

February 28, 2024
Homily Manuscript

Genesis 3 (NIV)

¹ Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, “Did God really say, ‘You must not eat from any tree in the garden?’”

² The woman said to the serpent, “We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden, ³ but God did say, ‘You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.’”

⁴ “You will not certainly die,” the serpent said to the woman. ⁵ “For God knows that when you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”

⁶ When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it. ⁷ Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves.

⁸ Then the man and his wife heard the sound of the Lord God as he was walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and they hid from the Lord God among the trees of the garden. ⁹ But the Lord God called to the man, “Where are you?”

¹⁰ He answered, “I heard you in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; so I hid.”

¹¹ And he said, “Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree that I commanded you not to eat from?”

¹² The man said, “The woman you put here with me—she gave me some fruit from the tree, and I ate it.”

¹³ Then the Lord God said to the woman, “What is this you have done?”

The woman said, “The serpent deceived me, and I ate.”

¹⁴ So the Lord God said to the serpent, “Because you have done this,

“Cursed are you above all livestock
and all wild animals!

You will crawl on your belly
and you will eat dust

all the days of your life.

¹⁵ And I will put enmity
between you and the woman,
and between your offspring and hers;
he will crush your head,
and you will strike his heel.”

¹⁶ To the woman he said,
“I will make your pains in childbearing very
severe;
with painful labor you will give birth to
children.

Your desire will be for your husband,
and he will rule over you.”

¹⁷ To Adam he said, “Because you listened to your wife and ate fruit from the tree about which I commanded you, ‘You must not eat from it,’

“Cursed is the ground because of you;
through painful toil you will eat food from it
all the days of your life.

¹⁸ It will produce thorns and thistles for you,
and you will eat the plants of the field.

¹⁹ By the sweat of your brow
you will eat your food
until you return to the ground,
since from it you were taken;
for dust you are
and to dust you will return.”

²⁰ Adam named his wife Eve, because she would become the mother of all the living.

²¹ The Lord God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed them. ²² And the Lord God said, “The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever.” ²³ So the Lord God banished him from the Garden of Eden to work the ground from which he had been taken. ²⁴ After he drove the man out, he placed on the east side of the Garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life.

Interpreting Genesis 3:16

So tonight we’re going to continue with our homily series on topics suggested by you, parishioners, by examining Genesis 3:16 and how best to interpret it. And we’ll also get into how to understand a few elements from surrounding verses. But the NIV has translated verse 16, thus:

Genesis 3:16 (NIV)

¹⁶ To the woman (God) said,
 “I will make your pains^a in childbearing^b very severe;
 with painful labor^c you will give birth^d to children.
 Your desire^e will be for your husband,
 and he will rule^f over you.”

a. Hebrew *ʾiṣṣāḇôn* - pain, labor, hardship, sorrow, toil

b. Hebrew *hērāyôn* - physical conception, pregnancy, conception

c. Hebrew *ʿēṣeb* - pain, hurt, toil, sorrow, labor, hardship; pain; hurt, offense; toil, hardship

d. Hebrew *yālad* - can refer to the act of giving birth or more broadly to begetting, raising, rearing children

e. Hebrew *təšūqâ* - desire, craving, either sexually or to devour (figuratively)

f. Hebrew *māšal* - to rule over

This verse concerns a woman’s relationship to bearing children, but also the relationship of women to men, which is a highly debated topic in the Church. Just to lay it out for you briefly, one position is called Complementarianism, which asserts that while women and men are of equal value, God has assigned them specific gender roles. Specifically, it promotes men's headship or authority over women, while encouraging women's submission.¹ The other position is often called Egalitarianism, though I prefer the term Mutualism. This belief affirms that women and men are different but equal and that correct interpretations of St. Paul teaches the mutual submission between husband & wife ecclesial and does not restrict women from any roles or offices in the Church.²

Now, tonight Genesis 3:16 will have us thinking more about marriage than church leadership. But I should disclose that, on both counts, the dominant theological view in our diocese is complementarianism, and it may even be the majority view in our parish, though I would argue that many people who identify as theologically complementarian are not actually complementarian in practice in their marriages.³ And this is largely because many married couples discover that a relationship where they function as equals work a whole lot better. But because complementarian doctrine remains the

¹ Kevin Giles defines complementarianism a little more startlingly, writing, “Complementarians teach that in creation before the fall, God set the man over the woman and thus the hierarchical ordering of the sexes is God-given, good, and can never change. Men and women are not equal in any substantive sense; men are to rule over women; women are to be submissive...The title of David Pawson’s book, *Leadership is Male*, [Pawson, *Leadership is Male*.] captures accurately what complementarians believe: men are to lead, women submit, the patriarchal principle.”

