

THE JOURNAL FOR BIBLICAL
JB MW
MANHOOD & WOMANHOOD

ARTICLES INCLUDE:

Boys Wearing Skirts to School? What's Going On?

R. Albert Mohler Jr.

A Review of Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ*

Thomas R. Schreiner

**Marriage as It Was Meant to Be Seen:
Headship, Submission, and the Gospel**

Jason Hall & Peter R. Schemm Jr.

Galatians 3:28: Grammar, Text, Context, and Translation

Wayne Walden

**THE JOURNAL FOR
BIBLICAL MANHOOD
AND WOMANHOOD**

is a biannual publication of the
Council on Biblical
Manhood and Womanhood
ISSN: 1544-5143

**CBMW
President**

Randy Stinson

JBMW STAFF

Editor

Denny Burk

Associate Editor

Christopher W. Cowan

Assistant Editor

Dawn Jones

Senior Consulting Editors

J. Ligon Duncan, III

Wayne Grudem

Rebecca Jones

Peter R. Schemm Jr.

Bruce A. Ware

Layout and Design

John Rogers

Contributors

R. Albert Mohler Jr.

Russell D. Moore

Nancy Leigh DeMoss

Editorial Correspondence

journaleditor@cbmw.org

Subscription Correspondence

journal@cbmw.org

Contact CBMW for institutional rates.

2825 Lexington Road • Box 926

Louisville, Kentucky 40280

502.897.4065 (voice)

502.897.4061 (fax)

office@cbmw.org (e-mail)

www.cbmw.org (web)

©2010 CBMW. The mission of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood is to set forth the teachings of the Bible about the complementary differences between men and women, created equal in the image of God, because these teachings are essential for obedience to Scripture and for the health of the family and the Church.

CBMW is a member of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability.

Table of Contents

STANDARD FARE

- 2 Editorial
- 5 Odds & Ends

ESSAYS & PERSPECTIVES

- 10 **Boys Wearing Skirts to School? What's Going On?**
R. Albert Mohler Jr.
- 13 **Marriage as It Was Meant to Be Seen: Headship, Submission, and the Gospel**
Jason Hall and Peter R. Schemm Jr.
- 15 **"Husbands, Love Your Wives . . ."**
A Practical Suggestion and Tool for Husbands to Use in Leading their Marriages for the Glory of God
Rob Lister
- 19 **Whither Men? A Response to a Recent Barna Study on the Increase of Female Pastors in Protestant Churches**
Owen Strachan

STUDIES

- 23 **Galatians 3:28: Grammar, Text, Context, and Translation**
Wayne Walden

FROM THE SACRED DESK

- 27 **Godliness and Gender: Relating Appropriately to All (1 Timothy 2:9–12)**
James M. Hamilton Jr.

GENDER STUDIES IN REVIEW

- 33 **Philip Payne on Familiar Ground**
A Review of Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ*
Thomas R. Schreiner
- 47 **Two Egalitarian Paths toward the Same Destination**
A Review of *Four Views on Moving Beyond the Bible to Theology*
Ben Reaach
- 51 **A Lack of Balance**
A Review of Steven R. Tracy, "What Does 'Submit in Everything' Really Mean? The Nature and Scope of Marital Submission"
Heath Lambert
- 55 **Insightful but Flawed Look at Gospel Women**
A Review of Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women*
Owen Strachan
- 57 **Fatherhood is No Accident**
A Review of Michael Lewis, *Home Game*
Phillip R. Bethancourt

Editorial: Brian McLaren, Homosexuality, and Apostolic Loathing

Denny Burk

Editor, The Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood

Dean of Boyce College

Associate Professor of New Testament

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Louisville, Kentucky

Breaking the Moratorium

In 2006, Brian McLaren infamously urged evangelicals to observe a five-year moratorium on making pronouncements about the moral status of homosexuality. He deemed Christianity's 2,000-year-old ethic too offensive to be preached to modern people and the Bible's teaching unclear. McLaren argued that evangelicals needed to have a five-year period of studied, humble conversation about homosexuality. In essence, McLaren told evangelicals and not to offend moderns with Christian sexual ethics.

