

**JOURNAL FOR
BIBLICAL MANHOOD
AND WOMANHOOD**

is a biannual publication of the
**Council on Biblical Manhood
and Womanhood**
ISSN: 1544-5143

CBMW

Executive Director
Randy Stinson

JOURNAL STAFF

Editor

Peter R. Schemm, Jr.

Associate Editors

Christopher W. Cowan
David W. Jones

Contributing Editors

Oren Martin
Barak Tjader

Assistant Editor

Lance Johnson

Senior Consulting Editors

J. Ligon Duncan, III
Wayne Grudem
Rebecca Jones
Bruce A. Ware

Design

Eric Tabor

Contributors

R. Albert Mohler, Jr.
Russell D. Moore
Nancy Leigh DeMoss
Todd L. Miles

JBMW

Editorial Correspondence

journaleditor@cbmw.org

Subscription Correspondence

journal@cbmw.org

Orders and Subscriptions

Single issue price \$10.00. Subscriptions available
at \$15.00 per year. Canadian Subscriptions
\$20.00 per year. International Subscriptions
\$25.00 per year. Ten or more copies to the same
address, \$12.00 per year.

Contact CBMW for institutional rates.

2825 Lexington Road · Box 926
Louisville, Kentucky 40280
502.897.4065 (voice)
502.897.4061 (fax)
office@cbmw.org (e-mail)
www.cbmw.org (web)

*The purpose of The Council on Biblical Manhood
and Womanhood is to set forth the teachings of the
Bible about the complementary differences between
men and women, created equal in the image of
God, because these teachings are essential for obedi-
ence to Scripture and for the health of the family
and the Church.*

*CBMW is a member of the Evangelical Council
for Financial Accountability and the National
Association of Evangelicals.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JBMW Responds to the TNIV

2 Guest Editorial:

**O. J. Simpson Is Not a Complementarian: Male
Headship and Violence against Women**

Russell D. Moore

7 Worldview, Anthropology, and Gender: A Call to Broaden the Parameters of the Discussion

Bruce Ashford

10 Ephesians 5:21 in Translation¹

Wayne Walden

14 Inscription to a High Priestess at Ephesus

P. G. Nelson

16 "And Adam Called His Wife's Name Eve": A Study in Authentic Biblical Manhood

Robert Bjerkaas

21 Fathers and Sons in Deuteronomy 6: An Essential Link in Redemptive History

Andrew M. Davis

32 A Review of *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity* by Kevin Giles

Jason Hall

40 Errata for *JBMW* 2005 – 2006

42 Annotated Bibliography for Gender-Related Articles in 2006

Oren Martin and Barak Tjader

GUEST EDITORIAL: O. J. SIMPSON IS NOT A COMPLEMENTARIAN: MALE HEADSHIP AND VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Russell D. Moore

Dean, School of Theology

Senior Vice President for Academic Administration

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky

Does the interpretation of the fifth chapter of Ephesians held by the church for over nineteen centuries turn men into wife-beaters? Some critics of male headship argue that it could, and it is time for complementarians to listen to their warnings. When we do, we will understand that only a historic vision of self-sacrificial male headship can provide the revelatory framework for a Christian response to the abuse culture.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, made headlines in recent months when he suggested that masculine God-language could lead to the abuse of women and children by “empowered” predatory males. The Archbishop’s concern is hardly novel.

In 1998, journalists Steve and Cokie Roberts opined that the Southern Baptist Convention’s inclusion of Ephesians 5 language on husband/wife roles in the denomination’s confession of faith would “clearly lead to abuse.” Moreover, leading egalitarians, including respected New Testament scholar I. Howard Marshall, have warned that a complementarian vision of sex roles could fail to provide the theological resources for the church to oppose spousal abuse by men. Against this backdrop, there also appears the so-called “soft complementarian” within some evangelical circles, who insists that he believes in male headship but takes a “mediating” position because he opposes abuse—as though the “hard complementarians” exegete Scripture to

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Daniel L. Akin
Donald Balasa
James Borland
Austin Chapman
Jack Cottrell
J. Ligon Duncan, III
Steve Farrar
Mary Farrar
Wayne A. Grudem
Joshua Harris
Daniel Heimbach

H. Wayne House

Susan Hunt
Elliott Johnson
Peter Jones
Rebecca Jones
Mary Kassian
Heather Moore
George W. Knight, III
C. J. Mahaney
R. Albert Mohler, Jr.
Dorothy Patterson
John Piper

James A. Stahr

K. Erik Thoennes
Bruce A. Ware

BOARD OF REFERENCE

Hudson T. Armerding
S. M. Baugh
Wallace Benn
Tal Brooke
Harold O. J. Brown
Nancy Leigh DeMoss
Lane T. Dennis

Thomas R. Edgar

Jerry Falwell
John Frame
Paul Gardner
W. Robert Godfrey
Bill H. Haynes
David M. Howard
R. Kent Hughes
James B. Hurley
Paul Karleen
Charles & Rhonda Kelley
D. James Kennedy

Beverly LaHaye

Gordon R. Lewis
Robert Lewis
Crawford & Karen Loritts
Erwin Lutzer
John F. MacArthur, Jr.
Connie Marshner
Richard Mayhue
Marty Minton
J. P. Moreland
J. Stanley Oakes
Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr.

J. I. Packer

Paige Patterson
Dennis & Barbara Rainey
Robert Saucy
James Sauer
Siegfried Schatzmann
Thomas R. Schreiner
F. LaGard Smith
R. C. Sproul
Joseph M. Stowell, III
Larry Walker
Stu Weber

William Weinrich

Luder Whitlock
Peter Williamson

allow for abuse. What are we to think of this? Is biblical patriarchy in danger of producing a generation of ESV-quoting O. J. Simpsons?

Complementarians should welcome this discussion. Our egalitarian interlocutors who raise the issue are asking the right questions. They are not suggesting that all—or even most—complementarian Christians beat their wives, any more than we are suggesting that all—or even most—egalitarian Christians are secretly transvestites. What they are suggesting is that the so-called “gender issue” is about more than who can teach whose Sunday school class. These convictions about creational differences—or the lack thereof—translate into real life consequences, consequences with spiritual, psychological, and even physical aspects. Egalitarians are also correct that the widespread physical, emotional, and psychological abuse seen in our culture today—and in previous generations—is indeed the result of a twisted view of manhood and womanhood.

The Roots of the Rape Culture

The term “spousal abuse” is mostly a misnomer. Yes, there are instances of wives abusing their husbands, and these instances are egregious. However, the overwhelming majority of abuse cases—reported and unreported—seem to be men abusing their wives or (even more likely) their unmarried live-in girlfriends. At the root of this is indeed—the egalitarians are correct—a hyper-masculinity that sees the role of a man as to dominate a woman for his own selfish purposes. At this point, Christians would do well to listen to secular feminists who warn us of a “rape culture” that manifests itself in the commoditization of women’s bodies

for use by men via media ranging from the *Sports Illustrated* swimsuit edition to Hooters restaurant chains to hard-core pornography. What kind of view of women does our culture hold when we can elect as governor of California a muscle-bound caricature of a man famous for depicting on-screen such acts of violence as smashing a woman’s head into a toilet? What kind of an age is it when accused murderer O. J. Simpson can consider writing a book about hacking apart his ex-wife, a book entitled *If I Did It?* What does it do to a culture when the average sixteen year-old evangelical male has seen an image on the Internet of a woman engaged in anal sex?

Moreover, secular feminists are correct in seeing a correlation between cultural celebration of commoditization of women and degradation and violence of women, ranging from sexual harassment in the workplace to fraternity house gang rapes. This violent misogynistic culture is indeed patriarchal—but it is based on a patriarchy reflecting the father of lies, not the Father of light.

This violent hyper-masculinity is obviously wrong. It assaults all but the most seared of consciences. But why does it still exist, even in American culture, a generation after the triumph of feminism not only in the academic realm but in popular culture as well? Could it be that the flattening of gender roles does little to tame fallen male aggression, even as it eliminates the primary means of channeling such aggression away from the self and toward the protection of women and children? Is it not a sad commentary when our bookstores are filled with self-protection manuals for women, instructing them to act like men in order to avoid getting hurt, with titles such as *Nice*

Girls Don't Get the Corner Office or Date like a Man?

Defining Male Headship

Violence against women can only be curtailed by a theology that takes seriously the honor and dignity of women and takes seriously the responsibility of men to provide and to protect. Of course, there have been men who have appealed to male headship passages as an excuse to abuse their wives. There are also child molesters who have appealed to Solomon's concubines to justify their sickening predation. There are child abusers who have appealed to Proverbs passages on spanking. There are libertines who have appealed to justification through faith to justify their sin. To all of these we reply with the apostle Paul, "God forbid!" (Rom 6:2 KJV)

Male headship is strictly defined in Scripture as the opposite of a grasp for power. The headship of men in the church and home is rooted everywhere in Scripture in protection and provision. This is why the apostle Paul calls the man who will not provide for his family "worse than an unbeliever" (1 Tim 5:8 ESV). The apostle Peter calls on husbands to recognize both that the woman is the "weaker vessel" (contra the gender flattening of contemporary feminism, both religious and secular) and that she is an "heir together of the grace of life" with her husband (1 Pet 3:7). Male headship is defined in Scripture as a man giving up his own wants in order to care for his wife "as his own flesh" (Eph 5). A man who would see such headship as a warrant to abuse is not simply confused. He is a blasphemer who does not grasp the gospel itself. An abusive man is no more representing biblical patriarchy than a father who gives his child a snake when he asks for a fish is representing

the fatherhood of God.

Male headship is not represented by violent men, but by men whose aggression is directed toward subduing their own fallen wills in order to protect and provide for a covenant wife and their offspring. It has less to do with Hollywood's *Fight Club* film about men beating one another senseless in order to make sense of life than it has to do with Hollywood's *Cinderella Man*, in which a Depression-era father enters the boxing ring to fight for money to buy milk for his wife and kids. This headship is not about raw sovereignty but covenant responsibility.

This is why so much egalitarian rhetoric on the abuse issue is so wrong-headed. They assume that headship is defined by a man's answer to a social science questionnaire, a methodology they would never take at face value if the issue at hand were, for instance, whether a person is a Christian. After I presented a paper on headship and abuse at the Evangelical Theological Society meeting this past year, a scholar in a hallway conversation with me pointed to social science data demonstrating, he thought, that headship leads to abuse. I pressed him further and he noted that the study he had in mind showed that men who were heads of their homes but were sporadic churchgoers were more likely to abuse their wives and children. I affirmed that I was sure such a study was accurate but that sporadic churchgoers are *not* heads of their homes, regardless of which box they check on a survey.

A man who is a nominal churchgoer is demonstrating by his actions that he is not carrying out his responsibility as spiritual leader in the household. My friend's point about headship would be similar to my saying to a Presbyterian friend that infant baptism leads to kitten

torture, since a study I've seen demonstrates that Christian paedobaptists who are also high priests of Santeria are more likely to sacrifice animals in cultic ceremonies. My point would be ridiculous since high priests of Santeria are by definition not Christians. Abusive men are, by definition, rejecting biblical male headship.

The Road from Here

Male violence against women and children is a real problem in our culture—and in our churches. Our first responsibility is not just at the level of social justice but at the level of ecclesial justice. We must teach from our pulpits, our Sunday school classes, and our Vacation Bible Schools that women are to be cherished, honored, and protected by men. This means we teach men to reject American playboy consumerism in light of a Judgment Seat at which they will give account for their care for their families. It means we must explicitly tell the women in our congregations, “A man who hits you has surrendered his headship, and that is the business of the civil state in enacting civil justice and of this church in enacting church discipline.” Church discipline against wife beaters must be clear and consistent. We must also stand with women against predatory men in areas of abandonment, divorce, and neglect. We must train up men, through godly mentoring as well as through biblical instruction, who will know that the model of a husband is a man who crucifies his selfish materialism, his libidinal fantasies, and his wrathful temper tantrums in order to care lovingly for a wife. We must also remind these young men that every idle word, and every hateful act, will be laid out in judgment before the eyes of the One with whom we will have to give

an answer.

In the public arena, Christians as citizens should be those most insistent on legal protections for women. We should oppose the therapeutic culture's dismissal of wife abuse as merely a psychological condition, but should call on the powers-that-be to prosecute abusers of women and children in ways that will deter others and make clear society's repugnance at such abuse. Whatever our views on welfare reform or the minimum wage, we must recognize that much economic hardship of women in our day is the result of men who abandon their commitments. We should eschew “welfare queen” rhetoric and work with others of goodwill to seek economic and social measures to provide a safety net for single mothers and abused women in jeopardy. This does not mean we will always agree on the means, but we can agree on the ends in view. We should join with others—including secular feminists—in seeking legal protections against such manifestations of a rape culture as prostitution, pornography, sex slavery, and the like.

An abusive man is not an overly-enthusiastic complementarian. He is not a complementarian at all. His is a pathetic aping perversion of Adamic leadership. He is rejecting male headship, because he is rejecting his role as provider and protector. As the culture grows more violent, more consumerist, more sexualized, more feminist, and, ironically, more misogynistic, the answer is not a church more attenuated to the ambient culture—whether through a hyper-masculine paganism or through a gender-neutral feminism.

Instead, the answer is a truly counter-cultural church—a church that calls men to account for leadership and cherishes and protects women and girls.

As we do so, we will grow more—not less—insistent that a biblical ethic demands gender complementarity and male headship. At the same time, we will grow more—not less—conformed to the image of Christ Jesus. And, like He did at the well of Samaria, we will seek out marginalized and battered women, saying to them, as He did, “You are right in saying ‘I have no husband’” (John 4:17 ESV). Only then will they hear us when we tell them of a bridegroom who cares for His church as His own body. Only then will they—and we—understand the burden of headship, and the glory of Christ. ■

WORLDVIEW, ANTHROPOLOGY, AND GENDER: A CALL TO BROADEN THE PARAMETERS OF THE DISCUSSION

Bruce Ashford

*Director of the Center for Great Commission Studies;
Research Fellow, L. Russ Bush Center for Faith & Culture;
Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Intercultural Studies,
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, North Carolina*

For years, evangelicals have been able to assume enough common ground with their interlocutors that they could focus on stating clearly their arguments concerning gender roles, and tracing out the implications. With Christian interlocutors, one could assume quite a bit of common ground (*imago Dei*, many moral issues, etc.); and, even with non-Christians, one could often assume a residue of basic Judeo-Christian views on humanity and morality.

But it seems that, because of shifting cultural winds, there is an increasing need to articulate a biblical view of the nature of humanity, of man himself, as a matter prior to discussing gender roles and relationships. As the United States becomes more multicultural, both factually and ideologically, the challenges to a Christian view of man increase exponentially. We must be prepared to converse with Hindu and Buddhist pantheists, Muslim theists, New Agers, militant pluralists, and even more importantly, confused and

syncretistic Christians.

An example of the need to articulate a biblical anthropology is the re-emergence of atheism in the public eye. In 2006, three of the bestsellers were Richard Dawkins's *The God Delusion*, Daniel Dennett's *Breaking the Spell*, and Sam Harris's *Letter to a Christian Nation*.¹ All three were written by atheists committed to overthrowing Christian belief and any of its cultural remainder.

