



# ***MERE MARRIAGE: THE PAIR-BOND EXIGENCY***

***Prepared By: Brian L. Jackson  
PARRC Research, Inc.  
2006***

## MERE MARRIAGE

A **marriage** is a committed relationship between or among individuals, recognized by civil authority and/or bound by the religious beliefs of the participants. This dual nature, a binding legal contract plus a moral promise, makes marriage difficult to characterize.

In Western societies, marriage has traditionally been understood as a monogamous union between a man (husband) and a woman (wife), while in other parts of the world polygamy has been a common form of marriage. Usually this has taken the form of polygyny (a man having several wives) but a very few societies have permitted polyandry (a woman having several husbands).

Precise definitions vary historically and between and within cultures: modern understanding emphasizes the legitimacy of sexual relations in marriage, yet the universal and unique attribute of marriage is the creation of *affinal ties* (in-laws). Traditionally, societies encourage one to marry "out" far enough to strengthen the ties, but "close" enough so that the in-laws are "one of us" or "our kind". One exception to this rule is found in the marriage of royalty, who strengthen their aid through concentration of wealth rather than through affinal ties. Even in this case, the individual was often encouraged to marry "within" close family limits. (Further discussion and reference: Marvin Harris, late Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University)

Marriage remains important as the socially sanctioned bond in a sexual relationship. Marriage is usually understood as a male-female relationship designed to produce children and successfully socialize them. Historically, most societies have allowed some form of polygamy. The West is a major exception. Europe and the United States have defined themselves as monogamous cultures. This was in part a Germanic cultural tradition, a requirement of Christianity (after the sixth century AD), and a mandate of Roman Law. However, Roman Law supported prostitution, concubinage, sex outside of marriage, homosexual sex, and sexual access to slaves. The Christian West formally banned these practices.

Globally, most existing societies no longer allow polygamy as a form of marriage. For example, China shifted from allowing polygamy to supporting only monogamy in the 1953 Marriage act after the Communist revolution. Most African and Islamic societies continue to allow polygamy (around 2.0 billion people). Probably, less than 3% of all Muslim marriages are polygamous. It is increasingly expensive in an Urban setting, but more useful in rural areas where children are a future source of agricultural labor. Most of the world's population now live in societies where polygamy is less common and marriages are overwhelmingly monogamous.

Since the later decades of the 20th century many traditional assumptions about the nature and purpose of marriage and family have been challenged, in particular by gay rights advocacy groups, who disagree with the notion that marriage should be exclusively heterosexual. Some people also argue that marriage may be an unnecessary legal fiction. This follows from an overall shift in Western ideas and practices of family; since WWII, the West has seen a dramatic increase in divorce (**6% to over 40% of first marriages**), cohabitation without marriage, a growing unmarried population, children born outside of marriage (**5% to over 33% of births**), and an increase in adultery (**8% to over 40%**). A system of somewhat **serial monogamy** has de facto emerged.

In modern times, the term *marriage* is generally reserved for a union that is formally recognized by the state (although some people disagree). The phrase **legally married** can be used to emphasize this point. In the United States there are two methods of receiving state recognition of a marriage: common law marriage and obtaining a marriage license. The majority of US states do not recognize common law marriage. Many localities do support various types of domestic partnerships.

**Since the Wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11), marriage or holy matrimony has been a sacrament when practiced by Christians.** (Marriages between non-Christians are regarded by the Catholic Church as "good and natural marriages.") Having always regarded it, in practical terms as a relationship between a man and a woman, in the 12th century that the Church (the Catholic Church ), as well as other Orthodoxies, formally defined marriage as such. (In Catholicism the Sacrament of Matrimony (Marriage) is between three people: God, the man and the woman). **The Protestant Reformation reformulated marriage as a life-long covenant.** Marriage of some kind is found in most societies, and typically married people form a nuclear household, which is often subsequently extended biologically, through children. In the West the nuclear family emerged after 1100. Most non-Western societies have a broader definition of family that includes an extended family network. Alternatively, people may choose to be "childfree". Finally, they may be childless due to infertility, and possibly seek treatment or consider adoption. The term **wedlock** is a synonym for marriage, and is mainly used in the phrase "out of wedlock" to describe a child born of parents who were not married (see illegitimacy).

In some societies, there is a growing debate about the form(s) that marriage should take. Two of the most hotly-debated variants are discussed below: same-sex marriage - legal, by 2005, in some countries such as Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, Canada (and the US states of Massachusetts and Hawaii) - and polygamy.

## Recognition

The participants in a marriage usually seek social recognition for their relationship, and many societies require official approval of a religious or civil body. Sociologists thus distinguish between a *marriage ceremony* conducted under the auspices of a religion and a state-authorized *civil marriage*.

In many jurisdictions the civil marriage ceremony may take place during the religious marriage ceremony, although they are theoretically distinct. In most American states, the marriage may be officiated by a priest, minister, or religious authority, and in such a case the religious authority acts simultaneously as an agent of the state. In some countries such as France, Germany and Russia, it is necessary to be married by the state before having a religious ceremony. Some states allow civil marriages in circumstances which are not allowed by many religions, such as same-sex marriages or civil unions, and marriage may also be created by the operation of the law alone as in common-law marriage, which is a judicial recognition that two people living as domestic partners are entitled to the effects of marriage. Conversely, there are examples of people who have a religious ceremony that is not recognized by the civil authorities. Examples include widows who stand to lose a pension if they remarry and so undergo a marriage in the eyes of God, homosexual couples, some sects which recognize polygamy, retired couples who would lose pension benefits if legally married, Muslim men who wish to engage in polygamy that is condoned in some situations under Islam, and immigrants who do not wish to alert the immigration authorities that they are married either to a spouse they are leaving behind or because the complexity of immigration laws may make it difficult for spouses to visit on a tourist visa.

In Europe it has traditionally been the churches' office to make marriages official by registering them. Hence, it was a significant step towards a clear separation of church and state and also an intended and effective weakening of the Christian churches' role in Germany, when Chancellor Otto von Bismarck introduced the *Zivilehe* (civil marriage) in 1875. This law made the declaration of the marriage before an official clerk of the civil administration (both spouses affirming their will to marry) the procedure to make a marriage legally valid and effective, and reduced the clerical marriage to a mere private ceremony.

## **Types of marriages**

The type, functions, and characteristics of marriage vary from culture to culture, and can change over time.

### **Western world**

In the Americas and Europe, in the 21st century, legally recognized marriages are formally presumed to be monogamous (although some pockets of society still accept polygamy socially, if not legally, and some couples choose to enter into open marriages). In these countries, divorce is relatively simple and socially accepted. In the West, the prevailing view toward marriage today is that it is based on a legal covenant recognizing emotional attachment between the partners and entered into voluntarily.

In the West, marriage has evolved from a life-time covenant that can only be broken by fault or death to a contract that can be broken by either party at will. Other shifts in Western marriage since World War I include:

- 1) Unlike in the 19th century, women, not men, get child custody more than 80% of the time, both spouses have a formal duty of spousal support (no longer just the husband),
- 2) Out of wedlock children have the same rights of support as legitimate children, in most countries, rape within marriage is considered illegal and can be punished,
- 3) Spouses may no longer physically discipline or abuse their partner, husband nor wife and in some jurisdictions, property acquired since marriage is not owned by the title-holder. This property is considered marital and to be divided among the spouses by community property law or equitable distribution via the courts.

### **Eastern world**

Some societies permit polygamy, in which a man could have multiple wives; even in such societies however, most men have only one. In such societies, having multiple wives is generally considered a sign of wealth and power. The status of multiple wives has varied from one society to another.

In the Muslim world, marriage is sanctioned between a man and a woman, but there are verses in chapter 4 of the Qur'an which state that in certain conditions a man is allowed up to four wives. In Muslim societies, the different wives are considered equal and must be treated as such. In Indonesia, the largest Muslim majority state, marriage is allowed between a man and a woman who profess the same faith, while atheists are not allowed to marry.

