An Exegesis of Genesis 2:18-24:
In Light of the Current Discussion on the Role of Man and Woman

By Michael J. Albrecht and Thomas P. Nass

[Michigan District Southwestern Conference, Pastoral Conference, Otsego, Michigan, February 24, 1981]

I.   Notes on the Hebrew Text:

Verse 18:

לֹא־טוֹב
- this is in contrast to Gen. 1:31, but not contradictory since 2:18 comes before 1:31 chronologically

הֱיוֹת
- infinitive construct of היה
- GK 114a - the infinitive construct can be used as the nominative of the subject

בד
- √בדד = be separate, isolated
- masc. noun - separation, part, member
- often used with preposition ל = in a state of separation, alone, by itself

עָשָׂה
- do, make
- this verb is used along side of בָּרָא in the creation account
- עשה is used in Gen. 1:7,16, 25, 26, 31; 2:2, 4, 18; 3:1, 21; 5:2; 6:6,7. This is a general word; when it is used, the emphasis is not on the making but on what is made
- ברא is used in Gen. 1:1,21,27- 3:3,4; 5:1,2. This word is used only of God. It does not necessarily imply creation *ex nihilo* the two terms appear to be used with little distinction in meaning cf. Gen. 1:26-27, 5:1
- the mappiq here is generally ignored

עֵזֶר
- help, helper
- this noun occurs 21 times in the Hebrew OT, in 12 of these occurrences the Lord is said to be a "helper."' in 5 occurrences it refers to "help" which comes from the Lord

נֶגֶד
- adverb = in front of (e.g. - mountain, people, God)
- twice (Gen. 2:18, 20) it is used with the preposition כ- "as in front of", corresponding to", "complementary to", "suited to"

Verse 19:

וַיִּצֶר - √יצר = form, fashion

- here the waw/consecutive form is written defectively (we'd expect וַיִּיצֶר)
- the English translation should be a pluperfect because it is referring to something prior to v. 18; Keil has found other waw/conseccutive imperfects which bear the pluperfect idea (cf. 1 Kings 7:13)
- יצר appears in the creation account in 3 places: Gen. 2:7,8,19

וַיָּבֵא - √בוא = come in, go

- hiphil waw/consecutive imperfect = bring in

לוֹ - frequently a singular suffix will refer to plurals or collectives with a distributive sense, "to see what he would call each of them"

נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה - commentators have found great difficulty in determining the connection of these words with other parts of the sentence

- GK 131 k-n takes it as a permutation, i.e. an apposition which defines the preceding term (here לוֹ) to prevent any misunderstanding

Verse 20:

לְאָדָם - there would be good reason to repoint this to לָאָדָם (including the definite article) because אדם from Ge 2:7 - Ge 4:1 always has the article otherwise

- Cassuto, however, suggests that with the pointing לְאָדָם the Masoretes already understood the definite article; he says they treated אדם like אלהים and never placed the vocalization of the definite article on prepositional prefixes before these words (p. 167)

לְאָדָם - possibly לֹא מָצָא can be understood in an impersonal sense: "for the man one did not find..." or "for the man there was not found"

לֹא מָצָא - otherwise לאדם can stand unrelated to the sentence structure and the man can be the subject of מצא

- " as for the man, he did not find..."

Verse 21:

וַיַּפֵּל - fall, lie

- hiphil waw/consecutive imperfect = cause to fall

תַּרְדֵּמָה - from √רדם = be in or fall into a heavy sleep

- the same word is used to describe Abraham's sleep in Ge 15:2 and Saul's sleep in 1 Sa 26:12

וַיִּישָׁן - √יָשֵׁן = sleep (pe yodh verb)

  - Qal waw/consecutive imperfect

וַיִּקַּח - a good example of a common characteristic of Hebrew style, here are two verbs in a row, neither of which has the subject explicitly mentioned, but Adam is the subject of the first and the Lord the subject of the second, as is clear from the context

צֵלָע - fem. noun, the basic meaning is "side"

  - of its 41 occurrences in the Hebrew OT, it only bears the meaning "human rib: in Genesis 2, yet the meaning is clear, it must refer to a bone taken from a number of similar bones in the side of Adam

