

# Gender and Ministry

CHRIS GREEN

## Introduction

Evangelicals are committed to the Bible. That is, or should be, as axiomatic as saying we are committed to the gospel. But in the debate over the ordination of women to the priesthood/presbyterate, Evangelicals have failed to come to a common mind on what the Bible teaches on this issue. Sometimes the handling of the relevant texts is just crass, as when the teaching that every Christian is a priest (1 Pet 2:9) is taken to mean that therefore there is no objection to women being ordained 'priest', ignoring the massive distance between the two meanings of 'priest' as used by Peter and the Church of England. Usually the handling of the texts has been more careful, but thoughtful evangelical scholars still frequently disagree on the meaning of a passage or a word, and each says the other is wrongly interpreting the text because it is being taken 'out of context'. How can Evangelicals who are committed to the Bible come to such divergent views? What are our exegetical methods?

Evangelicals are committed to obedience to the Bible. That also should be axiomatic. If there are areas of our church life where women have a biblical right to minister but where they have been excluded for sinful reasons (and I am convinced that there are such areas) then Evangelicals will want to push for obedience to the Bible and to change the church. Equally, where there are areas where calls for change come from sinful alliances with worldliness (and I am equally convinced that those exist too) then Evangelicals will want to resist those calls and obey an unfashionable Bible.

Evangelicals are committed to the sufficiency of the Bible—that is, God has spoken in a complete manner through it. No Evangelical will be convinced that the Holy Spirit is doing something today for which he has not made clear provision in his word, or that he is doing a new thing today which contradicts what he did before.

Evangelicals are committed to understanding the Bible. We should be known for the effort we make to ensure we are interpreting the Bible correctly. Much of the debate so far has been marked by slinging texts around because they happen to mention key words like 'headship', 'authority' and 'gift'. This article will look at a number of major texts where the debate is particularly complex; references have been given for the reader who wishes to follow the debate more closely than has been possible here.

Evangelicals are committed to the clarity of the Bible. This has not been evident in the debate, and we have been far too willing to explain away difficult verses—or even ignore them—in the light of easier ones. But a

commitment to the clarity of the Bible will mean that we believe it is possible for the newest Christian to grasp its meaning, and—in theory—for our best thinkers to solve all the textual and exegetical problems. That may well take time, but we must not be known as obscurantists.

Evangelicals are gospel people—we proudly carry that historical name, and seek to explain what it means about the centrality of the gospel to our lives. Because we believe Christ came to redeem and make a new humanity we refuse to be individualists, but want to grow in our unity in Christ. It is therefore a great sadness that the debate is inevitably causing fractures between Christians. It is also a sadness that this discussion on this topic (not a topic one would have chosen) is tying up time and energies that could be employed in preaching or pastoring, and our public debates are getting us a reputation for minutiae that rivals the discussions on how many angels could dance on a pin! Nevertheless, this article seeks to clarify the position and enable us to move forward confidently in our gospel work.

This paper is laid out as a series of statements followed by commentaries which explain—sometimes word for word—the underlying biblical material. The commentaries are sometimes quite lengthy as the biblical material is the subject of fierce debate.

- 1 The Bible is God's complete, clear and uniquely authoritative word to his world. That complete word stands over the whole of our life and doctrine.

We start with Scripture as our evangelical touchstone. This statement says Scripture is complete and clear because some would want to say that God is unfolding new truths to his church today that are not clear in Scripture. Throughout their history the churches have frequently heard God speaking to their contemporary blindnesses, and we must be open to the possibility that we too have misread the Bible; throughout their history the churches have had to find answers to new questions and new ways to express old orthodoxy. However God's process of revelation in Scripture is finished, and our responsibility is to handle it correctly, even if the rest of the church chooses not to. We say that it is uniquely authoritative because our courteous listening to the concerns of non-Christians must not be mistaken for equating their opinions with Scripture's. In particular we must remember that Satan would long to sidetrack us into a protracted biblical debate if that will harm our evangelism.

There is no area of our life and doctrine where God has not expressed his will, and sometimes his will is that we exercise responsible freedom. However we must be willing to be unpopular and lose credibility in the eyes of our thinking non-Christian friends if that is the price of theological and behavioural obedience. Similarly we must

beware the technique of debate that says because scholars disagree a text should be labelled 'difficult' and put on the side of the discussion. Of course some texts are difficult to understand, but any scholar can call any text difficult, and by that technique remove an inconvenient verse from the debate. The same methodology can be used to call into question any word in a verse, but to cite the disagreement is not an adequate reason to sideline a word or a verse (see the discussions over translating the Greek word κεφαλή—statement 23). We respect our scholars but we are not at their mercy.

- 2 The Bible contains an unfolding plan of salvation, which it took many generations to write and understand. It was written by a number of people in a variety of cultures, and it is our task to apply that message today. We must make allowances for those differences of culture and authorship while not permitting the Bible to lose its authority in the process.

It is important to say God has an unfolding plan of salvation because it is clear that we must not wrench verses out of their flow in their own books or in biblical history. The Bible was written by a number of people in a variety of cultures, and we have to pay attention to the concerns of each one, not ironing out their differences of style and content. However, for all their variety the biblical authors speak one message, and it is possible to say what the Bible as a whole is about, not merely what individual books are about. The ultimate context of any verse or passage will be not merely the intention of the human author, but the overall context of the Bible under the authorship of the Holy Spirit. Any particular word, sentence or passage must be read in the light of its place in the context of the entire Bible, which is under the authorship of the Holy Spirit, and not solely in the light of the intention of the human author. Furthermore, we should understand Israel not as one culture among many but as a God-made culture; Scripture that comes out of that culture is not therefore culture bound in any way that limits its authority or relativizes its truth.

When we aim to understand a passage in context, we must not fall into the trap of making the setting into which the author wrote so particular that no other application becomes possible. For instance, we will encounter letters which were written to churches in Corinth, Ephesus and Crete. The danger is that we will so tie in what they say to that setting that unless we live in a first century Mediterranean setting those letters have no relevance for us. That way we can convince ourselves that we are still Evangelicals, for we are concerned with what the Bible says, but we have sealed the Bible into such a watertight compartment that it cannot speak unless we choose to let it. We may then determine what the Bible is about (The Equality of Men and

Women) and release those passages which echo that. Anyone who mentions a passage which seems to undermine or redefine that is told firmly that they must 'put the verse in context', which actually means 'fit the verse into our previously determined framework'.

