MISCELLANEOUS BIBLICAL STUDIES

CHAPTER ONE

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON GENDER AND SEXUALITY IN BIBLICAL TRADITION

Thomas F. McDaniel, Ph.D.

I

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON GENDER
AND SEXUALITY IN BIBLICAL TRADITION

For the Israelites "salvation" did not mean entering heaven for eternity but was understood as experiencing God's special gifts—here on earth—of (1) *land*, (2) *liberty*, (3) *longevity*, (4) *prosperity*, and (5) *progeny*. These five nouns summarize all of the blessings spelled out in Deut28:1–14. They are an inverse summary of all the curses cited in Deut 27:9–26 and 28:15–68. Isaiah's promise about the suffering servant (Isaiah 53:10) that he will given *longevity*, *progeny*, and *prosperity* is noteworthy, along with

- Prov 8:35, "For he who finds me finds life and obtains favor from the LORD";
- Prov 9:11, "For by me your days will be multiplied, and years will be added to your life."
- Prov 10:2, "Treasures gained by wickedness do not profit, but righteousness delivers from death."

Salvation through progeny controlled many of Israel's sexual mores. Thus, the ongoing "eternal life" of one's ancestors ("those of-blessed-memory") was available only through the progeny of the successive generations. Without progeny the "eternal life" of all of one's deceased kin would be terminated. Barrenness (rq[', yrlyrl[', ~xr" rc[o lWkv) was experienced as a curse—a curse attributable to someone's sinning (Lev 20:20–21). In the minds of biblical Israelites sterility and infertility were due to moral imperfections rather than the result of physiological aberrations. Also, the waste of semen (Gen 38:2–10) became an abomination because such waste threatened the successful perpetuation of one's blood line through which the male and all of his ancestors would live forever in blessed memory.[1]

STATEMENTS ON GENDER IN GENESIS

Gender equality was clearly articulated in the Hebrew creation accounts of the Genesis 1–3, along with Gen 5:1–3. In a culture where it was customary for "first come first served" —and Adam was created before Eve—the female Eve might be expected to serve the male Adam.[2] But there was an off-setting balance in that the feminine *ᶜadamah* "earth" was created before the masculine *ᶜadam* "earthling." Therefore, "first come first served" was balanced: the feminine preceded the masculine and the male preceded the female.[3] Far from being Adam's servant, Eve was to be Adam's *savior* by doing for him what he was unable to do for himself. She would save him from his aloneness—not just by her presence but by their progeny. So *being* and so *doing* the woman would be the man's *savio*r (ΓΖ{ *ᶜezer*) and his *front-one* (ADgᴎ *negdô*).

The following verses as annotated are those relevant for recovering the gender equality articulated in the creation stories:

- Gen 1:26–27, "Let us[4] make *ᶜadam* (~dʼaʼ) in our image, in our likeness, and let them[5] have dominion . . . over all . . . So God created *ᶜadam* (~dʼaʼ) in his own image . . . male and female he created them."

- Gen 2:7, "then Yahweh God formed *ᶜadam* (~dʼaʼ) of dust from the *earth* (hmʼdʼa]*ᶜadamah*)."

- Gen 2:18, "it is not good for *ᶜAdam* to be alone; I will make a *savior* (ΓΖ{,*ᶜezer*)[6] *as his front one* (ADgᴎ.*kĕnegdô*)."[7]

- Gen 2:20, "*the *ᶜadam* (~dʼahʼ) gave names to all . . . there was not found for *ᶜAdam* (~dʼaʼ) *a savior* (ΓΖ{ *ᶜezer*) as his *front one*" (ADgᴎ.*kĕnegdô*).

- Gen 2:23, "this at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my

flesh . . . she shall be called wo<u>man</u> (hV'ai *ʾiššah*) because she was taken out of <u>man</u> (vyai *ʾiš*)."

- Gen 2:24, "Therefore shall a *man* (vyai *ʾiš*)) leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife (hV'ai *ʾiššah*) and they shall be one flesh."

- Gen 3:16a, "I will increase your [Eve] *sorrow* (!AbC'[i *ʾiṣṣabôn*) and your conception; and in *sorrow* (bc,[*ʿeṣeb*) you will birth sons."

- Gen 3:16b, "Your *desire* (hqWvT. *tešûqāh*) shall be for your husband and he shall be just like you." The qWv "desire" is the cognate of the Arabic j NH (*šûq*) and the l vm' "to be like" is the cognate of the Arabic q,S (*maṯala*) (Lane 1872:1620 and 1893: 3073).[8]

- Gen 3:17b "In *sorrow* (!AbC'[i *ʾiṣṣabôn*) you [Adam] shall eat of it all the days of your life."

- Gen 5:1–2, "This is the book of the generations of *ʾādam*. When God created *ʾādam*, he made *him* in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them *ʾādam* when they were created." The threefold use of the noun *ʾādam* in the Hebrew text is lost in the Septuagint which has the noun only once and the proper name Adam twice:

    autth h` bibloj genesewj anqrwpwn (= *ʾādam*)
    h| hmera| epoihsen o` qeoj ton Adam (= *ʾādam*)
    katV eikona qeou/epoihsen auton (= Atao)
    arsen kai. qhlu epoihsen autouj
    kai. euloghsen autouj

kai. epwnomasen to. onoma auꞇwꞑ Adam (= *ʾādam*)
hꞁ hꞇera ꞁ epoiꞑsen auꞇouj.

Here it is sufficient to note that the masculine singular auꞇoꞑ (= אֹתָם) which ends 5:1 is singular because *ʾādam* in Hebrew is a masculine singular *collective* noun including both the male and the female. The plural masculine auꞇwꞑ in 5:2 reflects the fact that although *ʾādam* is morphologically a singular collective noun, it is grammatically plural because both male and female were named *ʾādam*. The plural verb in 1:26, "let *them* have dominion" matches the ending of Gen 1:27, "male and female created he *them*." (The *ʾādam* in Gen 5:3 is the name of the male character introduced in Gen 2:19.)

Unfortunately interpreters demoted the "savior/rescuer" in Gen 2:18 to a mere "help/helper," which was then understood as an "assistant"; and the superior status of being "his front-one" was reduced to "one meet for him" (KJV, ASV) or "suitable for him" (NIB, NIV, NAU, NAS) or "fit for him" (RSV). In this manner the woman's being the *savior/rescuer* (עֵזֶר, *ᶜezer*) *as his front one* (כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, *kĕnegdô*) became simply her being a man's "helper" (Septiagint, boꞑqon kaꞇꞨ auꞇoꞑ).

This male gender bias was confirmed for many because the verb מָשַׁל (*māšal*) of Gen 3:16 was a homograph of two different verbs, one meaning "to rule, to reign" and the other meaning "to be like, to be similar" (BDB 605). With true poetic balance Eve was told in 3:16 that she will bear the fruit of the womb with *sorrow* (עִצָּבוֹן *ᶜiṣṣabôn*); and in 3:17, exactly like Eve, Adam was told that he will produce the fruit of the field with *sorrow* (עִצָּבוֹן *ᶜiṣṣabôn*). As a result of their sin they would be punished similarly and *sorrow* and heartbreak would be a reality for each of them in their gender

specific roles. Infant mortality would result in the woman's unbearable sorrow (**!AbC'[i**ᶜ*iṣṣabôn*); and the sterility of the fields and the infertility of the flocks and would preclude the father's ability to feed his family, which would result in the man's equally intense heartbreak (**!AbC'[i**ᶜ*iṣṣabôn*). This was the shared curse in Gen 3:16, **%B'-l vmyl aWhw>** "and he shall be just like you." Both would experience unbearable grief.[9]

However, most babies survived after birth, and when there was a famine food was imported (as when Jacob sent his sons to Egypt) or people migrated (as when Elimelech and Ruth moved to Moab). Consequently, the **!AbC'[i**ᶜ*iṣṣabôn* "heartbreak" of the woman was reinterpreted as the physical pain of childbirth, and the **!AbC'[i**ᶜ*iṣṣabôn* "heartbreak" of the man was taken to be the physical pain after hard work. Thus, the alternative interpretation of **%B'-l vmyl aWhw>** meaning "and he shall rule over you" became paramount and permanent.

SAMPLE STATEMENTS ON GENDER
IN NON-CANONICAL TEXTS

Although gender equality was clearly articulated in the Hebrew creation accounts of the Genesis 1–3, along with Gen 5:1–3, it did not flourish in the dominant post-exilic Jewish culture. To be sure, the canonical literature contains positive statements which are highly appreciative of good women, such as the words of Lemuel in Prov 31:10–31 about his wonderful mother, the **lyx;-tva,** "the woman of power," a title which was translated in the Septuagint as *gunaika andreia* "a manly woman."[10] This chapter of praise for a particular woman is matched by a chapter in the deutero-canonical text of I Esdras

4:13–32, where, a Jewish palace guard name Zerubbabel proclaimed approvingly to King Darius that all women must be recognized as the "masters" of kings and men because:

- women gave them birth and rear them (v. 15),
- women bring them glory (v. 17),
- without women men cannot exist (v. 17),
- men will forsake father, mother, and their country for a woman (v. 20),
- men prefer women above gold or silver (v. 19),
- men give their spoils of war to women they love (v. 24),
- men have lost their minds over women (v. 26),
- some have become slaves because of women (v. 26),
- even kings will submit to a woman's charm (vss. 28–32).

A positive recognition of women is also found in Sirach 36: 24, "He who acquires a wife gets his best possession, a helper fit for him and a pillar of support." But in Sirach 7:19 the positive affirmation is narrowed to just some women, "Do not deprive yourself of a wise and good wife, for her charm is worth more than gold"; and Sirach 25:8 states similarly, "Happy is he who lives with an intelligent wife."[11]

However, the statements in Sirach 42:9–14 probably reflect the prevailing sentiment of the day. Verses 42:9–11 read as a lament of sorts about the birth of a daughter because of all the worry a daughter causes her father,

A daughter keeps her father secretly wakeful, and worry over her robs him of sleep; when she is young, lest she do not marry, or if married, lest she be hated; while a virgin, lest she be defiled or become pregnant in her father's house; or having a husband, lest she prove unfaithful, or, though married, lest she be barren. Keep strict watch over a headstrong daughter,

lest she make you a laughingstock to your enemies, a byword in the city and notorious among the people, and put you to shame before the great multitude.

But the most negative words written in the deutero-canonical texts against women are those in Sirach 42:12–14,

Do not look upon any one for beauty, and do not sit in the midst of women; for from garments comes the moth, and from a woman comes woman's wickedness. Better is the wickedness of a man than a woman who does good; and it is a woman who brings shame and disgrace.[12]

An equally negative gender bias against women appears in the later extra-canonical text of the *Gospel of Thomas*, Logia 114 (Guillaumont 1959: 56–57), which ends with Peter saying,

Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of the Life," to which Jesus replied: "See, I shall lead her, so that I will make her male, that she too may become a living spirit, resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

This can only mean that according to the Coptic text there was no place for women in the Kingdom of God. However, behind the Coptic ϨΟΟΥΤ (*hooit*) "male," which occurs here three times, was a *Vorlage* with either the Hebrew rkz or the Aramaic rkd, both of which are cognates of the Arabic ʔk> (*ḏakara*). All three occurrences of rkz/rkd in the *Vorlage* could mean either (1) "male, the male organ" or (2) "remembrance, memory" (BDB 269–271). But the Arabic cognate ʔk> (*ḏakara*) also means "repentance" and "obedience" (Lane 1867: 969, 971), as in the *Qurʿan Sura* 89:23.[13] With this Arabic cognate in focus, the rkz/rkd in the *Vorlage* of *Logia* 114 could have meant that Jesus would lead Mary to "repen-

tance / obedience," promising that any repentant woman could enter the kingdom as readily as a male penitent, thereby dismissing Peter's male chauvinist request. Given the ambiguity of rkz̄ / rkd, it is easy to see how the *Vorlage* was interpreted to promote a widely attested gender agenda which deprecated the feminine and females.[14]

However, over against this deprecation of females in general was the celebration in I Esdras 4:34–41 of the *feminine* reality identified as "Truth" (with the *feminine* nature requiring the title "Lady Truth" in English for the Greek alhqeia and the Hebrew tma). Zerubbabel, the palace guard of King Darius who proclaimed the superior strength of women (as noted above), concluded that "Lady Truth" was even stronger than women because,

- Lady Truth endures and is strong for ever, and lives and prevails for ever and ever (v. 38),
- Lady Truth shows no partiality or preference (v. 39),
- Lady Truth does what is righteous instead of anything that is unrighteous or wicked (v. 39),
- all men approve of Lady Truth's deeds (v. 39),
- to Lady Truth belongs the strength and the kingship and the power and the majesty of all the ages (v. 40).

When Zerubbabel concluded his speech King Darius and all of his courtly guests shouted, "Great is Lady Truth! She is the strongest of all!" (4:41).

This prose praise of Lady Truth is outdone by the paean of praise for the heavenly "Lady Wisdom" in the Wisdom of Solomon 6:12–20 and 7:21–8:4, noting especially 7:25–26 and 28–29:

For [Lady Wisdom] is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing

defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness. . . . for God loves nothing so much as the man who lives with wisdom. For she is more beautiful than the sun, and excels every constellation of the stars. Compared with the light she is found to be superior.

