sup>271</sup>Philo, “That the Worse Attacks the Better,” in *The Works of Philo Judaeus, Vol. 1* (trans. Charles Duke Yonge; London: Bohn, 1854), 21, 261,

<https://archive.org/stream/workspphilojudaeu01philuoft#page/260/mode/2up>.

<sup>272</sup>Josephus, *The Wars of the Jews*, in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, 2.240,

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Asection%3D236>. Italics mine.

<sup>273</sup>Claudius Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* (trans. F. E. Robbins; LCL; Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 1940), 3.13.137–9, [Http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Ptolemy/Tetrabiblos/3D\\*.html#13](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Ptolemy/Tetrabiblos/3D*.html#13). Italics mine.

<sup>274</sup> Wilshire, “The TLG Computer and Further Reference to ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1Timothy 2:12,” 123–4, <http://womeninthechurch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Wilshire-authentew-TLG.pdf>.

<sup>275</sup> Harris, “Why Did Paul Mention Eve’s Deception? A Critique of P. W. Barnett’s Interpretation of 1Timothy 2,” 342, [https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1990-4\\_335.pdf](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1990-4_335.pdf).

<sup>276</sup>Cynthia Long Westfall, “The Meaning of Αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12,” *JGRChJ* 10 (2014):138–73, 162, [http://www.jgrchj.net/volume10/JGRChJ10-7\\_Westfall.pdf](http://www.jgrchj.net/volume10/JGRChJ10-7_Westfall.pdf).

despot (*authentēō*).<sup>277</sup> That great preacher forbade even men to behave in the way prohibited by Paul.

Consequently, it appears that some Ephesian women were domineering over men when engaging in forms of instruction permitted in other congregations (Eph 4:29–5:2; 1 Cor 11:5; 1 Cor 14:1–4; Rom 16:1–12). Hence, Paul resorted to drastic measures to combat their tendency.<sup>278</sup>

**Read 1 Tim 2:12–14.** What made Paul’s choice of the verb *authentēō*—rather than *exousiazō*—significant? Why aren’t women to domineer over men? How were even the men in Corinth like the Ephesian women? Given what we have read regarding the women of Ephesus in *The Cult of Artemis* (pp. 150–152) and *She Must Learn* (pp. 154–156), why do you think Paul forbade them from teaching? How can you apply this passage to your life?

### Saved Through Childbearing

**f) 1 Tim 2:15:** One expert called this sentence “certainly one of the strangest verses in the New Testament.”<sup>279</sup> Consequently, scholars have offered numerous interpretations of this verse.

Some assert that it serves as an admonition to live as a traditional wife and mother, making childbearing a means of “working out salvation” via a woman’s God-given role.<sup>280</sup> Others translate the definite article (“the”) to identify “the childbearing” as the birth of Jesus (Matt 1:18–25).<sup>281</sup>

Major difficulties beset those views. Paul advised virgins to remain unmarried, so he did not consider giving birth and raising children a necessary condition for women to receive salvation (1 Cor 7:32–38). The second explanation involves an obscure reference to the nativity. Other Scripture emphasizes the death and resurrection of Christ—not his birth—as the means of salvation (Acts 26:22–23; Rom 6:8–11; 1 Cor 15:3–4; Phil 3:10–11).<sup>282</sup>

Paul employed a medical term (*teknogonia*) for the physical act of giving birth.<sup>283</sup> In this instance, the preposition he chose also makes a critical difference. He wrote, “But they shall be saved *through* (*dia*) childbearing, if they remain in faith and in love and in holiness with self-control.” In this instance, he referred to coming through a prevailing circumstance,

<sup>277</sup>John Chrysostom, *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to the Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians* (Oxford; London: Parker; Rivington, 1843), 294, <https://archive.org/stream/homiliesofsjohnc14john#page/294/mode/2up>.

<sup>278</sup>Marshall and Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 459, 466.

<sup>279</sup>Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 143.

<sup>280</sup>Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 235.

<sup>281</sup>Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 145.

<sup>282</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, 103.