Well, that was then, and this is now. McLaren himself has made a moral pronouncement with still a year remaining on his moratorium. In his 2010 book *A New Kind of Christianity*, McLaren seeks to redefine the Christian faith for a new day, and in one chapter in particular he argues that traditional evangelicals need to get over their hang-ups with homosexuality. He pillories their beliefs as

“fundasexuality,” which he defines as a “reactive, combative brand of religious *fundamentalism* that preoccupies itself with *sexuality*.... It is a kind of *heterophobia*: the fear of people who are different” (174–75). Traditional evangelicals, he argues, need an enemy against which they can coalesce in common cause: “Groups can exist without a god, but no group can exist without a devil. Some individual or group needs to be identified as the enemy.... Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people are an ideal choice for this kind of scapegoating” (175). For McLaren, evangelicals who treat homosexuals as sinners are really just looking for an enemy—a scapegoat. In other words, traditionalist faith is less about theology than it is about psychology. Evangelicals need someone to loathe, and homosexuals are the unfortunate target. In this way, McLaren likens traditional evangelicals to racist bigots and misogynists of a former generation.

COUNCIL MEMBERS	Daniel Heimbach	Dorothy Patterson	Lane T. Dennis	H. Kelley	J. Stanley Oakes	Joseph M. Stowell III
Daniel L. Akin	H. Wayne House	John Piper	Thomas R. Edgar	Beverly LaHaye	Raymond C. Ortlund Jr.	Larry Walker
Donald Balasa	Susan Hunt	James Stahr	John Frame	Gordon R. Lewis	J. I. Packer	Stu Weber
James Borland	Elliott Johnson	K. Erik Thoennes	Paul Gardner	Robert Lewis	Paige Patterson	William Weinrich
Austin Chapman	Peter Jones	Bruce A. Ware	W. Robert Godfrey	Crawford & Karen Loritts	Dennis & Barbara Rainey	Luder Whitlock
Jack Cottrell	Rebecca Jones		Bill H. Haynes	Erwin Lutzer	Robert Saucy	Peter Williamson
J. Ligon Duncan III	Mary Kassian	BOARD OF REFERENCE	David M. Howard Sr.	John F. MacArthur Jr.	James Sauer	
Steve Farrar	George W. Knight III	S. M. Baugh	R. Kent Hughes	Connie Marshner	Siegfried Schatzmann	
Mary Farrar	C. J. Mahaney	Wallace Benn	James B. Hurley	Richard L. Mayhue	Thomas R. Schreiner	
Wayne A. Grudem	R. Albert Mohler Jr.	Tal Brooke	Paul Karleen	Marty Minton	F. LaGard Smith	
Joshua Harris	Heather Moore	Nancy Leigh DeMoss	Charles S. & Rhonda	J. P. Moreland	R. C. Sproul	

McLaren's Apostolic Loathing

There are a number of problems with McLaren's argument concerning homosexuality, but I want to address one in particular. There is a kind of apostolic loathing in McLaren's treatment of the Bible. He simply doesn't like what the apostles have to say, and he appeals to Jesus to back him up. McLaren views Jesus as the hermeneutical trump card in all discussions about the Bible and theology. That means that when other biblical texts disagree with Jesus, those texts have to give way to Jesus' authority. He writes,

If Jesus' life and example are simply textual data on equal par with Leviticus, and if Jesus can make no claim to be Lord and teacher over Paul, then perhaps the conventional approaches win. But if Jesus represents the zenith of God's self-revelation and the climax of a dynamic biblical narrative, rather than simply one article in a flat and static constitution, Jesus' treatment of the marginalized and stigmatized requires us to question the conventional approach. We have many examples of Jesus crossing boundaries to include outcasts and sinners and not a single example of Jesus crossing his arms and refusing to do so (179).

The implication here is clear. The book of Leviticus and Paul's letters contain unambiguous condemnations of homosexual behavior (Lev 18:22; 20:13; Rom 1:26–27; 1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10). McLaren views such statements as contradicting Jesus' radical inclusiveness of outcasts and sinners. Thus Leviticus and Paul must give way to Jesus. Jesus accepts homosexuals as they are, and so must we despite what Moses and Paul think. McLaren would have us believe that the Bible's condemnation of homosexual behavior is brushed away by Jesus himself.

This clever move by McLaren has a certain rhetorical attractiveness to it. After all, Paul called himself a "slave" of Christ on numerous occasions (e.g., Rom 1:1), and Jesus clearly subsumed Moses' authority under his own (Matt 5:21–22). Shouldn't

these other authorities give way to Jesus? Apart from the fact that the question presupposes that the Bible contradicts itself, there are other problems with McLaren's argument.

First, Jesus himself argues for the continuing validity of the Old Testament: "Do not think that I came to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I did not come to abolish, but to fulfill" (Matthew 5:17). McLaren speaks as if Jesus is abolishing the Old Testament's sexual ethic, yet Jesus himself does no such thing. In fact, Jesus explicitly defines the norm for human sexuality according to the creation pattern established in Genesis 2—which is a monogamous, heterosexual union (Matt 19:5; Mark 10:7–8).