וַיִּסְגֹּר - √סגר = shut, close

  - either the Lord God is the subject - "and God closed up in its place with flesh"

  - or בשר is the subject - "and the flesh closed up in its place"

  - in either case, God is the Ultimate Cause of the healing process

תַּחְתֶּנָּה - תַּחַת = preposition = 1) under, beneath

               2) in place of, instead of

  - נָּה here we see the preposition with a verbal suffix, it is feminine, referring back to the rib

Verse 22:

וַיִּבֶן - √בנה = build

  - Qal imperfect = יִבְנֶה, waw consecutive = וַיִּבֶן

  - this is an interesting choice of vocable, it may imply a bit more concentration or attention to detail than עשה, but note God is now doing what he said he would do when back in v. 18 He said אֶעֱשֶׂה perhaps this is merely a stylistic use of synonyms

וַיְבִאֶהָ - hiphil waw/consecutive imperfect from √בוא with third person fem. verbal suffix: "and he brought her"

לְאִשָּׁה - note that this is the first time this vocable appears

Verse 23:

זֹאת - fem. of זֶה = demonstrative pronoun = this, here

הַפַּעַם - √פעם - thrust, impel

  - פַּעַם = fem noun meaning 1) footfall, footstep, foot

               2) occurrence

- the Hebrew article originally was a demonstrative pronoun (Gk. 126 b) הַפַּעַם is one of the few idioms where this usage remains in the OT
- "this occurrence", "this time"
  (cf. הַיּוֹם = this day, הַשָּׁנָה = this year)

- the sense is: "This creature, this time (at last, after all the animals have passed by) is a helper for me"

עֶצֶם
- "my bone and my flesh" is a common Hebrew idiom to show close kinship (cf. Ge 29:14; Jdg 9:2; 2 Sa 5:1, 2 Sa 19:12-13; 1 Chr 11:1)

מֵעֲצָמַי

אִשָּׁה
- many scholars believe that אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה are not etymologically related
- however, ultimately that makes no difference in the understanding of this verse: (after all, who knows what language Adam spoke??), these words have a similar sound, and therefore aptly mark the affinity between the man and his spouse

אִישׁ
- this is the first occurrence of this vocable
- its basic sense is man as contrasted with woman, or husband as contrasted with wife; therefore the LXX translates it ἀνήρ in about 1083 passages and ἄνθρωπος in about 450
- אדם on the other hand is human nature or human race as contrasted with God above or with the brute creation below, the LXX translates it ἄνθρωπος in 411 out of 460 occurrences

לֻקֳחָה
- the normal pual perfect third fem. sing. is לֻקְּחָה
- often the dagesh forte is omitted in piel and pual when the middle radical has schewa under it (GK 52 d) (e.g. הַלְלוּ)
- then the vocal character of the schewa can be emphasized by its taking the form of a hateph; here (◌ֳ) owing to (◌ֻ)

זֹאת
- GK 20c calls this a dagesh forte conjunctivum

Verse 24:

עַל־כֵּן
- these words are not to be regarded as Adam's, but a comment made by Moses עַל־כן is always used in Genesis (with the exception of 20:6 and 42:21) to introduce remarks of the author, a good example of this is Gen. 32:32 (v. 33 in Hebrew)

יַעֲזָב־
- √עצב = leave, forsake, loose
- Qal imperfect יַעֲזֹב becomes יַעֲזָב before maqqeph

וְדָבַק
- √עצק = cleave, cling, keep close
- waw/consecutive perfect

- notice that leaving comes before cleaving (marriage must come before intercourse)

אֶחָד בָּשָׂר - this certainly includes the aspect of sexual intercourse (cf. 1 Co 6:16) but the concept of "one flesh" includes a unity and harmony of spirit and emotions which goes beyond the physical relationship and actually serves to make the physical love much deeper and more meaningful

This verse is quoted 4 times in the New Testament:

1) In Mt 19:5 and Mk 10-8 Jesus quotes it to support his argument that marriage is to be a life-long union.

3) In 1 Co 6:16 Paul quotes the last half of the verse to show that if one unites himself with a prostitute, he makes himself one flesh with her.

4) In Eph 5:31 Paul quotes it in his discussion of husbands loving their wives as their own bodies.