But praise of Lady Truth and Lady Wisdom was not to the liking of everyone. Philo of Alexandria (20 B.C.–40 A.D.) in *De fuga et inventione* [15] wrote:

While Wisdom's name is feminine, her nature is manly. As indeed all the virtues have women's titles, but powers and activities of consummate men (andrwh teleiota;twn). Let us, then, pay no heed to the gender of the words, and let us say that the daughter of God, even Wisdom, is not only masculine but father, sowing and begetting (speironta kai. gennwhta) in souls, knowledge, good action," and other virtues.

Consequently, Philo shifted his interest from hmkx'/Sofia "wisdom" to the masculine Logoj/*Logos* "Word." [16]

GENDER EQUALITY
IN NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS

The equality of male and female found in the Genesis creation account is reaffirmed in the New Testament accounts of the new creation, most notably in Gal 3:28 where Paul declared, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." This inclusiveness and equality reflects Jesus' teaching in Matt 12:48–50, where he asked the question, "Who is my mother and who are my brothers?" and then pointing to his disciples answered the question saying, ". . .

whoever does the will of my Father in heaven *he* (αὐτός) is my brother and sister and mother." The pronoun *he* (αὐτός) is here gender inclusive, embracing "my brother, my sister, and my mother"—evidence that women were among Jesus disciples. With these definitions in focus the Twelve male disciples (μαθηταί) would all be "brothers" and the un-numbered female disciples (μαθήτρια), like Tabitha (also known as Dorcas who is named in Acts 9:36), would have been "sisters." Mary Magdalene,[17] Joanna, Susanna, and the other women who, out of there personal resources, provided for Jesus and his twelve men (Luke 8:1–3) would no doubt be identified also as *sisters* and *disciples* (μαθήτριαι).

However, this gender equality reflected in Jesus' having both μαθηταί "male disciples" and μαθήτρια "female disci-ples" and Paul's affirmation in Gal 3:29 of the unity of male and female never became normative in the early church. This was due in part to Paul's own (unconscious) gender bias reflected, for example, in Gal 3:26 where he tells the church members, "in Christ Jesus you are all *sons* (υἱοί) of God through faith" and in Gal 4:7, "you are no longer a slave but a son (υἱός)." Ten times in the letter to the Galatians Paul called the church members "brothers" (ἀδελφοί), as if there were no women in the church. On the other hand, Paul recognized Phebe as a deacon (διάκονος) at the church of Cenchreae (Rom 16:1) and Junia as a kinswoman and an apostle (ἀπόστολος) in Rom 16:7.[18]

Paul consciously offered at alternative interpretation to the literal meaning of the Hebrew texts from Genesis cited above. Moreover, he made no mention of Gen 1:27b and 5:2,

~t'ao arB' hb'qeW rk"z"

male and female he created them [in his image]

~d'a' ~mV-ta, ar'q'Yw: ~t'ao %r,b'y>w: ~a'r'B. hb'qen>W rk'z"

male and female he created them and he blessed them
and he named them ADAM / Adam.

Paul surely recognized the ~d'a'/ ADAM / Adam in Gen 1:27b and 5:2 as the collective noun which included the male Adam and the female Eve. This ~d'a'/ ADAM / Adam was the equivalent of the gender inclusive Greek anqrwpoj / *anthrôpos*. But Paul made no reference to Gen 1:27b and 5:2, and interpreted the ~d'a' *ādam* in Gen 1:27a as the proper name Adam, and thus the male Adam alone was in the image the God.

In I Cor 11:3–10 Paul stated his belief in a hierarchy: at the top was God, then Christ, then man (o` anh,r) who is in the image of God, and at the bottom was the woman who is not in the image of God. Here is his statement:

> But I want you to understand that the head of every man (androj) is Christ, the head of a woman (gunaikoj) is her husband (anh,r), and the head of Christ is God [19]. . . . For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God (eikwn kai. doxa qeou/ uparcwn); but woman is the glory of man. For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. That is why a woman ought to have a "veil" (exousian = "authority") on her head, because of the angels.[20]

There is no hint here that in Gen 2:18–23 Eve was the *savior* (rz<[, *ᶜezer*) for Adam and *his front one* (ADgn<k *negdô*)." In I Tim 2:11–15 Paul changed the *active* (implied in Genesis with Eve's *saving* Adam from his aloneness by providing him with progeny) into the *passive* wherein the woman will *be saved* by childbearing. Far from being the man's *front one* (ADgn<k *negdô*) she was to be *his underling*, with his becoming her *head / head one* (kefalh,). Here is his statement:

Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty.

The submissiveness required of women reflects the alternative interpretation of %B'-l vmyl allhw> meaning "and he shall rule over you" rather than its meaning "he shall be like you." This is spelled out quite clearly in I Cor 14:33–35,

As in all the churches of the saints, the women should keep silence in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate (upotassesqwsan), as even the Law says. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

In the Septuagint nomoj "law" appears 196 times as the translation of hrAT "Torah," so there is good reason to identify the nomoj "law" in I Cor 14:34 as the *Torah* and, in particular, the unambiguous Greek version of Gen 3:16, kai. proj ton andra sou h` apostrofh, sou kai. autoj sou kurieusei, "and your turning shall be to your husband, *and he shall rule over you.*" (the Greek sou kurieusei *cannot* mean "he will be like you.") In Col 3:18, Paul gives the same commandment, but for a different reason, "Wives, be subject (upotassesqe) to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord."

In Eph 5:21 Paul commanded the Gentile saints (using a *masculine plural* participle with the force of an imperative and a *masculine plural* pronoun): "submit yourselves to one another out of fear of Christ" (-Upotassomenoi allh,loij en fobw| Cristou/). Possibly this mutual submission included the

female saints, with this masculine participle and pronoun being here as gender inclusive[21] as the masculine noun ~da'/ADAM was in Hebrew. Support for this interpretation is the absence in one manuscript tradition of any verb in 5:22.[22] The masculine upotassomenoi in 5:21 could possibly do double duty as the verb which addressed the wives in 5:22, as well as the saints in 5:21. But once the *masculine plural* participle and pronoun were interpreted as referring solely to the male saints who were to submit themselves to one another, a separate verb was required for 5:22, and a disjunction was created between 5:21 and 5:22. This interpretation, reflected in the majority of the Greek manuscripts and versions,[19] receives support from I Tim 2:11 and I Cor 14:34 which required women to be silent in the church. Obviously women and men could not be mutually "submitting themselves to one another" if the women were not free to speak.

As a result a gender neutral mutual submission of all saints to each other in the *household of God* never became a reality. Rather a hierarchy in the *household of each saint* was to manifest itself in the following manner:

> Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is head of the church . . . . let wives also [be subject] in everything to their husbands (ou|twj kai. ai` gunaikej toij andrasin en panti,) . . . . Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, . . . Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself (Eph 5:22–27).

A similar call for the submission of the wives appears in I Pet 3:1, 5–6,[23]

> Likewise you wives, be submissive to your husbands, so that some, though they do not obey the word, may be won without

a word by the behavior of their wives . . . . So once the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves and were submissive to their husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are now her children if you do right and let nothing terrify you.[24]

In summary, it appears that on the issue of gender equality Jesus would have interpreted the %B'-l vhyl alhw in Gen 3:16 as "he shall be just like you," thereby dismissing all claims for the supremacy of men over women based upon the Torah. He welcomed male disciples (maqhtai) as his "brothers" and female disciples (maqh,tria) as his "sisters." But Peter and Paul obviously interpreted the %B'-l vhyl alhw in Gen 3:16 as "he shall rule over you," even though they recognized that in the household of God "there is neither male nor female for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28).[25]

Many commentators argue that Paul and Peter were addressing problems of disruptive conduct in specific local churches, and their demands for silence and submission should not be made into universal and timeless absolutes. On the issue of men ruling over women (à la Gen 3:16) and wives being submissive to husbands, Paul was as inconsistent as he was with his advise about marriage in I Cor 7:29. He stated,

> I mean, brethren, the appointed time has grown very short; from now on, *let those who have wives live as though they had none* (iha kai. oi` econtej gunaikaj wj mh. econtej wsin).

This was at least a call for celibacy in marriage, which is inconsistent with his subsequent advice in 7:36, "if his passions are strong, and it has to be, let him do as he wishes: let them marry—it is no sin." But once the man married to honorably fulfill his sexual passions, the man was then expected to live as though he had no wife.

Over the past nineteen hundred years about ninety successive generations of married Christians have disagreed with Paul's advice to live as if they had no spouse. They recognized that Paul's anticipation of an imminent Parousia was off schedule and that the commandment in the Torah, "be fruitful and multiply" (Gen 1:28), remained an option for Christian saints. Although marriage and family would not provide a pathway to heaven, they do address the reality that "it is not good for Adam to be alone."

SEXUAL BEHAVIOR:[26]
OLD TESTAMENT TEXTS [27]

If Adam's loneliness had been simply a matter of his having no one with whom he could fellowship, God could have provided him with a brother. But instead of a brother God provided a spouse. Adam's being a lone male with sexual and reproductive potential needed a sexual partner. He needed much more than a *fellow*, he needed a *family*—a multi-generational progeny through which he would live forever in family memories. Thus, God gave Adam a *savior* (רזֶ{ *ʿezer*) as his *front-one* (אDgnK. *kĕnegdô*), a woman endowed with hqⱳvT "sexual desire" (Gen 3:16). Adam named his *savior* hⱳx; (*Ḥawwah*), the feminine name meaning "Life," for she would be the mother of all yx' (*ḥay*), the masculine noun meaning "life."[28] She would not simply *converse* with him she would *copulate* with him and *conceive* for him.

The first three commandments in Gen 1:28 were Wbrⱳ WrP. #rah'-ta, WalmW "Be fruitful! Multiply! Fill the earth!" Obedience to these imperatives would require a lot of sexual

activity. The types of sexual unions would stretch all the way from the monogamous Adam and Eve to the polygamous Solomon, with his three hundred wives and seven hundred concubines (I Kings 11:3).[29]

The parameters for properly complying with the commands in Gen 1:28, which emerged over time, were controlled (as noted above on page1) by the belief that an "eternal life" was available through one's progeny. All of one's ancestors lived on in the memories of their offspring, generation after generation. Every birth perpetuated a particular line of ancestral memory. Without progeny there would be no memory; and without memory the last vestige of life would vanish into oblivion, taking with it the newly deceased and all those in the ancestral family. Thus, progeny provided a degree of life after death.[30]

Complementing this belief was the matter on paternal inheritance rights. It was easy enough to determine who was the mother of a child, but impossible to determine who was the father—unless the sexual activity of the woman was strictly controlled. Consequently, male sexual promiscuity was tolerated,[31] but the woman's sexual activity was, upon penalty of death, restricted to her husband (or master in the case of a concubine). Thus, Solomon could have had a thousand sexual partners, but those in his harem could mate only with him.

This need to control the sexual activity of women, so that the paternity of the newborn could be guaranteed, lies behind the seventh of the Ten Commandments: "Thou shall not commit adultery" (Exod 20:14; Deut 5:18). Adultery is sexual intercourse between a betrothed or married woman and any man who is not her betrothed or husband. This sin heads the list in Lev 20:10–16, and the penalty for adultery appears in

Lev 20:10, 11–16,

> "If a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor,
> both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death. If
> a man lies with his father's wife . . . . daughter–in–law . . . .
> with a male . . . . both shall be put to death.

According to Exod 22:16–17 the seduction (rape) of a virgin
was not a capital crime. The penalty for that was to forced the
seducer to marry the violated virgin by providing the marriage
money (הֹּמֹר יִמְהֶּר תֹּהֹּ) or, if the woman's father objected to
the marriage, a monetary settlement equivalent to the marriage
present (50 shekels according to Deut 22:29) was required.
But if the raped virgin was betrothed it was a different matter,
it became a matter of adultery and the death penalty applied to
the male and possibly to the female (Deut 22:23–27)
However, not all of the texts dealing with sexual activities
were stated as clearly as were the commandments in Lev
20:10, 11–16 and Exod 22:16–17. A more detailed study of
other texts dealing with sexual activities is required.

In the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26), the verb שָׁכַב "to
lie" is as ambiguous as is the English verb "to lie." Clarity
comes only when the preposition after the verb comes into
focus: "Do not lie to me!" and "Do not lie on me!" These are
homophones and homographs—different verbs with different
etymologies. Similar to this is the Hebrew שָׁכַב, which is a
homograph for three different verbs with distinctly different
etymologies. Hebrew lexicons cite only שָׁכַב, stem I, "to lie
down," giving it a broad semantic range—going from "lying
with the fathers" (in death) to "lying with a male" (in sex).

However, Arabic cognates suggest that there were two other
verbs spelled as שָׁכַב, namely, שָׁכַב, stem II, "to penetrate,"

the cognate of Arabic %‎ḥ‎ᵃ‎+ (*ṯaqaba*) "to bore, to penetrate" (Lane 1863: 342)[32] and bkv, stem III, "to ejaculate," the cognate of Arabic %ID (*sakaba*) "to pour out/forth, to gush forth" (Lane 1872: 1388).[33] In Hebrew the nouns tbkv, hbkv. and hbykiv. all mean "the effusion of semen"; but the verb bkv, stem III, "to ejaculate" was not cited by Jastrow (1903: 1571, 1573) and needs to be added to the lexicon.[34]

With all three of these verbs now in focus, the prohibition Hb'-haḥ.jˈl. [rẕˈl. ^Tbkv. !Tti-al{ $tymi[] tvael aw> in Lev 18:20, can be translated literally, "*unto your kinsman's wife you shall not give your effusion to impregnate*[35] *and defile yourself with her*." Other translations paraphrase the verse as, "Do not have sexual relations" (NIV, NIB), "thou shalt not lie carnally" (KJV, ASV, RSV), "you shall not have intercourse" (NAS, NAU).

