

# **DIVINE ORDER OF HEADSHIP AND CHURCH ORDER**

**A Study of the Implications of the Principle  
of Male Headship for the Ordination  
of Women as Elders and/or Pastors**

by

**Samuele Bacchiocchi**

**Prepared at the Request  
of the Biblical Research Institute  
November 1987**

## DIVINE ORDER OF HEADSHIP AND CHURCH ORDER

Few theological subjects have stirred up as much controversy in recent years as that of the ordination of women to the office of elder, pastor or priest. Some churches, like the Anglican Church, has suffered schisms because of this issue, as new dissident churches have been formed.

At the root of much of the controversy is the interpretation and application of the Biblical principle of male-headship. Both liberal and evangelical feminists have long recognized the negative implications of the male-headship principle for the ordination of women. Consequently they have made a strenuous effort in recent times to reinterpret the male "headship texts" of the New Testament, in accordance with the "partnership paradigm" upon which the ordination of women is based.<sup>1</sup> Three major interpretations of the male-headship principle are espoused by three different groups of scholars whom I shall designate as: (1) Liberal Feminists, (2) Evangelical Feminists, (3) Biblical Feminists.

**"Liberal Feminists."** Most liberal feminists concede that Scripture teaches the principle of male headship in the home and in the church, but they argue that such principle need not be taken seriously because it is time-bound, culturally conditioned, adrocentric (malecentered), rabbinic in origin, anti-feminist in nature, and hopelessly conditioned by a patriarchal mentality. Thus they *reject* the Biblical teaching on headship and subordination. Their final authority is their own critical, socio-cultural interpretation of Scripture which ultimately makes them victim of their own culturally conditioned interpretation.

Among the writers representing this stance are Rosemary Radford Ruether, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Adela Yabro Collins, Mary Daly, Josephine Ford, Albertus Magnus McGrath, Phyllis Tribble and George Tavard. No attempt will be made in this study to interact with Liberal Feminists since their rejection of the authority and applicability of Scriptures offers no basis for any fruitful dialogue.

**"Evangelical Feminists."** For the most part Evangelical Feminists writers respect the authority of Scripture, but they *reinterpret* those Bible texts that speak of a male headship in the home or in the church. They argue, for example, that the word "head" in 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23 means "source" or "origin" and thus it does not indicate any leadership role on the part of man or any subordination on the part of the woman. Others concede that Scripture teaches the principle of husband headship in home government but deny that such a principle carries over to the church. As stated in the pro-ordination paper prepared by a group of Andrews University scholars, "*Husband headship* in the home is not equated [in Scripture] with *male headship* in the church."<sup>2</sup>

For Evangelical Feminists the true Biblical picture is one of perfect equality between male and female in all spheres of life. There are no "leaders," or "heads," and thus no church offices from which a woman can be legitimately excluded. All ministries in the church are equally open to men and women.

To sustain this equality position, Evangelical Feminists *reinterpret* the head coverings in 1 Corinthians 11 are simply a symbol of woman's authority and not of her

subordination. Paul's injunctions that "women should keep silence in the churches" (1 Cor 14:34) and that they are not "to teach or have authority over men" (1 Tim 2:12), are interpreted as "non-Pauline" interpolations, or as culturally conditioned, or as representing the early stage of Paul's thought ("Paul in process") before he had worked out the "equality theology" expressed in Galatians 3:28. The resounding affirmation of the latter text, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Gal 3:28), is seen as the great breakthrough, designed to abolish all role differences, thus opening the way for the ordination of women.

Some of the representatives of the Evangelical Feminist approach are Gilbert Bilezikian, Mary J. Evans, Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, Paul K. Jewett, Patricia Gundry, Virginia Mollenkott, Ruth A. Tucker, Richard N. Longenecker, Berkeley and Alvera Mickelson, David M. Scholer and Aida Besancon Spencer. To these can be added many other evangelical writers, including some Seventh-day Adventist teachers whose names are not mentioned to encourage the reader to examine issues rather personalities. Their major arguments will be examined in the course of this study.

**"Biblical Feminists."** Whereas the key term used to characterize Liberal Feminists was *rejection*, and the term for Evangelical Feminists was *reinterpretation*, the term that best describes Biblical Feminists is *reaffirmation*. Biblical Feminists *reaffirm* the teachings of the Bible regarding a divinely established order of male headship in the home and in the church. They insist that there *are* different functional roles between men and women. Such differences do not imply superiority or inferiority but complementarity. Women are called to minister in the church in a variety of roles, but are not eligible to function as representative heads (elders/pastors) of the congregation. The reasons for their exclusion from such offices are not cultural and time-bound but theological and timeless.

This paper is written from a Biblical feminist's perspective. Much of its content consists of excerpts from my book *Women in the Church*, which I have abbreviated and adapted to this paper. Several new concepts and issues are also presented.

Among the large number of writers supporting the Biblical feminist position, the followings may be selected as representatives: Stephen Clark, Susan T. Foh, James B. Hurley, George W. Knight, Wayne Grudem, Douglas J. Moo, and Charles Caldwell Ryrie.

**Objectives.** The overall objective of this paper is to examine the implications of the Biblical principle of male headship for the appointment of women to serve as local elders or pastors of congregations. To pursue this objective I will examine seven aspects of the concept of male headship, in accordance to the following outline:

Part I: The New Testament Meaning of Headship

Part II: The Meaning of Male Headship in Marriage

Part III: Headship and Role Distinctions in the Church (1 Cor 11:2-16)

Part IV: Headship and Women's Leadership in the Church (1 Tim 2:9-15)

Part V: Headship and Women's Speaking in the Church (1 Cor 14:33b-36)

Part VI: Headship and the Fatherhood of God

Part VII: Headship in the Home and in the Church

Conclusion



## PART I

### THE NEW TESTAMENT MEANING OF HEADSHIP

#### 1. Head as "Source"

What did Paul mean when he wrote that "the head of the woman is her husband" (1 Cor 11:3) and that "the husband is the head of the wife" (Eph 5:23)? Historically these texts have been understood to mean that husbands have "authority over" their wives. Recently this interpretation has been challenged, especially by liberal and evangelical feminists who contend that the word "head" in such passages means "source" or "origin" rather than designating "authority over."<sup>3</sup> The implication of this definition is that Paul was not teaching that man "has authority over" (= head over) his wife, but rather that he is her "source" and consequently he must be especially concerned for her.

This interpretation is used by feminists to reject any form of women's subordination to their husbands and to argue for sexual equality and role-interchangeability. For example, Scanzoni and Hardesty write: "If we think of the term "head" in the sense of *arche* (beginning, origin, source), we are again reminded of the *interdependence* of the sexes, each drawing life from the other."<sup>4</sup> This interdependence supposedly allows both spouses to fill the roles of father, mother, breadwinner, housekeeper, pastor, elder, etc.<sup>5</sup>

**Modern Authors.** The first to propound that "head" (*kephale*) in 1 Corinthians 11:3 should be understood as "origin" or "source" seems to have been Stephen Bedale in an article published in 1954.<sup>6</sup> Since then, numerous writers have expressed the same view.<sup>7</sup> Among them, the most influential have been Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen. In several articles they have argued that Paul used the term "head" not in the sense of "authority or hierarchy" but rather in the sense of "source, base, derivation" in 1 Corinthians 11:3 and of "one who brings to completion" in Ephesians 5:23.<sup>8</sup> The implication of this interpretation is that the "head texts" do not preclude women from being ordained to serve as pastors/elders in the church.

**Arguments for "Source."** The various arguments advanced for interpreting "head" as "source" or "origin" rather than as "ruler or authority" have been examined and compellingly refuted by Wayne Grudem.<sup>9</sup> The reader is referred to Grudem's exhaustive analysis for a fuller treatment of this question. Briefly stated the main arguments for this view fall into four categories:

(1) **Linguistic.** In classical and contemporary Greek "head" (*kephale*) does not normally mean "ruler" or "authority over."<sup>10</sup> The Mickelsens support this claim by appealing to the Liddell-Scott lexicon where the meaning of "authority over" is not listed. Instead, this lexicon cites two examples (Herodotus 4, 91 and *Orphic Fragments* 21a) where "head" is used with the meaning of "source."<sup>11</sup> The latter meaning of the "head" as the ruling part of the organism "would be unintelligible to St. Paul or his readers."<sup>12</sup>

(2) **Cultural.** The ancient world did not view the head as the seat of thinking and the executive part of the body. "In St. Paul's day, according to popular psychology, both Greek and Hebrew, a man reasoned and purposed, not 'with his head,' but 'in his heart.'"<sup>13</sup> Consequently, the metaphor of is supposedly present in the "head texts" (1 Cor 11:3; Eph 5:23).

(3) **Septuagint.** The Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament) supposedly shows that "head" (*kephale*) can mean "source." The main support of this conclusion is that when the Hebrew word *ro'sh* ("head") means "ruler" or "chief," it was translated by either *kephale* ("head") or *arche* ("beginning" or "ruler"). Since *arche* sometimes means "source," then *kephale* in Paul's writings may mean "source" as well.<sup>14</sup>

(4) **Parallelism.** The word "head" (*kephale*) is supposedly used by Paul in Colossians 2:19 and Ephesians 4:15 with the meaning of "source of life." Christians are exhorted in Colossians 2:19 to hold fast "to the Head, *from whom* the whole body, nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments, grows with a growth that is from God." The Mickelsens argue that in this passage Christ is the "head" in the sense that He is "the source of life," and not of "superior rank."<sup>15</sup> They believe that the same meaning applies to 1 Corinthians 11:3, since in verses 8 and 12 of the same chapter Paul says that "woman was made *from* man."

**Analysis of Linguistic Argument.** The first argument is based on an unproven assumption. Wayne Grudem has discredited this assumption by finding and quoting thirty-two examples in which *kephale* ("head") is used to mean "authority over" or "ruler" in Greek writings outside the New Testament (seventeen are from Greek translations of the Old Testament and fifteen are from other literature).<sup>16</sup>

The absence in the Liddell-Scott lexicon of "authority over" as a meaning for "head" is not conclusive evidence for the non-existence of such a meaning. The reason is, as Wayne Grudem rightly explains:

Liddell-Scott is the standard lexicon for all of Greek literature from about 700 B.C. to about A.D. 600 with emphasis on classical Greek authors in the seven centuries prior to the New Testament. Liddell-Scott is the tool one would use when studying Plato or Aristotle, for example; but it is not the standard lexicon that scholars use for the study of the New Testament. (The standard lexicon for that is Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker).<sup>17</sup>

**Analysis of Cultural Argument.** While it is true that in the ancient world "the heart" rather than "the head" was generally viewed as the seat of thinking (Prov 14:33; 22:17, in Hebrew and KJV; Luke 5:22), there is also significant evidence that the "head" was regarded as the thinking and ruling part of the body. Plutarch (A.D. 46-120), a prominent Greek author contemporary to the New Testament period, explains why the words "soul" (*psyche*) and "head" (*kephale*) can be used to refer to the whole person: "We affectionately call a person 'soul' or 'head' from his ruling parts."<sup>18</sup>

Similarly the Jewish philosopher Philo (c. 30 B.C.--c. A.D. 45) writes: "The mind is the head and the ruler of the sense-perception in us."<sup>19</sup> Also he says: "As the head in the living body is the ruling place, so Ptolemy became head among kings."<sup>20</sup> Examples such as these discredit the claim that the metaphor of the head ruling the body would have been "unintelligible to St. Paul or his readers."



**Analysis of Septuagint Argument.** The argument that "head" in the Septuagint sometimes means "source" is a gratuitous assumption, devoid of any textual support. The reader will search in vain for examples in the articles by Stephen Bedale and the Mickelsens showing that "head" (*kephale*) was ever used with the meaning of "source" in the Septuagint. The fact that *kephale* is sometimes used in the Septuagint interchangeably with *arche*, which can mean "source," or "beginning," does not per se demonstrate that *kephale* generally means "source."<sup>21</sup>

Wayne Grudem explains this inconsistency by using a fitting example from the English language:

A parallel to Bedale's argument in English would be if I were to argue (1) that "jump" and "spring" could both be used to translate some foreign word when it referred to a "leap in the air," and (2) that therefore there is a "virtual equation of 'jump' and 'spring' in English." I would then go on to argue that "jump" also can mean "a fountain of water," or "a coil of metal," or "a pleasant season of the year when flowers begin to bloom."<sup>22</sup>

**Analysis of Parallelism Argument.** The imagery of Christ as "the Head" of the church, which is compared to the word "body" in Colossians 2:19 and Ephesians 4:15, does allow for "Head" to mean "source," but it certainly does not exclude the meaning of "authority over." The context of Colossians 2:19 indicates that Paul encourages his readers to abandon the worship of angels and serve only Christ as the true "Head." In this context of allegiance to Christ instead of to angels, the reference to Christ as the "Head" best implies "authority over" the church. Moreover, even if it meant "the source" of the church, it would still imply "authority over" the church by virtue of the very fact that the church derives her origin and sustenance from Christ.

Similarly, the context (vv. 8, 10-12) of Ephesians 4:15 shows that Christ is "the Head" of the church in the sense that He is the sovereign Lord who rules the church and nourishes her growth. The fact that Christ as "the Head" is the source of growth of the church, presupposes that He is also the leader of the church.

This brief analysis of the four arguments used to interpret "head" in 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23 as meaning "source" rather than "authority over," suffices to show that this interpretation lacks textual, contextual and historical support.

## 2. Head as "Authority Over"

Are we correct in understanding "head" in 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23 as meaning "authority over"? When we read that "the head of a woman is her husband" (1 Cor 11:3) and "the husband is the head of the wife" (Eph 5:23), are we right to think that these mean that the husband is in a position of authority with respect to his wife? We believe that this understanding is correct. The main evidences supporting this conclusion fall into five major categories, each of which will be briefly stated here.

(1) **New Testament Lexicons.** All the standard lexicons and dictionaries for the New Testament do list the meaning of "authority over," or "ruler," or "superior rank" for "head" (*kephale*). The Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich lexicon gives the following definition under the word *kephale*: "in the case of living beings, to denote superior rank."<sup>23</sup> Thirteen examples are then listed of such usage, including 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23.

The same meaning is given by Heinrich Schlier in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Referring to the use of *kephale* in the Septuagint, he writes: "*kephale* is used for the head or ruler of a society."<sup>24</sup> Again, with reference to 1 Corinthians 11:3, Schlier says: "*kephale* implies one who stands over another in the sense of being the ground of his being."<sup>25</sup> Similar definitions are given by *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* and by the older New Testament lexicons by Thayer and Cremer.

**(2) Textual Evidences.** There are ample textual evidences from ancient Greek literature attesting to the use of "head" (*kephale*) with the meaning of "authority over." Wayne Grudem conducted a painstaking survey of 2,336 examples, by utilizing a computerized database of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae at the University of California-Irvine. This listing included the major classical Greek authors, in addition to the Septuagint, Philo, Josephus, the Apostolic Fathers, the New Testament and others.

The results of the survey are very significant. In the vast majority of instances *kephale* refers to an actual physical head of a man or animal (87%).<sup>26</sup> Of the 302 instances where *kephale* is used metaphorically, 49 times it is used to denote a "ruler" or a "person of superior authority or rank." "The other interesting conclusion from this study is that no instances were discovered in which *kephale* had the meaning 'source, origin.'"<sup>27</sup> This data openly contradicts the Mickelsens' statement that "a more common meaning [of "head"] was source, or origin, as we use it in the 'head of the Mississippi river.'"<sup>28</sup>

A sampling of few instances in which "head" (*kephale*) refers to a ruler or a person of superior authority will suffice to substantiate this usage. One of the 13 examples from the Septuagint is Judges 11:11: "So Jephthah went with the elder of Gilead, and all the people made him *head* and leader over them" (cf. Judges 11:8, 9; Is 7:8, 9; 9:14-16, [LXX 13-15]). Philo, in addition to the two examples already quoted, writes: "The virtuous one, whether single man or people, will be the *head* of the human race and all others will be like the parts of the body which are animated by the powers in the *head* and at the top."<sup>29</sup>

Referring to an army, Plutarch writes: "the light-armed troops are like the hands, the cavalry like the feet, the line of men-at-arms itself like the chest and breastplate, and the general is like the *head*."<sup>30</sup> These and other examples listed by Wayne Grudem amply show that the meaning "ruler, authority over" has sufficient attestation to establish it as a legitimate sense in those New Testament texts which speak of man as the "head" of a woman and the husband as the "head" of the wife.

**(3) Patristic Testimonies.** The early Christian writers who referred to 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23 understood the word "head" used in these texts to mean "authority, superior rank." The testimonies of such writers as Clement and Tertullian, who lived about a century away from the time of the New Testament, deserve consideration. Ruth A. Tucker, though a pro-ordinationist herself, concludes her survey of the patristic usage of "head," saying:

It [*kephale*] was generally interpreted by the church fathers and by Calvin to mean authority, superior rank or pre-eminence. These findings bring into question some of the Mickelsens' assumptions--particularly that the "superior rank" meaning of *kephale* is not "one of



the ordinary Greek meanings" but rather a "meaning associated with the English word *head*." . . . it seems clear that the fathers used this so-called English meaning long before they could have in any way been influenced by the English language.<sup>31</sup>

**(4) Contextual Evidences.** The context of both 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23 excludes "source" as a possible meaning of "head." In 1 Corinthians 11:3 Paul presents three sets of parallels: Christ/man, man/woman, God/Christ: "But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God." If "head" is taken to mean "source," as James Hurley convincingly shows, "there is no way to construct a satisfactory set of parallels."<sup>32</sup>

Adam could be the source of Eve in the sense that she was physically taken out of him, but Christ cannot be the source of Adam in the sense that Adam was physically taken out of Him. Nor can God be the source of Christ in the sense that Christ was physically created from a piece taken out of God. The latter is not only incompatible with other Pauline teachings but was also specifically rejected at the time of the Arian controversy.

On the other hand, if "head" means "authority or head over" a consistent set of parallels can be established. The husband is the head over his wife in the sense that she is "subject" to him (Eph 5:22). Christ is head over every man in the sense that every man is subject to Christ after whom he must model his behavior (Eph 5:25). God is head over Christ in the sense that the incarnate Son of God was obedient to God's authority (headship), even to the point of death (Phil 2:8).