A useful test-case is Gordon Fee's popular commentary on 1 & 2 Timothy and Titus, commenting on 1 Tim 2:11-12<sup>1</sup>:

By saying "I am not permitting," Paul focuses particularly on the situation in Ephesus. Such language as this, as well as the "I want" in 4:8 lacks any sense of universal imperative for all situations. This is not to say that he does not see his word as authoritative, but that it simply lacks the thrust of a universal imperative (cf 1 Cor 7:25).

But notice how Fee has proceeded: first his translation of a present tense as a present continuous (I am not permitting) creates the illusion of a temporary and local ruling, although the same tense frequently gives clear universal instructions (G W Knight's commentary on the same verses refers to Rom 12:1, 3; 1 Cor 4:16; 2 Cor 5:20; Gal 5:2, 2; Eph 4:1; 1 Thess 4:1, 5:14; 2 Thess 3:6; 1 Tim 2:1, 8<sup>2</sup>). Secondly, he uses quite subjective criteria for deciding how to understand the word, 'it simply lacks the thrust of a universal imperative'. But that is an unwarranted and unsupported assertion: Paul's uses of the word elsewhere (1 Cor 14:34 and 16:7) do have precisely that universally imperative thrust. Similarly, both 1 Cor 14 and 1 Tim 2 are in settings which cite Scripture and call all believers to obedience. The instructions to Corinth are in line with the pattern 'in all the churches of the saints' (1 Cor 14:33). Similarly, 1 Timothy's instructions are underlined by Paul's massive defence of his world-wide apostolic authority (1 Tim 1:12-17), followed by an appeal to obedience in vv18-2:7 which concludes with Paul's repetition that he is 'a herald and apostle—I am telling the truth, I am not lying—and a teacher of the true faith to the Gentiles'). The major New Testament passages will be dealt with below, but in the meantime we see how a respected and quoted evangelical scholar has persuaded himself he need not obey this particular injunction.

We need the strength to say that the Bible is about eschatological salvation, and that other issues may not even figure on its agenda. Where they do, and the equality of men and women is clearly one such, we need the strength to stand by the Bible where it is particularly unpalatable to modern men and women in challenging the contemporary mindset.

## **Gender and Creation**

- 3 God created people as his unique, image bearing ruler and representative on the earth. That unique role as the image bearer is

carried equally and fully by both men and women, and this statement presupposes that equality. To say that one gender more fully reflects the image of God is to distort important biblical teaching.

Genesis 1:26 is the important starting point. The decisive phrase 'let us make' marks people out as unique from the rest of creation. We are as distinct from other animals as they are from the inanimate world, both being marked out by a special act of God's 'creation' (Gen 1:1, 21, 27, Hebrew *bārā*). What it means to be image bearing is not explained except by the wider frame of the chapter where we see God creating, speaking, relating and ruling. Ruler and representative is an explanation of God's generous gift that we may 'rule' the world in his stead. This idea has much bad press in such environmentally aware times, but it is not a licence for rapacious and thoughtless greed—perhaps it is being better expressed these days in a call for more careful ecological stewardship. It is, however, a responsibility which men and women share together, and it is unhelpful to see domination as a male vice and environmentalism as a female virtue.

By saying that men and women are equally and fully made in the image of God the statement says two things. First, it must be reaffirmed that women are made in the image of God (we are not aware of any Evangelical who denies it!) despite the comments made by some critics of our position. That is to confuse us with those Catholics and Anglo-Catholics who say that the President at Communion has to be male in order to represent Christ: Evangelicals do not share that view, do not need that argument and do not believe that anyone today 'represents' Christ. Second, each individual bears the full image of God, and it is not necessary for both genders to be involved in something for God's image to be fully represented. Gretchen Gaebelien Hull says:

When I initially joined my sisters in asking, "As God calls us, may we too teach and preach the good news?" the reply was "No". When we asked... "Why not? Aren't we fully human?" the answer was always "Yes, but..."<sup>3</sup>

Whatever some people have heard, or think they have heard, we say loudly and firmly that to the question 'Are women fully human' there is no room for a 'Yes, but . . .' answer. The answer is an unequivocal and unconditional 'Yes'. Why there is still room to reply 'No' to Hull's first question will now emerge, but it has nothing to do with women being inferior or subhuman. Hull has made a category error in assuming that the church's 'preaching' function is a human right, and to deny it denies her humanity. While we long for her and her sisters to join with us in reaching a lost world for Christ we would say that to commission her for a preaching role would not affirm her humanity—it would deny her womanhood.

- 4 God created humankind<sup>4</sup> as equal but distinct: male and female. Some tasks will be shared as a race, some separated by talent or temperament irrespective of gender, some will be apportioned according to gender. Men were created to be male, women were created to be female.

It is an inevitable consequence of both Gen 1:27 and Gen 2:18-25 that men and women are equal but distinct. The equality is not a matter of much discussion today, for it is generally assumed, but we must notice that our equality is not an equality without any further definition, for that would mean that men and women are undifferentiated and indistinguishable apart from some biological specifics. Notice, though, that some tasks are shared as a race, the task of ruling over creation for example, some will be taken on by one person or the other depending on talent or temperament, and a third group (and this is the controversial group) will be apportioned according to gender. At this stage in the Genesis account we do not see what those second or third groups might consist of, but it is clear that men were created to be male, women were created to be female. If having two sexes is God's good plan then we would expect the Bible to equip us to serve him not only in those roles where we are the same, but also in those roles where only one sex can follow him, and for which he has made us different.

- 5 The creation pattern was that women was created out of man to be 'a helper suitable for him'. The word translated 'suitable for him' teaches us that men and women stand together, apart from and over the rest of creation, the word translated 'helper' teaches us that men express their equal complementarity in taking a responsible and loving lead. Neither is superior to the other in this non-reversible relationship which is part of the creation pattern preceding the Fall.

This controversial phrase has two Hebrew words at its root, but before we look at them three other comments should be made. First, notice Adam's aloneness: once again the difference of humankind from everything else is underlined. Second, that aloneness is not answered by the presence of God, for there are some things that only Eve will be able to share with Adam. Thirdly, this state of loneliness is the only part of God's creation which is 'not good' or unfinished.

The two Hebrew words are:

(a) *ēzer*, helper. This does not imply that Adam was superior to Eve, but it is a stronger word than 'equal partner', and we should notice that the nuance is that Eve is to help Adam rather than each helping the other. It is sometimes said that the usual context for this word is

for God being our helper, and that does not mean that God is submissive or loses his sovereignty. That is true, and we are not saying that Eve was inferior, but even if the meaning of a word in one place necessarily defines its meaning in another (a questionable method) we should notice that God helping us means an act of remarkable grace and condescension on his part towards us, and is not a true parallel for Eve.