<sup>283</sup>Marshall and Towner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, 468.

such as labor.<sup>284</sup>

Childbirth during the Greco-Roman era remained a frightening prospect. For example, the wife of a centurion married at the age of eleven. She died while giving birth to her sixth child at the age of twenty-seven. Only one of those children survived to adulthood, a sadly common statistic.<sup>285</sup>

Interpreting this passage while considering the cultural context of the cult of Artemis in Ephesus resolves much of the confusion. Women nearing childbirth often prayed and sacrificed to Artemis for protection during delivery.<sup>286</sup> In the Hymn to Artemis, the goddess told Zeus, “The cities of men I will visit only when women vexed by the sharp pang of childbirth call me to their aid.”<sup>287</sup>

Even a man prayed to her, saying, “Queen of heaven, whether you are Phoebus’ (Apollo’s) sister, who by relieving women in labor with your soothing remedies have raised up many peoples, and now are venerated at your shrine in Ephesus...help me in this extremity of tribulation.”<sup>288</sup>

Paul wrote against these practices. Godly women must direct their devotion and prayers to the Lord, not to Artemis (1 Cor 12:2; Gal 5:19–21; Rev 21:8). “Faith, love, and holiness with self-control” do not constitute good works but characterize God’s people (Gal 5:22–25; Eph 3:14–21; 1 Tim 6:11–12).<sup>289</sup>

“Shall be saved” (*sōzō*) can refer to physical deliverance in Scripture (e.g. Matt 9:20–22).<sup>290</sup> Nevertheless, the nuance of “salvation” throughout Paul’s letters to Timothy and Titus connotes our ultimate redemption in the age to come (1 Tim 1:15; 1 Tim 2:1–6; 1 Tim 4:16; 2 Tim 1:8–12; 2 Tim 2:10; 2 Tim 3:14–15; Tit 2:11–14; Tit 3:4–7).<sup>291</sup> God never promises that a woman shall live through childbirth.<sup>292</sup> Yet, a believer who approaches her time of delivery can rest in the assurance of the salvation of her soul and the resurrection of her body after the return of Christ. Indeed, when Paul described his impending death in 2 Tim 4:6–8, 16–18, he used the same verbal root to depict his expectation of salvation.

**Read 1 Tim 2:15.** How did Paul advise the women of Ephesus to spiritually prepare themselves for childbirth? What made his declaration counter-cultural? How can we apply this in our culture?

<sup>284</sup>Danker, et al., “δια” (*dia*), *BDAG*, 223–6, 224.

<sup>285</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 135.

<sup>286</sup>Aeschylus, *Suppliant Women*, 2 Vols. (Herbert Weir Smyth; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), 674,

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0016%3Acard%3D667>.

<sup>287</sup>Callimachus, “Hymn III: To Artemis,” in *Callimachus Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron. Aratus*. (ed. G. R. Mair; trans. A. W. Mair; LCL; London: New York: Heinemann; Putnam, 1921), 20–22, 63, <https://archive.org/stream/callimachuslycop00calluoft#page/62/mode/2up>.

<sup>288</sup>Lucius Apuleius, *The Golden Ass* (trans. E. J. Kenney; London; New York: Penguin Books; Penguin Putnam, 2004), 11.2, 170–1, [https://archive.org/stream/TheGoldenAss\\_201509/TheGoldenAsspenguinClassics-Apuleius#page/n219/mode/2up](https://archive.org/stream/TheGoldenAss_201509/TheGoldenAsspenguinClassics-Apuleius#page/n219/mode/2up).

<sup>289</sup>Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy*, 103.

<sup>290</sup>Danker, et al., “σωζω” (*sōzō*), *BDAG*, 982–3.

<sup>291</sup>Werner Foerster and Georg Fohrer, “σωζω” (*sōzō*), *TDNT*, 965–1024, 994–5.

<sup>292</sup>Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 144.

### A Minority Religion

**8) 1 Pet 3:1–2:** First Peter 3:1–9 features many similarities to 1 Tim 2:8–15.<sup>293</sup> In the early church, Christianity spread faster among women than among men. Converting to a despised minority religion proved more costly to males in terms of their social status.<sup>294</sup> Noting the great discrepancy in numbers, Celsus, a 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD Greek philosopher, complained, “[Christians] desire and are able to gain over only the silly, and the mean, and the stupid, with women and children.”<sup>295</sup>

Greco-Roman husbands held the authoritative position within a marriage.<sup>296</sup> “To submit” (*hypotassō*) involves placing oneself under someone else. Yet, it does not necessarily include compliance.<sup>297</sup> In contrast, the obedience expected of wives in Greco-Roman antiquity included allegiance to their husbands’ religions.<sup>298</sup> Most households included shrines containing figures of the gods.<sup>299</sup>