II. Preliminary Remarks

At the outset, it will be helpful for us to define what we mean with the term "subordination." Biblically speaking, the word "subordination" does not carry with it a notion of inferior value. Nor does it carry with it a notion of oppression or the use of force for domination. It is merely the best English equivalent for the Greek word *hypotasso* and literally means "ordered under." It refers to the order of a relationship in which one party depends upon another party for direction. Such subordination does not degrade the subordinate party to a position of secondary worth or importance. It merely establishes a wholesome order in which two parties can work together in harmony to achieve common goals.

In dealing with Genesis 2 and the question of subordination, we have found it helpful to boil the various problems and arguments down into two basic questions. First of all, is there subordination in Genesis 2 before the Fall? (There is no debate about the existence of subordination after Genesis 3:16). Then secondly, who is to be subordinate to whom? Are all women to be subordinate to all men, or does subordination exist only within the marriage relationship? These are the two questions we would like to face head-on in this presentation.

III. Was there subordination before the Fall?

There are some indications in Genesis 1-3 that there was no subordination before the Fall. There is a concern throughout Genesis 1 and 2 to show that the woman is a being of the same nature as the man. She and the man both bear the image of God (Ge 1:27). She is commanded to subdue the earth and rule over its creatures together with the man (Ge 1:28). About her Adam says, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh (Ge 2:23)." There are no explicit statements in Genesis 1or 2 saying that the woman was created to be subordinate to the man. And, one can easily read Genesis 3:16b as the establishment of a new arrangement for mankind as a result of the Fall. In this verse, the statement, "Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you." is sandwiched between other curses (pain in childbearing, toil in producing food, and death) which describe new aspects of mankind's world, things that are new and different as a result of the Fall. For this reason, Martin Luther in his commentary on Genesis 3:16 says that Eve before the fall was "very free" and "'in no respect inferior to her husband." (*LW* #31, p. 202). He says, "If Eve had persisted in the truth, she would not only not have been subjected to the rule of her husband, but she herself would also have been a partner in the rule which is now entirely the concern of males." (*LW* #31, P. 203).

However, these observations do not necessarily force us to conclude that there was no subordination in Genesis 1-2. The fact that the woman is presented as a being of the same nature as the man does not rule out subordination between the man and the woman. The fact that both rule the creation does not necessarily imply complete equality in their relationship to one another. And, Genesis 3:16b allows two other interpretations. Professor Lawrenz interprets Genesis 3:16b strictly as a reaffirmation of woman/man subordination before the Fall. As Adam was to rule over his wife before the Fall, so he will rule over her after the Fall. Others feel that Genesis 3:16b added an evil dimension to a subordination present already in creation. There was subordination from creation, as there was childbearing and work. However, it became an oppressive, dominating, painful subordination after the Fall, just as work and childbearing became painful. The Hebrew word for "rule" (*mashal*) is commonly used for a dominating rule as *kurieuo* is used in Greek. Notice also that the New Testament never refers to the curse on the woman as the foundation of any recommended form of Christian subordination.

On the other hand, there are indications in Genesis 1-3 that there was some form of subordination before the Fall. In Genesis 2:18, the Lord states, "I will make a helper suitable for him." It is frequently pointed out that the Hebrew word for "helper." (*ezer*) does not necessarily imply subordination. The word is often used of God as a help for human beings. However, Professor Lawrenz contends that in this context the word indicates subordination. The woman was made to be a helper, that is, the purpose for her creation was to be a helper for the man.
Whereas "being a helper" might not imply subordination, Professor Lawrenz contends that "being made to be a helper" must imply subordination. Professor Lawrenz also sees evidence of pre-Fall subordination in Genesis 3:17: "To Adam he said, 'Because you listened to your wife and ate from the tree'." Professor Lawrenz contends that Adam's listening to his wife is presented as part of his sin. One facet of his sin was a renunciation of his leadership role in taking the advice of his subordinate. Another indication of subordination might be the mode of the woman's creation. She was made from the rib which the Lord took out of the man. Perhaps another indication is the sequence of creation. The man was created first chronologically. Some see subordination in the fact that the man is the center of the entire narrative and especially of the narrative of the creation of the woman. Some also see subordination in the fact that Adam named Eve. There is considerable evidence that in Biblical times giving names was a right exercised only by super-ordinates who thereby demonstrated authority over the place or person they named. For example, that Adam named the animals was one indication of his rule over them. Likewise, God showed his dominion over creation by naming its parts (cf. Ge 1:5, 8, 10).

