

WHAT WINGER PRESENTLY GETS WRONG WITH GENESIS 1 – 3:

'WAS WOMEN'S SUBMISSION JUST A CURSE TO BE OVERTURNED?'

29 November 2022

Our full article takes up Mike Winger's kind invitation to give feedback. It's 28 pages and we hope you will enjoy reading it. Here's a quick summary in less than a page.

QUICK SUMMARY OF ARTICLE ON GENESIS by Andrew Bartlett and Terran Williams

Mike Winger believes Genesis 2-3 teaches that God built into marriage, at creation, a one-way authority of man over woman.

In the 4th century AD, the well-known Bible expositor John Chrysostom was a vocal advocate for the subordination of woman to man. But even Chrysostom saw clearly that God's design in Genesis 2 was for the full equality of woman and man, and that man's ascendancy in authority only came in as a result of the disobedience in Genesis 3.

Since our Lord Jesus Christ came to overcome the effects of human disobedience to God, we are working against our Lord if we try to maintain man's ascendancy over woman.

Mike's argument depends on seeing one-way male authority as *implied* in the Genesis text. But if we attend closely to the words of the text, and to its narrative technique and structure, it becomes apparent that there is no such implication.

We go through all the points that Mike relies on and show that they do not support his conclusion.

The supposed implication of unilateral authority is inconsistent with how the apostle Paul understands God's design for marriage. 1 Corinthians 7 is very clear on this. It is the only New Testament passage with express teaching on the authority of husband and wife and on how to make decisions in marriage. Paul refers to these topics in the context of centrally important matters – a couple's sexual relationship and their joint prayer life. He presents equality of authority and urges joint decision-making.

Even if Mike had successfully demonstrated that Chrysostom was wrong about Genesis 2, so that Genesis 2 presents one-way male authority as God's original design in the first creation, it would still need to be separately established that this model is intended to be adhered to in a Christian marriage lived in anticipation of the new creation, and that it is somehow relevant to women's exercise of spiritual ministries. Our answers must finally depend not on how we read Genesis 2, but on how we read the relevant New Testament texts.

In a short postscript we briefly explain why it is a mistake for Mike to employ the secular sociological concept of 'roles' in his exposition of Genesis.