This is related to a confusion that is often met, and shows how careful we should be in our theology. Christ is obedient to the Father in his work, but that does not mean he is inferior to the Father in his nature. Similarly, Eve's role as helper does not make her inferior to Adam. We must not be so eager to make Eve and Adam so equal and undifferentiated that we lose an insight from the inner life of the Trinity: the frequently stressed obedience of the Son to the Father—and of the Spirit to the Father and the Son—which is never reciprocated.

(b) *k<sup>e</sup>negdô*, suitable, a mirror image or reflection. The rest of the Bible maintains this balance between the different roles assigned to the man and the woman and yet their utter equality—a balance we find very difficult to hold. There have been attempts to prove that the word even means 'superior to', but the argument is massively flawed in its attempt to be politically correct. We cannot make up meanings for words which we dislike: here it has the usual meaning derived from 'before' or 'in front of'.

Saying that this is a non-reversible relationship<sup>5</sup> means that there are certain aspects of it which only Adam can fulfil, and others only Eve. In the creation account, for example, Eve is created 'from' and 'for' Adam, and in the general application made after that it is the man who takes the initiative to leave his parents and form a new family unit with his wife. Genesis is not saying that the only relationships which God sees as good are within the context of heterosexual marriage, for clearly friendships with people of the same or the opposite sex are frequently fruitful and delightful. But the norm given here is the highest peak of human relationships, and it is monogamous, heterosexual (a man . . . his wife), decisive (shall leave), committed (be united) marriage. Within that context the relationship will be sexual (the two shall become one flesh). Of course this pattern has been radically attacked by the Fall, but the ideal still holds good.

As a further consequence of this non-reversible relationship, the Bible will not permit us to call homosexuality God's good intention for anyone, nor homosexual marriage a possible option.

The phrase responsible . . . lead expresses Adam's role which is both to bear the accountability within his marriage, but to refuse to do so in a dominating way or to trample on Eve's equal dignity. Genesis teaches that this pattern is part of God's good intention within marriage,

and that (to use a New Testament term) the headship of the man within a marriage predates the Fall, although the Fall radically defaces it.

## **Gender and Sin**

- 6 The Fall is a story of reversals. Initially God rules his creation, the man and the woman have dominion over the rest of creation, and the woman has learned of God's goodness and morality from the man. In the Fall a creature exercises dominion over humankind, the woman takes responsibility for and teaches the man, God's goodness and morality are turned into demeaning pettiness, and his rule is overthrown.

That man and woman share the dominion under God is clear from Gen 1:28. However, 'In that woman was made from man to be his helper and is twice named by man (2:23; 3:28) indicates his authority over her'.<sup>6</sup> We would add that the authority would seem to include a teaching authority too, for God gave the instruction about the tree to the man (1:16-17) who presumably relayed it to the woman. 3:1 identifies the serpent with the 'wild animals the LORD God had made', the same group of 'beasts of the field' over which the man had just been given authority (2:19, the Hebrew phrase is identical). So the situation before the Fall is the Sovereign God, man and woman partners in dominion under him over the rest of creation, with the man in a loving leadership role.

That precise balance is exactly reversed by the Fall: the serpent teaches the woman, when it should be under her authority, the woman teaches the man, when she should be under his authority (we notice that their eyes are opened only when the man had eaten too), and God's sovereignty is questioned by their moral autonomy. This reversal will be important for Paul's use of this material, where he argues for a restoration of a pre-Fall order in church and home.

- 7 The consequences of the Fall are seen immediately in sexual terms. The man and the woman know shame before one another and guilt before God. God calls the responsible man to account for his abdication, but the man blames first the woman and then God. The consequence of the Fall is that what was good (work, parenting and male leadership) becomes painful and demeaning. In particular the male/female ideal is altered: loving male leadership becomes male domination and female submissiveness becomes an intolerable burden of obedience to a muscular tyrant, with all its ugly consequences in the world and the church.

The writer of Genesis 'does not regard female subordination to be a judgment on her sin'<sup>7</sup> for that predates the Fall, but the poison has



entered the marriage. The idea that Eve's desire is for mastery over her husband is supported by the parallel in Gen 4:7<sup>b</sup>, but is, says Gordon Wenham, linguistically 'impossible'.

- 8 God's verdict on sin is banishment and death, but built into the curses is the promise of a saviour who will reverse the Fall. Until that happens, the people he redeems fight against sin and try to live under God's rule.

The statement says until that happens, because the Christian's timescale is that the new creation and creation order will occur only at the return of Christ (2 Pet 3:10). Therefore as Christians who live in the in-between or 'end-times' we need to know how to behave. On the one hand we do not behave as those who are pagans (Eph 4:17), for that is to undervalue the radical difference Christ has effected. On the other hand—and this is more pertinent to our problem—we are not to live as if we already have the new creation order. We are certainly to live as those who belong to the heavenly city, not the earthly one, but we do not behave as if we already lived there with our resurrection bodies (where there is no marriage anyway! [Mk 12:25]). The resurrection, with its transformation, lies ahead of us. 1 Cor 15 is in many ways the heart of that letter, in that it looks as if many Corinthian Christians were trying to live as if they already had their resurrection bodies and no further resurrection lay ahead; Paul responds by reaffirming the future resurrection and saying that until then we live patiently and expectantly, but realistically with our weak pre-/resurrection bodies. One key to chapter 11 and 14 of 1 Corinthians is that some women may have so anticipated their resurrection bodies that they lived as if the gender distinctions had already been done away with, whereas Paul insists that gender-based distinctions are still valid for Christians. It is possible that if we lose our grip on what the future holds we may transfer promises for the future into promises for the present, and fall into the same trap as the Corinthians. Marianne Maye Thompson says:

If Christ has come to redeem us from sin *and its results*, the hope of redemption must also extend to our fallen human relationships in general and to the relationship between men and women<sup>8</sup>

but we must understand that not all the benefits Christ has won for us may be appropriated by us in the present. That is why Christians still sin, fall sick and die, for 'sin *and its results*' have not yet been removed from our created bodies. In the future we will be physically eternal and ontologically sinless, but in the present we live within the context of the Fall, waiting for the new creation. As male oppression and female subjugation is a consequence of the Fall we should oppose it, but the way to do that is to superimpose the patterns of male and

female that precede the Fall, not those which only follow the Second Coming.

## **Gender and Israel**

9 Israel was a nation called into being by God's redemptive covenant, which marked the nation as different from the surrounding nations, and was seen in their non-conformity to pagan customs. The lessons from Israel's history apply primarily to the new covenant people, the new Israel.