Support for this set of parallels is provided also by the meaning of the head covering discussed in 1 Corinthians 11. This, as we shall see, was seen as the sign of a woman's relation to her husband's authority. Thus, reading "head" as "authority or head over" in 1 Corinthians 11:3 and Ephesians 5:23 is consistent with the central issue in these chapters.

The meaning of "source or origin" is excluded also by the context of Ephesians 5:23, where Paul calls upon wives to be *subject* to their husbands "for the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior" (Eph 5:22-23). In this context, the language of headship and subjection precludes the notion of "origin or source" for three major reasons.

First, the idea of subjection to an authority ("head") is implied by the very verb "be subject" (*hypotasso*)--a verb which implies a relation to authority (cf. Eph 1:22). Second, while Adam was in a sense the source of Eve, husbands in the New Testament were not the physical source of their wives. Third, even if the husband was the actual source of his wife, that would make his authority more rather than less complete, contrary to what some wish to argue.

**(5) Unnecessary Opposition.** The attempt to interpret the meaning of "head" as "source" to the exclusion of "authority, head over," creates an unnecessary opposition between the two meanings. This fact is recognized even by Stephen Bedale himself, who is often quoted by those who argue against the meaning of "authority" in Paul's use of "head" in Ephesians 5:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:3. Having stated that Paul saw man as *kephale* ("head") of the woman in the sense of being her *arche* ("source, beginning"), Bedale goes on to say:



In St. Paul's view, the female in consequence is "subordinate" (cf. Eph 5:23). But this principle of subordination . . . rests upon the order of creation. . . . That is to say, *while the word kephale (and arche also, for that matter) unquestionably carries with it the idea of "authority,"* such authority in social relationships derives from relative priority (causal rather than merely temporal) in the order of being.<sup>33</sup>

It is obvious that Bedale offers no support to those who quote his article to prove that authority is not inherent in Paul's use of *kephale* ("head"). Even if it could be proven that Paul uses "head" with the meaning of "source," such a conclusion would still carry with it the idea of man's "authority, leadership" role in marriage and in the church.

**Conclusion.** The foregoing considerations indicate that "head" is used by Paul in Ephesians 5:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:3, to mean "authority, head over" rather than "source, origin." We must now examine the implications of this meaning for the role relationship of men and women first in marriage and then in the church.

## PART II

### THE MEANING OF MALE HEADSHIP IN MARRIAGE

The preceding discussion has established that Paul uses "head" in Ephesians 5:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:3 with the meaning of "authority over." At this junction two questions need to be addressed: (1) In what sense is the husband to exercise authority over his wife? To put it differently, What is the nature of the headship role a husband is called to fulfill in marriage? (2) In what sense is the wife to be submissive to her husband? Or, What is the nature of the subordination role a wife is called upon to fulfill in marriage? A clarification of these two questions will provide a basis for the discussion to follow on the principle of headship and subordination in the church. The clearest discussion of these two questions is found in Ephesians 5:21-33. Thus, we shall examine this passage to ascertain Paul's teachings, first regarding the subordination of the wife and then about the headship of the husband.

#### 1. Submission in Marriage

**Context.** Ephesians 5:21-33 forms part of a section of the epistle commonly described as a "household code." This consists of a series of exhortations, which are similar to those found in Colossians 3:18-19 and 1 Peter 3:1-7, and are given to wives and husbands, children and parents, and slaves and masters. These exhortations are part of a longer instruction on how the members of the body of Christ should love one another as brothers and sisters in the Lord.

The "household code" in Ephesians deals not with all the aspects of marital relationships, but with a specific one, namely, the aspect of order characterized by the wife's subordination and husband's headship. Regarding the former Paul writes:

Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ. Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. As the church is subject to Christ, so let wives also be subject in everything to their husbands (Eph 5:21-24).

**Mutual Submission?** The opening statement, "Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ" (v. 21), is taken by many to be the key that interprets the whole passage in terms of mutual submission.<sup>34</sup> In other words, Paul is calling upon husbands and wives to be mutually submissive by serving one another in love. This interpretation obviously excludes the notion of the husband's headship over the wife. Though the idea of mutual submission is not foreign to the intent of the passage, in our view it does not represent the main teaching of the passage. Verse 21 can best be understood as a general heading for the whole section which deals with the role relations of wives/husbands, children/parents, slaves/masters (Eph 5:21--6:9). Objections to the mutual submission interpretation of the passage as basically four:

**Structure of the Passage.** First, the whole passage (Eph 5:21--6:9) consists of a series of three exhortations in which wives, children and slaves are urged to submit to or obey respectively husbands, parents and masters. These exhortations negate the notion of mutual submission, especially in the case of children/parents and slaves/masters. They can best be understood as explanations of what is meant by being subject to one another.

**Exhortation to Subordinate.** Second, the exhortation to be submissive or to obey is given to the subordinate partner, not to both. The corresponding exhortations to husbands/parents/masters are not for them to be submissive but to respect and love their subordinates. Thus both the structure and context of the passage recognize a distinction of roles. This view is also strengthened by the absence of the corresponding exhortation for masters and husbands in the parallel passage of 1 Peter 2:18--3:2.

**Meaning of Verb.** Third, the New Testament use of the verb *hypotasso*, translated "to make subject" in the active and "to be subject" in the passive, consistently expresses the idea of exercising or yielding to authority.<sup>35</sup> "Each of the more than forty New Testament uses of the verb carries an overtone of authority and subjection or submission to it."<sup>36</sup> The meaning of the verb "to be subject" then, contains the idea of an order where one person subordinates himself or herself to the leadership of another.

**Meaning of "to one another."** Fourth, the phrase "to one another," which is the basis for the idea of mutual submission, does not always require identical reciprocity. An example of this is found in James 5:16 where the same phrase occurs: "confess your sins *to one another*." This instruction is given in the context of a sick person confessing his or her sins to an elder as part of the healing process. There is no indication in the context of a reciprocal confession of sin, that is, of the elder also confessing his sins to the sick person. In the same way the exhortation "Be subject to one another" does not necessarily require the idea of identical reciprocity. In the light of the above structural, contextual and verbal considerations, the phrase "Be subject to one another" can simply refer to the general principle of mutual respect for and submission to one another authority.



## 2. Nature of Submission

**Reasons for Submission.** What is the meaning of the exhortation, "Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord" (Eph 5:22)? In what sense are wives to be subject or submissive to their husbands? There are different kinds of submission and for different motivations. There is the calculating kind of submission designed to achieve the fulfillment of secret desires through the practice of "feminine wiles." There is the submission of conciliation which is accepted for the sake of peace. There is the submission of resignation to bitter necessity. There is the submission to the superior wisdom of another person.

Paul rejects the worldly patterns of submission, substituting for them a new definition: "as to the Lord." This does not mean that a wife's submission to her husband must have the same unconditional ultimacy of her commitment to Christ. This would be an idolatrous form of submission. The phrase suggests two possible meanings. First, the *manner* of a wife's submission to her husband should be similar in quality to her devotion to the Lord. This meaning is supported by the parallel text, Colossians 3:18, which states: "Wives, be subject to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord."

Second, the *reason* for a wife's submission is "because the Lord wants it." This meaning is suggested by the preceding and following verses. In the preceding verse (v. 21) the reason given for being submissive is "out of reverence for Christ." "Reverence" is a soft translation of the Greek *phobos* which means "fear." The KJV retains the literal meaning: "in the fear of God."

In Scripture the "fear of the Lord" is the response which produces obedience to His commandments. Thus, submission "in the fear of Christ" means to accept the authority of another (in this case, the husband) out of obedience to Christ who has delegated that authority. This interpretation is supported by the following verse (v. 23) which says, "For the husband is the head of the wife," that is to say, because the Lord has appointed the husband to function as the head. The recognition of this fact leads Paul to conclude his exhortation by urging wives again to fear their husbands: "Let the wife see that she respects [literally "fears"--*phobetai*] her husband" (Eph 5:33).

**Theological, not Cultural Reasons.** The main conclusion relevant here is that a wife's submission to her husband rests not on cultural but on theological reasons. *Wives are asked to submit not for the sake of social conventions or the superior wisdom of their husbands, but for the sake of Christ.* Paul grounds his injunction not on a particular culture but on the unique relationship of loving mutuality and willing submissiveness existing between Christ and the church.

The submission of a wife to her husband is not merely a cultural convention, but a divine principle. As stated in the "Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod," "The woman is reminded, always in the context of an appeal to the grace of God revealed in Jesus Christ, that she has been subordinated to man by the Creator and that it is for this reason that she should willingly accept this divine arrangement."<sup>37</sup>

Christ has appointed the husband to function as the "head," so that when the wife subordinates herself to him, she is obeying Christ. This does not mean that a wife is to relate to her husband as if he were Christ. Paul's exhortation is "Wives, be subject to

your husbands, *as to the Lord,*" and *not "because they are the Lord."* Husbands are human beings, but are appointed by the Lord to act as "heads" in the marital relationship. Thus, Paul takes what could be a natural subordination and places it within a spiritual order, an order that Christ stands behind.

The wife's submission to her husband is not based on the husband's superiority or the wife's inferiority, but, as we have seen, on the husband's headship role established by God at creation (1 Cor 11:8-9). This order has been established because it affords greater harmony and effectiveness in the marital relationship. The authority to which a wife bows is not so much that of her husband as that of the creational order to which both of them are subject.

**Voluntary Submission.** A wife's submission to her husband is not imposed but consciously chosen. It is a free, willing and loving subordination. It is not subservience but loving assistance. The voluntary nature of her submission is indicated by two facts. First, by the command to the husband to love his wife rather than to make her obey. Second, by the model of the submission of the church to Christ which Paul gives as an example for the wife's submission to her husband. This means that as the church willingly chooses to obey Christ in response to His creative and redeeming love so the wife willingly chooses to obey the husband as a response to his caring and self-sacrificing love. This form of active obedience is not self-demeaning but self-fulfilling and upbuilding.

The purpose of this submission is not to suppress the individuality of the wife, but to ensure a deeper and more solid oneness between husband and wife as they function together in the household. Elisabeth Elliot perceptively points out that

To say that submission is synonymous with the stunting of growth, with dullness and colorlessness, spiritlessness, passivity, immaturity, servility, or even the "suicide of personality," as one feminist who calls herself an evangelical has suggested, is totally to misconstrue the biblical doctrine of authority.<sup>38</sup>

In the Christian faith, authentic self-realization for men and women is found in the willing submission to the divinely-established roles which are grounded in creation and clarified by Christ's redemption. This liberating dynamic is exemplified in the life of the Trinity and expressed in the Scriptures.

**Rejection of Subordination.** Most liberal and evangelical feminists reject the notion of a woman's subordinate role in the home or in the church. They view the so-called "hierarchical paradigm" as an immoral legacy of the patriarchal society. Instead, they promote the "partnership paradigm," in which there are no headship or submission roles, but only role-interchangeability. The latter must be regarded as a clear repudiation of the Biblical paradigm of a wife's submission to the headship of her husband. Ellen White urges respect for this Biblical model:

The husband is the head of the family, as Christ is the head of the church; and any course which the wife may pursue to lessen his influence and lead him to come down from that dignified, responsible position is displeasing to God. It is the duty of the wife to yield her wishes and will to her husband. Both should be yielding, but the word of God gives preference to the judgment of the husband. And it will not detract from the dignity of the wife to yield to him whom she has chosen to be her counselor, adviser, and protector.<sup>39</sup>



**Danger of Insubordination.** The outcome of the prevailing rejection of this Biblical model of authority is evident today in the ever-increasing marital conflicts, broken marriages and divorces. In the efforts to assert their independence from their husbands, more and more women are willing to sacrifice their sacred calling to serve their families. Ellen White underscores the danger of this trend:

Eve had been perfectly happy by her husband's side in her Eden home; but, like restless modern Eves, she was flattered with the hope of entering a higher sphere than that which God had assigned her. In attempting to rise above her original position, she fell far below it. A similar result will be reached by all who are unwilling to take up cheerfully their life duties in accordance with God's plan. In their efforts to reach positions for which He has not fitted them, many are leaving vacant the place where they might be a blessing. In their desire for a higher sphere, many have sacrificed true womanly dignity and nobility of character, and have left undone the very work that Heaven appointed them.<sup>40</sup>

Susan Foh describes the current women's striving for independence and role interchangeably as "the forbidden fruit of our times:

Today, there is a forbidden fruit, just as there was in the garden. That fruit is role interchangeability in marriage and the church. Christian women, like Eve, are being tempted with half truths (such as subordination implies inferiority) and are being told that God (or the Bible or the church) is depriving them of something quite arbitrarily. (We forget that God's commandments are for our own good.) In some instances Christian women are deceived into thinking that God's word forbids more than it does; they think they must not even touch the tree with the forbidden fruit. And like Eve, Christian women are guilty of sinning against their creator by discussing with other creatures whether or not God's law is fair.<sup>41</sup>

### 3. Headship in Marriage

**Headship Acknowledged.** It is noteworthy that Paul speaks of the headship role of the husband only when exhorting wives and not when addressing the husbands themselves. In other words, the wives are reminded that "the husband is the head of the wife" (Eph 5:23), but that husbands are *not* exhorted to exercise their headship role by keeping their wives in submission. Instead, Paul chose to confront husbands with the headship model of Christ's sacrificial love (Eph 5:25-27).

Paul's approach reveals his sensitivity to human abuse of power. He was aware of some men's over-concern to assert their authority. Consequently, he chose to emphasize not the husband's right to be the head over the wife, but rather his obligation to exercise his headship through care for his wife. Paul acknowledges the headship role of the husband in the marital relationship as an indisputable principle: "the husband is the head of the wife" (Eph 5:23). There was no need to restate this principle when addressing the husbands. What husbands needed to hear was what it means to be the head over their wives.

**Headship Clarified.** Paul clarifies the meaning of headship by calling upon husbands to imitate the sacrificial leadership of Christ Himself:

Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself for her, that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish (Eph 5:25-27).

Paul here goes into great detail to explain how Christ exercises His headship role over the church, namely, through the sacrificial giving of Himself for her redemption and restoration. In the same way the husband's authority is to be expressed in self-giving love for the well-being of his wife. The husband who follows Christ's leadership will exercise his headship, not by forcing his wife into a mold that stifles her initiative, her gifts, her personhood, but rather by encouraging her to develop her mental and spiritual potential.

Paul further clarifies the meaning of headship by shifting back to the head/body analogy (vv. 28-30). The husband should care for his wife as he does for his own body. This means that a husband must be dedicated to his wife's welfare by providing for all her needs. This kind of loving and sacrificial leadership eliminates all the evils associated with hierarchical marriage and enables the two to "become one flesh" (Eph 5:31).

Biblical headship is for the sake of building others and not for one's own benefit. Headship means that the husband assumes a responsibility for the family in a way different from that of the wife. The husband serves as the provider and the wife as the home-builder. The two are not superior or inferior but complementary. Each supplements the special gifts and responsibilities of the other.

**Headship and Submission.** The model of Christ's sacrificial love for the church provides a most eloquent example of how headship and submission can be compatible in marital relationships. Christ's headship over the church is not diminished by his self-sacrificing love for her. By the same token, the church's submission to Christ does not diminish the possibilities for her fullest development, but rather enhances them.

The comparison between Christ-the-church and husband-wife points to the ultimacy of the authority structure in marriage. The latter, however, must always mirror the relation of Christ to the church. Neither headship nor subordination must crush or distort the possibilities for self-growth or personal fulfillment. Effective leadership in any organization must encourage the fullest development of the abilities of those under authority. This requires that a leader be aware of the concerns of those under him and that the subordinates respect the wishes of the leader. As Christians we need to maintain the delicate balance between the exercise of authority (headship) and the response to authority (submission).

#### 4. Reasons for the Rejection of Male Headship

**A Gross Misunderstanding.** Why are some feminists so offended at the Biblical principle of male headship that they even call for the abolition of marriage? "Marriage," states a feminist declaration, "has existed for the benefit of men and has been a legally sanctioned method of control over women . . . the end of the institution of marriage is a necessary condition for the liberation of women."<sup>42</sup> At the root of the rejection of male headship there is a gross misunderstanding of its Biblical meaning. In the Bible male headship relates to function not to value. If male headship in the home and in the church meant that man was innately more valuable than woman, then something would be terribly unjust in the Bible. But male headship in the Bible does not mean that women are inferior or of lesser value than men.



The value of a human being is not determined by office or function. The head of my Religion department is not of greater worth than myself, a regular teacher in the department. Human worth in the Scripture is determined not by our office or function but by our status before God by virtue of His creation and redemption. By virtue of creation both men and women are equal before God because both have been created in the image of God (Gen 1:27). Similarly by virtue of redemption both men and women are equal before God because, as we read in Galatians 3:28, we "are all one in Christ Jesus."

**Difference Between Value and Function.** The divine order of headship has nothing to do with men being of greater worth than women, for they are not. The issue is the different and yet complimentary functions God has assigned to men and women. Weldon M. Hardenbrook perceptively observes that

The failure to differentiate between value and function lies behind much of the power struggle that ravages families [and churches] across America. Men who actually think they are *more* valuable because God asks them to be head of the family [or of the church] unit are deceived. And women who feel reduced in personhood because they are not in charge are equally deceived.<sup>43</sup>

The Trinity provides a perfect model of how equality in worth can coexist with subordination in functions. God the Father is the Head in the Trinity (1 Cor 11:3), but His headship does not lessen the value of the Son, because both are equally God. Some argue that the Son's functional subordination to the Father was temporary, limited only to the time of His incarnation and/or of the completion of His redemptive mission.

This argument is untrue, because 1 Corinthians 15:28 clearly tells us that at the consummation of His redemptive mission, Christ who has been reigning until He subjects all things under His Father's feet, will Himself be subject to God: "When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to everyone" (1 Cor 15:28).

The Son is not of less value because of His functional subordination to the headship of the Father, since both fully share the divine nature. Similarly, a woman is of no less value because of her functional subordination to the headship of a man in the home or in the church, since both men and women are equally created and restored in the image of God (Gen 1:27; Gal 3:23).

**Irresponsible Male Headship.** Why then is male headship in the home and in the church so hotly contested by many liberal and evangelical Christians, including some Adventist feminists? I believe that a first major reason is that all too often men demand submission without in turn submitting themselves to the headship of Christ. With complacency men will quote the Scripture which says "the head of the woman is man" (1 Cor 11:3, NIV) to assert their authority, forgetting the preceding statement which says: "the head of every man is Christ" (1 Cor 11:3).