Plutarch (ca. 46–120 AD) gave this Advice to a Bride and Groom: “A wife ought not to make friends of her own, but to enjoy her husband's friends in common with him. The gods are the first and most important friends. Wherefore it is becoming for a wife to worship and to know only the gods that her husband believes in, and to shut the front door tight upon all queer rituals and outlandish superstitions. For with no god do stealthy and secret rites performed by a woman find any favor.”<sup>300</sup>

Polytheistic husbands regarded Christian women as highly insubordinate solely by virtue of their religious commitment. Peter commanded these wives not to compound the difficulty by abrasive or unseemly behavior.<sup>301</sup> Thus, he directed wives to submit in order to influence their non-Christian husbands toward embracing the faith, consistent with his teaching that Christians must live such holy lives that those who malign the gospel would see their error (1 Pet 2:11–12).<sup>302</sup> Nevertheless, a believer’s reverence belongs to God, not to one’s spouse (Acts 4:18–20; Acts 5:27–32).<sup>303</sup>

**a) Read 1 Pet 3:1–2.** What made the gospel more attractive to women than to men in Peter’s era? Why would people consider the women whom Peter addressed subversive? How could living in submission to an unbelieving husband win him over to the gospel? In what ways can people living in those circumstances today apply Peter’s teaching?

<sup>293</sup>Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis. A Survey of Approaches to 1 Tim 2:8–15,” 355, <http://womeninthechurch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/hugenberger%20women%20in%20church%20office%20re%20husbands%20and%20wives%20issue%20in%201%20timothy%202.pdf>.

<sup>294</sup>Keener, *IVPBCNT2*, 692.

<sup>295</sup>Origen, “Against Celsus,” in *Fathers of the Third Century: Tertullian, Part Fourth; Minucius Felix; Commodian; Origen, Part First and Second*, vol. 4 (ed. A. Cleveland Coxe; trans. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; ANF; New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1926), 3.44, 482, <https://archive.org/stream/antenicenefathe00menzgoog#page/n458/mode/2up>.

<sup>296</sup>Keener, *IVPBCNT2*, 692.

<sup>297</sup>Gerhard Delling, “ὑποτάσσω” (*hypotassō*), *TDNT* 8:39–46, 41.

<sup>298</sup>Keener, *IVPBCNT2*, 692.

<sup>299</sup>Laura Hutchinson, “The Roman House at Hopkins: Household Gods.” John Hopkins Archaeological Museum, <http://archaeologicalmuseum.jhu.edu/the-collection/object-stories/the-roman-house-at-hopkins/household-gods/>.

<sup>300</sup>Plutarch, *Advice to a Bride and Groom (Conjugal Praecepta)*, 19, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0181%3Asection%3D19>.

<sup>301</sup>David L. Balch, “Early Christian Criticism of Patriarchal Authority: 1 Peter 2:11–3:12,” *USQR* 39, no. 3, January 1, 1984: 161–73, 166.

<sup>302</sup>Scott McKnight, *1 Peter* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 183.

<sup>303</sup>J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1998), 157.

### In the Spirit of Sarah

**b) 1 Pet 3:3–6:** Peter’s admonition to develop “a gentle and quiet spirit” does not apply to women alone (Matt 5:5; Matt 11:28–30; 1 Pet 3:8, 15). While Sarah did call Abraham her “lord” (*adon*) (Gen 18:12) and typically deferred to him (Gen 12:10–15; Gen 20:1–2), she ordered Abraham to send his son Ishmael away, making her husband “very displeased.”

