## Leadership in the Family

### А. Introduction

This material will discuss and seek to answer the question of male leadership in the home. Does the husband have authority as final-decision maker in family affairs (the traditionalists’ position), or are husband and wife co-equal in authority (the egalitarians’ position).

The theology of relationships in marriage must be studied in the overall context of Christian virtue. No matter what else is said on the subject, the biblical instruction concerning love for neighbor will be the overriding guide. Thus the relationship between husband and wife should always be characterized by love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control (Gal 5:22-23). Husbands and wives should always be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, just as God in Christ also has forgiven them (Eph 4:32). Marriage partners should be patient, kind, not jealous, not brag, not be arrogant, not act unbecomingly, not seek their own, not be provoked, not to take into account a wrong suffered, not rejoice in unrighteousness, but rejoice with the truth, bear all things, believe all things, hope all things, and endure all things (1 Cor 13:4-7).

Specific biblical instruction about marital relationships must never be used as justification for violating these fundamental principles of Christian behavior. In fact, the need for authoritative rule in the home is greatly minimized when these virtues are practiced. Lea and Griffin write, “When these prescribed biblical attitudes between husband and wife prevail, there will be little (if any) need for resorting to God’s intended order for establishing authority within the home.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

At the same time the Bible’s insistence on observing these and other principles does not automatically exclude the concept of leadership in the home.[[2]](#footnote-2) They can all be observed in the context of a hierarchical relationship. Leadership *per se* is never equated with oppression or favoritism and is itself one of the spiritual giftings God gives to the church. Love and leadership are not mutually exclusive. Adoption into God’s family ushers us into the closest of relationships, which makes it possible for us to address our Father as “Abba.” Yet, at the same time we recognize Him as Lord and God.

### B. The Old Testament Witness

We begin our investigation at the beginning, examining the book of Genesis and God’s creation order.[[3]](#footnote-3) Our first major passage for consideration, Gen 1:26-28, gives us God’s basic plan for humanity. Here the word אדם (*adam*) refers to humanity in its entirety.[[4]](#footnote-4) In light of the context of Genesis 1, we can conclude that אדם (*adam*) was created as the last and greatest of God’s creation, alone possessing the divine image. אדם (*adam*) was to serve as God’s agent in managing the earth. Next, we see that אדם (*adam*), or humanity, consists of men and women: “Male and female he created them.” Both are created in God's image and are co-commissioned to carry out the work of populating and subduing the planet, the divine image providing both of them with the competence to rule. This corporate work of populating and subduing will thus require the cooperation of all the members of the human race, both among sexes and between sexes. In light of the Mosaic authorship of this passage, one can see in it a corrective toward those (as in the ancient world) who ascribe to woman a lower status than man before God or creation.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Genesis 2 presents us with a somewhat different perspective on the man-woman relationship than chapter one. The passage in question is Gen 2:18-24. It is found in a context where man begins the work of managing God's creation – he is placed in the garden to keep it. Yet, God observes that man is not at his best alone – he needs a helper to accomplish his task, one who will join him as a co-worker in fulfilling the divine plan.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Several features of the passage have led many commentators to conclude that male leadership is taught or at least implied by this passage. First, the woman being brought to the man and his choosing her name is thought to reflect a position of male leadership in the relationship.[[7]](#footnote-7) Additionally, that the man assumes the name, אדם (*adam*), that previously designated all humanity, again may underscore his leadership role.[[8]](#footnote-8) Also significant is the order of creation – man was created first and initially entrusted with the keeping of the garden. Subsequently, woman is created as a “helper” for man. Finally, when the first couple sins, God seeks out Adam, as head of the relationship, to answer for their behavior (Gen. 3:9, 11).[[9]](#footnote-9) God holds Adam primarily responsible for the failure in the garden, reflecting that the primary responsibility was his to manage its affairs.[[10]](#footnote-10)

However, the narrative is also careful to introduce factors that provide needed checks and balances in the proposed hierarchical system. Genesis 2:20 reveals that woman was “suitable for man.” This phrase translates the Hebrew כנגדו (*kinegdo*) which is literally “corresponds to man.” The similarity of names, איש (*ish*) and אישה (*ishah*) in Genesis 2:23, also point to this correspondence. As Matthew comments, “Adam responds by a shout affirming that he and the woman, indeed, are made up of the same ‘stuff.’”[[11]](#footnote-11) Many also see significance in the act of woman’s creation from the rib (side) of man. Keil and Delitzsch write, “The woman was created, not of dust of the earth, but from a rib of Adam, because she was formed for an inseparable unity and fellowship of life with the man.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

Girdlestone expresses the same thought, “Instead of being isolated and without a fellow, having God far above him, and the beasts of the earth below him, Adam found that he had a companion of a nature congenial to his own, ‘a help.’”[[13]](#footnote-13) Thus man is never to regard woman as inferior by nature. She is his equal in nature and dignity. A similar “check” in the system appears in Genesis 2:24, where the man will leave father and mother to cleave to his wife, becoming one flesh with her. This interdependence between the marriage partners, notably his dependence on her, can potentially deter the man from abusing his position of leadership.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Several objections have been raised in defense of the idea that only the egalitarian presentation of the sexes in Genesis 1 is normative for all time. First, it is claimed that the purpose of chapter 2 is not to teach the subordination of wives to their husbands, but simply to emphasize the woman’s likeness to man in distinction from the animals.[[15]](#footnote-15) Our preceding paragraph, in fact, points out most of the textual markers that lead to this conclusion. Indeed, the thrust of the text does appear to be woman’s congeniality with man.

Yet, this does not exclude the presence of secondary themes in the text. As discussed in an earlier paragraph, other items from this text also suggest male leadership in the relationship. We also note that this conclusion does not depend on Genesis 2 alone. God’s holding Adam responsible for the couple’s failure in the garden in chapter 3 also supports this conclusion. One might also make the observation that in the order of creation mentioned in Genesis 1:26 the man is mentioned first – a point that alone proves nothing, but is nonetheless consistent with the tenor of chapters 1-3, which, as a whole, points to male leadership. Additionally, as we will see in our examination of the New Testament, New Testament authors saw the theme of male leadership in Genesis 2 in spite of its contextual thrust of congeniality between the sexes.

It is also claimed that since the Genesis narrative progresses from lower degrees to higher degrees of precision and complexity, as is clear in chapter 1, then woman must be superior to man, being created after him.[[16]](#footnote-16) While we must recognize this progression in the narrative, extending it to the relationship of women and men violates other, clearer contextual markers pointing to the woman’s subordinate position.[[17]](#footnote-17) Also, after Genesis 2:3 a new context begins. The progression noted in Gen 1:1-2:3 does not necessarily apply to the next context. In fact, no evidence of its existence can be seen.

At the same time, the opposite objection can be made – if man’s creation before woman indicates male leadership, than the beasts’ creation before humans must indicates their headship over them. Of course, the second is not true. But if not, then male leadership based on creation order is also suspect. In response to this objection, Matthew writes, “The sense of the entire narrative makes it indisputable that all human life is superior to the lower orders. It is *within* the human family that leadership-fellowship is indicated in the garden account.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

A more substantial objection is that God created Adam and Eve at different times to show that it was not good for man to be alone, not to demonstrate headship in their relationship.[[19]](#footnote-19) This explanation is supported contextually, since God is addressing Adam’s isolation when he creates Eve. Here, though, we return to the discussion of an earlier paragraph, where it was claimed that the secondary theme of male leadership, even though not the main contextual thrust of Genesis 2:18-25, is strongly implied by a number of features throughout the first three chapters. Adam, as first created, acts in a leadership role in naming the animals, naming the woman, and being held responsible for the couples’ disobedience. In the New Testament, Paul felt the creation order had ramifications for male leadership (1 Tim 2:13).

Some have suggested that the woman being taken from man’s side reflects their equal authority in the marriage relationship. However, first we note that varying interpretations have been offered for this phenomenon, revealing the difficulty in determining the significance of woman being taken from man’s “side.”[[20]](#footnote-20) Paul alludes to Genesis 2:22-23 in Ephesians 5:28-29: “So husbands ought also to ﻿﻿love their own wives as their own bodies (allusion to Gen 2:22-23). He who loves his own wife loves himself; for no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it.” In this passage, Paul considers the creation of woman from man’s body (side) not as an indication of equal authority, but as a stimulus for the man to care deeply for the woman.[[21]](#footnote-21) It is also significant that in the same Ephesian context, Paul describes the relation of husband to wife by a different bodily relationship – the husband as head of the wife. Matthews likely summarizes best of all the significance of woman’s creation from man’s side: “The symbolic significance of the ‘rib’ is that the man and woman are fit for one another as companions sexually and socially.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Similarly, Thompson insightfully notes that the reuniting of the couple in marriage to become “one flesh” in part reverses their separation in creation. The event, then, does not appear to address issue of authority as much as of intimacy.

In respect to the use of the term אדם (*adam*) both for man and humanity, Groothues feels that this simply reflects a nuance of Hebrew language and has no real theological significance.[[23]](#footnote-23) Her observation does point out the linguistic complexity of the question, since it is likely that Adam did not speak Hebrew, and that the terms which designated man, woman, and human at that time are unknown to us. At the same time, a survey of languages in general (at least European languages) shows a consistent correspondence between the terms for man and for humanity,[[24]](#footnote-24) with some exceptions where they are different terms.[[25]](#footnote-25) It appears that only rarely does a designation for woman correspond to the term for humanity.[[26]](#footnote-26) More language families need to be included in this analysis, of course, but our data here does suggest the possibility that the correspondence between the terms “man’ and “human” reflect an original correspondence between these terms in the primal language of Eden. In addition, the standard approach to interpretation is to accept the words of Scripture as inspired in their original languages in spite of the fact that they may be translating an earlier account in a different language. Thus we commonly interpret and analyze the words of Christ recorded in Greek, accepting them as verbally inspired, although it is most likely that He spoke Aramaic. Thus, the word choice in Hebrew is significant for interpretation.

A more formidable objection in respect to this word correspondence is that אדם (*adam*) was used for both man and humanity because man was originally the only member of the human race – אדם (man) was אדם (humanity) until Eve was made.[[27]](#footnote-27) This claim finds support in the observation that in the Old Testament as a whole, אדם (*adam*) is used primarily when humans are contrasted with creation, while איש (*ish*) is used when man is contrasted with woman. Thus אדם (*adam*) may indicate more humanity’s domination over creation than man’s leadership over woman.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Both the traditionalist’s and egalitarian’s explanations of אדם (*adam*) have merit. The most one can say in defense of traditionalism here, then, is that their interpretation is consistent with the idea of male leadership, but is not a strong proof in favor of it.

Egalitarians offer another explanation for Adam’s naming Eve as well. It is felt that the first instance, where he calls her “woman” (Gen 2:23), is not naming as such, but just a means of identifying her.[[29]](#footnote-29) Adam does not give her a personal name until after the Fall (Gen 3:10). It is also noted that usually the noun “name” appears in a formulistic way in other occurrences of naming (Gen 2:19f; 3:20; 4:17, 25, 26, 5:2).[[30]](#footnote-30) Therefore, in woman’s case, this is not to be considered an official exercise of authority of the namer over the named.