We wonder how compelling these indications are, however. Does "being made a helper" necessarily imply subordination if "being a helper" does not? Genesis 3:17 might also allow the interpretation that there was nothing wrong in Adam's listening to Eve. Adam's listening to Eve might only be a narrative accounting of what happened before the actual sin. Surely you can say anything you want to about God making Eve out of a rib! Some say this indicates that the wife was to be under the arm of her husband. Others say it indicates that she was to be at his side on an equal level. And Adam's centrality in the account and his naming of the woman are more subtle arguments upon which we would hesitate to base any conclusions without other more explicit statements.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that Genesis 1-3 taken by itself does not force one to the conclusion that there was subordination before the Fall. Subordination is not presented in Genesis 1-2 with such clarity that one is compelled to see it there. There are indications that there is no subordination. There are indications that there is subordination. Lacking are the explicit statements. Yet this shouldn't surprise us because this is not the main point of the account of the creation of the woman. The main point rather is that in the woman, the man finds his God-created complement. She is the one who will be "suitable for him" in a way that the animals were not. She is the one with whom the man will become "one flesh." She is the one who will rule with the man and participate with him in carrying out the Lord's command, "Be fruitful and increase in number."

In answering this question, "Was there subordination before the Fall?", we must also consider the New Testament's understanding of Genesis 1-3. And we are grateful for Apostolic commentary without which our

task would be much more difficult. In both 1 Ti 2 and 1 Co 11, Paul bases his arguments for subordination on the creation account. The foundation for his exhortation in 1 Ti 2 is this, "For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not the one deceived, it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner." (1 Ti 2:13-14). The foundation for his exhortation in 1 Co 11 is this, "For man did not come from woman, but woman from man neither was man created for woman, but woman for man." (1 Co 11:8-9). Without question, Paul sees subordination in the Garden of Eden, built into God's world at creation. Otherwise it would be meaningless for him to quote the creation account as the basis for his statements on subordination. He sees subordination as a part of God's order of creation. This subordination is indicated by the fact that God made Adam first, by the fact that he made Eve out of Adam, by the fact that He made Eve for Adam, and by the fact that Eve was deceived.

The statements of Paul force us to conclude that there was subordination before the Fall. This is another instance of the New Testament giving us deeper insight into the Old Testament. As he does in Galatians 4 with his commentary on Hagar, Paul here with the guidance of the Holy Spirit amplifies our understanding of the Old Testament. By itself, Genesis 1 and 2 might not force every sincere Christian exegete to the conclusion that there is subordination in pre-Fall Eden. But we can clearly see subordination before the Fall because Paul shows us that it is there.

IV. Who is subordinate to whom in Genesis 1-3?

Once it is established that there is subordination in the Garden of Eden, we must determine its extent. It is here that the generic/specific question arises. If one understands Genesis 2:18-24 and particularly Genesis 2:18 generically, then the section is concerned with Adam as the representative of all males and the section presents a general subordination of all women to all men. If one understands Genesis 2:18-24 as specific, then the section is concerned with Adam as an individual and the section presents the subordination of one individual woman to her husband.

The Theses and Elucidation assert that both the specific and generic ideas are present. However, they maintain that both in Genesis 2:18 and in the entire section of Genesis 2:18-24, the principal idea is the generic idea. Two arguments are brought from Genesis to show that the entire section is principally generic. First of all, the article on *haadam* in Genesis 2:18 is said to be a generic article. Secondly, in Genesis 2:23 when Adam states, "She shall be called "woman," for she was taken out of man," Prof. Lawrenz says that Adam is primarily giving a name to the female sex (of which this creature was the representative) rather than to this one individual. This is evident, says Prof. Lawrenz, because Adam uses the class noun, *ishshah*—"woman", in naming the new creature, and he uses a class noun, *ish*--"man, the male sex," to refer to himself. Adam also presents the creation of woman as the reason for this name ("'For she was taken out of man."). This indicates that Adam was thinking of the new creature apart from her status as his wife, because at her creation, she was not yet his wife but merely a woman capable of entering into marriage at a later time.