According to Ancient Near Eastern cultural values, Abraham held the right to determine family policy. Yet, because Sarah’s demand corresponded with God’s plans, the Lord told Abraham to listen to his wife and do what she said (Gen 21:9–14).<sup>304</sup> Note that the word translated as “listen to” (*shema*) also means “obey” in Hebrew.<sup>305</sup>

Thus, these words from Peter gave Christian women more freedom and power in their repressive world than their polytheistic friends enjoyed. Due to the differences between Greco-Roman culture and ours, people now tend to view these verses as more restrictive for believers than for non-Christian women.<sup>306</sup>

Going to Christian meetings and refusing to worship the family gods would have almost certainly upset the unbelieving husbands of Greco-Roman women.<sup>307</sup> Such men likely would have employed various types of intimidation—physical, emotional, and social—to try to force Christian women to align themselves with their religious beliefs.<sup>308</sup>

Therefore, Peter called these wives to practice gentleness, inner tranquility, and subordination to their husbands in areas which did not negatively affect their Christian faith.<sup>309</sup> However, he also exhorted them to stand firm by calmly refusing to give in to the threats and sanctions of their spouses.<sup>310</sup> Given the cultural context, it is startling that no penalty for a wife’s failure to submit appears anywhere in Scripture.

**Read 1 Pet 3:3–6.** How did Peter encourage wives to adorn themselves? What made Sarah a great example of what Peter was seeking to teach these women? How can women married to unbelievers avoid giving in to fear in living out their faith?

### Living Together with Understanding

*Please note that this post carries a trigger warning*

**c) 1 Pet 3:7–9:** In this letter primarily concerned with how to interact with authority figures prone to oppressing others, Peter addressed husbands last and in only one verse (1 Pet 2:13–3:6).<sup>311</sup> People in Greco-Roman society expected a wife to automatically adopt her husband’s religion.<sup>312</sup> However, a woman may have appeared to embrace her husband’s new faith

<sup>304</sup> Wenham, *Genesis 16–50*, 83.

<sup>305</sup> Brown, Driver, and Briggs, “*shema*”, *BDB*, 1033–4,

<https://archive.org/stream/hebrewenglishlex00browuoft#page/1032/mode/2up>.

<sup>306</sup> Balch, “Early Christian Criticism of Patriarchal Authority 1 Peter 2:11–3:12,” 169.

<sup>307</sup> Balch, “Early Christian Criticism of Patriarchal Authority 1 Peter 2:11–3:12,” 166.

<sup>308</sup> Peter H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 121.

<sup>309</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003), 153.

<sup>310</sup> Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 121.

<sup>311</sup> Schreiner, *1, 2, Peter, Jude*, 159.

<sup>312</sup> Michaels, *1 Peter*, 169.

without experiencing true conversion.<sup>313</sup> Christian husbands could enforce external conformity, such as outlawing the worship of household gods. However, Peter charged them to live counter-culturally, in submission to the needs of their wives (Cf. Eph 5:25–30).<sup>314</sup>

The apostle wrote, “Husbands, likewise, live together with understanding—as with a weaker vessel—with your wife, paying her respect even as co-heirs of the gracious gift of life, that your prayers may not be hindered.” A “vessel” (*skeuos*) can refer to a container, object, or implement (John 19:29; Acts 10:11; 2 Tim 2:20–21). Figuratively, it can mean a person’s body as a housing for the spirit (2 Cor 4:5–10; 1 Thess 4:4).<sup>315</sup>

The Shepherd of Hermas (ca. 100–160 AD) admonished: “Be...long-suffering and prudent and you shall have power over all evil deeds and shalt do all righteousness. For if you are courageous, the Holy Spirit which dwells in you will be pure, not obscured by another evil spirit, but will dwell at large and rejoice and be glad with the body (*skeuos*) in which it dwells.”<sup>316</sup>

The term “weak” (*asthenēs*) can refer to illness, to emotional inadequacy, or to physical frailty.<sup>317</sup> Greco-Roman law and social codes enforced the subordination of women to men, as people considered males inherently superior to females.<sup>318</sup>

According to Aristotle (384–322 BC): “Divine Providence has fashioned the nature of man and of woman for different purposes. For they are distinguished from each other by the possession of faculties not adapted to the same purposes but, in some cases, for opposite ones, though contributing to the same ends. For Providence made man stronger and woman weaker (*asthenes*), so that, in virtue of his manly prowess, he may be ready to defend the home, and she, by reason of her timid nature, may be ready to keep watch over it.”<sup>319</sup>

While praising one woman, the Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BC–40 AD) claimed:

“The minds of women are, in some degree, weaker than those of men, and are not so well able to comprehend a thing which is appreciable only by the intellect...but she, as she surpassed all her sex in other particulars, so also was she superior to them in this, by reason of the pure learning and wisdom which had been implanted in her, both by nature and by study; so that, having a masculine intellect, she was so sharp-sighted and profound.”<sup>320</sup>

Despite that cultural background, New Testament authors give no hint of women as intellectually, emotionally, or spiritually weaker than men (Cf. Acts 16:13–15; Acts 18:24–28; Rom 16:1–12).<sup>321</sup> Paul employed an entirely different word in 2 Tim 3:6–7. He used the diminutive term “little women” (*gynaikarion*) to describe specific people in Ephesus whom false teachers led astray (1 Tim 2:8–15).<sup>322</sup>

<sup>313</sup>Karen H. Jobes, *1 Peter* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 207–8.

