

should, especially in the light of how competing worldviews view women.

It is true that Adam named his wife Eve after the Fall, but that was the second time he named her. The first time was 2:23, where he named her “woman”. This is clearly an act of authority, just as God’s naming of mankind showed His authority over them (I agree with your point 2), and Adam’s naming of the animals showed his authority over them. But there are different types of authority, and I would say that Adam’s authority over the woman is not the same as God’s authority over mankind or Adam’s authority over the animals.

I believe the woman’s designation as *ezer* is very important; the NICOT section on that passage says that “it suggests that what God creates for Adam will correspond to him. Thus the new creation will be neither a superior nor an inferior, but an equal.” I believe that the full ontological equality of men and women is very important, and frankly the only Christian position possible. This means that women are as fully human as men, they share all human rights that men possess, etc.

Now the question is: can subordination happen between ontological equals? And the answer is a resounding yes. We see it in work relationships. I may work for my boss, which involves some subordination (or I wouldn’t be employed for long!), but does that mean I am not ontologically equal to him? Of course not; no one argues that. It’s a somewhat similar situation in the Godhead; Jesus, God the Son, is eternally subordinated to the Father’s will, but we affirm His ontological equality to the Father (of course, some egalitarians would argue that Jesus’ submission to the Father was limited to His incarnation. I do not believe this to be a plausible position based on the biblical evidence). Subordination in and of itself need not be degrading, and true complementarians speak out against degradation in subordination as much as egalitarians.

I believe Genesis 3:16 refers to a distortion of the subordination already shown in Adam’s naming his wife

“woman.” Golovin’s interpretation of “desire” is plausible.

Nowhere in the Bible is the husband told to submit to his wife, but wives are clearly told to submit to their husbands. Ephesians 5:21 cannot be read apart from the following verses: husbands are rather to sacrificially love their wives, not submit to them. This means that husbands are to exercise their authority over their wives for their good, not to lord it over them and demean them. There is also a parallel in Colossians 3:18–19, without any hint of mutual submission. In Christian marriages, especially, when the marriage relationship comes close to what God intended all along, both partners are better off than either would be alone.

Regarding women’s roles in the church, it is clear from the New Testament that women prophesied: Paul does not restrict them from prophesying, but instead tells the married women to wear their head coverings while they do so, and that they are to do so in an orderly fashion—he regulates the practice, he doesn’t forbid it. It is hard to reconstruct exactly what women’s roles were in the early church. This is because a lot of the words that became technical terms—*diakonos* or deacon, for example, hadn’t fully developed in NT times. Sometimes *diakonos* has the technical meaning of “deacon” and sometimes it clearly only means “servant” or “helper” in a general sense. So if someone is going to argue there were, for example, female deacons, it would require proving that *diakonos* in that context has the technical meaning of deacon. Also, church structures were much different in the early church than they are today. So we can say that women prophesied, but what is the analogous role today? And if there is a role which women were prohibited from having in the early church, what is that role today? Much of the egalitarian/complementarian debate is precisely over these questions.

Lita Cosner  
Deerfield, IL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## The Bible’s high view of women—letter 3

I respectfully accept the author’s argumentation, while I still have some reservations on two points:

“It is true that Adam named his wife Eve after the Fall, but that was the second time he named her. The first time was 2:23, where he named her ‘woman’.”

- 1) We do encounter in the Bible situations when someone gets a new name, but Genesis 3:20 says nothing about the change or replacement of the name.
- 2) The wife is called “wife”/“female person” (Heb.—*ishshah*) in Genesis 2:22 already, so man is not the first one who came up with that concept.
- 3) Genesis 2:23 says about calling (*niphal*) vs calling (*qal*) name in 3:20. The (sort of) sacred concept of name (Heb. *shem*—same as for reputation, fame or glory).

Therefore I would suggest that man in 2:23 actually just recognizes who woman is—the same type of person, but of the opposite sex. He applies to her the same word he calls (not names) himself (*ish*), but in feminine gender (*ishshah*).

“Nowhere in the Bible is the husband told to submit to his wife.”

To use the word “nowhere” one should exclude Ephesians 5:21 from the Bible. However that, I am afraid, is the hardest issue to discuss in the area of semantic nuances of the concepts of submission, subordination, authority recognition etc. in Greek, Hebrew (which impacts Greek semantics in Paul’s writing), English and Russian (the language in which my understanding of the concepts is rooted) with no actual direct equivalents (semantic approximations only).

Even in ancient Greek the words had multiple semantic fields allowing the writer to play with them. As the Online Bible Greek lexicon states on “*hupotasso*”. (“In non-military use, it was a voluntary attitude of giving in,

cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden”).

So I believe the following instructions in 5:22–6:9 tells exactly how to assume responsibilities and carry each other’s burdens (cf. Gal 6:2) in the husbands/wives, masters/slaves and parent/children tandems.

Sergei L. Golovin  
Simferopol, Crimea  
UKRAINE

### Lita Cosner replies:

It is true that sometimes people like to take a biblical teaching to either one extreme or the other; it’s important for people on both sides to realize that there are passages that challenge their own view. Of course, I agree that any biblical view of gender issues has to take the Fall into account; whatever they were like before the Fall, they were seriously impacted by Adam’s sin.

Genesis 3:20 does not say anything about a change of a name, but it was not unheard of for people in that day to have more than one name; for instance, God named Solomon Jedidiah, but it did not replace his original name (2 Samuel 12:24–25). Genesis 2:22 may simply be referring to the woman by the name Adam would call her later; perhaps she had no name at all before Adam named her. I’m not saying that Golovin’s interpretation is absolutely untenable; but this is how I interpret it from a more complementarian point of view; I would argue that 2:23 is a classical naming formula. It’s an imperative, not a declarative statement, and has a reason for her being named.

I was certainly not excluding Ephesians 5:21 from the Bible, but saying that when it is taken in context, it reads like this: “Submit to one another: wives to husbands, children to parents, and slaves to masters.” There is no indication that husbands are to submit to their wives, parents to their children, or masters to their slaves. The context must inform the interpretation, and that means that to

get what 5:21 is saying, one needs to read the whole section from 5:21 to 6:9 (this is one of the places that proves the chapter breaks were definitely not inspired!). The revolutionary thing about this passage is that husbands are told to love their wives, fathers are told not to exasperate their children, and masters are entreated to treat their slaves well because they are slaves of God. The wives, children, and slaves were simply being told to do what their society already demanded of them; husbands, fathers, and masters were being told to take a radical new step in their treatment of those “under” them.

Lita Cosner  
Deerfield, IL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## Colorado Plateau sandstones derived from the Appalachians?

Mike Oard recently published an article discussing the uniformitarian idea that many sandstone members and formations found in the American Southwest were possibly sourced from the Appalachian Mountains.<sup>1</sup> His support for this idea is not completely firm due to the reliance on the radiometric ages of zircons within the sandstones. However, if this concept can be supported by other evidence, then he may be right that the Genesis Flood offers a better explanation for the transport of the original sands across North America.

I published an article on this same topic<sup>2</sup> in this same journal several years ago and I came to the same conclusion:

... if the sandstones can be linked to the Appalachian Mountains by greater evidence than the radiometric dating of zircons. The sheer size and lateral extent of the Navajo Sandstone is best interpreted within the context of the Flood. Sedimentary material derived from the uplifting

Appalachian Mountains may have been transported, sorted and deposited in massive sandstone layers during the Middle Flood Division of the Flood Event Timeframe. The Navajo Sandstone would then testify to the power and energy of the Genesis Flood.<sup>3</sup>

The concept of transcontinental transport of geologic materials is not new. This topic is certainly worth investigating, and the articles are valuable as an object lesson for all of us. However, authors need to be careful to cite prior work. It is now easier to find such prior work with the availability of search engines such as <<http://bryancore.org/celd/index.html>> [and <<http://www.creationeducation.org/cer/search.asp?offset=1>>].

Carl R. Froede Jr.  
Snellville, GA

United States of America

### References

- 1 Oard, M.J., Colorado Plateau sandstones derived from the Appalachians? *Journal of Creation* 23(3):5–7, 2009.
- 2 Froede, C.R., Jr., Eroded Appalachian Mountain siliciclastics as a source for the Navajo Sandstone, *TJ (Journal of Creation)* 18(2):3–5, 2004.
- 3 Froede, ref. 2, p. 3.

## The evolution of the horse

Todd Wood recently commented on my *Journal of Creation* article<sup>1</sup>, as a study of “bad scholarship”<sup>2</sup>. I will briefly refer here to some of his points.

Comment one by Wood:

“There are two ‘evolutionary gaps’ in the horse series.

As far as ‘evolutionary gaps’ go, he never defines what they are or how to recognize them. To support his claim of ‘evolutionary gaps,’ he cites papers by MacFadden, who would (probably passionately) disagree with the idea that there are real, hard gaps in the evolution of the horse.”