One can hardly blame women who resent being under the irresponsible headship of men who are not accountable to Christ. That is not only unfair but also unchristian. Biblical male headship, however, is patterned after the sacrificial headship of Christ over the church, manifested in the sacrificial giving of Himself for her redemption and restoration (Eph 5:25-30).

It was through His act of love and self-sacrifice that Christ became Lord and Master of the church. Similarly a man cannot rightfully claim to be the head of a home or of a church, unless he is willing to give himself for the well-being of all the members of his family or of his church. As Christ is both the Head and Servant of the church, moving from one role to the other, so a man who lives under the headship of Christ must be willing to exercise both headship and servanthood in the home and in the household of faith (Phil 2:8-9; Matt 20:26; 23:11; Mark 9:35; 10:43).

**Conclusion.** Our examination of Ephesians 5 has shown that Paul views the headship of the husband and the submission of the wife as an order established by God to ensure unity and harmony in the home. We have seen that Paul define and defends headship and submission in marriage not on theological and not on cultural basis. By utilizing the model of Christ and the church, Paul effectively clarifies the meaning of headship and submission in marriage. The purpose of this clarification, however, was not to do away with role distinctions in marriage, but rather to ensure their proper expression in accordance with God's intended purpose. This study of the Biblical principle of headship and submission in marriage provides an essential backdrop to the study of headship and submission in the church.

### PART III

#### 1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16:

#### HEADSHIP AND ROLE DISTINCTIONS IN THE CHURCH

How is the principle of male headship in marriage related to the role of women in the church? Does the Scripture correlate husband headship in the home with male headship in the church? To find an answer to these questions, we shall briefly examine three passages (1 Corinthians 11:2-16; 1 Timothy 2:9-15; 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36) where Paul refers directly and indirectly to the principle of male headship in conjunction with his instructions about women's demeanor and role in the church.

**Background of the Passage.** In 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Paul discusses the appropriate headdress for men and women during the worship service. The basic rule for church order that Paul gives in this passage is that in worship services men should leave their heads uncovered, while women should cover their heads. Since more of the passage discusses the head covering for women when they pray or prophesy in the public assembly, it seems probable that Paul was responding to a report received about some Corinthian women who were either refusing to cover their heads or were questioning such practice. Apparently some women saw the abandoning of their head coverings as an expression of their liberty and equality in Christ.

The importance of this passage lies not so much in what Paul says about head coverings as such, but rather in the significance that he attaches to head coverings as a symbol of the role distinctions that men and women must preserve in the church. These distinctions, as we shall see, are grounded for Paul not on cultural conventions but on a male headship role established by God at creation.



## 1. Headship and Headcovering

**The Order of "Heads."** Paul opens his discussion with a word of commendation to the Corinthians for holding to his teachings (1 Cor 11:2). He then proceeds to set forth his basic teaching that there exists a hierarchy of headship authority, consisting of God, Christ, Man, Woman: "But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor 11:3). This is a foundational statement that provides for Paul the basis for his ruling on head coverings.

Earlier we established that the word "head" (*kephale*) is used by Paul in this text and in Ephesians 5:23 with the meaning of "authority, head over." This meaning is evident especially in 1 Corinthians 11 where the central issue is the relation of head coverings to authority (cf. v. 10). Thus, Paul affirms the existence of an order of "headship" that must be respected in the home (Eph 5:21-30) and in the church (1 Cor 11:3-16).

Some reject the hierarchical interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:3, because Paul, "begins with Christ/man, which in a hierarchical structure should be in second position; he goes on with man/woman, which in a hierarchical structure should be in third position; and he ends with God/Christ, which in a hierarchical structure should be in first position."<sup>44</sup>

The fact that the headship of man is sandwiched between the headship of Christ and of God can hardly represent a negation of a hierarchical order. Instead, this irregular sequential arrangement could well reflect Paul's intent to place the headship of man within the context of the headship of Christ and God, since such Christological and theological model must govern our understanding of the meaning of the headship of man.

**Headship and Equality.** Some find the notion of a hierarchical order in the Godhead, and in the human family, to stand in open contradiction of the principle of equality.<sup>45</sup> How can a woman be equal to a man when she is expected to be subordinate to his headship in the home and in the church? This apparent contradiction can be resolved, as already pointed out, by recognizing that the hierarchical distinctions are functional and not ontological, that is, they have to do with roles and not with essential worth or dignity of being.

As Walter Kaiser points out, "Such a ranking speaks not of their relative dignity or worth (Is Christ any less than God? Or is a woman any less created in the image of God than man?), but only of their job relationships, responsibilities to each other and ultimately to God."<sup>46</sup> The model of the headship of God in relation to Christ should dispel any notion of superiority or inferiority. As George Knight points out:

The headship of God with reference to Christ can be readily seen and affirmed with no threat to Christ's identity. This chain of subordination with its implications is apparently given to help answer the objection some bring to the headship of man in reference to woman. Just as Christ is not a second-class person or deity because the Father is His head, so the woman is not a second-class person or human being because man is her head.<sup>47</sup>

**The Teaching about Head Coverings.** To preserve and to symbolize the order of hierarchical relationships, Paul now teaches that "Any man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, but any woman who prays or

prophecies with her head unveiled dishonors her head--it is the same as if her head were shaven" (1 Cor 11:4-5).

Noteworthy is the fact that Paul assumes that some women at Corinth were praying and prophesying along with men in the worship assembly (cf. Acts 21:9). The gifts of the Spirit are given to the church without regard to sexual differences (Joel 2:28; 1 Cor 12:7-11). Paul does not oppose the participation of women in the worship service. What he opposes is the behavior of those women who had disregarded their subordinate position by praying and giving prophetic exhortations to the congregation with uncovered head like the men.

## 2. Significance of Headcovering

**Reason for Head Coverings.** The reason why Paul opposes this practice is because "any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonors her head--it is the same as if her head were shaven" (v. 5). The "head" being dishonored is presumably her husband since Paul states in verse 3 that "the head of a woman is her husband." Why would a woman dishonor her head, the husband, when praying and prophesying in public with her head uncovered? Simply because the head covering, whatever its nature, was seen as the sign of her being under the "head" or authority of a man (cf. 1 Cor 11:10). Thus, the removal of such a sign constituted a repudiation of her husband's authority or headship.

It is not difficult to see how a wife would dishonor her "head," the husband, when she repudiated publicly the symbol of his authority by removing her head covering. By that act she would make a public statement that she viewed herself free from her vow of loyalty and submission to her husband.

Apparently some of the Corinthian women had concluded that, having been raised with Christ (1 Cor 4:6-9), they were now released from wearing a sign of submission to their husbands and thus they were free to participate in the worship by praying and prophesying with their head uncovered. Paul defends their right to pray and prophesy, but opposes their rejection of the symbol of their marital submission.

**Symbol of Submission and Honor.** Paul argues that if a woman chose to reject the symbol of her marital submission, "then she should cut off her hair; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her wear a veil" (1 Cor 11:6). To understand the meaning of this statement, we need to note that in New Testament times the Jews could no longer execute an adulteress (Lev 20:10). Instead, they punished her by shearing off her hair and expelling her from the synagogue.<sup>48</sup> Apparently a similar practice existed in Roman society because, according to Tacitus, the husband of an adulterous wife cut off her hair and drove her from her house.<sup>49</sup>

The clipped or shaven hair was thus a highly visible sign of a woman's shame resulting from her repudiation of her husband's authority. On the contrary the long hair was for a wife the symbol of her dignity (v. 15) and submission to her husband. As Stephen Clark points out: "This sign brought her honor and respect, because her position as a wife and as a woman was honorable. In fact, for her not to have the appropriate expression of her position as a wife and woman would be degrading. A woman without a veil and a woman without long hair would be disgraced."<sup>50</sup>



This reasoning appears strange to us who live in a Western society which is loosing its awareness of how certain symbols of status and subordination can be honorable. The situation was much different in Paul's time. Fritz Zerbst correctly observes:

The people of Paul's day felt much more keenly than do people of our day that the outward demeanor of a person is an expression of his inner life, specifically, of his religious convictions and moral attitude. The arguments of Paul will be rightly understood and appreciated only when the attempts of Corinthian women to lay aside the headcloth are recognized as an attack in general upon the relations between man and woman as established in creation. This attack Paul strives to counter with a meaningful custom.<sup>51</sup>

**Principle and Local Application.** Some reason that Paul's teaching on male headship in this passage is cultural conditioned because it is related to the local custom of head covering. Such reasoning fails to distinguish between the theological principle of male headship and its local cultural application. The concern of Paul is not merely to promote the outward maintenance of a custom, but primarily to protect the creational principle of the role distinctions men and women must respect in the home and in the church. Respect for this principle demanded in that culture that women wear some kind of head covering. *What is culturally conditioned is not the principle of headship-subordination but its application.*

Although there is disagreement on whether the head covering was a veil or long hair worn up as a bun, there is no doubt that Paul saw such a covering as a fitting cultural expression of a woman's acknowledgment of the headship of man. The head covering was a *custom* (vv. 13-15) subservient to the *principle* "the head of a woman is the man" (v. 3--literal translation). While the principle is permanent, its application will vary in different cultures.

### 3. Theological Justification

**Glory of Man.** To defend the principle of male headship expressed in the rule about head covering, Paul appeals not merely to cultural customs (headcovering, headshaven, and hair length), but primarily to the way in which man and woman were created in relationship to one another. First, he says: "For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man" (1 Cor 11:7).

My analysis of this text in chapter 3 of *Women in the Church* suggests that Paul uses the terms "image and glory," not with reference to personal dignity and worth, but in the context of the relation of man to God and of woman to man. In this context man images God's dominion and gives Him glory by exercising his headship role in a loving and self-sacrificing way (Eph 5:25-29). On the other hand, woman is the glory of man in the way she honors his headship by her life and attitude (Prov 12:4; Eph 5:21-24). Another possibility, suggested by F. W. Grosheide, is that a woman is the glory of man in the way she "reveals how beautiful a being God could create from a man."<sup>52</sup>

**Woman for the Sake of Man?** Paul continues in verses 8 and 9 to explain the reason why a man is the glory of God and a woman is the glory of man, namely, because ("for") the woman was taken out of (*ek*) of man (v. 8; cf. Gen 2:21-22) and

because woman was created for the sake of man (v. 9; Gen 2:18). These two facts, namely, the derivative origin of the woman and her creation to be man's helper, constitute for Paul the fundamental theological justification for the headship of man, expressed culturally through the head covering on the part of women.

The significance of the order of creation for the role distinctions of men and women in the church will receive further consideration in conjunction with our analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15, where Paul refers to the same creation texts. At this juncture it suffices to note that "Paul makes everything a question of creation."<sup>53</sup> He bases his argument for headship and subordination not on the cultural conventions of his time, but on the created relationship between man and woman.

**Authority on the Head.** Paul concludes his theological defense of the need for women to maintain a subordinate role in the worship service by wearing a head cover, saying in verse 10: "For this reason, and because of the angels, the woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head" (NIV). This cryptic remark has been the subject of much discussion. The problem centers on the meaning of "authority" (*exousia*) and on the role of angels.

Most commentators agree that "authority" is a metonym (the name of one thing referring to another) for the covering on the head. On the basis of this view the RSV translates *exousia* by the word "veil." The question is, In what sense is a woman's head cover the sign of authority? To put it differently, What is the function of the veil? For some, the veil is the symbol of the authority given to the woman to participate in public worship by praying and prophesying.<sup>54</sup> The support for this interpretation derives primarily from the fact that the word *exousia* is generally used in the New Testament not in the passive sense of "being under authority," but in the active sense of "having authority."

This interpretation, though appealing, can at best be accepted as a secondary application of *exousia*. First, because such an interpretation provides not a reason for ("for this reason") but a negation of the preceding argument on the need of women to show their subordination to man in the worship service by covering their heads. Second, because it ignores the connection, assumed in verses 5-6, between the use of the head cover in the church and its cultural meaning. Therefore, it is preferable to interpret the *exousia* over the head as being primarily a head covering which was seen as the sign of a woman's subordination to man's headship, and secondarily, a sign which gives to a woman the authority or right to participate in the worship service. As Bruce K. Waltke puts it, "By wearing a covering she preserves the order of creation while exercising her . . . spiritual right."<sup>55</sup>

**Respect for the Angels.** An additional reason given by Paul on why a woman ought to have a sign of her being under man's authority, is "because of the angels" (v. 10). The latter phrase has been interpreted in two major ways: (1) the woman ought to have a sign of a man's authority on her head so that the angels who are present at church gatherings will not be sexually aroused by women; (2) the woman ought to have a sign of man's authority out of respect for the angels who are the guardians of the "creation order."

The first interpretation, though rooted in ancient Jewish speculations about the "sons of God" of Genesis 6:2 who were supposed to have been evil angels who took to themselves the daughter of men, must be regarded as an odious fantasy, foreign to



Biblical thought. Christian women need not fear sexual assault by evil angels. Christ has defeated Satan and his host and the angels present at the gathering of God's people are obedient to God (Heb 12:22; Rev 5:11).

The second interpretation deserves acceptance because Scripture speaks of the angels as the witnesses not only of the creation of this world (Job 38:7), but also of the activities of God's people (1 Cor 4:8-9; 1 Tim 5:21; Heb 1:14). The angels are seen as the custodians of God's created order. Consequently, what Paul is saying is that a woman must cover her head not only out of respect for the headship of man, but also out of respect for the angels who are the guardians of God's order and discipline.<sup>56</sup>

**Subordinate but Equal.** Aware of the possibility that his argument could be misconstrued to mean that women are inferior to men, Paul quickly adds in verses 11 and 12 a clarifying statement on the equality and natural interdependence of man and woman: "Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God" (1 Cor 11:11-12).

The opening word "nevertheless" (*plen*) indicates Paul's concern to set the record straight. "In spite of what I have just said, I want you to know," Paul seems to be saying "that in the Lord man and woman are interdependent and equal." One senses how the apostle is fighting on two fronts. On one side he had to put the liberated Corinthian women in their place by telling them to respect the headship of man in the church service by covering their heads. On the other side he had to prevent men from considering and treating women as inferior by reminding them of their derivation from women and their mutual dependence in the Lord. This passage provides a fine example of how Paul respected and applied the Biblical principle of equality in being and subordination in function, at a time when the role distinctions between men and women were being challenged. The existence of a similar situation in our time makes Paul's approach particularly relevant to us today.

**Order of Nature and Church Custom.** In his closing remarks (vv. 13-16) Paul returns to his central teaching by adding two final reasons for the veil: the order of nature (vv. 13-15) and the prevailing custom of the congregations. Paul appeals to the good judgment of the Corinthians ("Judge for yourselves"), on the assumption that they will agree with him that it is not "proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered" (v. 13). To help them formulate the right judgment, Paul appeals to the order of nature: "Does not nature itself teach you that for a man to wear long hair is degrading to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her pride? For her hair is given to her for a covering" (vv. 14-15).

"Nature" (*phusis*) here apparently refers both to God's revelation in the world (Rom 1:20) and in one's heart (Rom 2:15). On the basis of natural revelation and their own consciences, the Corinthians can conclude for themselves that short hair is honorable for men but long hair is honorable for women. In giving long hair to woman as a covering, nature hints that she should not uncover her head.

As a final argument against anyone wishing to be contentious, Paul states categorically: "we recognize no other practice, nor do the churches of God" (v. 16). This final appeal to his own authority and to the authority of the existing practice in the churches of God is intended to make it clear that the practice of women covering their heads during worship service, is not open to debate.

**Overall Significance.** In spite of all the difficulties in its interpretation, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 provides one of the clearest statements on the fundamental significance of the role differences which must exist between men and women, not only in the home but also in the church. The lengthy discussion about head covering can mislead a person to think that in this passage Paul is majoring in minors, that is, he deals with incidental and culturally conditioned matters such as hair length and head covering.

The truth of the matter, however, is that the lengthy discussion on head coverings is only secondary and subservient to the fundamental principle of the headship of man ("the head of the woman is man" v.3, NIV) and of the subordination of the woman (vv. 5-10) which must be respected not only in the home but also in the church. This principle was being challenged by emancipated Corinthian women who had concluded that their new position in Christ (1 Cor 4:6-9), granted them freedom to stop wearing a sign of submission to their husbands, especially at times of prayer and charismatic expression in the church service. To counteract this trend, which would have resulted in the violation of creational role distinctions, Paul emphasizes at length the importance of respecting the custom of head covering as a way of honoring the creation order. As James Hurley puts it, "If the leadership of the congregation was divinely placed in the hands of men, a rejection of sexual differentiation was a rejection of the divine pattern."<sup>57</sup>

The concern of Paul, however, is not to legislate on hair styles or head coverings. In fact, no specific guidelines are given on the length of hair or type of head coverings. Rather, the concern of Paul, as stated by F. W. Grosheide, is "to teach that women are wrong if they in any respect neglect their difference from men, a difference which remains also in the church."<sup>58</sup>

What is the relevance of Paul's instruction on head coverings for our worship service today? Paul urges respect of a custom such as hair length and head cover during worship services because in his time these fittingly expressed sexual differentiation and role distinctions. Applied to our culture, this means that if certain styles of hair and clothing are distinctively male or female, their gender association must be respected especially during church services in order to maintain the clear distinction between the sexes enjoined in Scripture. This principle is particularly relevant to our time when some promote the blurring of sexual differentiations (unisex) by adopting the dress and sometimes the behavior of the opposite sex.

## PART IV

### 1 TIMOTHY 2:9-15

#### HEADSHIP AND WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP IN THE CHURCH

##### 1. Importance and Applicability of Passage

**Importance of Passage.** A second major Pauline passage which refers indirectly to the principle of male headship in discussing women in church leadership, is 1 Timothy 2:11-15, which says:



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

The significance of this passage lies in the fact that it addresses specifically the question of the role of women within the church on the basis of the of the headship principle. Thus, it is not surprising that this passage has been examined at great length by evangelicals who oppose or limit<sup>59</sup> or support the full participation of women in church leadership.<sup>60</sup> Usually, the view taken by an author on this passage reflects his or her views on the role of women in the church and vice versa.

**Local or General Applicability?** Before examining the specific instructions given by Paul in the passage under consideration, it is appropriate to consider whether such instructions were intended exclusively for the local situation existing at Ephesus or inclusively for the church at large.