In Imperial China, formal marriage was sanctioned only between a man and a woman, although among the upper classes, the primary wife was an arranged marriage with an elaborate formal ceremony while concubines could be taken on later with minimal ceremony. After the rise of Communism, only strictly monogamous marital relationships are permitted, although divorce is a relatively simple process.

## **Polygamy, monogamy, and polyandry**

### **Variations**

Polyandry (a woman having multiple husbands) occurs very rarely in a few isolated tribal societies with limited resources. These societies include some bands of the Canadian Inuit, although the practice has declined sharply in the 20th century due to the change from tribal religion to the Moravian religion. Additionally, the Spartans were notable for practicing polyandry. Spartan polyandry often took the form of adelphic polyandry (where the husbands are all biological brothers).

Societies which permit group marriage are extremely rare, but have existed in utopian societies such as the Oneida Community.

Today, many married people practice various forms of consensual nonmonogamy, including polyamory and swinging. These people have agreements with their spouses that permit other intimate relationships or sexual partners. Therefore, the concept of marriage need not necessarily hinge on sexual or emotional monogamy.

### **Christian insistence on monogamy**

***In the Christian tradition, a "one man one woman" model for the Christian marriage was advocated by Saint Augustine (354-439 AD) with his published letter The Good of Marriage. To discourage polygamy, he wrote it "was lawful among the ancient fathers: whether it be lawful now also, I would not hastily pronounce. For there is not now necessity of begetting children, as there then was, when, even when wives bear children, it was allowed, in order to a more numerous posterity, to marry other wives in addition, which now is certainly not lawful." (chapter 15, paragraph 17) Sermons from St. Augustine's letters were popular and influential. In 534 AD Roman Emperor Justinian criminalized all but monogamous man/woman sex within the confines of marriage. The Justinian Code was the basis of European law for 1,000 years.***

***Christianity has continued to insist on monogamy as an essential of marriage.***

### **Contemporary Western societies**

In 21st century Western societies, bigamy is illegal and sexual relations outside marriage are generally frowned-upon, though there is a minority view accepting (or even advocating) open marriage.

***However, divorce and remarriage are relatively easy to undertake in these societies. This has led to a practice called serial monogamy. "Serial monogamy" involves entering into successive marriages over time. Serial monogamy is also sometimes used to refer to cases where the couples cohabit without getting married.***

### **Forced marriages**

Some traditional cultures still practice marriage by abduction, a form of forced marriage in which a woman who is kidnapped and raped by a man is regarded as his wife. This practice is limited to a few traditional cultures in a small number of countries, and is generally regarded as abhorrent by other cultures.

### **Unique practices**

Some parts of India follow a custom in which the groom is required to marry with an auspicious plant called Tulsi before a second marriage to overcome inauspicious predictions about the health of the husband. However, the relationship is not consummated and does not affect their ability to remarry later. One should note that this is not a norm found across the entire Indian sub-continent.

In the state of Kerala, India, the Nambudiri Brahmin caste traditionally practices henogamy, in which only the eldest son in each family is permitted to marry.

In Mormonism, a couple may seal their marriage "for time and for all eternity" through a "sealing" ceremony conducted within the LDS temple. The couple is then believed to be bound to each other in marriage throughout eternity if they live according to their covenants made in the ceremony. Mormonism also allows living persons to act as proxies in the sealing ceremony to "seal" a marriage between ancestors who have been dead for at least one year and who were married during their lifetime. According to LDS theology, it is then up to the deceased individuals to accept or reject this sealing in the spirit world before their eventual resurrection. A living person can also be sealed to his or her deceased spouse, with another person (of the same sex as the deceased) acting as proxy for that deceased individual.

Other unusual variations include marriage between a living human and a ghost (Taiwan), a living human and a recently-deceased human with whom they were emotionally involved (France), and between a human being and God (Catholic and Orthodox monasticism). Again, these lack the social meaning of ordinary marriage and belong rather to the realm of religion or (in the case of weddings of dogs to other dogs, Kermit the Frog to Miss Piggy, and the like) pure spectacle.

One society that traditionally did without marriage entirely was that of the Na of Yunnan province in southern China. According to anthropologist Cia Hua, sexual liaisons among the Na took place in the form of "visits" initiated by either men or women, each of whom might have two or three partners each at any given time (and as many as two hundred throughout a lifetime). The nonexistence of fathers in the Na family unit was consistent with their practice of matrilineality and matrilocality, in which siblings and their offspring lived with their maternal relatives. In recent years, the Chinese state has encouraged the Na to acculturate to the monogamous marriage norms of greater China. Such programs have included land grants to monogamous Na families, conscription (in the 1970s, couples were rounded up in villages ten or twenty at a time and issued marriage licenses), legislation declaring frequent sexual partners married and outlawing "visits", and the withholding of food rations from children who could not identify their fathers. Many of these measures were relaxed in favor of educational approaches after Deng Xiaoping came into power in 1981.

## **Marriage restrictions**

Societies have always placed restrictions on marriage to relatives, though the degree of prohibited relationship varies widely. In almost all societies, marriage between brothers and sisters is forbidden, with Ancient Egyptian, Hawaiian, and Inca royalty being the rare exceptions. In many societies, marriage between some first cousins is preferred, while at the other extreme, the medieval Catholic church prohibited marriage even between distant cousins. The present day Catholic Church still maintains a standard of required distance (in both consanguinity and affinity) for marriage.

In many societies, various rights are allotted only to married individuals .

In Indian Hindu community, especially in the Brahmin caste, marrying a person of the same Gotra is prohibited, since persons belonging to the same Gothra are said to have identical patrilineal descension. In ancient India when Gurukul was in existence, the shishyas (the pupils) were advised against marrying any of Guru's children as shishyas were considered Guru's children and it would be considered marriage among siblings (though there were exceptions like Arjuna's son Abhimanyu marrying Ultra, the dance student of Arjuna in Mahabharata).

Many societies have also adopted other restrictions on whom one can marry, such as prohibitions on marrying persons with the same surname, or persons with the same sacred animal. One example is South Korea. Even today, it is generally considered taboo for a man to marry a woman if they both have the same last name. A large percentage of the total South Korean population have the surname "Kim" (an estimated 20%).

Anthropologists refer to these sorts of restrictions as exogamy. One exception to this pattern is in ancient Egypt, where marriage between brothers and sisters was permitted in the royal family -- as it was also permitted in Hawaii and among the Inca; this privilege was denied commoners and may have served to concentrate wealth and power in one family (See also incest). The consequence of the incest-taboo is exogamy, the requirement to marry someone from another group. Anthropologists have thus pointed out that the incest taboo may serve to promote social solidarity.

Societies have also at times required marriage from within a certain group. Anthropologists refer to these restrictions as endogamy. An example of such restrictions would be a requirement to marry someone from the same tribe. Racist laws adopted by some societies in the past, such as Nazi-era Germany, apartheid-era South Africa and most of the southern United States and Utah prior to 1967, which prohibited marriage between persons of different races (miscegenation) could also be considered examples of endogamy.

Cultures that practiced slavery might admit that slave marriages formed but grant them no legal status. This was the practice under the Roman empire, so that in the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas, the freewoman Perpetua could be described as "a married matron" but Felicitas as the "fellow-servant" of Revocatus -- even though the Christians regarded, religiously, such marriages as binding. Likewise, slave marriages in the United States were not binding, so that many contrabands escaping slavery during the American Civil War sought official status for their marriages.

## **Weddings**

The ceremony in which a marriage is enacted and announced to the community is called a wedding. A wedding in which a couple marry in the "eyes of the law" is called a civil marriage. Religions also facilitate weddings, in the "eyes of God." In many European and some Latin American countries, where someone chooses a religious ceremony, they must also hold that ceremony separate from the civil ceremony. Certain countries, like Belgium, Bulgaria and the Netherlands even legally demand that the civil marriage has to take place before any religious marriage. In some countries, notably the United States, the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland and Spain both ceremonies can be held together; the officiant at the religious and community ceremony also serves as an agent of the state to enact the civil marriage. That does not mean that the state is "recognizing" religious marriages; the "civil" ceremony just takes place at the same time as the religious ceremony. Often this involves simply signing a register during the religious ceremony. If that civil element of the full ceremony is left out for any reason, in the eyes of the law no marriage took place, irrespective of the holding of the religious ceremony.

Whilst some countries, such as Australia, permit marriages to be held in private and at any location, others, including England, require that the civil ceremony be conducted in a place specially sanctioned by law (ie. a church or registry office), and be open to the public. An exception can be made in the case of marriage by special emergency license, which is normally granted only when one of the parties is terminally ill. Rules about where and when persons can marry vary from place to place. Some regulations require that one of the parties reside in the locality of the registry office. Because of Australia's very relaxed rules on marriage, many famous people, including Michael Jackson, have opted to marry in Australia, so as to have a private ceremony.

The way in which a marriage is enacted has changed over time, as has the institution of marriage itself. In Europe during the Middle Ages, marriage was enacted by the couple promising verbally to each other that they would be married to each other; the presence of a priest or other witnesses was not required if circumstances prevented it. This promise was known as the "verbum". If made in the present tense ("I marry you", it was unquestionably binding; if made in the future tense ("I will marry you"), it would, by itself constitute a betrothal, but if the couple proceeded to have sexual relations, the union was a marriage. As part of the Reformation, the role of recording marriages and setting the rules for marriage passed to the state; by the 1600s many of the Protestant European countries had heavy state involvement in marriage. As part of the Counter-Reformation, the Catholic Church added a requirement of witnesses to the promise, which under normal circumstances had to include the priest.

## **Termination**

Many societies provide for the termination of marriage through divorce. Marriages can also be annulled or cancelled, which is a legal proceeding that establishes that a marriage was invalid from its beginning.

## **Rights and obligations relating to marriage**

Typically, marriage is the institution through which people join together their lives in emotional and economic ways through forming a household. It often confers rights and obligations with respect to raising children, holding property, sexual behavior, kinship ties, tribal membership, relationship to society, inheritance, emotional intimacy, and love.

Marriage sometimes: establishes the legal father of a woman's child; establishes the legal mother of a man's child; gives the husband or his family control over the wife's sexual services, labor, and/or property; gives the wife or her family control over the husband's sexual services, labor, and/or property; establishes a joint fund of property for the benefit of children; establishes a relationship between the families of the husband and wife. No society does all of these; no one of these is universal (see Edmund Leach's article in "Marriage, Family, and Residence," edited by Paul Bohannan and John Middleton).

Marriage has traditionally been a prerequisite for starting a family, which usually serves as the building block of a community and society. Thus, marriage not only serves the interests of the two individuals, but also the interests of their children and the society of which they are a part.

In most of the world's major religions, marriage is traditionally a prerequisite for sexual intercourse: unmarried people are not supposed to have sex, which is then called fornication and is socially discouraged or even criminalized. In practice, most societies have tacitly accepted sex between unmarried people if they marry as soon as pregnancy occurs (see shotgun wedding). Sex with a married person other than one's spouse, called adultery, is even less acceptable and has also often been criminalized, especially in the case of a person who is a representative of the government (e.g. president, prime minister, political representative, public-school teacher, military officer).

## **Marriage and religion**

Many religions have extensive teachings regarding marriage. Most Christian churches give some form of blessing to a marriage; the wedding ceremony typically includes some sort of pledge by the community to support the couple's relationship. In the Roman Catholic Church "Holy Matrimony" is considered to be one of the seven sacraments when performed by Christians, in this case one that a priest bestows upon the couple in front of members of the community as witnesses during a "Nuptial Mass". In the Eastern Orthodox church, it is one of the Mysteries, and is seen as an ordination and a martyrdom. In marriage,

Christians see a picture of the relationship between Jesus and the Church. In Judaism, marriage is viewed as a coming together of two families, therefore prolonging the religion and cultural heritage of the Jewish people. Islam also recommends marriage highly; among other things, it helps in the pursuit of spiritual perfection. The Bahá'í Faith sees marriage as a foundation of the structure of society, and considers it both a physical and spiritual bond that endures into the afterlife. Hinduism sees marriage as a sacred duty that entails both religious and social obligations. By contrast, Buddhism does not encourage or discourage marriage, although it does teach how one might live a happily married life.

Protestants believe that marriage is a lifetime commitment and should not be entered into lightly. God created the institution of marriage when He gave the first woman to the first man. Marriage can only be the union of one man and one woman. The Bible states in Genesis 2:24 (ESV), "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh."

Different religions have different beliefs as regards the breakup of marriage.

For example, the Roman Catholic Church does not permit divorce, because in its eyes, a marriage is forged by God. The Church states that what God joins together, humans cannot sunder. As a result, although acknowledging civil divorce may be required to protect one spouse or the children, people who get a civil divorce are still considered married in the eyes of the Catholic Church, which does not allow them to remarry, even if the state they live in allows a civil re-marriage. The Catholic Church recognizes marriages between non-baptized people as "good and natural marriages" and even in the event that one partner is baptized, does not allow their being divorced if the non-baptized person is willing to live peaceably with the Christian. However, if the non-baptized person refused to live with the Christian, or to do so peaceably -- as, for instance, interfering with the Christian's practice of religion -- the marriage can be broken. Currently, under some circumstances, Catholics can be permitted an **annulment**. With a nullity, religions and the state often apply different rules, meaning that a couple, for example, could receive a divorce from the state and not have their marriage annulled by the Catholic Church because the state disagrees with the church over whether an annulment could be granted in a particular case. This produces a situation of Catholics getting Church annulments simultaneously with state divorces, allowing the ex-partners to marry other people in the eyes of both the Church and the State.

Islam does allow divorce; however, there is a verse stated in the Qur'an describing divorce as the least desirable act allowed between people. The general rule is for a man to allow his wife to stay until the end of her menstrual period or for 3 months if she so wishes after the divorce. During this period they would be divorced in that they would simply be living under the same roof but not functioning as man and wife. The Qur'an scholars suggest that the main point is to prevent any decisions by the woman from being affected by hormonal fluctuations as well as to allow any heated arguments or differences to be resolved in a civil manner before the marriage is completely terminated. However, there is no obligation on the woman to stay, if she so wishes she may leave. The man is also obligated to give his wife a gift or monetary sum equivalent to at least half her *mahr* (gift or monetary sum which is given to the wife at the commencement of the marriage). Specific conditions as to how a divorce is conducted also apply if a woman is pregnant, or has given birth just prior to the divorce.

refer Qur'an 2:228-232, 236, 237, 241 and 65:1-7. See also 4:35.

Marriages are typically entered into with a vow that explicitly limits the duration of the marriage with the statement "till death do you part". However, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons) have a distinctive view of marriage called Celestial marriage, wherein they believe that individuals that are worthy can enter into a marriage relationship that can endure beyond death. This is documented in their Proclamation On The Family.

## **Marriage and economics**

The economics of marriage have changed over time. Historically, in many cultures the family of the bride had to provide a dowry to pay a man for marrying their daughter. In other cultures, the family of the groom had to pay a bride price to the bride's family for the right to marry the daughter. In some cultures, dowries and bride prices are still demanded today. In both cases, the financial transaction takes place between the groom (or his family) and the bride's family; the bride has no part in the transaction and often no choice in whether to participate in the marriage.

In some cultures, dowries were not unconditional gifts; if the groom had other children, they could not inherit the dowry, which had to go to the bride's children, and which, in the event of her childlessness, had to return to her family -- sometimes not until the groom's death, or his remarriage; often the bride was entitled to inherit at least as much as her dowry from her husband's estate.

Morning gifts, which might also be arranged by the bride's father rather than the bride, were given to the bride herself; the name derives from the custom, in Germanic tribes, of giving them the morning after the wedding night. She might or might not have control of this morning gift during the lifetime of her husband, but when widowed, is entitled to it. If the amount of her inheritance is settled by law rather than agreement, it may be called dower. Depending on legal systems and the exact arrangement, she may not be entitled to dispose of it after her death, and may lose the property if she remarries.

Morning gifts were preserved for many centuries in morganatic marriage, a union where the wife's inferior social status was held to prohibit her children from inheriting a noble's titles or estates. The morning gift would be to support the wife and children.

In many modern legal systems, two people who marry have the choice between keeping their property separate or combining their property. In the latter case, called community property, when the marriage ends by divorce each owns half; if one partner dies the surviving partner owns half and for the other half inheritance rules apply.

In some legal systems, the partners in a marriage are "jointly liable" for the debts of the marriage. This has a basis in a traditional legal notion called the "Doctrine of Necessities" whereby a husband was responsible to provide necessary things for his wife. Where this is the case, one partner may be sued to collect a debt for which they did not expressly contract. Critics of this practice note that debt collection agencies can abuse this claiming an unreasonably wide range of debts to be expenses of the marriage. The cost of defense and the burden of proof is then placed on the non-contracting party to prove that the expense is not a debt of the family.

The respective maintenance obligations, during and eventually after a marriage, are regulated in most jurisdictions; see alimony.

Some have attempted to analyze the institution of marriage using economic theory; for example, anarcho-capitalist economist David Friedman has written a lengthy and controversial study of marriage as a market transaction (the market for husbands and wives) [2].

## **Romantic marriage and pragmatic marriage**

### **Pragmatic marriage**

A pragmatic (or 'arranged') marriage that is facilitated by formal procedures of family or group politics. A responsible authority sets up or encourages the marriage. The authority could be parents, family, a religious figure or a consensus. The former two often start the process with informal pressure, social pressure, whilst the latter two often start the process with a formal system or statement. In both cases, the authority has a compelling veto over the marriage, and this system is socially supported by the rest of community so that to deny it is extreme and drastic. Once declared, an engagement is implicit, which follows through with a formal marriage ceremony.

Arranged and 'pragmatic' marriages are typical of dowry-based inheritance systems. Women in these societies inherit male wealth at the time of marriage, causing the parents to have a particular interest in their daughters' marriages. These same societies demanded pre-marital chastity and kept a high degree of separation of the sexes until marriage. Modern Western marriage expectations and traditions are derived from this system of dowry-based marriage.

### **Pragmatic marriage contrasted to romantic marriage**

Cultures that aspire to create relationships after couples marry are those with institutionalized practices of pragmatic marriage. Cultures that come to think that marriages should only be tried once a short-term compatibility already exists adopt romantic marriages.

Those who believe in romantic marriage will often criticize pragmatic marriage, considering it is oppressive, inhuman, sexist, or immoral. Defenders of pragmatic marriage disagree, often pointing to cultures where the success rate of pragmatic marriages is seen to be high, and holding that nearly all couples learn to love and care for each other very deeply.

Those who uphold pragmatic marriage frequently state that it is traditional, that it upholds social morals, that it is good for the families involved. They also have some traditional criticisms of romantic marriage, saying that it is short-term, overly based on sexual lust, or immoral. Defenders of romantic marriage would hold that it is preferable to achieve an emotional bond before entering into a lifelong commitment.

### **Same-sex marriage**

#### **Introduction**

Same-sex unions have been recorded in the history of a number of cultures, but marriages or socially-accepted unions between same-sex partners were rare or nonexistent in other cultures. Same-sex marriage remains infrequent worldwide, especially as it is not offered in most countries. As tolerance of homosexuality has become more widespread in Western cultures, some governments allow and/or sanction marriage between same-sex couples.

#### **Jurisdictions accepting same-sex marriage**

Some countries recognize same-sex marriage, including the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, and Spain; in the United States same-sex marriage is legal in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. South Africa will soon have same-sex marriage.

"Registered Partnership"/"Civil Union" is operative in Denmark (including Greenland but excluding the Faeroe Islands), Norway, Sweden, Finland, Iceland, Germany, France, Luxembourg, Andorra, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Czech Republic and the American states of Vermont,

Connecticut and California, the Australian states of Tasmania and Australian Capital Territory and some regions of Italy.

"Domestic Partnership", which give less rights than a "Civil Union"/"Registered Partnership" is operative in Hungary, Portugal, Croatia and Slovenia and in the American states of Maine, New Jersey and District of Columbia and in the Australian states of Western Australia and Queensland.

The State of Hawaii has "reciprocal beneficiaries relationship," which is a limited interpersonal status for same-sex couples. Vermont also has "reciprocal beneficiaries relationship," but this is a very different interpersonal status from the Hawaiian form. The District of Columbia also has a form of domestic partnership for same-sex couples. Legal challenges to marriage restrictions may soon expand the recognition of same-sex marriages to Washington, New York, and other states.

## **Controversy**

These developments have created a political backlash, most notably in Great Britain, where the Church of England has officially in a great discussion banned blessings of gay couples and in the United States, where several states have specifically outlawed same-sex marriage, often by popular referenda.

Most opinion polls in the United States indicate a majority oppose same-sex marriage [3][4]. Some polls report that a majority support civil unions[5], but other polls state majority favoring no legal recognition of homosexual couples[6].

At the United States federal level, the Defense of Marriage Act, signed into law by President Bill Clinton in 1996, has created a federal definition of marriage as between a man and a woman, as well as allowing one state not to recognize a same sex marriage recognized by another state. Arguments have been made that the DOMA conflicts with the United States Constitution, and could conceivably be overturned on this basis. To ensure this does not happen, some, including President George W. Bush, support amending the Federal Constitution to prohibit same-sex marriages.

The city of San Francisco in 2004 began sanctioning same-sex marriages despite them being explicitly illegal in California. The Supreme Court of California declared that the unions were null and void. In 2005, a bill AB19, changing California law to let same-sex couples marry, was passed by both houses of the California State Legislature and then vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger. See same-sex marriage in California for more information.

## **Criticisms of the institution of marriage**

### **Overview**

Some commentators have been critical of marriage, sometimes condemning individual local practices and sometimes even the entire institution. A good many of the criticisms are developed from a feminist viewpoint that claims marriage can be particularly disadvantageous to women. However, there are other viewpoints from which marriage in its usual forms is problematic.

### **Feminist concerns**

In many areas of the world, when a woman was in her early teens her father arranged a marriage for her in return for a bride price, sometimes to a man twice her age who was a stranger to her. Her older husband then became her guardian and she could be cut off almost completely from her family. The

woman had little or no say in the marriage negotiations, which might even have occurred without her knowledge.

Some traditions allowed a woman who failed to bear a son to be given back to her father. This reflected the importance of bearing children and extending the family to succeeding generations.

Often both parties are expected to be virgins before their marriage, but in many cultures women were more strictly held to this standard. One old tradition in Europe, which survived into the twentieth century in rural Greece, was for this to be proven by hanging the bloody bed sheet from the wedding night from the side of the house. Similarly, sexual fidelity is very often expected in marriage, but sometimes the expectations and penalties for women have been harsher than those for men.

In some traditions marriage could be a traumatic, unpleasant turn of events for a girl. "The Lot of Women" written in Athens in the mid 5th century BC laments this situation:

Young women, in my opinion, have the sweetest existence known to mortals in their father's homes, for their innocence always keeps children safe and happy. But when we reach puberty and can understand, we are thrust out and sold away from our ancestral gods and from our parents. Some go to strange men's homes, others to foreigner's, some to joyless houses, some to hostile. And all this once the first night has yoked us to our husband we are forced to praise and say that all is well.

On the other hand, marriage has often served to assure the woman of her husband's continued support and enabled her to focus more attention on the raising of her children. This security has typically been greater when and where divorce has been more difficult to obtain.

### **Antiquated traditions**

The remnants of older, arguably antiquated, ideas can be found in today's ceremonies and traditional practices. For example, women may be symbolically "given away" by their fathers. Some brides vow to "love and obey" their husbands and some bridegrooms vow to "care for" their wives. A groom might remove his bride's garter, a symbol of her virginity, as a public representation of his claim on her sexuality. Brides toss their bouquets towards a group of single women, who compete to catch the bouquet; the woman who catches the bouquet is believed to have the good fortune to be the next woman to get married.

One very common tradition is that of the groom carrying the bride over the threshold of their house. Investigating the origin of this tradition around 100 AD, Plutarch postulated three different possibilities. The first was that the act of picking up the bride was a symbolic re-enactment of the Rape of the Sabines. Another was that it symbolized the bride's reluctance to surrender her virginity, which she did only under duress. And the last suggested marital faithfulness - having been carried into the house by her husband she would only leave it the same way. This of course was in the context of a patriarchal culture in which it was said that a woman should only leave her house when she was so old that people would not ask whose wife she was, but whose mother. It has also been said to originate from a Roman belief that it was bad luck for a bride to stumble while entering her new home.

These traditions, though often attacked by critics and scholars, nevertheless remain a treasured part of many ceremonies, cherished by both bride and groom.

### **Masculinist concerns**

Some commentators argue that marriage and divorce now operate in Western societies in ways that are unfair to men. [7] The divorce rate is very high, now half that of the marriage rate, [8] but only 15 per cent of men are awarded custody. This is unchanged since 1994 (cf. p. 1), and [9] annual support payments increasing 18% to \$40 billion paid by 7.8 million separated parents, 6.6 million are fathers with [10] cash incentives of up to \$4.1 billion available to states that create support and arrearage orders, and then collect (cf. 6B, 6C, & 6D), it may help to explain the conclusion of a [11] recent marriage report by Rutgers University. "Continuing decline of the marriage rate accompanied by an increase in the number of cohabiting couples; a small increase in the percentage of children living in fragile families and born out of wedlock; and a sharp increase among teenage boys in their acceptance of unwed childbearing and a slight decrease in agreement among teenagers, especially girls, that "living together before getting married is a good idea." says 2004 Social Health of Marriage in America. Marriage strike behavior although not explicit.

Further, during a litigated divorce child custody, paternity, alimony, child support, fathers' rights, and allegations of domestic violence create additional concerns, especially with divorce attorneys rates up to \$300.00 per hour.

[12] 85% of orders of protections are awarded to females, 7% of petitions denied. Since the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 1995, [13] more than \$1 billion spent to police and prosecutors. Divorce attorneys practice leveraging this assault charge into an order of protection to get a spouse, usually the man, out of the home, physically separating him from children and his property.

### ***Marriage Redux:***

- Adultery - consensual sexual intercourse by a married person with someone other than their lawful spouse.
- Alimony - obligation of support.
- Annulment - legal procedure for declaring a marriage null and void.
- Arranged marriage - marital partners are chosen by others.
- Betrothal - formal state of engagement to be married.
- Chinese marriage - arrangement between families.
- Common-law marriage - class of interpersonal status.
- Covenant marriage - in some U.S. states, a form of marriage where divorce is made more difficult
- Digital marriage - two people who have no connection outside their gaming lives come together within a virtual community.
- Divorce - ending of a marriage.
- Engagement
- Fleet Marriage

- Free love - a social movement opposed to marriage
- Group marriage
- Levirate marriage
- List of people with multiple marriages
- Separation - ending of a marriage.
- Marriage (conflict)
- Marriage of convenience
- Marriage strike - Increasing ambivalence toward marriage in American men.
- Marriageable age
- Mail-order bride
- Monogamy
- Morganatic marriage
- Nikah urfi
- Open marriage
- Polygamy
- Same-sex marriage
- Sororate marriage
- Wedding
- Wedding ring
- Category: Marriage and religion
- Category: Marriage, unions and partnerships by country

LOTS OF DIFFERENT KINDS, HUH? HOWEVER—

Although it is not the official stand of PARRC Research, Inc., the Theoheurism Research study adheres to a unique possibility: that marriage was perhaps not even initially FOR the “hunter-gatherers” created in Genesis 1, and Adam and Eve were “pair bonded” in marriage in a unique way—the way we will describe later. To continue:

Man was made in God's image and likeness, which means that man has spiritual, emotional, moral, and intellectual capabilities. When God created mankind out of the dust of the earth, He created one man, Adam. The woman, as a separate being, did not yet exist. After creating everything in the beginning, God pronounced it good. The only part of creation that God considered not good was that man was alone. God then created woman and instituted marriage, the union of man and woman. He also established order in marriage and family life: man was to leave, cleave, and become one flesh with woman. Jesus said, "So then, they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore, what God has joined together let not man separate" (Matt. 19:6). Before sin entered the human race, God had a pattern for marriage and the family. We need to know what His will is concerning family life since God created the family. If we examine God's design established at creation, we will find a blueprint for our families today.

Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness. . . "(Gen. 1:26)

And the LORD God said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him." (Gen. 2:18)

Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. (Gen. 2:24)

It took both male and female to truly represent the likeness of God. The "man" was in charge, but the man to whom responsibility was given – to be fruitful, fill the earth, subdue it, and rule over every living thing – was still both male and female. Therefore, the first aspect of God's original plan for marriage is that the husband and wife function together as co-rulers, co-subduers.

When God removed the woman from Adam's side, He took out Adam's feminine characteristics. In other words, Adam, created in God's likeness, originally had both sets of attributes that today we call feminine and masculine. This has nothing to do with physical appearance -- Adam did not look partly masculine and partly feminine. It only has to do with his nature. While we are more familiar with God as a "father/creator" figure, it is not pagan or improper to examine the interesting and touching feminine side of His nature indicated by His name, El Shaddai (Genesis 17:1). El, meaning Strong One or Eternal One, is the basic Hebrew term for God; Shaddai is formed from the Hebrew root shad, which means a woman's breast. This is God expressing Himself as our nourisher, strength-giver, and satisfier, who pours Himself into our lives - - the "feminine" side of God. El Shaddai reveals God's all-sufficiency. Before Adam's feminine attributes were removed, Adam, as God's image-bearer, was complete or sufficient, being both male and female. However, Adam was alone. He recognized that he did not have another like him when he named the animals. When He separated Adam's two natures, God not only met Adam's need for fellowship, but also enabled the fruitfulness attribute of El Shaddai to be fulfilled.

The Hebrew for Adam is Ish. When Adam first saw the woman, he named her Isha, meaning one like me, but different -- his counterpart or compliment. God made the woman as a "helper" for Adam (Gen. 2:18). "Helper" in Hebrew denotes completing, suitable, fitted to, corresponding to, called to the side of, a helper. In other words, the woman was the "other part" of the man. Separately, Ish and Isha were not whole, but together as husband and wife they were one, as Ish was one before Isha was removed from his side. Adam's prophetic statement in verse 24 that man should leave his parents and be joined to his wife to

become one flesh was for future humanity, because Ish and Isha had already become one flesh. When a man and a woman join into the marriage covenant, they are one flesh – this is God’s plan for marriage. The couple then spends the rest of their lives working that 'oneness' out. In this plan the man and woman walked as co-rulers, as one flesh totally dependent upon God.

Scripture does not say that God gave the man an assistant to order around. Beasts of the earth were to be ruled over, but the woman was made to stand along side of the man in leadership – to be his partner. Together their purpose on earth was to have dominion and to be fruitful. As image-bearers of God, they were "vice-regents" over the earth (Psalm 8:4-8), and it was God’s intention that this couple fill and rule the earth with God’s love (I John 4:16). They were to enjoy fellowship with God and fellowship with each other – the "koinonia cross". [Koinonia is the Greek New Testament word used to denote committed relationships; it is reciprocal "agape". It is used to describe our relationship with the Lord and our relationships within the Body of Christ – koinonia cross – and is the "heart of the gospel." Usually translated fellowship, sharing, communion, or partnership.]

It was God’s desire that mankind simply enjoy an intimate, love relationship with Him, allowing their love for God to determine their choices. Because of this, God took the initiative and met with Ish and Isha daily for fellowship.

Dependent upon God as the only One who could give life and meet all their needs, the first man and woman did not need to make any demands on each other. Such a relationship truly reflected His image.

In order to properly deal with mankind’s sin, God imposed a different covenant with the following terms:

- 1) The serpent, who was the enemy’s tool, was cursed
- 2) A coming Redeemer was promised through the “seed of the woman”
- 3) The childbearing duty of the woman changed into hard work, and the whole of the woman’s reproductive system became troublesome
- 4) Woman would attempt to draw life from her husband instead of from God, and would struggle to control him
- 5) Man would attempt to “rule over” the woman, trying to keep her quiet about his inadequacy to fill her needs
- 6) The man was assigned to hard work in order to grow food from the ground which was cursed because of him
- 7) The inevitability of physical death was predicted

In Genesis 3:16b God told the woman, "Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you. . ." God is simply revealing the self-centered core that was beginning to motivate each of them. Each would demand love, respect, nurturing from the other. Thus, as the generations of their children passed, men and women would forget that they were never supposed to draw their life from each other.

God’s intention was for husbands and wives to rule together, dependent on Him, mirroring His image in the way we relate in love to each other. The Fall perverted all of that. The words "desire for" used by God in Genesis 3:16b are also used to warn Cain in chapter 4, verse 7: "If you do well, will you not be

accepted? And if you do not do well, sin is crouching at the door; and its desire is for you, but you must rule over it." Sin's desire is to rule or control; it is destructive, dominating, and usurping. This results in marriages locked in a battle for control. It can be carefully cloaked in religious terms or in worldly "in-your-face" rebellion. Passive and subtle or aggressive and obvious, it is controlling nonetheless.

C — Controlling

U — Unforgiving

R — Reactive

S — Shaming

E — Ego-Driven

The "Curse" – this is what pervades our marriages and is passed down to the children.

Here are the pronouncements for the family which are wise and obedient:

- 1) "And do not be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation, but be [continuously] filled with the Spirit, speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, giving thanks always for all things to God the Father in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, submitting to one another in the fear of God..."
- 2) "Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord..."
- 3) "Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for it..."
- 4) "Children, obey your parents..."
- 5) "Fathers, do not provoke your children to wrath, but bring them up in the training and admonition of the Lord."

Husbands and wives who attempt to be filled from their spouses, or parents who try to get filled from their children live out the consequences of the Fall. Ephesians 5:18-21 gives us some very insightful guidelines for New Covenant living that can transform marriages and families. Paul is reminding Christians to turn to the Holy Spirit as their Source of filling. The Greek word for "filled" is *pleroma*. It means permeated -- as the tea leaves in the tea bag permeate the water in a cup. Since the verb form "be filled" is in the present, passive, imperative form, it does not carry a command of something you can do, but rather something that must be done to you on a continuous basis. A more literal rendering might be: "Allow yourself to be continuously filled with the Spirit" or "Get your life from God. Remain in a continuously dependent relationship with Him in order to meet your needs." It is the very essence of the Christian life. The results of being filled with the Spirit literally reverse the effects that the curse has on relationships:

	THE CURSE	THE PLAN
--	-----------	----------

With Others	Blaming Desire for (female toward male) Rule over (male toward female)	Psalms, hymns and Spiritual songs Submitting to one another (v.21)
Inside Ourselves	Shame	A song in our hearts (v. 19)
With God	Fear and hiding from God	Going toward God with thanksgiving (v. 19, 20)

The word "submit" is the Greek word *hupostasis*. It means to arrange yourself underneath and has strong military overtones as an infantry person would submit to the commanding general. Submitting is a result of being continuously filled with the Spirit. After the Fall, husbands and wives became locked in a power struggle. Both are over the other and both are under the other, because both are trying to rule. This passage tells us how to reverse and escape the "Curse."

Paul's instructions to wife/husband (5:22,23), parent/child (6:1-4), and slave/master [employee/employer] (6:5-9) illustrate how submission to one another works in various relationships. While the passage begins with wives, we cannot ignore what Paul is saying about husbands in this regard. If husbands are not to submit to their wives, then there is no "submitting to one another."

If the husband is the head of the wife as "Christ is the head of the church," then we need to understand what it means for Christ to be the head of the church. Ephesians 1:18-23 portrays the powerful, eternal, victorious Christ whose headship over all things is a gift to the church. In Ephesians 4:7-16, Christ's headship defeats and takes our enemy captive, bringing about our freedom. That's why we have the gifts we need to learn, to grow, and to help others. Consequently, the effect of having Christ as our head is that we have everything we need in Jesus through the Holy Spirit. Just what did Jesus do to become the head of the church? He sacrificed His own life for the church (Eph.5:25). In other words, Jesus submitted His life not only to the Father, but also to the church.

"Just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many."  
(Matt. 20:28)

"Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before Him [the church] endured the cross, despising the shame, and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God."  
(Heb. 12:2)

". . . Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that you should follow His steps: Who committed no sin, nor was guile found in His mouth; who, when He was reviled, did not revile in return; when He suffered, He did not threaten, but committed Himself to Him who judges righteously." (1 Peter 2:21-23)

Christ is over the church, not because He placed himself over us, but because we placed ourselves under Him to become believers. Jesus never forces His headship. All the activity of Christ (our head) is to come under, to serve, to build, and even to die for the church. In the world "head" means boss. But in the Kingdom of God, the "head" is a person who comes under others, serving and building, and being willing to die for them – this is true submission. Therefore, the husband also submits to his wife just as the wife submits to her husband. In practical terms this means that each one loves, serves, and supports the other, allowing God to take the lead in changing each other and directing their lives. As we obey the scripture to submit to one another, we will have relationships in which God can be seen. The image of God will again be seen on the earth as it was in the beginning.

This teaching to the church in Ephesus went against the customs of their culture. Wives were for taking care of the house and the children, while men went to other women for sex and companionship. The only way Christian husbands and wives could go against the cultural norm and walk in mutual submission was by being continuously filled with the Spirit. The same is for us today. In our culture, feminism and New Age philosophies scream from every corner of society. And sadly, in the church, husbands and wives are burdened with lists of what each must do for their spouses so their marriages are "in God's order," resulting in a "works - centered" life, doomed for failure. However, when we find our fulfillment in Jesus, instead of trying to get our spouses to fill us up, we are empowered to live lives of mutual submission in all of our relationships. Whether or not a spouse or child responds in kind will not control us; the love, joy, and peace promised us by the Holy Spirit resides in us regardless of our circumstances. As husband and wife grow in their dependence upon the Holy Spirit, lives are changed, mutual submission flourishes, and the fruit of the Spirit is manifested. This is the "koinonia cross" lived out.

The heart of the Corinthian culture was its pagan religion. In its practice, prostitutes were used and honored. To identify themselves, they wore very short hair and did not wear a veil in public. Glutinous, drunken parties and orgies were frequent as acts of worship. Women – married or single – who were not a part of cult prostitution, wore long hair and/or veils in public. If a prostitute converted to Christianity, she would need a head covering to no longer be identified with her former profession. In keeping with the theme of not identifying with pagan customs, then, Christian wives/women who went uncovered in public were identifying with cult prostitution. Christians in that culture who identified with those pagan practices brought dishonor to God and to the marriage covenant. While on the one hand they were free to do as they pleased (10:29,30), on the other hand, they were not to just consider themselves, but to make choices that glorified God, choices that did not offend believers and unbelievers, and choices that caused "some to be saved" (10:31-33).

This is obviously not what God intended in this covenant relationship called marriage!

(If one is determined to use the term "head" as in "authority," this passage will still come to the same conclusions as above. Understanding mutual submission and true headship as described in Ephesians 5 co-operates with the principles in I Corinthians 11. To not walk in mutual submission brings dishonor to the marriage covenant and aligns one with the message brought by the serpent in Genesis 3.)

[Note: The Greek word for woman also means wife; the Greek word for man also means husband.]

## *PERCEIVED DIFFICULTIES NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND:*

I PETER 2:21-25. ". . . Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that you should follow His steps. . ." These verses describe how Jesus, our head, submitted Himself – how He willingly laid down His life for the unborn Church: He committed no sin; no deceit was found in His mouth; when reviled, he did not revile in return; He did not threaten when he suffered, but instead committed Himself to God who judges righteously; and He took all the blame/punishment for our sins. In this same way, wives and husbands are expected to treat each other! This is mutual submission as described in Ephesians 5 – laying down one's life for the other with a servant's heart. While it may seem odd that there are 6 verses devoted to the wives and only one to the husbands, it is noteworthy that verse 7 takes us back to Genesis 1 & 2 with the phrase "heirs together." The Message Bible states it like this: "But in the new life of God's grace, you're equals. Treat your wives, then, as equals. . ." Just as the man and woman were co-rulers/equal in the Garden before the Fall, so it is in the New Covenant, which takes us back to God's original plan in the beginning.

## I TIMOTHY 2:11-15

As the center of world paganism, a female deity was worshiped, named Diana by the Romans. The cult taught female superiority and domination of the male [MATRIARCHY]. It espoused a doctrine of feminine procreation, which taught that this goddess was able to bring forth offspring without male involvement. The cult was characterized by sexual perversion, fertility rites, endless myths, and elaborate genealogies traced through female rather than male bloodlines. Magic and all manner of demonic activity flourished.

The Jewish gnostics (meaning 'knowledge') were the first century equivalents of our New Age movement. These gnostics combined the teachings of the Old Testament with paganism. One example is their version of the Genesis 3 account of Adam and Eve in which Eve was the "illuminator" of mankind because she was the first to receive the "true knowledge" from the serpent, who gnostics saw as the "savior" and revealer of truth. They claim that Eve taught this new revelation to Adam, that she was the progenitor of the human race, and that Adam was her son rather than her husband. This belief reflected the gnostic doctrine that a female deity could bring forth children without male involvement.

Because these gnostic teachings infiltrated the church, Paul encouraged Timothy to confront the problem of false doctrines head-on. He told him to forbid certain people from peddling their false teachings in the Body of Christ and to admonish others to turn away from myths and endless genealogies. He also told him to: oppose those who spoke falsely of the living God; warn people about the doctrines of demons; avoid stupid, senseless controversies; and have nothing to do with old wives' tales such as the corrupted story of Adam and Eve. He urged Timothy to use the scriptures for sound teaching, reproof, correction, and training in righteousness. (I Tim. 1:3,4; 4:7,16; 5:13; II Tim. 2:16, 23-26; 3:6-9,16; 4:2-4,)

What we can surmise from this background information and the admonitions to Timothy is that women were teaching this false doctrine. In light of this, a closer look at the I Timothy 2 passage is very revealing. However, an understanding of some original language and Greek grammar is essential before we can proceed.

The word translated as "authority" is the Greek word *authentein*, and its meaning changed dramatically over a period of 1,100 years. In 6th century B.C. classical literature, the word meant "to initiate or be responsible for a murder." By 200 A.D. it meant "to usurp authority." At the writing of this letter to Timothy (about 64 A.D.), though, the most common meaning for *authentein* was "to claim to be the originator of something." The word that is translated "silence" (Greek, *hesuchia*) also means harmony, peace, conformity, or agreement.

The phrase "I do not permit" is in the present tense. That being the case, a more accurate rendering would be "I am not presently permitting/allowing".

With these in mind, a translation of I Timothy 2:12 more in keeping with the social context and the original language would be: "I am not presently allowing a woman to teach or to proclaim herself the originator of man [*authentein*], but to be in agreement [with sound teaching from the scriptures]." Paul was advocating that the women who had been teaching this false doctrine not be allowed to teach for a season, while they were being taught the truth from the Genesis account.

His statement that "Adam was formed first, then Eve" negates the doctrine of Eve as progenitor. And his claim that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman was and sinned" directly contradicts the notion that Eve was the "illuminator." Otherwise v. 13,14 do not make any sense within the context of this passage.

I Timothy, along with numerous other examples of women ministering in the Body of Christ, refutes the false teaching that women cannot speak out/teach in the Body of Christ. While others may say that a woman cannot teach "at church" (gathering/meeting), but may in other places, we must be aware that BELIEVERS ARE THE CHURCH. One cannot go to a building and say you are "in church" and then say that women cannot speak out. Since believers – the people – are the church, there is no way to justify women not speaking, teaching, or prophesying in a meeting.

The last 1700 years of teaching on the marriage has been based on the Genesis 3 curses instead of God's original plan in Genesis 1 and 2. This false teaching has produced a 'works-centered' formula based on hierarchy in the marriage. It works with marriages who have the correct personalities (i.e., husband is "choleric" personality – natural leader and the wife is "phlegmatic" personality – natural follower). But those marriages where the wife is gifted as a leader and the husband is a natural follower are doomed for failure and condemnation in this false teaching. They spend years on the treadmill, reading all the "right" books and never achieving their goal of hierarchy in their marriages. Understanding that the husband/wife are one, living in mutual submission, and practicing headship as servanthood – all in the context of the 'koinonia cross' – is a revelation that needs to be proclaimed to the Body of Christ.

***PARRC RESEARCH BELIEVES THAT THE FOLLOWING TEN SOCEITAL PRECEPTS ARE NOT TO BE PROMULGATED NOR CONDONED:***

- 1) That marriage not be looked at as a way to obtain physicality with a man or a woman; even though it is "better to marry than to burn," it is even better to do it right
- 2) That men not adhere to the hunter-gatherer male anthropology of "be fruitful and multiply," especially after taking marriage vows; understand that this instinct forms an undercurrent which

never leaves (without the paramount actions of the Holy Spirit in creating a “pair-bond” in the very beginning of the relationship)

- 3) That women not adhere to the hunter-gatherer female anthropology of “have children, keep a roof over your head, and stay safe from the lions; after that, everything else is a bonus...” You must insist on men being Godly, with honor and a chivalric code in how they relate to you and the family
- 4) That men never dishonor nor devalue their wives in any way
- 5) That women not allow themselves to be dishonored nor devalued for any reason
- 6) That men not force unnatural situations nor practices on their wives—just because they are married—through the urging of the darkside of male hunter-gatherer psychology
- 7) That women not accept impure or corruptive behavior from their men—nor through the urging of the darkside of female hunter-gatherer psychology
- 8) That men nor women should get married for economic reasons
- 9) That women should not allow the unseemly vision that it is all right for a man to have more than one woman through participating in media portrayals of men with seraglios and hareems because—ostensibly—all the women require is to “go to the mall” with the man’s money (the famous “gold-digger syndrome)
- 10) That women should not trade their God-given personal physical natures in the acquiring of wealth, material goods, nor station (“gold-digger, part two—a form of prostitution)