[Kevin Giles, *The Headship of Men and the Abuse of Women: Are They Related In Any Way?*, Cascade: Eugene, OR, 2020.]

² Giles defines “Evangelical Egalitarianism” as holding that “the Bible clearly makes the substantial equality of the sexes the God-given ideal. They hold that in creation before the fall, God bestowed on the man and the woman the same status, dignity, and leadership ability (Gen 1:27–28); the rule of the man over the woman is entirely a consequence of the fall (Gen 3:16), and is thus an expression of sin, and this is exactly what Jesus believed.”

³ Giles notes this: “In today’s world, a “happy marriage” is by definition a profoundly equal relationship. Some honest complementarian leaders admit that they have fully equal marriages, and that most complementarian couples have such equal marriages! [This is the substance of Moore’s article, “After Patriarchy, What?” He is a dogmatic complementarian.] Russell Moore, the Southern Baptist leader, says that most Christian marriages, including those who call themselves complementarians, are “pragmatically egalitarian.” In these marriages, headship teaching has been emptied of “its authoritative character.” [Moore, “After Patriarchy, What?,” 573.] The Sydney Anglican theologian and defender of the complementarian position, Michael Jensen, speaking specifically of fellow complementarian clergy in Sydney, says all their “marriages are remarkably egalitarian.” [Jensen, *Sydney Anglicanism*, 140.] This he sees as highly commendable! But whether or not complementarians openly confess that in most cases their marriages are profoundly equal, one cannot miss the fact that if a couple obviously have a happy and mutually rewarding marriage it is largely an equal one, and if the marriage is fraught very often the husband is seeking to exert his power over his wife—or she over him. What this means is that even in churches where male headship is frequently preached, claiming this is “what the Bible clearly teaches,” most of the marriages are fully equal relationships. Couples hear this teaching, but it is not how they operate. [Kevin Giles, *The Headship of Men and the Abuse of Women: Are They Related In Any Way?*]

dominant teaching in Western Christianity, many Christian couples do espouse it despite functionally only giving lip service to it. And it continues to hold sway because many read St Paul as advocating for the headship of men and the submission of women. And I almost chose to address such a passage, like 1 Corinthians 11, tonight, but I actually covered it in my crowd-sourced homily on 2 Timothy 2 back in 2021.⁴

So this is some background for the second half of Genesis 3:16 tonight, which is where I want to begin tonight. We're going to sort of go through verse 16 in reverse, as I want to start with the final clause of verse 16, where the writer of Genesis says that a woman's husband will "rule over" her. The question about this line is over whether God is being *prescriptive* here or *descriptive*. As Nathan Morales puts it, is God "saying that men should dominate women, or that this will be their tendency?"⁵ And to answer it requires that we zoom out and look at the larger context where this verse appears in Genesis chapter 3. Tonight, the lector read all of chapter 3.

- And the chapter begins in verses 1-7 describing humankind's fall into sin. As a result of Adam & Eve's sin in the Garden of Eden: eating the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good & Evil, which God had commanded them not to eat in chapter 2.⁶ And once they have done this, verse 7 says their eyes were opened and they were suddenly ashamed of being naked, and made clothes for themselves out of fig leaves.
- Next, in verses 8-13, the Lord confronts Adam & Eve about what they have done.
- And then God follows this by pronouncing what some have labeled as God cursing the serpent and the woman and the man for rebelling against His command. And this label of curse is not inappropriate, so long as we're clear that in the Bible a curse should not be understood like a hex, but rather as a removal of God's blessing.⁷ During their time in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve (and the serpent for that matter) had enjoyed certain graces or blessings from God, which they would not enjoy as they move forward in life outside of the Garden. So, another way to think about this section is that God is revealing what the consequences of the Fall into sin will be.
- Then finally, the chapter concludes with Adam naming Eve (v20), God making them better clothes out of animal skin (v21), but also God banishing them from the Garden of Eden, where they would no longer have access to the Tree of Life (v22-24). Remember from chapter 2 that there were two significant trees in the middle of the garden: the Tree of the Knowledge of Good & Evil, which they were not to eat from, *and* the Tree of Life,⁸ which has traditionally been understood that eating from the Tree of Life is what gave Adam & Eve immortality.⁹

⁴ See https://www.saintmatthiasoakdale.com/files/ugd/8c239b_b7cf97b44cc04685b91ad5d9dc4ad558.pdf

For an excellent, short, and accessible book on understanding "headship" and head coverings in 1 Corinthians 11, check out Lucy PEppiat's *Unveiling Paul's Women: Making Sense of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16* (Cascade: 2018) from Amazon ([link](#)) or Hoopla ([link](#)).

⁵ Nathan Morales, "Women in Ministry: Genesis 3:16," <https://gospelgeeks.net/women-ministry-genesis-316/>

⁶ Genesis 2:16-17 - ¹⁶ And the Lord God commanded the man, "You are free to eat from any tree in the garden; ¹⁷ but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat from it you will certainly die."

⁷ To bless someone is to put that person under God's protection, enjoying God's favor. To curse is to remove from God's protection and favor. It does not mean putting a hex on something or changing its character or nature by magical or mystical means. It does not mean to bewitch or put a spell on something. One of the clearest examples is in David's speech to Saul in 1 Samuel 26:19. If men have incited Saul against David, David declares them "cursed" (i.e., to be deprived of God's favor, blessing, and protection) because they have deprived him of God's favor (share in the Lord's inheritance) and protection (his Presence)[Walton, J. H. (2001). Genesis (p. 229). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.]

⁸ Genesis 2:9

⁹ Particularly since God promises Adam & Eve that if they eat of the forbidden fruit they will die (Gen 2:17, see footnote above) and the Tree of Life makes a reappearance in the final chapter of Revelation: "Then the angel showed me the river of the water of life, as clear as crystal, flowing from the throne of God

So verse 16, which we are focusing on, follows Adam & Eve's fall into sin and God confronting them about it. And it appears in the section of verses 14 to 19 where God is laying out the consequences - for the serpent, woman, and man - of their rebellion against God. And you'll note that not a single thing God says in this section - 14 through 19 - will improve or make better the circumstance of the one God is speaking about, whether God's talking to the snake or the woman or the man. And so, verse 16 is best understood as God explaining some consequences for women of humanity's fall into sin. And this final line of the verse in particular is describing how one consequence of the fall will be patriarchy: that men will sinfully assert their generally superior strength to subjugate their wives.

Now, some complementarians argue that the Hebrew word for *rule* here (*māšal*) must refer to a *harsh* rule: that it is not man ruling over a woman that is a consequence of sin, but a man ruling over woman *harshly*. But, as Philip Payne points out: there are a lot of words in Hebrew for "rule" and some of them refer to harsh rule; and God could have chosen one of those words if that's what was meant, but instead God (or the writer of Genesis) chose the Hebrew word *māšal*, which never connotes harshness.¹⁰ Meanwhile, some even read verse 20, where Adam gives Eve her name, something God had given him the right to do over animals back before the fall in chapter 2 (vv19-20) as Adam's first act of exercising sinful dominion over his wife.

Now, you may wonder why it really matters what Christians think about whether the relationship between men and women is hierarchical, particularly if it is true that many Complementarians actually function as equals in their marriages? Well, limiting this question to the dynamics of marriage, and leaving church leadership to the side tonight, one of the main reasons I want to suggest it matters enormously concerns domestic abuse. "Research has consistently found that men who hold traditional, hierarchical views about gender roles and relationships are more likely to perpetuate violence against women."¹¹ A 2015 study showed that, "The main drivers of partner violence are gender related norms and hierarchies that shape relationships between men and women."^{12 13} So even if complementarian beliefs seems benign or even like a blessing in your experience, the statistics indicate that these ideas are giving

and of the Lamb² down the middle of the great street of the city. On each side of the river stood the tree of life, bearing twelve crops of fruit, yielding its fruit every month. And the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations" (Rev 22:1-2, NIV).

¹⁰ Philip B. Payne, *The Bible vs Biblical Womanhood*, IVP: 2023.

¹¹ "Change the Story," 25 from Giles

¹² Heise and Kotsadam, "Cross-National and Multilevel Correlates of Partner Violence," 336. [Giles: "This is put as a thesis to be tested. It is found correct by the research."]

¹³ Many Complementarians take issue with this assertion, but employ faulty thinking to do so, as Giles explains:

In answer to the argument that patriarchal beliefs are the foundational "cause" of domestic abuse and violence, critics point out that in modern Western societies, with their ever-growing gender equality, domestic abuse and violence remain pervasive, possibly on the increase. The Nordic countries are often cited. In these countries gender equality is pursued rigorously—they are sometimes called "gender equal utopias"—yet domestic abuse and violence hover around 30 percent—higher than the European average of 22 percent, the United States average of 24 percent, and the Australian average of 25 percent. [Hill, See What You Made Me Do, 128.] There is not a great difference in these numbers, and certainly the statistics are approximations, but what is clear is that an increase in gender equality appears to push up abuse statistics. Complementarians incessantly note this fact, arguing that it proves that gender inequality is not the cause of domestic abuse and violence. [In an addendum at the end of this book, "Headship Teaching Does Not Encourage or Legitimate Domestic Abuse," I list and answer the various arguments complementarians use to deflect any suggestion that headship teaching could encourage churchgoing men to be abusive or violent. In this, I again point out why the emancipation of women may at first increase abuse.] This is not a compelling argument. We should expect

- violence against women to increase when men feel their power and control is slipping away.
- the empowerment of women to make men in patriarchal cultures, and needy and controlling men in Western egalitarian cultures, more anxious about their status.
- some men to feel their masculinity is being threatened when women act independently and assertively. [Hill, See What You Made Me Do, 8, calls this a "backlash" against women's empowerment.
- a male backlash against the emancipation of women.

In migrant communities that have come from patriarchal cultures to Australia, and to other Western countries, we see examples of what I have just argued. The new freedoms that women find in their new culture often lead to their abuse as their husbands sense their power over them is under threat.

many abusers cover and even divine justification for the mistreatment of their wife.^{14 15} And there are still 603 million women living *today* in countries where domestic violence is not considered a crime. Much more needs to be done.¹⁶ #

But returning to verse 16, the consequences of the fall in the marriage relationships will not only be to the fault of men. If the final line of verse 16 describes man's impulse toward patriarchy (of a husband exercising his power or strength to control his wife), this same lens should inform how we read the line before it, as well, where God tells the woman: "Your desire will be for your husband." The ancient Hebrew word there is *təšûqâ* (pronounced tesh-oo-kaw'). Now, understand: there is no 4,000 year old dictionary for Ancient Hebrew. The only way we know what a Hebrew word means is by considering the different contexts where it appears in scripture. And *təšûqâ* here only appears three times in *all* of the Hebrew scriptures: here, in Genesis 4:7, and in Song of Solomon 7:10. Well, the word is used in Song of Solomon in a positive sense of describing sexual desire of a husband toward a wife.¹⁷ But that use does not fit with the context of chapter 3, again these are all negative consequences of sin. The better reference occurs just a chapter later in Genesis, chapter 4, which is the story of Cain & Abel.¹⁸ There, *tesh-oo-kaw'* is used to describe sin's desire to control or manipulate Cain into doing something evil, which he eventually does in verse 8: killing his brother. And so, the better way to understand this word translated desire in 3:16 is that the woman will desire to control or manipulate her husband.¹⁹ So this second half of verse 16 would be saying that, as a result of sin, a woman will desire to control and manipulate her husband and men will be tempted to rule over their wives. So, Genesis scholar Derek Kidner summarizes this second half of the verse as describing (quote) "a marriage relationship in which control has slipped from the fully personal realm to that of instinctive urges."²⁰ The temptation for both husbands and wives will be to seek to control one another, to engage the relationship with power rather than sacrificial love.

So in the second half of verse 16, God describes what the primary consequence of sin will be on the marriage relationship, but in the first half of the verse, God describes what the primary consequence of sin will be on humanity's capacity to reproduce, but perhaps not in the way it seems at first glance.

¹⁴ Giles: "Abusive men in the community at large, who are not church attenders, must make up excuses for their awful behavior. Men who are regular church attenders, especially those well-versed in complementarian teaching, can, and frequently do, appeal to the Bible to justify their behavior. They feel they are acting in a way pleasing to God. They are asserting their authority as real men. Their wives should respect them and do as they expect. If wives do not, then the husband needs to remind them that they are rejecting "the clear teaching of Scripture." This "biblical" justification of abuse gives to the Christian abuser power that the non-churchgoer abuser can never have. The Christian abuser believes he has divine approval for the way he acts in his home. This is why headship teaching is so damaging for many churchgoing men and women."

¹⁵ A compelling read is "If I Were an Abuser, What Church Would I Want to Attend?" by Nancy Murphy: <https://andrewjbauman.com/abuserchurch/>

¹⁶ "Commission on the Status of Women 2013"

<https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/csw57-stop-violence-against-women#:~:text=More%20than%20125%20countries%20have.more%20needs%20to%20be%20done>

¹⁷ Song of Solomon 7:10 - *I am my beloved's, and his desire (təšûqâ) is for me.* (NRSVA)

¹⁸ Genesis 4:4b-7 - And the Lord had regard for Abel and his offering,⁵ but for Cain and his offering he had no regard. So Cain was very angry, and his countenance fell.⁶ The Lord said to Cain, 'Why are you angry, and why has your countenance fallen?'⁷ If you do well, will you not be accepted? And if you do not do well, sin is lurking at the door; its desire (təšûqâ) is for you, but you must master it.'⁸ Cain said to his brother Abel, 'Let us go out to the field.' And when they were in the field, Cain rose up against his brother Abel and killed him. (NRSV)

¹⁹ Alternatively, Walton has argued this ties to the first half of the verse and refers to a woman's sexual desire for her husband's ability to provide offspring for her [Morales]. I disagree.

²⁰ [Derek Kidner, Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary (Downer's Grove: Inter-varsity Press, 1967), 71.]

¹⁶ To the woman he (God) said,
 “I will make your pains in childbearing very severe;
 with painful labor you will give birth to children.

The NIV seems to translate this first half of verse 16 as being about the event of *childbirth itself* being painful for the mother. Now, of course, giving birth to a child is extremely painful for a woman; no one is debating that. But is that what this scripture is about?

You see, if it is, certain questions come up pretty quickly. The reason women have pain in childbirth is anatomical; it's caused by the large size of the human infant's head and the small size of the adult woman's birth canal.²¹ So, are we to assume that Eve was anatomically different prior to the Fall? Surely not.

But if you're someone like me, who believes in human evolution and that the story of Adam & Eve wasn't about the first ever humans, but instead about God specially creating or choosing two humans to bring the rest of the human race into relationship with Himself - you can learn more about this in my class, Adam & Eve & Evolution on the website²² - for those who affirm evolution then the NIV's translation here is even *more* problematic. Because evolution indicates that for millions of years there have been animals - including what eventually evolved into human beings - and while the process of giving birth is not painful for all animals, it is painful for some.²³

But this, again, is where some Hebrew word study becomes very important, because it is actually well established that the Hebrew word being translated here as “childbearing” is actually the word for “conception”. In fact, Old Testament scholar, John Walton, definitively states: “This cannot be viewed as an imposition of labor pains.”²⁴ Walton explains that “despite NIV's translation, ‘childbearing’, the Hebrew word in this first line is specifically concerned with conception, not with giving birth. Interpreters have understandably had trouble working out how conception is painful.” Moreover, he explains that “the noun translated “pains” [in childbearing] in NIV in the first line of Genesis 3:16, *iššabon* (pronounced *its-tsaw-bone*'), is used only two other times in the OT,”²⁵ and the root produces other Hebrew words that most often express grief and worry, and *not* physical pain.²⁶

Meanwhile, the word for painful labor in the second line - *‘ēšeb* (pronounced *eh'-tseb*) - often refers to pain associated with strenuous work, but this certainly doesn't refer exclusive to the labor pains of giving birth.²⁷ Well, without getting too much further into the linguistic weeds here: this first half of

²¹ “Why hasn't evolution made human childbirth easier?” <https://bigthink.com/health/childbirth-painful/>

²² <https://www.saintmatthiasoakdale.com/2023aee>

²³ See this fun video: <https://www.businessinsider.com/most-extreme-births-in-animal-kingdom-2018-7>

Or the much more technical:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8532935/#:~:text=Based%20on%20the%20several%20similarities.admitted%20as%20a%20painful%20process.>

²⁴ “Pain in Childbearing (Hebrew Corner 8)” by John H. Walton, <https://zondervanacademic.com/blog/pain-in-childbe> October 17, 2008

²⁵ Gen 3:17 and 5:29, where the word's translation is almost equally debatable.

²⁶ Walton: “Other nouns from the same root (*‘ēšeb* II, *‘oššeb* II, and *‘aššebet*) refer to pain, agony, hardship, worry, nuisance and anxiety. The verbal root (*‘šb* II) occurs in a wide range of stems with a semantic range that primarily expresses grief and worry...What is important to note about this profile is that the root is not typically used to target physical pain, but mental or psychological anguish (though physical pain may accompany or be the root cause of the anguish).”

²⁷ See other instances of *‘ēšeb* in Genesis 3:16, Psalms 127:2, Proverbs 5:10; Proverbs 10:22; Proverbs 14:23; Proverbs 15:1, Jeremiah 22:28

verse 16 is probably best understood as referring to anxiety around conceiving and raising children. And the case for this is strengthened when we consider what God promised would happen if they ate from the forbidden tree and then how chapter 3 concludes. God had promised in Genesis chapter 2 that eating of the forbidden fruit would result in death and in the final two verses of Genesis 3, God would banish Adam & Eve from the Garden of Eden and from access to the Tree of Life that gave them immortality.

You see, now that sin and death have become part of the equation of having children, God is saying that the prospect of having children will now be infused with an anxiety: about whether the child will survive childbirth and whether the mother will survive childbirth, not to mention the anxiety of raising children and what sin will do to them. Remember, in the very next chapter - Genesis 4 - we read about how Eve's firstborn son, Cain, will murder his brother, Abel.

So, where the second half of verse 16 described the primary consequences of sin for the marriage relationship, the first half explains its consequence for procreation. So, Walton explains that God's blessing to humanity from Genesis 1 to be fruitful and multiply,²⁸ that blessing is still intact, but with the consequence of sin - the blessings of Eden *are* removed - and therefore the blessing of "be fruitful and multiply" will be experienced differently.

Indeed, the same goes for the curse on man in verses 17 to 19. There, God says,

"Cursed is the ground because of you;
through painful toil you will eat food from it
all the days of your life.

¹⁸ It will produce thorns and thistles for you,
and you will eat the plants of the field.

¹⁹ By the sweat of your brow
you will eat your food...

It's not that there were never thorns or thistles on earth; there just hadn't been thorns or thistles in Eden, which God had specially blessed with plant life that was good for eating. God caused fruit trees to spring/be brought forth from the ground in Gen 2:9. But now, outside of Eden, Adam & Eve will have the burden of dealing with weeds.²⁹

Discussion Questions (with 2 or 3 or 4 people around you)

1. Is there something that stands out to you most about this teaching on Genesis 3:16 as either clarifying, confusing, conflicting, or convicting?

2. Does it make sense to you that in communities that believe men are privileged and should be in charge and women submissive, a much higher percentage of women are abused?³⁰ Why or why not? (please be mindful of the sensitive nature of this topic as you discuss)

²⁸ Genesis 1:28 *God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.'*

²⁹ "...where God caused fruit trees to spring/be brought forth from the ground in Gen 2:9. In a reversal of this now the ground would see weeds spring out (the Hebrew is the same)."

["Gen 3:17-19 thorns and thistles?" <https://christadelphiansoriginsdiscussion.wordpress.com/2020/07/14/gen-317-19-thorns-and-thistles/>]

³⁰ Scot McKnight, "Complementarianism and the Abusive Male,"

<https://www.christianitytoday.com/scot-mcknight/2020/july/complementarianism-and-abusive-male.html>