Yet, the presence or absence of the noun “name” is inconsequential in face of the fact that Adam did assign to her a designation. Also, since this event is recorded immediately after Adam names the animals the impression is clear that it was part of the same process and an exercise of his authority. Also notable is that Adam did not give the animals personal names at this time either, but more likely gave them more general designations by class, as he did subsequently to the woman in 2:23.

Another debated point is the referent for the term כנגדו (*kinegdo*), “corresponding to.” Egalitarians feel it may refer to correspondence in authority.[[31]](#footnote-31) However, there is nothing in the context that inherently makes this interpretation preferable to the one advanced above – that woman corresponds to man in nature and dignity.

Egalitarians also suggest that the lack of a reference to male authority in Genesis 2:24, where marriage was first instituted, is significant. Instead of picturing man in an authoritarian light, he cleaves to his wife and becomes one flesh with her.[[32]](#footnote-32) Still, the lack of reference to the husband’s authority in this passage does not nullify or minimize other such references that do affirm it, which occur both before and after this passage.

Egalitarians explain the fact that God spoke to Adam first after the sin in the garden by noting that he was the first created and knew of the sinfulness of the act before Eve did.[[33]](#footnote-33) Yet this assumes that the command was somehow difficult to understand, and required some time to assimilate. But the command was extremely simple, so Adam had no advantage over Eve by virtue of his knowing of it earlier.

In regard to woman as “helper,” egalitarians point out that the word itself does not connote inferior status, since seventeen of its twenty Old Testament occurrences describe God’s helping man.[[34]](#footnote-34) It is conceivable in human relationships as well to think of helpers who are not under the authority of those they help.[[35]](#footnote-35) At the same time the term “helper” indicates that the one being helped has the primary responsibility to accomplish a certain task. This responsibility may not necessarily imply authority over those who help, but it does indicate that the responsible party will be making the final decisions in regard to how the project is carried out. Groothues objects that even if woman’s role as helper is understood in this way, it should only then apply to the husband’s work life, not necessarily his home life.[[36]](#footnote-36) Yet the nature of Adam’s work – filling and subduing the earth – is too comprehensive to make such a distinction meaningful.

Finally, egalitarians note that all the items above are inferences – no text directly says that woman was created in subordination to man. This omission appears more significant in the light of the fact that direct references are found to God’s authority over man (Gen 2:16) and to humankind’s authority over creation (Gen 1:28).[[37]](#footnote-37) In response, it can be said that the number of inferences is nonetheless significant, and their accumulated weight appears significant enough to lead to a conclusion. Also, when we look later at New Testament teaching it will show that the apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, drew the same conclusions about male leadership from some of the inferences mentioned above.

The Fall of humanity and subsequent curse brought about negative changes that would hinder mankind in accomplishing its mission. Nature will fight people’s efforts to subdue it. The woman will have pain in multiplication. The Fall also had certain implications for the marriage relationship. Addressing Eve, God says, “Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you” (Gen 3:16). Several interpretations are offered for this verse. Before introducing them, a brief glance at some features of this passage will be helpful.

Two key words in the passage require comment. The word translated “desire,” תשוקה (*tishuka*), is found only three times in the Old Testament (Gen 3:16; Gen 4:7; Song of Sol 7:11). In Song of Solomon 7:11, the meaning is clearly desire for intimacy between a man and a woman. In Genesis 4:7, the context requires the interpretation “desire for mastery/control.” The other key term is משל (*mashal*), “rule, master.” TWOT, in discussing this term, correctly relates that it is non-specific, and one cannot discern a special nuance of rulership, whether kind or cruel, on the basis of this term’s usage alone: “*Māšal* usually receives the translation ‘to rule,’ but the precise nature of the rule is as varied as the real situations in which the action or state so designated occurs.”[[38]](#footnote-38)

The proposed interpretations of Genesis 3:16 are as follows:

1. In spite of the pain that will accompany childbirth, woman will continue to feel sexual desire for her husband. This option links the phrase “your desire will be for your husband” to the previous lines about pain in childbirth. The conjunction beginning the clause would thus be translated as a concessive “yet.” This statement would not be understood, then, so much as part of the curse, but as a statement that the reproductive process will be preserved in spite of the pain it will cause.[[39]](#footnote-39) One problem here is that the subsequent phrase “you husband will rule over you” seems out of place in a discussion purely of a woman’s reproductive process. One suggested solution is that a homonym for משל (*mashal*), meaning “be like,” be preferred. The resulting translation, “he will be like you,” would then reflect the reciprocal sexual desire of the man for the woman.[[40]](#footnote-40) Yet משל (*mashal*) as “be like” appears only in derivative stems, whereas it is used here in its basic form (*qal*).[[41]](#footnote-41)
2. The woman’s desire for her husband will be not only sexual, but emotional as well. She will become heavily dependent on him, leading to his domination in the relationship.[[42]](#footnote-42) Her over dependence is a fit punishment for the independence she demonstrated in eating the fruit.[[43]](#footnote-43) One problem with this interpretation is that the woman’s condition is hard to characterize as punishment if her desires promote her submission to her husband. Submission is punishment only when it is unwilling.[[44]](#footnote-44) One response is that the husband will sometimes take advantage of her passiveness to treat her abusively.[[45]](#footnote-45)
3. The woman’s desires will be “to her husband” in the sense that her desires will correspond to his. She will intuitively adopt all his desires and become passively submissive to his leadership.[[46]](#footnote-46) Yet this explanation hardly corresponds to reality. Wives often have desires contrary to their husbands.[[47]](#footnote-47) One response is that this is not a statement of future fact, but a reminder to the wife of her ongoing state of submission to the husband.[[48]](#footnote-48)

1. The woman will desire to control or master her husband, and he must seek to rule over her in spite of her tendency to insubordination.[[49]](#footnote-49) This interpretation is based on a similarity between Genesis 3:16 and Genesis 4:7. Commentators note that the exact wording (except for changes in gender and person) in Genesis 3:16 appears in Genesis 4:7:

וְאֶל־אִישֵׁךְ֙ תְּשׁ֣וּקָתֵ֔ךְ וְה֖וּא יִמְשָׁל־בָּֽךְ

for your husband will be your desire, and he will rule over you (Gen 3:16)

וְאֵלֶ֙יךָ֙ תְּשׁ֣וּקָתֹ֔ו וְאַתָּ֖ה תִּמְשָׁל־בֹּֽו׃

for you is its (sin’s) desire, but you must rule over it (Gen 4:7)

If the exact wording in these passages, not far from one another in the text, reflects similarity in meaning, then Eve’s desire to control her husband will be similar to sin’s desire to control Cain. Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 share other similarities: they both use the same preposition “for” (אל) in distinction from the preposition “for” (על) in Song of Solomon 7:10, where תשוקה (*tishuka*) means not desire for control, but sexual desire.[[50]](#footnote-50) Additionally, the Septuagint translators translate תשוקה (*tishuka*) in Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 with a single Greek term ἀποστροφή (*apostrophe*), but with a different term, ἐπιστροφή (*epistrophe*), in Song of Solomon 7:10.[[51]](#footnote-51) On the other hand, Genesis 3:16 and Song of Solomon 7:10 have an important common factor – they both discuss relationships between men and women, whereas Genesis 4:7 does not.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Another factor counts in favor of this fourth interpretation: the personal pronoun הוא (hu), positioned at the head of the second clause, indicates a contrast between the clauses: “You will want to rule him, but he will rule you.”

One objection is that such a reading describes a curse not to the woman, but to the man, who must attempt to rule an insubordinate wife. The curse on the man does not begin until verse 17.[[53]](#footnote-53) Yet the situation entails a painful conflict for the woman as well.[[54]](#footnote-54) Another objection is that the curse for man and woman concern propagation (of plants or people), and that the issue of headship would be intrusive on the context.[[55]](#footnote-55) Yet there is no reason to assume that the curse must only concern propagation.

The most substantial objection is the observation that each curse is accompanied by a subsequent explanation or elaboration on it: the serpent crawls on his belly (14a) – consequently he will eat dust (14b); enmity between man and serpent (15a) – consequently the serpent will have his head crushed (15b); the ground is cursed (17a) – consequently man will toil for food (17b-19a); man will die (19b), – consequently he will return to dust (19c). Likewise, childbearing will be painful (16a), yet the woman will still sexually desire the man (16b).[[56]](#footnote-56) Another weighty objection is the observation that the desire to usurp authority is an expression of human rebellion, the effect of sin itself on human character.[[57]](#footnote-57) The other curses concern changes in nature that complicate life.

In regards to the character of man’s rule over the woman several options are offered:

1. Man’s headship over woman, which existed from the beginning, is intensified – what was once a loving, gentle leadership has the potential to become insensitive and domineering. In support of this proposition, it is noted that other curses complicate an already preexisting relationship: the serpent’s means of movement, the woman’s ability to bear children, the man’s success in raising crops.[[58]](#footnote-58) This is not to be understood, however, as justifying a husband’s abuse of his wife. It is not a command to abuse the wife, but simply describes the consequence of the Fall.[[59]](#footnote-59)
2. The relationship of headship-subordination between man and woman in introduced for the first time in the passage, and is purely a result of the Fall.[[60]](#footnote-60) Groothues notes that, in distinction form other curses, there is nothing in the passage itself about male rulership that describes it as a pre-existing condition – it simply abruptly states, “He will rule over you.”[[61]](#footnote-61) She thus compares male headship as a whole with divorce, which God permitted in the Old Testament because of hardness of heart (Matt 19:8).[[62]](#footnote-62) Cassuot sees in 3:20, the naming of Eve, Adam’s first act of dominion over his wife.[[63]](#footnote-63) Yet, one must note that Adam had already named “woman” in Genesis 2:23. In addition, the discussion of male leadership before the fall provides weighty arguments in favor of the idea that it was part of God’s plan from the start. Knight also notes that the New Testament writers never attribute male leadership to the Fall, but they do appeal to creation order.[[64]](#footnote-64)
3. As mentioned above, it has been suggested that משל (*mashal*) be translated “be like.”[[65]](#footnote-65) It that case, male dominance is not in the picture at all in Genesis 3:16. Still, even if the idea of male dominance in absent in this passage, it little effects one’s conclusions, since the primary question at hand is what God’s order was before the Fall, not the conditions that ensue after it.

After examining the arguments advanced above, the second position concerning the nature of woman’s desire, and the first option concerning man’s headship appear most convincing. Woman’s desire for and dependency on her husband are increased after the Fall. Fallen man will at times take advantage of her vulnerability and abuse his power. This is not, however, the first introduction of male leadership into the marriage relationship, but its exacerbation and potential distortion of a preexisting hierarchical relationship. Furthermore, it does not justify abuse by the male. The potential for abuse, in spite of its inevitability, must be opposed and striven against, like all other aspects of the curse on humanity.

The fourth option concerning the nature of woman’s desire, that the woman desires to overthrown male leadership, also has fair support, although it is mostly indirect and little derived from the context itself. Nonetheless, the fact that women struggle with male leadership is a fact of life and likely prompted the apostles to devote considerable attention to this question in the New Testament. Yet, the issue of insubordination, although present in other contexts, is not conclusively demonstrated in this one.