Even a cursory reading of 1 Timothy suffices to see that the instructions given by Paul were meant not merely for the local church at Ephesus but for the Christian church at large. While the epistle was occasioned by the disruptive influence of certain false teachers (1:3-6; 6:3-5), Paul's concern is not to launch a detailed rebuttal of their false teaching, but rather to explain to the congregation, its leaders and to Timothy himself, how Christians ought to live godly lives in the face of unhealthy teachings and a depraved pagan environment.

The general applicability of 1 Timothy is evident especially in the nature of the subjects discussed. The opening chapter discusses the perverted use of the law by false teachers, the proper use of the law to develop character, the work of Christ and the challenge to Timothy to exercise competent leadership. The second deals with prayers for rulers and worship procedures for men and women. The third and fourth chapters discuss the qualifications for church leaders and practical suggestions for a more earnest ministry. The fifth and sixth chapters explain how Timothy should function in relation to old and young members, widows, elected elders, false teachers, and worldly riches

The topics discussed are not culturally relative, although they are addressed within the context of the culture of Paul's time. The fact that a particular teaching was occasioned by local circumstances does not per se negate the normative nature of such a teaching. Paul's teaching that "a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ" (Gal 2:16) does not lack universal validity because it was occasioned by a specific Judaizing heresy which attracted the Galatians. The general applicability of virtually *any* Biblical command could be negated simply by arguing that there are possible local circumstances behind it. Any attempt to reduce the instructions of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 to local and temporary applicability cannot be legitimately supported from the text itself where Paul offers general instruction with no condition attached to it.

## 2. Modesty and Submissiveness

**Adornment and Insubordination.** The first part of 1 Timothy 2 deals with prayer and modesty. After urging that prayers be made "for all men," especially "for

kings and all who are in high positions" (2:1-2), Paul turns to discuss how "men should pray," namely, by "lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling" (2:8). He then expresses his concern for women, saying: "I desire . . . also that women should adorn themselves modestly and sensibly in seemly apparel, not with braided hair or gold or pearl or costly attire but by good deeds, as befits women who profess religion" (2:8-10). Paul's call for a high standard of modesty in dress and hair adornment is obviously not culturally relative. What may be culturally relative are some of the examples given: "braided hair or gold or pearls or costly attire" (2:9).

Ostentatious external adornment apparently expressed a woman's independence from her husband. David Scholer concludes his analysis of numerous texts regarding women's adornment and dress in the Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures, by saying:

More important, in virtually all the Jewish and pagan texts, the rejection of external adornment was part of a woman's submission to her husband and a recognition of her place among men in general. Using external adornments such as pearls, gold jewelry, hair styling and expensive, provocative clothing indicated two undesirable characteristics -- material extravagance and sexual infidelity.<sup>61</sup>

The connection between a woman's modest adornment and her submission to her husband is also suggested by Peter's double exhortation that wives be submissive to their husbands and that they be modest in their adornment (1 Pet 3:1-4). Some argue that there is a progression of thought from Paul's concern for women's immodest dress (vv. 9-10), which expressed insubordination, to his injunction that women be submissive and silent in public worship (vv. 11-12). The conclusion drawn from this is that it was not women in general that Paul prohibited to teach in the church, but only those women in the church in Ephesus who were indecently dressed. As Philip Payne puts it, "For such indecently clad women to teach in the church would bring the gospel into contempt."<sup>62</sup>

This argument may be right in suggesting the existence of an underlying unity between Paul's admonition against women's immodest dress and their improper roles in the church. Presumably, both of them expressed insubordination. But the argument is wrong in maintaining that a "contributing factor to Paul's restriction on women in the church in Ephesus was indecent dress."<sup>63</sup> First, the problem appears to have been one of overdressing rather than of underdressing, as indicated by the emphasis upon not dressing lavishly (cf. 1 Pet 3:3-5). Second, the reason given by Paul for his prohibition of v. 12 is not indecent dress but the order of creation of Adam and Eve (v.13). Thus, the attempt to relativize Paul's prohibition by appealing to the alleged indecent dress of the Ephesian women must be rejected as devoid of contextual support.

**Quiet Learning.** From modesty in dress, Paul proceeds to discuss in verses 11 and 12 the learning and teaching aspects of the lives of "women who profess to worship God" (2:10, NIV): "A woman should learn in quietness and full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent" (2:11-12, NIV). These two verses should be taken as a unit, because they form an inverted parallelism. What is stated positively in verse 11, is restated and amplified negatively in verse 12. Quiet learning is paralleled by the command not to teach, and the attitude of submission is paralleled by the command not to exercise authority.



The first injunction is significant because it contains Paul's positive command (*manthaneto*--an imperative verb): "Let a woman learn." This command shows that Paul assumed that women can and must learn the truths of the Gospel. His view of women, then, is not rabbinic but "quite radical for his time."<sup>64</sup>

The manner in which women are to learn is qualified by two phrases: "in quietness (*hesychia*) and full submission (*hypotage*). "The word *hesychia* does not require total silence as the word *sigao* used in 1 Corinthians 14:34, but rather "quietness, peacefulness."<sup>65</sup> As James Hurley points out, "Paul is not just calling for 'buttoned lips' but for a quiet receptivity and a submission to authority in his description of the manner of women's learning."<sup>66</sup>

To appreciate the relevance of Paul's injunction it is important to remember that a New Testament home church service was more of discussion group than of one preacher sermon. Thus, learning "in quietness" is recommended by Paul presumably because some women through their speaking may have expressed insubordination to their husbands or to the officials of the church. The latter is suggested by the second qualifying phrase "with all submissiveness" (RSV). The concept of "submission" to male headship (*hypotasso*) recurs regularly in the discussion of women in relation to men (Eph 5:21-24; 1 Pet 3:1-5). "Submission" is the pivotal concept that unites the learning of women in verse 11 with the issue of their teaching in verse 12.<sup>67</sup>

### 3. Teaching and Exercise of Authority

After calling for women to learn "in quietness and full submission," Paul moves to forbid the contrary: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent" (2:12, NIV). We noted earlier that this verse forms with the preceding one an inverted parallelism. Therefore, it is important to look at the two verses together, to grasp what Paul is emphasizing. The thrust of the parallelism is well explained by James Hurley:

Verse 11 calls for quiet and submissive learning. Verse 12 forbids teaching or exercising authority over men. The two are visibly parallel. Quiet learning inversely parallels (verbal) teaching and full submission inversely parallels exercising authority. Both verses have the same situation in mind, one in which women are not to teach authoritatively but are to learn quietly. The closing remark of verse 12 makes this clear by summing up both verses with a single short statement: 'she must be silent.' We conclude, therefore, that Paul intended that women should not be authoritative teachers in the church.<sup>68</sup>

**Local or Universal Prohibition?** Before attempting to define what constitutes authoritative teaching, it is important to establish whether Paul's prohibition is of a local or universal nature. Some writers argue that Paul's command is neither universal nor permanent (transtemporal), because he uses the first person present indicative active form of the verb: "I do not permit . . ." This form of the verb, according to Philip B. Payne, "is Paul's typical way of expressing his own personal opinion." To support this contention Payne appeals to the fact that the verb "to permit" (*epitrepo*) "in the NT only rarely occurs with reference to a continuing state" and that "Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 does not claim that this restriction on women is from the Lord or to be observed in all the churches."<sup>69</sup>

The argument that the first person present active indicative is generally used by Paul to express his own personal opinion rather than a universally valid principle cannot be supported. Though this form is relatively rare in Paul's writing, there are instances in which the apostle uses the first person singular indicative to communicate what he believed to be the will of God. For example, in Romans 12:1, Paul makes this appeal: "I urge you, brothers, . . . to offer your bodies as living sacrifices." (NIV; cf. 1 Cor 4:16; 11:2; 12:3; Gal 5:2,3; Eph 4:1; 1 Thess 4:1; 5:12,14). No one would interpret this exhortation as being Paul's personal, presumptive opinion because he uses the first person singular indicative without a universal qualifier.

The rare occurrence of the verb "to permit" (*epitrepo*) to express a continuing state, is per se irrelevant because the verb in itself has no temporal connotation. Similarly, the fact that Paul "does not claim that this restriction on women is from the Lord or to be observed in all the churches," does not negate its universal applicability. Paul had just established the ground of his authority in verse 7: "I was appointed a preacher and apostle."

Only rarely Paul clarifies whether his instruction is personal advice or a command from the Lord. This clarification is usually given only in few uncertain situations, as with regard to Paul's counsel to the married and unmarried (1 Cor 7:6, 10, 12, 25, 40). When in these instances Paul expresses his own personal view, he explicitly says: "I say, not the Lord" (1 Cor 7:12; cf. vv. 6, 40). Thus, the absence of any qualifier in the prohibition of 1 Timothy 2:12, suggests that Paul had no doubt as to the normative nature of his instructions. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the similar instruction given in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 is followed by Paul's statement: "What I am writing to you is a command of the Lord" (1 Cor 14:37).

**Female False Teachers?** What is the meaning of Paul's injunction: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man" (2:12)? Obviously Paul's intent here is not to prohibit all forms of women's teaching and speaking in the church. In 1 Corinthians 11:5 Paul assumes that some women were praying and prophesying along with men in the worship service. Moreover, Paul explicitly enjoins older women "to teach what is good and so train the young women" (Titus 2:3-4).

Some authors argue that Paul's injunction is only "directed against women involved in false teaching who have abused the proper exercise of authority in the church (not denied by Paul elsewhere to women) by usurpation and domination of the male leaders and teachers in the church at Ephesus."<sup>70</sup> This conclusion rests largely on two faulty assumptions: (1) Paul's injunction was occasioned by and directed (*exclusively*) to "the false teaching plaguing the church in Ephesus."<sup>71</sup> (2) The verb *authenthein* usually translated "to have authority over" seems "rather clearly to carry the negative sense of 'domineer' or 'usurp authority.'"<sup>72</sup> Thus, Paul is only forbidding teaching to women who were false teachers and who were usurping the authority of male leaders. Had the women been orthodox teachers and respectful of church leaders, Paul would have had no objection to their teaching.

The first assumption is discredited by the fact that, as we have shown earlier, though the writing of 1 Timothy was occasioned by the disruptive influence of certain false teachers (1:3-6; 6:3-5), Paul chose to counteract such an influence not by addressing specifically the false teachers, but rather by offering guidelines on how Christians should live in the world and in the church in the face of unhealthy teachings and a depraved pagan environment.



If Paul intended to prohibit only the teaching done by certain female false teachers, he would have surely alluded to it, as he does refer to young widows who got "into the habit of being idle and going about from house to house. . . . saying things they ought not to" (5:13, NIV). Moreover the reason given by Paul for his prohibition is not the sinister effect of certain women's false teaching, but the priority of the creation of Adam and the deception of Eve, both of which are unrelated to the problem of false teaching.

**"Authority over" or "Domineer"?** The second assumption that the verb *authenteo* should be translated "to domineer, to usurp authority," instead of "to have authority," is faulty for two major reasons. First, the recent study of George Knight of all the major lexical occurrences of *authenteo* (published in *New Testament Studies*, January 1984), has shown that "the recognized meaning for the first century BC and AD documents . . . is 'to have authority over.' The nuance is positive, or at least neutral, but in any case there is no inherent negative overtone such as is suggested by the word 'domineer.'" <sup>73</sup>

Second, the meaning "to have authority over" fits better in the text with the verb "to teach" (*didasko*) with which it is joined, since the latter has no negative implications. Moreover, we have seen that authority and teaching in verse 12 are parallel to subordination and quietness in verse 11. This suggests that the converse of *authenteo* is to be found in the phrase "full submission." The concept of "submission," as we have seen from our study of Ephesians 5, does not carry with it the meaning of "cringing servility under a domineering person but of a willing submission to a recognized authority."<sup>74</sup> What Paul disallows, therefore, is not the abuse or usurpation of authority, but simply the exercise of that kind of authority by women over men which violated the principle of male headship.

**The Nature of Teaching.** What is the nature of the teaching forbidden to women? This question has been debated at great length. Some have assumed that Paul prohibits women from participating in any kind of teaching or speaking, including teaching in public schools and having a job in which a woman exercises authority over man. Such a view is obviously unwarranted because in Paul's ministry women prayed, prophesied and exercised a teaching ministry (1 Cor 11:5; Acts 18:26; Phil 4:3; Rom 16:12).

The nature of teaching forbidden to women in 1 Timothy 2:12 is undoubtedly the authoritative teaching restricted to the pastor or elder/overseer of the congregation. This conclusion is supported not only by the meaning of the inverted parallelism discussed earlier but also by the use of the verb "to teach" and of the noun "teaching" in the pastoral epistles. The teaching ministry is presented, especially in the pastoral epistles, as a governing function performed by Paul, Timothy or appointed elders/overseers of the congregation. Paul speaks of himself as "a teacher of the Gentiles" (1 Tim 2:7; cf. 2 Tim 1:11). He charges Timothy to "Command and teach" (1 Tim 4:11), "Take heed to yourself and to your teaching" (1 Tim 4:16), "teach and urge these duties" (1 Tim 6:2), "preach the word . . . in teaching" (2 Tim 4:2).

The restrictive meaning of the teaching ministry is especially evident in 2 Timothy 2:2 where Paul gives this solemn charge to Timothy: "what you have heard from me before many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also." The "faithful men" are presumably the elder/overseers of the congregation. A

qualification for such an office was "an apt teacher" (1 Tim 3:2). Paul urges that special recognition be given to "the elders who rule well . . . especially those who labor in preaching and teaching" (1 Tim 5:17).

**Importance of Teaching.** The importance attached to sound teaching in 1 Timothy and the other pastoral epistles is illustrated by the fact that of the 21 occurrences of the word "teaching, doctrine" (*didaskalia*) in the New Testament, 15 appear in 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus.<sup>75</sup> The teaching by appointed church leaders was most important because it involved the careful transmission of the teachings of Jesus Christ (cf. Gal 1:12) and their significance for the life of the church. Before the existence and general availability of the writings of the New Testament, the teacher (pastor, elder, overseer) was a kind of living Bible to the congregation. He was the guardian of the body of teachings which had been received by the churches and to which they were to remain true (Rom 16:17; Eph 4:21; Col 2:7; 2 Thess 2:15).

In the light of the restrictive use of the words "to teach" and "teaching" in the pastoral epistles, it is reasonable to conclude that the teaching forbidden to women is the authoritative teaching done by "leaders of the congregation"<sup>76</sup> such as Paul, Timothy, Titus, elder/ overseers. The teaching role of these leaders is emphasized especially in the pastoral epistles, where destructive and demonic teaching (1 Tim 4:1) necessitated leaders who would uphold "sound teaching" (2 Tim 4:3). Paul forbids women to teach as the representative leaders of the church because this would place them in a headship role of authority over men. This role is inappropriate for women, not because they are any less capable or competent than men, but because of the principle of male headship which Paul finds rooted in the order and manner of creation of Adam and Eve. These theological reasons given by Paul will now be examined.

#### 4. First Theological Reasons: The Priority of Adam's Creation

**Reason or Illustration?** To justify his ruling about the exclusion of women from teaching (as leaders) and exercising authority over men in the church, Paul submits two reasons: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor" (1 Tim 2:13-14). Before examining these two reasons, attention must be given to the conjunction "for" (*gar*).

Some argue that "for" is illustrative and not illative, that is to say, it is designed to introduce an example and not a reason for Paul's ruling.<sup>77</sup> To defend this view they appeal to grammar and context. Grammatically, the illustrative use of *gar* ("for") is a lexical possibility. Contextually, they see Paul's reference to Eve as a historical example of what once happened when, in a situation similar to that at Ephesus, a deceived woman taught a man. Thus, Paul's statement does not offers reasons for the general exclusion of women from teaching or exercising authority over men in the church, but merely a historical example relevant only to the local situation in the Ephesian church.

This interpretation of *gar* ("for"), as Douglas Moo has cogently shown, founders both on grammar and context.<sup>78</sup> Grammatically, the "illustrative" use of *gar* ("for") is rare. All the major lexicons and grammars give the causal meaning as the first and



most common one. Contextually, the illustrative use of *gar* ("for") fails to explain how, for example, the priority of Adam's creation can illustrate what happens when women false teachers teach and exercise authority over men in the church. Reasons such as these indicate that the conjunction "for" is used to introduce not an illustration but a reason for the ruling of verses 11-12.

**Priority of Adam's Creation.** The first reason given by Paul to justify his ruling is the priority of Adam's creation: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve" (1 Tim 2:13). The meaning of this statement is clearly expressed by Paul Jewett when he writes, "The plain meaning of Paul's argument is that the subordination of woman to the man is an essential part of the hierarchy which God himself established to insure a proper order in the relationships of life."<sup>79</sup>

According to several writers, Paul's argument from creation is faulty on two counts. First, it is based on the wrong creation account. Instead of using the creation account of Genesis 1 which accurately speaks of the simultaneous creation of man and woman, Paul made the unfortunate mistake to use the second, "poetic," account of creation.<sup>80</sup> Second, it attaches hierarchical significance to the fact that man was created before woman. "If beings created first are to have precedence, then the animals are clearly our betters."<sup>81</sup> Paul allegedly fell back on his rabbinic eisegesis, which caused him to argue for a wrong doctrine from a wrong text.<sup>82</sup> Therefore, the argument from creation offers no valid support to Paul's ruling in verses 11-12.

**Authority of Scripture.** The charges that have been leveled against Paul on this issue are not inconsequential. If Paul made a mistake in interpreting the meaning of Genesis for the role relations of men and women, he could have been equally in error in interpreting the meaning of the life and death of Christ, of the resurrection, of the Second Advent, or of the relation between faith and works in the process of salvation. Ultimately what is at stake is the authority of Scripture. If any part of the Scripture presents false teachings through faulty exegesis or reasoning, then its normative authority is discredited.

Paul stated very clearly his own understanding of the authority of his own teaching and of those who would challenge it: "If any one thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord. If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized" (1 Cor 14:37-38). Strikingly, Paul made this claim in the very context of his teaching about the role of men and women in the church. Therefore, it behooves us to accept his interpretation of Scripture.

**Priority of Creation and Subordination.** Why does Paul appeal to the prior formation of Adam to justify his injunction that women should not be permitted "to teach or to have authority over men" (1 Tim 2:12)? Primarily because Paul saw in the priority of Adam's creation the symbol of the headship role God intended man to fulfill in the home and in the church.