<sup>314</sup>Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 122.

<sup>315</sup>Arndt, Danker, and Bauer, “σκεῦος” (*skeuos*), *BDAG*, 927–8.

<sup>316</sup>John Lightfoot, trans., “The Shepherd of Hermas,” in *The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. 2* (ed. J. R. Harmer; London; New York: MacMillan, 1891), 5.1–2, 87, <https://archive.org/details/apostolicfathers02lakeuoft/page/86>.

<sup>317</sup>Arndt, Danker, and Bauer, “ἀσθενής” (*asthenēs*), *BDAG*, 142.

<sup>318</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 67.

<sup>319</sup>Aristotle, “Oeconomica,” Pages 323–426 in *Metaphysics: Books 10–14* (trans. Hugh Tredennick and G. Cyril Armstrong; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935), 1.1343b, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0048%3Abook%3D1%3Asection%3D1343b>.

<sup>320</sup>Philo, “On the Embassy to Gaius,” in *The Works of Philo Judaeus, Vol. 4*, 99–180, 169, <https://archive.org/stream/worksofphilojuda04phil#page/168/mode/2up>.

<sup>321</sup>Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 160.

<sup>322</sup>Arndt, Danker, and Bauer, “γυναικάριον” (*gynaikarion*), *BDAG*, 208.

Furthermore, in the preceding verses, Peter exhorted women married to unbelievers to exhibit strength of character as they adhered to God’s commands. He called them to yield to their husbands’ desires when they could yet live in a manner contrary to Greco-Roman cultural expectations (1 Pet 3:1–6).<sup>323</sup> Consequently, “weaker” (*asthenēs*) in this context most likely refers to physical strength.<sup>324</sup>

The Greek philosopher Xenophon (430–354 BC) wrote:

“Since all work, both indoors and out, demands labor and diligent attention, Heaven, I think, so ordered our nature as to fit the woman for things demanding labor and diligent attention within, and the man for such things as demand them without. Heaven so made their bodies, and set their lives, as to render man strong to endure cold and heat, journeyings and warfare, so laying on him the works of the field; but to the woman, he gave less strength for such endurance, so laying, I think, on her the works of the house...”

“It was made the duty of the woman to guard the things brought into the house; so Heaven, knowing that for the guarding of goods a fearful heart is nothing ill, gave to the woman a larger share of fearfulness than to the man; whilst in the knowledge that he who works in the field must defend himself against all injury, there was given to the man the greater share of courage.”<sup>325</sup>

“Weaker” may also allude to a lack of social standing in a civilization which devalued women (Cf. 1 Cor 1:26–29).<sup>326</sup> Women in the Greco-Roman world—as in ours—remained vulnerable to exploitation.<sup>327</sup> In that culture, the head of a family (*paterfamilias*) held absolute power over his household, even determining whether a member of it should die or be permitted to live.<sup>328</sup>

Therefore, Peter commanded Christian husbands to treat their wives with respect (*timē*) (Cf. Eph 5:33). In fact, he may have expanded that admonition.<sup>329</sup> By writing “live together with understanding...with the female” (*gynaikeios*), rather than the typical term for a wife (*gynē*), the apostle likely included all women in the household.<sup>330</sup> In the Greco-Roman culture, the male head of a household was free to seek sex for pleasure with his male and female slaves, prostitutes, or any unmarried woman. He reserved sex with his wife primarily for procreation.<sup>331</sup>

Demosthenes (384–322 BC) asserted this:

“For this is what living with a woman as one's wife mean: to have children by her and to introduce the sons to the members of the clan and of the [city], and to betroth the daughters to husbands as one's own. Mistresses we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for the daily care of our persons, but wives to bear us legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of our households.”<sup>332</sup>

Greco-Romans expected wives to assent to their husband’s extramarital affairs with

<sup>323</sup> Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 123.

