

Can the New Testament be blamed for unfair discrimination or domination in modern societies?



Author:

Elma M. Cornelius¹ 

Affiliation:

¹School of Christian Ministry, Faculty of Theology, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa

Corresponding author:

Elizabeth Cornelius,
elma.cornelius@nwu.ac.za

Dates:

Received: 21 Feb. 2022

Accepted: 12 Apr. 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

How to cite this article:

Cornelius, E.M., 2022, 'Can the New Testament be blamed for unfair discrimination or domination in modern societies?', *In die Skriflig* 56(1), a2848. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v56i1.2848>

Copyright:

© 2022. The Authors.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

Read online:



Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

For many Christians the word *patriarchy* became an offensive word as it is seen as a system 'created by men to serve men' with men in positions of domination, creating a social system that 'left women as victims'. Patriarchy hurts society in many ways – it creates the opportunity for violence, rape, it suppresses women, deprives women of freedom of choice, and creates identity crises for both men and women as it steals humankind's freedom to choose their roles to be played in society. Who or what is to be blamed for the eternalisation of patriarchy throughout history? As religion is one of the most important agents of socialisation and social control, playing a significant role in organising and directing social life, the underlying patriarchy in the New Testament is very often blamed for inequality in our societies.

Contribution: This article focussed on the question who or what was to be blamed for discrimination and domination in societies. It contributed by arguing that both 'male-dominion' and 'equality of men and women' are portrayed in the New Testament. It was claimed that with resistance to patriarchy came the challenge on how to interpret the Bible and that it was all about hermeneutics. It seemed as if the New Testament as such was not to be blamed for the reinforcement of patriarchy in our modern societies, but the interpretation of the New Testament. The author therefore pleaded for a hermeneutics with a focus on all three elements in the process of communication, namely author and background, text and the reader. A method with a focus on all elements in the process of communication was used as an example of how it could be done, without being caught in over-contextualisation and the distortion of the biblical message.

Keywords: patriarchy; New Testament; hermeneutics; discrimination; domination.

Introduction

'Patriarchy symbolizes male domination' (Singh 2016:27). In ancient societies, patriarchy was a social organisation in which the *pater* played the main role (Cornelius 2002:53). Wolmarans (2012:59) refers to the 'embedded inequality between male and female' in this social organisation and Malina (2002:38) mentions women being 'relegated to the periphery of society'.

For many Christians, the word *patriarchy* became offensive. 'Patriarchy is toxic', says Fradet (2018), it 'makes rape, sexual violence, or romantic manipulation not only possible, but rather a normal, expected occurrence for many people'. Daly (1985:4) defines patriarchy as a system 'created by men to serve men' with men in positions of domination, creating a social system that 'left women as victims'. According to Daly (1985:8, 15), our societal structures are infected by patriarchy, and we need to rid ourselves of 'oppressively patriarchal gender roles and gender stereotypes that affect all of humanity'.

Patriarchy hurts society in many ways – it creates the opportunity for violence, rape, it suppresses women, deprives women of freedom of choice, and creates identity crises as it steals humankind's freedom to choose their roles to be played in society. However, for too long have we thought that patriarchy only hurts women. Fradet (2018) states that, although patriarchy is set up in a way to benefit men, enabling them to enjoy their privileges, it can also hurt men in many ways: they might feel uncomfortable to uphold masculinity as defined by patriarchy. That is why Salau (2018) says patriarchy is for men both 'a blessing and a curse'. Although male supremacy can make life easier for men, they are socialised to 'suppress so many human parts of themselves'. Gilligan and Richards (2009:i) refer to this 'destructive patriarchal power ... that is damaging to men and women alike' as a 'deepening darkness'.

Mulambya-Kabonde (2021:38) is of the opinion that patriarchy has been eternalised throughout the history of humankind with the result that domination has been institutionalised in societies and that is why she blames patriarchy for preventing both men and women from being fully human. Mulambya-Kabonde supports the opinion of Hutunuwatr (2000:4–5) that, in the context of globalisation, it is patriarchy that created a civilisation ‘that victimises its own people’, teaching them to view reality ‘in the form of unequal power relations’. Patriarchy is blamed for women being silent in abusive relationships and for God’s plan for creation being distorted as women are not allowed to share in the caring of the earth (Mulambya-Kabonde 2021:45; Mananzan 1995:35). It is also blamed for the disempowered status of women on land ownership (Matlhaope 2021:85–100).