As the Genesis narrative continues, many of the features we have noted above are seen in practice, along with some unfortunate deviations. Men continue to represent their families before God. This is evident in God’s covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob concerning their descendants and His calling of Noah to construct an ark for the salvation of both his and the entire future human family. Isaac becomes intercessor for his wife in regard to her barrenness, and God answers his prayer (Gen 25:21). Jacob demonstrates that the husband must lead not only in good times, but when the family is threatened with danger as well, as he places his wives and children safely in the rear of his company as he goes ahead to meet Esau, his estranged brother (Gen 32:2-3). Women in the Genesis narrative, in general, adopt a helping role. Besides childbearing and child raising, they manage the home (e.g. Gen 18:6).

The results of the Fall predicted in Gen 3:16 are also manifested. Leah’s desperate attempts to win Jacob’s heart (Gen 29:31-34) manifested an exaggerated “desire” for her husband. The husband’s potential abuse of his wife is realized as both Abraham and Isaac subject their spouses to humiliation by giving them to other men (Gen 20:1ff; Gen 26:6-11). Another unfortunate practice also appears. In Genesis 4:19, Lamech becomes the first polygamist. The results of polygamy, as recorded in Scripture, are universally negative – envy, jealousy, and abuse are repeatedly encountered (e.g. Gen 16:3ff; 29:1ff. See also Jud 11:2ff).

In the area of male leadership, a significant qualification can be noted – the woman becomes a channel of divine counsel for her husband and thereby serves in yet another way as his “helper.” In particular, God commands Abraham to heed Sarah’s counsel concerning Hagar, and even employs her (unjustifiable) jealousy of Hagar and her son to separate the true heir, Isaac, from his potential rival, Ishmael (Gen 16:2; 21:9ff). This instance presents an interesting contrast to God’s rebuke of Adam for listening to his wife in that Abraham is commanded to do just that.[[66]](#footnote-66) Adam’s problem, then, was not in listening to his wife, but in putting her counsel above the clear command of God. The fact that Eve offered advice was not wrong, but rather the content of her advice was wrong. On the other hand, Sarah did not always give good counsel to Abraham – she gave him Hagar as a wife (Gen 16:2).

In another even more striking example, God reveals his plan for Esau and Jacob not to Isaac, but to Rebekah (Gen 25:23). Unfortunately, Rebekah feels compelled to use deception to secure the blessing for the chosen son (Gen 26:5ff). One might imagine that if Rebekah had shared her revelation with her husband (and if Isaac had been open to receive it), the sad scene of Genesis 26 might have been avoided. Additionally, Rebekah wisely counsels her husband about sending Jacob away to seek a wife.[[67]](#footnote-67) Finally, Jacob shows respect for the counsel of his wives in asking their advice before abandoning Haran for Canaan (Gen 31:1-16).

Later in the Torah, old features are repeated and new elements added. Moses leads his family through the transition from wilderness shepherding to delivering God’s people (Ex 4:20), an arrangement that Zipporah does not always appear pleased with (Ex 4:24). For an unspecified reason (either because of her complaining or for her protection) Moses parts with his wife for a time until his return from Egypt (Ex 18:2). Another example of men protecting their wives is seen when the men of Gilead leave their wives and children in Gilead while they cross over with the other tribes to complete the conquest of Canaan (Num 32:26). Male leadership has very negative consequences for the wives of Dathan and Abiram, as they and their entire households perish with their husbands in their rebellion (Num 16:27ff).[[68]](#footnote-68)

Looking to the Law of Moses, it is significant that the husband had the right to nullify his wife’s vows (Num 30:6-8). This appears to demonstrate male priority in decision making in the home. Other stipulations in the Law of Moses protect the individual partners of the marriage relationship or the relationship itself. The couple is guaranteed an extended honeymoon – the husband is exempted from military service for the first year of marriage (Deut 24:5). Although a man is permitted to divorce his wife, he is forbidden to take her back again if she had subsequently remarried (Deut. 24:1-4). On the one hand, a jealous husband could subject his wife to the “test of bitter waters” to determine is she had been unfaithful (Num 5). On the other hand, penalties were enacted for falsely accusing one’s wife publicly of sexual misconduct (Deut 22:13ff). A final stipulation of the Law reveals that there are at times higher priorities than support for one’s spouse, as the husband is to participate in the execution of his wife if convicted of leading God’s people into idolatry (Deut 13:6).

In the pre-monarchical period we again encounter both some commendable and some not so commendable examples of martial relations. On the positive side, Elkanah comforts his wife Hannah because of her barrenness (1 Sam 1:3-8). He also allows her the freedom to determine the future of their son Samuel (1 Sam 1:21-23), thereby delegating authority to her. In another instance, Elimelch leads his wife Naomi to Moab to escape the famine in Israel and thereby provides for his family (Ruth 1:1).

On the other hand, one of the most horrid examples of abuse occurs as a man, in order to save his own life, gives his concubine over to a mob (Jud 19:25), thus failing to take the leadership role when danger was at hand. In a similar way Samson’s wife, when faced with danger, fails in her role as helper to her husband – she betrays his secret, the solution to his riddle (Jud 14:15-18).

We also see further development in the wife-as-counselor theme. First of all, Othniel’s wife wisely counsels her husband to obtain a field from her father Caleb (Josh 15:18). Samson’s mother receives the revelation from an angel concerning her son’s future (Jud 13:2ff) and shows more discernment than her husband in interpreting the revelation (Jud 13:22f).

A new element is introduced in the pre-monarchical period – a wife called to ministry. Deborah, wife of Lappidoth, served as judge and prophet in Israel many years (Jud 4:4).[[69]](#footnote-69) Thus the Scriptures give precedence for a woman’s involvement in ministry independent from her husband.[[70]](#footnote-70) In the Deborah narrative, another example of female heroics is encountered, as Jeal, the wife of Heber, plans and executes the slaying of Sisera, the captain of the enemy forces, as he was fleeing from the armies of Israel.

Next, we will examine the monarchical period. In contrast to the cowardice of the concubine’s husband mentioned above, David and his men battle to recover their wives, children, and property from raiders (1 Sam 30:3). As for a wife’s heroism – Michal protects David from Saul, who planned to kill him (1 Sam 19:11-17). Uriah demonstrates that at times there are higher priorities than marital bliss, as he refuses to sleep with his wife out of sympathy for his fellow soldiers still at war (2 Sam 11:11). In other instances, David shows solidarity with his wives – he recovers Michal, whom Saul had separated from him (2 Sam 3:12-14), and comforts Bathsheba after the death of their first son (1 Kin 11:1ff).

This period of biblical history again showcases instances of womanly advice, some helpful and some not so helpful. On the positive side, Bathsheba reminds David of his promise to make Solomon king after him (1 Kin 1:15ff). In addition, although not in a marriage context, a “wise woman’s” counsel saves an entire city (2 Sam 20:16-22), and a wise woman of Tekoa counsels king David (2 Sam 14:1-20). On the negative side, Solomon’s marriage to foreign wives results in their leading him into idolatry, causing the ruin of both him and his kingdom (1 Kin 11:1ff). Although the date of this event is unknown, Job’s wife’s famous exclamation, “Curse God and die,” is another example of very bad advice (Job 2:9).

Another significant occurrence in this period is when Abigail, acting in the best interest of her husband, but against his wishes, sends David the supplies Nabal had refused him, thereby saving the latter’s life (1 Sam 25:18-35). At the same time, Abigail’s respect for her husband’s honor is demonstrated in that she waits for an appropriate time to reveal to Nabal the ominous results of his foolish choice (1 Sam 25:36-37).

Most likely written during the monarchical period, the wisdom literature often speaks to the marriage issue. Proverbs describe the virtuous wife in terms of godly character: she fears God (Prov 31:30) and is charitable (Prov 31:20). Other commendable character traits include strength (Prov 31:17, 25), wisdom (Prov 31:26), dignity (Prov 31:25), and optimism (Prov 31:25). She is hard-working (Prov 31:16, 18, 24, 27), especially in domestic affairs (Prov 31: 13, 15, 19, 21, 22), “building up her house” (Prov 14:1). Her industry and character bring benefit and honor to her husband (Prov 31:12, 23; 12:4) and result in her praise (Prov 31:28-31). The husband is to consider a good wife a gift from God (Prov 19:14; 18:12), and to enjoy her in marital faithfulness (Prov. 5:15-19). The Song of Solomon celebrates marital love, but at the same time the Preacher of Ecclesiastics cautions that sexual relations alone are not enough to bring full life satisfaction (Ecc 2:8).

One negative note is sounded in the wisdom literature. Frequently we hear of the scourge of a contentious wife, who is not able to reconcile herself to being under her husband’s headship (Prov 21:9; 19:13; 21:19; 25:24; 27:15-16). This is a significant observation for the issue of egalitarianism – the contentious wife is not hailed as a reformer in her male-dominated society, but is presented in a negative light.

The period of the divided kingdom will be examined next, in which we encounter more negative than positive examples. First, Jeroboam shirks his leadership role by sending his wife to Elijah to inquire about their son’s health (1 Kin 14:1-4). Several instances can be cited of a wife’s leading her husband into idolatry or other sin: Jezebel leading Ahab into Baal worship (1 Kin 16:31ff; 21:25), and arranging the murder of Naboth and seizure of his property (1 Kin 21:11ff); Ahab’s daughter leading Jehoram of Judah into idolatry (2 Kin 8:18; 2 Chr 21:6); and the Israelite wives practicing idolatry in Egypt after fleeing the Babylonian conquest. In this last instance their husbands openly defy the prophets warning, which condemned the idolatrous practices of their wives (Jer 44:15).

One positive example of a wise woman can be found in this period – the Shunammite suggests to her husband that they provide housing for the prophet Elisha and is greatly blessed as a result (2 Kin 4:8ff). Additionally, we find a second example of a woman in ministry independent from her husband, as Huldah, wife of Shallum, serves as a prophetess in Israel (2 Kin 22:14ff).[[71]](#footnote-71) Of note also is that Isaiah’s wife apparently served in prophetic ministry along with her husband (Is 8:3).

A final observation from this period is that the families of men in prophetic ministry sometime encounter unusual stresses – Isaiah is prophetically directed to give his children unusual names (Isa 8;1ff), and Ezekiel is instructed not to mourn for his recently deceased wife (Eze. 24:15ff).

We complete our survey of marital relationships in the Old Testament with a look at the post-exilic period. A major issue at this time was that of mixed marriages with foreigners. Learning from mistakes of the past, the leaders of Israel insist on marriages within the commonwealth to prevent the influx of unhealthy practices through the influence of foreign wives (Ezra 9-11; Neh 13:23ff).

One happy exception, however, was Esther’s marriage to the king of Persia. Demonstrating great tact and perseverance (in contrast to her predecessor Queen Vashti), Esther is able to bring the king to the realization of his mistake in opposing Mordecai and the Jews, and to secure his full support in their defense (Esther 4ff; 8:3; 9:11-13). Esther’s wise behavior can be contrasted with that of Haman’s wife, who at first advises her husband to hang Mordecai (Est 4:14), then heartlessly predicts his downfall for attempting it (Est 6:13). Another example of a wife’s wise counsel in this period is when Belshazzar’s wife counsels her husband to call for Daniel to explain a riddle (Dan 5:10).