<sup>324</sup> Danker, et al., “ἀσθενεία” (*astheneia*), *BDAG*, 142.

<sup>325</sup> Xenophon, *The Economist of Xenophon* (ed. John Ruskin; trans. Alexander D. O. Wedderburn and W. Gershom Collingwood; Bibliotheca Pastorum; London; Kent: Ellis and White; George Allen, 1876), 7:22–5, 47, <https://archive.org/details/economistofxenop01xenouoft/page/n46>.

<sup>326</sup> Silva, “ἀσθενής” (*ashtenēs*), *NIDNTTE*, 1:420–4, 423.

<sup>327</sup> Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 123.

<sup>328</sup> J. Ryan Davidson, “Family Relations in the First Century,” *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, no pages.

<sup>329</sup> Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 160–1.

<sup>330</sup> Jobs, *1 Peter*, 207.

<sup>331</sup> Roy E. Ciampa, “Revisiting the Euphemism in 1 Corinthians 7.1,” *JSNT* 31, no. 3 (1 March 2009): 325–38, 326, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0142064X08101527>.

<sup>332</sup> Demosthenes, “Against Neaera,” in *Demosthenes with an English Translation* (trans. Norman W. DeWitt and Norman J. DeWitt; LCL; Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1949), 59.122, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0080%3Aspeech%3D59%3Asecti%3D122>.

good will.<sup>333</sup> Typically, when women reached 14–15 years of age they married men close to thirty years old.<sup>334</sup> The sexual abuse of slaves occurred so rampantly that Jewish rabbis ruled that female slaves must have been released by the age of three to marry as virgins. Otherwise, they were “amenable to the accusation of non-virginity” (*m. Ketuboth* 1:2)<sup>335</sup> These religious leaders believed that enough time would pass for the bodies of such women to return to a state as if they had never been violated. They took for granted that a female slave in a Greco-Roman household experienced rape by the age of three.

Men who claim to know Christ must treat those around them with the respect due to people they love.<sup>336</sup> Peter stated that a Christian husband must not be demanding or selfish in his marital relationship. Instead, he should practice consideration and sensitivity as he serves his wife,<sup>337</sup> rendering appropriate honor (*aponemō timos*) to her.<sup>338</sup> This includes expressing respect verbally and exhibiting appropriate deference due to her increased physical and societal vulnerability as “a weaker vessel.”<sup>339</sup>

Christian men who fail to treat their wives lovingly—even where cultural expectations permit authoritarianism—cannot expect God to hear their prayers.<sup>340</sup> Similarly, Paul asserted that abusive behavior is incompatible with a true relationship with the Lord.<sup>341</sup> One of the terms he employed in 1 Cor 6:9–10 (*loidoros*) means “reviler, abusive person.”<sup>342</sup>

Peter described both partners as “co-heirs of the gracious gift of life.” In God’s eyes, a husband and wife share equal standing (1 Cor 7:1–5; Gal 3:28).<sup>343</sup> A man who desires a close connection with God must cultivate a healthy relationship with his wife (Cf. Matt 5:23–24; Matt 6:12–15; James 4:1–12).<sup>344</sup> The Lord shuts his ears to the prayers of abusive people.<sup>345</sup>

Greco-Romans believed that the well-being of a household depended upon the prayers of the paterfamilias to the family gods.<sup>346</sup> Xenophon recalled this statement by Socrates (469–399 BC):

“Heaven is lord of agriculture as much as of war. And in war, I think, you see men propitiating Heaven before setting forth on any warlike enterprise and inquiring there with sacrifices and oracles what they must do and what avoid. And in agriculture, think you there is less necessity to win the favor of Heaven? For, know this well, he added, that good men

<sup>333</sup>Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians*, 71.

<sup>334</sup>Baugh, “Cultic Prostitution in New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal,” 456, [http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460\\_JETS.pdf](http://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/42/42-3/42-3-pp443-460_JETS.pdf).

<sup>335</sup>*Mishnah*, Ketubot 1:1–3, <http://sacred-texts.com/jud/etm/etm120.htm>.

<sup>336</sup>Marshall, *1 Peter*, 1 Pet 3:7.