Similarly, the prohibition against male homosexuality in Lev 18:22, awhi hb'[AT hV'ai ybK.vmi bKv.ti al{ rkẕ"-taw> can—in light of bkv stem II "to penetrate"—be translated literally as "*Do not penetrate a male in preference to the penetratings of a woman*." But the Septuagint translators understood the verb to be bkv stem I "to lie, to sleep." It reads, kai. meta. arsenoj ouv koimhqhsh| koi.thn gunaikoj bde,lugma ga,r estin, "and with a man you shall not lie (as in) a bed of a woman, for it is an abomination." By way of contrast the Vulgate has *cum masculo non commisceberis coitu femineo quia abominatio est*, "with a male you shall not join sexually in coitus (as) with a female, for it is an abomination." The English translations have: "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination (RSV, NRS), or as "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman" (NIV,

NIB). All the translations treat the MT -ta, as the preposition "with," rather than as the direct object sign.[36]

The closing phrase, awhi hb'[AT, can mean not only "it is an abomination," but also (1) "it is destructive" or (2) "it is vile" or (3) "it is stupid." These meanings become available once hb'[AT "abomination" (BDB 1072–1073) is derived from the root b[w, the cognate of either the Arabic %\0 (*waᶜaba*), which in Form 4 means "he eradicated, cut off, uprooted," or the Arabic %ˉ0 (*waġaba*) "vile, stupid, weak in intellect" (Lane 1893: 2951, 2954).[37] The idea of a destructive "eradication" associated with male-to-male sex would refer to the termination of one's own bloodline, resulting in the end of the "eternal life" of all of one's ancestors. Exod 22:16–19 and Lev 21:13, stipulate the death penalty (tAm WtmWy) for male homosexuality, which was the same penalty in the Holiness Code for adultery, bestiality, incest, blasphemy, murder, offering a child to Molech, cursing a parent, or being a sorceress or a wizard.[38]

There are two more verses where bkv', stem II, "to penetrate sexually" appears. The first is in II Sam 13:14, where it tells of Ammon's rape of Tamar in these words: hNMmi qzxYw: Ht'ao bKvYw: hN[yw: hNMmi qzxYw, which was rightly translated in the NIV and NIB as "and since he was stronger than she, he raped her," and in the NJB as "he overpowered her and raped her."[39] But, as will become clear in the following paragraphs, the NJB, NIV and NIB translations here are based on context rather than being philologically grounded. The translators were not aware of bkv', stem II, "to penetrate."[40]

The remaining verse with bkv', stem II, appears in Ezek 23:8,

hbʒ['al{~yrˌcMimi hˊytˌWhzˋT;-taw⟩
hyrˊW[nˊbi Wˊbkˌv' HtˊAa yKi
hyˊlˌWtb. yDˊD; WF[i hMhˊn⟩
`hyˊlˌ[' ~tˊWhzˌt; WˊkPˌvˊYˊn:

And her fornications from Egypt she did not forsake,
Indeed, they *penetrated* her in her youth,
and they caressed[41] the breasts of her virginity,
and they poured out their fornication upon her.

Surprisingly, in light of the translation of II Sam 13:14, the NIV, NIB, and NJB translated the Wˊbkˌv' HtˊAa here as "they slept with her," even though contextually the HtˊAa "her" is unmistakably the direct object *not* the prepositional HTˊai "with her," which accommodates the verb "to sleep."

The term tˊWhzˋT; "fornication" repeated in the above verse requires clarification; and this will serve as an introduction for a brief look at the biblical texts dealing with prostitution. Just as there are three different lexemes spelled bkˌv', so there are at least three different roots spelled hnˊz. First is hnˊzˋ, stem I, the well recognized word meaning "to commit fornication, to play the harlot." Its Arabic cognate is ﻰﻨﺑ (*zanay*) "to commit fornication" (BDB 275) This is the lexeme appearing in the first tˊWhzˋT; of Ezek 23:8, a feminine abstract noun which appears with a feminine suffix and is the direct object of a feminine verb. The second hnˊz is the feminine participle of the stem !Wˊz "to support, to nourish, to feed" (Jastrow 1903: 387). Properly vocalized as hnˊWˊz it means "inkeeper," which was the occupation of Rahab according to the Targums and Josephus.[42] This lexeme has no Arabic cognate. The third hnˊz is the cognate of the Arabic Z> (*danna*) "it (semen or mucus)

flowed" and the corresponding noun ‏יָאוֹן‎ (*ḍanîn*) "thin mucus [of the eyes, nose, or mouth], semen, seminal fluid" (Lane 1867: 979).[43] This is the stem behind the second ‏תַּזְנוּת‎ in Ezek 23:8, which can be repointed as the suffixed plural noun ‏תַּזְנֹתָם‎ "their seminal fluids," the direct object of the masculine plural verb ‏וַיִּשְׁפְּכוּ‎. Thus the last three words of Ezek 23:8 can mean "and they poured out their seminal fluids upon her" (i.e., they ejaculated) rather than "they poured out their fornication upon her," as traditionally translated.[44]

Two types of fornication can be recognized in Israelite literature: *commercial* (‏זָנָה‎) and *cultic* (‏קָדֵשׁ‎). According to Lev 19:29 one type of commercial fornication was prohibited,

$$\text{אַל־תְּחַלֵּל אֶת־בִּתְּךָ לְהַזְנוֹתָהּ}$$
$$\text{וְלֹא־תִזְנֶה הָאָרֶץ וּמָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ זִמָּה}$$

Do not profane your daughter by making her a harlot,
that the land not become prostituted and full of depravity.

Aspects of commercial fornication appear in Gen 38:12–26, when Judah agreed to pay a harlot (his daughter-in-law Tamar in disguise) "a kid from the flock" for her services and offered his signet, cord, and staff as a pledge until the goat was delivered. Although Tamar acted as a harlot to have her leverite right to be impregnated by a member of her deceased husband's family, the commercial transaction made Tamar's scheme appear as an authentic act of prostitution.

Just as the daughter of any priest who acted as a harlot was to be burned alive (Lev 21:14), Tamar's deception almost cost her her life, for Judah was ready to burn the pregnant Tamar alive (Gen 38:24) until he recognized the signet, cord, and staff that she displayed in her defense where his own— proving that he was the father of her child. As a result Judah

declared, ****yN|Mmi hq'dɛ',**** "She is more righteous than I am!" In time Tamar gave birth to twins and lived happily ever after.

Judah's affair with a harlot, as such, created no moral, ethical, or religious problems. But had he out of sexual desire "uncovered the nakedness of his daughter-in-law" it would have been adultery, and both Judah and Tamar could have been stoned to death. They were saved by Tamar's daring application of the law of the leverite (Deut 25:5–10).

By contrast deception by a prostitute could prove to be fatal. According to Deut 22:13–21, if a prostitute presented herself as a virgin when she married and was unable to produce her "tokens of virginity,"

> then they shall bring out the young woman to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her to death with stones, because she has wrought folly in Israel by playing the harlot in her father's house; so you shall purge the evil from the midst of you. (22:21)

It is important to note that in Gen 38:15 the prostitute was called a **hnÅz** "harlot," but in Gen 38:21–22 she was identified as a **hv'dq.** "holy (woman)," which is generally translated as a "cult prostitute." The masculine **vdeq'**/~yvidq. "holy (man/men)," found in II Kings 23:7, is variously translated as

- *sodomites*   KJV, ASV
- male cult prostitutes   NAS, NAU, RSV
- male shrine prostitutes   NIV, NIB
- *male temple prostitutes*   NRS
- *sacred male prostitutes*   NJB
- *male prostitutes*   NAB
- *perverted persons*   NKJ
- *whoremonger*s   YLT
- *effeminate*   DRA.

A more literal translation, reflecting the religious overtones of vdq, is *sacralist*, which appears below in my translations.

In Deut 23:17–18 (MT 23:18–19) the nouns hn�az "harlot" and hv"dq. "sacralist" appear together, but they are not inter-changeable:

laer'fyl tAnBmi hv"dq. hyh.ti-al{
`laer'fyl ynBmi vdeq' hyhyl-al{w>
^yhlÛ{a/ hw"hy> tyBe bIK, ryximW hnAz !n:ta, aybit'-al{
`~h,ynEv.-~G: ^yhlÛ{a/ hw"hy> tb;[]At yKi rd<n<-lkl.

There shall be no *scaralist* of the daughters of Israel, neither
shall there be a *sacralist* of the sons of Israel.
You shall not bring the hire of a *harlot*, or the wages of a
pimp,[45] into the house of Yahweh your God
in payment for any vow; for both of these are an
abomination to Yahweh your God.[46]

Nothing in the literature suggests that the "sacralist" (vdeq'
and/or hv"dq.) required the services of a pimp.

In Hos 4:10–14 seven times the lexeme hnZ" appears along with one occurrence of the plural tAvdq., namely,

- Wnz>hi "they have play the harlot"   4:10
- tWnz> "fornication"   4:11
- ~ynIWnz> "fornications"   4:12
- Wnz>Yr: "the have played the harlot"   4:12
- hn"yn<z>Ti "they play the harlot"   4:12
- hn"yn<z>Ti "they play adultery"   4:14
- tAnZOh "the harlots"   4:14
- WxBeZy> tAvdeQh;-~[iw> Wdrpey> tAnZOh;-~[i ~he 4:14

> "they [men] go aside with harlots and sacrifice
> with the [women] sacralists."

The male "sacralists" (~yviDeq.) were no doubt related to the l[Bh; yaeybin> "the prophets of Baal" (I Kings 18:19), and the tAvdeq, the female "sacralists" would have been related to the hrVeah' tAaeybin> "the prophetesses of Asherah."[47]

In the fertility cult the ~yviDeq. and tAvdeq. "the holy ones" of Baal and Asherah were not involved simply with sexual intercourse. In the vision of Ezekiel (8:3–18) there was rampant idolatry, with rooms of images of men, of beasts and idols, especially "the image of the Creatress,"[48] with women weeping for Tammuz, and men worshiping the sun. Some images were erotic, as Ezekiel noted, rkZ" ymleC; %l'-yfi[]Tw: ~b'ynbZtiw: "you made for yourself phallic images and played the harlot with them" (16:17).[49] The harlotry even included child sacrifice, as Ezekiel conveyed the words of Yahweh in 16: 20–21,

> And you took your sons and your daughters, whom you had
> borne to me, and these you sacrificed to them to be devoured.
> Were your harlotries so small a matter that you slaughtered my
> children and delivered them up as an offering by fire to them?
> (Compare 16:36–37.)

Jeremiah also conveyed these words of Yahweh in 32:35,

> They built the high places of Baal in the valley of the son of
> Hinnom, to offer up their sons and daughters to Molech, though
> I did not command them, nor did it enter into my mind, that they
> should do this abomination, to cause Judah to sin. (Compare II
> Kings 23:10.)

On the other hand Jeremiah's condemnation of Judah for adultery (3:9, 5:7, 7:9, 23:14, 29:23) and harlotry (3:1–8, 5:7,

13:27) included one practice that was family oriented. In Jer
7:18 Yahweh declared: "The children gather wood, the fathers
kindle fire, and the women knead dough to make cakes for the
queen of heaven; and they pour out drink offerings to other
gods." This asexual harlotry appears again in Jer 44:15–25,
where Judah's women, as refugees in Egypt, insist on fulfilling
their vows to burn incense to other gods, to pour out libations
to the queen of heaven, and to make cakes for the queen of
heaven which bear her image. As Jeremiah pointed out, they
would do so at their own expense.

In II Kings 23:7 another type of asexual harlotry was noted
in the listing of Josiah's religious reforms:

hwhy>tybB. rva] ~yvdQh; yTB-ta, #Tw:
hrVal' ~yTB' ~v' tAgra ~yvNh; rva

> And he [Josiah] broke down the houses of the (male)
> sacralists which were in the house of Yahweh,
> where the women wove garments for the Asherah.

kai. kaqeilen ton oikon twh kadhsim
twh en tw|oikw| kuriou
ou·ai` gunaikej ufainon ekei/cettiin tw|a;lsei

> And he pulled down the house of the KADESIM
> that were by the house of the Lord,
> where the women wove KETTIM for the grove.

Although the Septuagint translators transliterated the MT
~yvdQh;and ~yTB;(which they read as ~ytk), Montgomery
(1951: 539) rightly concurred with Šanda (1911) and Driver
(1912) that the ~yTB;was the cognate of the Arabic) #(*batt*)
"woven garment" (Lane 1863: 148). There is nothing obvious-
ly sexual about weaving clothes. But the participle tAgraomay
not be from gra', stem I, "to weave" but from gra', stem II,

"to perfume," which would be the cognate of the Arabic 6@ (*‘arija*) "to perfume, to make perfume to have a strong, odor" (Lane 1863: 46). Women perfuming clothes calls to mind Prov 7:10–23, where a woman in a harlot's dress (hnAz tyvi) seduces a young man by saying,

> I have decked my couch with coverings, colored spreads of Egyptian linen; have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon. Come, let us take our fill of love till morning; let us delight ourselves with love. (7:16–17)

Jerusalem's being castigated for her erotic behavior which involved phallic images, oil, incense, and food, with Yahweh saying in Ezek 16:17–19,

> you took your embroidered clothes to put on them [the images], and you offered my oil and incense before them . . . I fed you with fine flour and oil and honey which you set before them for a pleasing odor, says the Lord Yahweh.