The two references to Israel, that Israel was different and practised non-conformity to pagan customs, are both important. Because she was different there were rules and expectations that applied to her that did not apply to the surrounding nations, and she had to keep to practices that could serve only to mark her out. In the same way there will be parts of the New Testament that place requirements upon Christians—we are called to behave differently. In this way we can state that the principle of male leadership in home and church is maintained in the New Testament (statement 24)—for that will mark the church out from the rest of the world. In no other area of life is the submission of a woman to a man required, and it is sinful to impose it, but where it is required it is equally sinful to remove it. This will mean that we too practise non-conformity to pagan customs, for we claim the right to be counter-cultural, criticising and critiquing from a biblically informed perspective. Just as Israel could not keep the Good News to herself, but still required only Jews to be circumcised, we too must neither restrict to the church the claims of Christ which apply to all people, nor seek to impose those standards on society which rightly apply only to the church. Are there any roles in society, outside the church, which the Bible limits to men? Should not Evangelicals be highly critical of many areas where talented and able women are passed over in favour of equally (or less!) gifted men? Our concern here however is for those areas in church and Christian home which Scripture does make prescriptive for obedient Christians, the new Israel.

- 10 The covenant covered both men and women without distinction: they shared equally in its blessings (the Exodus) and curses (the Exile).
- 11 The covenant was sealed with covenant signs. Some signs were shared in by the whole nation (the Passover, the sacrificial system), others only by men (circumcision, priesthood). This did not indicate a narrower or superior covenant with the men of Israel: they were signs to the whole nation of the same covenant, but signs which men alone could rightly carry. There were no equivalent covenant signs carried by women alone to the whole nation.

- 12 God gave Israel gifted leaders and prophets who were variously men and women, failures and successes. However, the norm was for men to occupy such a position, and, where a woman occupies it, the text states either that those women ministered only to women, or that their capable leadership was an indictment of the lack of suitable male leaders.

There are three examples which are often referred to at this point as giving proof that Israel was used to women occupying positions of leadership:

- (a) Miriam, it is said, exercised a leadership parallel to Aaron's under Moses, and on one occasion after the crossing of the Red Sea took the lead in community praise. But the text explicitly says:

Miriam the prophetess, Aaron's sister, took a tambourine in her hand, and all the women followed her, with tambourines and dancing. Miriam sang to them . . . (Ex 15:20).

Miriam led, but she led the women, and Miriam sang, but it was 'to them'. The other occasion is an equally flawed example: Miriam and Aaron are equal leaders in Num 12, but they are leaders of a rebellion which Aaron learns to call 'sin' (12:11) and which requires Moses' intercession (12:13). With Moses and Aaron she formed part of a plural leadership, but clearly under Moses' headship (Micah 6:4).

- (b) Deborah was a judge (and a good judge too!) who appears to have led Israel into battle against Sisera. But careful reading shows that that was precisely what did not happen: Deborah invited Barak to lead the attack (Judges 4:6-7), but Barak refused unless Deborah went with him (4:8).

'Very well,' Deborah said 'But because of the way you are going about this, the honour will not be yours, for the Lord will hand Sisera over to a woman'. (4:9)

In other words Deborah's leading Israel into battle was because the appropriate man had shirked the responsibility, and the result was shame for him.

- (c) Huldah prophesied after the finding of the Law (2 Kings 22:14-20), again at a time of national apostasy and sinful leadership, apart from the king's newly found repentance.

It would be precarious to build upon these three examples alone the idea that Israel was used to women in leadership: the only one who clearly occupies that role is Deborah, and her story is shot through with the fact of her leadership being anomalous. There are undoubt-

edly women that the Old Testament admires: Ruth and Esther spring first to mind, but neither could be said to be a leader. Proverbs 31 profiles a remarkable woman, but again, not a leader of Israel. It is ultimately, in fact, both a cause of God's anger and a sign of his judgment that 'Youths oppress my people, women rule over them' (Is 3:12, expanded in vv16-17).

- 13 Godly and capable women shine through the history of Israel, and it does not and must not demean their vital contribution to God's plan of salvation to notice that the pattern of male leadership is regulative in both home and nation.

## **Gender and Redemption**

- 14 Jesus' ministry touched men and women: he gave both an equal responsibility for sin, equal forgiveness and an equal place in the new Israel. Radically, he counted women and men as his followers, taught both and was ministered to by both. After his resurrection he was seen by both.

Women and men shared equal status and salvation in the Old Testament, so it is no surprise to find it equally in the New. Jesus' involvement of women in his ministry was undoubtedly unusual for his day, and would have aroused considerable criticism for his willingness to teach women disciples. However it is possible to make the contrast between the Old Testament and the New too great at this point: the OT sees women learning alongside men as a matter of normality (Neh 8:2-3, for example). It is therefore to overstate the case quite wildly to say that Jesus' behaviour was a 'revelational breakthrough', in Willard Swartley's phrase<sup>9</sup>. Jesus was behaving as a scripturally obedient Jew would have behaved - which was culturally offensive in his day.

- 15 Jesus chose twelve Jewish men as his closest associates and apostles. Clearly he was not bound by the customs of his time, and he deliberately chose Jews and not Gentiles, men and not women as the foundation for his church. Equally clearly, the apostles are unique, and we cannot draw from this either the conclusion that Jesus wants all church leaders to be male (for then they would have to be Jewish too), nor that Jesus was limited by his culture and he would have chosen women if he could.

The relationship between Jesus and the customs of his time is an important one to think through clearly. Could Jesus have chosen women apostles? Those who wish he had account for Jesus' selection of males in two ways: first, that it would have been culturally impos-

ible for Jesus to have thought in that way, but in the light of the development of Christian doctrine we can see that such a decision would have been in line with principles he enunciated. Second, that it would have been culturally inappropriate for him to have done so, whatever his wishes, because of the impact on the crowds he wished to reach. But Jesus' strength of character and independence of mind militate against both lines of thought. Jesus frequently reached conclusions that one might have humbly thought to be 'culturally impossible'—his whole attitude to the Law shows how freely his mind moved. And to accuse Jesus of not taking a course of action he knew to be right because it was 'culturally inappropriate' is not to have read his clashes with the Jewish leadership over Sabbath. Those who see Jesus as culturally constrained in some way should notice the number of times the Gospels portray him as the radical revolutionary in so many other areas, and then wonder whether his behaviour they think of as reticence may not actually be the one he deliberately chose out of all the options.

The uniqueness of the apostles as commissioned witnesses to Jesus precludes us from taking them as examples in any way other than the ways they lay down. Although they make sure the next generation of leadership is in place, they do not make provision for the next generation of apostles—there will be none. We are not required to model our ministries on them but on the models they hand down to us, and so our example is not Paul, but the example he gives us: Timothy. We do not look to the maleness of the apostles as a necessary requirement of Christian leadership, any more than we look to their race, number, or occupations. That Jesus chose twelve men does not mean we should have male apostle substitutes today.