While it is not at all clear that there is an *actual* resurgence of atheism in the United States, one notices that prominent atheists are turning up the volume and are receiving increased media exposure. As such, Christians should seek to articulate the biblical view of humanity as created in the image of God, and flesh out the implications thereof in a manner that is intelligent, winsome, and persuasive.

The problem with atheism, as with other worldviews, is that it is not able to account for the unique nature,

capacities, and ends of human existence. Inevitably, it tends toward either an enthronement or a denigration of humanity, unable to strike a proper balance.

At times, atheists tend toward the enthronement of humanity. This might seem an obvious move; if one chooses not to worship God on his throne, the next best thing would be to enthrone oneself. This can be seen in Humanist Manifesto II, which states, “At the present juncture of history, commitment to all humankind is the highest commitment of which we are capable.”²

At other times (or ironically, at the same time), atheists denigrate humanity. The glittering example of this is, of course, Peter Singer, of Princeton University’s Center for Human Values. Singer, like Nietzsche and others, realizes what a radical revisioning of mankind must take place. For him this means that we cannot base our ethics on the *imago Dei* or argue that our immortal soul distinguishes us from the animals. “By 2040,” he writes, “it may be that only a rump of hard-core, know-nothing religious fundamentalists will defend the view that every human life, from conception to death, is sacrosanct.”³

For Singer, the moral status of a human being is defined, not by his being created in the image of God, but by his consciousness and ability to function. Those humans who are most conscious and functional have more worth and moral status than those who are less conscious and functional. Healthy teenagers and middle-aged folks, then, are worth more than babies and old people, and certainly more than the mentally and physically handicapped.

For this reason, certain non-human animals have higher moral status than certain human animals. A donkey or a dog will often have superior con-

sciousness and function than a defective human baby. It is for this reason that he believes one might find instances when infanticide is acceptable; sometimes, he thinks, it would be more wrong to take the life of an animal than to take the life of a defective baby.⁴

Furthermore, since Singer does not hold to the *imago Dei*, which gives a clear line of delineation between humans and animals, he has no problem suggesting that inter-species sexual activity is sometimes acceptable. In some instances, sex between a man and an animal might be mutually satisfying and, therefore, not problematic. He hurries to say, however, that with small animals such as chickens or ferrets, sexual activity might be painful for the animal and would, therefore, be problematic.⁵

Singer’s re-definition of humanity finds company even in popular culture. Take, for example, the movie *Bicentennial Man* (1999). In this movie Robin Williams is a robot who is on a two-century journey toward becoming “human.” At one point in the movie, he begins to use the word “I,” signifying that he has now become self-conscious. He is now every bit as “conscious” as human beings, and the implication, it seems, is that he has, therefore, achieved humanness.

But it is not only Singer and the atheists who cannot understand humanity. Hindu, Buddhist, and Muslim accounts of humanity are likewise defective. Many Hindus and Buddhists are pantheistic monists: they believe that all is One, that the universe is one substance. Man is part of the soul of the cosmos; if he thinks that he is actually separate from the cosmos, he is under illusion. Essentially, human beings are impersonal—they are merely part of the World Soul, that great ocean of

being that includes all that exists. This view that humans are impersonal might explain the quietism and inaction of many Buddhist and Hindu cultures; one thinks of India's untouchables and Southeast Asia's rampant child prostitution.

Muslims, likewise, lack a doctrine of humanity rooted in the *imago Dei*. As such, they have difficulty making sense of the inherent dignity and worth of every human being, and this is probably seen most clearly in the Qur'anic teaching that men are ontologically superior to women. The outworking of this doctrine can be seen in such practices as wife-beating, disdain for female babies, male polygamy, and female circumcision.⁶

Worldviews other than Christian theism, whether atheism, pantheism, or Islamic monotheism, cannot make proper sense of mankind—they will tend either toward the enthronement or the denigration of humanity. The *imago Dei* is essential for understanding humanity. It makes sense of who we are; indeed, it renders coherent the socio-cultural activities that surround us and pervade our lives. As we image forth God through our capacities for spirituality, morality, rationality, relationality, and imagination, we are able to live distinctively human lives. Our work in the sciences is possible because of our ability to reason. In the arts, we may participate because of our imaginative and creative capacities. In the public square, we may hold forth because God made us not only rational but relational beings.

As theologians, this robust Christian anthropology is our foundation; an understanding of the essence of humanity is what allows us to think through intrinsically related ideas such

as biblical manhood and womanhood. And for our broader American audience, an apprehension of the *imago Dei* and its implications will likewise enable them to comprehend our exposition of biblical teaching on gender roles and related issues. ■

¹ Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 2006); Daniel C. Dennett, *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon* (New York: Penguin, 2006); Sam Harris, *Letter to a Christian Nation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006). Another book is Marc D. Hauser, *Moral Minds: How Nature Designed Our Universal Sense of Right and Wrong* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006). In this text, Hauser gives a naturalist explanation of the notions of right and wrong.

² "Humanist Manifesto II," n.p. [cited 3 April 2007]. Online: <http://www.americanhumanist.org/about/manifesto2.html>.

³ Peter Singer, "The Sanctity of Life," in *Foreign Policy* (Sept/Oct 2005): 40.

⁴ Peter Singer, "Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life," *Pediatrics* (July 1983): 129. Also, in *Practical Ethics* (New York: Cambridge University, 1979), he argues that membership in the human species is irrelevant to moral status.

⁵ Singer's most famous treatment of bestiality, or as he calls it *zoophilia*, is "Heavy Petting," published at *Nerve.com*, on March 12, 2001. Lest one think that Singer is an obscure radical with no real influence, it should be noted that he is often called one of the most influential philosophers alive. In fact, his *Practical Ethics* is the most successful philosophy text ever published by Cambridge University Press.

⁶ Concerning the ontological superiority of men, see Surah 4:34. For female circumcision, see Islamic legal manual *Umdat al-Salik*, e4.3. For a brief overview of Muslim folk religious views on men and women, see Bill Musk, *Touching the Soul of Islam* (Grand Rapids: Monarch Books, 2004), 29–60.

EPHESIANS 5:21 IN TRANSLATION¹

Wayne Walden

Author

Smyrna, Tennessee

“Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ” (TNIV).
“subjecting yourselves one to another in fear of Christ” (ASV).

ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ (27 Nestle-Aland).

As our samples above show, texts (and commentaries) cannot decide just what this vague verse has to do with its environment, some formatting it with the preceding paragraph, some with the following, and some as a separate paragraph all to itself (this wee little verse of only five words in Greek!). The present proposal is that a fourth option, rare among texts, is the correct one, namely that the verse is related to *both* what precedes *and* what follows, which should be shown in translation.

Three components of the clause call for comment. The first (which is the primary reason for the confusion) is the so-called “reciprocal” pronoun ἀλλήλων,

which has suffered from a lexical deficiency resulting in a mis(-leading) translation. Contrary to grammars and dictionaries of both Greek and English, “reciprocal” constructions are not always to be taken literally (i.e., showing mutuality in the usual sense of exchange of an activity between parties). We know this from our own expressions such as “trampling one another” and “killing one another.” The Greek concordance turns up the same idioms, the former in Luke 12:1, and the latter in Rev 6:4 (of course, mutuality is *possible* in such cases, but that is not generally what is meant). If not mutuality, then, what does “reciprocal” mean in such expressions? Via Hellenistic concordances, we formulate more precise rules:

(1) When only two parties are involved, ἀλλήλων usually expresses mutuality. Herod and Pilate became friends “with each other” (Luke 23:12) during the Jesus episode.

Christians and God have fellowship with each other (1 John 1:7).

(2) When a larger group is envisioned, “reciprocal” often indicates random or distributive activity within the designated group as appropriate.

In this sense people “envy one another” (Gal 5:26), or pagan gods may be “born from one another” (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.240). Greek has other options for expressing this random/group activity, including ἄλλος (Acts 2:12), ἕκαστος (1 Cor 1:12) and the “reflexive” pronoun (again, not always literal) ἑαυτοῦ (Eph 4:32; 5:19). The latter synonym of ἀλλήλων is especially relevant in our pericope where the two occur interchangeably (as in 4:32) for literary variety: ἑαυτοῖς (5:19) is the same as ἀλλήλοις (v. 21). Similarly in English a teacher may say, “While I am out of the room, talk among yourselves,” which is the same as saying, “talk to each other/one another.” Translators also have options besides (the sometimes misleading) “one another.” TNIV and NRSV employ the “reflexive” rendering for ἀλλήλων in John 6:42, 53 (“among yourselves/themselves”). In our verse the ASV moves in that direction. In other contexts, no word-for-word equivalent may be desirable, as in Acts 19:38, where ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλοις is simply “they can press charges” (TNIV). Of these options, employing the perfectly legitimate “reflexive” rendering for our verse fits well philologically and contextually within the (Ephesian) Christian community. We get the verb person (second, as in ASV) from verse 18 and render ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, “be(-ing) in subordination among your-

selves.” The verse teaches structure and means simply, “Obey whom you are supposed to,” a general principle with examples following, the first of which is wives (v. 22). Within this instruction of general subordination expressed by ὑποτάσσω, the writer then switches to the more directive verb ὑπακούω, “pay attention,” when addressing children (6:1) and servants (6:5). Superiors are not addressed in 5:21 but in 5:25, 6:4, and 6:9. Our verse, in other words, says precisely the opposite of what has usually been made of it.

A case such as ἀλλήλων points up a common weakness among translators: neglecting the literature and concordance, and going too slavishly by lexis that sometimes fail to take adequate account of idiom and context, which includes semantics, syntax, literary structure, and the author’s own rhetorical aims. Ἀλλήλων is also a good example of the power of the lexicon and the chain reaction it sets up. If the lexicographer misses it, that mistake is passed on to the translator who depends on the lexicon, to the commentator who depends on the translation, to the preacher and professor who depend on the commentary, and to the congregation and students who depend on the sermon and lecture. The result in our case has been mass confusion over a simple little verse. The concordance is the only way to get at a word such as ἀλλήλων. The word is not important enough to make the theological dictionaries. G. Lampe’s *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961) even left it out until a careful reader got it into the appendix. But the little word is very important for understanding many passages—namely asking how many / who the parties are, what their relation to the action is, and, especially, what their relationship to each other is. All of these

indications must be taken into account before working out an accurate translation. The semantic range for ἀλλήλων extends beyond expressing mutuality.

Problems created by the traditional presentation of Eph 5:21 include the following: (1) Greek texts, translations, and commentaries are confused over how to format/punctuate the verse. (2) Versions seem to say no one is in a position of authority, which contradicts the following verses. (3) Just how is such a fuzzy concept as mutual submission supposed to be implemented? Mutual service is intelligible, as in the case of Jesus himself who was both servant and master; the two need not be exclusive. But mutual subjection is a different matter.² It is, in fact, a non-entity, a contradiction in terms, nowhere taught in Scripture. The problem with the usual rendering of the verse is expressed by Ernest Best: “a difficulty exists in relating this verse to the on-going argument.”³ Likewise, S. D. F. Salmond states, “The connection of this clause is by no means clear.”⁴

In favor of a structure, rather than mutual, interpretation are the following: (1) Non-mutual usage of ἀλλήλων is quite common in the literature.⁵ (2) The next verse clearly teaches structure. (3) Verse 22 also has no verb; its verb is in v. 21.⁶ (4) Parties in this *Haustafel* pericope are not given instructions of mutuality; parents, for example, are not told to obey their children (6:4). (5) Ὑποτάσσω, unlike δουλεύω and διακονέω, is not used of mutuality but addresses specific subjects: youth (Luke 2:51), women (1 Pet 3:1), servants (Titus 2:9), the congregation (Eph 5:24), and citizens (Rom 13:1).⁷ Our verse is not the sole known mutual usage that some would make of it.⁸ The word introduces a new kind of directive pointing the pericope forward

and thereby gives the verse a transitional function. In keeping with the meaning of ὑποτάσσω, subordinate parties are addressed first. (6) “Fear/reverence” for Christ reinforces the tone of the verse as teaching submission to duly appointed authority.

Regarding the latter (and second element to be discussed), “God-fearers” show up in both Testaments. Though “fearing God” may describe any believer (Acts 10:35), more technically the description refers to non-Jewish synagogue/assembly attendees who are not actually members (Ps 115:11; Acts 10:2; 13:26). They do, though, respect the God and ethics of Judaism enough to become somewhat involved, even if they do not adopt all of the ceremonies. This population is the bulk of Paul’s converts in Acts (13:26, 48; 14:1–5). They were attracted to the gospel message and became Gentile Christians. Paul’s struggle is to keep Gentile Christians from being influenced by Judaizers—who believed Jesus was the Messiah but who told Gentile Christians that they must keep certain aspects of the law (e.g., circumcision) in order to be a part of the people of God. Respectful obedience is “fear.”⁹ The word occurs twice again in our pericope (5:33 and 6:5).

In addition to ἀλλήλων and φόβος, a third, and final, element in the verse is that it contains the last in a series of participles¹⁰ illustrating what it means to be “filled with the Spirit” (v. 18)—not just by what one says (vv. 19–20) but also by what one does, specifically respecting proper authority (5:21–6:9). Both the KJV (“submitting yourselves”) and ASV try to show this; one must compare also the NLT title, “Spirit-Guided Relations: Wives and Husbands.”

All of these elements—the re-

suming force of the participle, the “fear” of Christ, the contextual understanding of ἀλλήλων, and the transitional role of the verse—must be incorporated into an accurate translation which should, in addition, clear up the obscurity. In keeping with English style, I have placed “and” before the last in a series (as does NASB):

(v. 18) be filled with the Spirit (v. 19) by speaking . . . (v. 21) and, along with respectful obedience to Christ, by being in subordination among yourselves: (v. 22) wives to husbands.¹¹

This clause is *the* pivotal verse in the pericope, connecting what precedes (via both the participle and ἀλλήλους = ἑαυτοῖς) with what follows (via both ὑποτάσσω and φόβος).¹² Among disparate formattings for this verse in the various texts, those which plot the tiny clause as a separate paragraph (presumably unrelated to anything else around it) are the farthest off base (TNIV, NRSV, TEV), while those rare ones that format the words inside a larger pericope extending both directions (Westcott-Hort, R. Knox,²⁵ Nestle-Aland) are correct. There remains only the matter of translating accordingly.¹³ Quite consonant with the Bible’s emphasis on being holy/distinctive, the verse most immediately cautions against being drawn into cultural trends to the contrary going on in the first-century Roman Empire.¹⁴ ■

¹ The substance of this article previously appeared in two parts: “Ephesians 5:21—A Translation Note,” *Restoration Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (2003): 254; and “Translating Ephesians 5:21,” *Restoration Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (2005): 179–82. For a response to these articles, see Stanley N. Helton (“Ephesians 5:21: A Longer Translation Note,” *Restoration Quarterly* 48, no. 1 [2006]: 33–41) who at least agrees that the

verse needs more work in translation. He sees the participles as showing result (cf. note 11), in which case translating, “so that you will be in subordination” is also an option. Whether ὑποτασσόμενοι is middle or passive is, again, negligible for the meaning.

² John Schuetze (“Exegetical Brief: Does Scripture Teach a Mutual Submission?” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 100 [2003]: 209) fails to make this important distinction. The one area of mutual “control” for husband and wife, as recognized in 1 Cor 7:4, is the marriage bed.

³ Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; London: T & T Clark, 1998), 515.

⁴ S. D. F. Salmond, *Expositor’s Greek Testament* (repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 3:364.

⁵ In addition to present observations, cf. Peter O’Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 403.

⁶ The UBS *Greek New Testament* committee gradually but confidently arrived at this conclusion. On a scale of “A” to “D” (“A” being the most confident of their decision), the no-verb choice was given a “D” in the first ed. (1966), a “C” in the 2nd (1968) and 3rd (1975), and a “B” in the 4th (1993).

⁷ Cf. Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 465.

⁸ E.g., Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (Word Biblical Commentary 42; Waco, TX: Word, 1990), 365.

⁹ Horst R. Balz, “Φόβος,” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (10 vols.; ed. Gerhard Kittel; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 9:201; and Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Translation and Commentary on Chapters 4–6*. (Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 64.

¹⁰ Carrying imperatival force; cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) §468(2); John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Black’s New Testament Commentary 10; London: Continuum, 2001), 256. Whether the participles show means or result (per NET Bible note) is negligible for the meaning, though cf. author’s note at the end of this article.

¹¹ Cf. Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1980), 74, 76 n. 4: “let there then be subordination among you.”

¹² Also noted by Richard D. Balge, “Exegetical Brief: Ephesians 5:21—a Transitional Verse,” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 94 (1998): 41–43.

¹³ Some translations at least show that vv. 21 and 22 are related. The *Anchor Bible* begins the latter, “[e.g.] . . .” and ²NLT (2004) begins, “For wives this means . . .”

¹⁴ Bruce W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

INSCRIPTION TO A HIGH PRIESTESS AT EPHESUS

P. G. Nelson

Writer

Hull, East Yorkshire, United Kingdom

I am writing this note to draw attention to a little-known inscription. This is a tribute to a high priestess at Ephesus, and is dated to the first century A.D. It reads as follows:

The tribe of Tethades to Flavia Ammon, daughter of Moschus, who is called Aristion, high priestess of the temple of Asia in Ephesus, president, twice crown-wearer, also priestess of Massilia, president of the games, wife of Flavius Hermocrates, for her excellence and decorous life and her devotion.¹

This inscription shows that the high priestess played a prominent part in the life of the city and commanded considerable respect. It also supports Luke's claim that the goddess of Ephesus (Artemis to the Greeks, Diana to the Romans) was revered throughout the Roman world (Acts 19:27): Ephe-

sus is in modern Turkey, and Massilia (Marseilles) in France. Luke's claim is also supported by the discovery of coins bearing the inscription *Diana Ephesia* in many countries.²

The inscription thus has considerable significance for the interpretation of Paul's instruction to Timothy at Ephesus restricting the ministry of women (1 Tim 2:11-12). It shows that, far from conforming to contemporary culture, Paul was going against it. This explains why he felt the need to give reasons for the restriction (vv. 13-14), and why he carefully qualified it (v. 15).³

Many Christians today (at least in the UK) believe that, in restricting the ministry of women, Paul *was* conforming to contemporary culture.⁴ The inscription shows that they are mistaken.

The inscription also tells against the suggestion that the cult of Artemis promoted wrong ideas about women. Flavia Ammon was decorous and married.⁵ ■

¹ Mary R. Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome* (London: Duckworth, 1982), Translation 258 (slightly modified).

² *New Bible Dictionary* (ed. James Dixon Douglas; London: InterVarsity, 1965), 381.

³ See, e.g., P. G. Nelson, *Paul's Teaching on the Ministry of Women* (2nd ed.; Latheronwheel, Caithness, Scotland: Whittles, 1996), chapter 2.

⁴ Cf. Andrew Perriman, *Speaking of Women* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998), chaps. 5-6. Perriman presents a sophisticated version of this view, but overlooks the data I have cited, and distorts verses 11-14.

⁵ See, e.g., Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992).

“AND ADAM CALLED HIS WIFE’S NAME EVE”: A STUDY IN AUTHENTIC BIBLICAL MANHOOD

Robert Bjerkaas

Pastor

*Trinity Presbyterian Church
St. Albans, Vermont*

Any recovery of an authentically biblical understanding of men and women must begin in the Garden of Eden. It is there that we learn about the special creation of Adam and Eve. It is there that we read God’s mandate to the first male and female. And, perhaps more importantly for this article’s purpose, it is there in the garden that we are able to see the effects of sin and grace on the relationship between Adam and Eve. Of these lessons on the relationship between the sexes, it might be the case that the effect of grace on Adam and Eve’s sin-broken relationship receives less attention than some other equally valuable biblical truths recorded in the first chapters of Genesis. This article will explore this perhaps neglected lesson on grace in the garden. It will do so by posing two questions: (1) Why does Adam call his wife Eve; and (2) What lessons does this surprise ending to the narrative of the fall teach us? Although this article will focus on Adam’s role in acting in accord with the grace that he

has received, other equally important considerations regarding Eve’s transformation by grace could be developed as well.

Why Does Adam Call his Wife Eve?

Recently I preached a short series of sermons that dealt with the relationship between Adam and Eve as it is presented to us in Genesis 1–3. In preaching on the text of Gen 3:20, one comment was surprisingly frequent in conversations with parishioners after the service: “I always thought Eve meant ‘mother.’” In point of fact, Eve means ‘life.’ And in naming his wife “life,” we are presented with a surprising change in the rather, up until now, uninspiring conduct of our first father.

Other writers have demonstrated with poignant and decisive clarity the utter failure of Adam in Gen 3:1–12.¹ He had been present and silent during his wife’s interview with the serpent. He had allowed the word of God to be questioned. He appears to have done

nothing to stop her from hazarding her life on the contrary word of a creature. To compound his failure, he then partook of the fruit himself and, on being examined by his Maker, attempted to blame his wife for the whole sinful business.

God then pronounces a curse on the serpent, the woman, and on Adam, but not without a promised blessing. In the curse God gives the serpent, he promises a seed of woman who would crush the head of the serpent. There would be an ultimate victory over the enemy. God bound himself by his promise—a coming offspring would utterly defeat the one whose deceitful schemes lead the first man and woman to fall into sin. God then pronounces curses on both the woman and Adam. And these curses are terrible. The woman would experience increased pain in childbirth and strife in her marriage. The man would toil painfully, sweat, and, together with his entire race, die.

The very next words of the sacred text tell us what Adam proceeded to do: he named his wife “Eve.” He called her “life.”² Several commentators note the apparent *non-sequitur* between what God had just said to Adam and the name Adam immediately gives his wife. Derek Kidner puts it this way, “After the sentence of death, this name, ‘life,’ with its play on the word living, is very striking.”³ Gerhard Von Rad considers the disparity between this verse and the preceding curse as an “irregularity” or “break” in the narrative that constitutes a “noticeable fracture” in the text; the naming of the woman “life” “was not thought acceptable as the first echo, so to speak, to the penalty.”⁴ This “striking irregularity” requires some explanation. The most obvious explanation is that Adam has come away from his meeting

with God a changed man.

It seems obvious that this relatively brief notice in the text regarding the naming of his wife indicates a significant change in Adam’s character. Prior to this event, all of the evidence from Genesis 3 would lead us to expect that Adam would again focus on his wife’s liability for his problems. After hearing God’s curse, he knew that his life would be hard. He would have conflict with his wife, his work would be difficult, and he would surely die. Yet he named her “life.” It might be the case that this short verse speaks to us as loudly of the power of grace to transform broken hearts as any other in Scripture. Adam, hearing in God’s word to the serpent a promise of hope that would come through his wife, deliberately chose not to look at his wife in light of what she had done or what the effects of her actions would be. Instead he chose to give her a name that reflected his confidence in the integrity of God concerning a promised, future good that would affect the overthrow of his race’s greatest enemy.⁵ If any woman who ever lived was deserving of the name “death,” it was the first woman. But Adam chose to see things differently. Adam chose to call her life because she would be the mother of the living.

Lessons for a Biblical Manhood

In this signal act, Adam demonstrates a faith in the word of God, a confidence in the integrity of God, and a commitment to looking at his wife as one through whom God was purposing to accomplish great things. In this act we see a biblical manhood that is not simply about roles and responsibilities. At its most fundamental core, it is a matter of faith and a transforming experience of grace. The first man who was recovered

from the fall into sin by the grace of God immediately engaged in a gracious act of humbling proportions. If this is indeed the case, there are three specific lessons that might be helpful for us today if we would pursue as biblical a manhood as that demonstrated by our first forgiven father. These can be summarized as (1) believe God, (2) look forward, and (3) speak first.

Believe God

Keil and Delitzsch describe Adam's response to the blessing of God succinctly: "It was through the power of divine grace that Adam believed the promise with regard to the woman's seed, and manifested his faith in the name which he gave to his wife."⁶ The faith of Adam was an immediately-demonstrated faith. And it was a faith that required no evidences. Eve had borne no children at that time and the serpent's head was not yet crushed. Adam simply heard God's promise that a delivering seed would come through his wife and, believing it, he committed himself to a faithful expectancy of God's provision by giving her a name that explicitly invoked the hope of that promised deliverer.

Look Forward

In naming his wife Eve immediately after God's curses, Adam engages in what has already been described as a "strikingly irregular" act. There is indeed an obvious disparity between the curse Adam received and the name that he gave his wife; in light of Gen 3:1–12 we could certainly expect a different sort of name. How easy it might have been for Adam, overwhelmed with the keen edge of fear that his death sentence undoubtedly evoked, to have named her maliciously. How understandable it

would have been had Adam focused on what she had done or on the immediate effects of her actions; he could have named her "foolish" for listening to a snake or "thorny" for making his work toilsome.⁷ But in faith he chose to *look forward* to an as yet unaccomplished act of God that would be performed through her. This ability to look forward in faith is a mark of biblical manhood that cannot be overstated. Men who are transformed by grace are able with Adam and with Paul to be confident that he who began a good work in another is faithful and will carry it on to completion (Phil 1:6). Without this ability to joyfully look forward to the good, yet future, works of God in his wife's life, the Christian man has not achieved a biblical manhood that is fully marked by a graciousness begotten of faith.

Speak First

A fascinating feature of the account of God's curse on Adam is the preface to his word to Adam: "Because you listened to your wife." In one sense, the account of Adam in Genesis 3 goes from bad to worse to good. He begins by simply being a passive spectator to a conversation between his wife and the serpent. He then more actively listens to and heeds her counsels in defying God's one proscription. Then he defends himself against God—even suggesting that God is in part responsible for his troubles as it was God who created the woman in the first place. But then at the end of this tragic chapter, it is Adam who, having been humbled by the justice and grace of God, speaks first. And he names his wife "life." It might be the case that biblical headship means very little if it does not, as a salient feature, require men to be the first to speak grace and life into the strife and toil of our

earthly, imperfect relationships.

Conclusion

As a pastor, I have heard many names applied to women in general and wives in particular by Christian men. Some of them are frankly shocking. I have also counseled men who cannot seem to get past real and perceived failures in their spouse's life—some of which took place long before the two were ever acquainted, much less married. And these are real struggles for genuine Christian men who truly want to be biblical husbands. The first regenerate act of our first forgiven father has much to say to those of us who struggle in these and perhaps other ways in our quest for biblical manhood.

In the first place, it might be helpful to consider what we call our wives. Are the names that we use to refer to our wives echoes of the blessing or echoes of the curse? One can only wonder at the comfort the first wife must have felt in hearing her husband call her "Eve" as she buried Abel. Adam's choice of a name that deliberately recalled the hope her Maker had given her was a ministry to his wife that we too must pursue in our relationships with our wives. It may be that there are things we call our wives that we must never say again. There may be words and names that we use that even deliberately remind our wives of their failures past and present and of the wrongs and hurts they have perpetrated against us. And perhaps as biblical men we need to find more and better ways to speak life to the imperfect women with whom and through whom God has blessed us.

This will not be easy as the circumstances of our lives are difficult. We are sinners who daily seek to know our Savior and our salvation more deeply and

completely. Our wives are imperfect and they too struggle under the effects of the curse on this side of heaven. But the circumstances of Adam's gracious, confident ministry to his wife is only more humbling when we consider his first grace inspired act. Your wife did not bring sin into the world. Your wife did not set in motion a chain of events that would cause all men and women to die. Your wife did not make your world a toilsome place to live and work. Your wife may have done some terrible things in her past and some of them might continue to bind and hurt your heart even now. And it might even be the case that she has made your world a more toilsome place in some regards. But she has certainly not done anything worse than the great sin of rebellion the first wife committed. And the first husband was able to let God's chastisements be sufficient for his wife's failures. He deliberately chose not to dwell on her sins or their just effects, but instead chose to constantly remind her of the brief but grave-shattering word of hope that God had uttered in the promise of a redeeming seed.

Biblical manhood, if it is to be informed by an experience of the grace of God, must be about a preemptive, hopeful, and confident ministry to our wives. We must speak first, look forward, and truly believe that God is purposing and has covenanted himself to carry on his good and beautiful work in their lives. It is our unique privilege to minister to our wives by reminding them of this. Apart from such a "life"-speaking ministry to our wives, our manhood may be many things, but it has not attained to a fully biblical manhood. ■

¹ See especially Lawrence J. Crabb, Don Hubbard, and Al Andrews, *The Silence of Adam: Becoming Men of Courage in a World of Chaos* (Grand Rapids:

Zondervan, 1995).

²There seems to be a general consensus among Bible scholars that “Eve” is to be understood as a reference to “life.” Von Rad notes that “there can hardly be any doubt that the narrator connects *ḥawwā* (Eve) very closely with the Hebrew word *ḥay*, *ḥayyā* = life.” Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 96. For a more complete discussion of the etymology of the name “Eve” see John Peter Lange, *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Genesis* (trans. Philip Schaff; Grand Rapids: Zondervan), 240; and more recently Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 205–07.

³Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction & Commentary* (Tyndale Old Testament Commentary; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1967), 72.

⁴Von Rad, *Genesis*, 96.

⁵C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 1:106; Lange, *Genesis*, 240; Kidner, *Genesis*, 22; and Hamilton, *Genesis*, 207 are among the scholars who support this interpretation. This interpretation can be found as early as Philip Melancthon, who called this name a “memorial of promised grace.” See Lange, *Genesis*, 240.

⁶Keil, and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, 1:106.

⁷Two attempts at understanding the meaning of “Eve” follow such lines. Zimmermann connects the Hebrew *ḥawwā* with *ḥavvah*, “to be empty, to fail” and makes Adam’s naming a reminder of the ruin she brought upon Adam and their posterity. Other scholars have attempted to connect *ḥawwā* with the Aramaic word for serpent. For references and evaluations of these interpretations, see Lange, *Genesis*, 240 and Hamilton, *Genesis*, 205–207.

FATHERS AND SONS IN DEUTERONOMY 6: AN ESSENTIAL LINK IN REDEMPTIVE HISTORY

Andrew M. Davis
Senior Pastor
First Baptist Church
Durham, North Carolina

We stand presently at a vital juncture in the history of the evangelical church. Statistics show that large numbers of the children of evangelical parents are turning away from their faith when they leave the home. On September 18, 2001, just one week after the devastating terrorist attacks of 9/11, T. C. Pinckney made this shocking statement to the Southern Baptist Convention's Executive Committee: "We are losing our children. Research indicates that 70% of teens who are involved in a church youth group will stop attending church within two years of their high school graduation."¹

Few subjects bring as much joy to the hearts of parents than to see their children grow up and mature into a strong faith in Christ (2 John 4, 3 John 4). Conversely, few subjects bring as much grief to the hearts of parents as the apostasy of their children when they reach adulthood. The disintegration of the Christian family is a dire problem for the future of the evangeli-

cal church. God has made the family the centerpiece of his redemptive plan, from the creation of Adam, through the call of Abraham, through the establishment of the Davidic Covenant, through the lineage of David's descendants that eventually brought the Christ to the earth, God has chosen to work in and through families. But now, our families are in serious trouble.

In this article, I am going to argue based on Deuteronomy 6 that God intends fathers to adopt a multi-generational vision to train their sons to love God with all their hearts and to keep his commandments, so that they, in turn, can train their own sons to lead their families in the same pattern. I am going to argue that this in no way shows a lack of concern for mothers or daughters, but rather upholds the structure for family leadership that God established from the beginning of humanity. I will describe in detail the practical steps Deuteronomy 6 commands fathers to take in training their

sons. And I will conclude with a call to Christian fathers in the new covenant to take these words seriously and apply them to their own sons and families for the glory of Christ.

A Dramatic Moment in Redemptive History

It would be difficult to overstate the drama of the moment in redemptive history represented in the book of Deuteronomy. There stood Moses, the man of God, addressing Israel, the people of God, assembled on the plains of Moab after forty years of wandering in the desert (Num 36:13; Deut 34:1). This would be Moses' final official address to the people he had led out of bondage in Egypt, since he was about to die. The people were about to cross the Jordan River and take possession of the Promised Land, the inheritance God had sworn on oath to give to Abraham and his descendents forever.

They had been in this same position forty years before. But because of the sin of the people, and especially of the men (fathers) who had led them, they had had to wander those forty years until that entire generation of fighting men had died out (Num 14:1–45). The poignancy of the moment was sharpened by these truths; a holy God was leading a sinful people by the power of his might in proportion to their obedience to his words. Because their fathers had not truly loved him they had refused to trust him and, thus, had disobeyed his commands. And so they died, every one of them, except Joshua and Caleb.

At this poignant moment, Israel's greatest leader chose to give them a precious gift—the gift of words. Not just any words, but living words, the words of the living God. Moses would comment later on the immense importance of these words:

Take to heart all the words I have solemnly declared to you this day, so that you may command your children to obey carefully all the words of this law. They are not just idle words for you—they are your life. By them you will live long in the land you are crossing the Jordan to possess (Deut 32:45–47 NIV).

In Deuteronomy 6, Moses was specifically charging fathers with the responsibility to train their sons to obey the law of God. I am not in any way minimizing the importance of mothers teaching their sons² or of parents teaching daughters. However, the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 6 puts an emphasis on sons, and the patriarchal structure of the whole book puts an emphasis on fathers. The emphasis on sons is, I believe, for the purpose of raising up future godly fathers who will themselves continue to teach this covenant to their families for the entire history of Israel. Thus, the father-son relationship is highlighted in Deuteronomy 6 specifically because godly leadership had proven to be so vital.

Words from God through a Mediator

Fundamental to my argument is the concept that God mediates his truth to his people by means of appointed messengers. Perhaps the clearest example in the Bible is in Rev 1:1–2: “The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show to his servants the things that must soon take place. He made it known by sending his angel to his servant John, who bore witness to the word of God and to the testimony of Jesus Christ, even to all that he saw” (ESV). Here we see the book of Revelation given from God the Father to

God the Son to an angel to John then to God's servants. Three mediators stand between God and his beloved people.

God employed this kind of "relay race" of revelation in transmitting the old covenant itself. According to statements made in the New Testament, God gave his laws to Moses by means of an angel. Stephen spoke of the law that "was put into effect through angels" (Acts 7:53). Paul wrote that "(the law) was put in place through angels by an intermediary" (Gal 3:19). Even more significantly, in the passage immediately preceding this one, Moses reminded the people that they had begged God for a human mediator on Mount Sinai:

But now, why should we die? This great fire will consume us, and we will die if we hear the voice of the LORD our God any longer. For what mortal man has ever heard the voice of the living God speaking out of fire, as we have, and survived? Go near and listen to all that the LORD our God says. Then tell us whatever the LORD our God tells you. We will listen and obey (Deut 5:25–27 NIV).

This is the beginning of the prophetic office, for the Lord later said he would raise up a prophet like Moses to speak to the people (Deut 18:15). It also lays the foundation for the concept I desire to establish here—God wills that husbands/fathers should be priests and prophets to their own families and teach the words of God to them. Therefore, God specifically commands fathers to teach the stipulations of the covenant to their sons: "You shall teach

them diligently to your sons and shall talk of them when you sit in your house and when you walk by the way and when you lie down and when you rise up" (Deut 6:7 NASB, emphasis added). God desires men to play this mediatorial role of relaying the words of God to their families, and here in Deuteronomy 6, he makes clear provision for the training of the next generation of mediators, of men who will so instruct their own families.

Fathers as Representative Leaders

It is God's pattern, established from creation, to lead families through the husband/father. He established this by first creating Adam alone, with no wife, and giving him the original prohibition concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:16–17). This patriarchal pattern is relatively easy to prove in Deuteronomy; the words of God given first to Moses, then to men as leaders, then through them to all the people of Israel. A series of indicators is sufficient to make our point, such as the following:

- (1) God is identified as the "God of your fathers" repeatedly (e.g., Deut 1:11, 21; 4:1; 6:3; 12:1).
- (2) God specifically holds Israel accountable for the sins of the fathers, even to the third and fourth generation (Deut 5:9); it was because of the sins of their fathers that Israel had to wander in the desert for forty years.
- (3) The consistent use of "brother" to represent Israelites in case studies; again and again it is the case of a brother that the judges must judge

(Deut 1:16), brothers to whom God gives rest in the Promised Land (Deut 3:20), brothers who must be released from debt every seven years (Deut 15:1–3), a brother's ox or sheep that strays and needs to be returned (Deut 22:1–3).³ The Hebrew word "sister" only appears once in the entire book, and that only concerning a sexual prohibition (Deut 27:22).

- (4) The language of the Ten Commandments specifies that one must not covet a neighbor's wife, not husband (Deut 5:21).
- (5) The warning against being led astray into idolatry by loved ones, even by the "wife you embrace" (Deut 13:6).
- (6) The curses against sexual immorality follow a masculine pattern: "Cursed be the man who lies with his" father's wife, sister, or mother-in-law (Deut 27:20, 22, 23).
- (7) Levirate marriage shows the patriarchal structure of Israelite society as envisioned in Deuteronomy; the clear assumption is that the family lineage is carried on through sons who bear their father's name in the next generation and inherit his portion of the Promised Land (Deut 25:5–10).
- (8) A father has special responsibility for his daugh-

ter's purity. If an Israelite daughter was found to have committed premarital sexual immorality, then the woman would be taken to the door of her father's house and stoned to death, "because she has done an outrageous thing in Israel by whoring in her father's house" (Deut 22:21). The location of the stoning (the door of her father's house) and the reason for the stoning (whoring in her father's house) show the responsibility the father has for protecting the purity of his daughter.

By way of balance, it is as easy to prove that God intends to bless all of his people with his word as it is to prove that he intends patriarchal structure. Many commands in Deuteronomy are clearly given for the benefit of women and of daughters. For example, daughters are specifically mentioned as being as free from labor on the Sabbath as are sons (Deut 5:14); daughters are invited to rejoice before the Lord and share in the offerings at the one place of worship God will choose from among the tribes (Deut 12:18); daughters are also to participate joyfully in the annual Feast of Weeks and Feast of Booths (Deut 16:11, 14). And clearly both males and females stand under what Jesus called "the first and greatest commandment" (Matt 22:36–38), to love the Lord with all their hearts, souls, minds and strength (Deut 6:5).

In fact, whenever God says "Hear O Israel," as he does in the "greatest commandment," he is ad-

dressing all his people, male and female, young and old. All of God's word is for all of God's people, even if the commandments are given to Levites or Aaronic priests. It is beneficial for those who are in the new covenant and no longer required to circumcise their sons or to offer animal sacrifice to read the laws concerning those things.

However, God speaks his covenant words first to the leaders of Israel, the fathers, who must transmit those words faithfully to their families.

Sons in Deuteronomy: Future Representative Leaders

Pivotal to my argument is the handling of the word translated "children" in Deut 6:7 in the KJV, RSV, NIV, ESV, but "sons" in the NASB. The verse reads as follows: "You shall teach them diligently to your children (*banîm*), and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise" (Deut 6:7 ESV). The Hebrew word, *ben* in the singular, *banîm* (plural) here, is the most common term of relationship in the Old Testament, used some 4850 times.⁴ It is used 127 times in Deuteronomy alone. There are some clear instances in which the word must stand for both sons and daughters. Concerning the Feast of Booths, God gave this command:

Assemble the people, men, women, and little ones, and the sojourner within your towns, that they may hear and learn to fear the LORD your God, and be careful to do all the words of this law, and that their children, who have not known it, may hear and learn to fear the LORD your God, as long as you live

in the land that you are going over the Jordan to possess (Deut 31:12–13 ESV).

Clearly God wants both genders to assemble, as he says in verse 12. But in verse 13, he gives the reason for it: "that their children (*banîm*)... may hear and learn to fear the LORD." Since both males and females are to be assembled, then the word *banîm* must refer to both sons and daughters.⁵

Why, then, does God use the same word for both male offspring and for all offspring regardless of gender? The same question is raised concerning the use of the Hebrew word 'adam commonly translated "man." The word means "man," "husband," or the first man, Adam. But the word also refers to the human race as a whole: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them" (Gen 1:27); "When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them Man when they were created" (Gen 5:1–2, emphasis added). God named the whole race collectively, both male and female, by the same name he gave the male. I believe this reveals God's intention for male representational leadership. Therefore, the use of the word "son" or "sons" to represent both male children and all children is a reasonable corollary.

How should Deuteronomy 6:7 be translated? And how should it be applied? These are two different questions. While the NASB translates *banîm* "sons," thus following the more literal translation, I think the rest of the English translations (KJV, NIV, RSV, ESV) have it right, translating *banîm* "children" rather than sons. The reason for this is the universality of the com-

mand that Jesus called “the first and greatest command” in the Bible. However, the issue goes beyond merely how best to translate *banîm*. Rather, it is to see the primary responsibility a generation of fathers has to train (1) their own children (*banîm*) generally; and (2) the next generation of family leaders, their sons (*banîm*) specifically. I am arguing here that we should not merely translate it “children” without acknowledging the principle of male headship and leadership in the home that God is intending thereby. In our own age, when the father’s primary role as evangelist and disciple-maker of his children is being openly attacked, the primacy of fathers in Deuteronomy generally and of sons in Deuteronomy 6 specifically is a helpful remedy.

How Israelite Fathers Should Prepare Their Sons to Lead Their Families

(1) *Begin with the fear of the Lord.* The timeless wisdom of Deuteronomy 6 begins where Proverbs will later begin, with the fear of the Lord: “That you may fear the LORD your God” (Deut 6:2). This is the very lesson God sought to establish in the hearts of his people at Sinai with such a terrifying display of his power and wrath, with a dark cloud and an earthquake, with lightning and thunder, with a trumpet blast and his own powerful and deafening voice (Exod 19:18–19). God said very plainly that his whole purpose was to generate a holy fear of the Lord: “Do not fear, for God has come to test you, that the fear of him may be before you, that you may not sin” (Exod 20:20). In other words, God was saying to Israel, “If you fear me properly, you need fear nothing else the rest of your lives.” The fear of the Lord was the beginning of the wisdom a godly Israelite should pass on to his son.

(2) *Know God’s commandments thoroughly.* “Now this is the commandment, the statutes and the rules that the LORD your God commanded me to teach you” (Deut 6:1). The whole purpose of Deuteronomy is to exhort obedience to the law of God by which the people would be permitted to remain in the Promised Land. If the people do not know the law, they cannot keep it. Therefore, the most important thing a father can do is teach his son the very words of God. God does not speak a single “empty word” (Deut 32:47), and man lives on “every word that comes from the mouth of God” (Deut 8:3). Thus, godly fathers in Israel needed to make the study of the entire law of God their central concern.

(3) *Develop a multigenerational view of spiritual protection and prosperity.* Deut 6:2: “that you may fear the LORD your God, you and your son and your son’s son, by keeping all his statutes and his commandments, which I command you, all the days of your life, and that your days may be long.” Given that verse 3 speaks of the “God of your fathers” and that this verse speaks of “you, your son, and your son’s son” we have at least four generations in view here. Israelite fathers knew already how faithful God is to multiple generations, keeping his promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, through the enslaved generations in Egypt, to the point of bringing this generation into the Promised Land. Conversely, from the time of Adam onward, godly fathers have recognized that their sins will greatly affect future generations; thus, they must carefully train their sons. In this alone will Israel find their spiritual protection (that “your days may be long”), and prosperity (“that it may go well with you, and that you

may multiply greatly, as the LORD, the God of your fathers, has promised you, in a land flowing with milk and honey,” v. 3) for generations to come.

(4) *Hear and obey.* “Hear therefore, O Israel, and be careful to do them” (Deut 6:3). Godly fathers must hear these precious words that God is speaking through Moses, and not merely hearing with the ears but with the heart, resulting in obedience. If they are truly not empty words, then they must be taken to heart and lived out in daily life. The *Shema* of verse 4 takes its name from the command to “Hear, O Israel,” and this upholds God’s intention to create a nation the same way he created the universe, by the word of his power.

(5) *Make loving God with all your heart your highest end.* The “greatest command” in the Bible is found in verses 4–5: “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one. You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might.” It is a genuine love relationship that God is seeking from his people, nothing less. In this relationship, God is the leader, the initiator. He declares to his people who and what he is, and, based on that, he commands worship, love, and reverence. Ideas about God do not originate with man; therefore, the greatest command begins with “Hear, O Israel.” Israel is in a passive stance, allowing God to reveal himself as he sees fit. From that revelation, God commands love from the heart. Without this heart relationship, the people will most certainly degenerate from compulsory obedience to hypocrisy and eventually to idolatry. Godly fathers in Israel must begin here, by setting God up as their greatest treasure, and by cherishing his name

and his word above all things.