We wonder, however, if these arguments force us to conclude that the entire section is primarily generic. First of all, we must not forget that the Hebrew article on a class noun like adam may be used in two different ways. It may be used as a generic article when the class noun is used to denote the sum total of individuals belonging to the class. (GK 126 l,m). *Haadam* is undoubtedly used that way in Genesis 1:27, "So God created (the) man in his own image male and female he created them," and in Genesis 6:1, "When (the) man began to increase in number on the earth." However, the article is also employed when terms applying to whole classes are restricted to particular individuals. (GK 126 c). Gesenius lists a number of examples of this usage. Satan means "adversary," but *hasatan* refers to one particular adversary, Satan. *Nahar* means "river," but *hanahar* refers to one particular river, the Euphrates. *Kikar* means "circle," but *hakikar* refers to one particular circle, the circle of the Jordan or the Jordan plain. Gesenius also lists *haadam* from these chapters of Genesis as an example. *Adam* means man or mankind, but *haadam* refers to one particular man, "the first man, Adam." It is interesting to note, then, that the word *adam* is used 24 times from Genesis 2:7 (creation of the first man) through Genesis 4:1 (birth of the second man) and in each occurrence it has the article and seems to refer to "the

first man." *Haadam* was placed in the garden (Ge 2:15). *Haadam* named the animals (Ge 2:20). A rib was taken out of *haadam* (Ge 2:22). *Haadam* heard the sound of the Lord walking in the Garden (Ge 3:8). *Haadam* lay with his wife Eve (Ge 4:1). It is only after the birth of Cain that Adam is no longer referred to as *haadam*. Now there is another *adam* so the article is dropped and the first man is given the proper name (Ge 4:25). So what about the article in Genesis 2:18? We notice that in its immediate context (Ge 2:3 - 4:1), its use is consistently specific. It refers primarily to one particular individual, the first man.

In regard to Adam's statement in Genesis 2:23, we wonder whether the text forces us to the conclusion that the generic understanding of the creation of woman was primary in Adam's mind. Was Adam thinking, "Here is the female sex which was created out of the male sex for the good of the male sex?" Or might Adam have been thinking, "Here is my wife/companion. This individual is my flesh and blood. I'll give this individual the name woman/wife because she was taken out of me, a man/husband?" At this point, Adam would have good reason to be thinking about this creature as an individual. God has just presented the woman to Adam to be his wife. Adam is looking at his bride. This is a creature with whom Adam has had no experience apart from her being his wife. From the moment he saw her, (when God brought her to him), he was married to her. Perhaps the three "this one"'s also indicate that Adam was commenting on this particular individual standing before him. Furthermore, we feel that the words Adam uses would have been altogether proper and natural if Adam had the specific understanding in mind, i.e. if he had himself and his wife in mind as individuals.

Ishshah, of course, combines our concepts of wife and woman. In the verses immediately following (v. 24 & 25), *ishshah* is translated "wife" by almost everyone. This certainly would be a fitting name for this individual, and we notice that throughout Genesis 3 *haishshah* is the designation given to this one individual woman, Eve. As for the reference to her creation out of *ish*, perhaps the preceding line offers commentary on what Adam meant. Adam calls this creature "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh." These first person suffixes certainly are specific. Perhaps Adam chose the name *ishshah* for this individual creature because he thought it was fitting name for someone who had been taken out of himself, an individual *ish* ("male"). At any rate, one wonders whether we are able to read Adam's mind with absolute certainty at this point.

These verses (Genesis 2:23-24) introduce one of the thorniest problems in the whole discussion of the roles of man and woman in the Bible. Both Biblical languages have only one word, *ishshah* or *gune*, where English requires the two distinct terms, woman and wife. Both Biblical languages have only one word, *ish* or *aner*, where English requires the two distinct terms, man and husband. Since we have two words in English, we constantly feel compelled to choose one or the other in the translation of the Biblical terms. But these distinctions were not so clear-cut in the minds of the Biblical authors. They blended the two concepts, wife and woman, into one word. They blended the two concepts, husband and man, into one word. Perhaps we would do well to start with the translations woman/wife and man/husband when these terms arise. Perhaps we should be very cautious in excluding either notion in preference for the other.