A pleasant, but unexpected development also occurs at this time – God reveals his attitude about divorce and abusive treatment of the wife. God hates divorce (Mal 3:16f), and will not accept the offerings of those who deal faithlessly with their wives (Mal 3:13ff).

Other miscellaneous observations can be made. The builders of Jerusalem are motivated by love of family to fight their opponents (Neh 4:14). Wives along with their husbands complain about usury in Judah (Neh 5:1). During the eschatological repentance of Israel, wives will mourn separately from their husbands (Zech 12:12-14). Between the testaments, according to Longenecker, the status of women in Israel fell significantly, likely due to the influence of Hellenism.[[72]](#footnote-72)

In summarizing the Old Testament witness, we can say the following. Although we do not encounter a specific command for the wife to be submissive to her husband, several factors do point to male leadership in the home. Adam gave Eve her name and answered to God for humanity’s sin. God characteristically appealed to the husband as the representative of the home (e.g. Noah, Abraham, etc.). In addition, the Bible does not praise women who oppose their husband’s leadership (i.e., the “contentious woman”), but denounces them.

We also conclude that the curse of the woman in Genesis 3:16 did not introduce a new leadership structure in the home, i.e., the wife’s subordinate position, but rather warned that the husband in his fallen state will sometimes abuse his God-given authority to mistreat his wife.

Throughout the Old Testament narrative, we see a stable picture of male leadership in the home. Yet, we encounter instances where wives do give good counsel from the Lord that their husband should heed. At times, they demonstrate competence in leadership as well – they served as prophetesses and once as a judge. Yet, women leaders are not mentioned without reference to their husbands, which may indicate their subordinate position within their family units.

### C. The New Testament Witness

**1. Gospels and Acts**

Moving on to the New Testament, we encounter a radical change in attitudes toward women in the ministry of Christ. Jesus greatly raised the level of women in his time and treated women equally with men in teaching and discipling them.[[73]](#footnote-73) In contrast to rabbinic thought of His day, Jesus preferred that women studied God’s word than did housework (Luke 10:38-42).[[74]](#footnote-74)

In His specific teaching on marriage, Jesus reminds us again that dedication to God and His kingdom take priority over family loyalties (Lk 18:29). Families may actually divide over issues of faith (Matt 10:34-36). This means that at times a wife will disobey her husband if it involves a compromise of Christian faith. At the same time, Jesus did nothing to annul the Old Testament pattern of male leadership. Echoing God’s attitude toward divorce expressed in Malachi, Jesus forbids divorce except in cases of adultery (Matt 19:3ff; Mk 10:2ff).

Egalitarians, noting Jesus’ more liberal attitude toward women, feel this reflects God’s will for woman’s total liberation from male leadership in home and society. Jesus, it is felt, did not take His reform farther in His own time out of concern for jeopardizing His overall mission of redemption.[[75]](#footnote-75) This is speculation, though, since Jesus did not say or do anything to indicate that He secretly held a totally egalitarian position.

The relationship of Joseph and Mary deserves special attention. On the one hand, Joseph respected the special calling given to Mary and the ramifications it will have for his personal life (Matt 1:24f). This reminds us of the special callings Deborah and Huldah received in the Old Testament, which certainly affected their marriage and family lives.[[76]](#footnote-76) On the other hand, God respected Joseph’s leadership in their family and guided him through dreams (Matt 1:20; 2:13f, 22).

In the Gospels and Acts, wives again can provide both wise and unwise counsel. Pilate’s wife warns her husband about condemning Jesus (Matt 27:19), while Herod’s wife instigates the execution of John the Baptist (Matt 14:6-11). In an apparently concerted effort, Ananias and Sapphira conspire together to deceive the church (Acts 5:7ff).

The Gospels and Acts also record a number of instances where the wife demonstrates greater spiritual insight than her husband. Elizabeth, for example, quickly understood and embraced God’s plan for the birth of Messiah’s forerunner, whereas her husband initially doubted (Lk. 1:8ff, 59-63). Luke points out how women, perceiving the significance of Jesus’ mission, became His supporters and followers apparently independent of their husbands (Lk 8:3; 23:27; Acts 1:14). All the Gospel writers observe that women were the first witnesses of the resurrection, and that the male disciples all doubted.

Lydia was the first believer, not only in her family, but in all of Europe, and became instrumental in leading her family to the Lord (Acts 16:14ff).[[77]](#footnote-77) It is also notable, that in Acts both Aquila and his wife Priscilla are considered Paul’s co-workers in ministry, and Priscilla is usually mentioned first, possibly indicating a leadership role in ministry (Acts 18:18, 26; Rom 16:3; 2 Tim 4:19). It is also likely that Junias (if indeed a female name) served as an apostle in the Roman church along with her husband (Rom 16:7).

**2. Galatians 3:28**

Moving on to the epistles, we encounter here the most vital texts for understanding our question. Our first passage (proceeding chronologically) is Galatians 3:28. This verse appears to openly declare the removal of all racial, social, and gender distinctions in Christ. A strong emphasis is placed on gender in this verse – Paul uses the words ἄρσην (*arsen*) **and θῆλυς (*thelus*), words specifying male and female gender.** Thus Paul does not say there are no men or women in Christ (as persons), but no male and female (as distinctions). **Both of these adjectives are in the neuter as well, again avoiding the nuance of personality. Another interesting feature is that the other couplets are joined by the conjunction οὐδε (*oude*), i.e., “or,” but male and female by και (*kai*), i.e., “and.” It is thought that this conjunction, as well as the words** ἄρσην (*arsen*) **and θῆλυς (*thelus*), allude to the identical construction in Gen 1:27.**[[78]](#footnote-78)

Paul’s context here is salvation by faith alone without the need for circumcision or observance of Jewish law. Now that Christ has come, the tutelage of the Law has ended. Adoption into God’s family depends now not on national origin, but on imitating the faith of Abraham.

The primary interpretive problem here is which gender distinctions are removed in Christ, and which, if any, remain. A common understanding, based on the context, is that salvation (and, correspondingly, baptism) is available for all regardless of race, gender, or social standing. George writes, "What Paul was really saying is this: ‘As far as your being joined to Christ Jesus is concerned, there is no difference between how this takes place for Jews and Gentiles, for slaves and free men, for males and females; you are all just like one person in being joined closely to Christ Jesus.”[[79]](#footnote-79) Yet role distinctions in marriage (and possibly in church) remain intact.

Others object that this passage must be understood as nullifying all gender distinctions (except, of course, physical).[[80]](#footnote-80) It is argued that if men and woman are spiritually equal in Christ, then that should be reflected in equal roles, status, and authority.[[81]](#footnote-81) It is also noted that the relationship of children to parents is not listed here, since that authority structure must remain in place. Nevertheless, subordination of women to men and slaves to masters ends in Christ.[[82]](#footnote-82) Egalitarians are ready to recognize different levels of authority on the basis of spiritual giftings, but not on the basis of gender. The first excludes only individuals, because not all are so gifted, while the latter excludes an entire class, as if inability to rule the family was inherent to all women.[[83]](#footnote-83)

Later passages, in which Paul appears to reinstate gender distinctions, are to be understood as concessions to the status quo of societal norms out of concern for effective evangelization. Passages such as 1 Corinthians 9:19–23 and Acts 21:26 underscore that Paul’s general strategy was to become “all things to all men” in order to save some. Paul discusses circumcision, slavery and marriage again in 1 Corinthians 7:17-31 and obviously makes concessions to the status quo in the first two instances – Jews should not be concerned about their previous circumcision, and slaves are not to worry about their slavery – one can serve God in spite of these circumstances.[[84]](#footnote-84) It is assumed that the same applies to gender distinctions – they are simply the status quo that one must put up with until a time of reformation comes. Since societal norms in our day permit female leadership, there is no reason to continue to observe the previous norm of submission in marriage.

In response to the above claims, a few points should be made. First, the context of Galatians 3:28 addresses only salvation and only supports the concept of equality in relation to God. Generalizing the passage to apply to all areas of gender distinction is conjecture and without support from the surrounding context. Galatians 3:28 can be compared with 1 Peter 3:7, where the husband, although having authority over the wife (1 Pet 3:1), is to regard her as his equal in Christ, or, in Peter’s words, as a “fellow heir of the grace of life.”[[85]](#footnote-85) Second, the claim that later passages about submission in the home are culturally relative cannot be decided until those passages are examined themselves in their own context. One can freely admit that Paul used cultural accommodation in evangelization, but whether or not he considered the wife’s submission a culturally relative issue is a separate question. Third, we note in 1 Corinthians 7:25-31 that Paul’s “concession to culture” in reference to marriage did not consist of counseling wives to submit to husbands for the time being, but he addressed instead issues of divorce and singleness. Paul’s only “concession to culture” in this passage is that it is all right to get married if you are single.

Other important differences exist between the couplets in Galatians 3:28. God’s choice of Israel over the Gentiles as heirs of His kingdom was already reveled in the Old Testament to be temporary. Also, slavery was not instituted in Eden as part of God’s creation order, and Paul spoke in favor of freedom for slaves (1 Cor 7:21; Philemon),[[86]](#footnote-86) although, as egalitarians rightly assert, his agenda was not to change the social order in this respect. In distinction from Gentile exclusion and slavery, however, family relationships were established as part of God’s creation order, and no other text suggests that that order has been or will be abolished in this age.

There is likely an eschatological reference in Galatians 3:28 to the fact that in the age to come gender distinctions will completely cease to exist (Matt 22:30). Consistent with Paul’s “in Christ” theology, not all that the believer possesses in Christ is attainable in this life. Our “completeness in Christ” (Col 2:10), bodily resurrection in Him (1 Cor 15:22), and full experience of our new creation in Him (2 Cor 5:17) await us in the eschaton, although we can enjoy the foretaste of them now.[[87]](#footnote-87) In a similar way, women enjoy equality in Christ in regard to their relationship with Him, but will not enjoy freedom from all gender distinctions until “Christ, who is our life, is revealed” (Col 3:4).[[88]](#footnote-88)

**3. 1 Corinthians 7 and 11**

The next passages written concerning our question are in Paul’s first epistle to the Corinthians. In chapter 7, he gives detailed instruction about divorce and sexual conduct. It is noted in verses 2-5 that a woman has authority over her husband’s body, and visa versa, and that periods of abstinence are to be agreed on mutually. Here, it is felt, the ideal pattern for marriage is displayed, where decisions are reached mutually by partners of equal authority.[[89]](#footnote-89) However, it is conjecture to assume that this instruction applies to all areas of decision making in the home and not simply to this one situation. The context does not allow such a generalization. The fact that Paul devotes several verses to describing the husband’s and wife’s equal authority in this regard creates the impression that this was an exceptional case which required special explanation and substantiation.