From an empirical standpoint, it seems arbitrary and irrational that leadership should be assigned on the basis of priority of creation. From a Biblical standpoint, however, the arbitrariness and irrationality disappear because the priority of creation is seen not as an accident but as a divine design, intended to typify the representative headship role man was created to fulfill in the home and in the church. The

sanctification of the seventh day provides another example. From an empirical standpoint, it seems arbitrary that God should choose to bless and sanctify the seventh day instead of the first day. After all the seven days, each consisting of the same 24 hours, seemed identical to one another. From a Biblical standpoint, however, it is not arbitrary that God should choose the seventh day as a symbol of creation and sanctification (Gen 2:2-3; Ex 31:13,17; Ezek 20:20).

In the same way Paul sees Adam's prior formation and Eve's derivation from man (1 Cor 11:8), as typifying the headship role God called man to fulfill. This typological understanding of the priority of Adam's formation is reflected in the meaning the Old and New Testaments attach to primogeniture (being first-born). The first-born son inherited not only a "double portion" of his father's goods, but also the responsibility of acting as the leader of worship upon his father's death.

**Christ the "First-Born."** The typological meaning of the first-born is used by Paul also with reference to Christ in Colossians 1:15-18: "He is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in him all things were created. . . . He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in everything he might be pre-eminent." The rich imagery used in this passage presents Christ as (1) the Image of God, (2) the First-born, (3) the Source of Creation, (4) the Head of the church. All of these are drawn together to establish the pre-eminent authority of Christ over everything.

It is noteworthy that the headship and authority of Christ is expressed also through "the first-born typology," presumably because such typology, derived from the priority of Adam's formation, fittingly illustrated the role of Christ as the head of the human family. Paul's use of the "first-born" typology to express the headship and authority of Christ suggests that he saw in the priority of the formation of Adam a type of the headship role God called man to fulfill, and thus, a reason why men, rather than women, should teach or exercise authority as the representative heads of the congregation..

**Priority of Animals.** The above observations help to show the weakness of the argument that Paul's reasoning leads to the conclusion that animals should rule mankind by right of their temporal priority in creation. Proponents of this argument fail to realize that no typological significance is attached in Scripture to the temporal priority of the animals. Moreover, Paul clearly associates the priority of Adam's formation with Eve's derivation out of man in 1 Corinthians 11:8-9. The animals were created before mankind, but mankind does not derive from animals.

## 5. Signs of Headship in Genesis 2

**Name of Humanity.** The significance that Paul attaches to Adam's prior formation is compatible with the central role of man in Genesis 2. There are several indications in Genesis 2 which point definitely and consistently to an existing pre-Fall role distinctions. Genesis 2:7 informs us that man was created prior to the woman. The man was designated as "Adam" (Gen 2:20, *adam*), a term which is used to describe the whole human race. In spite of the objection from feminists today, the name for the human race in Genesis is the proper name of the man, because he is seen as the



embodiment of the race. Eve is seen as the mother of all human beings, but not as the embodiment of the race.

Several events of the narrative indicate that Adam was invested with the position of leadership and authority prior to the creation of Eve. He was commanded to "cultivate" and "keep" the garden. He was given instruction about the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He was given the opportunity to observe and name the animals and to sense his own incompleteness.

**"A Helper Fit for Him."** Adam's headship role is further indicated by the fact that Genesis 2 tells us that God made the woman *of* the man and *for* the man ("a helper fit for him"--Gen 2:18) and brought her *to* the man.. The usage of "helper" ('ezer in Hebrew) has generated considerable debate. Since in 16 of the 21 instances the word "helper" is used in the Old Testament to refer to God as the "helper" of the needy, Scanzoni and Hardesty argue that the "helper" referred to is a superior, just as God is a superior helper of man.<sup>83</sup> Such reasoning ignores the context where the "helper" is not divine but human.

"If one human being is created to be the helper of another human being," rightly notes George W. Knight, "the one who receives such a helper has certain authority over the helper."<sup>84</sup> This does not mean that woman exists solely for the sake of helping man, but rather that she is a helper who corresponds to man because she is of the same nature. Any subordination is functional and not ontological, that is, in roles not in nature or worth. Michael F. Stitzinger comments:

Until this time, all of man's help was superior. However, man had a specific need for a human helper. The divine helper supplied this need by designating for him a subordinate human helper who would aid him in obeying the commands. This woman, who was to be voluntary submissive to man in function, would "correspond to" or be "suitable to him" spiritually, physically, mentally, and in ability.<sup>85</sup>

**Leaving and Cleaving.** Man's headship is demonstrated also by the fact that he is commanded to leave his mother and father and cleave to his wife (Gen 2:24). Some argue that since it is "the lesser person who cleaves to the greater," God's command implies that man is subordinate to woman.<sup>86</sup> Such reasoning ignores two major facts. First, the emphasis of leaving and cleaving is not on headship as such but on a new unity which is closer to that of parents and children. Second, God places the responsibility for forming this new unity primarily upon Adam (and his male descendants) as He has done with all the other instructions. Thus, such a command implies strong headship and not weakness on Adam's part.

**Man Addressed First.** Man's headship role is further implied in Genesis 3:9, 11. If Adam was *not* the head of his house before the Fall, why did God call Adam to account first: "The Lord God called to the man, and said to him, 'Where are you?' . . . 'Have you eaten of the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?' (Gen 3:9, 11). Why did not God address Eve first, since she was the first to sin? Moreover, why does Scripture present Adam and *not* Eve as the head of fallen humanity ("in Adam all die"-- 1 Cor 15:22)? If there were no role distinctions before the Fall, then it would be only logical that Eve should serve as the representative head of fallen humanity, since she was the first one to sin.

These facts suggest strongly, if not conclusively, that the man had exercised a headship role from the very beginning. What Paul offers in 1 Timothy 2:13 is an

explicit interpretation of these historical facts, applying them to the role of women in the worship service, in accordance with the subordinate, helping role envisaged for them in the order of creation.

#### 6. Second Theological Reason: The Deception of Eve

**Are Women More Gullible?** The second reason given by Paul to support his ruling is derived from the deception of Eve: "and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor" (1 Tim 2:14). This argument is less developed by Paul, and it has produced many dangerous interpretations. Some have assumed that this verse teaches that women are not qualified to teach religious doctrine in the church, because they do not have the same critical acumen as men and thus they are more susceptible to external pressures.<sup>87</sup>

This view is without warrant, because the text does not say that "the woman is deceivable," but simply that "the woman was deceived." If it were true that women are more susceptible to deception, it would ultimately make God responsible for having created women less perfect than men. If Paul believed that women are more prone to err than men, he would not have admonished them "to teach what is good" to children and other women (Titus 2:3-4; cf. 2 Tim 1:5; 3:15).

**Typological Role of Eve.** The best way to understand the statement "the woman was deceived" is to look at it not empirically, that is, by asking how Eve's deception affects the subordination of women; but rather typologically, that is, by asking what Eve's deception represents for Paul. As Stephen B. Clark perceptively points out, we tend to think empirically, that is, in terms of observable causes, while Bible writers were "more inclined to think typologically,"<sup>88</sup> that is, in terms of the symbolic meaning of an event. "Typological thinking," explains Clark, "focuses on the concrete event--the 'type' which reveals the general purpose or intention of God. Empirical generalizations focus on verifiable facts and observed regularities."<sup>89</sup>

Typological thought assumes that if Adam was formed first, then Scripture must be indicating something about the role of man. Similarly, if the woman was deceived and not man, then Scripture must be indicating something about the role of women. As Adam is a 'type' man (Rom 5:12, 18), so Eve is a 'type' woman, and her being deceived points to what women should do or not do.

How could Paul view Eve's deception as a type of woman's subordination to man? The text does not tell us. We can presume that Paul understood Eve's deception to be the result of her attempt to assert her independence from man. The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* supports this interpretation: "The apostle's second argument for the submissiveness of women is that when Eve tried to assert leadership she was beguiled."<sup>90</sup> What happened to Eve at that most historic and significant occasion becomes then a type of what can happen when the order of creation is reversed. "In verses 13-14, then," as Douglas Moo observes, "Paul substantiates his teaching in verses 11-12 by arguing that the created order establishes a relationship of subordination of woman to man, which order, if bypassed, leads to disaster."<sup>91</sup>

**Subordination and the Fall.** Some contend that the argument from the deception of the woman is untenable because it bases the subordination of the woman to



man on the results of the Fall. If Paul's ruling about the subordination of women in the church is based on the "curses" which resulted from the Fall, then such ruling has been reversed by the work of Christ.<sup>92</sup>

The weakness of this reasoning is twofold. First, it ignores the fact that Paul's primary appeal is to the priority of Adam's formation. Second, it fails to distinguish between the deception which led to the Fall and the curses which resulted from the Fall. Eve's deception which resulted in the Fall occurred before the human race faced the judgment of God and began suffering its consequences. Paul does not ground the subordination of women on the consequences of the Fall, but on events that preceded the Fall. The point of his argument is that "Adam was formed first" and "the woman was deceived." (vv. 13-14). These two events, which occurred before the human race faced the judgment of God, represent for Paul the origin of the functional headship role of man and of the subordinate role of women.

## 7. Faithfulness to Proper Role

**Saved through Childbirth?** To counteract any possible misunderstanding deriving from his negative statements in verses 11-14, Paul concludes his argument with a positive statement: "Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty" (v. 15). This verse is clearly connected with the preceding by the preposition *de* ("yet") and forms the climactic conclusion to the whole argument introduced in verse 9 with the phrase "likewise women." Therefore, an understanding of this closing statement can further clarify the meaning of the whole passage.

The interpretation of this verse poses some linguistic problems. The major one has to do with the verb *sothesetai*, which can mean either "she will be *saved*" or "she will be *kept safe* through childbirth." The second option has been adopted by the New International Version.<sup>93</sup> According to this translation what Paul is saying is that woman will survive childbirth if she is pious. This interpretation is not only irrelevant to the context but also empirically untrue. Godly Christian women have died bearing children.

The first translation is in harmony with the usage of the verb "to save" in Paul's writings where it virtually always refers to salvation from sin. The question is, in what sense will a woman be saved through childbirth? Some believe that it means that Christian women will be saved through good works, figuratively represented by childbearing.<sup>94</sup> This would be a flat contradiction of Paul's view of salvation by faith in Christ.

Others believe that it means that Christian women will be saved through *the* childbirth, that is, the coming of the Messiah.<sup>95</sup> This interpretation finds support especially in the presence of the article "*the* childbirth" (*tes teknogonia*), which could suggest a particular childbirth, namely, that of Christ. Such a view, however, is discredited first of all by the most likely lexical meaning of *teknogonia* ("childbearing" or "childrearing") which denotes the *woman's* role in giving birth, not the birth as such (cf. 1 Tim 5:14). Second, this interpretation does not fit the context. How can Mary's role in the birth of Jesus be the means of the salvation of women?

**Faithfulness to Proper Role.** The interpretation which best fits the vocabulary and the contextual location of verse 15, is that women will be saved, not by

aspiring to the leadership role of teacher-superintendent of the local congregation, but through faithfulness to their maternal and domestic roles, providing they continue in faith, love and holiness, with modesty.<sup>96</sup>

This interpretation admirably suits the immediate context of verses 9-14, where the concern of Paul is to emphasize the proper sphere of women's activities. It also finds support in the larger context of the pastoral epistles where a recurring motif is the need for Christian women to devote themselves to their maternal and domestic roles (1 Tim 5:9-14; Titus 2:3-5).

This admonition was apparently needed to counteract the sinister influence of false teachers, who counseled women to abstain from marriage (1 Tim 4:3) and to seek fulfilment outside the home (1 Tim 5:13-15), by assuming leadership roles in the church (1 Tim 2:12). To counteract this teaching Paul urges Christian women to maintain their "modesty" (*sophrosyne*)--a term he uses twice (vv. 9, 15), at the beginning and at the end of his admonition. Christian women were to show their modesty and propriety by dressing sensibly, by learning submissively, by refraining from aspiring to the role of teacher (leader) of the congregation, and by fulfilling their maternal-domestic roles.

**Salvation through Childbearing?** Our interpretation poses a problem: Did Paul mean in verse 15 that all women should get married and bear children in order to be saved? Obviously not. We know from 1 Corinthians 7 that Paul considered *both* celibacy and marriage a divine calling. Moreover, this view would reduce salvation to a biological process rather than to a divine gift of grace (Rom 3:28; Gal 2:16). It is, therefore, more likely that Paul mentions childbearing as a typical but not exclusive aspect of a woman's role. This is supported by 1 Timothy 5:14 where Paul expresses the wish that younger widows "marry" and "bear children" (*teknogonein*). It is obvious that Paul did not expect *all* young women to marry. Rather, he expected them to maintain their proper domestic roles.

To remove any possibility of attributing meritorious value to childbearing, Paul adds the essential Christian virtues women must maintain: "faith and love and holiness, with modesty" (v. 15). Verse 15 ends emphasizing "modesty," the very quality mentioned at the beginning of the passage (v. 9). This quality is emphasized by Paul because it expresses the chief virtue of a Christian woman, manifested not in aspiring to be the teacher-leader of the congregation, but in maintaining a submissive and domestic role, which is in accordance with the role for women established by God at creation.

In its immediate and larger context, then, 1 Timothy 2:15 helps to clarify why Paul forbids women "to teach or to have authority over men" in the church, namely, because he sees such a role as a violation of the proper domestic and subordinate role God has established for women at creation. By maintaining this proper role in faith, love and holiness, women, like men, become recipients of the gift of eternal life.

**Contemporary Relevance.** How relevant is Paul's teaching about the role of women in the home and in the church for us today? Some argue that it is totally irrelevant because today many married women find their fulfilment not in rearing a family but in pursuing a professional career. They argue that had Paul lived in our age, he would have taken a much different stand. Consequently, to be faithful to the "central thrust" or "greater vision" of Paul, we must reject his restrictions and allow



women to function as leaders not only in the secular world, but also in the church where they ought to be ordained as pastors/elders of the congregation. This reasoning is unacceptable for three major reasons.

First, Paul's conviction on the role of women in the church and in the home derives not from cultural perceptions, but from his understanding of the special role God has called women to fulfill. Rearing a family and being subordinate were for Paul central elements of the Biblical definition of womanhood and of her fulfilment of God's calling to mankind. Therefore, if Paul lived today he would still admonish women to be true to their divinely established roles.

A second reason why Paul's teachings on the role of women are relevant today is because in some ways the emancipation of women of our time may be strikingly similar to that of his time.<sup>97</sup> If, as numerous writers argue, Paul's opponents in the pastoral epistles included "women [who] were in the forefront of the libertarian trend,"<sup>98</sup> as evidenced by their extravagant dress, the "forsaking of domestic roles such as raising children in order to assume such a prominent role in congregational life--as teaching,"<sup>99</sup> then Paul was addressing a situation somewhat similar to the one existing today.

The existence of a "women's liberation" movement in early Christianity is implied not only by Paul's strictness (1 Tim 2:11-12; 5:13; 2 Tim 3:6; 1 Cor 11:5-10; 14:34) but also by such post-New Testament documents as the apocryphal *Acts of Paul* (about A.D. 185). In the latter, Paul commissions a woman, Thecla, to be a preacher and teacher of the word of God: "Go and teach the word of God." Thecla obeyed by going away to Iconium. There she "went into the house of Onesiphorus . . . and taught the oracles of God."<sup>100</sup>

The attempt of this apocryphal document to present Paul, not as forbidding, but as commissioning a woman to be an official teacher of the Word of God in the church, offers an additional indication of the possible existence of a feminist movement already in Paul's time.<sup>101</sup> If such a movement existed at that time, then Paul's instruction on the role of women in the church would be particularly relevant to our time, since it would have been given in response to a feminist movement within the church somewhat similar to the one existing today.

**The Witness of the Text.** A third reason for accepting Paul's teaching in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 as relevant for today is the fact that the text contains no cultural elements that should be modified in the light of our new historical situation. If Paul had said "I do not permit a woman to teach as the leader of the church or to have authority over man because women are uneducated and culturally unacceptable as leaders in the church," then there would have been a legitimate reason for rejecting his injunction as culturally relative.

Paul, however, grounds his ruling not on cultural factors, but on the pre-Fall events of the opening chapters of Genesis. He makes no reference whatsoever to cultural factors such as lack of education and any possible cultural offense which might result if women were allowed to teach as the leaders of the congregation. His argument precludes the introduction of "new cultural factors" which would cause him to take a different stand today on the role of women in the church.

**Conclusion.** The conclusion of our examination of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 is that the intent of this passage, in the light of its immediate and wider context of the pastoral

epistles, is not to prohibit women from participating in the general teaching ministry of the church ("they [women] are to teach what is good"--Titus 2:3), but rather to restrain women from aspiring to the restricted teaching role of the leader of the congregation. The reason for Paul's ruling is that for a woman to exercise such a headship role is incompatible with the subordinate role which at the beginning God assigned to women in the home and in the church. Essentially the same view is expressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36, a passage which we shall now examine.

## PART V

### 1 CORINTHIANS 14:33B-36

#### HEADSHIP AND WOMEN'S SPEAKING IN THE CHURCH

**Injunction.** Paul appeals indirectly to the principle of male headship also 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36 where he gives a brief instruction regarding women speaking in the church. The passage reads as follows:

As in all the churches of the saints, the women should keep silence in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as even the law says. If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church. What! Did the word of God originate with you, or are you the only ones it has reached? (1 Cor 14:33b-36).

This statement occurs in the context of the discussion of how to maintain order in the worship assemblies. Beginning with verse 26 Paul gives specific instructions on how speaking in tongues and prophesying should be regulated in the church, so that good order might prevail. In this context Paul gives his instruction regarding the silence of women in the assembly. This passage has been the subject of considerable discussion, especially because it appears to stand in stark contrast to 1 Corinthians 11:5 where, as we have seen, Paul assumes that women will pray and prophesy in the church.

#### 1. Interpretation of the Passage

**The Key Phrase.** The sentence which may provide the key to resolve this apparent contradiction is the phrase "For they are not permitted to speak, *but should be subordinate*, as even the law says" (1 Cor 14:34). The phrase "should be subordinate" is often overlooked in determining the meaning of the passage, yet it contains an important qualification. The strong contrast implied by the preposition "but" (*alla*), suggests that the speaking that Paul has in mind is that which was seen as inconsistent with the subordinate role of women in public worship.