- 16 Jesus was a stern critic of men abusing women inside marriage and more generally. However nothing Jesus says or does can be taken to mean that he disagreed with the principle of responsible male leadership.**

Jesus was a stern critic of the consequences of the Fall, as can be seen when he confronts those men who play power games with women (Matt 5:27-32, John 7:53-8:11). However, at no point does he usurp the principle of loving male leadership: those three examples of lust, divorce and adultery actually presume it. His choice of male apostles, while it is not necessarily of itself a model to follow, is entirely of a piece with the Old Testament mindset, and what we should expect of the obedient Jew. There is a dangerous three step argument which says (1) the OT teaches submissiveness, (2) Jesus was radically different from the OT, (3) we must be radically different from the principle of submissiveness, and when we see it in the New Testament we treat it as a hangover from the past. The reasons why it is a dangerous argu-

ment are evident in each step: (1) draws such a hard line between the two Testament that it seems the only purpose of the New Testament is to subvert the Old, (2) makes the same error for Jesus, and (3) leaves us with the problem of deciding which parts of the New Testament belong, for example, to Paul the Christian Apostle and which to Paul the Unreformed Jew. (The answer to (3) will in fact be obvious to anyone with some cynicism: Converted Paul wrote the parts we want, on other grounds, to accept, Unconverted Paul the parts we do not.) It is fundamentally flawed logic, but often accepted because the conclusion is wanted and the lines of the argument look scriptural.

- 17 The cross of Christ accomplishes the redemptive programme God promised: it reverses the banishment from God and subsequent death penalty which were the consequence of the Fall, and there is 'neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, slave nor free, for you are all one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:28). That equality within salvation means that no-one is more saved than anybody else, and requires us to fight against those distortions of relationships which are the consequences of the Fall, while not eradicating those differences of gender which are part of God's good order for creation which precede the Fall.

We must be precise about the achievements of Christ on the cross. This is especially important in the light of such statements as Gretchen Gaebelein Hull's:

Jesus himself said of his redemptive act, "It is finished". Yet the traditionalists qualify that by saying to women who desire full participation within the body of Christ, "Yes, but . . .". The traditionalists' qualification is twofold: first, yes you are redeemed, but you are permanently flawed because of Eve's frailty; second, yes you are redeemed, but because of your flaw you must work out your salvation through a particular role.<sup>10</sup>

We will look at the major texts below, but this redemption principle deserves examination on its own.

When Christ said 'It is finished', precisely what was finished? There remained much more for him to do: the resurrection appearances, his ascension to the right hand of the Father, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the working out of his sacrificial and priestly ministry in terms of world evangelisation and his return as Saviour and Judge being the most obvious. If Jesus' death accomplished absolutely everything in God's redemptive programme and our task was merely to work out the implications, we should side with Hull. Of course much of our task does lie in those implications, but as we have constantly stated, the continued presence of sin and death in our world means that God's programme of redemption has not yet been completed, *and cannot be*

*completed by any human activity at all.* We draw a clear line between those activities which we are required to do before Christ's return, and for which we will be held accountable, and those which only Christ will do after his return. 'It is finished' means that the redemptive programme finds its universal focus in, and only in, Jesus' death. God was right to acquit Abraham as he is right to acquit us, because he looks on Christ crucified. But 'It is finished' does not mean that everything Christ has to do is finished; it means that everything that Christ had to do on the cross to redeem people is finished. Christ's death has three different time spans to it: we were redeemed when he died for us, we are being redeemed in our transformation to Christlikeness and we will be redeemed when Christ returns. Just as it is damaging to separate one of these and make them three unrelated events, so it is equally damaging to unite them in such a way that they lose their distinctiveness. When Hull asks 'Are women fully redeemed?' the reply should be, if you are asking whether they are less redeemed than men, then of course they are fully redeemed, but if you are asking whether they may now enjoy all the benefits Christ has won for them then neither men nor women are fully redeemed. Women are neither less nor more redeemed than men.

So it is not a problem that women are redeemed but still have to live under the curse on Eve, any more than it is that men are redeemed and live under the curse of Adam (meaning those things that apply to him as a male). It is not a problem that women are redeemed yet have to work out their salvation through a particular role, any more than it is for the same to be true of a man. Both are redeemed, both have gender roles still prescribed for them, both still suffer the consequences of the Fall which are specific to their gender as well as those which apply to both (1 Jn 1:8-9). One day there will be no gender, but we are not there yet, and must not behave as if we were.

At this point Gal 3:28 acquires central importance. What does the eradication of the distinctions mean? Is it the text by which all other gender based material in Paul must be read? Is it his ideal, while everything else is reality? Is he, for whatever reason, inconsistent when he seems to go back on this ideal in 1 Corinthians and the Pastorals? (We assume the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, but that is not necessary for our argument: simply by being in the canon they are authoritative for us.)

Two dangers must be avoided. First, we must not so limit this verse that it speaks only of invisible, spiritual realities but has no social impact at all. Paul clearly saw a change in relationships between a slave and master when both were Christians, and Galatians itself is to do with abandoning circumcision, so it would be foolish to assert that this verse does not apply to women and men too. Secondly, though, we must not apply this verse in such a way that Paul is seen to be inconsis-

tent in all three areas. There may be neither slave nor free, but that does not stop him addressing each party and giving it separate instructions. Being a slave now means learning to be like Christ, as does being a master. Paul was keen to build churches of mixed Jewish/Gentile stock, but recognised that they might still have dietary differences (the point in Galatians is not that they had those differences, but that those differences were being interpreted in salvation terms). Similarly, then, he still addresses issues which particularly apply to one gender or the other as well as those that apply to both. Christ does make a difference to the relationships between a believing husband and wife (for they are equally saved and equally required to become Christlike), but does not so remove the difference that he says 'Partner, love your partner, Partner submit to your partner'. At the risk of tautology, Gal 3:28 applies to those things Paul intended it to apply to, and not to those things he did not. If we find Paul's application of the principle limited or not consistent then we are applying the principle wrongly.

## Gender and Church

- 18 Men and women being equally saved by Christ, they are equally filled and gifted by the Holy Spirit. In the New Testament we see a variety of women who exercise ministry in a way that attracts attention and who are models for women in churches today.