In conclusion for this section on sexual behavior in Old Testament texts, it is important to note the Arabic noun ZOB (*zûn*) "an idol, and anything taken as a deity and worshiped beside God . . . a place in which idols are collected and set up," which is a synonym of @OB (*zûr*) "anything that is worshiped in place of God' (Lane 1867: 1268, 1273). This ZOB (*zûn*) may well be the cognate and by-form of the hnz" found in prophetic literature when Israel and Judah are castigated for their idolatry and worship of other gods. Instead of understanding an expression like hnzti hnz" in Hosea 1:2 strictly as a metaphorical use of hnz" "to fornicate," it may be better understood as a verb meaning literally "to worship other gods or idols." A *double entendre* may well have been intended.

SEXUAL BEHAVIOR:
NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS

New Testament texts dealing with sexual behavior span just a century, whereas the much larger Old Testament corpus covers more than a millennium. In the Greek texts homographs are not a problem, but whether a text is to be interpreted metaphorically or literally can be an issue. In the Gospels the references to sexual activities are rather straight forward. One can infer from the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11–32) that harlotry was tolerated and did not carry the death penalty as did adultery (John 8:3–4). Jesus forgiveness of the adulteress and his redefinition of adultery in Matt 5:27–32 were truly surprising,

> But I say to you that every one who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart . . . But I say to you that every one who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

These statements were but preliminaries to his telling the chief priests and elders in Matt 21:31–32, "Truly, I say to you, . . . the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

The references to sexual behavior in the Epistles have been a bit problematic given the semantic range of the Greek terms. Before citing annotated texts from Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, and I Timothy which deal with morality the following Greek words need to come into focus:

- arsenokoi,thj/arrenokoi,thj "coitus with a man" and arsenomixia "sodomy" (Liddell Scott: 246). Wold (1998: 190) noted that arsenokoi,thj designates the active partner in a homosexual act, whereas malakoj designates the passive partner.

- *asebeia* "ungodliness, impiety, disloyal," *asebew* "to be impious, act profanely, commit sacrilege" and *asebhj* "ungodly, unholy, profane sacrilegious (Liddell Scott: 255).

- *aselgeia* "licentiousness, wanton violence, brutal, lewd, vulgar, outrageous" (Liddell Scott: 255). Wold (1998: 167–168) conjectured that "it is possible that Jesus had homosexuality in mind when he used it [*aselgeia* in Mark 7:21–23] . . . . (and) it would appear that Peter thought of *aselgeia* [in 2 Peter 2:6–10a] as a term for homosexuality."

- *aschmosunh* "indecorum, obscene or disgraceful conduct" (Liddell Scott: 267).

- *genesewj* "origin, source, generation, beginning, manner of birth, coming into being" (Liddell Scott: 343).

- *koith* "bed, marriage bed, to become pregnant by a man" (Liddell Scott: 970).

- *malakoj* "fainthearted, cowardly, morally weak, lacking in self-control, soft, effeminate"—the opposite of *karteria* "strong, staunch, mighty, potent, in control of" (Liddell Scott: 880,1077). In BAG *malakoj* is defined as "soft, effeminate, especially of catamites, i.e., of men and boys who allow themselves to be misused homosexually," citing I Corinthians 6:9 and Polycarp to the Philippians 5:3."

- *moicelai* "adultery" and *moicoj* "adulterer, paramour, paramour of a sodomite" and a metaphor for an "idolatrous person," as in James 4:4 (Liddell and Scott: 1141).

- *porneia* "fornication, prostitution, unchastity," metaphorically "idolatry" (Hosea 4:11); *pornoj* "fornicator, catamite, sodomite, idolater"; *pornh* "harlot, prostitute" (Liddell Scott: 1450).

TEXTS FROM THE EPISTLES

Rom 1:26–27 address homosexual behavior, with verse 1:32 referring to Lev 18:22 and 20:13. In Leviticus there is no reference to lesbian sex since lesbians are unable "to penetrate" (בכב , stem II) each other or to willfully "spill their seed." Paul knew that his eternal life would be in heaven, thanks to God's grace through Jesus Christ, *not* through a progeny in whose memory he would live forever (which was the faith in early Israel when male homosexuality was an abomination because it robbed one's ancestors of the progeny to which they were entitled and on which their eternal life depended). Nevertheless, Paul perpetuates the law against homosexuality. According to Paul to ignore the Torah of Leviticus 20 makes one "a hater of God" and "worthy of death." When Paul wrote "Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom13:8), he did not include homosexual love. For Paul "*homosexual love*" would have been an oxymoron. The texts from Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, and I Timothy reads as follows and speaks for themselves.

Romans 1:26–32

For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions (paqh atimiaj); for their women exchanged the natural function (fusikhn crhsin) for that which is unnatural (para. fusin), and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function (fusikhn crhsin) of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent (aschmosunhn) acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error. And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind (adokimon noun), to do those things which are not proper, being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil;

full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malice; they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; and, although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them."

I Corinthians 6:9–11, 18

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the Kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the

- fornicators   pornoi,
- nor idolaters   eidwlolatrai,
- nor adulterers   moicoi,
- nor effeminate   malakoi,
- nor sodomites   arsenokoitai
- nor thieves   kleptai,
- nor the greedy   pleonektai,
- nor drunkards   mequsoi,
- nor slanderers   loidoroi,
- nor extortioners   arpagej

will inherit the kingdom of God . . . Shun immorality (porneian). Every other sin which a man commits is outside the body; but the fornicator (porneuwn) sins against his own body.

Galatians 5:19–21

Now the works of the flesh are plain: fornication (porneia), impurity (akaqarsia), licentiousness (aselgeia), idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, party spirit, envy, drunkenness, carousing (kwmoi), and the like. I warn you, as I warned you before, that those who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

I Timothy 1:9–10

. . . the law is not laid down for the just but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, fornicators (po,rnoij), sodomites (arseno-koi,taij), kidnapers, liars, perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine, in accordance with the glorious gospel of the blessed God with which I have been entrusted."

CELIBACY

According to the first book in the canon, in Genesis 1–3, there was no room for celibacy in the Garden of Eden. As clearly stated, "It was not good for *the man* (~d'ah' = ton anqrwpon) to be alone." Thus, God created out of *the man* (~d'ah') "*a savior as his front one*" (Adgn*K. rz{,). The *man* (vyai) recognized this *savior* as his own flesh and bone; and named her *woman* (hV'ai), the feminine counterpart of the masculine *man* (vyai). They were of one flesh (dx'a, rfB'). And when "the man forsakes his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, they [again] become one flesh" (Wyh'w> dx'a, rfb'l.) (Gen 2:24). As one flesh the male and female were commanded: "Be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth!"

In Genesis *families* were in; *celibacy* was out. But in Revelation *celibate virgin males* were in and *marriage* and *families* were out. John's vision of the Lamb of God standing on Mount Zion, with 144,000 *celibate virgin males* who had the Lamb's name and his Father's name written on their foreheads, appears in Rev 14:1–5,[50]

And I heard a voice from heaven like the sound of many waters and like the sound of loud thunder; the voice I

heard was like the sound of harpers playing on their harps, and they sing a new song before the throne and before the four living creatures and before the elders. *No one could learn that song except the hundred and forty-four thousand who had been redeemed from the earth. It is these who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are virgins* (ουτοι, εισιν οι] μετα. gunaikwh ouk emolunqhsan(parqenoi gar eisin)*; it is these who follow the Lamb wherever he goes; these have been redeemed from mankind as first fruits for God and the Lamb* . . .

Although Elijah never married and the word of Yahweh to Jeremiah was "You shall not take a wife, nor shall you have sons or daughters in this place" (Jer. 16:1–2), male celibacy was not prized in Israel. Ginzburg (1968: IV: 273) tells of the Jewish tradition in which the prophet Isaiah declared to King Hezekiah that his sickness unto death was "incurred because he had failed to take unto himself a wife and bring forth posterity." Hezekiah's defense "that he preferred a celibate's life because he had seen in the holy spirit that he was destined to have impious children," was rebutted by Isaiah with the words, "Thou hast but to do thy duty [to bear children]."

Israelite men were commanded by Moses not to approach a woman for three days (hVai-la, WvGTi-la; ~ymy" tvl{vli) while he ascended Mount Sinai (Exod 19:15); and Jewish tradition attests that Moses remained celibate thereafter for life. Sexual abstinence for short periods of time—as when David and his men went out on an expedition (I Sam 21:3–7) and when the priests were serving in the temple—was often required, but lifelong celibacy was different matter in Israel and in Rabbinic Judaism. Schneider (1971: 767) noted that

For the Rabbis marriage was an unconditional duty. There is only one known instance of a celibate Rabbi. In T. Jeb.,

8, 4 we are told that Ben ᶜAzzai remained unmarried. He justified his attitude in the words: "My soul cleaves to the Torah; there is no time for marriage; may the world be maintained by others. . . .The same Ben ᶜAzzai did, of course, proclaim the duty of marriage as a command . . . In T. Jeb 8, 4 he says "He who does not see to the continuation and propagation of the race (as commanded in Gen. 1:28), may he be accounted by Scripture as if he diminished the (divine) image."

However, Jesus, John the Baptist, and the Apostle Paul were celibate—even though in recent fiction Jesus became the husband of Mary Magdalene and Paul became a widower in the writings of Luther (*Works* 41: 161, n. 410; 54: 271). In Matt 19:10–12 Jesus' answer to the Pharisees concerning divorce led his disciples to conclude, "It is not expedient to marry," and Jesus concurred, acknowledging that "not all men can receive this precept, but only to those to whom it is given." He followed this remark with his identifying three types of eunuchs:

- there are eunuchs who have been so from birth,[51]
- there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by men,
- there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs[52] for the sake of the kingdom of heaven;

and concluded, "He who is able to receive this, let him receive it" (ὁ δυναμενοj cwreih cwrei,tw).[53]

The key for interpreting the last phrase in Matt 19:12b is found in the *Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew*, which adds to the parable of the sower this interpretation in Matt 13:23b,

As for the hundred, this is the one purified (trhjm) of heart and sanctified (tXwdq) of body. As for the sixty, this is the one separated from women. As for the thirty, this is the one sanctified in matrimony, in body, and in heart.

Thus, there was for Jesus a hierarchy of good works: the hundred fold speaks of the fruit of *the ascetic life*, the sixty fold recognizes the fruit of *the celibate life*, and the thirty fold acknowledges the fruit of *sacred matrimony*. For Jesus, John the Baptist, the Apostle Paul, and others—like Origen of Alexandria who actually castrated himself—the command to be fruitful, to multiply and fill the earth with progeny (Gen 1:28) was superceded by their personal preference for celibacy and continency for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.

The two variants in the *Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew* in 19:12 are noteworthy:

Manuscripts C H L

hl wdg hl (mb Mymkx Mh wl)

these are the wise ones in great prominence

Manuscripts A B D E F G

hl wdg hl (mb My) bh Mh wl)

these are those coming into great prominence

These two variants , ~ymkx "wise ones"and ~yabh "those coming," when conflated, present a tradition in which Jesus taught that those who made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven are the *wise ones* who, having rightly understood the ways of God, would *come into great prominence* (hl wdg hl [m). Whereas in Israelite and later Jewish tradition a father would be *first* and the childless male would be *last*, this was reversed in Matt 19:28–30,

> Jesus said to them, "Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one who has left houses or brothers or sisters or father or mother or children or lands, for my name's sake, will receive a hundredfold, and inherit eternal life. But many that are first will be last, and the last first.

This matches the text of Luke 14:26, once the verb μισεω (= hnX/anX "to hate" is corrected to εγκαταλειπω (= hnX/anX) "to forsake."[54] Jesus' original statement as recorded in Luke's Hebrew source no doubt meant,

> If any one comes to me and does not *forsake* (hnX/anX) his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

If Jesus really required his followers to *forsake* (αφιημι) or to *abandon* (εγκαταλειπω), or even to *hate* (μισεω) all of one's family members, was it then permissible for a man to divorce (απολυω) his wife? According to Luke 16:18 the answer was a flat-out "No!" with Jesus saying, "Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery." In Mark 10:11–12 Jesus' reply to his disciples is the same, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery." But in Matt 19:3–6 when the Pharisees asked Jesus, "Is it lawful to divorce one's wife for any cause?" Jesus answered,

> Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh." So they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder."

Dissatisfied with this answer, the Pharisee appealed to the Torah and asked, "Why then did Moses command one to give a certificate of divorce, and to put her away?" (19:7). They

were referring specifically to Deut 24:1–4, which reads,

 When a man takes a wife and marries her, if then she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency (rbD' twr{[) in her, and he writes her a bill of divorce (ttyrK. rps) and puts it in her hand and sends her out of his house, and she departs out of his house, and if she goes and becomes another man's wife, and the latter husband dislikes her and writes her a bill of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out of his house, or if the latter husband dies, who took her to be his wife, then her former husband, who sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after she has been defiled (haM'Jhi; for that is an abomination (hb'[At) before Yahweh, and you shall not bring guilt (ayjix]t) upon the land which Yahweh your God gives you for an inheritance.