The speech then denied to women is a speech that is inappropriate to their position as women or wives. Such speech could include women speaking up in the church as authoritative teachers of the congregation, or as judges of the words spoken by prophets, elders or even by their own husbands. It could also include any form of questioning that was seen as challenging the leadership of the church. In my view it is preferable to understand Paul's prohibition in broader terms, that is, inclusive of any



form of women's speaking that was seen as reflecting lack of subordination to their husband and/or church leaders.

**Speech and Authority.** To appreciate the significance of Paul's ruling, it is important to note that in most cultures, including the Jewish culture of Paul's time, people were expected to speak in a manner appropriate to their position. For example, as Stephen B. Clark points out, "a trained disciple in first century Palestine would be very reluctant to voice an opinion in the presence of his rabbi or any other rabbi; he would even be reluctant to intervene in a discussion when his rabbi was present."<sup>102</sup>

Disciples, wives and children were expected to hold their speech in a public gathering where the teachers or the heads of the households were discussing issues of concern to the community. These men represented in public the concerns of their household members to whom they would later explain or expand any question discussed.<sup>103</sup> Presumably this is why Paul urges women to ask their questions not publicly in the assembly but privately to their husbands at home (v. 35). By so doing they were showing respect for the headship role of their husbands. On the contrary, if a woman insisted on presenting her own viewpoint, irrespective of the presence of her husband or church leaders, that, according to Paul, was "shameful" (v. 35), because it violated the "law" (v. 34) regarding the subordination of women.

## 2. Headship-Subordination Principle

**Which Law?** To validate the authority of his ruling, Paul appeals to "the law:" "For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as even the law says" (v. 34). To which "law" is Paul referring? Some argue that Paul is referring to cultural "Jewish and Gentile laws that restricted the public participation of women."<sup>104</sup> This view is discredited by the fact that the term "law" (*nomos*) is never used in Paul's writings with reference to cultural customs. Moreover, as we have seen in our analysis of 1 Timothy 2:13 and 1 Corinthians 11:8-9, Paul grounds his rulings regarding women not on cultural customs but on Biblical revelation.

The problem is to figure out which Old Testament "law" Paul had in mind. Since the law to which Paul appeals in the parallel or analogous passages (1 Cor 11:8-9; 1 Tim 2:13) is the order of creation of Genesis 2, we can safely presume that the latter is also what Paul has in view in his reference to the "law" in 1 Corinthians 14:34. This means that Paul's appeal to "the law" need not have any particular text in mind. It is sufficient for him to remind women of the headship-subordination principle that God had established in the Old Testament, a principle still applicable to the participation of women in the worship service (1 Cor 11:5).

**Biblical Principle and Cultural Application.** Some negate the universal relevance of the principle of male headship implied in 1 Corinthians 14:34 (and 1 Timothy 2:11-15) because Paul instructs women to be "silent" in church, supposedly because of local behavioral problems and/or culture. This reasoning fails to distinguish between the general principle of "submission" to male headship and its local application. Note should be taken of the fact that in both in 1 Timothy 2:11 and 1 Corinthians 14:34, Paul appeals to the principle of submission to male headship as the basis for his instructions on "silence." The following outline might help to illustrate the point:

**Principle:** "Let a woman learn . . . with all *submissiveness*" (1Tim 2:11); Women "should be *subordinate*, as even the law says" (1 Cor 14:34).  
**Meaning:** For Paul divine revelation requires that women respect the principle of submission to male headship while learning and participating in church services.

**Application:** "Let a woman learn in *silence* with all submissiveness" (1 Tim 2:11); "Women should keep *silence* in the churches" (1 Cor 14:34).  
**Meaning:** The cultural application of the principle of submission to male headship in Paul's time required that women refrained from speaking, asking questions or discussing the sermon publicly. Similarly in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 the cultural application of the principle of male headship ("the head of every woman is man"--v.3, NIV) required that women wear some sort of headcovering during church services.

What all of this means is that while the principle of headship/subordination is permanent, its cultural application is conditioned by culture. *What is culturally conditioned is not the principle of headship-subordination but its application.* In Paul's time, as noted earlier, women and students showed respect for the authority of their husband or of a teacher by refraining from asking questions in public. To my surprise I discovered that the same custom still held true in most of the classes I took at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. Questions were to be asked not publicly in the class but privately to the teacher after class. Refraining from asking questions in class was seen as a sign of respect for the authority of the teacher. It is obvious that in our culture the application of the Biblical principle of headship-subordination requires not that women button their lips during church services but that they speak respectfully.

This interpretation is consistent with Paul's concern to maintain an authority structure in the home and in the church, where men are called to exercise responsible and sacrificial headship, and where women respond supportively. We have seen in the course of our study that Paul repeatedly emphasizes the importance of respecting the headship-subordination principle: "the head of a woman is her husband" (1 Cor 11:3); "Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord" (Eph 5:22; cf. Col 3:18); "Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men" (1 Tim 2:11-12); "train the young women . . . to be submissive to their husbands" (Titus 2:4-5).

**Harmony Between 1 Corinthians 11:5 and 14:34.** In the light of the headship-subordination principle, it is understandable why Paul would allow women to pray and prophesy in 1 Corinthians 11:5 and prohibit them to ask questions publicly in 1 Corinthians 14:34. The former did not involve assuming a headship role in the congregation, the latter did. Prophesying at Corinth was understood in the broad sense of communicating to the congregation a message of exhortation from God. This ministry did not involve assuming the leadership role of the church for at least two reasons. First, Paul suggests that the prophetic ministry of "upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" (1 Cor 14:3) was open to all: "For you can all prophesy one by one" (1 Cor 14:31). Second, each member of the congregation could question and challenge the speech of the prophets: "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said" (1 Cor 14:29).

The implication of the Greek word *diakrino*, here translated "weigh what is said," is that members were to listen critically, sifting the good from the bad. It is hard to imagine that an Old Testament prophet like Isaiah would have invited the people to



critically evaluate his message and to accept only what they viewed as sound. This suggests, as Wayne A. Grudem notes, "that prophets at Corinth were not thought by Paul to speak with a divine authority of actual words."<sup>105</sup> This conclusion is supported by verse 36: "What! Did the word of God originate from you, or are you the only ones it has reached?" This statement implies that the word of God had come forth from Paul and the other apostles, thus even prophets in the local churches were to be subject to apostolic directives. In the light of this observation there is no contradiction between the prophetic speaking of women in 1 Corinthians 11:5 and the prohibition of their speaking authoritatively in 1 Corinthians 14:34, since the former did not involve the latter.

**Wives or Women?** Is Paul's directive in 1 Corinthians 14:34 intended for all women or only for wives? Verse 35 refers explicitly to wives: "If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home." This statement has led some to conclude that Paul's ruling applies exclusively to wives and not inclusively to all women.<sup>106</sup> In our discussion of 1 Corinthians 11:3 we have seen that for Paul the husband-wife relationship is the paradigm for the man-woman relationship in general. Married women, which made up the majority of women in the congregation, served as a model for women in general. Stephen B. Clark illustrates this point with a fitting analogy:

If Paul had forbidden children to speak in public as an expression of their subordination to their parents, no one would hesitate to apply the rule to orphans as well as to children with parents. The parent-child relationship would be the normal case, but the rule would also apply to children with surrogate parents. Similarly, unmarried women would be expected to adhere to a rule for married women.<sup>107</sup>

**Women and Spiritual Gifts.** Note should be taken of the fact that Paul's ruling concerning women in the church in 1 Corinthians 14 is given in the context of a chapter dealing with spiritual gifts. Apparently some people claimed then, as now, that if a person has received a spiritual gift, then he or she can freely use it in the church without restrictions. A question often asked is, who has the right to deny to a woman the opportunity of serving as a pastor/teacher of a congregation if the Holy Spirit has given her such a gift?

In this chapter on spiritual gifts, Paul shows, first of all, that an unrestricted use of gifts results in confusion and disorder. The latter is contrary to God's will, "for God is not a God of confusion but of peace" (1 Cor 14:33). Second, the apostle refutes the apparent contention that unless women are allowed to speak as the authoritative leaders of the congregation, then the church may be opposing God and His Spirit. Paul responds that such an exercise of that spiritual gift is contrary to God's law, that is, to the headship-subordination principle which is grounded in the order of creation. Therefore, spiritual gifts are given to be used, not contrary to, but in harmony with the revealed will of God. In other places Paul explains how women can use their spiritual gifts with propriety by praying and prophesying in the church (1 Cor 11:5) and by teaching women and children (Titus 2:3-5; 1 Tim 5:14).

**No Independent Norms.** Paul closes his instructions about the "speaking" of women in the church, saying: "What! Did the word of God originate with you, or are you the only ones it has reached?" (1 Cor 14:36). These words are directed not

merely to women but to both men and women, as the masculine plural form of *monous* ("only ones") indicates. In this closing statement Paul challenges the right of the Corinthian church to establish norms for church worship which are contrary to the ones he has laid down, namely, that women should, in a qualified sense, keep silent in the churches.

Paul's direct challenge ("What! Did the word of God originate with you?") suggests that the Corinthian church had adopted the practice of allowing women to speak and teach authoritatively as the leaders of the congregation. The apostle challenges their course of action by reminding them that they were not the source and definition of Christian principles and practices. On the contrary, they should conform to what was done "in all the churches of the saints" (v.33).

To strengthen the authority of his instructions given in the whole chapter, Paul appeals to any one who regards himself as "a prophet, or spiritual" to acknowledge that what he has written "is a command of the Lord" (v. 37). This forceful statement makes it clear that Paul viewed the teachings of the whole chapter, including those concerning women, to apply not only to the local situation of the Corinthian church but to Christian churches in general. This means that Paul's teachings on the role of women in the church are to be accepted as an integral part of God's revelation found in Scripture.

**Conclusion.** The foregoing study of the principle of headship-subordination as expressed in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, 1 Timothy 2:9-15 and 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36 has shown that the application of this principle in the church requires that women not be appointed "to teach" (1 Tim 2:12) or "to speak" (1 Cor 14:34) authoritatively as representative leaders of the congregation. We have found that this Pauline instruction derives, not from the cultural conventions of his time, but rather from the distinctive roles for men and women which God has established at creation.

Paul felt that the creational pattern of male headship and female submission in the home and in the church, requires that women should not exercise spiritual oversight for the flock. He grounded his view on the relationship of man and woman *before*, and not after, the results of the Fall. He did not appeal to local or cultural factors such as the disorderly conduct of some women, their relative lack of education or the negative impact on outsiders of the appointment of women as leaders in the church. The nature of Paul's arguments leaves no room to make his instructions of only local and time-bound application.

The exclusion of women from the teaching and leadership office in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36 must not be construed to mean that Paul excludes women from active participation in the ministry of the church. Paul commends a significant number of women for working hard with him in the missionary outreach of the church. However, women ministered in the church, not as appointive leaders but in supportive roles such as "fellow-workers," deaconesses, and prophets who edified and encouraged the congregation.

To better appreciate why women have served in Bible times in various religious and social ministries, but were never appointed to serve as priests in the Old Testament or as apostles, elders or pastors, in the New Testament, we shall consider in the final part of this paper the correlation that exists in the Bible between male headship and the Fatherhood of God and between the male headship role in the home and in the church.



## PART VI

### HEADSHIP AND THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

**Male Imagery.** It is an accepted fact that God has revealed Himself in the Scriptures and through Jesus Christ predominantly in male terms and imagery. Obviously God transcends human sexual distinctions, yet He has chosen to reveal Himself predominantly and unmistakable through male terms and imagery.

God has revealed Himself as *Father* and not as *Mother*. He sent His *Son* and not His *Daughter*. Jesus spoke of the *Fatherhood* and not of the *Motherhood* of God. He appointed twelve *men* and not twelve *women* to act as His representatives. We pray "*Our Father*" and not "*Our Mother*" who art in heaven. Christ is the *new Adam* and not the *new Eve*. He is the *Bridegroom* and not the *Bride* of the Church.

**God is the Father.** The term "Father" is used in Scripture not only in a "figurative" sense to describe what God is like, but also in a "literal" sense to describe what God really is. As Hendrikus Berkhof points out, "God is not 'as it were' a Father; he is the Father from whom all fatherhood on earth is derived."<sup>108</sup> Similarly Karl Barth observes:

No human father, but God alone, is properly, truly and primarily Father. No human father is the creator of his child, the controller of its destiny, or its savior from sin, guilt and death. No human father is by his word the source of its temporal and eternal life. In this proper, true and primary sense God--and He alone--is Father.<sup>109</sup>

The self-revelation of God as Father stands out especially in the teaching of Jesus. Joachim Jeremias, in his massive study of the Aramaic "Abba" ("Father") used consistently by Christ, shows that there is no evidence in the extensive Jewish literature of the term "Father" being used by itself by an individual to address God.<sup>110</sup> In startling contrast to the prevailing custom of avoiding whenever possible the name of God out of reverence, Jesus not only called God "Father" but "Abba" (Mark 14:36), an Aramaic diminutive equivalent to our "daddy." Such a familiarity with the Almighty and Holy One was sacrilegious for the Jews. "Jesus, however, not only addressed God with the warmth and security of a child addressing its father, but he taught his disciples to do the same (Gal 4:6)."<sup>111</sup>

**Implications of God's Fatherhood.** Why has God revealed Himself, especially through Jesus Christ, as our Father and not as our Mother? Some feminist theologians believe that the answer is to be found in the patriarchal culture of the time where the father was the head and ruler of the household. God would have adopted this culturally accepted analogy to reveal Himself. Since we no longer subscribe to such a patriarchal social structure and world-view, the analogy of God as "Mother" would be equally appropriate today.

This reasoning is not correct because although God has used the patriarchal imagery of a Father to reveal Himself, He transcends this imagery radically. As Karl Barth aptly puts it, "when Scripture calls God our Father, it adopts an analogy only to transcend it at once."<sup>112</sup> Jesus' revelation of God as "Abba" was not only counter-cultural but also determinative for His self-understanding as the Son of God and for the self-understanding of His followers as sons and daughters of God.

God has used the language of fatherhood to reveal Himself because such language contains an abiding truth about Himself which cannot lightly be dismissed. *Fatherhood preserves the Biblical principle of headship and subordination.* As our Father, God is the creator and controller of our lives and we are His subordinate children (James 1:17-18). If God were our Mother we would think of Her not as our Creator but as our Generatrix, that is, not as the one who created us out of nothing (*ex nihilo*), but as the one who generated us out of Herself. This shows, as Kallistos Ware states it, that "if we were to substitute a Mother Goddess for God the Father, we would not simply be altering a piece of incidental imagery, but we would be replacing Christianity with a new kind of religion."<sup>113</sup>

It is important to remember that the symbol of the Fatherhood of God was not created by the prophets or apostles out of their patriarchal culture, but was revealed and given to us by God Himself. "God as Father is God's own witness to himself, not a mere human witness to God."<sup>114</sup>

**Headship Role.** To appreciate the implication of the Fatherhood of God, it is important to note the difference between fatherhood and motherhood. In Scripture both are similar in terms of compassion for his/her child (Is 49:15; Ps 103:13). The only difference is to be seen, as Susan Foh points out, in "their relationship to one another. The father is the head of the household; consequently, his wife must submit herself to him and reverence him (Eph 5:22-24, 33). It is the husband's headship and the wife's submission that makes it necessary to address God as Father, not Mother."<sup>115</sup>

The same principle applies, as we shall see, to the headship role that a pastor/elder fulfills in the extended family of God, the church. If one erases the Biblical distinction between the roles men and women are called to fulfill in the home and in the church, as many feminist theologians are seeking to do, then there is no longer any reason for maintaining the Fatherhood of God.

Feminists have well understood the correlation that exists between the Fatherhood of God and the male headship role in the home and in the church. Consequently, it is not surprising that some of them are endeavoring to remove the Fatherhood of God, calling it a cultural vestige of a patriarchal age. To do so, however, means not only to reject the revelation which God has given of Himself but also to undermine the principle of male headship which God has established to ensure harmonious relationships in the home and in the church. In the last part of this paper we wish to examine more closely the correlation that exists in the Bible between male headship in the home and in the church.

## PART VII

### HEADSHIP IN THE HOME AND IN THE CHURCH

#### 1. Changes in Family and Church Structures

The family is the basic unit of the church. It is not surprising that the rapid changes that have occurred in family structures and roles, are affecting also church structure and roles. In recent decades the family has become less of a sacred institution and more of a secular companionship arrangement. The roles within the family have



become blurred. There has been a movement from partners with distinct roles to partners with fluid and interchangeable roles. The "headship" role of the father as the priest and house-band of the home, is often exercised today by mother instead of father.

These recent changes in family structures and roles have led many Christians, including some Seventh-day Adventists, to redefine the nature and the authority structure of the church. The church is no longer viewed as a sacred institution with roles patterned after the structure of the family, but rather as a secular organization with roles patterned after service organizations. Consequently, as clearly stated in the pro-ordination document prepared by a group of Andrews University teachers, "the Biblical principle of husband headship in home government" cannot be used "to establish male headship in church government."<sup>116</sup>

The headship role of an elder or pastor in the church is increasingly seen as being more that of an administrator than of a father of a spiritual family, the household of God (1 Tim 3:15; Gal 6:10; Eph 2:19). Since women can manage businesses as effectively as men, pro-ordinationists maintain that women have the right to serve in the church as elders or pastors.

The fundamental fallacy of this view is its failure to recognize that in Scripture the church is not a secular organization where leadership roles are modeled after service organizations but but a sacred institution patterned after God's design for family structure and roles. To clarify this basic truth we shall examine succinctly what the Bible teaches on the close correlation that exists between the church and the family as far as their structures and roles are concerned.

## 2. The Church as a Family in the Old Testament

**Household as Church.** The church, as a group of worshiping believers, began with the first human family. "God had a church," writes Ellen White, "when Adam and Eve and Abel accepted and hailed with joy the good news that Jesus was their Redeemer."<sup>117</sup> During much of Old Testament history, specifically until the institution of the synagogue around 500 B.C., communal worship services were conducted primarily within the household. Thus in a real sense the family was the church. Family altars were built by Noah (Gen 26:25) and Jacob (Gen 35:2-3) to lead all the members of their household into the worship of God.

Many of Israel's chief religious festivals were family celebrations. The Sabbath, for example, was a family celebration in which every member of the extended family, including the manservant, maidservant and the sojourner had the right to participate (Ex 20:10). Note that no instruction is given in the Fourth Commandment regarding attendance of religious services at a sanctuary, because the home was the church where the Sabbath was celebrated.