Even more central to the question is Paul’s discussion of male-female relations in chapter 11. It is generally accepted that the words γυνή (*gune*) and **ἀνήρ (*aner*) used here, which are also the words for “wife” and “husband,” refer to men and women in general. Such features as the lack of the article before** γυνή (*gune*) **or possessive markers with ἀνήρ (*aner*), the attributive “every man” in verse 3, the reference to man coming from woman in verse 12, and the reference to natural order in defense of head coverings all support this conclusion.**[[90]](#footnote-90)

**Other features, though, point more specifically to the husband-wife relationship: the woman disgracing “her head” likely refers to her husband, the woman being created ‘for man” applies primarily if not exclusively to marital relations, and Paul, in other places, uses ἀνήρ (*aner*) only to describe a husband. For the sake of our discussion, though, whether** γυνή (*gune*) and **ἀνήρ (*aner*) refer to woman and man or husband and wife is not crucial, since what is being said about men and women in general in this context will certainly apply to wives and husbands in marriage.**

**A more crucial discussion is Paul’s meaning when he says that man is the “head” of the woman (11:3). The Greek word here is κεφαλἠ (*kephale*). This word, in the great majority of its uses, refers to the literal, physical head. However, it has metaphorical applications as well. Commentators debate the following as possible metaphorical meanings in this passage: head as authority, head as most prominent member, and head as source. A survey of major Greek lexicons produces varying results. The standard Greek lexicon from classical times on, Liddell-Scott-Jones, mentions prominence and source, but not authority.**[[91]](#footnote-91) **The standard biblical Greek lexicons, BAGD and Louw-Nida, mention prominence and authority, but not source.**[[92]](#footnote-92) **Other leading biblical Greek lexicons, EDNT and Grimm-Thayer, also fail to mention “source.”**[[93]](#footnote-93)

**Wayne Grudem offers further criticism on κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as “source” in ancient Greek. He notes that Liddell-Scott-Jones provides only two references for κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as “source,” and that both are questionable. One reference dates back to 500 B.C., much earlier than the New Testament text, and may be understood as “first” as well as “source.”**[[94]](#footnote-94) **The other reference is to the head (source) of a river.**[[95]](#footnote-95) **On the other hand, the** Mickelsens object that BAGD’s reference to **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as “authority” is based on only one reference, which dates back to only 500 A.D.**[[96]](#footnote-96)

**Grudem’s more extensive investigation of 2,336 instances of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) in Greek literature revealed that 49 times (16% of the instances of the metaphorical use of the word) the meaning was “authority”; but he found no instances of “source.”**[[97]](#footnote-97) **Thiselton agrees with Grudem’s critique of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as source, but wonders if his instances of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as “authority” might not better be understood as “prominence.”**[[98]](#footnote-98) **Payne, on the other hand, cites two passages in Philo and another in a second century A.D. work** Artemidorus Daldiani where **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*)** means “source,”[[99]](#footnote-99) and Thiselton cites an early first century A.D. letter from Seneca to Nero describing the “head” (Nero) as a source of health and well being.[[100]](#footnote-100)

**Some appeal also to the understanding of human physiology in ancient Greece – was the brain understood as the source of life or the control center for the body? Thiselton claims that one can find both understandings of the brain’s function in ancient Greece.**[[101]](#footnote-101)

**Another way to understand the meaning of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) is how it is used in the Septuagint, where it translates the Hebrew ראש (*rosh*). In most occurrences, ראש (*rosh*) is physical head, but 180 times it metaphorically indicates “leader.” Of note is that in 104 of those instances ראש (*rosh*) as “leader” is translated not by κεφαλἠ (*kephale*), but by ἄρχοντος (*arhontos*)** or a derivative.[[102]](#footnote-102) Only between 8-18 times does **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*)** translate **ראש (*rosh*)** in this metaphorical sense.[[103]](#footnote-103) The clearest example is likely Judges 11:6-11. Also significant is that **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*)** is never used as “source” in the Septuagint.

From the evidence presented above, it appears that a first-century reader could have understood **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) in any of the three metaphorical senses listed earlier, authority, prominence, or source, yet evidence for the third variant is the weakest.**

**When we look at the other metaphorical occurrences of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) in the New Testament, the following is observed. Prominence in rank or importance in clear in Colossians 1:17-18, where the phrase “that He Himself will come to have first place in everything” is key to understanding how He is “head of the church.” Prominence in rank or importance is also the meaning in a variant reading of Acts 16:12 (mss D). “Head” as physical prominence is seen in 1 Peter 2:7 and its parallels. Ephesians 4:15 appears to hold up the “head” as an example to follow or goal to aspire to. In addition,** the Mickelsens rightly note that the notion of spiritual growth follows in the next verse, connected to v. 15 by the relative pronoun “from whom.”[[104]](#footnote-104) Thus, **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*)** as “source” could be suggested here. Source is the most likely connotation in **Colossians** 2:19 as well. Finally, **“head” as authority is clear in Colossians 2:10 and Ephesians 1:22. Thus, we see in the New Testament corpus evidence for κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) in all three aspects under debate – authority, prominence, and source.**

**Other arguments in favor of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as source, head, or prominence have been advanced based on the context of this passage. A key factor is the relationship of the man’s headship with the headship of Christ and God, which are placed in parallel in 1 Corinthians 11:3. Some feel all three relationships speak of “source.” Christ is the source of man, as creator, man is the source of the wife, God is the source of Christ in incarnation (Jn 8:42).**[[105]](#footnote-105) **The order, then, is chronological.** Adherents of egalitarianism claim that if hierarchical relationship were in view, the order would be God-Christ, Christ-man, man-woman.[[106]](#footnote-106)

**One difficulty with κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as source here, however, is the claim that Christ is the head of “every” man – Christ does not individually create every man, but He is Lord of each. Another problem is that in each case, “source” must be understood differently: Christ is the source of man’s entire being; man is only the medium God used to create woman, and God is the source of Christ only in the sense of sending. If κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) is understood as “authority,” this difficulty is lessened. Although the authority relationships between these three pairs is not exactly parallel, the essential feature of “authority” as “leadership” is still preserved in all three. Also in support of κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as “authority” is the parallel passage in Ephesians 5:23, which is the only other mention of man’s “headship” over woman (or wife). Here, as will be demonstrated, the issue is clearly leadership.**

**The following context, however, does support κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as source. Christ’s headship of man and man’s headship of woman (v. 3) is the basis for man’s not covering his head and woman covering hers (vv. 4-5). After the parenthetical verse 6, the discussion continues about the rationale for head coverings, but this time in terms of image and glory (vv. 7-8). Women should cover their heads because they are glory of man and have originated from him. One could easily argue that the rationale in v. 3 and v. 7-8 are the same. Consequently, headship is an issue of glory and origin.**[[107]](#footnote-107)

**Verse 9, as conventionally translated, could potentially support κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as authority since woman being created “for” man can imply leadership. However, it is noted here that “for” translates δία (*dia*), which, with the genitive, usually, if not always, means “because of,” not “for the benefit of.”**[[108]](#footnote-108) **Woman being created “because of man” could relate simply to the order of creation and thus parallel v. 8, without connotations of submission.**

**Another pertinent feature of the context is the phrase in v. 10 that “woman ought to have authority on her head.” Translators usually insert the phrase “a symbol of” to give the sense that she is under her husband’s authority. It must be noted, however, that in all the other 31 New Testament occurrences of the phrase “has authority” (ἔχειν ἐζουσίαν), it is the subject of this predicate construction who has the authority. It is felt, then, that the woman’s authority (to pray and prophecy) is spoken of here.**[[109]](#footnote-109)

**Yet, the verses surrounding verse 10 complicate this understanding. Verses 8-9, which are the basis for v. 10 (connected by δία τοῦτο), emphasize the woman’s origin from man. It is hard to imagine how woman’s origin from man could serve as the basis for her having (and displaying on her head) authority. It is easier to understand her needing a sign of her husband’s authority on her head (v. 10) because of her origin from man (vv. 8-9). Thus, “she is to have (a symbol of) authority” is the better contextual reading. In confirmation of this conclusion, we note that verses 11-12 are concessive – they reassure the wife that in spite of male leadership, the marital relationship is far from one-sided.**[[110]](#footnote-110) **In addition, Grudem notes that head coverings symbolized male authority in the culture of the day and would have been so understood by the readers of 1 Corinthians.**[[111]](#footnote-111)

**The above paragraph demonstrates an important point – woman’s origin from man implies his authority over her. This is significant both for our understanding of v. 3 and for our understanding of Genesis 2. Although sufficient evidence exists for either claim – that κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) could mean “source” or “authority” in v. 3, and may imply both – yet in v. 8-10, we see that the idea of source implies authority. Man is woman’s source, and by virtue of that, he is also her authority. Relating this conclusion to Genesis 2 provides support for the proposal that male leadership was part of the original creation order, where woman’s originating from man is first described.**

If a sense of **κεφαλἠ (*kephale*) as leader is present in v. 3, it provides great inspiration for the wife in regard to her submission to her husband.** God the Son, being equal in nature and dignity with the Father, voluntarily submits to His authority. The Holy Spirit, in fact, submits to both Father and Son. It is misguided to conclude that submission indicates inferiority, since the Scriptures teach the full Deity of Christ and the Spirit and, at the same time, their voluntary subjection to the Father’s will and plan.

**4. Ephesians 5:22-33**

The next key passage is Ephesians 5:22-33. It is the second passage in which we encounter the phrase that the husband is head of the wife. Paul uses the same terms that he did in 1 Cor 11:3 – γυνή (*gune*) as woman, **ἀνήρ (*aner*) as man, and κεφαλἠ (*kephale*)** as head. Yet, here the issue is clearly the marital relationship, so we appropriately translate **ἀνήρ (*aner*)** as husband and γυνή (*gune*) as wife.

In this passage, Paul makes clear that headship is related to authority and submission. The headship clause in v. 23 begins with the conjunction γαρ (gar), that is, “for,” indicating that it serves as the basis for what precedes. Verse 22 instructs the wife to submit to her husband, and verse 23 explains why – because her husband is the head. Consequently, headship in this context must be understood in terms of leadership-submission. Additionally, the husband’s headship of the wife is compared with Christ’s headship of the church (v. 23) and the church’s corresponding submission to Him (v. 24).

At the same time, some features in the context may give the idea of headship here a second sense, more resembling the head as “source.” The phrase “He Himself {being} the Savior of the body” runs in apposition to the preceding phrase “as Christ also is head of the church.” Appositions usually explicate what precedes, and following that general rule, Christ’s headship, then, must also be related to His saving work. Although it is rightly noted that the husband is not his wife’s savior, it is also mistaken to understand this as an extraneous addition by Paul, unrelated to the contextual issue of marital relationships. In Paul’s instructions to the husband, in fact, one encounters exhortation to demonstrate the same sacrificial love that Christ showed in His saving work.[[112]](#footnote-112)

In relation to the above, scholars debate the significance of the contrasting conjunction ἄλλα (*alla*), “but,” in v. 24. Those who feel that the appositional phrase, “He Himself {being} the Savior of the body,” is unrelated to the husband-wife discussion see this contrasting conjunction as a means to return to the main topic.[[113]](#footnote-113) It could also serve as transition from the idea of headship as source, introduced by the phrase “He Himself {being} the Savior of the body,” back to the discussion of headship as leadership, as shown in the words following, “as the church is subject...” etc. A paraphrase of the entire section would go something like this:

Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord, for the husband is the head (leader) of the wife, as Christ also is the head (leader) of the church (He Himself also serving as head in another capacity – as Savior of the body). However, returning to the leadership question, as the church is subject . . .