Jesus' response to the Pharisees' appeal to Torah was his clarification that "For your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so." He concluded (Matt 19:9) in agreement with the Torah:

> *Whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity,*
> *and marries another, commits adultery.*

This statement basically repeats what appears in Matt 5: 31–32. In the *Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew* this passage reads as follows (with italics added):

Again Jesus said to his disciples: You have heard what was said to those of long ago that everyone who leaves his wife and divorces is to give a bill of divorce, that is, *libela repudio*. And I say to you that everyone who leaves his wife is to give her a bill of divorce *except for matter of adultery. He is the one who commits adultery and he who takes her commits adultery.*

The nineteen words in italics translate the last ten words of the Hebrew text, which appear to have lost three letters.

The Hebrew text reads,

@wan rbd l[~a yk
@any htwa xqwlhw @awnh awh

except for the matter of adultery,
he is the adulterer, and the one taking her commits adultery.

The text needs to be corrected by adding *before* the awh the three letters wah and changing a w into a y. With this restoration the text becomes

wa hpwan rbd l[~a yk
@any htwa xqwlhw @yanh awh

except for the matter of her adultery, otherwise
he causes adultery and the one taking her commits adultery.

This correction brings the @yanh awh into agreement with the Greek text's poiei/authn moiceuqhhai "he makes her an adulteress." Consequently, in light of the Greek text tradition and the Hebrew tradition, Jesus' statement in Matt 5: 31–32 had these three points:

• a divorce due to (allegations or suspicions of) adultery on the part of the wife does not require a certificate of divorce,

• all other divorces require the disgruntled husband to issue a certificate of divorce which liberates the former wife to legally marry again,

• and failure to issue the certificate of divorce would mean that the former wife and her next spouse would technically be living in an adulterous relationship.

It goes without saying that a woman *caught* in an act of adultery was to be stoned (Lev 20:10; John 8:3–4).

CONCLUSIONS

Credit goes to Trito-Isaiah for initially initiating the elevation of the eunuch with this statement in Isa 56:4–5,

> And let not the eunuch say, "Behold, I am a dry tree." For thus says Yahweh: "To the eunuchs who keep my sabbaths, who choose the things that please me and hold fast my covenant, I will give in my house and within my walls a monument and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name which shall not be cut off.

According to Lev 21:17–21 and Deut 23:1–2 the eunuch (along with the blind, the lame, the hunchback, the dwarf, and the diseased) was excluded from the assembly of Yahweh. But by the time the Wisdom of Solomon was written things had changed, for "Blessed also is the eunuch . . . for special favor will be shown him for his faithfulness, and a place of great delight in the temple of the Lord" (3:14). According to Acts 8:27–39, in the account of Philip's baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch upon his profession of faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the early Christian community was in full accord with Isaiah 56:4–5 and Wisdom of Solomon 3:14.

Similarly, in Isa 54:1 the female counterpart to the male eunuch was told,

> Sing, O barren one, who did not bear; break forth into singing and cry aloud, you who have not been in travail! For the children of the desolate one will be more than the children of her that is married, says Yahweh.

This blessing is quoted in Gal 4:27 and alluded to in the Wis Sol 3:13, "For blessed is the barren woman who is undefiled, who has not entered into a sinful union; she will have fruit when God examines souls."

As the definition of "salvation" changed for the Pharisees
—though not for the Sadducees—and for the first Christians

- *from* living a long life in the land of Israel and having an
  "eternal life" through one's progeny
- *to* living eternally in the heavenly kingdom through God's
  gracious gift to the righteous and/or upon one's profession
  of faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God

there was also a shift away from disdain and contempt for
sterile males and infertile women. Thus, eunuchs and barren
women who were once religious outcasts were welcomed into
the communities of faith.

However there has been no corresponding reversal of atti-
tudes toward homosexual males. The idea that they were an
"abomination" because they wasted their seed and thereby
threatened the eternal life of all of their ancestors had become
irrelevant. Eternal life was more than a survival in the memory
of one's progeny. It was a resurrection into a heavenly
kingdom upon a profession of faith that Jesus Christ is the Son
of God. It was available to repentant harlots and tax
collectors (Matt 21:31–32), but not to practicing sodomites (I
Cor 6:9 and I Tim 1:9–10).

The biblical texts on gender equality and sexual morality are
applied quite differently and subjectively in the various faith
communities. Many texts are ignored while others are deemed
to be absolute and enforceable. Like hundreds of my ancestors
over the centuries I disagreed with Paul's advise: "to the un-
married and the widows I say that it is well for them to remain
single as I do" (I Cor 7:8). Once I became married Paul's
further admonition, "let those who have wives live as though
they had none" (I Cor 7:29), i.e., be celibate, seemed sense-
less. To the contrary, I Cor 7:2–3 made sense:

But because of the temptation to immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband.

Other Christians disagree with Paul not only on the matters pertaining to marriage but also with his prohibition of divorce as recorded in I Cor 7:10–11,

To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband (but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband)—and that the husband should not divorce his wife.

Paul's charge reflects the words of Jesus in Mark 10:9, "What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder," which Mark quotes as an absolute. But Christians seeking a divorce make Matt 19:9 (as discussed above, 34–36) the absolute and dutifully provide a document of divorce as required in the Torah and ignore what the apostle wrote in the epistle.

In an effort to fulfill the commandment "Be fruitful and multiply!" many in ancient Israel and in the early churches participated in *fertility cults*. Nowadays fertility cults have been replaced by *fertility clinics*, and for some believers this too is anathema because Paul said, "*Every one should remain in the state in which he was called*" (I Cor 7:20), echoing the sentiment of predestination found in Sirach 33:10–14,

All men are from the ground, and Adam was created of the dust. In the fulness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways; some of them he blessed and exalted, and some of them he made holy and brought near to himself; but some of them he cursed and brought low, and he turned them out of their place. As clay in the hand of the

potter—for all his ways are as he pleases—so men are in the hand of him who made them, to give them as he decides.

Thus, some argued that sterility and infertility are divinely determined, rather than being the consequence of sin. On the other hand, homosexuals are not *"to remain in the state in which they were called"* because their sexual propensities are deemed to be self-inflicted expressions of freewill, as spelled out in Sirach 15:11–20,

> Do not say, "It was [the Lord] who led me astray"; for he had no need of a sinful man. The Lord hates all abominations, and they are not loved by those who fear him. It was he who created man in the beginning, and he left him in the power of his own inclination. If you will, you can keep the commandments, and to act faithfully is a matter of your own choice.

Advocates of celibacy can appeal not only (1) to the role model provided by Elijah, John the Baptist, Paul, and Jesus, (2) to Jesus' statements in Matt 19:12 and the expanded text of Matt 13:23 in the *Shem Tob Hebrew Gospel*, wherein the ascetic and celibate life-styles are elevated, but also (3) to the advice in Sirach, 16:1–3,

> Do not desire a multitude of useless children, nor rejoice in ungodly sons. If they multiply , do not rejoice in them, unless the fear of the Lord is in them. Do not trust in their life, and do not rely on their multitude; for one is better than a thousand, and to die childless is better than to have ungodly children.

This diversity of biblical texts dealing with gender and sexuality, with all of their complexities and ambiguities, stands in sharp contrast to the simplicity of the moral and the ethical statements in which Paul—using what I prefer to interpret as a gender inclusive "brethren"—advises,

Finally, brethren, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is gracious, if there is any excellence, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things (Phil 4:8).

For we ourselves were once foolish, disobedient, led astray, slaves to various passions and pleasures, passing our days in malice and envy, hated by men and hating one another; but when the goodness and loving kindness of God our Savior appeared, *he saved us, not because of deeds done by us in righteousness*, but in virtue of his own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior (Titus 3:3–6).

NOTES

1. Compare the *Qurᶜan Sura* 29:28, "Lot said to his people, 'You commit such an abomination, no one in the world has ever done it before you. Do you indeed approach men lustfully and cut off *the way of the offspring* (ⵇ ᵃⵣᵃ�$ⵛⴷ ⵣN[Vⵏᵃⵕⵓ [*wataqṭaᶜûna ᶜssabîla*]) and you allow all kinds of vice in your society.'" (Lane, 1872: 1302 and 1893: 2990.) Note also V/?d]Vg[*qaṭâᶜa ᶜalraḥim*] "to forsake *kindred* [or *womb*]" (Wehr, 1979: 906–909) and note !Al Bsi "betrothal gift."

2. Compare the *Life of Adam and Eve* 12:1–16:3 in the Pseudepigrapha (Charles, 1913: II: 137) for the account of Satan's refusal to worship Adam and Eve because they should have worshiped him because he was created before they were.

3. Compare Leonard Swidler's letter to Josef Ratzinger (Sept. 12, 2004), which is also available online. It reads:

But Josef, in your section six you really shock me with your misreading of the second chapter of Genesis. It is almost as if you didn t read Hebrew! You write, God placed in the garden which he was to cultivate, the man, who is still referred to with the generic expression Adam. You know perfectly well that in chapter one the text states that God took some earth (Hebrew; *adamah*), breathed his spirit into the earth (*adamah*) and created *ha adam* (The Earthling). In chapter two of Genesis it is not the man (I wonder, did you in German write *der Mann* (the male) or *der Mensch* (the human being), and surely it is not that guy Adam who is spoken of. It is *ha adam*, the earthling (ungendered, as the rabbis recognized and discussed at length later). . . .

To view the document which Swidler refers to check out http://tmcdaniel.palmerseminary.edu/Ratzinger on Women.pdf.

4. For the role of Wisdom and Word in creation, note Prov 3:19; 8:22–30; Sir 43:33; Wis Sol 9:1–2, 9.

5. The *ʿadam* "man" is a singular collective noun which includes the male and the female, thus the plural verb stating that *they* will have authority over all.

6. The name Azariah (Why"rz:[]) "Yahweh is savior/rescuer" is sufficient evidence that rz,[e did not connote an "assistant" or "helpmate." (Were I drowning and yelled "Help! Help!" I would not be calling for an assistant to help me drown, but for a savior to rescue me.) The following texts illustrate the fact that rz:['/rz,[e function as a synonym for jLPi "to rescue, to deliver" and [vy" "to save."

Psa 37:40

~y[iv'r>me ~jeLpy>~jeLpy:w: hwhy>~re[Yw:
Abo WSx'-yKi ~[evIyw>

Yahweh rescues them and delivers them;
he delivers them from the wicked,
and saves them, because they take refuge in him.

Psa 30:12 (MT)

yli rz[ehyh/ hwhy>ynNEkw>hwhy>[mv'

Yahweh heard, and had compassion upon me;
Yahweh has become a rescuer for me.

Psa 54:6

yvpn: ykmsB. ynda] yli rz[o ~yhil a/ hNhi

Behold, God is a rescuer for me;
the Lord is with those upholding my soul.

Psa 70:1, 6 (MT)

. . . . hvWx ytirz[l. hwhy>ynlyCh;l. ~yhil a/
~yhil a/ rxa;T-la; hwhy>hT'a; yjilpmW yrz[, yLi-hvWx

Hasten, O God to deliver me! O Yahweh, to rescue me! . . .
O God, come quickly to me! You are my rescuer
and my deliverer; O Yahweh, do not delay!

Psa 146:5

wyh'l a/ hwhy>l[; Arb.fi Arz[B. bq[]y: la w, yreva;

Blessed is he whose rescuer is the God of Jacob,
whose hope is upon Yahwh his God.

Deut 33:7

hyk.Ti wyrCmi rz[w>. . . hdWhy>lAq hwhy>[mv.

Hear, O Yahweh, the voice of Judah . . .
and may you be a rescuer from his enemies.

Deut 33:26

Atw'a]bW ^rz[b. ~ymv' bkero!Wrvy>la K' !yae
~lA[t[ro>tx;TmW ~dq, yhl a/ hn"[m. . . . .

> There is none like the God of Jeshurun, riding (the) heavens
> to your rescue . . . .
> The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the
> everlasting arms.

7. Note the noun ‮דגיה‬ "leader, ruler, prince" which was a title used for Saul (I Sam 9:16), David (I Sam 13:14, 25:30), Solomon (I Kings 1:35), Jeroboam (I Kings 14:7), Hezekiah (II Kings 20:5), Abijah (II Chron 11:22), Pashur (Jer 20:1), and the ruler of Tyre (Ezek 28:2).

8. The Septuagint has kai. proj ton andra sou h` apostrofh, sou kai. auÑtoj sou kurieusei "Your *turning away* [*apostrophē*] shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you." The translators read the MT ‮%תקושת‬ as either ‮%תבושת‬ (see I Sam 7:17) or as ‮%תגושת‬, from the root ‮גוש‬). The Vulgate's *et sub viri potestate eris* "you shall be under your husband's power" must have associated the ‮%תקושת‬ with the stems ‮רוש / ררש‬ "to have power," or it reflects the stem ‮קוש‬ which was the cognate of the Arabic ‮ج٥د‬ (*sawwaq*) "he made such a one to have the ruling of his affair" (Lane, 1872: 1471) A more detailed study of this verse is available online in Chapter II of my book *Clarifying Baffling Biblical Passages*, available at http://tmcdaniel.palmerseminary.edu/ Volume Two.htm.

9. Note Schmidt's article "Like Eve, Like Adam: *mšl* in Genesis 3:16," in *Biblica* (1991) 72: 1–22.

10. A more detailed study of Proverbs 31 is available online in Chapter XI of my book *Clarifying More Baffling Biblical*

Passages, available at http://tmcdaniel.palmerseminary.edu/CMBBP_ELEVEN.pdf.