Our conclusion, then, is that the section Genesis 2:18-24 is not primarily generic. This section seems to relate the story of particular individuals. Surely it is one individual who names the animals (Ge 2:20), not all mankind. Surely it is one individual who falls into a deep sleep (Ge 2-21), not all mankind. Surely it is one individual who speaks the words in Genesis 2:23, not all mankind. Surely it is one individual who is naked with his wife, not all mankind (Ge 2:25). This account, like the account of the Fall in Genesis 3, records the historical actions of the first human beings. It is first and foremost a biography of individual people.

However, this specific understanding, does not exclude generic implications. Certainly, generic implications are involved in the early chapters of Genesis. However, they are always generic implications based on the actions of specific people. For example in Genesis 3:6 it was one individual person who ate of the fruit of the forbidden tree. Yet this historical event in the life of an individual had implications for all of his descendants. Romans 5:12 brings this out. "Sin entered the world through one man," yet because of him all his descendants are born in sin. God spoke the curse in Genesis 3:17 to one particular individual. Yet the implications of the curse overshadow all of this individual's descendants. As death entered the world through the sin of one man, death came to all men (Ro 5:12). Another good example is in Genesis 14. When Abraham

paid tribute to Melchizedek, this was a historical event involving two particular individuals. Yet, this incident had significance for the descendants of Abraham as is shown in Hebrews 7:9. As the ancestors of the entire human race, what Adam and Eve did set important precedents for their offspring. We are still living with the implications of their actions. Yet the account in Genesis 2 still reads primarily as the account of two specific individuals.

So who is subordinate to whom in Genesis 2 in God's order of creation? Again it is our conviction that we will have to let the New Testament elucidate this point. Genesis 2:18-25 is most easily read as the account of two individuals. With this specific understanding, Genesis 2:18 is understood principally as God's intention to make an individual helper for his individual *haadam*, the first man. The subordination in Genesis, then, is a subordination primarily between husband and wife because the only two people involved in the narrative are husband and wife. However, there certainly may be wider implications and we would expect such implications because Adam and Eve are the progenitors of all Mankind. However, such implications will have to be clarified and more specifically defined for us in the New Testament.

What is the New Testament's comment on this point? Does the subordination built into God's order of creation apply only to wives over against husbands or to all women over against all men? We have already noticed that Paul based his exhortations concerning subordination on the creation account. In these exhortations, he seems to imply more than just subordination in marriage. Here we feel Zerbst has some commendable comments. He makes the observation in his comments on 1 Corinthians 11 that in all of his pronouncements concerning the position of woman, Paul's central concern is for the preservation and protection of marriage. However, Zerbst says, "It is a fundamental consideration for him (Paul) that the preservation of marriage always depends also upon the deportment of the unmarried. The demeanor of the unmarried, woman, for instance, is not a matter of indifference for the preservation of marriage. One may perhaps say, therefore, that every declaration concerning the relationship between the sexes in general is decisive also for marriage. This fact explains the characteristic indefiniteness of 1 Corinthians 11, which in one place speaks of men and women in general and in another place of married people in particular." (p. 34) In the New Testament statements there is a certain indefiniteness. Certain phrases seem to apply to the marriage relationship and others seem to speak of men and women in general. However it appears as though the subordination within marriage is also to be reflected outside of marriage. The New Testament ethic, then, is really an expanded family ethic. We are to treat every elder as a father, every younger man as a brother, every older woman as a mother and every young woman as a sister (1 Ti 5:l-2). So what is said about spouses holds true in general, *mutatis mutandis*, for the ethical obligations of the sexes toward each other. From the New Testament we are led to believe that the subordination of the order of creation is intended to go beyond marriage and include all men and all women. But this is a New Testament question. We trust that the afternoon paper will deal more specifically and comprehensively with the New Testament's answer to this question.

V. Evaluation of the Theses and Elucidation

From the preceding paragraph, it is clear that our final conclusions do not differ greatly from the conclusions presented by Professor Lawrenz in his Theses and Elucidation. We see an order of creation involving subordination. We see a subordination that extends beyond the marriage relationship to include all men and all women.