Some attempt to emphasize head as “source” in the passage to the exclusion of head as “leader.” Evans, for example, points to the proximity of this context to chapter 4, where Christ is head in the sense of “goal” and “source,” in comparison to a more distant context, chapter 1, where Christ’s headship is definitely authoritative.[[114]](#footnote-114) Such attempts are, on the basis of the arguments advanced above, unjustified. They are also unnecessary. Leadership and provision are in no way contradictory and do not exclude each other in the marriage relationship. As long as we do not exclude the concept of leadership, we can affirm with Groothues that the man’s headship is a “life-giving headship.”[[115]](#footnote-115)

Having established the connection between headship and leadership-submission, the next task is to determine what Paul means by submission. The term used here is ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*), which is the ordinary word for submission and used to describe submission of children to parents, slaves to masters, citizens to government, people to God, church members to leaders, and demons to disciples. Even though, as Lincoln points out, submission may take on a different character in each of these examples,[[116]](#footnote-116) nonetheless the element of leadership and authority connoted by this term cannot by bypassed.

It is well noted that ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*) is in the middle-passive voice (middle preferred). This indicates that submission by the wife is her initiative and done voluntarily as unto the Lord.[[117]](#footnote-117) The Scriptures give no mandate to the husband to subdue his wife or demand her obedience.[[118]](#footnote-118)

Some writers have noted a distinction in Paul’s instructions to wives in comparison with what he says to children and slaves. The later must obey (ὐπακοὐω – *hupakouo*) their parents and masters, but this term is not used in respect to the wife (the same phenomenon is noted in the Colossians parallel). The significance of the distinction is not clear, but it is unlikely that ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*) carries no connotation of obedience in this context.[[119]](#footnote-119) Obedience is the core element of submission. As Lincoln writes, “This is to drive a wedge between terms that are frequently synonymous.”[[120]](#footnote-120) They are used synonymously, for example, in describing the wife’s submission in 1 Peter 3:5-6, where the word ὐπακοὐω (*hupakouo*) describes Sarah’s obedience to Abraham.[[121]](#footnote-121)

As in the case of 1 Corinthians 11:3, it is helpful here again to compare the wife’s role in the home with Christ’s role in the Trinity. We have already mentioned that Christ’s submission to the Father, according to 1 Cor 15:28, appears to extend into eternity. It is significant that the same word ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*), describing the Son’s submission to the Father, is also used to describe the wife’s submission to the husband.[[122]](#footnote-122) This observation, as in our comparison of the Father’s headship of Christ with the man’s of woman, demonstrates that submission need not imply inferiority – no more that Christ is inferior to the Father.

Verse 21 also contributes to our understanding of the wife’s submission. Verse 22 is elliptical (missing a verb), and so the verbal sense of the verse, translated “be subject,” is derived from the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*) of verse 21. In this verse believers are encouraged to be subject “to one another (ἀλλήλος - *allelos*).” Two views exist on the meaning of verse 21. Some feel the verse simply introduces the following household code, which then spells out how submission of believers is to be worked out unilaterally in relation to wives, children, and slaves only. They note that nowhere in Scripture is the husband told to submit to the wife, masters to slaves, or children to parents. In addition, they claim the term ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*) requires an ordering “under” (ὑπο) something, and therefore does not permit reciprocity. The reciprocal pronoun is understood not in a reciprocal, but in a unilateral sense. Instances are cited where ἀλλήλος (*allelos*) has this more unilateral sense.[[123]](#footnote-123) Therefore, the verse can be paraphrased, “Be subject to those among you who are in authority over you.”

On the other hand, others see in this verse a true reciprocity. In support of this option, it is noted that the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*) of verse 21 is part of a string of participles, which describe the results of being “filled with the Spirit” in v. 18.[[124]](#footnote-124) The other items in this string of participles are all incumbent for all believers (speaking, singing, making melody, giving thanks). In fact, a reciprocal pronoun (this time ἐαυτοις - *eautois*) appears in v. 19, “Speaking to one another (ἐαυτοις) in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.” Also in support of this view is the observation that the pronoun ἀλλήλος (*allelos*) is a virtual Christian code-word for mutual care, concern, and cooperation (Eph. 4:25; John 13:34, 35; 15:12, 17; Rom. 1:12 are just a few examples). In addition, other New Testament passages hint at the idea of mutual submission as well (Phil. 2:3-4; Gal 5:13). Especially notable is Peter’s charge in the context of church leadership, “Clothe yourselves, all of you, with humility toward one another” (1 Pet 5:5).[[125]](#footnote-125)

In view of the above, it does appear that Paul is encouraging mutual submission between believers. This is not to be understood, however, as nullifying the clear instruction that follows about submission in the home, or as abolishing leadership roles in the church. Verse 21 alone cannot carry that much doctrinal weight so as to overthrow numerous other verses that qualify it. It is better to understand Paul’s instruction here in the same sense of Peter’s – that those in leadership positions are to “clothe themselves in humility” before their subordinates and be open to hearing from God through them. The numerous Old Testament and New Testament examples of how the wife wisely counseled her husband are examples of the kind of valuable input she can give.

Another possible way to reconcile mutual submission with male leadership is to view the husband’s sacrificial love and service of the wife, also described in Ephesians 5, as his expression of submission to her. As Evans explains, the command to love has an aspect of submission – a willingness to give up personal preferences for the sake of others.[[126]](#footnote-126) Lincoln sums up this view, “In this writer’s vision of Christian marriage what is called for from wives is complete subordination to complete love.”[[127]](#footnote-127)

We must also determine the meaning of the phrase that a woman should submit to her husband “as to the Lord.” It could possibly refer to her attitude in submission – she does it as unto the Lord. This understanding is supported by the subsequent comparison of how the church submits to Christ. Or, the phrase could indicate the degree of submission – only to that degree that is appropriate in the Lord. Since both ideas are true and supported elsewhere in Scripture, it is not imperative to decide between these two options. They both describe God’s will for the believing wife. Thus, submission to the husband is never absolute. At times, it is necessary to “obey God, rather than men.”

Viewing this passage from a historical perspective is also very revealing. In the Hellenistic Jewish and Greco-Roman world, “household codes” also existed, which were in many ways similar to those found in Scripture. In particular, they prescribed submission of wives to husbands, slaves to masters, and children to parents.[[128]](#footnote-128) It is often felt that such secular parallels indicate that the church was simply accommodating to societal norms in their instructions for order in Christian marriage, and that these are therefore not abiding norms for all time.

Although similarities exist, there are also significant differences between the secular and scriptural household codes. For Greeks, the overriding purpose of household order was to promote the welfare of the State, a concept foreign to the biblical injunctions.[[129]](#footnote-129) As mentioned above, the New Testament instructions are based not on secular, but on spiritual, and uniquely Christian principles.[[130]](#footnote-130) In the New Testament accounts, children, slaves, and wives are addressed directly and considered independent moral agents. In the other lists, they are generally mentioned only as objects to be controlled.[[131]](#footnote-131) Requiring reciprocal obligations from those in authority was another distinction of New Testament thought.[[132]](#footnote-132) Furthermore, in antiquity women were expected to assume the religion of their husband.[[133]](#footnote-133) The New Testament, however, warns that the gospel will divide households (1 Cor 7:15-16). Thus, the Christian attitude toward wives, as described in the New Testament household codes, was in fact considered quite liberal for its time.[[134]](#footnote-134) The fact that the Paul was advocating radical alterations in attitudes toward women here speaks against the understanding that he was simply accommodating culture.

In addition, in the Ephesian passage there is no contextual clue that Paul’s is advocating merely cultural accommodation in his instructions to husbands and wives.[[135]](#footnote-135) He bases his instruction for couples on the assertion of man’s headship over the woman in God’s creation order and on the model of Christ and the church. His instructions for children also have a permanent basis in the fifth commandment.[[136]](#footnote-136)

In contrast, Paul’s instruction to slaves is not based on some external abiding principle – they are simply to serve their masters (as long as they served them) as they would serve Christ. Consequently, one could envision, based on the texts themselves, a time when master-slave relations could be different than they were at Paul’s time, even abolished altogether. Melick aptly sums up this discussion, “When servants are servants (and masters are masters), these guidelines pertain. When children are children (and parents are parents), these guidelines remain. Likewise, when a woman is a wife (and a man is a husband), this is the order God expects. Of course, when other situations occur, such as when servants/slaves are freed, a different set of guidelines are appropriate.”[[137]](#footnote-137)

Mounce makes another insightful observation about the issue of cultural accommodation: “While the issue of cultural accommodation is too large to discuss in detail here, it is hard to believe that the apostle Paul, if the picture of him in Acts and through his writings is to any degree accurate, would teach something that he believed was false. While he may voluntarily have altered his behavior, may have had Timothy circumcised but not Titus, may have become weak for the weak (1 Cor 9:22), this is different from teaching error. For example, while he instructs slaves to be obedient to their masters, he never teaches that slavery is right.”[[138]](#footnote-138)

Neither was Paul limited in his teaching by his cultural background or rabbinic training. Even Evans, writing from a basically egalitarian position, affirms that Paul “was quite willing and able to go against the normal cultural pattern if necessary.”[[139]](#footnote-139) Those who claim that Paul was simply a product of his age and not able to break out of the patriarchal mindset of his time underestimate the capabilities of a man who likely had deeper insight into the plan of God than any of his day, and possibly of all time. The man who was “caught up to the third heaven” and “heard inexpressible words, which a man is not permitted to speak,” who received a thorn in the flesh because of the “surpassing greatness of the revelations” can hardly be classified as a partially reformed rabbi. As we read the works of the inspired apostle, we, as the Ephesian believers before us, can “understand (his) insight into the mystery of Christ” (Eph 3:4).

Judging from the passage in context, then, and the character of Paul himself, it is highly unlikely that cultural accommodation was his agenda in his instruction to married couples in Ephesians 5. Similarities with secular household codes, then, are better understood as the result of God’s general revelation of order in society being preserved (although imperfectly) in secular society, whereas the Scriptures, by virtue of special revelation, give a more perfect description of God’s plan. It is a fallacy to claim that observing similar features both in society and in the church necessarily means the church was accommodating to culture.[[140]](#footnote-140) Melick affirms, “The end result is an authority (the Bible) which is no authority since at any place where the culture differs with express biblical commands the Bible will be perceived as secondary to culture.”[[141]](#footnote-141) Helpful also is Melick’s comment, “By what standard is the culture to be measured? Is the twentieth-century cultural pattern the norm, or could it be that the Bible intends to correct the modern scene at this point, as it does at many others?”[[142]](#footnote-142)

The presence of these household codes, in fact, may indicate not an accommodation to culture, but a warning against unhealthy cultural influences. Evans makes the observation that there are no specific Old Testament commands about submission of the wife as there are in the New Testament. She concludes that this is because the practice was universally accepted and never challenged. The fact that the New Testament specifically prescribes this behavior may indicate that believing wives were beginning to abandon this tradition. Evans speculates that believing wives were influenced in this way not only by their new freedoms in Christ, but also by egalitarian tendencies among elite women in Greco-Roman culture of the 1st century.[[143]](#footnote-143) If her conclusions are correct, then the household codes were written not to accommodate cultural tendencies, but to oppose them.