Fradet (2018) remarks that patriarchy forces most men to stay in their privileged positions. They will defend it no matter what, but a few men might step forward to love themselves as persons and not as men. With this remark in mind, I read the article of Snyman (2021).

Snyman (2021:2) also blames patriarchy; specifically, the patriarchal social order in the Reformed churches of Southern Africa (*Gereformeerde Kerke van Suider-Afrika [GKSA]*) which makes him feel ‘defenceless’. As a white male South African and as a member of the GKSA, Snyman feels uncomfortable in an awkward position of an ‘evildoer’ and ‘sinful human being’. Snyman blames the patriarchal social order in the GKSA for gender (and racial) socialisation that put him into this position of awkwardness.

How did the typical patriarchal roles of the different genders affect so many societies in the world? Who is to be blamed for the eternalisation of patriarchy throughout history? Who or what is to be held responsible for the institutionalisation of patriarchy’s domination in societies? It might be helpful to focus for a moment on the socialisation of gender roles in societies.

Gender in the socialisation process

Socialisation is a process in which people learn to behave in particular ways as dictated by societal values, beliefs and attitudes (see Ballantine & Roberts 2014:110; Rousseau 2014:82; Tischler 2014:3) in order to successfully participate as members of society. From the background discussion it became clear that *gender* is a social construction with very actual consequences.

Ballantine and Roberts (2014:305) explain that gender is about ‘a society’s notions of masculinity and femininity – socially constructed meaning associated with being male or female – and how individuals construct their identity in terms of gender within these constraints’. Gender-role socialisation begins at birth and continues throughout life (Rousseau 2014:68–76; Tischler 2014:268). Sociologists explain

that from birth, children are introduced to certain roles that are typically linked to their biological sex (Tischler 2014:268). The term *gender role* refers to ‘society’s prescriptions for the values, attitudes, motivations, and behaviour considered appropriate to each sex according to their culture’ (Tischler 2014:268). Singh (2016:28) claims that humans are educated about gender roles from birth, and this ‘gender role socialization continues throughout life’. It is important, however, to realise that gender has more psychological and cultural than biological connotations as Stoller (1968:7) stated. Singh (2016:29) refers to an identity crisis as probably the result of a ‘discrepancy between chosen roles and roles acceptable by society’. Patriarchy, Singh says, ‘imposes limitations on both men and women’.

Sociologists identify primary and secondary agents of socialisation. The primary agents are those who influence persons from birth, namely family, schools, peer groups and the media (see Tischler 2014:91). Parents are children’s first source of information, while schools, peer groups and the media (such as television, movies, social media, books and magazines) reinforce the constructions of typical roles. Religion and workplace are considered to be secondary agents of socialisation that affect people throughout life. It is important, however, to keep in mind that the primary agents – parents, other family and teachers – already carry with them the influences of religion and their workplaces.

Religion is one of the most important agents of socialisation and social control. It has a significant role in organizing and directing social life. Society needs values and these values emanate from religion. Rousseau (2014:161–162) explains that religion ‘offers a moral compass for life’ – it gives meaning and purpose to life, reinforces social stability and unity, acts as an agent of social control and to strengthen social order, brings greater psychological and physical well-being, motivates people to work for positive social change. Therefore, religion plays such an important role in the socialisation process. However, religion can also reinforce and promote social inequality and conflict. Karl Marx therefore said that religion is like a drug (Marx 1844). Okon (2011:184) claims that religion has, through history, contributed to the marginalisation of women and provided the platform for male domination in societies (see also Essien & Ukpong 2012:286). Tischler (2014:260) states that many religions have declared men’s superiority to women, and he shows how Christianity gives theological justification for this situation by holding on to Bible passages such as 1 Corinthians 11:3, 8–9.