**Israel as a Great Household.** Not only individual households functioned as churches in the Old Testament, but also all the families of Israel were seen as one great household with which God had established His covenant through Abraham. As Amos wrote: "Hear this word that the Lord has spoken against you, O people of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt: 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for your iniquities'" (Amos 3:1-2).

In spite of the upheavals of the monarchy, the disruption of the exile, and the disintegration of the Jewish race as a national community, the Jewish people preserved the notion of being a family related not only to God's Fatherhood but also to the Abrahamic covenant family (Matt 3:9; Rom 4:16). The latter is confirmed by the use of such terms as the "house of Jacob," the "house of Judah," and the "house of David."

The reason why the family is so prominent in the Old Testament is because the covenant community which in a sense is the Old Testament church, is really nothing more than a family; an extended family, to be sure, but nevertheless a family. Furthermore the family is most important because it is through the family that God's Old Testament covenant promises are ultimately fulfilled in "Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt 1:1, cf. Luke 3:23-38; Rom 4:13-25; Gal 3:6-19).

Summing up we might say that in the Old Testament God graced the family with sacred dignity, making it not only a center of corporate worship, equivalent to the New Testament church, but also the vehicle through which the covenant promises of salvation would find their ultimate fulfillment through the birth of "Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt 1:1). In the light of the witness of the Old Testament, it is unwarranted to differentiate between the structure of the church and that of the family, since, as we have seen, in a very real sense the church was the family and the family was the church.

### 3. The Church as a Family in the New Testament

**Household of Faith.** The Old Testament understanding of the *physical* household as a center of worship and as a type of the whole covenant community of Israel, is in the New Testament applied to the church, as a *spiritual* family or household of faith. The family or household (*oikos*) is of crucial importance in the teaching of Jesus because the family is the key unit in the mission of God's kingdom. Membership in the family of Christ, however, is determined not by biological descent but by spiritual relationship: "My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it." (Luke 8:21).

This understanding of the church as a spiritual family is expressed in the New Testament in a variety of ways. For example, Paul encourages the Galatians to "do good to all men, and especially to those who are of the household of faith: (Gal 6:10). This spiritual family welcomes all including "strangers and sojourners": "So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God" (Eph 2:19). Perhaps the most striking description of the church as a spiritual family or household is found in 1 Timothy 3:14-15 where Paul writes: "I am writing these instructions to you so that, if I am delayed, you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the church."

A major factor which contributed to viewing the church as a spiritual family is the fact that by accepting Jesus Christ as their Saviour, believers "received adoption as sons" (Gal 4:5). As adopted children we call God "Abba! Father!" (Gal 4:6) and relate to one another as "brother and sister" (James 2:14-15; 1 Cor 8:11; 1 Thess 4:6; Rom 12:1).

**Household Churches.** Another factor which contributed to viewing the church as a household or an extended family is that until long after the apostolic age Christians



met not in church buildings but in each other's homes for worship fellowship, and a common meal, sometimes called the "breaking of the bread" (Acts 2:4-6). The church itself came into being on the day of Pentecost in the upper room of a home in Jerusalem that possibly belonged to John Mark's mother. The New Testament records several prominent house churches such as those of Aquila and Priscilla (1 Cor 16:19, Rom 16:5), of Chloe in Corinth (1 Cor 1:11), of Stephanas in Achaia (1 Cor 16:15), of Jason in Thessalonica (Acts 17:5,7), and of Justus, with whom Paul stayed at Corinth (Acts 18:7).

Significant is also the fact that the Book of Acts reports that numerous whole families were baptized (Acts 10:24, 48; 11:14-15, 31-33; 18:8). This fact testifies, as Herbert T. Mayer points out, that not only "whole families were won for Christ with the Gospel, but also that the housefather became the spokesman of the family before God."<sup>118</sup>

This brief survey suffices to show that both in the Old and New Testaments, the church and the family are not conceptually or structurally different, as pro-ordinationists maintain. On the contrary, the family and the church are viewed as being closely interrelated, since the latter derives from and is seen as an extension of the former. "The Church Paul and Timothy knew," writes Edith Deen, "was, at its best, a unified family."<sup>119</sup>

A recovery of the Biblical view of the home as a potential church and of the church as an extended family of believers, is indispensable to revitalize the life of both Seventh-day Adventist families and churches. Pauline and Elton Trueblood aptly express this conviction in their book *The Recovery of Family Life*: "If we can believe that a home is potentially as much a sanctuary as any ecclesiastical building can ever be, we are well on the way to the recovery of family life which our generation sorely needs."<sup>120</sup>

#### 4. Roles in the Family and in the Church

**Women's Roles.** The church and the family are closely related in the Bible not only in terms of a similar structure of communal worship, but also in terms of roles. The family roles structure where the husband function as the head and priest of the household, serves as a model for the church where qualified men capable of serving as spiritual "elders" or "fathers" are appointed as heads of the household of God.

In ancient Israel women fulfilled vital roles both at home where they taught the principles of God's law to their children (Prov 1:8; 1 Sam 1:22) and in the public religious life, where they served as singers at the temple (Ezra 2:65; Ps 68:24-25); as helpers at the entrance of the tabernacle (1 Sam 2:22); as prophetesses, offering exhortation and guidance to the people (Ex 15:20; 2 Kings 22:14; Neh 6:14). Deborah's highest title was "a mother in Israel" (Judges 5:7). The title suggests that she functioned as a spiritual mother and not as an "elder" or spiritual father in Israel. Her motherly function transcended the limits of her own home and reached her own people whom she trained in the ways of righteousness with a love a kin to her love for her children.

In apostolic Christianity women are praised not only for their role as religious teachers at home (2 Tim 1:5; Rom 16:13), but also for their active participation in the mission of the church as "fellow workers in Christ Jesus" (Rom 16:3-4. cf. Acts 9:36; 16:14,16,40; 1 Cor 11:5-6).

**Male Headship Role.** The vital religious roles which women fulfilled in the Old and New Testaments were however different from the religious roles of men. During patriarchal times the first born son (not daughter) was called to serve as the head of the household and as the priest representing God to his household. (Gen 8:20; 22:13; 35:3; Job 1:5). Later on with the establishment of the theocracy at Sinai and the erection of the tabernacle, God appointed the men (not the women) of the tribe of Levi to serve as priests in place of the first-born or head of each family (Num 3:6-13).

When we come to the New Testament we find, as stated by Herbert T. Mayer, that "the patrocentric [father-centered] social structure of the household was not set aside by Christ and the disciples. Instead, the family structure was acknowledged and put into the service of building the church of the New Testament."<sup>121</sup> Not only is the church perceived as an extended spiritual family, the "household of faith" (Gal 6:10; Eph 2:19; 1 Tim 3:15), but also spiritual leadership in the church is assigned, according to the family model, to men capable of functioning as the spiritual "Elders" or "Fathers" of "household of faith."

The *SDA Bible Commentary* recognizes the connection between male headship in the home and in the church in its comment on 1 Timothy 2:13: "As the husband is the head of the home, so he is the natural leader of a group of homes in a church congregation."<sup>122</sup>

**Significance of Eldership.** It is noteworthy that the term most frequently used in the New Testament to designate the leader of the church, is that of "Elder" (used over 20 times). The term "pastor" is used only once in Ephesians 4:11 to describe not a church office but a gift of the Spirit, the gift of shepherding. The reason for the widespread use of the term "elder" is simply because the NT church, as we have seen, is modeled after the extended family or household, where the "elder," usually the older father (Ex 3:16; 12:21, 27), functioned not only as the physical father/head of the household, but also as the representative of the heavenly Father to his household.

It is because the NT recognizes the close correlation between the husband/father's headship in the home and the male headship in the church (a correlation rejected by some Adventists pro-ordinationists) that it requires that an "elder/bishop" be not merely a person with charismatic gifts, but primarily *a man with the tried virtues of fatherhood* (Titus 1:6; 1 Tim 3:1-5). The reason given is simple: "for if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how can he care for God's church?" (1 Tim 3:5). In this remarkable statement we are told not only that an elder must be "a man," but also that he should be a father with proven spiritual leadership in his own home, so that he can be expected to serve as a moral and spiritual leader in the church, the household of God.

The fatherly role of a church elder/leader is further indicated by the fact that Paul, for example, who was a church elder like the rest of the apostles (1 Pet 5:1, 2 John 1; 3 John 1) frequently refers to believers as his children and to himself as a father: "I do not write this to make you ashamed, but to admonish you as my beloved children. For though you have countless guides in Christ, you do not have many fathers. For I became your father in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (1 Cor 4:14-15). And again "For you know how, like a father with his children, we exhorted each one of you and encouraged you" (1 Thess 2:11; cf. Eph 5:1; Gal 3:26). Note that Paul viewed himself not as an administrator or director of the believers but as their spiritual father.



**Importance of Role Distinctions.** The Scripture emphasizes with amazing clarity the need to respect the role distinctions between men and women which God has established for the well-being of the home and the church. Man is called to exercise a loving, sacrificial headship in the home and in the church (Eph 5:23; 1 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 2:13; Gen 22:3; 35:1-4; Deut 4:9; 6:4-7; 11:18-21; Job 1:5; Num 3:6-13). Woman is called to willingly accept the caring headship of man in the home and in the church (Eph 5:22; Col 3:18; 1 Pet 3:1; 1 Tim 2:12; 1 Cor 14:34), not for the sake of cultural conventions, but for the sake of Christ ("as to the Lord"--Eph 5:22).

The fundamental reason given in Scripture for respecting these distinctive roles in the home and in the church is not social or cultural conventions, but a divine design reflected, as we have seen, in the *order* and *manner* of the creation of Adam and Eve: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve" (1 Tim 2:13) and "For man was not made from woman, but woman from man" (1 Tim 11:8).

**Loss of Sense of the Sacred.** A major reason why the principle of male headship in the home and in the church is so hotly contested today is because as mentioned earlier, both of these institutions are no longer viewed as sacred but as secular structures. The humanistic and secularistic ideologies of our time have caused many Christians to loose the Biblical sense of the sacred. For example, for many human life is no longer sacred as they choose to destroy it through such practices as abortion and drug abuse. Marital relationships are no longer sacred as an increasing number of husbands and wives choose to break up what "God has joined together" and what no one has the right to put asunder (Matt 19:6). The Lord's Day is no longer for many a holy day but a holiday, a day spent seeking for personal profit and pleasure rather than for divine presence and peace.

It is the same secular trend that is influencing today liberal and evangelical feminists to reject the sacredness of the role distinctions which God has established for the well-being of our homes and churches and to promote instead the so-called role-interchangeability model. According to the latter women can function in male's roles and men in female's roles.

**Danger of Secularism.** It is imperative for our Seventh-day Adventist church to be deeply committed to resist the secular pressure which is bent on blurring or eliminating the male/female functional role distinctions by promoting the ordination of women to the headship role of elders or pastors. The reasons are theological and practical. Theologically, if our Seventh-day Adventist church were to give in to such secular pressure, it will erode not only our confidence in the authority of Scripture for defining our beliefs and practices, but also the very sense of our sacred calling to be a "holy people" among a secularly minded and perverse society.

To give in to the secular view of the home and of the church which rejects as an immoral legacy of the patriarchal society the principle of male headship established by God at creation, will eventually lead Adventists to give in also to similar secular pressures which rejects the sacredness of other creation institutions such as the Sabbath and marriage. Sad to say, the problem of the secularization of the Sabbath and of marriage already exists and in some Adventist churches is assuming alarming proportions. I am confronted with the problems of Sabbath profanation and of broken marriages practically every weekend while conducting seminars in North America and overseas. Thus, today more than ever before it is imperative that our Adventist church

resists the secular pressure to "let the world squeeze [us] in its mold" (Rom 12:2, Philips).

**Practical Consequences.** The practical reason for resisting the secular pressure to eliminate role distinctions by ordaining women, is the negative consequences of such an action for the structure of our homes and society. Stephen B. Clark rightly observes that

The ordination of women is part of a wider pattern of interlocking elements that have to do with how marriages are contracted, how families are formed, how boys and girls are taught to be men and women, how careers are pursued, and many other things. Changing one element in the pattern, such as sex roles, affects other elements in an adverse way because of elements.<sup>123</sup>

It is not difficult to perceive the negative impact of the headship role of a female elder or pastor both in her own family and on the families of the congregations. In her own family, will not her headship role in the church make it difficult for her husband to function as her head in the home? In the church, will not a female elder or pastor tempt at least some women in the congregation to arrogate to themselves a position of headship in their family similar to the headship role over the church exercised by their female elder/pastor?

Even more crucial is the impact of role modeling of a female elder/pastor upon those children in the congregation who have no father figure at home. A female elder/pastor would deprive these children of an appropriate father role model, which in some instances may be the only positive male role model in their lives.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusions that have emerged in the course of our investigation into the relationship between the divine order of headship and church order, are the following:

(1). The principle of male headship in the home and in the church derives, not from illegitimate male efforts to dominate women, but from a legitimate order established by God. We have reached this conclusion first by ascertaining the New Testament meaning of "head" and then by examining Paul's application of the principle of male headship in marriage (Eph 5:21-33) and in the church (1 Cor 11:2-16; 1 Tim 2:9-15; 1 Cor 14:33b-36). We have seen that Paul uses the term "head" with the meaning of "authority, head over" and not of "source, origin."

(2) The headship of man in marriage is patterned not after the cultural customs of Biblical times, but after the Christological model of the relationship between Christ and the church. By utilizing this model, Paul effectively clarifies in Ephesians 5:21-33 the meaning of the husband's headship as loving and sacrificial leadership and the meaning of the wife's submission as willing response to a caring husband. For Paul, headship and subordination do not connote superiority or inferiority, but order-in-service. The authority to which a woman subordinates herself is not so much that of her husband as that of the divine order to which both are subject.



(3) The headship of man and the subordination of woman in the church derive from the *order* and *manner* of the creation of Adam and Eve (1 Tim 2:13; 1 Cor 11:8-9), which reflect God's design for the functional distinctions between men and women that must be respected within the home and the church. These distinctions were being challenged by emancipated Corinthian women who had concluded that their new position in Christ (1 Cor 4:8-10) granted them freedom to stop wearing a sign of submission to their husbands (head covering), especially at times of prayer and charismatic expression in the church service. Paul counteracts this trend by emphasizing the importance of respecting customs which in his time helped to maintain the creational role distinctions.

(4) The headship between man and woman is correlated by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 to the headship between God and Christ: "The head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor 11:3). The latter refutes the charge that submission means inferiority because in the Trinity there is a headship among equals. Christ's submission to the authority and headship of His Father did not stifle His personality, but was the secret of His wisdom, power, and success. Similarly, a woman who accepts the leadership of a mature and caring man in the family or in the church will not feel unfulfilled, but rather will find the needed protection and support to exercise her God-given ministries.

(5) The application of the headship-subordination principle to church ministry requires that women not be appointed "to teach" (1 Tim 2:12) or "to speak" (1 Cor 14:34) authoritatively as the representative leaders of the congregation. We have found that this Pauline instruction derives, not from the cultural conventions of his time which restricted the participation of women in public gathering, but rather from Paul's understanding of the creational order of male headship and female subordination.

For Paul this creational order requires that women not be appointed to serve as representative shepherds of the flock. His reasons are not the women's relative lack of education or their disorderly conduct, but rather the need to respect the distinctive roles for men and women established by God at creation. The theological nature of Paul's arguments leaves no room to make his instructions of only local and time-bound application.

(6) The exclusion of women from teaching or speaking as the leaders of the church in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36 must not be construed to mean that Paul prohibited women from actively participating in the public worship and mission of the church. On the contrary, we have seen that Paul commends a significant number of women for their outstanding ministry in and for the church. For Paul (and for the rest of Scripture) the question is not, Should women be appointed to minister in the church?, but rather, To which ministry should women be appointed? The answer given by Paul and the rest of Scripture is: *Women should be appointed to any and all ministries which do not violate the creational role distinctions for men and women.*

(7) The principle of male headship is related in the Scripture to the predominant male imagery used in Scripture to reveal God. Obviously, God transcends human sexual distinctions, yet He has chosen to reveal Himself in Scripture and through Jesus Christ in predominantly and unmistakably male terms and imagery.

We have seen that contrary to the prevailing custom, which out of reverence avoided mentioning the name of God, Jesus taught His disciples to address God not only "Father," but also "Abba," an Aramaic family term equivalent to our "daddy." The reason why God revealed Himself, especially and consistently through Jesus Christ, as our Father and not as our Mother, is primarily because Fatherhood preserves the Biblical principle of headship and subordination and thus best represents the role that God Himself sustains toward us His children, namely, the role of an almighty, just, and caring Father. This divine role functions as the foundational model for all forms of human fatherhood (Eph 3:14-15), whether it be that of the husband in the home or of the pastor in the church.

Feminist theologians have long recognized the enormous significance of the connection between the Fatherhood of God and the male headship role in the home and in the church. For them this connection rightly represents a formidable stumbling block to the ordination of women. Consequently, they have been actively engaged in revising the language of God through the introduction of impersonal or feminine names for God. However, to worship God as "Fire, Light, Divine Providence," or as "Mother, Daughter, Father-Mother, Son- Daughter," means not only to destroy the personal relationship provided by the revelation of God as our "Father," but also to fabricate a God who is totally different from the One of Biblical revelation.

(8) Male headship in the home and in the church are closely interrelated because functional roles in the church are largely patterned after those of the family. The church as a community of believers derives from the family which during much of Biblical history has functioned as the sole center of daily and weekly worship. Similarly, the headship role or "elder/pastor" in the church is patterned after the husband/father role in the family. As the husband is called by God to serve as the head and priest of his home so the elder/pastor is called to serve as the head and leader of the extended family of believers, the household of God.

We have found that the Biblical principle of male headship in the home and in the church is patterned after the sacrificial headship of Christ over the church and demands that a man be willing to live under the headship of Christ by serving as both head and servant in the home and in the church.

(9) The real issue is not whether women are equally capable as men, but whether God has called women to serve as pastors, that is, as indicated by the meaning of the word, shepherds of a spiritual flock. The answer we have found in the Scripture is No, because the pastor's role is perceived in the New Testament as being that of a spiritual father and not of a spiritual mother. This does not mean that the church does not need spiritual mothers. The contrary is true. As a home without a mother lacks that tender, loving care that only mothers can give, so a church without spiritual mothers lacks that warmth, care, and compassion that spiritual mothers can best give. The conclusion, then, is that men and women are equally called by God to minister in the home and in the church, but in different and yet complementary roles.