However, we would like to list some of our concerns about the Theses and Elucidation. Some of these concerns have been mentioned in the paper. Others are questions that we feel need yet to be addressed.
1. Is it proper to say that Genesis 2:18-24 is principally generic? We would like to say that account is principally specific, but the actions of Adam and Eve have long-range implications.
2. Is it necessary to distinguish so precisely between the creation of woman (in general) and the institution of marriage? This distinction is closely related to the assertion that Genesis 2:18-24 is principally generic. Did God principally create the female sex or a wife for Adam? Perhaps we ought not feel we must answer that

question. However, looking at the text of Genesis 2, we think the principal idea is God's creation of an individual helper for *haadam*. If Genesis 2:18-24 is principally specific, this distinction between the creation of the woman and the institution of marriage is not of vital importance.

3. Is the key element (or at least **a** key element) in the Fall of Eve her insubordination to Adam? This interpretation seems to rest heavily on a debatable interpretation of Genesis 3:17. If her first sin was insubordination, what should she have done in speaking with the serpent? Was it wrong for her to speak? Was it wrong for her to make a decision? In this regard one might also keep in mind that Eve was a co-ruler over creation with Adam (Ge 1:28).

4. In the Elucidation we have this statement in regard to Genesis 3:16b: 'If Eve was subordinated to her husband and bidden to be in submission to him as a punishment for her fall into sin. Then Adam would be absolved of all guilt in being appointed to rule over her.' This statement is made to support the position that Genesis 3:16b is a reaffirmation of the pre-Fall subordination. It does not necessarily follow, however, if one understands Genesis 3:16b as a punishment, that Adam was thereby absolved of all guilt. Adam receives his due in the following verses.

5. Is there general agreement that *o vomos* in 1 Co 14 refers to Genesis 2 without any reference to Genesis 3?

6. Is subordination clearly established in Genesis 2 by itself? The Theses maintain that it is. The Theses start with six paragraphs of discussion on Genesis 2 and then state that the subordinate position found in Genesis 2 is clearly "confirmed' by Paul in his letters. We feel it is best to rely heavily on the New Testament because Genesis 2 alone doesn't present subordination with sufficient clarity to convict every Christian conscience.

7. How does one determine and define precisely a binding moral principle when this principle is wrapped up in cultural applications? The Theses maintain that the essence of the binding moral principle for man/woman relationships is *authentein*. What is the hermeneutical rule used to extract that as the binding principle? For example, could one argue that the moral principle also includes teaching?

8. Once a binding moral principle is recognized, can one say it is permissible to violate that principle as long as one does it "in the right spirit?" According to the Theses, the moral principle is *authentein*. Yet the Theses allow for legitimate exceptions when a woman exercises authority in the right spirit. Is it possible to allow exceptions to a moral principle? Two thoughts come to mind in regard to the Theses' statement on this point:

   a. Perhaps by allowing legitimate exceptions to a moral principle we are admitting that we have not defined the principle specifically enough. Perhaps we need to redefine the moral principle as this: "Women ought not to have a domineering spirit in their relationship with men," so we need not allow the possibility of exceptions.

   b. Perhaps women will be permitted to have authority over men in some cases because of the hardness of our hearts (the effects a sinful world has on our consciences.) Hardness of heart forced Moses to permit divorce Oft. 19:18); he had to choose between divorce and chaos in society. Some times we also have to choose the lesser of two evils. However, if this is a concession to the hardness of hearts, we ought not to Five the impression that it is an indifferent matter that depends on the motives of those involved.

We also have a concern about the general approach to the topic as presented in the Theses. The Theses begin by trying to define the roles of man and woman outside of marriage. Only after its discussion of the general subordination B of all women to all men does the statement enter into a discussion of marriage. Theses B3 states: "The order of creation which assigned distinctive roles to men and women was established by God in the interest of the institution of marriage and the family, upon which human society in this earthly life is basically structured."