<sup>337</sup>McKnight, *1 Peter*, 186.

<sup>338</sup>Arndt, Danker, and Bauer, “ἀπονέμω” (*aponemō*), *BDAG*, 118.

<sup>339</sup>Dauids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 122.

<sup>340</sup>Jobes, *1 Peter*, 209.

<sup>341</sup>An official statement of the theologically-conservative Presbyterian Church of America states, “The Committee believes that when there are words and actions on the part of one spouse that threatens the life of the other spouse and/or children, that the one(s) threatened should be counseled by the [elders], or representative thereof, to remove themselves from the threatening situation and the abuser should be urged to seek counsel. Such a procedure will protect those threatened. When the abuser does not cease these words and actions, the [elders] should investigate whether these words and actions are in effect breaking the one-flesh relationship by ‘hating’ the abused spouse and not ‘nourishing and cherishing’ this one (Eph. 5:28–29). In counseling the abuser, the reality of his Christian faith should be ascertained. When it is determined by the [elders] that the abuser does not appear to them to be Christian and the abuse continues, the Pauline teaching about an unbeliever leaving a believer should be applied [1 Cor 7:12–16].” (PCA Digest, “Report of the Ad-Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage.” (To the Twentieth General Assembly, 1992), Appendix 0, <http://pcahistory.org/pca/studies/divorce-remarriage.pdf>, 291–2.

<sup>342</sup>Danker et al., “λοιδορός” (*loidoros*), *BDAG*, 602.

<sup>343</sup>Silva, “γυνή” (*gynē*), *NIDNTE*, 624.

<sup>344</sup>Dauids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 123.

<sup>345</sup>Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 161.

<sup>346</sup>Jobes, *1 Peter*, 209.

offer prayer about every kind of produce—about oxen and horses and sheep—yes, about all that they have.”<sup>347</sup>

Peter alluded to that cultural thought while forbidding domestic violence.<sup>348</sup> According to the apostle, access to God is both the goal and the test of a man’s faith.<sup>349</sup>

**Read 1 Pet 3:7–9.** Why would Peter write this corrective to Greco-Roman Christian husbands? What makes Peter’s threat to men who fail to treat their wives with proper honor and understanding so severe? Compare the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence’s Equality Wheel to the Power and Control Wheel How can you identify a healthy relationship (summary on pp. 85–86)? What constitutes abusive behavior?<sup>350</sup>

### Marriage throughout Redemptive History

9) How would you summarize what God has done for spousal relationships through the process of creation, sin, exile, and redemption? These are the pertinent links:

#### Creation:

Made in the Image of God (Gen 1:26) through Male and Female He Created Them (Gen 1:27)

<sup>347</sup>Xenophon, *The Economist of Xenophon*, 5.19–20, 34–35,

<https://archive.org/details/economistofxenop01xenouoft/page/34>.

<sup>348</sup>Jobes, *1 Peter*, 209.

<sup>349</sup>Edward G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd Ed.* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1981), 188.

<sup>350</sup><http://www.ncdsv.org/images/EqualitywheelNOSHADING.pdf>;

<http://www.ncdsv.org/images/PowerControlwheelNOSHADING.pdf>. Used with the permission of the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence ([http://www.ncdsv.org/ncd\\_about.html](http://www.ncdsv.org/ncd_about.html)).

Not Good! (Gen 2:18) through A Transfer of Loyalty (Gen 2:24)

Naked and Not Ashamed (Gen 2:25)

God Evaluates His Creation (Gen 1:31)

Your summary:

**Sin:**

A World-Altering Conversation (Gen 3:2–5) through Their Eyes Are Opened (Gen 3:7)

A Day of Reckoning (Gen 3:9–13)

The First Good News (Gen 3:15)

An Anguishing Process (Gen 3:16) through Slaves and War Brides (Exod 21:10–11 and Deut 21:10–14)

Your summary:

**Exile:**

God Hates Violence (Mal 2:13–16)

Your summary:

**Redemption:**

Effects of the Fall Reversed (Rom 5:12–21 and Rom 16:1–12) through Living Together with Understanding (1 Pet 3:7–9)

Marital Separation (1 Cor 7:10–11) through Dissolution of Marriage (1 Cor 7:15–16)

Adopted as Sons (Eph 1:5–6)

Your summary: