

Gender differentiation in the Bible: created and recognized

Hilary B.P. Mijoga

Introduction

The thesis of the paper is that according to the Bible, gender differentiation is created and recognized (accepted).¹ In light of this assertion, it will be demonstrated that the apparent marginalization of the women folk in society² on the basis of their feminine gender is not inherent in that creation and recognition³.

A philological study of the creation accounts in Genesis 1-2 reveals that gender differentiation is created, whereas a narrative study of the rest of the Biblical narratives shows that gender differentiation is recognized. Both studies demonstrate that gender differentiation has nothing to do with the creation of the marginalization of the female gender. This paper, however, does not discuss the issue of the treatment of women in society in general and the Bible and the church in particular. This issue, though interesting is outside the remit of the present discussion.⁴

Gender differentiation created: a philological study

This section aims at showing that gender differentiation is created. To prove this assertion, a word study⁵ of the creation accounts in Genesis 1-2 will be undertaken. Topics of the study are: (i) Hebrew word study of '*adam*', '*ish*', and '*ishsha*'; (ii) the common origin of humanity (1:26-27); (iii) the inter-dependency of genders for existence (2:7, 21-22).⁶

Hebrew word study

'adam'⁷

This word is a masculine noun which appears eighteen times in Genesis 1-2 (1:26, 27; 2:5, 7 (2x), 8, 15, 16, 18, 19 (2x), 20 (2x), 21, 22 (2x), 23, 25). In 1:26, 27, the term refers to collective humanity, whereas in 2:5, 7, 8, 15, 16, 18, the referent is a generic human being. In 2:22, 23, 25, the word is used in the sense of "man" (male

gender) as opposed to "woman" (female gender). It should be pointed out here that one feminist reader of Genesis 1-3 has claimed that in chapter 2 '*adam*' is prefixed by the definite article *ha* and therefore should not be regarded as a masculine term."⁸ She argues that the masculine point of view emerges in Gen 2:18. Grammatically, claiming that *ha'adam* is not a masculine term, does not do justice to the Hebrew term. We have to remember that there is no neuter gender in Hebrew.

The first time we come across this word is in 1:26, where the noun does not have a definite article. The absence of the definite article can either mean that the referent is a single object or in this case it is indefinite⁹. The indefinite sense could explain why the term refers here to collective humanity. Other instances where this noun does not have a definite article are 2:5, 20. In all, this noun is used three times without the definite article in this pericope. What this means simply is that if the noun '*adam*' is understood as a collective term, then it encompasses both male and female genders.

In 2:20,¹⁰ the indefinite noun '*adam*' appears in a list containing animals which the definite '*adam*' names. So from the indefinite usage of and collectivity of the term '*adam*', we observe that the question of gender differentiation partially comes into play. This is because collectivity can imply gender differentiation only that it is overlooked in preference for commonality.

The situation is clear in 2:22,23, 25 where gender differentiation is created as the use of the noun '*adam*' would show. Here '*adam*' is opposed to the noun '*issha*'. Grammatically, the two nouns have different genders: '*adam*' is masculine, whereas '*issha*' is feminine. In addition to the grammatical gender differentiation, there are other factors which contribute to the process of differentiation. First, 2:22 reveals that God stands at the origin of sexual differentiation when he creates '*issha*' from '*adam*'. What is obvious here is that God did not create another '*adam*', but he created '*issha*' who was different from the '*adam*', hence the differences in the nouns used. Second, 2:23¹¹ reveals that the '*adam*' contributed to the creation of the gender differentiation for in his exclamation of joy of finding someone like himself, '*adam*' names this being as '*issha*', who is obviously different from '*adam*' or '*is*'.¹² Finally, 2:25¹³ indicates that the narrator of the story also creates the gender differentiation, for he introduces two genders: husband (male) and wife (female). 1:27¹⁴ also shows that gender differentiation is created. However, here we have the use of the different terms: *zakar* ("male") and *neqeva* ("female"). So with regard to the use of the term '*adam*' in Genesis 1-2, we note that gender differentiation is created by the Lord God (2:22), the '*adam*' (2:23), and the narrator (2:25). For this reason, I argue that gender differentiation is part of creation.

From the word study then, is the marginalization of the female gender inherent in the gender differentiation? From the verses cited (1:26-27; 2:22, 23, 25), the issue of marginalization of the female gender is not inherent in the gender differentiation.¹⁵ Commenting on Gen 1:26-27, Bonhoeffer states: "Man is not alone, he is in duality and it is in this dependence on the other that his creatureliness consists. Man's creatureliness is not a quality, something that exists, something that is, any more than freedom. It can only be defined in man's being over against the other, with the other and dependent upon the other."¹⁶ Feminist scholars would accept that in Genesis 1, there is sexual differentiation between male and female, but they would argue that "there is not even a hint of any pattern of domination and subordination."¹⁷ In other words, in God's original plan, "neither sex was superior or inferior to the other."¹⁸

In 2:22, the process of "building" of the "rib" (matter) of the 'adam into 'issha is similar to what happened to 'adam in 2:7 where the 'adam was "formed" from "dust" (matter) of 'adama.¹⁹ So both genders are created from matter taken from a source of the opposite gender. In 2:23, the 'adam expresses his supreme joy at finding someone like himself ("bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh"²⁰). So "[b]y a flash of intuition the man divines that the fair creature now brought to him is part of himself, and names her accordingly."²¹ In other words, "[t]he most complete physical congruity of this new person with himself is at once recognized by the first person."²² In 2:25, the narrator indicates that both the 'adam and his 'issha were naked and none was ashamed.

In short, the study of the use of the term 'adam in Genesis 1-2 reveals that gender differentiation is created. But the marginalization of the female gender is not inherent in the usage of the term.

'ish'²³

This term does not appear in connection with creation, except for 2:23 which is itself problematic. By creation, I am referring to God's "building" of 'adam, i.e. *zakar* and *negeba* in 1:27, God's "forming" of 'adam in 2:7, and God's "building" of 'issha in 2:22. In all these instances, the term 'ish does not occur. However, the term is first found on the lips of 'adam in 2:23. Here, the 'adam indicates that 'issha was taken from 'ish, hence the creation of gender differentiation.²⁴ So the Hebrew text reveals that the "woman" was taken from the "man." What is obvious here is the fact that the 'adam makes gender differentiation between the two beings. In the Septuagint (LXX) and targum renderings of the same verse, the "woman" is said to have been taken from "her man," hence the "husband-wife" understanding. This understanding is sup-

ported by 2:24, 25, but not by the Hebrew of 2:23. It appears, therefore, that the LXX and targum renderings were influenced by 2:24, 25. In this case, gender differentiation ("husband-wife") is created by the *'adam* and the translators of the LXX and targum. Grammatically speaking, the two terms belong to different genders: *'ish* is a masculine noun, whereas *'issha* is a feminine noun.

Is the marginalization of the female gender inherent in the above created gender differentiation? 2:23 only says that the *'issha* that the Lord created was named thus by the *'adam* simply because the *'issha* was taken from the *'ish*²⁵. If the process of being "taken from" means that the female gender is inferior to the *'ish*, surely the *'adam* should be inferior to the *'adama* from which he was "taken"! But the text does not suggest this. We also note that in 2:24 the *'is* leaves his parents and joins his wife. Does this process of movement suggest that *'is* becomes inferior in relation to the *'issha*? The text does not say this.

So the study of the usage of the term *'ish* reveals that gender differentiation is created. However, its usage does not show that the marginalization of the *'issha* is inherent in its usage.

'issha'²⁶

The first time we come across this term is in connection with creation in 2:22. As already noted, in 2:22 God creates gender differentiation, but there is no hint that male gender is superior or dominant over the female gender. In 2:23, the term appears on the lips of the *'adam* when he exclaims for joy as he finds someone like himself. Here too, there is no suggestion of dominance of the male gender (*'ish*) over the female gender (*'issha*). In fact, in 2:24 it is the male gender (*'ish*) that abandons everything to cling to the *'issha*. In 2:25, both genders are naked, hence are equal in terms of nakedness.

So the use of the term *'issha* does not reveal any marginalization of the female gender. What is clear is that *'issha* is different from *'ish*. This is along the lines of gender.

Common originality of humanity

According to 1:27, God created *'adam* in his image.²⁷ Here, the singular in v. 27a-b is contrasted with the plural in v. 27c. The addition of the phrase "male and female" in v. 27c should be understood in two ways: (a) that gender differentiation was already created (v. 27c). In other words, "God makes man but He does not make each person the same. It is His plan that there should be differences between people."²⁸ (b) that this is an attempt to avoid assuming that originally God created an androgynous

human, for some scholars have suggested that "humanity was a dual being male and female,"²⁹ for example. But "[t]he persistent idea that man as first created was bi-sexual and the sexes separated afterwards...is far from the thought of the passage."³⁰ In other words, the term '*adam*' is meant generically,³¹ i.e. "humanity defined as male and female."³² Hence "all queer speculations about the first man are cut off as well as the quaint heresy that he was created androgynous, half man and half woman."³³ The bottom line is that the created '*adam*' is the created "male and female." In other words, "human beings are a unit and diverse in sex."³⁴ So "the sexes are complementary."³⁵ The complementarity suggests that both have a common origin and purpose. But gender dominance is not inherent in this common originality for both are created at the same time.

Inter-dependency of genders

In 2:5, 7, we observe two things: paronomasia: '*adam*' and '*adama*' and dependence of the male gender on the female gender for its creation (existence). The paronomasia here is used to suggest that the two terms are related in some ways. This relationship is evident in the fact that '*adam*' is formed from the '*adama*', i.e., the '*adam*' is the product of the '*adama*'. In fact, it is suggested that the root of the word is "to be sought in the cognate word *adhamah*."³⁶ In this case, the masculine '*adam*' is dependent for its creation on the feminine '*adama*'. And grammatically, the substance (matter) used to create the masculine '*adam*' (male gender) comes from the feminine '*adama*' (female gender), i.e., the '*apar*', "dust," (masculine) through which the '*adam*' is formed. What is evident here then is that the male gender is dependent on the female gender for its creation (existence). But is the apparent marginalization of the female gender inherent in the dependency of the male gender on the female gender?

The dependency of the genders on each other for creation (existence) is also manifest in 2:21-22. Here, the feminine matter/substance "rib" which is taken from the masculine being '*adam*' is used to "build" the feminine being '*issha*'. In this case, the creation of the feminine being '*issha*' is dependent on the matter/substance from the masculine gender. Hence, the feminine gender is dependent on the masculine gender for its creation.

Some interpreters have understood the creation of a woman as a "helper" to the man to mean that the woman is the assistant of the man, i.e., she occupies an auxiliary and secondary position. In response to this traditional view, it has been argued from the word study of *ezer* ("helper") and *kenegddo* ("as his helper") that this is not correct.

Ezer is understood to mean a helping companion and *neged* denotes equality of relationship. What this means is that their "relationship is one of equality and mutuality."³⁷ So the marginalization of the female gender is not inherent in the use of the terms *ezer* and *kenegdo*.

The preceding presentation reveals that there is interdependency of the genders, male and female, especially when it comes to their creation or existence. One needs the other, hence none can be dispensed with. So there is a symbiotic relationship. In such a situation, none is dominant, hence the question of marginalization or domination of the female gender does not come into play. In short then, although the Bible shows that gender differentiation was created, gender interdependence for existence argues for the equality of the genders. So, the marginalization or domination of the female gender is not inherent in the interdependency of the genders.

Gender differentiation recognized: a narrative study

Thus far, it has been demonstrated that gender differentiation was created. The aim of this section, however, is to show that gender differentiation is recognized by God and narrators of Biblical accounts. This recognition is evident in the use of gender terms as, for example, used in the marriage institution (man [husband], woman [wife]) and in instances where people are listed in their gender categories. This section also investigates whether recognition of gender differentiation contributes to the marginalization of the female gender. This narrative study of the Biblical accounts does not consider the creation accounts in Genesis 1-2.

Recognition of gender differentiation in the Old Testament

This study considers a select number of narratives from the Torah, especially from Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus. First, we look at Genesis accounts. Genesis 3 narrates the account of the fall of humanity. In this account, two major characters are "woman" (3:1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17) and "man" (3:8, 9, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24), i.e., "husband" (3:6, 8, 16) and "wife" (3:8, 17, 20, 21). Here, God himself uses the gender terms "woman" (3:15), "wife" (3:17), and "man" (3:22). This means that God recognizes these gender terms as labels for the two characters in the story. But God's usage of these terms does not suggest that the apparent marginalization of the female gender is inherent in their usage. In other words, God's recognition of the gender differentiation does not suggest female gender marginalization. For example, the account here does not say that the serpent deceived the woman because the woman was female. This is because the woman could have rejected the deception if she chose to observe God's injunction, for she knew that God said, "You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree which is in the

midst of the garden,...lest you die" (3:3). What we observe from the text is that the woman: (a) is inexperienced and credulous before the shrewd and deceitful serpent; (b) does not flee the temptation but begins a conversation with the serpent; (c) corrects the distortion of the serpent's question, but then she herself exaggerates the prohibition by including a command not to touch the fruit of the tree. 2:17 says nothing at all about touching the fruit. In her zeal to correct the serpent, she goes too far. It is as though she wanted to set a law for herself by means of this exaggeration.

What is evident in the text is that the woman fell for the deception not because she was female, but because she "saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise" (3:6). This means that other factors explain the choice to disobey God's injunction.

It has been said that the man was an innocent victim, while others have said he was a willing participant when he chose to disobey God's injunction. Feminist readers have argued that both the man and the woman fell for the deception. So the responsibility for the fall is shared. They support this position by a textual study of the account but also by silence in the text. First, it is said that in the Hebrew text the serpent always speaks in the second person plural. This implies that the serpent does not only speak to the woman, but the woman and the man were being addressed together. Second, the Hebrew text has *le'ishah `immah*, "to her man [husband] with her." This shows that the man was around when the serpent was talking to the woman³⁸ Because it is understood that the man was present, some Greek and Samaritan manuscripts have "and they ate" in 3:6. So the conclusion drawn from this is that both were present and both ate the forbidden fruit, hence both fell for the deception. Third, following from the preceding that the man was present, it appears that the woman did not seek any advice or permission from the man. It is, therefore, argued that the man did not speak out about the temptation or the behaviour of the woman nor did he raise any question or objection. In this case, the man was irresponsible by neglecting and denying his right and responsibility as a partner to the woman.

What is obvious from the text is that the man chose to disobey the injunction not because he was male, hence gender is not an issue in the decision to eat the prohibited fruit. So both genders are at fault. In fact both the man and woman were cursed for failure to keep God's injunction. In short then, the text does not suggest in anyway that gender was the issue in whatever transpired in the narrative.

Gen 3:1-6 is also interesting in another way. The narrator states that after eating the

fruit "the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked" (v. 7). This means that the transgression of the injunction enjoined on them led to the discovery of their nakedness. This discovery entails that they realized ("knew") that they were of different sexes. So sin leads to this recognition. It is also interesting to note from this passage that the man did not accuse the woman for this state of affairs. What happened was that "they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves aprons" (v. 7). So even here we don't see any marginalization of any sex. The narrator doesn't present that aspect.

Where does the marginalization of the woman come from in this fall account? It has been said that sin and punishment resulted into the domination of man over the woman. It is pointed out that it is "in the punishment that we find division of roles according to gender between Adam and Eve. Eve's life revolves around pain in childbirth, sexual passion for her husband and her humiliating subservience to her husband."³⁹ In this case, "her partner becomes her master."⁴⁰ So the understanding here is that sexuality is now distorted to become the domination of one partner over the other member of the partnership. Now, if domination of the female gender is due to sin and punishment, are we blaming God for this situation because it is God who pronounced this judgment? Is this what the feminist readers of this text are implying?

In Genesis 6-8, we have the flood narrative.⁴¹ In this account, gender differentiation is recognized. God and the narrator give lists of people in gender categories. In 6:18, God says, "But I will establish my covenant with you; and you shall come into the ark, you [Noah], your sons, your wife, and your sons and your sons' wives with you." And in 8:16, God tells Noah, "Go forth from the ark, you and your wife, and your sons and your sons' wives with." Here God recognizes the gender differentiation: men (Noah and the sons) and women (the wives). In other words, God recognizes the husband-wife relationship, a recognition which involves gender separation. In this account, God also recognizes gender differentiation by using gender terms in the expression: "male and female" (6:19: "they shall be male and female;" 7:3: "male and female;" see. 7:2 where the expression "the male and his mate" is used). So the foregoing reveals that, in the flood account, God recognizes gender differentiation through his listing of people in gender categories but also in his use of gender terms. It is not only God who is involved in the recognition of gender differentiation in this account. The narrator also does the same. In 7:7, 13; 8:18, the narrator presents people in gender categories: "Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives" (see. 7:7). In addition to listing according to gender, the narrator also uses an expression with gender terms: "male and female" (see.

7:9). So these examples show that in the flood account, the narrator recognizes gender differentiation through his use of gender terms and the listing of people according to their gender.

Is the marginalization of the female gender inherent in this recognition then? There are two issues one can consider in trying to answer this question. First, there is the issue of order of people in the lists. One way of interpreting the order in the lists is to say the people appear in their order of importance. This interpretation obviously puts the women folk at the bottom of the ladder. But does this point to the marginalization of the female gender? What is clear in the narrative is that the narrator is consistent in the way people are lined up, but God is not consistent (see. 6:18 with 8:16). This means that the order cannot be used as an argument for the apparent marginalization of the female gender. In other words, the fact that God's and narrator's orders do not follow the same pattern, is an argument for not stressing on the order of importance of gender in the lists. In addition to this, insisting on the importance of the orders for the apparent gender marginalization might lead to pitying God against the narrator. Second, there is the issue of insistence on both sexes in the lists as well as the use of the expression "male and female." This alone implies that there is interest in equal gender representation. If this is true, then the recognition of gender differentiation here does not contribute to the marginalization of the female gender, i.e., the female gender marginalization is not inherent in the recognition of the gender differentiation.

The decalogue also serves as an instance of recognition of gender differentiation in the Bible. As recorded in Exod 20:1-17,⁴² God singles out the wife as one of the beings not to be coveted (see v. 17). This is also the same in Deut 5:6-21 (see v. 21).⁴³ So in both versions of the decalogue, there is insistence on the wife not to be coveted.⁴⁴ One way of understanding this insistence is to suggest that God recognizes the female gender ("wife") as distinct from the household or the man, for example. Obviously here, the recognition of the female gender is made for reasons of safeguarding the gender at stake.

Finally, we look at the laws of purity in Lev 12:1-8.⁴⁵ In this account God makes gender distinction: the people of Israel in contrast to the woman (vv. 1-2); "male child" (v. 2) in contrast to "female child" (v. 5).

Here, the law of purity applies to the female gender for two reasons: child bearing and menstruation. What is clear is that both situations involve secretions. So "[t]he legislation...deals with the secretions that occur at parturition, and it is these that make the

mother unclean. Thus the chapter should be read within the context of chapter 15, which also deals with bodily secretions."⁴⁶ Hence, the uncleanness at issue does not come in because of her female gender, although biologically child bearing and menstruation are associated with the female sex. However, what is to be pointed out is that child bearing and menstruation come much later in the woman's life. For this reason, we cannot say that the woman as female is inherently unclean, the uncleanness which could contribute to her marginalization. Perhaps, one may query the differences in time when it comes to uncleanness due to child birth: seven days for a male child and two weeks for a female child. The account makes clear that duration of uncleanness is dependent on the sex of the child. So gender plays a role in this situation. But one thing is clear and that is, the period is in the multiples of the number seven (cf. the first creation story): seven denotes completeness. Probably, the emphasis should be placed on the number rather than on the gender for the woman's purity. This explanation is contrary to the view which says, "[t]he female child keeps the mother unclean double the time. Perhaps one reason of this was, that the male child had the advantage of the covenant circumcision, and brought thereby blessing to his mother. Another reason, however, was, 'because the woman was in transgression' (1 Tim ii.4), and led Adam into it. It kept up the remembrance of the Fall, and of the first sin."⁴⁷

The foregoing narrative study of the OT texts show that gender differentiation was recognized by God and narrators. The study does not, however, show that gender marginalization is inherent in the recognition.

Recognition of gender differentiation in the New Testament

This section considers a select number of narratives from the *New Testament*, i.e., from the gospels and epistles.

Gospel narratives

In the gospel narratives, we begin with the episode of the feeding of the multitudes. Matt 14:15-21⁴⁸ records that Jesus fed *pentakischilioi choris gynaikon kai paidion*. Literally this translates as: "five thousand [male] [i.e, masculine beings] besides women and children." In the Greek phrase, the three nouns are masculine, feminine, and neuter respectively.⁴⁹ This means that the narrator recognizes gender differentiation in this list. In other Greek manuscripts, the order of the last two nouns is reversed: "children and women." The listing of the recipients here is meant to show the magnitude of the event. For our purposes, however, our interest is in the recognition of the

gender differentiation.⁵⁰ This episode also appears in Mark 6:35-44.⁵¹ In this version, no listing is given (see. v. 44). So one can conclude that no recognition of gender differentiation is made by the narrator of the Marcan account. The same situation is true of the Lucan account (Luke 9:10-17).⁵² No gender differentiation is made. In the case of Luke, this absence is strange for it has always been claimed that Luke is interested in women.⁵³

Another version of the feeding episode has four thousand recipients. Matt 15:32-39⁵⁴ has this account. As with the other account, the narrator recognizes gender differentiation among the recipients: "Those who ate were four thousand [male], besides women and children" (v. 38). Mark 8:1-10 also records the same episode, but the narrator here does not record any gender differentiation among the recipients. So from the feeding episode, it is evident that Matthew alone records recognition of gender differentiation among the partakers of the food. The differences in the presentation among the evangelists is partly due to their interests, i.e., why they presented a particular account. That interest would dictate what is to be included or left out. It is also partly due to their sources which may or may not have the details in question. So for our purposes, the fact is that one evangelist recorded recognition of gender differentiation in the feeding accounts.

In the parables of the lost sheep (Luke 15:3-7) and the lost coin (Luke 15:8-10),⁵⁵ we see Jesus recognizing the male (Luke 15:3) and female (Luke 15:8) genders. Both are used as good illustrations and not for marginalizing any gender.

In the account of the way to the cross, the narrator singles out women (Luke 23:27)⁵⁶ from the great multitude who were following Jesus. So the presence of women is highlighted. This emphasis on the female gender argues for the importance of this gender in this particular episode. In fact, in the process Jesus makes a statement in vv. 28-31 which has far reaching consequences.

In the crucifixion account in Mark 15:40-41, women are singled out as witnessing the event. The narrator is depicting how concerned the women were. Their concern is obviously to be contrasted to that of the male folk in the same situation. After the crucifixion in Luke 23:44-49,⁵⁷ the narrator lists people who were around: centurion, multitudes, acquaintances, and women. The women folk are not simply part of the multitudes or the acquaintances: they deserve a category of their own, hence gender differentiation in the process.

So the different episodes presented here demonstrate that the evangelists (including Jesus) recognized gender differentiation. What has emerged clearly here is the prominence of women, hence the female gender. This prominence is not for ill, but it stresses the women's concern over the situations depicted. So the fact of the recognition of gender differentiation does not in anyway contribute to the marginalization of the female gender.

Epistles

In this section, we first look at the Pauline corpus. From the uncontested/genuine letters, we cite examples from 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and Romans. In 1 Cor 7:1-40,⁵⁸ Paul addresses the issue of marriage as raised by the Corinthian Christians. Here Paul recognizes gender differentiation through the institution of marriage. He talks about "man" and "woman" (v. 1), "man" and "wife" (v. 2), and "woman" and "husband" (v. 3). According to Paul then, each of these people rules over the other's body (v. 4). So while recognizing gender differentiation, Paul is keen to stress that both are equal in relation to each other's body. This means that according to Paul, the institution of marriage ensures the equality of genders, hence the question of the apparent marginalization of the female gender does not issue from this institution.

In 1 Cor 14:34-35⁵⁹ Paul enjoins silence in public on the part of the wife. But Paul's injunction is harsh. Some scholars have suggested that this text is probably an interpolation included later or a marginal note made by a reader at the end of the first century. If it was an interpolation or a marginal note, then why was it retained when the letter was accepted into the canon? Several suggestions have been made to explain the attitude expressed here, e.g., (a) there was fear of enthusiastic women's participation comparable to what was happening in some hellenistic religions where such was the case; (b) women wishing to learn disturbed with their questions; (c) Paul refers only to Christian women.

Strictly speaking, this account hinges upon the treatment of women and this is not within the remit of this paper. Whatever the case, a word needs to be said here. First, the woman at issue is a wife, "for in vs. 35 these female persons are enjoined to gain church information from their husbands at home."⁶⁰ So, is this injunction made because the wives are female? Obviously the injunction is not made on the wives because they are female, for there are other females who are not wives. In fact, the text in v. 34 seems to have a generic referent "women." Why is this injunction made then to the wives?

The intent of the command, is to interdict situations in which wives publicly contradict what their husbands say or think or embarrass them by an interchange of conversation. They may thus be rejecting the authority of their husbands (which was firmly fixed in the sociology of their religion) and thereby be no longer subordinate. In 11:5 Paul indicated that women could pray or prophesy in the church, so unless Paul is contradicting himself he here enjoins silence in matters other than praying and prophesying. Since good order is a major emphasis of the context (cf. vss. 26, 33, 40) he may be referring especially to speaking in tongues or even to any sort of clamorous discussion of controversial issues which have arisen in the assembly.⁶¹ So the injunction is not a male thing.⁶²

In Gal 3:28⁶³ Paul also recognizes gender differences. He says here that there is no distinction between "male and female." From the discussion in 1 Cor 11:2-16, it is apparent that "Paul did not intend to abolish the gender roles between men and women"⁶⁴ but what Paul wanted to do was to abolish the "difference between...men and women."⁶⁵ In fact, it has been asserted that "Galatians 3:28 is the first occurrence of a doctrine openly propagating the abolition of sex distinctions."⁶⁶ Abolishing sex distinction is not the same as abolishing gender roles between men and women. What lies behind Paul's views here is the fact that there was discrimination in the community: by race (Jews and Gentiles), societal status (slave and master), and sex. So this discrimination is what Paul is trying to abolish in the church. In other words, Paul is speaking of equal privileges between men and women.⁶⁷ In this account, we are not told, however, whether the sex discrimination was based on gender issues or on other factors.

In Phil 4:2-3⁶⁸ Paul mentions those people who had "laboured side by side" with him, among whom were women. Women are "very visibly and significantly present in his references to associates in ministry. Women preached and prayed in Paul's churches (1 Cor. 11:5) and their names are many in Paul's remembrances of a lifetime of shared service (Rom. 16:1-16). In fact, Luke says the church at Philippi was begun when Paul went to a place of prayer and 'spoke to the women who had come together' (Acts 16:13)."⁶⁹ So Paul recognizes gender differentiation among his fellow workers here. The text as it stands suggests that the two women mentioned (Euodia and Syntyche) disagreed, for Paul urges them to "agree in the Lord" (v. 2). What the text does not say is that the two women disagreed because they were female. However, the text shows that these women were fellow workers with Paul, along with the men folk. So the recognition of the gender differentiation here is meant to show that the female gender was also involved in the proclamation of the gospel and so the call to agree is not made because the two were women.

Rom 13:9-10⁷⁰ makes an allusion to the decalogue (Exod 20:13-17; Deut 5:7-21). As we have already noted, the wife is singled out among those not to be coveted. Although Paul refers to the injunctions of the decalogue, he does not mention the wife. Paul simply quotes: "You shall not covet" (v. 9). Does this omission of the mention of the wife mean anything? One thing that is clear from the quotation is that the injunctions stop at the action (verb). In the decalogue, this is true up to the third injunction, but for the others, they are extended. So the omission of the mention of the wife could be explained as Paul wanting to stop at the action as he does also at Rom 7:7. In addition to this, it can be observed that in the decalogue, the things/beings that are not to be coveted are many, the wife being simply one of them. For this reason, it is difficult to say to which injunction Paul is referring. So the silence on the recognition could apply to others as well. Hence, from this silence we cannot seriously claim that Paul doesn't recognize gender differentiation here.⁷¹

We now turn to the disputed/contested Pauline letters (i.e. the deutero-Pauline letters). Col 3:18-4:1⁷² presents the *haustafel* (household code). This is repeated in Eph 5:22-6:9.⁷³ In this code, the writer recognizes the institution of marriage (cf. reference to "wives" and "husbands" [vv. 18-19]), hence the recognition of gender differentiation through marriage: husband (male) and wife (female). The issue that raises problems in this code is the subjection of the wife to the husband, whereas the man is only told to love the wife. But the text does not indicate that the subjection is based on the wife's being female. In the Colossians' text, the wife is to be subject to her husband because it "is fitting in the Lord" (Col 3:18). The Ephesians text explains the basis of this subjection by saying they should do that "as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Saviour. As the Church is subject to Christ, so let wives also be subject in everything to their husbands" (Eph 5:22-24). So according to the Ephesians text, the basis of the subjection is christological and not gender. In addition to this, the text says, "Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. For no man ever hates his own flesh but nourishes and cherishes it...let each one of you love his wife as himself" (Eph 5:28-33). So the wife and the husband are one flesh, hence the subjection is not dependent on gender.

Finally, we come to the pastoral letters which are also attributed to Paul. In 1 Tim 2:8-15,⁷⁴ the writer recognizes gender differentiation (cf. reference to "men and "women"). This pericope has raised problems, especially on what the writer says in vv. 11-13: "Let the women learn in silence with all submissiveness; permit no woman to teach or have authority over men; she is to keep silent" (cf. Col 3:18-4:1; Eph 5:22-6:9). Most femi-

nist readers have pointed out to this text as the basis for the domination of women in the church.⁷⁵ But why did the writer have such a view of women? Several possibilities have been suggested, for example, (a) the view is based on misinterpretation of Genesis⁷⁶ and failure to discern the distinctive purpose for each narrative;⁷⁷ (b) the creation account was interpreted not in the light of the principle and experience of the equality of the gospel but by the patriarchal experience and principles of the church and society.⁷⁸

But having said this, we should note first that this text seems to contradict what Paul said in 1 Cor 7:1-40, especially what he says in v.4: "For the wife does not rule over her own body, but husband does; likewise the husband does not rule over his own body but the wife does." However, a careful reading of the text would show that the text of Timothy talks about a generic woman ("a woman"), whereas the Corinthians as well as the Colossians and Ephesians texts refer to "wives." Second, we should note that the text doesn't urge submissiveness or silence on the part of the women because they are female, i.e. because of gender. The reason given by the writer, according to the text, is that "For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor" (vv. 14-15). So submissiveness or silence is urged in the text because of order in creation and transgression and not gender.⁷⁹

Is the writer correct in his understanding of the Biblical situation of the woman? One of the versions of the creation accounts says that "male and female he [God] created them" (Gen 1:27), which means that both genders were created at the same time. But the other version says "and the rib which the Lord had taken from the man he made into a woman" (Gen 2:24). So the writer is referring to this version when he says Adam was created first. In the process of doing this, the writer is ignoring the first version where both were created at the same time.⁸⁰ According to the fall account, it is true that Eve was deceived by the serpent. But one could argue that Adam was also deceived, as we have already pointed out, when he accepted to eat the fruit, for he knew quite well the injunction not to eat it. In short then, it can be said that according to the text, the submission or silence enjoined upon "a woman" is not based on gender but on other factors.⁸¹

From the catholic epistles, we examine 1 Pet 3:1-7⁸² (cf. 1 Cor 7:1-40; 14:34-35; Col 3:18-25; Eph 5:22-33; 1 Tim 2:8-15) where the writer also recognizes gender differentiation. This recognition comes through the institution of marriage (husband and wife). Here too, women are urged to be submissive to their husbands (3:1). The reason for this submission, according to the text, is "so that some, though they do not obey the word,

may be won without a word by the behaviour of their wives, when they see your reference and chaste behaviour" (v. 20). The example of Sarah obeying Abraham is also presented as reason to be submissive to husbands (vv. 5-6). So the injunction to be submissive to the husbands is made on other grounds apart from gender. The husbands are also enjoined to "live considerately" with their wives (v. 7). Part of the reason given in the text for this call is because women are "the weaker sex" (v. 7). Out of all the texts that we have looked at, this is the only one that links gender (sex) to the relationship between man and woman. The adjective "weaker" suggests the superiority of the male sex over the female sex. But the way it has been used here is not to continue marginalizing the female sex but to uplift it because the writer says the two sexes "are joint heirs of the grace of life" (v. 7). So when it comes to the "grace of life" both sexes are on the same level. Being "joint heirs" implies both have equal opportunities in that inheritance.⁸³

So the study of the narratives from the *New Testament* reveals that there is gender recognition. However, this recognition does not explain the apparent marginalization of the female gender.

Concluding on the narrative study, I am saying that the study of the select number of narratives from the *Old and New Testaments* has revealed that gender differentiation that was created in the creation accounts (Genesis 1-2) is recognized as such by God and narrators in the subsequent accounts in the Bible. Notwithstanding 1 Peter 2:7, the study of the Biblical narratives has demonstrated that this recognition of gender differentiation in no way contributes to the apparent marginalization of the female gender.

Conclusion

Right from the start, it was stressed that treatment of women in the Bible is outside the remit of this paper, but the issue at stake in this paper is gender differentiation. The discussion of this issue has revealed that gender differentiation is created and recognized as such in the Bible. Being created implies that it is inherently good (see Paul's assessment of the law in Rom 7:12) and this goodness is evident in its recognition. But what is inherently good has become not good, for it has been said to be used to marginalize the female gender. We may pause and ask here as Paul did: "Did that which is good, then bring [marginalization] to [the female gender]?" Paul's answer is: "By no means!" (see Rom 7:13). But it is how gender differentiation has been manipulated today that has led to this apparent female gender marginalization. According to this paper, evidence is clear: gender differentiation was created and recognized as such.

But women in the church in general have been enjoined to be silent, submissive, and not to preach, i.e. not to be ministers of the word and sacraments.⁸⁴ On the popular level, this injunction is made simply because women are emotionally unstable, uncertain at certain times, and child bearing; the Bible does not permit women to have authority over men; our culture does not allow women to have authority over men; if women were brought to leadership of the church, cases of immorality would increase among the leaders; and women cannot handle leadership roles.⁸⁵ Even if this were all true, would this not mean that the male folk in the church were denying women the ministry of the word and sacraments because of their being female? There is, therefore, an urgent need to revisit the Bible in order to address the apparent gender imbalance in society in general and the church in particular.⁸⁶ Indeed, "the Bible is the engine that is keeping the church running."⁸⁷ In other words, "Scripture is the Soul of Theology."⁸⁸

In this paper, we have noted that feminists have attributed the apparent marginalization of the female gender to two factors: the Bible and culture. On the Bible, it is said: (a) through sin and punishment, the woman was made subservient to the man; (b) as the woman was created as a helper, she was in fact made an auxiliary and secondary to the man; (c) as the woman was created from the man, the woman was made inferior; (d) that the text of 1 Timothy is a major contributor to the issue.⁸⁹ On the cultural factor, it is said that the patriarchal system is the root cause of the marginalization of women in society.⁹⁰ In addition to all this, it has been claimed that the Western Latin theology also contributes to this marginalization. On this, it is said that views of patristic writers like Aquinas, Augustine, Tertullian have permeated the church, hence the marginalization of women.

In short then, this paper has attempted to demonstrate that gender differentiation is created and recognized in the Bible. This has been proved by the philological study of some Hebrew terms in Genesis 1-2 and the narrative study of a select number of episodes in both the *Old* and the *New Testaments*. These two studies have shown that the apparent marginalization of the women has to be explained otherwise because the marginalization of women is not inherent in the creation and recognition of gender differentiation.

Notes

- 1 The original version of this paper was delivered at the Association of the Theological Institutions of Southern and Central Africa (ATISCA) conference held in Harare, Zimbabwe (December 1998). The theme of the conference was "Theology and Gender Issues."
- 2 The feminist movement has often attributed the apparent marginalization of women to our so-called patriarchal societies. However, this paper will not discuss this issue. For discussions on the issue of patriarchy, see for example, Kavesta Adagala, "Mother Nature, Patriarchal Cosmology and Gender," in Gilbert E.M. Ogotu (ed.), *God, Humanity and Mother Nature* (Nairobi: Masaki Publishers, 1992), pp.47-65; Sang Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," in Ursel Rosenhager & Sarah Stephens (eds.), *"Walk, My Sister": The Ordination of Women: Reformed Perspective* (Studies from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches 18; WARC, 1993), pp. 34-51; Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Introduction* (2 vols.; London: SCM, 1994), vol. 1, pp. 101-86; Isabel Apawo Phiri, *Women, Presbyterianism and Patriarchy: Religious Experience of Chewa Women in Central Malawi* (Kachere Monograph; Blantyre: CLAIM, 1997); Elsa Tamez, "No Longer Silent: A Bible Study on 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 and Galatians 3:28," in Rosenhager & Stephens, *"Walk, My Sister,"* pp. 52-62.
- 3 The feminist movement has developed in part as a response to this apparent marginalization (making inferior or oppressing or suppressing) of women by the male folk. This apparent marginalization is understood as the domination of the female gender, hence the gender question. For discussions on feminist theology and/or feminist approach to the Bible, see for example, A. Yarbro Collins (ed.), *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (Biblical Scholarship in North America 10; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1985); A. Yarbro Collins (ed.), *Women's Bible Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); E. Schussler Fiorenza, In *Memory of Her* (New York: Crossroad, 1983); Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, *Jesus: Miriam's Child, Sophia's Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology* (London: SCM, 1994); Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary* (London: SCM, 1995); Alvera Mickelsen (ed.), *Women,*

Authority and the Bible (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1986); Isabel Apawo Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2): A Biblical Exegetical Study from a Malawian Chewa Presbyterian Perspective," Rosenhager & Stephens, "Walk, My Sister," pp. 24-33. Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Towards A Feminist Theology* (London: SCM, 1983); Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Reading Towards A Feminist Theology* (Woman Guildes; Boston: Beacon Press, 1985); E. Cady Stanton, *The Woman's Bible* (2 vols.; New York: European Publishing Co., 1885, 1898); Elaine Storkey, *What's Right with Feminism* (London: SPCK, 1985).

- 4 A lot has been written on the treatment of women. The reader is advised to consult the literature in question, for example, literature in footnotes 1 and 2.
- 5 Some of the tools used in this word study include, for example, William F. Arndt & E. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: University Press; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957); F Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. & ed. Robert W. Funk; Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1961); Francis Brown with S.R. Driver & Charles A. Briggs, *The New Brown Driver-Briggs-Genesius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publisher, 1979); Benjamin Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1850; 5th printing 1990); K. Elliger & W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977); Paul Jouon, *Grammaire de L'Hebreu Biblique* (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1923). I acknowledge that language can be used to oppress women. However, in this study language contributes positively to the debate.
- 6 For detailed discussion of the creation accounts in Genesis, consult commentaries on Genesis. For example, see Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1959), pp. 13-63; Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J.A. Baker; London: SCM, 1967); vol. 2; pp. 93-150; John Hargreaves, *A Guide to Genesis* (TEF Study Guide 3; London: SPCK, 1969; 7th impression 1991), pp. 6-23; David F. Hinson, *Theology of the Old Testament* (TEF Study Guide 15; London;

SPCK, 1976), pp. 18-64.

7 This Hebrew word is translated as "man, mankind/humankind."

8 Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," p. 46.

9 For discussions on Gen 1:26, see for example, Bonhoefer, *Creation and Fall*, pp. 35-40; Kidner, *Genesis*, pp. 50-52; Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, pp. 85-93; Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, pp. 30-33.

10 For discussion on Gen 2:20, see for example, Kidner, *Genesis*, pp. 65-66; Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, pp. 132-34.

11 For discussions on Gen 2:23, see for example, Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 69; Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, pp. 135-37.

12 In this passage, 'is is used as a synonym of 'adam.

13 For discussions on Gen 2:25, see for example, Kidner, *Genesis*, pp. 65-66; Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, pp. 93-95.

14 For discussion on Gen 1:27, see for example, Hargreaves, *A Guide to Genesis*, pp.9-11; Kidner, *Genesis*, p. 52; Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, pp. 93-95.

15 Grammatically, it is easy to detect inferiority or degradation in Greek. This can be deduced from the use of the neuter gender (the diminutive). But it is difficult to do the same in Hebrew because there are only two genders: a thing is either masculine or feminine.

16 Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall*, p. 38.

17 Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," p. 46.

18 Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2)," p. 25.

19 Note the paronomasia in 2:7: 'adam and 'adama.

20 Note that there is nothing said about "flesh" in 2:21. There, the object is "rib." But

how did the 'adam know that God took his "rib" (bone)? This is a clue that the account should not be taken literally.

- 21 Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 69.
- 22 Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 136.
- 23 This Hebrew term is translated as "man."
- 24 There is no etymological relationship between the two Hebrew words. But there is in English.
- 25 Gen 2:22-23 is interesting for another different reason. Here, what God created is called 'issa by God, whereas the same being is called 'issha again, but this time because she was taken from 'is. What is apparent is that when 'adam refers to himself, he uses the term 'ish. This implies that 'adam and 'ish are synonymous.
- 26 This Hebrew term is translated as "woman, wife, female."
- 27 As note earlier, 'adam is a masculine noun. Philologically, does this suggest that gender differentiation (see v. 27c) was created from the male gender? What we do know is that in Hebrew, "mothers" of things are in the feminine gender. But does this "motherhood" apply to 'adam? These are difficult questions to answer in a paper like this one. Perhaps, 'adam has neutral connotations (cf. its indefinite and collective nature), but since things are either male or female in Hebrew, it so happens that the creation of "male" and "female" gender stems from the masculine gender.
- 28 Hargreaves, *A Guide to Genesis*, p. 10.
- 29 Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," p. 44.
- 30 Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 33.
- 31 Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 94.
- 32 Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2)," p. 25.

- 33 Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 94.
- 34 Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy)," p. 24.
- 35 Kidner, *Genesis*, p. 65.
- 36 Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis*, p. 88.
- 37 Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," p. 47.
- 38 However, it is also possible to understand the phrase differently because the beginning of the chapter does not tell whether or not the man was present when the serpent appeared on the scene.
- 39 Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy2)," p. 28.
- 40 Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," p. 50.
- 41 For discussions on the flood narrative, see for example, Hargreaves, *A Guide to Genesis*, pp. 43-57; Kidner, *Genesis*, pp. 83-100; Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, pp. 139-69; Speiser, *Genesis*, pp. 47-56.
- 42 For discussions on the decalogue in Exod 20:1-17, see for example, Brevard S. Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1974), pp. 385-439; Alan Cole, *Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary* (Leicester/Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973), pp. 149-61; Terence E. Frethem, *Exodus (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching)*; Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991), pp. 220-39.
- 43 For discussions on the decalogue in Deut 5:6-21, see for example, S.R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy (International Critical Commentary)*; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895; latest impression 1965), pp. 81-6; Gerhard Von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary (Old Testament Library)*; London: SCM, 1966), pp. 56-9; J.A. Thompson, *Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentary)*; Leicester/Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), pp. 114-18.
- 44 This injunction borders along the question of the treatment of women. It is, how-

ever, discussed here because of the listing of the people according to their gender.

- 45 For discussions on Lev 12:1-8, see for example, Andrew Boanr, *A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus* (Giant Summit Book; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1978), pp. 228-31; Felix L. Chingota, "Scraments and Sexuality," *Religion in Malawi* No. 8 (1998), pp. 34-40, especially pp. 39-40; R.K. Harrison, *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary (The Tyndale Old Testament Commentary; Leicester/Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980)*, pp. 133-36.
- 46 Harrison, *Leviticus*, p. 134.
- 47 Bonar, *Leviticus*, pp. 229-30. The emphasis is his. For the doctrine of *Peccatum originale*, "Original sin," explained in terms of not imitation but of propagation or generation, see Augustine, *De peccatum meritis et remissione*, 1.9.10; CSEL 60.12; Augustine, *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, 4.4.7; CSEL 60.527-28. In fact, original sin is a term derived from the Western Latin Theology. See. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Scripture the Soul of Theology* (New York/Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1994), p. 69.
- 48 For discussions on Matt 14:15-21, see for example, W.F. Albright & C.S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (The Anchor Bible; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1971), pp. 177-79; Douglas R.A. Hare, *Matthew (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching;)* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993), pp. 165-67.
- 49 In Greek, there are three genders: masculine, feminine, and neuter. This is different from Hebrew which has only two genders: masculine and feminine.
- 50 The order in the listing could be interpreted as the narrator putting emphasis on a particular gender over against the others. This could be true, but as we have noted the order is reversed in other Greek manuscripts. So we shouldn't emphasize on the order, but on the recognition of the gender differentiation.
- 51 For discussions on Mark 6:35-44, see for example, C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1959), pp. 216-23; Ezra P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark (International Critical Commentary;)* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896; latest impression 1975), pp. 115-20; John Hargreaves, *A Guide to St Mark's Gospel*

(TEF Study Guide 2; London: SPCK, 1979), pp. 105-108; C.S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1986), pp. 298-303.