The following questions arise: If religion can be blamed for reinforcing inequality in society, is the interpretation and the proclamation of the authoritative texts the problem? Or are the authoritative materials in the different religions the problem? Is the Bible in Christianity the problem? Essien and Ukpong (2012:288) say that Christian denominations who are eager to support patriarchy will always find Bible passages to support their view. The Bible as Christianity’s sacred text as the Word of God carries authority and therefore plays an immense role in Christian religion.

Do the pertinent commands or exhortations in the New Testament to women to keep quiet (1 Cor 14:33–35; Tm 1 2:11–15) and to be submissive (Eph 5:22–24; Col 3:18; Pt 1 3:1) reflect a patriarchal bias in the New Testament? Can the New Testament be blamed for the consequences of patriarchy in our modern societies?

The New Testament and patriarchy

One cannot fail to notice patriarchy in the New Testament – the tracks are clearly present. Various commands in the New Testament show patriarchy. The language of the New Testament also reflects patriarchy. Wolmarans (2012:61) refers to the ‘malespeak’ of the New Testament – the authors are males, the narratives have mainly male characters, and to address people, the male form ‘brothers’ is used. Milne (1989) refers to the ‘patriarchal stamp’ of the Bible.

Wolmarans (2012:61–71) analyses New Testament passages in which women are mentioned. He studies the words used to refer to women, he considers New Testament figurative language in which women are mentioned and studies the New Testament female archetypes, and comes to the following conclusions:

- The female is presented as being created for the sake of the males;
- women’s primary roles are to give birth to children and to manage the household;
- with regard to marriage, women are only objects used in transactions between males; and
- women were expected to behave modestly: to not dress in a provocative way, to only talk to males in the household, to be quiet and to be obedient.

To Milne’s mind (1989:34), one can either ‘accept the patriarchal Biblical text as sacred’ or we can ‘expose its patriarchy and reject it’ as sacred literature.

Although the New Testament does portray patriarchy, one cannot ignore the presence of a social organisation that almost presents the opposite of patriarchy. Essien and Ukpogon (2012:287) refers, for example, to the ambivalent position of Paul in the New Testament, departing from patriarchy and proclaiming an all-inclusive culture. The following passages or verses can be identified in the New Testament to portray *male-dominion* on the one hand and *equality of men and women* on the other hand:

Does Table 1 show that the New Testament *prescribes, attacks, redefines, transmits or reinforces* patriarchy? The limitations on the role of women in the passages mentioned in the diagram, along with the fact that no books in the New Testament were written by females and that women were only mentioned in the New Testament as ‘a passing by fact’ (Cornelius 2002:60), clearly reinforce patriarchy. These passages can be interpreted to support patriarchy. However, the narratives on how Jesus reacted to women and Paul’s claim to an all-inclusive culture in his letter to the Galatians, challenge patriarchy. The fact is

that the New Testament does not only portray *patriarchy*; and what is even more clear from the above, is that *equality between men and women* is role-modelled by Jesus and preached by Paul. The New Testament, on the one hand, thus transmits and reinforces patriarchy, but, on the other hand, prescribes equality between the genders. Although Jesus is not portrayed in the New Testament to attack, reinforce or redefine patriarchy in words, his actions were definitely an attack on patriarchy, according to Cornelius (2002:56). Jesus’ attitude towards women was nothing less than revolutionary.

This leads to the question why the New Testament reflects both a reinforcement of and an attack on patriarchy. One needs to keep in mind that, for the ancient world, philosophy was a way of life (Ferguson 1987:255) and Christian thought was influenced by these philosophies (Ferguson 1987:264). Plato (425–348 BCE) and Aristotle (384–322 BCE) were influential Greek philosophers who contributed to the development of social organisations in which the roles of men and women, slaves and children were prescribed. While Aristotle *Politics* I1254b:13–14) considered the relation between male and female to be a relation of superior to inferior, his teacher Plato was seemingly open to the potential equality of men and women (see Plato 2013). Although both Plato and Aristotle agreed that social roles should be in strict accordance with ‘nature’ (see Smith 1983:468), they had different conceptions of ‘female nature’. Smith (1983:472) is of the opinion that Plato and Aristotle have different theories on the role of women because of their different theories of the ‘soul’: while Plato sees the soul as sexless, Aristotle regards the souls of male and female to be different. The ancient world was thus exposed to different views on the role of women in societies.

Perhaps the question should be how Jesus, as the central figure of Christianity, approached society in order to determine if he aimed at reinforcing patriarchy or whether he acted as an agent of change. Wolmarans (2012:71) acknowledges that Jesus did challenge the strict roles of patriarchy by:

- ‘including non-Jewish women in God’s household’;
- ‘debating religious questions with them’;
- ‘exposing the dilemma for divorced women’;
- ‘siding with a woman caught in adultery’; and
- ‘socializing with women regarded as impure’.

Corley (2002:143), however, is of the opinion that the reality that a few women were part of Jesus’ movements and that Jesus acknowledged them, does not indicate equality amongst men and women in the ancient world. One can say that, although Jesus ignored the limitations on women in the ancient society in his actions, he never verbalised ‘concerns for gender inequity’ (see Corley 2002:144). According to Corley (2002:144), one might see Paul’s claim in Galatians 3:28 that ‘there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave, nor free, neither male, nor female’, as a later ‘extension of a gendered inclusivity’. In Corley’s mind, one cannot consider Jesus’ behaviour toward women as revolutionary, as he never

TABLE 1: Ancient social organizations portrayed in the New Testament.

Male dominion	Equality of men and women
<p>New Testament passages reinforcing patriarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women should submit themselves to their husbands (Eph 5:22–24, Col 3:18, Pt 1 3:1) • Women are the weaker partners (Pt 1 3:7) • Women should be quiet in church (1 Cor 14:33–35, Tm 1 2:11–15) 	<p>New Testament passages proclaiming equality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no difference between man and woman (Gl 3:28) • Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ (Eph 5:23) • Jesus talked to a woman in public (Jn 4:1–42) • When Jesus preached, he also included women in his stories (e.g. Lk 13:18–21) • When Jesus healed, he did not ignore women (e.g. Mk 1:30–31) • Jesus also had female followers (e.g. Lk 10:38–42) • Jesus allowed women to accompany him (Mk 15:40–41) • Women are mentioned in the New Testament as ‘co-workers, prophetesses, believing, advancing the Lord’s cause, anointing Jesus, following Jesus and having theological conversations with Jesus’.

extended the principle of inclusivity. In my mind, however, Jesus’ disregard of the typical male behaviour towards women in the ancient societies, is highly revolutionary – as ‘Jesus did challenge ancient assumptions about social rank’ (see Corley 2002:146). Corley (2002:146) herself acknowledges that ‘the presence of women within Jesus’ movement reflects changing social patterns’.

Gilligan and Richards (2009:125) investigated the resistance to ancient patriarchy from its origins in classical time and found that Jesus’ critique of patriarchy was radical. They show how Jesus, while patriarchy prescribed the stoning of a woman who committed adultery (see Jn 8:1–11), turned against it when he said to this woman ‘I do not condemn you ... from now on, avoid this sin’ (Jn 8:11). Jesus taught nonviolence (Mt 5:38–42; 7:1–6; Gilligan & Richards 2009:126) and love for all (Mt 5:43–48; Gilligan & Richards 2009:127).

As readers of the New Testament, we need to get clarity on whether Jesus perhaps aimed at the transformation of persons, social structures and philosophies through his behaviour, instead of verbally attacking patriarchy or whether he followed a strategy of being a role model instead of an activist against patriarchy. Interpreting the New Testament passages, we need to determine if the patriarchal commands were probably meant to keep general order in society or to specifically protect patriarchal order. We have to be clear on whether the New Testament gives its readers reason to reinforce patriarchy, male domination, suppression of females, and inequality in our societies. We need to be careful and responsible with the way the New Testament is interpreted and proclaimed in churches, and how it affects our societies.

Gilligan and Richards (2009:137) say that, historically, the ‘most influential resistance’ to patriarchy ‘came from within Christianity’. They refer to Bayle and Locke who called for equality in the interpretation of the gospels in the late 17th century, questioning patriarchy (Gilligan & Richards 2009:137) shortly after Spinoza who developed his argument for toleration from a different view of Bible interpretation

(p. 140). They (Gilligan & Richards 2009:144) also refer to Martin Luther King, Jr. ‘who came to a powerful stance of resistance’. According to Gilligan and Richards (2009:147), there was ‘a great awakening in Christianity that challenged the traditional religious, ethical, and political authority of the Christian churches’, when King fought for nonviolence, spoke to women about ‘the moral authority of their own experience’, and challenged manhood (p. 147). In Gilligan and Richards’ opinion (2009:148) King’s stance came from his interpretation of the ethical voice of Jesus in the Christian tradition. This proves that with resistance to patriarchy came the challenge on how to interpret the Bible.

Snyman (2019) is of the opinion that the process of reading the Bible needs to be researched when believers’ understanding of the Bible controls people. Snyman (2021:9) pleads for a hermeneutics that, inter alia, has clarity on whether the male image of the Bible is ordained by God or simply part of a social structure of ancient times, namely patriarchy. It thus seems to be all about hermeneutics.

The interpretation of the New Testament

Many scholars contributed to the development of methods of Bible interpretation, and many books are available on the topic of biblical hermeneutics (e.g. Bartholomew 2015; Kaiser & Silva 2009; Klein, Blomberg & Hubbard, Jr. 2017; Zuck 2002).

Snyman (2021) is an example of a male person being affected by the patriarchy in the biblical texts. He realises that hermeneutics might solve the problem. Newman (2017) says that feminist theology emerged inter alia due to ‘the widespread acceptance that the biblical text’ is used as a tool to oppress women. The question is how this situation influenced biblical hermeneutics. Although all feminists interpret the Bible in the interest of women in order to challenge the effects of patriarchy on women, their methods of interpretation differ. Milne (1989:17) explains that, amongst feminists, one finds a variety of exegetical methods of interpretation because of their different hermeneutical goals. Some feminists remain within the biblical tradition, while others prefer to ‘analyse and critique’ from outside the biblical tradition. The last-mentioned end up in questioning the canon and the biblical authority. Those who remain within the biblical tradition, either focus on positive biblical texts about women or on texts critiquing structures of oppression and patriarchy, or on texts about women in patriarchal societies.

Newman (2017) is of the opinion that feminist theology can also be seen as a liberation theology, as it ‘focusses on the experiences of women as an oppressed sex’. She says feminist theologians want women to be liberated ‘from the oppressive ways the Bible has traditionally been interpreted and reinforced by Christian tradition’. These scholars, Milne (1989:18) states, do not mainly have a problem with

the biblical text, but with the patriarchal interpretation of it. Their major goal is to 'rehabilitate the text and its interpretation'.

Patriarchy in the Bible definitely influenced biblical hermeneutics. It is clear that one's spontaneous understanding of a biblical text is limited by various obstacles: historical, cultural, philosophical and linguistic gaps (according to Virkler & Ayayo 2007:19). It therefore seems important for interpreters of the New Testament to focus in interpretation on all three elements in the process of communication, namely author and background, text and the reader. Focussing on the sender, message and receptor, results in an 'integrated exegetical-hermeneutical approach', a 'multi-dimensional' or 'integrated' approach (Van der Merwe 2015:3, 7). The principles and processes of biblical interpretation of Virkler and Ayayo (2007) in which they focus on all three elements in the process of interpretation, can be taken as an example. They focus on the author in considering the 'historical-cultural' background of a passage, and when they focus on the text itself, they suggest doing a 'lexical-syntactical analysis', a 'theological analysis' and an interpretation of the use of 'literary forms'. In their focus on the reader, they 'apply the Biblical message'.

Interpret the New Testament by focusing on the socio-historical background of the text

Smstrouse (2021) says that we need to read our biblical texts with a 'hermeneutics of suspicion' – meaning that we need to be 'mindful that these texts have been largely shaped by male perspectives'. This can be reformulated by saying that we should keep in mind that the biblical texts have been shaped by the social-historical background behind it: the social, religious, political, geographical and economic conditions of ancient times. The New Testament was part of ancient history and God's people were influenced and affected by ancient history.

Virkler and Ayayo (2007:80) indicate that a historical-cultural analysis of a passage 'considers the historical-cultural milieu in which an author wrote in order to understand his allusions, references, and purpose'. The meaning behind a given behaviour, according to Virkler and Ayayo (2007:205), 'can be more accurately ascertained the more one knows about the context of that behaviour'.

Why is the socio-historical background of the passage important in order to understand the New Testament's stance on patriarchy in society? As patriarchy was part of the socio-historical background of the New Testament, the interpreter of the New Testament needs to consider the influence of this ancient social reality on the New Testament texts. Ancient patriarchy has influenced the creation of texts in ancient societies: authorship of New Testament documents was limited to males, New Testament narratives centre more around male characters, the readers are addressed as males ('brothers') and some of the New Testament texts exhort typical patriarchal behaviour.

Considering and studying the socio-historical background of New Testament passages will give the interpreter clarity on the role of patriarchy in the ancient societies behind the text.

Interpreting the New Testament by focusing on the text

Focussing on the passage itself, will help the interpreter to understand the words used to communicate, syntax, stylistic figures, different kinds of meanings (literal, figurative, symbolic), literary form, the development of themes, divisions in the text, connecting words in sentences and paragraphs (see Virkler & Ayayo 2007:98–100), the rhetorical situation in the text and the persuasion strategies (e.g. Snyman 2009; Tolmie 2005). It is important to realise that, although this step follows a text-centred approach, it cannot stand on its own as a method to interpret the meaning of a text. The socio-historical situation considered in the first step, will definitely influence the language used in the text, the persuasion strategies, the literary form, the rhetorical purpose of the text, the divisions in a text, the stylistic figures used, et cetera. On the other hand, this step of interpretation influences the meaning of the text – which can then be applied to the reader.

Interpreting the New Testament by focusing on the reader

Focussing on the reader involves the process of contextualisation. Contextualisation is a step to make a text understandable in a particular context or culture. Because of the threats of patriarchy in modern societies, and because women's experiences are focussed on, this step might end up in over-contextualising. Too much focus on making the biblical message relevant, very often results in the culture of the modern reader defining the biblical message. The following question arises: What are the limitations in this last step of interpretation in order to avoid over-contextualisation and distortion of the biblical text?

In Virkler and Ayayo's focus (2007) on the reader, they 'apply the Biblical message'. In this step, they determine the 'implications' of the meaning of a text for 'a different time and culture' (Virkler & Ayayo (2007:193). The culture of the reader cannot be excluded from the process of interpretation (De Vries 2016:1), but it is important to note that the meaning of the biblical text should not be defined by the culture of the modern reader. Rather, the implications of the text's meaning should be determined for the modern reader. Virkler and Ayayo (2007:193–216) explain that, when the focus is on the modern reader, the aim should be, inter alia, to decide whether the normative commands in Scripture are transcultural or whether it should be transformed for the modern reader. They (Virkler & Ayayo 2007:193) ask, 'do we transfer them (the normative commands of Scripture) wholesale into our time and culture, regardless of how archaic or peculiar they might seem to us?'. They quote Muller (1991:161) admitting that 'moving from original meaning to contemporary significance' is often 'a magical

act' (see Virkler & Ayayo 2007:194). The problem is that the interpreter (in this last step of interpretation) often 'brings along a certain amount of cultural, linguistic, and ethical baggage' when he or she approaches a text (Carson 1996:126). Carson (1996:128) explains that this causes interpreters to read their personal theologies into the text.

Virkler and Ayayo (2007:201) believe that interpreters need 'guidelines for interpreting the Scriptures in diverse cultural situations'. That is why they (Virkler & Ayayo 2007:194) propose two steps to make this process easier: 'principlizing' and 'translating biblical commands from one culture to another'. The meaning, for example, of the command to women to be quiet (1 Cor 14:34), or Paul not allowing women to teach or exercise authority over men (Tm 1 2:12), or the prescriptions to women to be submissive (Eph 5:22), or the commands to men to be the strong ones who exercise authority in all situations (Tm 1 3:4; 5:8; Pt 1 3:7; 1 Cor 16:13; Eph 5:23), should be interpreted by using these two steps. Interpreters need to determine whether these commands to males and females are transcultural (applicable to all societies) or culturally bound. This serves to assist interpreters in distinguishing between central and peripheral truths in the Bible. In Virkler and Ayayo's proposed method of interpretation, one, for example, needs to determine if this behaviour suggested for men and women in ancient societies, might have 'a different meaning in another culture', if it might be necessary 'to change the behavioural expression of a scriptural command in order to translate the principle behind the command(s) from one culture and time to another' (Virkler & Ayayo 2007:205). This could mean, for example, that one has to decide whether order is perhaps the principle behind the command to women to keep quiet.

To summarise: whether readers of the New Testament simply aim at understanding the message of the New Testament or even attempt to fight patriarchy; in other words, driven by whatever force, all readers need to interpret the New Testament in a responsible way. A responsible way to interpret the New Testament must always include a consideration of the socio-historical background of the text – an interpretation of all the forces in the text used to communicate effectively with a responsible contextualisation of the message.

Conclusion

Religion is indeed a powerful force in society, and Christianity is no exception. Due to, inter alia, 'a' patriarchal stamp of the New Testament, Christianity might have gotten involved in proclaiming and nurturing patriarchy in societies. However, as the New Testament also portrays equality of women and men, the New Testament does not need to be a force behind transmitting and reinforcing patriarchy in the church and society. As human beings are the ones to interpret and proclaim the New Testament, their methods of interpretation might lead to proclamation resulting in violence, inequality and unfair expectations in societies. Uninformed and irresponsible hermeneutics might be the culprit when we ask

who or what is to be blamed for unfair discrimination in modern societies.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Author's contributions

I am the only author of this article.

Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency.

References

- Aristotle, *Politics* 1.1254b, see Aristotle 1932
- Aristotle, 1932, *Politics*, transl. H. Rackham, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. (Loeb Classical Library 264)
- Ballantine, J.H. & Roberts, K.A., 2014, *Our social world. Introduction to sociology*, Sage, London.
- Bartholomew, C.G., 2015, *Introducing biblical hermeneutics: A comprehensive framework for hearing God in Scripture*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Carson, D.A., 1996, *Exegetical fallacies*, 2nd edn., Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Corley, K.E., 2002, *Women and the historical Jesus. Feminist myths of Christian origin*, Polebridge Press, Santa Rosa, CA.
- Cornelius, E.M., 2002, 'Patriarchy and the NT', *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 13(1), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10226486.2002.11745703>
- Daly, M., 1985, *Beyond God the father: Toward a philosophy of women's liberation*, Beacon Press, Boston, MA.
- De Vries, B.A., 2016, 'Towards a global theology: Theological method and contextualisation', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 37(1), a1536. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1536>
- Essien, N.A.M. & Ukpong, D.P., 2012, 'Patriarchy and gender inequality: The persistence of religious and cultural prejudice in contemporary Akwa Ibom State', *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity* 2(4), 286–290. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.111>
- Fradet, P.L., 2018, '7 reasons why patriarchy is bad (and feminism is good) for men', in *The body is not an apology*, viewed 22 October 2021, from <https://thebodyisnotanapology.com/magazine/7-reasons-why-patriarchy-is-bad-and-feminism-is-good-for-men/>.
- Gilligan, C. & Richards, D.A.J., 2009, *The deepening darkness, patriarchy, resistance, and democracy's future*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, viewed 30 March 2022, from <https://sierra.nwu.ac.za/record=b2219627~S4>.
- Ferguson, E., 1987, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, W.B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Hutanuwat, P., 2000, 'Globalisation from Buddhist perspective', *Dagainfo*, viewed 6 May 2022, from www.daga.org.hk/res/dagainfo/di098.htm.
- Kaiser, W.C. & Silva, M., 2009, *Introduction to biblical hermeneutics: The search for meaning*, Zondervan Academic, Grand Rapids, MI.