It is because men and women are equally saved that they are equally gifted, and the list of women who served the churches in the New Testament is long and impressive (Rom 16 is an outstanding single illustration). We need care, however, concerning 'Andronicus and Junias . . . (who) are outstanding among the apostles' (Rom 16:7). The word 'apostle' has been subject to much scrutiny here. They were obviously not members of the Twelve, but of a different grouping who did not have any Apostolic (as we normally use the word) authority. They may have been respected church leaders or planters, or simply itinerant church 'messengers' (which is what the word apostle means), but they are not part of an authoritative inner ring.

This is important, because of the gender of Junia(s) - was he a he or she a she? The name itself cannot tell us, and that has led to speculation that there were women apostles. J D G Dunn, for example, says 'We may firmly conclude that one of the foundation apostles of Christianity was a woman and a wife'.<sup>11</sup> But we may conclude nothing of the sort. It *may* be right to say that the name is female, and if so it is reasonable to guess that she and Andronicus were married. But the term 'foundation apostle' should be reserved for the Twelve plus Paul, personally commissioned delegates of Jesus. Of course the word 'apostle' is used of Andronicus and Junia(s) and many others too, but



in that other, secondary sense. A contemporary of Paul would have had no difficulty distinguishing between this apostleship and Paul's (Rom 1:1-5), just as we have no difficulty distinguishing between the politician who is a minister and the minister of the local church. Would Paul have fought so hard for his apostolic title if it could be had so easily? Would it be the consistent New Testament record that they were The Twelve if in fact they were The Five Hundred (1 Cor 15:5-6)? It would be fairer to conclude that Junias was probably a woman, probably married to Andronicus, exercised a ministry with him that is correctly called 'apostleship' but exercised absolutely no 'foundation apostleship'.

- 19 We must distinguish carefully between the liberation caused by the Holy Spirit, which will always be subject to the Bible, and a liberation which is an aping of the concerns of the world. Sometimes we should lead the world, sometimes we should follow, sometimes we must walk in the opposite direction.

Freedom, liberation and justice are words often used in this debate. Again, they must be controlled by Scripture. We must affirm that 'It is for freedom that Christ has set us free. Stand firm then, and do not let yourselves be burdened by a yoke of slavery' (Gal 5:1), but we must also affirm that the Christian must 'not use your freedom to indulge the sinful nature' (Gal 5:13). There are, then, areas where the Christian is free, and areas where the Christian is not free, and the sinful nature will try to make us confuse the two. So we must not assume that everything that the world proclaims free, liberating and just, will be that way, nor must we assume that everything it calls restricting and unjust is so. Once again, we must test our values, and the world's values, against Scripture. It is not good enough simply to say that the ordination of women is a matter of justice: *if* God has decreed otherwise then it is manifestly *not* so. Justice needs careful biblical scrutiny, because to fallen human eyes God can act in an apparently unjust way (Gen 18:25, 19:1-29).

- 20 The church has limited some areas of church life to men on wholly spurious grounds. There is no explicit biblical requirement that the person leading a communion service should be male, and where the issue would be sharpest, in Corinth, Paul is unconcerned on that issue. That person does not in any way 'represent' Christ to us. There is no requirement that the person be 'ordained', that too being an alien category to the New Testament, and it is not stated that the person even be a presbyter, overseer or deacon. It is not even a New Testament requirement that any one person 'lead' a service, although that may be desirable on grounds of good order.

- 21 The church is being asked to open all areas of church life to women on equally spurious grounds. The person leading a com-

munion service is not doing so as ‘the image of God’, and it is fallacious to argue that not having a woman in that role means that the image of God is not fully present. There is no biblical reason why that role should not be filled by any recognised senior member of the church, male or female, ordained or lay.

The question of leadership at a communion service example is one among many, but a relevant one to this debate, since it shows how Evangelicals can be tied to non-evangelical traditions. Catholic discussions on this issue have set the agenda, and women have argued powerfully that if the President ‘represents’ Christ then it is as a human, not a male, and that a woman may equally well occupy that role. Some of us wish to agree with the conclusion that a woman may lead at communion, but disagree with the argument, for Christ is present in reality, and needs no substitute. Others of us disagree with both the conclusion and the argument: the one introducing the Lord’s Supper is occupying a leading and teaching role, and for that reason may only be male. (The former group of Evangelicals would see New Testament leadership as plural and either one male or mixed with a single male leader; and the latter would see leadership as singular and male, but both would deny that there is any sense in which there is an echoing of Christ’s priestly role; none of us stands as a mediator or representative between God and his church.)

- 22 That an individual is gifted by God does not necessitate the use of that gift. Paul places restrictions on both tongue speakers and prophets, and does not impoverish the church by that restriction, for there are other scriptural principles which come into play. It is in that context, and using the same word, that Paul requires the Corinthian women to be silent. That a woman, or a man, is a gifted prophet does not mean that she or he must exercise that gift.

Here we begin to look at some key NT texts, and we start with 1 Cor 14:33-34 ‘As in all the congregations of the saints, women should remain silent in the churches’. We need to be clear on the whole flow of Paul’s argument and not merely focus on a phrase. The context is a discussion on what happens ‘in church’—the assembly of Christians—and Paul’s concern is that the top priorities, intelligibility for outsiders and strengthening the believers, are being lost (1 Cor 14:23-26). He then proceeds to place an identical restriction on three different groups: if there is no interpreter a tongue speaker ‘should keep quiet’, if a prophet is interrupted he should ‘stop’, and the women should ‘remain silent’ (vv 28, 30, 34). Although the NIV gives a different impression, all three phrases involve the Greek word *σιγᾶω* as a present imperative, the only difference being that the third occurrence is in the plural.

Paul clearly does not have a bias against women, unless we say he has an equal bias against tongue speakers and prophets. We suggest that in all three cases Paul is not denying the reality of a gift, but placing limits upon it in the light of higher concerns. 1 Cor 11:3-16 explicitly recognises women praying and prophesying. Clearly there is a shift between chapters 11 and 14, and we suggest it is the arena for exercising ministry: 'in church'. To those who argue that because a woman has a gift she should be used, and if she is not used the church is impoverished, we answer that Paul has a higher concern than personal fulfilment. He does not see a restriction placed on the individual as an impoverishment of the whole.

We should notice too the introductory phrase 'as in all the congregations of the saints', for this adds two dimensions to Paul's meaning. On the one hand he universalises his command: 'all'—we cannot make this a restriction on a temporary Corinthian problem—and on the other he *restricts* his command by saying it applies to 'congregations' (ἐκκλησίαι)—that is, this is not a command that relates to every aspect of life, but only to Christians when they come together as church.