***PARRC RESEARCH BELIEVES THAT THE FOLLOWING TEN SOCIETAL PRECEPTS ARE TO BE BOTH PROMULGATED AND CONDONED:***

- 1) That men nor women should embark on marriage with the express involvement and participation of the Holy Spirit as the founder, creator, establisher, and finisher of the marriage; He must pair-bond the couple, and perform certain esoteric and genetic changes in the new entity going forth in the world. Without this, they will go forth in a type of “legalistic” philosophy where they “act out” the roles of man and wife; the Holy Spirit will bind you in a pair-bond that creates a new thing that needs no one else, desires no one else, loves no one else, and wants no one else. This is supernatural, and required...
- 2) That men—in the true biblical sense—are to be the heads of the household in geometry (from heaven to usward to the family) and should accept the responsibility like men
- 3) That men accept their wives as true “help-meets—“ with equal power, authority, station, and respect
- 4) That men should “deserve” the honor, love, and respect of their wives through the attainment of the chivalric, honor, strength, courage, and fidelitas—not demand it because they are married
- 5) That women do the best they can to bring the best characteristics of the pair-bond partner to the marriage because the man deserves it—and not because of some implied guarantee of marriage let themselves slip into a mode of non-performance and undeserved expectations; continue to work to be attractive and desirable, and maintain the same ethics that you applied during courtship and the so-called “honeymoon period”
- 6) That men tend to the needs of their wives in the true traditions of the strong, confident heterosexual male—practicing masculine Christianity
- 7) That women tend to the needs of—and share in the bounty of—their husbands because the man loves, respects, and carries himself in such a way as to be attractive and desirable to his wife; be his best friend, his sure confidant, and his constant advocate
- 8) That the man and wife work shared goals for themselves and the family (productivity)
- 9) That the man and wife develop shared interests for themselves and the family (commiseration)
- 10) That the man and wife be “equally yoked” in their belief in Christ, saved through grace attained by faith and facilitated by the Great Master, and dedicate themselves to a shared evangelical effort for Christ (obedience)

## **PARRC THEN DRAWS THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSIONS:**

- 1) MARRIAGE IS A COVENANT ESTABLISHED BETWEEN HIMSELF, A MAN, AND A WOMAN.
- 2) IT IS SUPERNATURALLY CALLED (THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL BRING YOU A MATE), ESTABLISHED (THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL JOIN YOU TOGETHER), AND SUSTAINED (HE WILL GO FORWARD WITH YOU AS A COUNSELOR, GUIDE, AND FRIEND).
- 3) WHEN GOD JOINS TWO PEOPLE TOGETHER, IT IS A "PAIR-BOND," WHICH ESTABLISHES A "COHESIVE" SURFACE BETWEEN THEM. THIS BOND CANNOT BE BROKEN, AS THE SEPARATE SURFACES (THE MAN AND WOMAN, PER SE) WOULD BE DESTROYED IN THE PROCESS OF TEARING THEM (THE PAIR-BONDED, COHESIVE SURFACE) APART. IN OTHER WORDS, DIVORCE IS A MUTUALLY DESTRUCTIVE ACT, WHICH SHOULD NEVER HAPPEN IN A PAIR-BONDED, GOD-CREATED MARRIAGE
- 4) THAT COHESION IS THE NEW, COMPLETE CONSUMMATION WHICH IS A NEW THING.
- 5) THE MAN AND WOMAN WHO ARE PAIR-BONDED ARE GENETICALLY CHANGED, ENERGIZING A DEFEATING OF THE TYPICAL HUNTER-GATHERER ANTHROPOLOGIES.
- 6) IN THE SAME WAY THAT CELIBACY CAN ONLY BE ACHIEVED THROUGH A CHANGE IN THE BRAIN AND PHYSIOLOGY OF A PERSON (OR THE HUNTER-GATHERER PREDILECTIONS AND HUMAN PERVERSIONS WILL BECOME INCIDENT), THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP MUST BE SO ENERGIZED.
- 7) THIS ALLOWS AN "ADAMIC" RELATIONSHIP IN WHICH THEIR BRAINS FIND THAT THEY ONLY HAVE EYES FOR EACH OTHER; DESIRE TO ALWAYS BE TOGETHER; AND HAVE A MIND TO ADAPT THE ROLES THAT MEN AND WOMEN OCCUPY IN THE GODLY DESIGN FOR MARRIAGE.
- 8) IF A MAN AND A WOMAN MARRY OUTSIDE OF THIS PHILOSOPHY AND DESIGN, IT IS THE EQUIVALENT OF STARTING OUT ON A TRIP WITH A HALF A TANK OF GAS; IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO EMBARK UPON A GOD-ORDAINED COVENANT UTILIZING YOUR OWN ENERGY AND UNDERSTANDINGS.
- 9) WHEN YOU EMBARK ON THIS "RULES ORIENTED" RELATIONSHIP—WHICH IS REALLY NOT MARRIAGE, BUT A CONTRACT RELATIONSHIP—YOU MUST ADHERE TO RIGHTS, WRONGS, AND ARE SUBJECT TO THE RAVAGES OF TIME AND ENTROPY—IN OTHER WORDS, IN MOST CASES, IT WILL NOT WORK.
- 10) IF YOU SEE OTHERS AROUND YOU WHO HAVE NOT COME INTO THIS RELATIONSHIP IN THE PROPER WAY THAT WE HAVE DESCRIBED HERE—AND YET HAVE STAYED TOGETHER THROUGHOUT THE YEARS—WE GUARANTEE IT IS NOT THE QUALITY RELATIONSHIP THAT GOD HAD PLANNED; INDEED, YOU MUST BE SURE THEY ARE STILL HAPPY, DESIRING OF EACH OTHER, AND NOT JUST STAYING TOGETHER FOR SOCIETAL OR RELIGIOUS REASONS.

WHAT DO YOU DO IF YOU STARTED OUT WRONG, AND WANT TO CHANGE WHILE THERE IS STILL TIME?

YOU MUST GO TO GOD IN REPENTANCE OF YOUR IGNORANCE OR ARROGANCE WHICH WAS PRESENT WHEN YOU "MET" YOUR SPOUSE; ADMIT THAT DUE TO THESE FACTORS, YOU DID NOT START OUT THE WAY ONE SHOULD IN A GOD-ORDAINED COVENANT RELATIONSHIP....

*...BUT IN THE SAME WAY THAT SALVATION IMPUTES WORTH TO THE INDIVIDUAL WHO ACCEPTS CHRIST, ASK FOR RESTORATION BACK TO THE POINT OF ORIGIN—AND HIS BLESSING UPON YOU BOTH SO THAT YOU CAN ESTABLISH THE COVENANT RELATIONSHIP IN HONOR AND CORRECTNESS AS YOU GO FORWARD.*

*THIS WILL BE A SUPERNATURAL ACT: IN OTHER WORDS, YOU WILL HAVE THE CORRECT COVENANT RELATIONSHIP IMPUTED UNTO BOTH OF YOU—AND THEN YOU HAVE THE PROVISION TO MOVE FORWARD INTO THE FUTURE WITH SUCCESS AND HAPPINESS.*

*HENCE, AND THEN, YOU FIND THE LOGIC IN THE PHILOSOPHY IN THE BIBLE THAT ONE SHOULD NOT PUT AWAY (DIVORCE) THEIR SPOUSE; WHEN THE LORD ESTABLISHES A PERFECT PAIR-BOND, THERE WILL NEVER BE A REASON WHY YOU SHOULD!*

---

PARRC RESEARCH, INC., 2004-2010, ALL RIGHTS AND TRADEMARKS RESERVED