**Final Appeal.** What does all of this mean for our Seventh-day Adventist church today? It means above all that it is imperative that our church resists the secularization of the family and the church, manifested especially in the rejection of the Biblical principle of male headship and promotion instead of role interchangeability in the home and in the church. To give in to such pressure means not only to violate a clear Biblical principle, but also to erode our confidence in the authority of the Scripture and in the very sense of our sacred calling to be a "holy people" among a secularly minded and perverse society. It is as simple as that.

The history of Christianity has been to a large extent a story of compromises with contemporary ideologies and practices. Every generation has the same choice--to follow Scripture or to conform to the pressures that surround us. If our Seventh-day Adventist Church is to retain its identity and mission, it must choose not to conform to the world but to confront our society with the principles which God has established for the well-being of our homes, our churches and society.

Our Adventist church must choose between *commitment* to the Biblical sacred view of the home and the church where men and women fulfill different and yet complementary roles and *conformity* to the feminist secular view which calls for the abolition of role distinctions and adoption of role interchangeability in the home and in the church. We cannot have it both ways. If role distinctions is God's plan for the well-being of our homes and churches ("as even the law says"-- 1 Cor 14:34), then role interchangeability is to be excluded. May God help us to live up to our historical commitment to the authority of Scripture (*sola Scriptura*), by respecting His divine order for the well-being of our churches and families.

## NOTES

1. Roberta Hestenes mentions briefly the reinterpretation done by the "proponents of the partnership paradigm" in her article, "Women in Leadership: Finding Ways to Serve the Church," *Christianity Today* (October 3, 1986): 8-1.

2. "A Statement of Support for the Ministry of Women as Local Elders at PMC," Spring 1987, p. 4

3. Philip Barton Payne, "Response to Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen Chapter 'What Does *Kephale* mean in the New Testament?'" in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Illinois, 1986), pp.118-132; Richard and Joyce Boldrey, *Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1976), p. 34; Margaret Howe, *Women and Church Leadership* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982), p. 60; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London, 1971), p. 248; Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (n. 2), pp. 30-31, 100.

4. Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation* (Waco, Texas, 1975), p. 100.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

6. Stephen Bedale, "The Meaning of *Kephale* in the Pauline Epistles," *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1954): 211-215.

7. See above n. 3.

8. Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen, "What Does *Kephale* Mean in the New Testament?" in *Women, Authority and the Bible* (n. 4), pp. 106-109; also by the same authors, "Does Male Dominance Tarnish Our Translations?" *Christianity Today* (October 1979): 23-29; "The 'Head' of the Epistles," *Christianity Today* (February 20, 1981): 20-23.

9. Wayne Grudem, "Does *Kephale* ('head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," appendix 1, in George W. Knight III, *The Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Chicago, 1985), pp. 49-80.

10. Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen, "Does Male Dominance Tarnish Our Translations?" *Christianity Today* (October 5, 1979): 23, 25; Stephen Bedale (n. 6), p. 211.

11. H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., with Supplement (Oxford, 1968), vol. 1, p. 944.

12. Stephen Bedale (n. 6), p. 212.

13. *Ibid.*

14. Stephen Bedale (n. 6), p. 213.

15. Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen, "What Does *Kephale* Mean in the New Testament?" (n. 8), pp. 105-106.

16. For the listing and quotation of each passage, see Wayne Grudem (n. 9), pp. 72-76.

17. Wayne Grudem (n. 9), p. 62.

18. Plutarch, *Table-Talk* 692, D, 11.

19. Philo, *Life of Moses* 2, 82.

20. Philo, *Life of Moses* 2, 30. For other examples see Wayne Grudem (n. 8), pp. 73-74.

21. Stephen Bedale speaks of a "virtual equation of *kephale* with *arche*" without giving one text to prove it (n. 6), p. 213.

22. Wayne Grudem (n. 9), p. 56.

23. Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, trans. and eds. William F. Arndt and F. Wilber Gingrich (Chicago, 1979), s. v. "*kephale*," p. 430.

24. Heinrich Schlier, "*Kephale*," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974), vol. 3, p. 675.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 679.

26. Wayne Grudem (n. 9), p. 67.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 68. Grudem questions the meaning of "source" in the two instances given by Liddell-Scott (Herodotus 4, 91 and *Orphic Fragments* 21a). See his reasoning on pp. 57-61.

28. Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen, "Does Male Dominance Tarnish Our Translations?" (n. 8), p. 23.

29. Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 1, 25; cf. *Moses* 2,30; 2, 82; *On Dreams* 2, 207.

30. Plutarch, *Pelopidas* 2, 1, 3. For other examples from Plutarch and other authors, see Wayne Grudem (n. 8), pp. 72-78.



31. Ruth A. Tucker, "Response to Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen's article 'What Does *Kephale* Mean in the New Testament?'" in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Illinois, 1986), p. 117.
32. James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1981), p. 166.
33. Stephen Bedale (n. 6), p. 214 (emphasis supplied).
34. See, for example, Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1985), pp. 153-162; Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (n. 4), p. 30; J. Sampley, *And the Two Shall Become One Flesh* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 116-117; Marcus Barth, *Ephesians: 4-6*, The Anchor Bible (New York, 1974), pp. 609-610.
35. For a general discussion of the use of the term, see Gerhard Delling, "*Hypotasso*," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds., Gerhard Kittel and Hergard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974), vol. 8, pp. 41-46.
36. James B. Hurley (n. 32), p. 142.
37. *Women in the Church: Scriptural Principles and Ecclesial Practice*, A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, September 1985, p. 31.
38. Elisabeth Elliot, "Why I Oppose the Ordination of Women," *Christianity Today* 19 (June 6, 1975): 14.
39. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Mountain View, California, 1948), vol. 1, p. 307-308.
40. Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Mountain View, California, 1958), p. 59.
41. Susan T. Foh, *Women and the Word of God* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1979), p. 261.
42. Cited in Weldon M. Hardenbrook, *What Every Man Should Know About Fatherhood*, (Arcadia, California, 1987), p. 12.
43. Weldon M. Hardenbrook (n. 42), p. 13.
44. Gilbert Bilezikian (n.34), pp. 153-162; cf. Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (n. 4), p. 30.
45. See, for example, Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (n. 4), p. 110.
46. Walter Kaiser, "Paul, Women, and the Church," *Worldwide Challenge* (September 1976): 12.
47. George W. Knight (n. 9), p. 21.
48. For discussion and documentation on cutting the hair of an adulteress, see James B. Hurley (n. 32), pp. 169-171. F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1983), p. 254; Leonard Swindler, *Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism* (Metuchen, New Jersey, 1976), pp. 121-122.
49. See C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York, 1968), p. 251.
50. Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1980), p. 171.
51. Fritz Zerbst, *The Office of Woman in the Church* (St. Louis, Missouri, 1955), p. 40.

52. F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Commentary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1953), p. 256.

53. *Ibid.*

54. See, Susan T. Fohn (n. 41), p. 113; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, New Century Bible (Greenwood, North Carolina, 1976), p. 106; M. D. Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Corinthians 11:10," *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963-64): 413; Leroy Birney, *The Role of Women in the New Testament Church* (Pinner, England, 1971), p. 9.

55. Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135 (January-March 1978): 53.

56. Among those who support this view are Bruce K. Waltke (n. 56), p. 54; James Moffatt, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (London, 1947), p. 152; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula, Montana, 1974), p. 204; Fritz Zerbst (n. 51), p. 43.

57. James B. Hurley (n. 32), p. 181.

58. F. W. Grosheide (n. 52), p. 262.

59. Some of the studies which view 1 Timothy 2:9-15 as limiting or prohibiting the full participation of women in the ministry of the church, are: George W. Knight III, "Authenteo in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 143-157; Douglas J. Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder," *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981): 198-222; Carroll D. Osburn, "Authenteo (1 Timothy 2:12)," *Restoration Quarterly* 25 (1983): 1-12; A. J. Panning, "Authentein--A Word Study," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78 (1981): 185-191; B. W. Powers, "Women in the Church: The Application of 1 Timothy 2:8-15," *Interchange* 17 (1975): 55-59; Susan T. Foh (n. 1), pp. 122-128; James B. Hurley (32), pp. 193-228.

60. Some of the studies which view 1 Timothy 2:9-15 as supporting the full participation of women in the ministry of the church, are: J. J. Davis, "Ordination of Women Reconsidered: Discussion of 1 Timothy 2:8-15," *Presbyterian Communique* 12 (November/December 1979): 1-15; N. J. Hommes, "Let Women Be Silent in the Church: A Message Concerning the Worship Service and the Decorum to Be Observed by Women," *Calvin Theological Journal* 4 (1969): 5-22; Catherine C. Kroeger, "Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb," *Reformed Journal* 29 (March 1979): 12-15; "1 Timothy 2:12--A Classicist's View," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Illinois, 1986), pp. 225-244; Philip B. Payne, "Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo's Article: '1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance,'" *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981): 169-197; David M. Scholer, "Exegesis: 1 Timothy 2:8-15," *Daughters of Sarah* 1 (May 1975): 7-8; also "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry" in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Illinois 1986), pp. 193-224; Aida D. B. Spencer, "Eve at Ephesus (Should Women Be Ordained As Pastors According to the First Letter to Timothy 2:11-15?)," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 17 (1974): 215-222.

61. David M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry" (n. 3), pp. 201-202; For an extensive documentation of this point, see David M. Scholer, "Women's Adornment: Some Historical and Hermeneutical Observations on the New Testament Passages," *Daughters of Sarah* 6, (January/February 1980):3-6.

62. Philip B. Payne (n. 60), p. 191; see also David M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," (n. 60), p. 202.

63. Philip B. Payne (n. 60), p. 192.

64. Aida Spencer, "Eve at Ephesus," *The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 17 (1974): 217.



65. Philip B. Payne offers very compelling reasons for translating *hesychia* as "quiet" and not "silence" (n. 60), pp. 169-170.

66. James B. Hurley (n. 32), p. 200.

67. Douglas J. Moo sees in verses 11 and 12 a chiastic structure (inverted parallelism) with the word "submission" (*hypotage*) functioning as the pivotal point of the verses ("1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance," *Trinity Journal* 1 [1980]: 64).

68. James B. Hurley (n. 32), p. 201.

69. Philip B. Payne (n. 60), p. 172; see also Grant Osborne, "Hermeneutics and Women in the Church," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 347.

70. David M. Scholer (n. 61), p. 205; also Grant Osborne (n. 69), p. 346; Richard and Joice Boldrey, *Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1976), p. 62; Philip B. Payne (n. 60), pp. 173-175; Catherine C. Kroeger (n. 60), pp. 225-232.

71. David M. Scholer (n. 60), p. 203.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 205; the same view is defended by Philip B. Payne (n. 65), p. 175. A somewhat similar conclusion is reached by Catherine Clark Kroeger who interprets 1 Timothy 2:12 as follows: "I do not allow a woman to teach nor to represent herself as the originator or source of man" ("1 Timothy 2:12 -- A Classicist's View" [n. 60], p. 232).

73. George W. Knight III, "Authenteo in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12," *New Testament Studies* 30 (January 1984): 152. The same view is expressed by Fritz Zerbst, *The Office of Woman in the Church* (St. Louis, Missouri, 1953), p. 53 (Zerbst gives an extensive list of other authors who hold the same view); J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1963), p. 68; James B. Hurley (n. 32), p. 202; Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1980), pp. 197-198.

74. George W. Knight III (n. 73), p. 152.

75. See 1 Tim 4:6, 13, 16; 2 Tim 3:14-17; 4:1-4; Titus 1:9; 2:1, 7.

76. See Karl H. Rengstorff, "Didasko," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974), vol. 2, p. 147; also Douglas J. Moo, "1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance" (n. 67), pp. 65-66; "The Interpretation of Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder" (n. 59), pp. 200-202; R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon* (Minneapolis, 1937), p. 564; David P. Scaer, "May Women Be Ordained as Pastors?" *The Springfielder* 36-2 (September, 1972): 104; Susan T. Foh (n. 41), p. 125.

77. Aida Spencer, (n. 60), p. 219; Philip B. Payne (n. 60), pp. 175-177.

78. Douglas J. Moo provides a most compelling critical refutation of this interpretation in ("The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder," *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981): 202-204.

79. Paul K. Jewett, *Man as Male and Female* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1975), p. 57.

80. Virginia Mollenkott, *Women, Men and the Bible* (Nashville, 1977), p. 99; Arlene Swidler, *Woman in a Man's Church* (New York, 1972), pp. 34-35; Karl Schelkle, *The Spirit and the Bride* (Collegeville, Minnesota, 1979), p. 90.

81. Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (n. 4), p. 28; see also Paul K. Jewett (n. 79), pp. 126-127; Karen Hoover, "Creative Tension in 1 Timothy 2:11-15," *Brethren Life* 22 (1977): 164; Margaret Howe, *Women and Church Leadership* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982), pp. 46-47.

82. Elizabeth Fiorenza, in *The Liberating Word: A Guide to Nonsexist Interpretation of Scripture*, ed. Letty Russel (Philadelphia, 1976), p. 49.

83. Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (n.4), p. 26.

84. George W. Knight (n. 9), p. 31.

85. Michael F. Stitzinger, "Genesis 1-3 and the Male/Female Relationship," *Grace Theological Journal* 2, 1, (1981): 31-32.

86. Clarence J. Vos, *Woman in Old Testament Worship* (Delft: Judel and Brinkman, 1968), p. 18, n. 25.

87. See Paul K. Jewett (n. 79), p. 61; Francis Cleary, "Women in the New Testament," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 10 (1980): 81; Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles: an Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1957), p. 77; H. P. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy* (Minneapolis, 1978), p. 19.

88. Stephen B. Clark (n. 50), p. 204.

89. *Ibid.*

90. *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Washington, D. C., 1957), vol. 7, p. 296; see also George W. Knight III (n. 9), p. 32.

91. Douglas J. Moo (n. 67), p. 70.

92. See, for example, Ida Ramig, *Exclusion of Women from the Priesthood: Divine Law or Sex Discrimination?* (Metuchen, 1976), pp. 111-116; Sister Albertus Magnus McGrath, O. P., *What a Modern Catholic Believes about Women* (Chicago, 1972), pp. 36-37.

93. This translation has been adopted also by Moffat and NASB.

94. See C. Spicq, *Les Epîtres Pastorales* (Paris, 1969), p. 380.

95. Philip B. Payne (n. 60), p.; Aida Spencer (n. 60), pp. 219-220; H. P. Liddon (n. 87), pp. 38, 39; Walter Lock, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh, 1924), p. 33; Pace Don Williams, *The Apostle Paul and Women in the Church* (Van Nuys, California, 1977), p. 113.

96. This view is expressed by Douglas J. Moo (n. 67), pp. 71-72; Robert Falconer, "1 Timothy 2:14-15. Interpretative Notes," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66 (1941): 376-378; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1963), p. 69; C. Spicq (n. 94), pp. 382-383; Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan 1975), p. 309.

97. For information on the improved social status of women in the Roman world in New Testament times, see Mary Lefkowitz and Maureen Fant, *Women in Greece and Rome* (Toronto, 1977); J. P. V. D. Balsolon, *Roman Women* (London, 1962). For a brief treatment, see Elisabeth Meier Teitlow, *Women and Ministry in the New Testament: Called to Serve* (Lanham, Maryland, 1980), pp. 14-20.

98. Philip B. Payne (n. 60), p. 190; see also David M. Scholer (n. 61), pp. 195-205; Catherine Clark Kroeger (n. 72), pp. 226-232.

99. Carroll D. Osborn (n. 59), p. 11.

100. *Acts of Paul* 41, 42, in *New Testament Apocrypha*, eds. Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Philadelphia, 1965), vol. 2, p. 364; Tertullian challenges the use that some made of Thecla's example to defend the right of women to teach and to baptize, by pointing out that the presbyter who fabricated the story was convicted and removed from office (*On Baptism* 17).



101. The suggestion is made by Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia* (Philadelphia, 1972), p. 48.
102. Stephen B. Clark (n. 50), p. 187.
103. See discussion in Stephen B. Clark (n. 50), pp. 186-187.
104. Walter L. Liefeld, "Women, Submission and Ministry in 1 Corinthians," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Illinois, 1986), p. 149.
105. Wayne A. Grudem *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Washington, D. C., 1982), p. 73. See Grudem's analysis of the prophetic speech at Corinth on pp. 58-73.
106. See, for example, E. Earle Ellis, "The Silenced Wives of Corinth," in *New Testament Textual Criticism*, eds. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford, 1981), p. 217; Gilbert Bilezikian (n. 34), p. 149.
107. Stephen B. Clark (n. 50), p. 187.
108. Hendrikus Berkhof, *Christian Faith*, tr. Sierd Woudstra (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1979), p. 167.
109. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics: Index Volume with Aids for Preachers*, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance (Edinburgh, 1977), p. 495.
110. See discussion in Gottlob Schrenk, "Pater," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1967), vol. 5, p. 985.
111. James R. Edwards, "Does God Really Want to be Called Father?" *Christianity Today* (February 21, 1986): 29.
112. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* I, 1 (Edinburgh, 1963), p. 447.
113. Kallistos Ware, "Man, Woman, and the Priesthood of Christ," in Peter Moore, ed., *Man, Woman, and Priesthood* (London, 1978), p. 84.
114. Donald G. Bloesch, *Is the Bible Sexist?* (Westchester, Illinois, 1982), p. 77.
115. Susan T. Foh (n. 41), p. 153.
116. *A Statement of Support for the Ministry of Women as Local Elders at PMC*, Spring 1987, p. 2.
117. Ellen G. White, *Upward Look*, p. 228.
118. Herbert T. Mayer, "Family Relationships in the New Testament," in *Family Relationships and the Church*, ed. Oscar E. Feucht, (Saint Louis, Missouri, 1970), p. 60.
119. Edith Deen, *The Family in the Bible* (New York, 1978), p. 168.
120. Pauline and Elton Trueblood, *The Recovery of Family Life* (New York, 1953), p. 120.
121. Herbert T. Mayer (n. 118), p. 60.
122. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Washington, D.C., ), vol 7, p. 296.
123. Stephen B. Clark, "Social Order and Women's Ordination", *America* 134 (January 17, 1976): 33.