This restriction will need to be placed alongside other NT passages before we can develop a full picture, but we still need to justify the inclusion of these verses, for Fee's Commentary on 1 Corinthians argues that vv34-35 should not be in our text at all, and this view is gaining acceptance by repetition. D A Carson has reviewed Fee's arguments at length and concludes that:

neither Fee's appeal to transcriptional probability nor his appeal to intrinsic probability is very convincing. With all respect to a brother whose text-critical prowess is far greater than my own, his arguments in this case sound a bit like the application of a first-class mind to the defense of a remarkably weak position.<sup>12</sup>

Those who find Fee persuasive should be urged to read Carson's critique.

- 23 The conditions under which men and women may exercise their gifts are not necessarily identical. Some of the New Testament expressions of this principle spoke to those particular cultures and require thoughtful application today, as for instance the hair and veils of 1 Corinthians 11. However the underlying principle is clear, universally valid and not culture bound. That the man is 'head' of the woman must not be taken to mean sinful male dominance but the word should not be weakly mistranslated as 'source'.

This refers to the complex verses in 1 Cor 11:3-7. The underlying problem seems to have been that gender differences were being disregarded in Corinth (perhaps to the banning of intercourse, ch 7), and Paul is arguing that the basic difference *even for those who are in*

*Christ* may not be disregarded. Whether we understand Paul to mean hats or veils or elaborate hair, or debate how the culture of Corinth was infecting the church, are issues for which we need the detailed commentaries. However the broad sweep on Paul's argument is clear: men and women are different and interdependent, and their life together must reflect that. Men, when they prophesy, do so as men, women as women. Our culture will reflect the gender difference in other ways from Corinth, but it must be observed and celebrated, not rubbed out.

The proposed change of meaning for κεφαλή from one with a sense of authority to 'source' remains unconvincing. Wayne Grudem's two surveys,<sup>13</sup> the latter responding to criticisms of the first, seem still to have the weight. 'Source' is a frequent meaning for inanimate objects but unparalleled for humans, whereas the 'authority' connotation is well documented. It is worrying that such an academically abstract debate is setting the pace while it is incomprehensible to most Christians, and also that it is becoming sufficient to cite what is still a 'proposed' shift of meaning as if had won the field. It has not.

- 24 The principle of male leadership in home and church is maintained in the New Testament, modelled on Christ's servant leadership. The principle of 'mutual submission' must not be taken to mean that men and women are undifferentiated and interchangeable in all roles. 'Headship' is a concept with undeniable overtones of authority, but does not imply that a wife is a servant or slave of the husband.

Eph 5:21-6:9 (parallel Col 3:18-4:1) is a list of different roles Christians occupy, working out the principle 'Submit to one another out of reverence to Christ'. We notice, though, that Paul only ever works out the principle of submission (or obedience in the case of slaves and children) in terms of one half of the relationship. 'Submit to one another' then does not mean that *all* Christians submit to *all* other Christians, but that in certain relationships submission is an appropriate behaviour by one partner in order to learn Christlikeness, just as Christlike love is required of the other. Once again we find ourselves defending the idea that gender differences are observed by NT writers, not abolished on the grounds on Gal 3:28.

- 25 In church the gender difference should be observed by entrusting the ultimate responsibility for teaching to a few men. This does not mean that women are less gifted or intelligent, nor more likely to teach error, nor that women cannot preach. In expressing the reversal of the Fall we should observe the order of teaching in Genesis.

The New Testament pattern of is of plural leadership, although some would wish to focus that in one person, modelled on Timothy or Titus.

However we notice that the assumption in the Pastorals is that there is the involvement of a team.

We notice secondly that the only part of the description of those who are to oversee which is not merely a mark of Christian maturity is being 'able to teach' (1 Tim 3:2, cf Titus 1:9), and this is the principle difference between an overseer and a deacon. Since that immediately follows the strongest proscription of women teaching in Paul it would seem clear that he assumes that 'oversight/teaching' is for mature Christian men only.

So may women exercise 'oversight' *without* teaching? If the only difference between a deacon and overseer is the latter's teaching role, then we could expect Paul to open that role to women—and 1 Tim 3:11 could equally well be referring to women deacons as to wives of deacons (Rom 16:1). We must not confuse Paul's use of 'deacon' with the Anglican use, and we recognise this as a valid and important role that woman and men should equally fill.

May, then, women teach *without* exercising oversight? This brings us to 1 Tim 2:11-14. Again, we need to exercise care in the light of current arguments. First, we should deny that this is a localised problem for which Paul was giving a local, temporary or tentative ruling. 'I do not permit' is a good translation (see above, commentary on Paragraph 2). Secondly we should deny that 'have authority' should be re-translated as 'seize authority', as if the problem were pushy women in Ephesus. Knight's recent commentary says:

the word shows no inherent negative sense of grasping or usurping authority or of exercising it in a harsh or authoritative way, but simply means 'to have or exercise authority' (p141).

Paul makes two positive directions (learn, full submission) and two prohibitions (teaching with authority and silence) and they clearly form pairs, 'Quiet learning inversely parallels (verbal) teaching, and full submission inversely parallels exercising authority'.<sup>14</sup> From the following gender based argument we see that Paul means that he does not permit a woman to exercise a teaching authority over men (cf Titus 2:3-5, where women teach women).

He has two reasons, one coming from Genesis 2, the other from Genesis 3. 'Adam was formed first, then Eve' is in line with the constant biblical teaching about the authority of the firstborn, culminating in the authority of Christ. Humankind is radically different from everything else God made, made in his image, and Adam is the firstborn of this race—hence his authority, which predates the Fall.

The deception of Eve . . . involved the temptation for Eve to take the initiative in her relationship with Adam. She took the initiative in deciding to eat the fruit without reference to Adam although she had

knowledge of the prohibition with respect to the tree. The subtlety of Satan's temptation is to deceive Eve into taking the role of headship.<sup>15</sup>

So the Fall involves a reversal of roles, and Paul wishes to reinstate their Edenic pattern in the church.

John Stott is therefore right to say that 'female submission to male headship is firmly rooted in the biblical account of creation', and that the silence/teaching is 'an *expression* of the authority-submission syndrome rather than an *addition* to it'.<sup>16</sup> However we would wish to stress that the expression of it is as biblically bound as the principle itself, as both are rooted in the Genesis account. The question is not 'authority/submission was expressed in learning/silence in Ephesus, so how should that be expressed today', but that 'authority/submission expressed in learning/silence was binding in Ephesus and on us, although we might express it differently'.