(6) *Cherish the commands of God in your own life.* “And these words that I command you today shall be on your heart” (v. 6). Godly fathers must show a deep reverence for the words of God by taking them into their very being, saturating their minds with them, memorizing them, repeating them to themselves every day. If an Israelite boy discovers his father fervently praying over and meditating deeply on God’s word, he will find all the motivation he needs to hide God’s word in his own heart as well. Herein we find the absolute importance of role modeling for good parenting. Sons can spot hypocrisy in their fathers, and will more likely follow their true path than their sham path. These commandments must find deep root in the hearts and lives of godly fathers or they will not likely be passed on to the next generation.

(7) *Teach by consistent repetition, in everyday life situations, and by physical reminders.* “You shall teach them diligently to your sons, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise. You shall bind them as a sign on your hand, and they shall be as frontlets between your eyes. You shall write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates” (vv. 7–9). Here is where the advice to Israelite fathers becomes the most practical and down-to-earth. Here is a workable plan for discipleship that extends to the details of daily life.

The first verb, translated “teach diligently” is fascinating, a word that is usually used for the sharpening done to metal weapons. For instance, God uses it again in Deut 32:41 in the Song of Moses for the whetting of his glistening sword for vengeance on his

adversaries. The whetting of a sword, like the sharpening of an arrowhead (cf. Ps 64:4; Isa 5:28), is done by constant repetition, a circular motion on a whetstone. Thus, an Israelite father was to “sharpen” these commandments into the hearts of his sons, repeating them again and again until they have been worked into the very structure of their minds. They were to talk about them constantly, in everyday life situations, “sitting, walking, lying, rising.” An Israelite father should skillfully weave these commandments into life in the promised land, while sowing and reaping, while threshing and gathering grain into barns. There would be no daily life situation in which the father would not mentor his constantly present sons, preparing them for the future leadership of their own homes. He would even write these commands on the doorposts of the home, a command taken literally by Jews in the form of the mezuzah, a small bit of parchment on which was written the Shema and fastened to their doorposts. Jewish sons would be hearing and seeing the commands of God everywhere, “sharpened” into their hearts by godly fathers for the future protection and prosperity of Israel.

(8) *Develop a disposition of constant vigilance, especially in prosperity.* In verses 10–19, Moses specifically warned Israelite fathers to beware of allowing their hearts to be drawn away from obedience to the Lord by the easy abundance and gracious prosperity of the Promised Land, an abundance and prosperity they did not earn. The same sins that led Sodom astray, “pride, excess of food, and prosperous ease” (Ezek 16:49), threatened the very existence of Israel in the Promised Land. Godly Jewish fathers needed to train

their sons to guard their hearts against this slothful, self-sufficient arrogance.⁶ The luxurious sensuality of idolatrous worship will be singing its siren song of destruction into the ears of the Israelites for generations to come, for the land is rich and prosperous, a “land flowing with milk and honey.” Godly fathers had to prepare their sons to keep pure, eating and being satisfied while not forgetting that all these blessings are from God, and he is a jealous God who will tolerate no rivals (vv. 14–15).

(9) *Seize teachable moments when your son’s heart is open.* With a godly father’s constant teaching and repetition, with his clear love for the Lord as manifested by a lifestyle of comprehensive obedience to these pervasive commands, undoubtedly teachable moments will come when the son will ask his father about their religion: “When your son asks you in time to come, ‘What is the meaning of the testimonies and the statutes and the rules that the Lord our God has commanded you?’ then you shall say to your son...” (vv. 6:20–21). Notice that the son is asking the father, confirming the father-son relationship assumed throughout this chapter. (Please note that this in no way means a mother should not seize such teachable moments with her son or daughter, either. Simply that the patriarchal system in which Deuteronomy was written is assumed here.) Notice also that the son is asking the father about the commands God had commanded the father. It is the father’s consistent lifestyle under the law that has prompted the question, just as it is clear that on Mount Moriah, young Isaac asked his father Abraham based on years of observation, “Here is wood and fire, but where is the lamb for the burnt offering?” (Gen 22:7). The natural curiosity

of a young son was assumed in verse 20, and it would be the foundation of ongoing training. A wise father will make the most of those precious and strategic opportunities.

(10) *Saturate your son in the history of God's faithfulness.* The answer the godly father gives at that moment is to saturate the son in the redemptive history of God's dealings with his covenant people.

Then you shall say to your son, "We were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt. And the LORD brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand. And the LORD showed signs and wonders, great and grievous, against Egypt and against Pharaoh and all his household, before our eyes. And he brought us out from there, that he might bring us in and give us the land that he swore to give to our fathers" (vv. 21–23).

Amazingly, this is precisely the instruction that this very generation of Israelite fathers failed to give their sons, thus initiating the cycle of sin, judgment and restoration that characterized the period under the Judges.⁷ What an obscene tragedy, the failure of this very generation of fathers to whom God had first given these commands on the plains of Moab to train their sons in the mighty works of God in the Exodus. Fathers and sons formed a key link in redemptive history, and it was the father's responsibility to make this clear.

How Christian Fathers Should Prepare Their Sons to Lead a Family

It is important for Christian fa-

thers under the new covenant to understand how to apply the practical spiritual advice of Deuteronomy 6 for their own families. There is a clear difference between the righteousness of Israelites under the old covenant and that we enjoy now in Christ. A godly father in the old covenant was to instruct his sons saying, "And it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all this commandment before the LORD our God, as he has commanded us" (v. 25). It would be based on this obedience to the law that the Israelites would maintain their righteous standing in the sight of God and be blessed in the Promised Land.

But a godly father in the new covenant has a different message for his children. He will teach them that our righteousness cannot come from obedience to the Law, as clearly proven by the tragic history of Israel. Rather it will come only from faith in Christ, the "righteousness that comes from God and is by faith" (Phil 3:8–11; cf. also Rom 3:21–24).

Indeed, Deuteronomy was not merely pessimistic about the future generations of Israelite sons being able to keep the covenant, but rather openly prophetic that they would not do so. Moses introduced his prophetic song with these words:

I know that after my death you will surely act corruptly and turn aside from the way that I have commanded you. And in the days to come evil will befall you, because you will do what is evil in the sight of the LORD, provoking him to anger through the work of your hands (Deut 31:28–29).

And in that Song of Moses, they learned what they would do in the future: “Jeshurun grew fat, and kicked; you grew fat, stout, and sleek; then he forsook God who made him and scoffed at the Rock of his salvation. They stirred him to jealousy with strange gods; with abominations they provoked him to anger” (Deut 32:15–16).

But a new covenant father can be not merely optimistic but openly prophetic based on the promises of God that any who are justified by faith in Christ will have the law of God written on the hearts (Heb 8:10) and be enabled by the power of the Spirit to walk consistently (although not perfectly) in its righteous requirements (Rom 8:4), and afterward to be received into glory.

Other than this, however, Christian fathers today are facing the same challenges that Israelite fathers did then. The basic concept of this article is that fathers must prepare their sons to take the spiritual leadership of their families. That concept is upheld in the central passage on parenting in the New Testament, Eph 6:4: “Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.” The Greek word for “children” in the verse implies both sons and daughters, but it is the fathers who are clearly given the final responsibility for bringing the children up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. These two words imply that fathers must give their children a complete, whole life training in the things of God, with heavy emphasis on warnings concerning the dangers of sin. What better passage to turn to than Deuteronomy 6?

And though new covenant fathers are not seeking to prepare their children for generations in the physi-

cal Promised Land, yet the relevance of this type of training is upheld, even in Ephesians 6. In Eph 6:1–3, Paul admonishes children in the new covenant: “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. ‘Honor your father and mother’ (this is the first commandment with a promise), ‘that it may go well with you and that you may live long in the land.’” Thus, Paul uses an old covenant commandment with an old covenant blessing attached to it (cf. Deut 5:16) to motivate new covenant children to obedience.

A wise Christian father, therefore, will see the word “fathers” in Eph 6:4, take his own responsibility seriously toward his children, and turn to Deuteronomy 6 for practical insights into how to bring up his children in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. But he will do more than that. He will develop the multigenerational vision clearly taught in Deut 6:2 and will prepare his sons to lead their own families into spiritual obedience and lasting fruitfulness for the glory of Christ. And he will prepare his daughters to delight in and choose such a man as her prospective husband and to embrace and submit to his leadership as the head of the family (Eph 5:22–24). The future health and spiritual prosperity of the church of Jesus Christ depends on fathers who will delight in the multigenerational vision of family leadership laid out in Deuteronomy 6 and confidently trust in God’s Spirit to prepare their sons and daughters to walk in a law now written on their hearts by faith.

¹ T. C. Pinckney, “We Are Losing Our Children: Remarks to Southern Baptist Convention Executive Committee, 18 September 2001” n.p. [accessed 1 Feb 2007]. Online: <http://www.nehemiahinstitute.com/articles/index.php?action=show&cid=8>. See also disturbing survey in Josh McDowell, *Right from Wrong: What You Need to Know to Help*

Youth Make Right Choices (Dallas: Word, 1994).

The survey results of 3795 Christian children shows very little difference in the way they think compared with the views of non-Christians on the nature of the family, on definitions of marriage, on sexuality, and on other vital issues. Perhaps most shocking of all was that fifty-seven percent of the youth surveyed did not think that an objective standard of truth exists

² Proverbs 1:8 reads, “Hear, my son, your father’s instruction, and forsake not your mother’s teaching.”

³ That the word “brother” refers to both males and females in many cases is clear from Deut 15:12, which says “If your brother, a hebrew *man or woman*, is sold to you, he shall serve you six years, and in the seventh year you shall let him go free.”

⁴ Eduard Schweizer, “ὄϊός” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (ed. Gerhard Kittel; trans. Geoffrey Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76), 8:340.

⁵ Another example is in Deut 32:19–20: “The LORD saw it and spurned them, because of the provocation of his sons (*banim*) and his daughters. And he said, ‘I will hide my face from them; I will see what their end will be, For they are a perverse generation, children (*banim*) in whom is no faithfulness.’ Both male and female offspring are mentioned in verse 19, but only *banim* in verse 20. And again, in Exod 21:4–6, a slave is given a wife by his master, and his wife bears him sons and daughters. In Exod 21:5, he declares that he loves his “children” (*banim*) and decides to become his master’s slave for life. Here *banim* must refer to the “sons and daughters” his slave wife has borne him.

⁶ Moses will sound the same warning in Deut 8:11–14: “Take care lest you forget the LORD your God by not keeping his commandments and his rules and his statutes, which I command you today, lest, when you have eaten and are full and have built good houses and live in them, and when your herds and flocks multiply and your silver and gold is multiplied and all that you have is multiplied, then your heart be lifted up, and you forget the LORD your God.”

⁷ “And all that generation also were gathered to their fathers. And there arose another generation after them who did not know the LORD or the work that he had done for Israel. And the people of Israel did what was evil in the sight of the LORD and served the Baals” (Judg 2:10–11).

A REVIEW OF *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity* BY KEVIN GILES

Jason Hall

*Director of Communications,
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, North Carolina*

Introduction

In *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Kevin Giles makes some bold accusations. This is his second book dealing with issues of subordination and ordering in the Godhead, and this book expands on the arguments he advanced in his first, *The Trinity and Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate* (InterVarsity Press, 2002). In the most recent volume, Giles goes further than ever before, accusing a wide swath of evangelicals of being heretics along the lines of the notorious fourth century Alexandrian presbyter, Arius, and of being tritheists as well. Audacious claims, to be sure, but does Giles make his case? The present review intends to explore and answer that question.

Until his recent retirement Giles was the vicar of St. Michael's Church, an Anglican congregation in North Carlton, Australia. His writing has primarily focused on the issue of women's

roles in the church. In *The Trinity and Subordinationism* he specifically charged that complementarians were using a faulty understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity to substantiate and undergird their views on male-female role relationships in the home and the church. He also contributed a chapter on the same subject to *Discovering Biblical Equality* (InterVarsity Press, 2004). *Jesus and the Father* is an expansion of parts of those works; specifically, Giles's desire is to examine the issue of subordination in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. His arguments have not changed substantially from the earlier works. He claims that his even more intense study of the doctrine in the intervening years have reinforced his view of an egalitarian Trinity.

This review will proceed by, first, examining Giles's thesis and his stated intentions in *Jesus and the Father*; second, by providing a brief overview of the book's contents; and third, by providing an evaluation of the book in regard to

philosophical and theological strengths and weaknesses.

Contents

Thesis and Purpose

The book may best be seen as a polemic against those who assert that, within the bounds of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, there exists room for the view that there is an asymmetry of relationships among the members of the Godhead, and the Father has relational primacy such that the Son and the Spirit, while remaining in their very nature God, eternally submit to the Father. In contrast, Giles claims that there is no place for subordination *in any kind or in any way* among the Trinity in eternity. He writes, “One of the basic arguments of this book is that to speak of the *eternal subordination of the Son* in function and authority by necessity implies ontological subordinationism” (30, emphasis original).

With that as his thesis, Giles’s purpose is to demonstrate how a proper interpretation of Scripture and the giants of orthodox historical theology, particularly Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Augustine, Calvin, Barth, and the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, bolster an egalitarian understanding of the Godhead and see any hint of subordination as heretical. By extension he desires to show that those who assert the eternal functional subordination of the Son have strayed from orthodoxy and are, in fact, Arian heretics. Among those he places in this camp are, most explicitly, Wayne Grudem and the Sydney Anglican Doctrine Commission, but also George Knight, John Frame, Robert Letham, and Bruce Ware.¹ Giles explicitly states that his desire is not to offer a thorough treatment of the doctrine, but instead to focus on what he

considers a foundational issue. It should be noted that his stated intention is to treat this question in complete separation from the issue of male-female role relationships.

Evangelicals and Trinitarian Doctrine

Giles opens the book with an introductory chapter on the current form of the debate on the doctrine of the Trinity, asserting that it was only in response to women taking a more pronounced role in leadership in church and home that some defensive evangelicals began positing the eternal subordination of the Son to the Father in role or function. Such a view, he argues, did not exist prior to the mid-1970s. This hypothesis leads him to the conclusion that those who take this view are reading their views on gender roles back into the doctrine of God, a case of the tail wagging the dog. The idea that the Son is, in view of his very nature, totally equal with God but also submits to the Father in his relationship as the eternal Son is paradoxical and confusing to Giles. He regards this understanding of the Trinity as a veiled attempt “to reinstate a form of social ordering modern culture has largely repudiated” (31).

To Giles “eternal” is the same as “ontological.”² He charges that many complementarians, in defending this aberrant understanding of the Trinity, have intentionally and with malice misused words like role, order, and difference. He also explicitly equates two pairs of words with such force that it affects his conclusions throughout the book. To Giles, “subordinate” is the same as “inferior.” This continues the affirmation that has been at the heart of egalitarian doctrine from the beginning of the debate—that to be subordinate in any way is to be inferior to or less than. The second pair

of important synonyms is “authority” and “power” or “omnipotence.” More on that later.

Giles concludes his introductory chapters with biographical notes on the “major players” in the debate, namely, the historical theologians with which he will interact. His final note in this section is to say that he is reading the Bible and sources as they are meant to be read, and not with presuppositional bias like his opponents.

In his chapter on biblical teaching on the Trinity, Giles sketches a three-stage Christology, which he says clearly leads to the view that the Son was subordinated to the Father only in the second stage, in his time on earth. He can say this because he is reading the Bible as the best historical theologians have—that is, when the Scriptures refer to the Son’s obedience or submission, it is speaking of his earthly ministry; but when it speaks of his glory, it is speaking of him eternally.

In the book’s longest chapters, Giles reiterates the arguments he made in *The Trinity and Subordinationism* that Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Augustine, and Calvin, among others, all claim that functional subordination of the Son is heresy. Perhaps one of his biggest challenges is dealing with the widely held belief that Athanasius and the Cappadocians in particular, and Augustine, held to the *monarche* of the Father, a position that would be problematic for his view. He seems to say that Athanasius and the Cappadocians believed the whole Godhead was the *monarche*, and describes Augustine as “not altogether logically consistent or clear” on the matter (156).

Giles expands on his assertion earlier in the book that authority and power are interchangeable. His argu-

ment is that to say the Son eternally submits to the Father is to deny his authority, and thus to deny his power, and thus to deny his equality with the Father. It is important to note that here he does not quote the church fathers at length in defense of this logical assertion. Rather, he assumes the legitimacy of the assertion and then quotes the church fathers in defense of the idea that denying the authority and power of the Son is heretical. This is an idea, of course, with which any evangelical theologian would agree.

In his next chapters Giles asserts that the persons of the Trinity are only to be differentiated by their relations to one another, and to differentiate them in any other ways leads toward tritheism. In chapter 7 he includes a less-than-detailed overview of the modern debate over the immanent and economic Trinity, arguing that Rahner erred in his axiom equating the two and asserting again that what is true of the Incarnation cannot be understood to be true of the Godhead in eternity. In the final chapter he notes that his opponents who claim Barth on their side in this debate do not adequately account for the dialectic nature of Barth’s theology. Barth, he argues, held simultaneously that the Son is both Lord and servant; this view is totally compatible with his own, and incompatible with that of his opponents.

Evaluation

Giles rightly places the doctrine of the Trinity where it should be, in the middle of the whole of Christian theology. His strong affirmation of the centrality of Trinitarian doctrine—he writes that many Christians mistakenly believe the Trinity is a “very abstract and somewhat impractical doctrine” (12)—is

clear, concise, and most welcome.

Giles is also an excellent writer. The subject of each chapter is clearly delineated, he sticks to his argument without veering into matters of little import, and he summarizes his arguments well and often. He is rarely repetitive, but often repetitious—by that I mean that he restates his arguments often enough to make them clear and discernible to the reader, but not so often that it seems monotonous. In fact, Giles’s writing ability is likely what has gained him such a following among those who share his views. He is able to put forth his ideas with clarity and succinctness. Were his presuppositions and conclusions not so erroneous, this is the type of book one could hand to an educated layman who was interested in the doctrine of the Trinity.

Unfortunately, I cannot recommend this book for such a purpose. Giles fails to accomplish his goal—that is, to prove that those who hold to the eternal submission of the Son to the Father in role or function are Arian heretics. That is his central purpose, and that is the standard to which he must be held. If he succeeds in showing that the eternal functional submission of the Son is Arianism, then his book stands as a strong condemnation of those views. If he cannot succeed in that task, then he has missed the point entirely and his book is relatively worthless. I believe he has not made his case.

Distinction of person and nature

Giles does not make the necessary distinction between person and nature in the doctrine of the Trinity that the creeds allow. It should come as no surprise that he does not do this, because it seems that to do so would damage his central thesis that eternal subordination

in role or function is the same as Arianism. In one passage that fairly represents his overall view, Giles writes, “If the divine Son is eternally subordinated in role or function, he is a subordinated divine person. His subordination as it is eternal defines his person. In other words, he is subordinated in being” (46). What makes this statement problematic is how the last sentence stands in relation to the first two. In Giles’s mind, to be subordinate as a person eternally is to be subordinate in nature as well. Restating Giles’s argument in Trinitarian terms, the eternal subordination of the Son in his *Sonness* is the same as the eternal subordination of the Son in his *Godness*. But this is not necessarily so, at least not according to classical formulation of Christian doctrine.

Those who hold to the eternal subordination of the Son in function or role would argue, along the lines of historic trinitarian orthodoxy, that the Son’s role or function is particular to his person as the Son, not to his nature as God. These distinctions are allowed, even encouraged, by all of the creeds Giles mentions in his book. It is also important to note that both *person* and *nature* are eternal categories, a fact that is demanded by the creeds. No one, though, is arguing that the Son is subordinate in his nature as God, and Giles’s insistence that such a corollary is logically demanded by the complementarian position is invalid. Complementarians claim that the subordinate role or relationship of the Son is particular to his person as the Son, and his Sonness is just as eternal and necessary as his Godness. Bruce Ware puts it well:

Every essential attribute of God’s nature is possessed by the Father, Son, and Spirit

equally and fully. We cannot look at aspects of the *nature of God* as that which distinguishes the Father from the Son or Spirit; rather we have to look at the *roles and relationships* that characterize the Father uniquely in relation to the Son and the Spirit.³

The claim that the eternal subordination of person is the same as eternal subordination of being is untrue. The disagreement at hand over the nature of Christ's subordination, important as it is, seems to be a debate that can take place within the bounds of the creeds because of the way they distinguish between person and nature. Giles's insistence that this is a matter of heresy versus orthodoxy overstates the case. Unfortunately, the contents of *Jesus and the Father* are based on the bald assertion that complementarians are Arian heretics because of the position they hold.

The preceding point leads one to doubt seriously whether all of the patristic and Reformation evidence that Giles has supposedly amassed in his favor in *Jesus and the Father* is as cut-and-dry as he makes it out to be. Because his arguments from Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Calvin, and others have not substantially changed from his earlier works, it is not necessary for me to delve into great detail criticizing his arguments when others have done so rather skillfully.⁴ My point is simply this: Patristic scholars, particularly those writing around the time of Nicea and Constantinople, were not primarily having a discussion about whether or not the functional subordination of the Son, particular to his person, was eternal or limited to the incarnation.

They were having a discussion about whether or not the Son is subordinate to the Father in nature as God. As I have tried to demonstrate, the former of these discussions can be had within the bounds of orthodoxy. The second cannot. It is at least questionable whether the content of great theologians engaged in the latter debate—Athanasius, the Cappadocians, etc.—can be lifted wholesale and advanced as authoritatively in the former debate, as Giles does. This is not to say that the great theologians have nothing to say to those of us engaged in this debate; rather, one should be rather more circumspect and careful when handling such texts, in contrast to the relative carelessness displayed in *Jesus and the Father*.

Giles makes a similar mistake in regard to the discussion of power and authority, which he has equated with "omnipotence." The Son's omnipotence is best seen theologically to belong to his nature as God, and thus as the Son he possesses the same omnipotence as the Father or the Spirit. A separation cannot be drawn. All of that does not preclude the fact that as the second person of the Godhead the Son can exercise his power under the submission of his Father and still remain omnipotent. It is because Giles misunderstands this point that he writes, "the assertion that the Father rules over the Son indicates that it is believed that the Father has greater authority and power than the Son. He reigns over all, including the Son, as a monarch" (202). Giles has again misrepresented the complementarian view and as a result his analysis is off-base.⁵

Mischaracterization of his opponents

Giles's caricature of his opponents' mindset is disingenuous, at places absurdly so. One example will

suffice. Early in the first chapter, under the heading “How Could Evangelicals Get Their Doctrine of the Trinity So Wrong?”, Giles seems to be speaking to the uninformed in this debate when he asks rhetorically about his opponents, “How is it that so many evangelicals believe what is patently counter to the Christian faith as it has been defined in the past?” (32). Putting aside the fact that he has assumed the veracity of his thesis for the purpose of argumentation without bothering to prove it, Giles’s “answer” to his own question is sheer arrogance.

First, he claims that evangelical scholars’ weakness in historical doctrine has led them to miss completely this obvious “[Arianism] in a new form” (32). Second, he lays the blame at the feet of wrong-headed theologians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, even though later in the book the only actual enemy engaged in any real depth is Charles Hodge. Third, everyone—except, it seems, egalitarians who knew better—assumed that Grudem, Ware, the Sydney Doctrine Commission, et al, were good theologians who were always right, so no one bothered to check up on them.

While it may be stylish to accuse one’s opponents of historical ignorance, in this case it is a gross overgeneralization that is unsubstantiated in its facts. In the ensuing explanation of his three answers to his rhetorical question, Giles does not put forward one piece of credible evidence to show that the particular theologians whom he is attacking had a deficient knowledge of historical theology such that they were unaware that they were touting Arianism. Neither does he prove that other theologians or pastors who have applauded their work—say, many members of The

Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood—are so ignorant. Never does Giles prove a *substantial causal link* between a supposed lack of knowledge among evangelicals and the doctrine of the eternal submission of the Son to the Father in role. It is simply asserted.

Misunderstanding of Arianism

Giles understates the nature of the Arian heresy. Giles believes that the most fundamental characteristic of an Arian is one who subordinates the Son in role, authority, and being. He writes, “[Arianism] is a very broad category covering people and theological groupings with differing views on many things, united only by their common conviction that the Son is eternally subordinated to the Father in being, work/function, and authority” (9, n.1). This statement betrays a stilted view of Arianism that is rhetorically designed to advance his book’s argument, rather than designed to be most true to historical theology. The most fundamental characteristic of the Arian heresy, the one that the Nicene Creed was crafted to dismiss, is the notion that the Son is a creature and therefore unlike the Divine Father in substantial ways.

Gregg and Groh—who, Giles claims, support his argument in their book *Early Arianism*—write, “The central Arian model was that of a perfected *creature* whose nature remained always creaturely and whose position was always subordinate to and dependent upon the Father’s will (*italics mine*).”⁶ Each first year seminary student learns the Arian mantra, “There was when he was not,” referring to the Son’s createdness. The total subordination of the Son was a necessary corollary of this view, to be sure, but it *was not* the starting point. To boil Arianism down to make

subordination as such its central tenet is misleading. No one in this debate is saying that the Son is a creature, and no one is arguing for the eternal functional submission of the Son on that basis. Thus, there is a great difference between classical Arian arguments for the subordination of the Son and contemporary arguments for the submission of the Son.

In pressing this point further, Giles launches an *ad hominem* attack on many evangelicals, making them guilty by association. His argument goes: The Arians believed in the eternal functional subordination of the Son. There are modern evangelicals, like Grudem, Ware, et al., who believe in the eternal functional subordination of the Son. Therefore, Grudem, Ware, and company are Arians. For example, he writes,

That Arius ontologically subordinated the Son to the Father is well known. What is less well known and adequately recognized is that he and all the Arians also subordinated the Son in authority. Richard Hanson in his monumental study of Arianism says the Arians consistently taught that the Son “does the Father’s will and exhibits *obedience and subordination* to the Father, and adores and praises the Father, *not only in his earthly ministry but also in Heaven*” (italics in original) (178).

This statement is misleading on several levels. First, how is it “less well known” that the Arians subordinated the Son in authority? This information is in fact widely known because

it follows from the Arian teaching on the Son’s creaturely status. Second and most important, when read in context, by italicizing phrases in Hanson’s work, Giles means to imply a causal connection between the Arian teaching and modern evangelical complementarianism. The logic is false, and again his charge of Arianism does not stick.

Differentiating the Divine Persons

The question must be asked, how does Giles actually differentiate the divine persons? His argument is that their differences are relative; that is, the Father is not the Son, the Son is not the Spirit, the Spirit is not the Father, and so on. On the other hand, he argues vociferously elsewhere that the terms Father and Son are metaphorical, and do not describe God in his essence. If these relational terms do not actually describe God in his essence, then how can they be the basis for eternal differentiation?

Letham has pointed out that Giles’s view of the Trinity has “troubling modalist tendencies.”⁷ In fact, when read out of context and stretched to their extreme conclusions, Giles’s views could be considered modalistic, as he grounds distinctions only in the fact that one divine Person is not the other without adequately discussing any distinction in role or function. But this in and of itself does not make Giles a modalist. So it is with the complementarian view. Could one push the view of Grudem, Ware, and the Sydney Doctrinal Commission to its extreme and end up with subordinationism and tritheism? It is possible, but that is not what these theologians have done. They have attempted to formulate their understanding of Trinitarian doctrine within the realm of historic orthodoxy

and have repeatedly affirmed their belief in the equality of nature of the Father, Son and Spirit. Giles does not recognize or appreciate the important point that almost any view can be stretched or distorted to resemble heresy—that does not mean it should be.

As an aside, Giles emphatically accuses his opponents of forming their Trinitarian theology on the basis of their anthropology, specifically the issue of gender roles. He fails to mention that, based on his publication record, he seems to have come to his in-depth study with already-formed opinions on gender roles. One can only conclude that he must feel himself impenetrable to such bias.⁸

Conclusion

Perhaps the most unnerving weakness of Giles's book is not in its argumentation, but rather in its harshness toward fellow believers with whom he disagrees. Giles asserts that he has been personally attacked by many on the complementarian side of this at-times rancorous debate over gender roles, and that is a shame. But that is hardly an excuse for the polemical and *ad hominem* attacks that typify *Jesus and the Father*. He calls his book in one place a "plea from the heart" (9), but that hardly jives with the numerous times he charges that his opponents must be stupid, lazy, or deceitful for not sharing his views.

To equate one's debating opponents with the most notorious heresy in Christian history while lacking clear and irrefutable evidence does not befit a discussion amongst the children of God. Unfortunately, this book brings the debate between complementarians and egalitarians to an all-time low, and cannot be recommended. ■

¹ For purposes of brevity, I will occasionally refer to this view as the "complementarian view." This is not meant to imply that all of those who hold to the headship of men in home and church (complementarians) necessarily hold to the eternal functional submission of the Son to the Father.

² He writes, "If the divine Son is eternally subordinated in role or function, he is a subordinated divine person. His subordination as it is eternal defines his person. In other words, he is subordinated in *being*" (46).

³ Bruce Ware, *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2005), 45.

⁴ See two excellent examples: Peter R. Schemm, Jr., "Kevin Giles's *The Trinity and Subordinationism: A Review Article*," *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 7, no. 2 (2002): 67–78; Robert Letham, *The Holy Trinity* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004), 489–96. Giles claims to have read all of the reviews of his earlier work, but he has not changed his positions as a result.

⁵ Giles charges that one of the primary reasons complementarians hold this view is because they are reading the earthly father-son relationship back into the Trinity. For a better understanding of what complementarians are really arguing, see Ware, *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, 45–67.

⁶ R.G. Gregg and D.E. Groh, *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 24. Behr dismisses the idea that Arius's concerns were primarily soteriological—John Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, Part 1 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), 130–50. In his study, Rowan Williams gives much of the credit for Arius's views to Neoplatonism—Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy & Tradition* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001). Despite their divergent views, all of these studies affirm that Arianism foundationally denied the equal deity of the Son and Father.

⁷ Letham, *The Holy Trinity*, 494.

⁸ Other theologians have disagreed. At the 58th meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society in 2006, at a parallel session sponsored by the Gender and Evangelicals Study Group, two scholars who have never published in the area of gender studies—Michael Bird and Fred Sanders—both presented papers that noted the slant of Giles's book and, based at least partly on its shrill tone, began asking whether the doctrines of gender roles and the Trinity should be related at all.

ERRATA FOR *JBMW* 2005 – 2006

Vol. 10.2 (Fall 2005)

<i>Page</i> (<i>A or B = Column</i>)	<i>For</i>	<i>Read</i>
35, A, line 13	הַלֵּךְ... עָמַד... יָשָׁב	הַלֵּךְ... עָמַד... יָשָׁב
35, A, line 21	w qatal	wəqatal
39, A, line 46	describ	describes
44, A, line 43	בִּאֵהָלַי... בְּהַר קָדְשִׁי	בִּאֵהָלַי... בְּהַר קָדְשִׁי
45, A, line 5	כִּמּוֹן	כִּמּוֹן
46, B, line 1	אֲשֶׁרִי	אֲשֶׁרִי
46, B, line 10	אֲשֶׁרִי	אֲשֶׁרִי
46, note 2, line 9–10	(Hebrew quotation)	ובתורתו יהנה – מתחלה היא נקראת תורת יי' ומשעמל בה היא נקראת תורתו
46, note 4, line 3	<i>lgbr db wrh d'wl l hlk</i>	<i>lgbr 'db 'wrh 'd 'wl l'hlk</i>
48, note 50, line 1–2	(Reverse order of the two Hebrew lines)	
49, note 94, line 3	אֲשֶׁרִי	אֲשֶׁרִי
50, note 111, line 1	כִּמּוֹן	כִּמּוֹן
50, note 111, line 1	כִּמּוֹן	כִּמּוֹן
50, note 113, line 1	בִּאֵהָלַי... בְּהַר קָדְשִׁי	בִּאֵהָלַי... בְּהַר קָדְשִׁי
53, A, line 34	literature, and is to	literature, and this is to
54, A, lines 11, 15	' <i>nosh</i>	' <i>enôsh</i>

Vol. 11.1 (Spr 2006)

<i>Page</i> (<i>A or B = Column</i>)	<i>For</i>	<i>Read</i>
cover, 3rd article title	Casual	Causal
1, 3rd article title	Phophets	Prophets
1, 6th article title	Sematic	Semantic
20, title	Phophets	Prophets
44, header	45–65	44–65
44, title	Sematic	Semantic
45, A, line 18	comparably	comparable
45, B, line 21	unattested the	unattested in the
46, A, line 21	murder <i>αὐτοχειρία</i>	murder by <i>αὐτοχειρία</i>
47, B, line 2	From	Form
48, B, line 27	One	On
48, B, line 28	<i>of Iliad</i>	<i>of the Iliad</i>
49, A, line 3	δε	δὲ
49, A, line 4	αὐθεντεῖν	αὐθεντεῖν
49, A, line 11	τῆν	τῆν
49, A, line 24	Moeris Atticista	(6) Moeris Atticista
49, B, line 6	the restored	The restored
50, A, line 32–33	in pejorative	in a pejorative

Vol. 11.1 (Spr 2006) continued

Page

(A or B = Column)

50, B, line 5
 52, A, line 12
 52, B, line 12
 54, A, line 3–4
 56, A, line 18
 58, B, line 25
 59, A, line 8
 59, A, line 11
 60, note 5, line 6
 60, note 7, line 1–2
 60, note 13, line 13
 60, note 20, line 3
 60, note 23, line 1
 61, note 9, line 5
 61, note 30, line 3
 61, note 36, line 4
 61, note 40, line 6–7
 61, note 42, line 3
 61, note 42, line 4
 62, note 48, line 1
 62, note 48, line 6
 62, note 48, line 9
 62, note 51, line 3
 62, note 55, line 7
 62, note 61, line 4
 62, note 63, line 9
 63, note 69, line 2
 63, note 69, line 7
 63, note 73, line 4
 63, note 75, line 1
 63, note 86, line 2
 64, note 86, line 10
 64, note 93, line 3
 64, note 107, line 5
 65, note 118, line 2
 65, note 126, line 2
 65, note 126, line 10
 65, note 132, line 2

For

other form
Paraphrasis
 probably
 τὸ ν
 Herodutus
 58
 Ptolemy
 autodi,khn
 Klinkcksieck
Sitzungsberichte
 pre-AD312
Comentary
 9.5.6 ἀθέντης
 Kurfes
 the semantic
Lexicographia
Lexikog-raphie
Armenian-English
 St Lazarus
Zeitalter der
 Deissman
Testament, II (Ox-
 Hinrichs
 Ptolemäer
 ἡγεμονέω
 usally
Emendtiores
 ‘Appenix 2’
 οἱ κοδεσποτέω
Prolemaei
 (‘restriciton’)
 jurisdiciton
 word found
 Apehl
 ’awtent□yā’
 γίγασθαι
 this extant
Tricilinii

Read

other from
Paraphrasis
 probable
 τὸν
 Herodotus
 58
 Ptolemy
 αὐτοδίκην
 Klincksieck
Sitzungsberichte
 pre-AD 312
Commentary
 9.5.6. ἀθέντης
 Kurfess
 the same semantic
Lexicographica
Lexiko-graphie
Armenian-English
 St. Lazarus
Zeitalter des
 Deissmann
Testament (Ox-
 Hinrichs
 Ptolemäer
 ἡγεμονέω
 usually
Emendatiores
 ‘Appendix 2’
 οἰκοδεσποτέω
Ptolemaei
 (‘restriction’)
 jurisdiction
 word is found
 Aphel
 ’awtentēyā’
 γίγασθαι
 this is extant
Tricilinii

Vol. 11.2 (Fall 2006)

Page

(A or B = Column)

93, B, line 24

For

extention

Read

extension

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR GENDER-RELATED ARTICLES IN 2006

Compiled and Annotated by Oren Martin and Barak Tjader

Contributing Editors

Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood

Louisville, Kentucky

In this issue of the journal we profile some of the most significant gender-related articles from 2006. Here is a brief reminder about the categories we are using and our intent in using them. *Complementarian* designates an author who recognizes the full personal equality of the sexes, coupled with an acknowledgment of role distinctions in the home and church. *Egalitarian* classifies evangelicals who see undifferentiated equality (i.e., they see no scriptural warrant for affirming male headship in the home or the church). Under the *Non-Evangelical* heading, we have classified important secular works and books that address the subject of biblical gender issues from a religious, albeit, non-evangelical point of view. This category also serves as our classification for liberal scholars wanting to retain some sort of Christian identity. Finally, under the *Undeclared* heading, we have listed those books that do not give sufficient indication of their fundamental stance for us to classify them more specifically.

Complementarian Authors/Articles

Cowan, Christopher W. "The Father and Son in the Fourth Gospel: Johannine Subordination Revisited." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49, no. 1 (2006): 115-35.

Cowan examines a tension in the Gospel of John which has come under fire in recent scholarship. The majority of Johannine scholarship in the historical tradition has recognized the equality of divine nature between the Father and Son to be in tension with the hierarchical relationship between the two. Yet some recent scholars have contested the idea that the Son is functionally subordinate to the Father in John's Gospel. Cowan demonstrates the existence of the Son's subordination to the Father as a theme throughout John by examining (1) the Son as "sent" by the Father; (2) the Son's apparent unilateral dependence on and obedience to the Father; and (3) John's recurrent use of "Father" and "Son" terminology for God and Jesus. Lastly, he demonstrates that this relationship is

firmly set in the context of perfect divine love between the Father and Son, which makes possible the Father sending and the Son perfectly obeying the will of his Father.

Ennis, Patricia A. “Practicing Biblical Hospitality.” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 2 (2006): 116–27.

Ennis notes that while hostesses often focus on decorations and table settings, the Bible is much more concerned with the attitude of hospitality that one displays. In this article Ennis looks at various biblical examples and exhortations to practice hospitality. She suggests that the home should be a place of refuge, a center for evangelism, and a place for showing compassion to those in need.

Farrar, Mary. “Equal, Yet So Very Different: Understanding a Man’s Sexuality and His Inherent Struggle.” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 2 (2006): 85–106.

Farrar examines some of the intrinsic differences between men and women concerning sexuality. Writing to women who may have difficulty understanding the sexual struggles that men face, Farrar attempts to explain the natural, visual, and sometimes secretive ways in which men battle against sexual temptation. Farrar suggests that women first understand the differences in sexuality between men and women and then assist men by being an “agent for accountability and change” instead of an “enabler” of sin.

Huttar, David K., “Causal Gar in 1 Timothy 2:13: A Response to Linda L. Belleville” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 1 (2006):

30–33.

Huttar offers a brief refutation of a point made by egalitarian scholar Linda L. Belleville in her book *Women Leaders in the Church* (Baker, 2000). Belleville claims that the popstpositive conjunction gar (“for”) in 1 Tim 2:13 cannot be taken in a causal sense. However, Huttar demonstrates that, in making her argument, Belleville has misused the Greek grammar text (BDF) that she cites and has failed to argue adequately against any normative idea present in vv. 13–14.

Jones, Rebecca. “Women Against Public Blasphemy.” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 2 (2006): 8–18.

Jones explores the ways in which improperly ordered gender roles blaspheme God, subvert the authority of the Bible, and stand in contrast to the gospel. Jones argues that because Paul points to the husband-wife relationship as a type of the love that Christ has for the church, the very witness of the gospel is at stake in the ordering of Christian homes.

McCulley, Carolyn. “When You Don’t Have a Better Half: Encouraging Biblical Roles as a Single Woman.” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 2 (2006) 69–75.

In this article, McCulley recounts her conversion and the impact that it had on her view of gender. Although drawn to the biblical ideal of manhood and womanhood, she found that many of the fundamental aspects of biblical femininity had to do with how a woman relates to her husband and children and, consequently, can be difficult for a single adult to cultivate. McCulley, therefore, offers practical advice for single women

in their desire to apply biblical femininity in non-romantic relationships.

Merkle, Benjamin L. "Paul's Arguments from Creation in 1 Corinthians 11:8-9 and 1 Timothy 2:13-14: An Apparent Inconsistency Answered." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49, no. 3 (2006): 527-48.

Merkle analyzes 1 Cor 11:8-9 and 1 Tim 2:13-14, in which Paul grounds his arguments in the order of creation, and shows that it is not inconsistent to reject the need for women to wear head coverings while still affirming that women are not to teach or have authority over men. The reason for this, Merkle argues, is that in 1 Corinthians 11 Paul only indirectly uses the argument from creation to affirm head coverings for women in order to demonstrate that creation affirms gender and role distinctions between men and women. The result is that in the Corinthian context this distinction was to be upheld through head coverings. In 1 Timothy 2, however, Paul directly uses the argument from creation to demonstrate that women cannot teach or have authority over men, thus making this command transcultural.

Mohler, Mary K. "Motherhood Matters." *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 2 (2006): 48-55.

Mohler's article extols the God-given glories of motherhood in a culture largely hostile to the idea. While advocating that mothers stay at home with their children, Mohler provides some guidelines for thinking about motherhood and employment. She then offers seven suggestions for how one can strive for excellence in motherhood.

Moore, Russell D. "After Patriarchy, What? Why Egalitarians Are Winning The Gender Debate." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49, no. 3 (2006): 569-76.

Moore argues that egalitarians are winning the gender debate because many evangelicals, although professing complementarian ideas, are not practicing a comprehensive vision of biblical patriarchy that is rooted in the gospel. Moore insightfully shows how cultural influences and secular therapeutic "insights," which often pass in many churches as Christian counseling, have worked their way into the church and have resulted in a "servant leadership" that often emphasizes passivity rather than a loving headship. He rightly presents a vision of patriarchy that is firmly grounded in the fatherhood of God, a particular fatherhood that is seen not only in his relation to the patriarchs of the Old Testament, but supremely and eternally in the God and Father of Jesus Christ.

Riddle, Jeffrey T. "Are the Daughters of Philip Among the Prophets of Acts?" *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 1 (2006): 20-29.

Riddle addresses himself to the question of whether or not the daughters of Philip in Acts 21:9 were among the prophets of Acts. After surveying three views on the daughters of Philip, Riddle makes the exegetical case that women may prophesy in the church, which is a fulfillment of Acts 2:17-18. However, they do not fill the role or office of prophet within the early church since this role requires the authoritative teaching and regulation of doctrine. In this respect, Luke is in agreement with Paul who sees prophesying as an activity that may be done by both men

and women as they are led by the Holy Spirit, but limits the role or office of prophet to men.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "A New Testament Perspective on Homosexuality." *Themelios* 31, no. 3 (2006): 62–75.

Schreiner provides a convincing case exegetically that homosexuality is prohibited throughout the biblical canon. Although focusing primarily on the NT, Schreiner rightly situates the NT teaching regarding homosexuality in its biblical context, demonstrating that Jesus and the NT authors interpreted the Jewish tradition correctly. Beginning with Gen 1:26–27, and the fuller account in 2:18–25, he argues that Jesus, in his teaching on marriage and divorce in the Gospels, and Paul, in Rom 1:26–27, 1 Cor 6:9, and 1 Tim 1:10, correctly interpret from Genesis 1–2 that marriage is intended by God to be between one man and one woman, and that violation of this goes against their created nature. He then concludes with wise pastoral application calling believers in Jesus Christ to rely upon the grace of God as they live in the "already not yet" tension between being new creations in Christ yet awaiting final redemption and freedom from sin.

Walton, Mark David. "Relationships and Roles in the New Creation." *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 1 (2006): 4–19.

In an earlier article (JBMW 9, no. 1 (2004): 17–28) Walton argued that gender distinctives shall remain even in the new creation. In this article he follows up by examining whether or not resurrected saints will have gender-specific roles. Upon surveying the flawed egalitarian assumptions about the new

creation, Walton makes the exegetical and theological case that the functional distinctions established in God's "very good" creation will remain in the new creation.

Wolters, Albert. "A Semantic Study of ἀθέντης and Its Derivatives." *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 11, no. 1 (2006): 46–65.

Wolters conducts a study of the word ἀθέντης and its usages in ancient Greek until the year A.D. 312. Used only once in the New Testament, in 1 Tim 2:12, this word has been rendered "murderer," "master," and "doer" in extra-biblical sources. Wolters shows how the latter two understandings of ἀθέντης actually belong to the same semantic family, with the "doer" of something being someone who has "mastered" that thing. Furthermore, Wolters argues that the connotations of "murder" and "master" in ancient Greek for ἀθέντης are clearly distinct, with the former fading away while "master" became the predominant usage of the word. Wolters concludes from this study that ἀθεντέω in 1 Tim 2:12 should be rendered "have authority over." Significantly, Wolters notes that this word carries no pejorative connotation. Thus, Paul does not tell Timothy that women should not lead in a domineering manner, but he instructs Timothy that a woman is not to have authority over men in the church regardless of the manner in which she leads.

Egalitarian Authors/Articles

Anderson, Loraine Cleaves. "The Legacy of Pain: An Analysis of Genesis 3:16a." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 2 (2006): 11–15.