11. Note also Sirach 26:13–17,

A wife's charm delights her husband, and her skill puts fat on his bones. A silent wife is a gift of the Lord, and there is nothing so precious as a disciplined soul. A modest wife adds charm to charm, and no balance can weigh the value of a chaste soul. Like the sun rising in the heights of the Lord, so is the beauty of a good wife in her well-ordered home. Like the shining lamp on the holy lampstand, so is a beautiful face on a stately figure.

12. Were this statement the guideline for evaluating the major twentieth century personalities it would mean that Adolf Hitler was better than Queen Elizabeth and Pol Pot was better than Mother Teresa. See also Sir 7:19; 7: 24–26; 9:1–9; 22:3.

13. *Sura* 89:23 reads, "On that day, Gehenna will be brought forth. On that day, the human being will *repent* (?k=ꞕ [*yata-ḏakkaru*]), but how will that *repentance* (ℇ ?ᵃk=d [*ʿaḏḏik-ray*]) profit him?"

14. Lane (1867: 969) also noted the following Arabic tradition which reflects the supremacy of the masculine over the feminine: A0?k=C ?k> z!?hd (*ʿalqurʿanu ḏakrⁿⁿ faḏakkiruhu*), "*the Qurʿan is eminently excellent* [lit., *masculine*]: *therefore do ye hold it and know it and describe it as such*."

15. The translation of Philo's *De fuga et inventione* by C. D. Yonge (entitled "A Treatise on Fugitives") is now online at http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/book19.html.

(The text there is Chapter IX, verses 51–52.) Later rabbinic teachings reflect a similar deprecation of the feminine and of women as found in the Talmud *Sotah* 20a,

> Rabbi Ben Azzai [said] a man is under the obligation to teach his daughter Torah, so that if she has to drink [the water of bitterness], she may know that the merit suspends its effect. Rabbi Eliezer says: whoever teaches his daughter Torah teaches her obscenity. Rabbi Joshua says: a woman prefers one *kab* (measure) and sexual indulgence to nine *kab* (measures) and continence. He used to say, a foolish pietist, a cunning rogue, a female Pharisee, and the plague of Pharisees bring destruction upon the world.

Noteworthy also is the following paragraph from *Kodashim Menahoth* 43b:

> It was taught: R. Judah used to say, A man is bound to say the following three blessings daily: '[Blessed art thou . . .] who hast not made me a heathen . . . who hast not made me a woman'; and ' . . . who hast not made me a brutish man'. R. Aha b. Jacob once overhead his son saying '[Blessed art thou . . .] who hast not made me a brutish man', whereupon he said to him, 'And this too!' Said the other, 'Then what blessing should I say instead?' [He replied,] . . . who hast not made me a slave'. And is not that the same as a woman?

> Click here to view the full texts of the Talmud online.

16. Aristotle and other Greek thinkers contributed to the deprecation of women in the Hellenistic period. The following three lengthy quotations from the study of Richard Smith (1988: 345–360) are relevant:

- Aristotle (384–322 B.C.) opines that the male semen provides the form (eἰdoj) of the embryo (kuḥma) and makes it perfect (teleiow). The function of the female sex organ is to receive the

sperm and to provide matter (ulh) and nourishment (trofh) for the embryo. There is an extensive series of associations with male semen, all of which Aristotle considers superior (kreit-twn). Semen has power (dunamij), it has heat (qermothj), it has activity (kinhsij), and has soul (yuch). The female's role is simply cast in contrast to the male's. Instead of his power, she has inability (adunamia) and weakness (asqenhj); while he is hot, she is cold (yucroj); in place of the soul, she has matter; as he is active, she is passive (paqhtikon); and instead of having divine (qeion) form, femaleness (qhluthj) is a natural (fusikh) deformity (anaphria). All of these associations Aristotle considers inferior (ceiron). [page 346]

- There was widespread disagreement with Aristotle's theories in antiquity, especially from the medical profession. . . . the consensus was that the female also produced semen . . . The theory is found in the medical tradition as early as the Hippocratic text *On the Seed.* "Both the man and the woman have sperm," (460–377 B.C.). . . . "The female semen is extremely weak, formless and imperfect," . . . without the male semen the fetus lack perfection (teleiothj). [pages 347, 350]

- Galen (129–200 A.D.) says, "Aristotle was right in thinking the female less perfect than the male." Men and women have the same sexual organs, Galen says, except for one important difference. The male organs are on the outside, the female's are on the inside. . . Females, in fact, especially their sexual organs, are imperfect (atelhj) and deformed (anaphron). [page 349]

Theological misogyny—in the past and in the present—has been grounded in this primitive Graeco-Roman medical science and sexology. Many contemporary religionists have abandoned the antiquarian medical science but cling to its derivative deprecation and deprivation of women and its misogyny.

17. In the gnostic text *Pistis Sophia*, thirty-nine of the sixty-four questions addressed to Jesus by his disciples are attributed to Mary Magdalene, who readily admitted to her persistence in questioning Jesus, saying, "I will not tire of asking thee. Be not angry with me for questioning everything," to which Jesus replied, "Question what thou dost wish." (I: 24)

18. See Brooten (1977) for a brief but excellent history as to whether the masculine Ἰουνιαν (Junias) was originally the feminine Ἰουνιαν (Junia). Click here to view it online.

19. See Arndt and Gingrich (1957: 431) who noted that κεφαλη, "head" was used "in the case of living beings to denote superior rank" This parallels (1) the Hebrew ראש "head" which can mean "chief, magistrate, leader president" (BDB 911; Jastrow 1903: 1437) and (2) the Syriac *rîš* "head," meaning also "prince, chief, prefect, superior" (Payne Smith 1903: 540). Compare Brauch (1989: 138) who noted,

> In only eight out of 180 cases was *kephalē* used to translate *ro'sh* when it designated the leader or ruler of a group. It is very possible that one of the figurative meanings of *kephalē* (namely, "top" or "crown") allowed the translator to use it in describing a prominent individual.

The eight cases Brauch mentioned (but did not cite) are:

- Deut 28:13, κατασthσαι σε κυριος ο θεος σου εις κεφαλην και. μη. εις ουραν "the Lord thy God make thee the head, and not the tail."
- Judges 10:18 (A text), και. εσται εις κεφαλην πασιν τοις κατοικουσιν Γαλααδ "and he shall be head over all the inhabitants of Gilead."

- Judg 11:11, ὁ λαὸς ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς εἰς κεφαλὴν καὶ εἰς ἀρχηγόν "the people made him head and ruler over them."
- II Sam 22:44, φυλάξεις με εἰς κεφαλὴν ἐθνῶν "you have made me the head of the nations."
- Isaiah 7:8a, αλλ᾽ ἡ κεφαλὴ Ἀρὰμ Δαμασκός "the head of Aram is Damascus."
- Isa 7:8b, καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Δαμασκου ρασσειμ "the head of Damascus is Rezin."
- Isaiah 7:9, ἡ κεφαλὴ Σομορων υἱὸς τοῦ Ρομελιου, "the head of Samaria is the son of Remaliah."
- Psalm 18:44, (MT) καταστήσεις με εἰς κεφαλὴν ἐθνῶν "you have made me the head of the nations."

A debate about the translation of κεφαλὴ, as "authority" or as "source" by W. Gruden and R. Cervin is available online at http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/cbmw/rbmw/appendix1a.html.

20. A more detailed study of this verse is available online in Chapter Two of my book *Clarifying New Testament Aramaic Names and Words and Shem Tob's Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*, pp. 45–61, which is available online at http://tmcdaniel.palmerseminary.edu/Volume4_ShemTob+.pdf.

21. The gender inclusive αὐτὸς in Matt 12:50, αὐτὸς μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν, "he is my brother, my sister, and my mother," provides evidence that among Jesus' *disciples* were women whom he identified as "sister" and "mother." See above, page 8.

22. See Aland (1968: 676) for a full listing of these variants:

- mss. B and p⁴⁶, Clement, Origin, Jerome, and Theodore have no verb in v. 22.
- mss. K, 181, 326, 614, 629, Chrysostom, and others have ὑποτασσεσθε (subjunctive present passive 2nd person plural) as the fifth word in the phrase;
- mss. D and G have this same ὑποτασσεσθε as the second word in the phrase;
- ms. Y, the Sahidic and the Bohairic have ὑποτασσεσθωσαν (present passive imperative 3rd person plural) as the second word in the phrase;
- mss. a, A, I, and P have this same ὑποτασσεσθωσαν as the fifth word in the phrase.
- Peshiṭ ta has the masculine !ydb[tvm !wtywhw (*wah-waitûn mešta‘bĕdîn*) "submit yourselves" in 5:21 and the feminine !db[tvm !ytywh (*hĕwaitēn mešta‘bĕdan*) "submit yourselves" in 5:22.

23. The present passive nominative feminine participle with the force of the imperative, ὑποτασσομεναι, appears in I Pet 3:1, "you wives, be submissive" and 3:5 "being submissive"; the accusative ὑποτασσομεναj appears in Titus 2:5, "to be submissive to their husbands."

24. But noteworthy in the story in Gen 21:9–14 is Abraham's obedience (required by God) to Sarah's demand for the expulsion of Hagar. God used Sarah to give Abraham a message! It was correctly noted that Sarah called Abraham by the title "Lord," but the fact that Abraham always call his wife by a title of nobility, hr'f "Princess," was not mentioned.

25. Barth (1974: 611, n. 12) defended Paul for his statements on gender equality, stating

> Despite all Paul says about the creation of woman out of man, and about her role in the fall (I Cor 11:3, 7–9; II Cor 11:3; cf. I Tim 2:14), his letters surprise the reader by an overwhelming number of passages which treat man and woman on an egaltarian basis. See especially I Cor 7:2–5, 8–16, 28, 32–34; Gal 3:28; Eph 5:21 and the gratitude expressed to women in the greeting list, Rom 16:1–15.

Barth's most helpful comment (618–619) comes when he interprets Eph 5 in the light of Mark 10:42–45, stating,

> Even more than an enlightened monarch in his relation to his subjects, he [the Christian husband] is then "the first servant" of his wife. In short, a headship qualified, interpreted, and limited by Christ alone is proclaimed, not an unlimited headship that can be arbitrarily defined an has to be endured. If a colloquialism can help to understand 5:23, them the husband is told always and under all circumstances to "go ahead" by loving his wife and by paying gladly whatever the appropriate price.

26. The Mortuary Text from the 18th Dynasty (1550–950 B.C.E.), cited in Pritchard's *ANET* (34–35), included a list of 78 affirmations by the deceased about his past life. The affirmations include,

> "*I have **not** :*
>   *committed evil against men*
>   *mistreated cattle*
>   *committed sin in the place of truth*
>   *blasphemed*
>   *done violence to a poor man*
>   *made (anyone) sick*

made (anyone) weep
killed nor caused terror
defiled myself
had sexual relations with a boy
had sexual relations with the wife of (*another*) *male*."

27. For a comparable code of conduct focused on sexual crimes, see *The Code of the Assura* (c. 1075 B.C.E.) in James Pritchard's *ANET*, 181. The most relevant lines include:

> I.2. If a woman, whether the wife of a man or the daughter of a man, utter vulgarity or indulge in low talk, that woman bears her own sin; against her husband, her sons, or her daughter they shall have no claim.

> I.7. If a woman bring her hand against a man, they shall prosecute her; 30 *manas* of lead shall she pay, 20 blows shall they inflict on her.

> I.8. If a woman in a quarrel injure the testicle of a man, one of her fingers they shall cut off. And if a physician bind it up and the other testicle which is beside it be infected thereby, or take harm; or in a quarrel she injure the other testicle, they shall destroy both of her eyes.

> I.9. If a man bring his hand against the wife of a man, treating her like a little child, and they prove it against him, and convict him, one of his fingers they shall cut off. If he kiss her, his lower lip with the blade of an axe they shall draw down and they shall cut off.

> I.12. If the wife of a man be walking on the highway, and a man seize her, say to her "I will surely have intercourse with you," if she be not willing and defend herself, and he seize her by force and rape her, whether they catch him upon the wife of a man, or whether at the word of the

woman whom he has raped, the elders shall prosecute him, they shall put him to death. There is no punishment for the woman.

I.13. If the wife of a man go out from her house and visit a man where he lives, and he have intercourse with her, knowing that she is a man's wife, the man and also the woman they shall put to death.

I.14. If a man have intercourse with the wife of a man either in an inn or on the highway, knowing that she is a man's wife, according as the man, whose wife she is, orders to be done, they shall do to the adulterer. If not knowing that she is a man's wife he rapes her, the adulterer goes free. The man shall prosecute his wife, doing to her as he likes.

I.15. If a man catch a man with his wife, both of them shall they put to death. If the husband of the woman put his wife to death, he shall also put the man to death. If he cut off the nose of his wife, he shall turn the man into a eunuch, and they shall disfigure the whole of his face.

I.16. If a man have relations with the wife of a man at her wish, there is no penalty for that man. The man shall lay upon this wife, the penalty he wishes.

I.18. If a man say to his companion, "They have had intercourse with thy wife; I will prove it," and he be not able to prove it, . . . on that man they shall inflict forty blows, a month of days he shall perform the king's work, they shall castrate him, and one talent of lead he shall pay.

I.19. If a man started a rumor against his neighbor in private saying, "People have had intercourse repeatedly with him ". . . since he is not able to prove it they shall flog him fifty times with staves and for a month of days he shall do the work of the king; they shall castrate him, and one talent of lead he shall pay.

I.20. If a man have intercourse with his brother-in-arms, they shall turn him into a eunuch [*CAD* N 198 *nâku*.]

Click here to view the full text online.

28. The English name *Eve* is a defective transliteration of the Hebrew *Ḥawwah*. The initial *Ḥ* (an unvoiced pharyngal fricative) has no corresponding sound in English so it was ignored. The *v* in the name *Eve* reflects the *ww* in the name *Ḥawwah*; and the bi-syllabic *awwa* in *Ḥawwah* was reduced to a monosyllabic *eve*. The Septuagint reads "and Adam called the name of his wife "Life" (Ζωη = *Zôē*), because she was the mother of all "living" (ζωντων = *zôntôn*).

29. So many upper class young Israelite males were killed off fighting King David's wars that thousands of upper class Israelite young women could not find a living male to marry. Solomon provided welfare for these upper class young ladies by bringing them into the royal household—thereby maintaining the support of the upper class Judahites for the Davidic dynasty. It was for political reasons, domestic and international, that he had a thousand women—not for sexual reasons. Solomon taxed the poor so heavily to pay for this welfare for the rich that the ten northern tribes of Israel rebelled against Rehoboam, Solomon's son and successor, when Rehoboam followed his father's tax policies benefitting the rich at the expense of the poor.

30. The levirate marriage (Gen 38:6–11 and Deut 25:5–10) was instituted to provide progeny for the man who died without a male heir so that the deceased and his ancestors might live on in family and tribal memory. It provided for a brother of a man who died without a son to impregnate the widow of

the deceased and "the first son she bears shall carry on the name of the dead brother so that his name will not be blotted out from Israel" (Deu 25:6).

31. According to Exod 22:16–17, the seduction of a virgin was not an act of adultery, nor was it a capital crime. The penalty for such a seduction was a marriage or a monetary settlement equivalent to the marriage present for a virgin.

32. The Arabic ت (t) always appears as a שׁ (š) in Hebrew; and the Hebrew כ and ק were often interchanged as with %kD' and qqD' "to crush" and %kr" and qqr" "to be tender, weak." Compare the current use in English of "Kwik Mart" as the equivalent of "Quick Mart."

33. The Arabic ﻉ (s) usually appears as a שׁ (š) in Hebrew.

34. When dealing with regulations about ceremonial uncleanness, the male's [rz"-tbkvi "seed of emission" (koi,th spermatoj) could balance the female's ~D' hbz" "issue of blood" (r̀eousa ai[mati). See Lev 15:16–18, 32; 19:20; 22:4. Moreover, the same words for "emission" or "ejaculation" appear in Num 5:13 [rz<tbkvi Ht'aovyai bkvI> "and a man penetrate her (with) the seed of emission" (which became kai. koimhqh/ tij metV authJ koi,thn spermatoj, "and were someone to have slept with her the seed of emission") and in Num 5:20 AtbkV-ta, %B' vyai !Tw "and a man give you his emission" (which became kai. eḍwkeṇ tij thn koi,thn autou, "and someone gave you his emission"). The Septuagint translators recognized the noun hbkvi "emision" but not the verb bkv' "to ejaculate."

35. The [rʒ'l. ^TbkV, translated as "sexual intercourse" (NLT, NIV, NIB) and "lie carnally" (KJV, ASV, RSV) is unusual in that the l of [rʒ'l .is a l genitive meaning literally "to a seed." But the [rʒ'l. may be better read as the *Hiphᶜîl* infinitive (*scriptio defectiva* [GKC 53ᑫ] for [yrʒh;l . "to impregnate") and is so translated here.

36. In Lev 18:23, which deals with bestiality, the verb bkV', stem II, "to penetrate" appears in the prohibition addressed to the male, but since women can not penetrate, not surprisingly, in the prohibition addressed to the female the verb shifted from bkV' "to penetrate" to [br" "to lie down." In post-biblical Hebrew [br"came to mean "to copulate in an unnatural way, to commit buggery" (Jastrow, 1903: 1444-1445).

37. In this case, the initial T of hb'[AT would be the noun preformative on a w"p stem—analogous to the noun hrAT "Torah" which is derived from the root hrw / hry, not hrt (GKC § 85 ᴾ). See BDB 582 (6a) for reading the preposition !mias "*in preference to.*" Note the use of q}3 (*jahal*) "fool-ish, ignorant, irrational" in the *Qurᶜan Sura* 27:54, when speaking of sodomy: "Lot said to his people, 'How could you commit such an abomination, publicly, while you see? Would you approach men in your lust rather than women. Indeed, you are ignorant / foolish (q}3 [*jahal*]) people.'"

38. Whereas according to Gen 19:1–11 the sin of Sodom was male homosexual behavior, as when the Sodomites instructed Lot saying, "Bring [the men] out to us, that we may know (h[dnÜ= suggenwmeqa = "have sex with") them," Ezekiel

(16:49–50) provided a different definition of sodomy:

> Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughter had pride, fullness of food, and abundance of idleness; neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. They were haughty, and did abominable things before me; therefore I removed them, when I saw it.

In the the *Qurᶜan* the story of Lot and the Sodomites receives much attention, appearing in *Sura* 7:81–85; 11:7–81; 26:160–175; 27:54–58 (see note 33); and 29:28–35 (see note 1).

39. Gen 6:1–4 is another story about rape, although the verb bkv' does not appear there. Supra-earthly "sons of God" impregnated earthly women who gave birth to the *Nephilim* "giants," who became, according to tradition, "the men of renown." But the ~Veyvĕa; (*andrej onomastoi*) "men of renown" is better read as ~fh' yvĕa; "men of violence." The Hebrew ~Xh in this context is more likely to be the cognate of the Arabic VG| (*hašama*) "to destroy, smash, shatter." The violence initiated by the ~fh' yvĕa; "men of violence" resulted in God's decision to bring on the flood (Gen 6:11–13). Click here to view online Chapter 2 in my book *Clarifying More Baffling Biblical Passages* for a more detailed study.

40. Ammon's penetration of his virgin sister Tamar led to his death at the hands of his brother Absalom (II Sam 13: 28–29), similar to the way that Shechem's rape of Dinah led to the death of all the males in Hamor's family (Genesis 34). By contrast, Lot preferred to have his daughters raped rather than have his male guests violated (Gen 19:1–11), and the old man from Ephraim, who resided in Gibeah of Benjamin, preferred to have his virgin daughter and a concubine raped rather than

his male guest. The men of Gibeah raped the concubine, who by dawn was dead. This disgraceful folly (הI bhֶW hMֶzֹl) led to battles in which all together 90,000 Benjaminites were allegedly slain (Judges 19–20).

41. The MT וִF[i is from hf'[', stem II, "to compress," the cognate of the פG` (*ġašiya*) "to compress (a woman)" (BDB 796). It occurs also in Ezek 28:3.

42. See Chapter 9, "The Rehab of Rahab" in my book *Clarifying Baffling Biblical Passages*. Click here to view the book online, or here to view just the chapter.

43. See Chapter 18, "The Excited Stallions in Jer 5:8" in my book *Clarifying Baffling Biblical Passages*. Click here to view the book online, or here to view just the chapter.

44. Here the verb %pֹ'v "to pour out" could be a by-form of xpֹv "to pour out (semen)," which is the cognate of the Arabic فdD (*safaḥa*) "he poured out (blood, tears, semen)," with form 3 meaning "he committed fornication" and the nouns فc"Cs (*musâfiḥ*) and çOc"Cs (*musâfiḥat*) meaning a "fornicator" (Lane, 1872: 1369; BDB 1046).

45. The NIV, NIB, and NRS translate the MT bI K, "dog" as "male prostitute." My translation "pimp" is based upon the Arabic cognates Z"$(pֵK (*kaltabân*) "pimp" and the verb %pֵK (*kaliba*) "to act as a pimp" (Lane, 1885: 2627 and 2625).

46. For this verse, the Septuagint has the doublet:

(1) ouk estai pornh apo. qugaterwn Israhl kai. ouk estai porneuwn apo. uiwh Israhl "There shall not be a *harlot* of the daughters of Israel, and there shall not be a *fornicator* of the sons of Israel."

(2) ouk estai telesforoj apo. qugaterwn Israhl kai. ouk estai teliskomenoj apo. uiwh Israhl "There shall not be a *sorceress* from the daughters of Israel, and there shall not be an *initiate* from the sons of Israel." (See Liddell and Scott, 1966: 1770[1] bottom and 1772[1] III and 1772[r].) According to this reading the Xdq "holy one" had no sexual overtones.

47. Elijah killed 450 prophets of Baal (I Kings 18:40); but not the 400 prophets of Asherah (I Kings 18:19). I Kings 15:12 states that Asa killed off all of the "sacralists" (~yvideq,) and destroyed all their "idols" (~yl Lgi). Those that survived Asa's purge (vdeQh; rty<"the rest of the *cult*") were exterminated by Jehosaphat (I King 22:46). Instead of treating the MT tAame [Bra; hrVeah' yaebiNW "and the prophets of the Asherah four hundred," as a gloss to be deleted (as proposed by many), the yaebiNW "and the prophets of" can be emended to read tAaybiNW "and the prophetesses of." The prophetesses of Asherah would match the female tAvdeq. "sacralists," just as the male prophets of Baal match the male ~yvideq. "sacralists."

48. The MT has hnqMh; hahOh; lmse which is usually translated as "the seat of the image of jealousy, which provokes to jealousy." But the stem anq'/hnq' can also mean "to create," as well as "to acquire" and "to be zealous" (Gordon, 1965:

479). Thus, the Septuagint has ἡ στήλη τοῦ κτωμενου "the pillar of the purchaser" (as if הַקִּנְיָן הַמַּצֵּבָה were a doublet). I translate the phrase as "the image of the zealous Creatress."

49. Note also תְּוָרְכָז "male genitals" (Jastrow, 1903: 400) and the Arabic cognate ذكر (*ḏakar^{un}*) "the male organ of genera-tion, the penis " (Lane, 1867: 970). Compare I Kings 15:13 and II Chron 15:16, which speak of Asa's removing "the abominable image for Asherah" which his mother made (אֲשֶׁר־עָשְׂתָה לַאֲשֵׁרָה מִפְלֶצֶת . . . מַעֲכָה).

50. See Ford (1975: 234–235) for a brief survey of scholarly opinions on the identity of these virgins, whether they were symbolic for all Christians, or they were true "ascetics," or they were ritually pure soldiers surrounding the military Lamb-Lion. Allen (1920: II, 9) concluded that a "monkish inter-polator," probably John's editor, identified the 144,000 as male celibates rather than all of them being Christian females and males.

51. The twelfth book in the polemical treatise published be-tween 1380–1400 by Shem-Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut, en-titled אבן בוחן (*ʿeben boḥan > Eben Bohan*) meaning "The Touchstone," contains the entire Gospel of Matthew in He-brew. The critical edition of this Gospel has been published by George Howard, cited in the bibliography. In the preface to the Second Edition, Howard stated,

> The main thrust of this second edition is to demonstrate that the Hebrew Matthew contained in Shem-Tob's *Evan* (sic) *Bohan* predates the fourteenth century. In my judgment, Shem-Tob the polemist did not prepare this text by translating it from the Latin

Vulgate, the Byzantine Greek, or any other known edition of the Gospel of Matthew. He received it from previous generations of Jewish scribes and tradents

Here in this verse Shem Tob's *Matthew* adds "these are those who have not sinned" (ⱳⱥⱼ x al rXa ~h wl a).

52. Here Shem Tob's *Matthew* adds "who subdue their desire" (~rcy ta ~yXbwkX).

53. Among those who were able to act as though they were eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom were the Essenes, who were probably related to the community at Qumran. Josephus (*Jewish Wars* II: 8: 2) wrote,

> These Essenes reject pleasures as an evil, but esteem continence, and the conquest over our passions, to be virtue. They neglect wedlock, but choose out other persons children, while they are pliable, and fit for learning, and esteem them to be of their kindred, and form them according to their own manners. They do not absolutely deny the fitness of marriage, and the succession of mankind thereby continued; but they guard against the lascivious behavior of women, and are persuaded that none of them preserve their fidelity to one man.

54. See Chapter 31 "The Misreading which Led to Hate in Luke 14:26–27," in *Clarifying Baffling Biblical Passages*.

ADDENDUM

Katherine Bushnell's publication *God's Word to Women: 100 Bible Studies On Woman's Place in the Divine Economy*, first published in 1923, was republished in 1943 by Raymond Munson and is available in print and online [click HERE], thanks to the publishers of the *God's Word to Women* web page [click HERE]. It was a pioneering work which boldly challenged traditional male chauvinist interpretations of many biblical texts, especially Gen 3:16, which in the MT reads,.