Once again we notice Paul's careful restrictions: this is a ruling which only applies to Christians, and only when they are in church, and only when the issue is one of teaching with authority—the issue of oversight. 'The clause as a whole describes the status of women not in relation to every aspect of the gathered assembly (i.e. praying, prophesying, singing, etc; cf again 1 Cor 11:5) but specifically in relation to that with which it is contrasted, i.e. teaching.'<sup>17</sup>

All Evangelicals would be happy to have women teaching in some spheres, although we have differing emphases. Some are happy so long as there is one single male teaching leader under whose authority the teaching is done, some would wish to stress that the leadership should be male but plural. Others would wish a further limitation, on women teaching only women, and never a mixed gathering. However we all agree that we cannot devolve the teaching authority of the local church—to a bishop, for example. The visible teaching authority of the local church must express Paul's regulation here.

- 26 Just as there is an area of life which is limited by gender to men, so there is one limited by gender to women—the bearing and nurture of children. This should be seen as a joyful key area of life and not a restriction or subjugation of gifts. Clearly there will be areas of parenting that both will share equally, but there will be some uniquely 'fatherly' tasks and some uniquely 'motherly' tasks.

Because gender differences continue in the church, under God's good ordering, there are therefore some roles that are exclusively gender based (most, of course, are not). Paul's comment is relevant here, that 'women will be saved through childbearing' (2 Tim 2:15). We can discount the interpretations that are either universalist, or medical ('women will be kept safe') as being untrue to Scripture and irrelevant to his argument here. Knight<sup>18</sup> defends the idea that Paul is referring to

The Childbirth—ie the birth of Jesus, but that seems stretched and an odd way for Paul to talk. It is perhaps better to see that Paul is making the familiar point about gender differences: that they continue, that there is nothing wrong in them, and that we should not try to eradicate them before God does. Women remain women, men men, and should not take one another's roles.

- 27 **Marriage and singleness are both gifts from God, and we must not elevate one state as the ideal. Many marriages are childless, many have children who have left home and every church contains unmarried, divorced or bereaved individuals, all of whom who are demeaned if we idolise the family (and if we altered the examples, we could demean others if we idolise celibacy). However, just as we would argue that although not every man should lead a church, church leadership is a uniquely and typically male role, so we would argue that although not every woman should or can be a mother, that is a uniquely and typical female role. The man who does not nurture a church, and the woman who does not nurture a child, are not 'less' human, fulfilled, saved or gifted.**

Paul calls both marriage and singleness 'gifts' (χαρίσματα) in 1 Cor 7:7, and his argument could be summarised as 'marriage is good, not being married is even better!'. We do not wish to be misunderstood or misrepresented as saying that 'a woman's place is in the home'; all single women and many married women need to work in order to pay bills, and many mothers have deeply satisfying careers which they do not wish to lose. Changes in our society since the First World War have made it quite acceptable for women to have the same employment as men, and we welcome those liberating changes. However, we have shown strong reasons for thinking differently about church leadership.

- 28 **Many areas of church life should be liberated to be the responsibility of both men and women. It is alarmingly noticeable in many churches, missionary societies and organisations that the unsung and invisible tasks are done by the women and the more glamorous tasks done by men. In areas where there is no requirement from Scripture to make gender distinctions, we should deliberately encourage a policy of non-distinction. Where there is such a requirement we should embrace it gladly for our good, and not repeat the error in the Garden.**

This suggests that there are two, opposite, ideas to counter. On the one hand we operate with gender distinctions that are undeniably unbiblical and should be challenged—where the freedom Scripture gives is not being fully enjoyed, or the responsibilities Scripture gives equally

shared, we must make sure we implement God's plan. On the other hand, there remain the twin temptations inherent in the Fall: for men to abdicate their responsibility and for women to exercise it in their place. Again, we must ensure that God's plan, and not ours, is in place.

## Gender and Hope

29 We are people with a future, and that glorious future is tantalisingly only outlined in the New Testament. It is clear, though, that the restrictions of our created bodies will be overcome, and that even the concept of marriage will be replaced by something even more wonderful. That should put our present discussion in perspective, and make us look forward to the day when we will not even need to have it.

The clearest clue we have is from Jesus, that:

the people of this age marry and are given in marriage. But those who are considered worthy of taking part in that age and in the resurrection from the dead will neither marry nor be given in marriage, and they can no longer die; for they are like the angels. They are God's children, since they are children of the resurrection (Luke 20:34-36).

What that will mean for us is something we can only imagine and give thanks for.

**CHRIS GREEN** is Minister of Emmanuel Church, Surbiton.

## NOTES

- 1 *New International Biblical Commentary* (Hendrickson 1988) p77
- 2 *New International Greek Testament Commentary* (Eerdmans 1992) p140
- 3 *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed Alvera Mickelson (Marshall Pickering 1986) p22. This work contains a usefully wide range of opinions.
- 4 Some people find the word 'humankind' ponderous, but in the context of this article the word 'mankind' would carry weighted overtones. There is no point in being taken as sexist when we are not!
- 5 The phrase is drawn from Michael Ovey's insightful paper *Equality but not Symmetry*, a Cambridge Paper, available from Gill Smith, 41 London Road, Stapleford, Cambridge CB2 5DE.
- 6 Gordon J Wenham *Word Biblical Commentary on Gen 1-15* (Word 1987) p81
- 7 *Ibid*
- 8 *Women, Authority and the Bible* p96, Thompson's italics
- 9 *Women, Authority and the Bible* p86
- 10 *Women, Authority and the Bible* p24-25
- 11 *Word Biblical Commentary on Romans* (Word 1988) vol 2 p895
- 12 *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* edd J Piper and W Grudem (Crossway 1991) p145
- 13 Berkeley and Alvera Mickelson (summarised in *Women, Authority and the Bible* pp97-117) lead those who wish to translate κεφαλή as 'source'. As a reply to some ear-



lier articles in *Christianity Today*, Wayne Grudem published 'Does *kephalē* ('head') mean 'source' or 'authority over' in Greek literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples', as an appendix to G W Knight's book *The Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Moody 1985) pp49-80, concluding that the Mickelsons' proposed revisions do not reflect Greek usage. His article has generated considerable response, and he has recently published '*Kephale* ('Head'): A Response to recent studies' *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* pp425-468. This second survey has more nuances than the first, but still concludes, 'There is no linguistic basis for proposing that the New Testament texts which speak of Christ as head of the church or the husband as head of the wife can rightly be read apart from the attribution of authority to the one designated as "head"' p468.

- 14 J B Hurley *Men and Women in Biblical Perspective* (IVP 1981) p201
- 15 Glenn Davies 'Biblical Study Paper—1 Timothy 2:8-15' *Explorations 1—'Personhood, Sexuality and Ministry* ed B G Webb (Lancer 1987) p90
- 16 *Issues Facing Christians Today* (Marshalls 1984) p252, Stott's italics
- 17 Knight *The Role Relationship of Men and Women* p142
- 18 *Ibid* p142