Anderson examines the term "pain" in Gen 3:16a in light of linguistic

and lexical research and concludes that its meaning cannot be limited to physical pain in childrearing. Rather, she argues that the inspired author has in view that pain encompasses the entire scope of suffering experienced by women as a result of their sexuality. In other words, pain extends far beyond physical discomfort in childbirth because it is grounded in woman's gender specificity in general. The result is that pain affects her in all spheres of life, which includes relationships with men. Anderson is correct in seeing the universal effects of sin on the human race, including broken and distorted relationships between men and women; but what Anderson fails to see is that role distinctions are not a result of the fall. Rather, they are distorted by the fall but are restored in Christ, which results in Christians being enabled by the working of the Holy Spirit to live out Christ-like leadership and submission, respectively, for the glory of God.

Cary, Phillip. "The New Evangelical Subordinationism: Reading Inequality Into the Trinity." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 42–45.

After commending Kevin Giles's *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity* (Zondervan, 2006), Cary examines Nicene formulations of the Trinity in light of current gender debates. Like Giles, Cary confuses the debate by refusing to clearly differentiate between the ancient subordinationist heresy and those who hold to the eternal functional subordination of the Son to the Father. Cary also co-opts the entirety of church history in purporting that this doctrine is a late twentieth-century development in "an overarching strategy to keep women subordinate to men who

can no longer use the old weapons of thoughtless prejudice." Furthermore, Cary suggests that those who affirm the orthodoxy of the eternal functional subordination of the Son are guilty of "historical ignorance" stemming from "fundamentalist separatism" cut off from scholarship and the church. He goes on to warn that this unorthodoxy will sever evangelicals from the historic church, consigning them to "a new sect in the characteristically American mode of Mormonism or Jehovah's Witnesses."

Dufield, Sandra. "Chivalry Is Not Dead: Protecting and Defending Beauty in the Church." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 1 (2006): 28–29.

Dufield argues that a new kind of chivalry is being practiced by men who defend full and equal participation of women in ministry alongside men. These "protectors and defenders of beauty" include men such as Richard Foster, John Ortberg, Billy Graham, J. Lee Grady, Gilbert Bilezikian, and Gordon Fee. What emerges from Dufield's presentation, however, is her failure to see that complementarians do not "endorse the idea that women are inferior to men or that the spiritual gifts and callings of the Holy Spirit are conferred only upon males." Egalitarians, such as Dufield, often think that complementarians are following "deviant teachings of the world that have found their way into the church," instead of seeing the dual emphases in Scripture that men and women are equal in value and personhood yet different with respect to their God-given roles.

Giles, Kevin. "Post-1970s Evangelical Responses to the Emancipation of Women." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 46–52.

In this article, Giles briefly details the twentieth-century women's liberation movement and then offers an overview of evangelical understandings of gender over the past three decades, listing six problems with complementarianism and providing a defense of the egalitarian position. Giles suggests that twentieth-century feminism confronted Christians with the fact that women were not inferior to men as they had "uniformly presumed for countless centuries." Thus, he contends that both the complementarian and egalitarian positions on gender are novel in that they reflect an understanding of women's equal ontological status never before recognized in the history of Christianity. While Giles asserts that evangelical gender debates center on hermeneutics rather than the authority of Scripture, he dismisses Paul's arguments from the creation narratives in 1 Timothy 2 and 1 Corinthians 11 as "off the cuff" reasoning that "virtually no one considers binding today." One cannot help but wonder the sense in which the apostle Paul's interpretation of Genesis 1-3 is authoritative if it simply is an "off the cuff" argument that has no binding meaning. Once again, Giles's reasoning demonstrates that, at least in this area, egalitarians are simply not being faithful to the authority and meaning of the Bible.

Haddad, Mimi. "Egalitarian Pioneers: Betty Friedan or Catherine Booth?" *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 53-59.

Haddad traces egalitarian roots to "first wave" feminists of the nineteenth century. Haddad argues that these feminists challenged the view that men were ontologically superior to women which, she asserts, was the position of

the church for the first eighteen hundred years. Haddad then seeks to show that rather than succumbing to the agenda of secular feminists, egalitarians stand in the line of earlier feminists who did not completely sever their arguments from Scripture.

Heath, Elaine A. "Prophetic Women and the People of God." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 1 (2006): 25-27.

Heath explores Walter Brueggemann's concept of prophetic imagination specifically in relationship to women in leadership in evangelical churches. According to Brueggemann, prophetic ministry addresses public crises where domination and marginalization occur. Heath contends that to be a Christian woman in leadership is to be a prophet because the world is overwhelmingly patriarchal. First, she calls women to prophetic leadership by being true to their calling and to themselves. Women must repent from cooperating with the ungodliness of the dominant culture and embrace the freedom of their God-given identity. Second, women in prophetic leadership must no longer "live in Egypt" and participate in the violence of male hierarchies which, she says, models dysfunctional and abusive families. When women do this they will receive from God their "new name" promised in Rev 2:17. The underlying problem with Heath's argument rests on poor methods of interpretation and application of biblical texts. For example, Christians should primarily be concerned with how Scripture defines the role of prophets, not with Brueggemann's concept. Also, the redemption of the Israelites from the Egyptians foreshadows a greater, more perfect redemption from sin brought about through the person and work of Christ, not oppression from male hierar-

chies. Finally, her (mis)assumption that freedom comes from escaping a patriarchal world misses the important biblical truth that ultimate freedom comes from submitting to Christ and God's wise design for men and women.

Heath, Elaine A. "Head Over Heels: A Theology of Leadership in Christian Marriage." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 17–20.

Heath suggests that the only "headship" in marriage is the "head over heels" love that God has for everyone. Heath then develops a model of mutual hospitality and self-giving in marriage that altogether removes the leadership from Christ's example of "servant leadership." Significantly, Heath does not even address any New Testament passages that deal with male headship, mentioning merely in passing that objections to her "head over heels" model of headship are relegated to "a particular interpretation of a few texts in the epistles."

Hestenes, Roberta. "Christian Women and Leadership." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 31–35.

This article addresses leadership issues with a focus on women. Hestenes details several symptoms of the "leadership crisis within American Christianity and culture." Hestenes then defines leadership and provides four criteria for effectiveness in leadership. Interestingly, Hestenes suggests that the servant leadership "model and mandate" in the New Testament "is not a call to weak or passive leadership." While Hestenes is incisive in diagnosing the problem of anemic leadership, she fails to acknowledge the biblical parameters for who *should* lead in the home and church.

Instone-Brewer, David. "The Scandal of Equality in Jesus' Ethical Teaching." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 2 (2006): 17–22.

Instone-Brewer looks at three ethical issues in Matthew 19, in which Jesus could have taken an egalitarian or complementarian stance—polygamy, divorce, and singleness. He argues that Jesus came to what can be regarded as an egalitarian conclusion, but Instone-Brewer does not stop here. He goes further and asks why Jesus came to this conclusion. His answer is that since Jesus' teaching went against the majority in the areas of polygamy, divorce, and singleness, then this placed him on the side of egalitarianism. It should be noted that Instone-Brewer thinks it unlikely that Jesus taught in order to promote an egalitarian agenda, since this would be anachronistic, but that his interpretation of Scripture directed him to "conclusions and actions that today we label 'egalitarian.'"

Johnson, Alan F. "A Meta-Study of the Debate over the Meaning of 'Head' (*Kephalē*) in Paul's Writings." *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 21–29.

Johnson's article surveys the most important contributions in the debate over Paul's usage of *kephalē* since the middle of the twentieth century. Johnson summarizes the arguments for those arguing that *kephalē* means "authority over," "source," and, more recently, "preeminent" or "representative." After this overview, Johnson concludes that *kephalē* in 1 Cor 11 should be taken to mean "prominent" of the male-female relationship and that Eph 5 designates "authority over." Johnson, however, argues that Paul is capitulating to a cultural understanding of gender to serve a

missiological purpose and that this passage should not be applied the same way in a predominantly egalitarian society.

Knowles, Charles O. “God’s Reign is the Reign of Right Relationships.” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 37–41.

Knowles argues that God’s restoration of “right relationship” in Christ is typified in the Great Commandment as well as the paradigm of Jesus’ teaching and actions. In driving the money changers from the temple and the splitting of the temple veil at the crucifixion, Knowles reasons, Jesus removes the hierarchical barriers that separate humanity and demonstrates the self-giving love that should characterize human relationships. This, of course, begs the question as Knowles fails to show that the loving headship of men over their homes as well as the church is antithetical to the “right relationships” prescribed in Scripture.

Kroeger, Catherine Clark, “Toward an Understanding of Ancient Conceptions of ‘Head.’” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 3 (2006): 4–8.

Kroeger draws from ancient extrabiblical poetry and theological arguments to support her contention that *kephale* should be understood to mean “source” in some instances of New Testament Greek. Citing Chrysostom, Kroeger asserts that *kephalē*, in 1 Cor 11:2, must be taken as a metaphor concerned with the origin of life rather than authority structures. She charges that the traditional reading of 1 Corinthians 11 succumbs to the subordinationist heresy combated by the church fathers. In discussing the Father’s being the “head” of the Son and the man’s being “head” of the woman, however, Kroeger

never differentiates between ontological and relational equality.

Morse, MaryKate. “Gender Wars: Biology Offers Insights to a Biblical Problem.” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 1 (2006): 3–8.

Morse synthesizes recent biological discoveries on maleness and femaleness in an effort to understand more clearly God’s intention both in the creation account in Genesis 1–2 and the fall of mankind into sin in Genesis 3. She rightly argues that the “gender war” problem is theological, not secular, and that every person interprets Genesis 1–3 with certain presuppositions. She argues biologically that maleness and femaleness are distinctive and that shared distinctiveness creates a mutual strength. Thus, “male” and “female” possess tendencies toward differences, but those tendencies are not determinative. In the end, because (1) both men and women are created in God’s image, and (2) God is in a Trinitarian relationship, to be truly human is to experience both male and female tendencies. But, according to Morse, shared equality must be maintained so as to avoid either a hierarchical or an egalitarian culture. In her estimation, differences must be equally valued so that equal authority and honor will be given to both men and women. It becomes clear in her argument, however, that she interprets Genesis 1–3 through her biological findings, which reveal her presuppositions. A better, more biblical approach would be to interpret Genesis 1–3 on its own terms and then follow how the NT interprets the creation account. This will yield a proper interpretation which, along with Morse, celebrates the differences of men and women who are created in God’s image, but will also give special attention

to the complementary roles which God has designed for them.

Omelianchuk, Adam. “The ‘Difference’ Between ‘A and Not-A’: An Analysis of Alleged ‘Word Tricks’ and Obfuscations.” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 1 (2006): 9–12.

Omelianchuk examines “Egalitarian Claim 10:6” in *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth* (Multnomah, 2004) by Wayne Grudem. Omelianchuk first defines and examines key terms used in the gender role debate (i.e., authority, leadership, submission, etc.) by using reference books such as a dictionary and thesaurus. He then critiques the “hierarchicalist” position and concludes that they, not egalitarians, use word tricks and obfuscate language to conceal the incoherence of their view. However, Omelianchuk’s fundamental error is the assertion that differences in function necessarily implies inferiority in being, which is a common mistake to make when words and concepts are defined by resources other than the Bible. His logic fails because he, like other egalitarians, cannot grasp the simultaneous biblical concepts of equality in personhood and difference in function. He also fails to see that male headship is not harsh headship. As God is the head of Christ and Christ is the head of man (1 Cor 11:3), so men are to lovingly and sacrificially lead like Christ, who did not come “to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Mark 10:45). Lastly, he fails to see that male leadership is not due to women being “unfit” to lead. Rather, it is God’s wise design for his creation which points to greater realities, namely, Christ’s leadership of the church and the Triune God himself, who as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are equal in essence yet different

in function.

Payne, Philip B. “Wild Hair and Gender Equality in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16.” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 3 (2006): 9–18.

The main thrust of Payne’s article is to argue that Paul was advocating gender-appropriate hairstyles rather than head coverings such as shawls in 1 Corinthians 11. Although this understanding of Paul’s admonition lies within the bounds of complementarianism, Payne then offers fourteen reasons why “head” in this passage should be interpreted as “source” rather than “authority.”

Reasoner, Mark. “Chapter 16 in Paul’s letters to the Romans: Dispensable Tagalong or Valuable Envelope?” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 11–16.

Reasoner exegetes and examines the significance of Romans 16. Looking at Phoebe, Junia, and other significant women mentioned in this concluding passage, Reasoner concludes that Paul provides concrete examples of women occupying leadership positions in their local churches and that churches in the modern context should emulate this practice. While complementarians affirm the vital part of women in the work of the church, Reasoner stretches these leadership positions to the breaking point by understanding Junia to be an apostle as well as suggesting that this passage advocates women serving in teaching/ruling functions of the church.

Wright, N.T. “The Biblical Basis for Women’s Service in the Church.” *Priscilla Papers* 20, no. 4 (2006): 5–10.

In this article, Wright laments that Christians have “seriously mis-

read” passages in the New Testament concerning gender and service in the church. Wright provides a sound exegesis and explanation of Galatians 3:28 in which he argues that Paul’s full inclusion of both men and women in the body of Christ in no way eradicates the differences in men and women. Then, after giving examples of the prominent place of women in the Gospels and Acts, Wright offers explanations of gender issues in 1 Corinthians 11, 1 Corinthians 14, and 1 Timothy 2. Far from providing a biblical basis for women in pastoral roles, in each case Wright simply changes the unambiguous wording of Paul to conform to a preconceived notion of gender roles in the church.

Non-Evangelical Authors/Articles

Claassens, L. Juliana M. “And the Moon Spoke Up: Genesis 1 and Feminist Theology.” *Review and Expositor* 103, no. 2 (2006): 325–42.

Claassens attempts to deconstruct “binary oppositions” in Genesis 1 in order to break down hierarchical sociological divisions. Claassens sees a series of dualistic relationships such as male/female, sun/moon, light/dark, and land/sea in Genesis 1 that propagate the idea of dominance and superiority of one entity over the other. Appealing to Hebrew midrash and a story about the moon’s inferiority to the sun, Claassens offers an “imaginative interpretation” that rethinks all of the dualistic relationships of Genesis 1, most significantly that between male and female. This reasoning, however, is diametrically opposed to the most basic tenets of Christianity—that God created and ordered the cosmos, declaring it all to be good.

deClaissé-Walford, Nancy L.
“It Is Not Good for the Human to Be

Alone.” *Review and Expositor* 103, no. 2 (2006): 343–58.

In this retelling of the creation narrative, deClaissé-Walford contends that the creation of the woman in Genesis 2 primarily suggests human community in general as opposed to the marriage relationship in particular. Therefore, the woman is seen as a “strong helper equal to” the human rather than a “helper fit for” the man.

Nyengele, M. Fulgence. “Gender Injustice and Pastoral Care in an African Context: Perichoresis as a Transformative Theological Resource.” *Journal of Theology* (Summer 2006) 45–55.

Nyengele suggests that pastors adopt a model of pastoral care informed by the perichoretic relational community of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. According to Nyengele, this example of mutual indwelling and self-giving, without “superiority and subordination, command and obedience,” should be reflected in all human relationships and can serve to liberate oppressed females. ■