- 52 For discussions on Luke 9:10-17, see for example, G.B. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke (Pelican New Testament Commentary)* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Book, 1963), pp. 1226-28; Fred B. Craddock, *Luke (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching)* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990), pp. 124-26; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke (International Critical Commentary)* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922), pp. 242-46.
- 53 This is notwithstanding that Luke recognizes the role of women in the service of the ministry of Jesus (cf. Luke 8:1-3).
- 54 For discussions on Matt 15:32-39, see, for example, Hare, *Matthew*, pp. 179-82; Mann, *Matthew*, pp. 189-90.
- 55 For discussions on Luke 15:3-7, 8-10, see, for example, Caird, *Luke*, pp. 179-81; Plummer, *Luke*, pp. 368-71.
- 56 For discussions on Luke 23:27, see, for example, Caird, *Luke*, pp. 249-50; Plummer, *Luke*, pp. 527-30.
- 57 For discussions on Luke 23:44-49, see, for example, Caird, *Luke*, pp. 252-54; Plummer, *Luke*, pp. 536-40.
- 58 For discussions on 1 Cor 7:1-40, see for example, Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (trans. James W. Leich; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 114-38; William F. Orr & James Arthur Walther, *1 Corinthians: A New Translation Introduction with a study of the Life of Paul, Notes and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible: New York: Doubleday, 1976), pp. 205-26.
- 59 For discussions on 1 Cor 14:34-35, see for example, Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 246-47; Orr & Walther, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 311-13.
- 60 Orr & Walther, *1 Corinthians*, p. 312. Emphasis theirs.

- 61 Ibid., p. 313. Emphasis theirs.
- 62 For other discussions on 1 Corinthians, see for example, Walter L. Liefen, "Women, Submission and Ministry in 1 Corinthians," in Mickelsen (ed.), *Women, Authority and the Bible*, pp. 134-60; Antoinette Wire, "1 Corinthians," in Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures*, vol. 1, pp. 153-95.
- 63 For discussions on Gal 3:28, see for example, Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), pp. 181-201; Dieter Lührmann, *Galatians* (A Continental Commentary; trans. O.C. Dean, Jr; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 74-8; Frank J. Matera, *Galatians* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1992), pp. 141-47.
- 64 Matera, *Galatians*, p. 143.
- 65 Lührmann, *Galatians*, p. 71.
- 66 Betz, *Galatians*, p. 197.
- 67 Tamez, "No Longer Silent," p. 53.
- 68 For discussions on Phil 4:2-3, see for example, Fred B. Craddock, *Philippians* (*Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*) (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1985), pp. 69-71; Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians* (The Tyndale New Testament Commentary; rev. ed.; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1987), pp. 167-69.
- 69 Craddock, *Philippians*, p. 71.
- 70 For discussions on Rom 13:9-10, see for example, Paul J. Achtemeier, *Romans* (*Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*) (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1985), pp. 208-210; F.F. Bruce, *The Letter of Paul to the Romans* (The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985), pp. 226-27; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible; New York: Doubleday, 1993), pp. 676-81; Ernst Kasemann, *Commentary on Romans* (London: SCM, 1980), pp. 359-64.
- 71 For other discussions on Romans 13:9-10, see for example, Elizabeth A. Castella, "Romans," in Fiorenza, *Searching the Scriptures*, vol. 2, pp. 272-300.

- 72 For discussions on Colossians 3:18-4:1, see for example, Mary Rose D'Angelo, "Colossians," in Fiorenza, *Searching the Scriptures*, vol. 3, pp. 313-24; Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 154-63; Ralph P. Martin, *Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching)* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991), pp. 126-29; N.T. Wright, *Colossians and Philemon* (The Tyndale New Testament Commentary; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1986), pp. 145-51.
- 73 For discussions on Eph 5:22-6:9, see for example, Martin, *Ephesians*, pp. 67-74.
- 74 For discussions on 1 Timothy 2:8-15, see for example, Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (The Tyndale Bible Commentary; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1990), pp. 84-90; Bruce W. Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992), pp. 130-49; Linda M. Maloney, "The Pastoral Epistles," in Fiorenza, *Searching the Scriptures*, vol. 2, pp. 361-80.
- 75 See for example, Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," pp. 34-41; Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2)," pp. 25-29.
- 76 The one who advocates this view contradicts herself when she says the writer of this text follows Jewish interpretation (See. Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2)," p. 29.
- 77 Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2)," p. 26.
- 78 Chang, "The Place of Women in Genesis 1-3 and 1 Timothy 2," pp. 40-41.
- 79 For other views on this text, see for example, David M. Scholar, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," in Mickelsen (ed.), *Women, Authority and the Bible*, pp. 193-253.
- 80 The writer is also overlooking the fact that God created 'adam and not a being with a personal name of Adam.
- 81 Perhaps, this passage can properly be discussed under the treatment of women in the Bible, hence it is not wholly within the scope of this paper.

- 82 For discussions on this text, see for example, Kathleen E. Corley, "1 Peter," in Fiorenza, *Searching the Scriptures*, vol. 2, pp. 349-60; Wayne Gruden, "1 Peter" (The Tyndale Bible Commentary; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), pp. 134-46.
- 83 This passage can properly be discussed under the treatment of women in the Bible, hence it is not wholly within the remit of this paper.
- 84 On sacraments and sexuality, see for example, Chingota, "Sacraments and Sexuality," pp. 34-40.
- 85 See Phiri, "The 'Proper' Place of Women (Genesis 1, 1 Timothy 2)," p. 32.
- 86 See for example, Jaon D. Flikkema, "Strategies for change," in Mickelsen (ed.), *Women, Authority and the Bible*, pp. 255-84.
- 87 Hilary B.P. Mijoga, "Bible and Church Growth in Malawi," *Religion in Malawi* No. 8 (1998), pp. 27-33, especially p. 27.
- 88 Fitzmyer, *Scripture, the Soul of Theology*.
- 89 The Biblical factor would only explain the Jewish and Christian situations for both religions use the Bible. Peoples of other faiths would not be covered by this factor since they don't use the Bible.
- 90 The cultural factor would encompass people across the board, i.e, this would explain the situation of women in general.

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES
CHANCELLOR COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF MALAWI
PO BOX 280
ZOMBA