Second, we have no access to an unmediated Jesus. McLaren speaks as if the Jesus of the Gospels is the author of the Gospels just as Paul is the author of his letters. But that is not the case. Each Gospel account comes to us either from an apostle (Matthew, John) or someone closely associated with an apostle (Mark, Luke). We have no unmediated access to Jesus' life and words. We know what we know about Jesus from the evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Jesus promised the apostles that after he left he would lead them into all truth (John 16:13). Similarly, Jesus chose Paul to bear his name before the Gentiles (Acts 9:15). Jesus has the right and authority to choose his own spokesmen, and no person—not even McLaren!—has the right to gainsay Jesus' selection. The evangelists and Paul speak in behalf of Jesus, and it's hermeneutical and theological nonsense to pit their witness against one another.

Moreover, anyone who would tell Christians to listen to one and not the other is not being faithful to Jesus. That is why the apostle John wrote, "We are from God; he who knows God listens to us; he who is not from God does not listen to us. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error" (1 John 4:6). McLaren is outraged by those who do not follow his hermeneutical paradigm (274, n.6). But when he calls believers to ignore Jesus' apostolic spokesmen, he has more in common with the spirit of antichrist than with the spirit of Jesus (1 John 4:3).

What Jesus and Paul Really Say

McLaren would like to dismiss the Old Testament's sexual ethic as marred by polygamy and other sexual dysfunctions. But what he misses is the unity between Jesus and Paul in the way that they ground their teaching in the Old Testament. When Jesus and Paul set out new covenant norms for marriage and sexuality, they do not appeal to polygamist kings like David or Solomon or to polygamist patriarchs like Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob. For all the importance these Old Testament figures have in the history of redemption, Jesus and Paul do not look to any of them as the paradigm for understanding marriage and sex. Instead, Jesus and Paul look back without exception to the pre-fall monogamous union of Adam and Eve in Genesis 2 as the norm of human sexuality and marriage. "For this cause a man shall leave his father and his mother and shall cling to his wife; and they shall become one flesh" (Gen 2:24, author's translation; cf. Matt 19:5; Mark 10:7–8; 1 Cor 6:16; Eph 5:31).

If McLaren is serious about following Jesus, then he should follow Jesus to Genesis 2. But this is one way in which Jesus' teaching is just too counter-cultural for Brian McLaren.

Odds & Ends

The Death of a Feminist

Radical theologian Mary Daly died January 3, 2010, at age 81, ending one of the most interesting and tragic careers in contemporary theology. Known for her exaggerated outspokenness, Daly took theological feminism to what she believed was its rightful and logical conclusion—the absolute rejection of Christianity and all theistic conceptions of God.

In the first phase of her career she was known as a Roman Catholic, and she taught at Boston College for many years. Her tenure there could only be described as controversial. At the beginning her teaching career was marked by a fight over tenure. At the end she left Boston College after refusing to allow male students in some of her classes in feminist thought.

Her critique of the Roman Catholic Church as a bastion of patriarchy, expressed in her 1968 book, *The Church and the Second Sex*, was extended to the entire Christian tradition. She rejected Christianity's focus on a monotheistic deity and what she attacked as its intrinsic patriarchy. She asserted that Christianity's focus on Jesus Christ was just another dimension of its patriarchy—a Savior in a male body.

As Margaret Elizabeth Köstenberger explains, Daly's "complete rejection of Scripture" on the basis of its "irremediable patriarchal bias" took her far outside the Christian faith. While other feminists called for the adoption of female or gender-neutral language for God, Daly attacked those efforts as half-measures that fail to take the phallocentricity of theism seriously.

Her famous dictum, "if the God is male, then the male is God," stood at the heart of her radical revision of religion. She accused Christianity of "gynocide" against women and suggested that all monotheistic religion—and Christianity in particular—is "phallogentric."

She referred to feminists as "pirates in a

phallogentric society" and preached her version of feminist liberation, describing herself as a "radical lesbian feminist." She rejected the biblical notion of sin and called for a celebration of lust and the breaking of all sexual rules. She attacked heterosexuality as inherently patriarchal and championed lesbianism as a means of the liberation of women from the "phallogentric" power system of the culture.

In her later years, Mary Daly identified herself as a "post-Christian—a term that was, if anything, an understatement.