A passage closely related to the Ephesian text is Colossians 3:18-19. The essential issues are the same, and so our treatment of the Ephesians passage will address most of them. As in Ephesians 5, adherents of egalitarianism propose that in Colossians 3 again Paul was seeking to accommodate secular norms for the sake of evangelistic ministry. Of special note in this passage is Paul’s use of the impersonal verbs ἀνῆκεν (*aneken*), “it is fitting,” and εὐάρεστον (*euareston*) “it is pleasing,” which were used by Stoic philosophers as well.[[144]](#footnote-144) This common vocabulary is thought to indicate Paul’s borrowing his content from Stoic texts. However, we can refer back to our discussion on Ephesians 5 to refute the idea that Paul is accommodating to culture in either of these passages. In spite of two instances of common word usage (which is insufficient to prove literary dependence), here, as in Ephesians 4, “nothing in the passage itself suggests even remotely that this was a temporary command for a specific situation.[[145]](#footnote-145)

In Colossians we again encounter the issue of Paul’s phase “as is fitting in the Lord.” The key word ὡς (*hos*), “as,” can serve as comparative particle, meaning “in such a way as is fitting in the Lord,” thus limiting the husband’s authority by the higher standard of obedience to God. Or, it could be taken as a “marker introducing the perspective from which a pers., thing, or activity is viewed or understood as to character, function, or role,” that is “because it is fitting in the Lord.”[[146]](#footnote-146) Our discussion of Ephesians 4 applies here as well – both are applicable in the setting of Christian marriage.

**5. Pastoral Epistles**

We move on now from Paul’s prison epistles to the Pastorals. First, we will examine 1 Timothy 2:9-15. In one sense, this text is not as useful for our discussion since the issue at hand in women in church ministry. Yet two elements in this passage are important for our investigation. First is Paul’s instruction in v. 12 that woman should not teach or have authority over a man. If this instruction is taken to forbid women from filling leadership roles in the church, then it would likely have ramifications for authority relationships in the home as well. The most problematic feature of this text is the word translated “authority.” The common word, έξουσία (*exousia*), is not used, but a rare form, αὐθεντέω (*authenteo*). Because of the rarity of this word’s usage (and its theological importance in this passage), its meaning is much debated. The word appears to be originally based on the idea of aggression. Therefore, it is often thought to refer to an aggressive, domineering use of authority.[[147]](#footnote-147)

The main question is whether Paul was forbidding women all exercise of authority and teaching ministry over men in the church, or just their teaching men in a domineering way. The first is more probable based on the syntax of the passage. In order for the two verb “teach” and “exercise authority” to function as a hendiadys (equivalent or complimentary in meaning), they would need to approximate each other in the text. Instead, they are separated from each other by five words. [[148]](#footnote-148) Another difficulty is the conjunction οὐδε (*oude*), “or,” stands between them, thus signifying that two distinct activities are involved.

A less commonly encountered suggestion is based on the research of Dr. Catherine Clark Kroeger, who claims that the term αὐθεντέω (*authenteo*) was used in mystery religions for a female figure in the myth who murdered, so that the murdered individual could be reborn. It is proposed, then, that αὐθεντέω (*authenteo*) suggests “rebirth” or “origin.” Consequently, Paul’s meaning here is that a woman shouldn’t teach that man “originated” (αὐθεντέω) from woman, which was a Gnostic teaching. Several difficulties, however, preclude this view. First, Gnosticism was a second century phenomenon, and although certain Gnostic tendencies began earlier, one would have to somehow demonstrate that the specific Gnostic teaching about Adam originating from Eve was in circulation as early as A.D. 60. Second, in the mystery religions the word αὐθεντέω (*authenteo*) itself did not mean “originate,” but “murder.” Likely another word was used in the mystery religions to describe the rebirth that took place after the murder. If Paul had meant to refer to this myth, he would have used the term that described the rebirth, not the term that described the murder.

Third, the theory is built on the speculation that Paul was writing to combat a specific false teaching in Ephesus at this time, yet nothing in the context confirms that conclusion. Fourth, commentators have argued that Paul would most likely have not limited his prohibition of false teaching only to women, especially since all the false teachers mentioned in 1-2 Timothy were men.[[149]](#footnote-149) It is also unlikely that one or several specific woman false teacher(s) were in view due to the lack of the article before the word γυνή (*gune*), “woman.”[[150]](#footnote-150) Finally, one cannot ignore that the conjunction οὐδε (*oude*), “or,” stands between “teach” and “exercise authority,” signifying distinct actions.

Another key section of this passage for our discussion follows in verse 13: “For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve.” Groothues feels that the mention of Adam and Eve (especially about Eve being deceived) is merely meant as an analogy in order to teach that what happened in the garden should not happen again.[[151]](#footnote-151) However, the connecting conjunction γαρ (*gar*), “for,” eliminates that possibility, since it denotes that what follows is the grounds for what precedes. The reason and basis for Paul’s teaching about woman’s leadership in the church is the creation order of Genesis 2. Here, then, we find still another confirmation that the inferences to male leadership in Genesis 2 are not coincidental, but serve as proof that God intended such an order from the beginning. We would hesitate to affirm with Jewel that Paul is simply speaking from his rabbinical background and that his teaching is not always accurate.[[152]](#footnote-152) Such a claim undermines the totally of Scripture as a reliable guide for Christian doctrine and practice.

The final passages in the Pastorals for our consideration are 1 Timothy 5:14 and Titus 2:3-5, which we can investigate together. Many features of the Titus passage concern the domestic life of the Christian family.[[153]](#footnote-153) The passage emphasizes the wife’s love for husband and children, listing these qualities even before “sensible” and “pure.”[[154]](#footnote-154) It also instructs woman to be submissive to their own husbands.[[155]](#footnote-155) We have already discussed the term ὑποτασσόμενοι (*hupotassomenoi*) and its relation to authority in the home, so we will not need to repeat that discussion here.

A new item appears in this list, though, the term οἰκουργός (*oikourgos*), i.e., “workers at home” (BAGD). This term is disputed in the text, since many other manuscripts have οἰκουρός (*oikouros*), i.e., “stayers at home” (BAGD). Metzger and associates prefer the first variant because of much better external support[[156]](#footnote-156) and because of the extreme rarity of the term. Copyists would more likely replace it with the more common tern than visa versa.[[157]](#footnote-157) The difference is significant, since the former term emphasizes the wife’s activity in the home, whereas the latter – her location in it.

1 Timothy 5:14 also encourages the wife’s domestic life, but uses the word οἰκοδεσποτείν (*oikodespotein*), “manage the home.” This word is derived from οἰκος (*oikos*), “home,” and δέσποτης (*despotes*), “master.” Thus, her activity in the home is emphasized over her presence. Mounce’s comments are helpful here, that this instruction “does not require a woman to work only at home (cf. Prov 31), but it does state that she does have duties at home.[[158]](#footnote-158) Mounce’s mention of Proverbs 31 is also instructive, since the wife’s activity in that chapter includes both domestic activity and tasks outside the home.[[159]](#footnote-159) Helpful also is the observation that Paul’s concern in the Timothy passage was that women should be busy in the hone so that they would not spend their time gossiping from house to house (1 Tim 5:13).[[160]](#footnote-160) This was a temptation because few other options existed for women outside the home[[161]](#footnote-161) One could possibly conclude from this discussion that the Scriptures do not forbid the wife’s involvement outside the home as long as she is able to manage the home adequately and provided that her outside labors are productive (unlike the women of 1 Timothy 2).

In distinction from our previous New Testament passages, there exists in Titus 2 and 1 Timothy 5 evidence that Paul was concerned about society’s perception of the Christian marriage. The stated purpose for his instruction to the wife is so “the word of God will not be dishonored.” In 1 Timothy 5, the wife’s good behavior will “give the enemy no occasion for reproach.” Nevertheless, these features need not necessarily be understood as a *concession* to culture. Nothing excludes the possibility that such behavior was esteemed both in secular society and by God and therefore normative for women of all times.[[162]](#footnote-162)

Several features in text, in fact, support this conclusion. The instruction to the wife to be submissive and a worker at home are part of a substantial list of exhortations to believers of different ages and genders (Tit 2:1-10). The other items listed are indisputably normative behavior for all times. It appears somewhat arbitrary to single out submission to husbands and domestic work as concessions to culture while claiming the rest are universal.[[163]](#footnote-163) In addition, Titus 2:3 speaks of older women teaching “what is good” to the younger women, and includes in that “good teaching” submission to husbands and domestic work. The term “good” here refers, as elsewhere in Scripture, to what is good before God and pleasing to him.[[164]](#footnote-164) Moreover, verses 11-14 provide another basis for the instructions that precede it. Besides a concern for the gospel’s reputation, the behavior encouraged in v. 1-10 is a working out of the believer’s redemption – a lifestyle consistent with the gospel.[[165]](#footnote-165)

**6. 1 Peter 3:1-7**

Our final NT passage will be 1 Peter 3:1-7. This passage begins with our fourth encounter with the instruction for wives to be submissive to their husbands. Like the passages in Titus and 1 Timothy 5, a main concern here is how the world perceives the church, in particular how believing wives should relate to unbelieving husbands and influence them for the gospel. The entire context of the book, as Groothues notes, is about Christian living in a hostile environment.[[166]](#footnote-166) Evans feels that Peter’s exhortation is, therefore, for the purpose of avoiding offense to the unbelieving husband, who, according to societal expectations, would expect his wife’s submission.[[167]](#footnote-167) This situation would have already been exacerbated by the fact that the Christian wife had already demonstrated insubordination to her husband in becoming a Christian.[[168]](#footnote-168) Thus, the egalitarians conclude that Peter’s instruction here is a cultural accommodation to the unbelieving word of Peter’s day. Now that society no longer expects a woman’s submission, this teaching is no longer applicable.

Returning to our text, though, we notice that Peter’s instruction was not only for wives of unbelieving husbands, but for all wives: “You wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that *even if* any of them are disobedient to the word…” (italics mine). Furthermore, Peter appeals to Sarah and her obedience to Abraham as an example of the conduct of “holy women of former times.” Thus, Peter regards the wife’s submission as “holy” behavior.[[169]](#footnote-169)

A final debated feature in 1 Peter is his reference to honoring and obeying the king (1 Pet 2:13-17). It is argued that this is a cultural concession, and that submission to kings is no longer required in our day. In a similar way, Peter’s instruction to obey one’s husband in the next chapter can be viewed as culturally conditioned as well, and no longer applicable in societies that don’t require it.[[170]](#footnote-170)

In response, we note that we have already discussed the danger of assigning cultural relativity to a biblical principle without substantial support from the context that this is indeed the case. In none of the passages we have examined is it stated that submission to the husband is *only* for the purpose of the believer’s reputation with outsiders. The likelihood of this simply being an oversight by the New Testament authors is small, since there are at least 4 separate contexts all dealing with the issue of submission, and none of them regulate it purely to cultural accommodation. Additionally, Knight insightfully notes that the principle of obedience to government authority is universally valid. The reign of kings was simple the mode that authority existed in at that time. Notable in this regard are the more general terms for government leaders used in other texts: “every human institution” (1 Pet 2:13); “governing authorities” (Rom 13:1); and “authority” (Rom 13:2).[[171]](#footnote-171)

### D. Remaining Arguments

One argument sometimes voiced is that one can perceive a movement in Scripture from a domineering patriarchal society to a more tolerant patriarchal society. If one extrapolates this tendency one can conclude that God’s ultimate intention is to abolish male leadership entirely.[[172]](#footnote-172) We may object, thought, that the overview of Scripture we just completed showed no substantial change in God’s attitude toward leadership in the home. There is no indication of a movement toward abolishing the male leadership in domestic affairs. The same family order established in Eden is affirmed by the apostles. We can agree, especially based on an eschatological application of Galatians 3:28, that male leadership is not an eternal institution. However, the question is when it will end. Jesus revealed that in the resurrection gender distinctions will be abolished (Matt 22:30). It is best to conclude, then, that God’s order for the home will remain intact until that time.