%nrrhw>%nbbC.[i hBra; hBrh; rma' hV'ah'-la,
~ynb' ydll.Tebc,[B.
`%B'-l vmyl allhw>%tqllvT. %vyai-la>

KJV

Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire *shall be* to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

Septuagint

kai. th/ gunaiki. eipen plhqunwn plhqunw/ taj lupaj sou
kai. ton stenagmon sou en lupaij texh| tekna
kai. proj ton andra sou h` apostrofh, sou
kai. autoj sou kurieusei

And to the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy pains and thy groanings; in pain thou shalt bring forth children, and thy turning shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

Appealing in part to the translation of the Septuagint, Bushnell argued that this verse should be translated as, "*Unto the woman He said. 'A snare hath increased thy sorrow and thy sighing. . . . Thou art turning away to thy husband, and he*

shall rule over thee'" (italics added). However, Bushnell's translation of hBˌɾaˌ hBɾhˌ as "*A snare hath increased*" requires the deletion of one letter from hBˌɾaˌ hBɾhˌ The first word is an infinitive absolute used as an adverb of intensity for the second word, a verb of the same stem bbɾ meaning "to be great." Both are in the *Hiphᶜîl* (the causative stem) meaning "making great I will make great." To make hBˌɾaˌ hBɾhˌ mean "*a snare made great*" the final h of hBˌɾaˌ needs to be deleted. The h on the end of this word, if it is read as a noun or participle, makes it a feminine form. But the infinitive absolute, hBɾhˌ when read as a perfect form of the verb is a masculine singular. The serpent was also a masculine creature and would not be referred to by using a feminine participle. Thus, to make hbɾa refer to the serpent as *a snare* or *one-lying-in-wait* (a masculine participle or noun) the hbɾa would have to be corrected to bɾa. But for Bushnell any such "correction" would violate her view of the inerrancy of the text.

With reference to the word %nˌɾhwˌ "thy conception" in Gen 3:16, Bushnell stated (§ 121),

> This word ["conception"] is spelled in Hebrew HRN —but that is *not* the correct Hebrew way to spell "conception." The latter occurs, and correctly spelled, in Ruth 4:13 and Hosea 9:11, and nowhere else. The real word, "conception," as it occurs in the above passages, is spelled HRJWN. This word in Genesis comes two letters short of spelling the word. All Hebrew scholars know this. For instance, Spurrell says: "It is an abnormal formation which occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament." Our highest lexical authorities (Brown, Briggs

and Driver) call it a "contraction, or erroneous." Indeed! and
is one half the human family to be placed at the mercy of the
other half, on such a flimsy claim as this!

However, the MT %n**רהו** "thy conception" begins with the
conjunction **ו** "and." It ends with the suffix **%** "your / thy." In
between is the noun **!רהו**(HRN) "conception," which is from
the stem **הרה** "to conceive." There is no error in the text with
this word, as suggested in the Hebrew lexicon, for there were
two nouns in Hebrew meaning "conception," not just one. The
first, **!רהו**(HRN), fits the pattern clearly attested in the words

- **הֵאָג** and **!אָג**"/**!הֵאָג**"(BDB 144; Jastrow 202) "to rise up"
  and "exultation"

- **הרָּח** and **!רֹח**(BDB 354) "to burn with anger" and "burn-
  ing "anger," with the defective spelling appearing in Exod
  15:7, **^נֹרֹח]** "your anger" for the full spelling **^נֹארֹח]**.

In this pattern a **!** (the *nun* of the syllable *on*) was suffixed to
the stem to form a noun and at the same time the third letter
of the stem—the consonantal **י** (*yod*) of the original **יֹאג** and
ירֹח—disappeared completely. In the same way the third letter
of the original stem **ירה** "to conceive" disappeared complete-
ly, and as a result the noun became **!רה** "conception," just like
the **!אג** "exultation" and **!רֹח** "burning anger." The second
noun in Hebrew meaning "conception," based upon the stem
ירה/**הרה** was the **!אירהו**(HRJWN) which is found in the
Samaritan Pentateuch of Gen 3:16 and the MT of Job 9:17
and Psalm 139:11. In this "dialect" also a **!** (the *nun* of the
syllable *on*) was suffixed to the stem to form a noun but the

third letter of the stem—the consonantal י (*yod*) of the original ירה—was retained. Thus, there were the nouns הרֹן/ הרָאן "conception" and הֹיֹן/ הרָיֹן "conception."

As for translating והרֹנך "and thy conception" as "and thy sighing," Bushnell stated (§ 121):

> The Septuagint gives the correct reading here, which is, "*thy sighing*,"—the whole sentence meaning, then, "*A snare hath increased thy sorrow and thy sighing.*" Many ancient authorities agree with the Septuagint.

However, the Septuagint's <u>kai ton stenagmon sou</u> "and your sighs" is not a translation of הרה "to conceive" or its derivative nouns הרָיֹן and הרֹן. Rather, it is a translation of the stem רנן (BDB 943), noting especially the spelling רני "my cries (of joy)" in Psalm 32:7 and the רני "cry out (in anguish)" in Lam 2:19. The Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the Septuagint translators probably read רנך, but if it matched the MT, they read the ה of הרנך as a definite article which, as a rule, does not appear on a noun which has a possessive suffix.

The phrase ואל־אישך תשוקתך was translated by Bushnell (¶ 130–145) as "thou art turning away to thy husband," in agreement with twenty-one of twenty-eight ancient versions and translations of תשוקה (*tešûqâ*) as "turning" in Gen 3:16, 4:7, and Cant 7:10. However, in Gen 3:16 all of the translations and versions which have "turning" rather than "desire" are probably translating the word תשובה (*tešûbâ*) rather than the word תשוקה (*tešûqâ*). This difference reflects a scribal error in the Hebrew text tradition in which there was a mis-

reading of the original Hebrew q (*qoph*) in hqⅧvT. (*tešûqâ*) as a b (*beth*), which changed the word to hbⅧvT. (*tešûbâ*). This hbⅧvT. is from the root bⅧ "to turn back, to return, to repent." (The noun hbⅧvT. [*tešûbâ*)] for example appears in I Samuel 7:17.) Thus, the difference between "turning" or "desiring" was not a matter of two different ways in which hqⅧvT. (*tešûqâ*) was translated. Rather it was a matter of a scribal misreading in Hebrew of a q as a b which spread to various text traditions. (See Jastrow, 1903: 1540 and 1703.) The Arabic cognates of hqⅧvT. (*tešûqâ*) "desire" are ﺝ NH (*šawq^{un}*) "desire or longing of the soul," ÒòBS (*šâ^ciq^{un}*) "exciting one's desire of the soul," and ﻲ áH (*šayyiq^{un}*) "desirous long of the soul" (Lane, 1872: 1620).

The graphic similarity of the Aramaic atbⅧaT. (*ti^cubta^c*) "desire" and aΥbⅧaT. (*te^cubayya^c*) "returnee" (Jastrow, 1903: 1641) could be responsible for similar variants in the Aramaic Targums. Bushnell's claim (¶133) that the first phrase of the Vulgate's *et sub viri potestate eris et ipse dominabitur tui* ("and you shalt be under your husband's power, and he shall have dominion over you") is "mere guesswork; it is no translation of the original words," cannot be sustained in light of the Arabic cognate ﺝ ND (*sûq*) "to have the ruling or ordering in an affair" (Lane, 1872: 1471).

Bushnell also had doubts about the KJV text of Gen 3:15,

bq{' ⅧpⅧvT. hT'aꙊvaroᴼpⅧy>aⅧh

It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

auvtoj sou thrh,sei kefalhn
kai. su. thrh,seij autou/ pternan

He shall watch against your head,

and you shalt watch against his heel.

Vulgate

ipsa conteret caput tuum et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius
She shall crush your head,
and you shall watch-and-wait for her heel.

Here are her comments from ¶ 115–116,

> "Bruise" is an obscure word. . . . The sense "bruise," so unsuitable for the figure of a biting serpent, has been fixed upon on account of St. Paul's words, Romans 16:20, "*The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.*" But we have no proof that Paul meant to translate the word *shuph;* he may have meant merely to give the general sense of the phrase, as it relates to man's part, which is clear to us all, whatever *shuph* means.

> Some of the ancient versions translate, here, "lying in wait," or a kindred idea; and on the strength of this the R.V. gives us this as an alternative meaning in the margin. But this leaves the thought incomplete—to say merely that the "seed" will "lie in wait for his head." In that case, the seed of woman might in the end be defeated, while the real force of the prophecy is one of victory. No, *shuph* means something else, but we must leave the matter unsettled.

But there is really little obscurity here once it is recognized that the "bruise" in the KJV and ASV meant "crush," which was the meaning of "bruise" in Old English. The Greek sun-triþw, in Rom 16:20 means "to shatter, to shiver, to crush, to have one's head broken" (Liddell and Scott 1728–1729).

Moreover, there is now no uncertainty about (A) the meaning of @Ⅲⅴ, stems I, II, and III, and (B) @aⅴ', stems I and II. The by-forms @Ⅲⅴ and @aⅴ' are a perfect match for the same

type of variant by-forms with the following stems:

~aq'   ~llq   "standing, rising" (Jastrow 1306, 1331)

~ar'   ~llr   "to be high" (Jastrow 1437, 1460)

~ar'   ~yrf   "ox" (BDB 910; Jastrow 1437)

The verb @av', stem I, means "to gasp, to pant, to pant after, to long for" and @av', stem II, means "to crush, to trample upon" (BDB 983; Jastrow 1508). This @av', stem II, has the by-form @lv, stem II, "to crush, to grind," as well as the Old English definition "to bruise" (BDB 1003; KBS 4: 1446–1447).

The Hebrew @lv, stem I, "to cover, to adorn," comes in Psalm 139: 11, ynpwvy>%vx0%a; "surely the darkness covers me." This @lv, stem I, is a cognate of the Arabic فاص (*šûf*) "to cover, to adorn" (Lane 1872: [1619]). The Hebrew @lv, stem III, "to look, to see," is the cognate of the Arabic فاص (*šûf*) " to look down on, to see," with فاّص (*šawwâ f*) meaning "a sharp sighted man" (Lane 1872: [1619]). The Vulgate's *insidiaberis* "to watch-and-wait" and the Septuagint's thrh,sei . . . thrh,sej, "he shall watch . . . you shall watch," make sense once the Arabic فاص (*šûf*) "to see," the cognate of @lv, stem III, comes into focus.

Furthermore, the triyei/tribw "to bruise, to pound, to knead" in some Greek codices of 3:15 is obviously a translation of @av' stem II and/or @lv, stem II. Also the prostriyei "rubbing" in Aquila and the qliyei "rubbing" in Symmachus reflect this same meaning of @lv, stem II, much like the @av', stem II, in Amos 2:7,

~yLD; varB. #ra,-rp;[]-l [; ~ypiaVoh;
the ones panting after the dust of the earth
on the head of the poor

Septuagint

ta. patou/nta epi. ton cou/n thj ghj
kai. ekondu,lizon eij kefalaj ptwcw/n

the ones trampling on the dust of the earth,
and they have smitten upon the heads of the poor

Vulgate

qui conterunt super pulverem terrae capita pauperum
who crush upon the dust of the earth the heads of the poor.

Bushnell (¶ 167) maintained that Genesis 3, "rightly translated and interpreted, reveals to us the fact that lordship of the husband over the wife, which began when man sinned, was Satanic in origin." But she failed to explain how the *serpent*, which was hw"hy>hf'[' rv,a] hd,Fh; tY:x; lKomi ~Wr[' "the most crafty of all the beasts of the field which Yahweh had made," was transformed into the supra-earthly Satan. Moreover, Bushnell missed the best translation of two key phrases, namely, the ADg>n<K. rz<[e AL-Hf,[a, "I will make for him a *savior* as *his-front-one*" in Gen 2:18, and the %B'-l v;m.yI aWhw> "and he shall be just like you" in Gen 3:16 (see note 9 and pp. 2–15 above).

In commenting on I Cor 11:10, Bushnell (¶ 254–259) noted that a Valentinian cited by Clement of Alexandria was teaching that "*the woman ought to wear a power*." She argued that the reading of "veil" there as "power" was due to a confusion in Coptic of the nouns *ouershishi* (sic) "authority, power" and *ouershoun* (sic) "veil." She noted that fifteen Coptic manuscripts have the "power," whereas four or five have "veil."

However, there is little graphic or aural similarity between the Coptic erSiSi (*eršiši*) "power" and rS wn (*ršōn*) "veil," as spelled in Crum's *Coptic Dictionary*. It is also difficult to concur with her that a Coptic variant was responsible for the εχουσια "power" in all of the major Greek manuscripts.

The problems I Cor 11:10 with "veil" versus "authority" disappear once the s of εχουσια is removed from the word and the remaining six letters are recognized as a transliterated Aramaic loanword. The εχουσιαν appearing in all of the major Greek manuscripts needs to be corrected to εχουιαν and read as the loanword aYWska, "a covering," a variant of the well attested yWSKi (Jastrow 634, 652–653). (The prosthetic a of yWska, is analogous to the variant [Arza, in Job 31: 22 for [Arz> "arm" and is analogous to the Greek prosthetic εν with the variants εcqej and cqej "yesterday.") Using a loanword for an item of clothing is quite common, like the English *scarf* coming from the Old French *escherpe* and the English *gown* coming from the Late Latin *gunna* "a leather garment." For a more detailed study of I Cor 11:10, see pp. 55–58 of my book *Clarifying New Testament Aramaic Names & Words and the Shem Tob Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* (click here).

These criticisms of Bushnell's translations and her exegesis of Genesis 1–3 and Corinthians 11 are not made to undermine her agenda to expose the three millennia of biased male chauvinist interpretations which have erroneously deprecated women. Hopefully, now that her book is online and again in print, the corrections present in these notes will strengthen her arguments.