We agree that there is nothing essentially wrong with this approach. After all, Paul bases his arguments for subordination on the creation order. However, we wonder if it wouldn't be more natural and convincing, to reverse the flow of thought in such a statement. We have seen how marriage appears to be the central concern in

all of the statements concerning subordination. The family is the basic unit in God's society and marriage is the jewel he wishes to preserve with his distinctive roles for man and woman. Besides, there is general agreement in our circles about the distinctive roles of man and woman within marriage. We can envision a statement that would start with marriage in defining man/woman roles and then go on to explain how these roles are also to be reflected elsewhere in God's church and in society at large.

At one point the Theses draw an analogy between the God-ordained roles for man and woman and the God-ordained relationship between parents and children. We feel this analogy is helpful. God's will in regard to parents and children within the family is very explicit. God's will in regard to parents and children outside of the family, on the other hand, is less explicit, although it is clear that submission to our elders goes beyond the bounds of the immediate family (1 Ti 5:1-2). Our question is this: If we were asked to define parent/child roles, where would we start? We feel that it would be natural to start with the family and then demonstrate how these family relationships are to be reflected outside of the family. In like manner, why not begin by defining man/woman relationships in the family and then proceed to wider applications?

Such an approach to the woman/man issue, in our opinion, might serve Christ's kingdom best and restore unity to our brotherhood.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, Selected:

Cassuto, U. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1961.

Clark, Stephen B. *Man and Woman in Christ*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books, 1980.

Keil, C.F. and F. Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament, Volume I, The Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Knight, George W. III. *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.

Luther, Martin, Translated by George V. Schick. *Luther's Works, Volume I. Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1-5*. St. Louis Concord

Zerbst, Fritz, Translated by Albert G. Markens. *The Office of Woman in the Church*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1955.

Periodicals, Selected:

Judisch, Douglas. "Theses on Woman Suffrage in the Church." *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 41,3 (July, 1977).

Osborne, Grant R. "Hermeneutics and Women in the Church." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 20,4 (December, 1977).

Pieper, August. "Gibt es im Neuen Testament gestzliche Verordnungen?" *Theologische Quartalschrift*. XIII, 3 (July, 1916).

Scaer, David. "May Women Be Ordained as Pastors?" *The Springfielder*, 36,2 (September, 1972).

Schroeder, Edward. "The Orders of Creation -- Some Reflections on the History and Place of the Terri in Systematic Theology." *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 43,3 (March, 1972).

Current Discussion in WELS

Bauer, H. Paul, Douglas Engelbrecht, Keith Haag, Thomas Liesener, and Dale Schulz. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on 'The Role of Man and Woman According to Holy Scripture.'" Northern Wisconsin District Convention. August 4-6, 1980.

Franzman, Thomas, "A Study of the Statement in BoRam, 1979, 'The Role of Man and Woman according to Holy Scripture.'" Arizona-California District Pastoral Conference.

Fredrich, Edward III. "Woman's Call to Serve in the Church, the Home, and Society." Michigan District Pastor-Teacher Conference. Saginaw, Mich. June 15, 1977.

Gawrisch, Wilbert R. "The Place of Women in the Life and Work of the Church." Dakota-Montana District Convention. 1968.

Gawrisch, Wilbert R. "Man and Women in God's World." Michigan District Teacher's Convention. August, 1979.

Henkel, William. Translated by Max Hermann. "The Status of Woman in the New Testament Church." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, 58,3; 59,1.

Penning., Thomas. "Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2 with Emphasis on Women in the Church." Minnesota District Pastoral Conference. April 27-28, 1976.

Johnson, Iver. "Some Views on the Role of Man and Woman in the World and Church."

Kuster, Thomas A. "A Comment on 'The Role of Men and Women According to Holy Scripture." June 15, 1979.

Kuster, Thomas A. "Our Church and Woman in Society A plea for responsible social comment." The Lutheran Sentinel. Summer, 1930.

Lange, Gerald L. "The Role of Women in the Church and Ministry." WLS Summer Quarter, 1980.

Lawrenz, Carl. Elucidation sent to Pres. Carl Mischke on June 2, 1980.

Lawrenz, Stephen. "The Role of Women in the Church." Mankato Pastoral Conference. Dec. 7, 1976.

Leyrer, Carl. "'A Study of the DHE Statement: The Role of Han and Woman According to Holy Scripture."

Mueller, Wayne. "The Role of Women in the Church with Special Reference to Genesis 1-3. Metro South Pastoral Conference. September 15, 1980.