Speaking more generally about the approach to Scripture employed above, we must insist that it is imperative to base our teaching on what God has revealed and not on speculative assumptions. Any principle of Scripture can be (and usually eventually is) taken to an extreme and can lead to error. Most false teachings in the history of the church are based on solid biblical principles that are embraced, however, with disregard for other factors in Scripture that balance and qualify them.

Another claim is that subordination relates to God’s creation order, but gender equality results from God’s work in redemption. Since redemption has priority over creation, we need to acknowledge submission, but emphasize equality. Sometimes submission in the home, it is felt, is not beneficial for advancing the cause of redemption.[[173]](#footnote-173) Returning to our passage in Titus chapter 2, however, we see that God’s order for the home does not hinder, but rather enhances His redemptive work. Verses 11-14 of that chapter, which speak of the outworking of God’s redemptive plan, are the basis for observing the virtues listed in verses 1-10. Included in that list of virtues is love for husband, love for children, working at home and submission to husbands. These virtues contribute to God accomplishing His goal of “purifying for Himself a people for His own possession, zealous for good deeds” (Tit 2:14).

One apparently formidable objection is outlined in Rebecca Groothues’ “Good News for Women.”[[174]](#footnote-174) She argues that women cannot be considered “equal in nature, but different in function,” which is the favorite cliché among traditionalists. She distinguishes “functional subordination” from “female subordination.” Functional subordination is based on ability and is temporary in nature – it ends when the subordinate party gains sufficient ability to fill the higher role. However, in the case of women, her subordinate role is based on her gender and can consequently never be overcome. Only two conclusions, then, can be reached. In one case, women, being equal in nature and ability, are being held back unjustly from filling roles they are capable for. Thus, they are denied the personal satisfaction participating in leadership could bring, and others are denied the positive contribution they could make on a leadership level. Or, if this charge of injustice is to be avoided, women must be considered incapable by nature to hold leadership positions, and consequently the “equal in nature, but different in function” theory fails.[[175]](#footnote-175)

Groothues feels the first of the options is correct. Women are as capable for leadership as men, and are being unjustly held back. She points out that moral standards among men and women are identical. This indicates that they are both equally competent morally and spiritually. Since leadership roles require moral and spiritual qualities such as wisdom, maturity, and responsibility, a woman cannot be considered less capable for leadership than a man.[[176]](#footnote-176) She also points out that scientific research does not confirm essential difference between the sexes in leadership qualities.[[177]](#footnote-177) Groothues use the same argumentation to refute the traditionalist’s appeal to the Trinity as the model for the Christian home. If Christ is eternally submitted to the Father, then He is either being unjustly held back, or is inferior in quality or essence.[[178]](#footnote-178)

There are several ways this objection can be answered. First, the goal for the Christian is not to seek personal satisfaction, whether through involvement in leadership or by any other means, but to do God’s will. If it pleases God, as our study of Scripture above has revealed that it does, that husbands should have leadership in the home, then the Christian wife will in fact derive the greatest personal satisfaction by knowing that her submission to her husband pleases God.

If it seems that limiting the wife in this way deprives others from benefiting from the positive contribution she could make on a leadership level, it must be remembered, that both in the Old and New Testaments godly women often gave wise counsel to their husband. The wife’s input and participation is not automatically eliminated by her submissive role. It is also erroneous to think that being qualified for a position guarantees participation in it. God’s plan does not always appear logical in this respect. Paul, for example, was eminently qualified for Jewish evangelism (experience, education, passion, vision, contacts). Yet, God sent him instead to the Gentiles, a commission Paul struggled with his entire career (Acts 22:18-21; Rom 9:1-4; 11:13-14).

In addition, we must consider that if egalitarians deem male headship an injustice (that is, the system itself, not the abuses that have often come because of it), we must note at whose door this charge is being laid. If men are to blame for this institution of this system, then egalitarians have a basis to object. However, as our study above has shown, God has instituted the system, then God is being charged with injustice. As Job learned during his trials, it does not work to accuse God of being unfair.

The comparison with Christ’s submission to the Father does not help the egalitarian position either. There is no “injustice” in this arrangement in that, even if the order is eternal, it is voluntary on the part of the Son. It does not necessitate that Christ be inferior to the Father, but rather He is free to choose a subordinate position if He pleases. This does not demonstrate weakness on His part, but rather great strength of character.

Concerning the claim that male leadership implies inferiority of the women – that she is no longer “equal by nature” – the terms used here must be more closely examined. The concept “inferior” requires the existence of a common standard, according to which one is judged “superior” and another “inferior.” What common standard exists between men and women on the level of “nature”? The standard is expressed in the concept “humanity.” Both men and women share a common “human” nature. Yet, of what does human nature consist? The concept “humanity” can be compared with a genus classification in taxonomy. Humanity, like the genus, is defined by all the characteristics that members of that genus have in common. Thus, since men and women are the only members of humanity, humanity is, by definition, those qualities that men and women share completely in common. Consequently, men and women, by definition, must be equal in nature. The man cannot claim to be more human than the woman, or visa versa. On the level of “genus,” they are (and by definition must be) completely equal.

At the same time, it is obvious (at least physically, if not emotionally or spiritually) that men and women are different. These difference in no way effect their equality as humans. They exist not of the level of “genus,” but (roughly speaking) on the level of “species.” It is logically valid and theoretically possible to assert, that the unique combination of qualities in their proper proportion inherent to men make them (in general, exceptions, of course, exist) more capable for leadership. This capability for leadership, however, does not make men more “human” than women. On the other hand, the unique combination of qualities in their proper proportion that inherently make women (in general, exceptions, of course, exist), better nurturers then men do not make them more “human” than men. On the “species” level, differences are expected. There is no common standard here by which one can be considered “superior” and another “inferior” by nature. If, for argument’s sake, we claim that men are inherently better leaders than women, the only claim to superiority a man can make is that he is more “male” than the woman is. If, for argument’s sake, we claim that women are inherently better nurturers than men, the only claim to superiority a woman can make is that she is more “female” than the man. Such claims, of course, are meaningless.[[179]](#footnote-179)

Another objection is as follows. Adherents of egalitarianism often propose that if the topic of male leadership is examined *theologically*, that is taking into consideration the whole biblical picture (especially those elements that are central in God’s plan of redemption), instead of by means of several *proof-texts*, which appear to prescribe male leadership in the home, the conclusion would be clear – equality of authority in the home is considered more consistent with God’s overall plan. This approach to theologizing, however, has inherent dangers since it assumes an inconsistency in biblical teaching that must be overcome by embracing certain principles and rejecting others. Besides violating the evangelical doctrine of plenary inspiration, which guarantees total consistency throughout biblical revelation, it creates the dilemma of needing to establishing criteria for classifying which biblical revelation is important and needs to be preserved, and which is not important and may be ignored. Moreover, one must recognize that “the whole biblical picture” consists of individual parts, and cannot be determined without taking into consideration all these constituent parts. If a theological conclusion requires omission of even several texts (especially if those texts speak directly to the issue at hand), then one can justifiable question the correctness of that theological conclusion.

Discussion has also arisen about the significance of the use of masculine pronouns in respect to God. First, it is must be noted that God is spirit (Jn 4:24), and therefore without gender.[[180]](#footnote-180) He is depicted in Scripture as filling both masculine and feminine roles.[[181]](#footnote-181) Therefore, the preference for masculine pronouns in no way attributes gender to God or proves the superiority of males over females. Some feel the use of masculine pronouns is an accommodation to a patriarchal society – people of biblical times could not have accepted a feminine presentation of God.[[182]](#footnote-182)

This acknowledged, the consistent use of masculine pronouns throughout the canon along with the fact of a masculine incarnation and the preponderance of the title “Father” likely communicates more than accommodation. If it were simply the latter, one might expect occasional exceptions to the rule so as to indicate that it indeed was only accommodation to cultural norm. A more likely explanation is that in using the masculine pronoun, God is emphasizing those qualities He shares with males in distinction from those He shares with females, in particular, His leadership qualities.

Related to the above discussion, it is proposed that Christ’s maleness had nothing to do with His work of redemption – that He could have been female instead of male and still died for our sins. If this is denied, it is claimed, then his redemption is not for all people, but just for men. In addition, the fact that Christ is the perfect image of God has nothing to do with his maleness. He could have come as a female and still displayed the image of God. Christ’s maleness has no relation to His being God’s image bearer or the redeemer of humans, any more than his Jewishness did.[[183]](#footnote-183)

Immediately, we note the misguided claim that Jesus’ Jewishness was incidental. In order to fulfill messianic prophecy, Jesus needed to be a physical descendent of Abraham as well as of David and Judah. We also encounter here the issue of representation. As argued above, Adam was humanity’s representative before God in the Garden. Adam’s representative role in creation is typological of Christ’s representative role in redemption (see Rom 5:12ff). Being a male, Jesus could become the “Second Adam” and represent humanity before God.

### E. Conclusions

We conclude our study with a brief summary. God’s order for male leadership in the home was established in Eden and is preserved through all ages of God’s people to the present day. We do not anticipate its nullification until the resurrection. Because of sin, the history of male leadership has been scared with great abuses and injustices toward women, as was predicted (but not prescribed) in Gen 3:16. Scripture’s encouragement to the husband to love his wife sacrificially counteracts this tendency.

At the same time, man does not serve as a mediator for woman in spiritual things, but in Christ she enjoys equal access to God and a relationship with Him in no way inferior to his. She is to be his helper not only in material things, but in spiritual things as well, bringing wise counsel. At times division may arise in the home over disagreements about essential aspects of the gospel. In such cases, the wife’s loyalty to Christ precedes her loyalty to her husband. God may entrust to a wife a special spiritual ministry in distinction from her husband’s. While it is recognized that this may be the exceptional case, the husband must be ready to make the appropriate lifestyle changes to accommodate her calling.

Finally, to recall the material in our initial paragraphs, a Christian home ruled by love will provide little occasion for conflict, even in the area of authority and decision making. Nevertheless, undergirding this life of mutual respect, consideration, and submission is God’s order for the husband as head of the home.
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