- Klein, W.W., Blomberg, C.L. & Hubbard, Jnr, R.L., 2017, *Introduction to biblical interpretation*, 3rd edn., Zondervan Academic, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Malina, B.J., 2002, *The social world of Jesus and the gospels*, Routledge, London.
- Mananzan, M.J., 1995, 'Feminist theology in Asia: An overview', in O. Ortega (ed.), *Women's visions, theological reflection, celebrational Action*, pp. 29–36, WCC Publications, Geneva.
- Marx, K., 1844, 'Introduction' to a contribution to the critique of Hegel's philosophy of right, *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*.
- Matlhaope, M.O., 2021, 'Women and their right to land ownership: A biblical and holistic approach', in S. Daniel, M.D. Kebaneilwe & A. Savaala (eds.), *Mother earth, Mother Africa & mission*, pp. 85–100, Sun Press, Stellenbosch.
- Milne, P.J., 1989, 'The patriarchal stamp of scripture: The implications of structuralist analyses for Feminist hermeneutics', *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 5(1), 17–34.
- Mulambya-Kabonde, P., 2021, 'Salvation re-imagined: Theological perspectives on gender and ecology', in S. Daniel, M.D. Kebaneilwe & A. Savaala (eds.), *Mother earth, Mother Africa & mission*, pp. 33–50, Sun Press, Stellenbosch.
- Muller, R.A., 1991, *The study of theology: From biblical interpretation to contemporary formulation*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Newman, D., 2017, *The seriously flawed criticism of the Bible harmonizes so well with today's secular way of thinking*, Christian Publishing House, viewed 03 April 2022, from <https://christianpublishinghouse.co/2017/02/13/seriously-flawed-feminist-criticism-of-the-bible/>.
- Okon, E., 2011, *Religion and human rights education*, University of Calabar Press, Calabar.
- Plato, 2013, *Republic*, vol. I, books 1-5, ed. and transl. C. Emlyn-Jones & W. Preddy, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. (Loeb Classical Library 237).
- Rousseau, N., 2014, *Society explained. An introduction to sociology*, Rowman & Littlefield, New York, NY, viewed 15 February 2022, from <https://sierra.nwu.ac.za/record=b2222544~S4>.
- Salau, T., 2018, 'How patriarchy could be spiking the rate of suicide among men', *The Guardian*, viewed 10 November 2021, from <https://guardian.ng/features/how-patriarchy-could-be-spiking-rate-of-suicide-among-men/#:~:text=So%2C%20while%20men%20benefit%20from%20patriarchy%2C%20they%20also,political%20leadership%2C%20social%20privilege%2C%20and%20control%20of%20property>.
- Singh, A.V., 2016, 'The influence of patriarchy on gender roles', *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies* 3(1), 27–29.
- Smith, N.D., 1983, 'Plato and Aristotle on the nature of women', *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 21(4), 467–478. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hph.1983.0090>
- Smstrouse, 2021, *Dismantling patriarchy in the world's religions*, viewed 6 May 2022, from <https://dismantlingpatriarchy753717292.blog/author/smstrouse/>
- Snyman, A.H., 2009, 'Persuasion in 1 Corinthians 1:1-9', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 30(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v30i2.57>
- Snyman, G.F., 2021, "'Ek is Kain": 'n Hermeneutiek van weerloosheid as 'n antwoord op die dekoloniale diskoers', *In die Skriflig* 55(3), a2738. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v55i3.2738>
- Stoller, R.J., 1968, *Sex and gender*, Science House, New York, NY.
- Tischler, H.L., 2014, *Introduction to sociology*, 11th edn., Wadsworth Cengage Learning, San Francisco, CA.
- Tolmie, D.F., 2005, *Persuading the Galatians: A text-centred rhetorical analysis of a Pauline letter*, vol. 190, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Van der Merwe, D., 2015, 'Reading the Bible in the 21st century: Some hermeneutical principles: Part 1', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 36(1), a1391. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v36i1.1391>
- Virkler, H.A. & Ayayo, K.G., 2007, *Hermeneutics. Principles and processes of biblical interpretation*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Wolmarans, J.L.P., 2012, 'The female in NT malespeak', *Journal of Gender and Religion in Africa* 18(2), 59–72.
- Zuck, R.B., 2002, *Basic Bible interpretation: A practical guide to discovering biblical truth*, David C. Cook, Colorado Springs, CO.