In the end, Mary Daly will be remembered for the radical lesbian feminist that she was. She must be given credit for her honesty in accusing theological liberals of lacking the courage of their convictions. As she saw it, they were clinging to the furniture of Christianity long after rejecting its central beliefs. She saw the entire structure as hopelessly patriarchal and called for a complete break with Christianity and theism.

In the largest sense, she was undoubtedly right in arguing that the logic of radical feminism is diametrically opposed to the truth claims of Christianity. She was, as she claimed, taking ideological feminism to its logical conclusion.

Interestingly, Mary Daly also serves as a reminder that radicals are seldom so comprehensively radical as they consider themselves. Daly was criticized by transgender and transsexual activists for her failure to see transsexuals as anything other than "death-loving Frankenstein monsters." Womanist author Audre Lorde complained that Daly, though a radical feminist, did not recognize the role of race in patriarchy. Even the most radical thinkers among us apparently have a hard time keeping up.

According to *The New York Times*, Mary Daly died of "declining health," not "gynocide." Her intellectual work lives on among the radical feminists, but her influence extends far beyond those who would identify themselves as "post-Christian."

Many of today's liberal denominations and seminaries have absorbed and accepted her basic critique of Christianity, but lack her boldness and intellectual honesty.

In one of her later books, Daly said, "There are and will be those who think I have gone overboard.... Let them be assured that this assessment is correct, probably beyond their wildest imagination." The story of Mary Daly is, by any Christian measure, a tragedy. And, we must add, a tragedy with lessons we dare not miss.

– R. Albert Mohler

Drunk: The New Female Tenderness?

So I'm watching the latest romantic comedy when I sense it coming. "Oh, no, here comes the drunk scene," I groan aloud.

Everyone else in the room looks at me, question marks popping up over their heads.

"Watch," I say, gesturing toward the TV. "This is the turning point in their relationship. She gets drunk. He has to care for her. She has to stop being her pugnacious self and dial down her obnoxious-meter. She finally receives some protection and leadership from him, and his ability to see her in a tender way changes their relationship dynamic."

Ten seconds later, the script plays out in the predicted manner. And I want to pull my hair out of my head! Why is this the required plot point in 99 out of a 100 romantic comedies?!

My answer? Because Hollywood has no other device to help young women receive the care and leadership of men—other than to have them get falling-down drunk. Until that point, every female rom-com character is outspoken, in-your-face, quirky, and reeking of insecurities that are propped up by a brittle facade of self-confidence. She spars with her love interest because she has not been taught to make room for him in her life, to live *inter-dependently*, rather than merely *independently*. And that independence is a sham, anyway, as the drunk scene inevitably reveals. She needs the help of others, but she is too proud to admit it. And that's when his care comes along. He tames her, so to speak, in her drunkenness. She stops fighting him and learns to trust him, but only after she has

been humbled by being out of control herself.

Once the drunk scene is out of the way, the scriptwriters now have a reason for the male and female lead characters to work together, to trust each other, and to have some mutual care for each other. It is sad that women are being told over and over again that (1) this kind of trust and tenderness can only come about by losing self-control, and (2) that alcohol is a female problem (I never see the men getting drunk in these movies anymore).

My recommendation is that when you watch these movies, point out this contradiction to those watching with you—especially if they are young men and women. Our culture doesn't have a framework for masculine benevolence anymore, which is sad. It seems the only way to showcase that quality is for someone to be so obviously helpless, as in a drunk scene, and then it's okay for a man to exert protective qualities. As for young women, help them to understand that feminine tenderness and receptivity is a *good* thing, that men today are still looking for that quality, and that you don't have to get drunk to find it.

– Carolyn McCulley

Women Fighting, and Men Doing Little About It

I have been shocked of late to find two videos showing women enacting brutality against one another. Femininity is a contested sphere nowadays, both literally and figuratively.

First, I came across a video of a recent fight between women in a mall food court. A massive crowd watches the awful scene before two men—including basketball coaches Tim Floyd and Henry Bibby—gingerly break it up. Second, I watched in horror as college women's soccer players battered one another, with one young woman outright attacking her opponents (the footage is gruesome, I warn you).

In previous days, you might have seen Laila Ali battering another woman into submission. There is a common thread, I think, between both informal and formal female brutality. As femininity suffers in our professedly "gender-neutral" society, women adopt the habits of men, including their

propensity for violence and aggression. The two fights listed above show examples of women acting in shocking and traditionally masculine ways. In neither instance is this development positive.

In a way that most people, and that includes many Christians, don't think about, contact-oriented sports teach and encourage women to engage in typically masculine behavior. As researchers, following the scent of common sense, have found, women's bodies cannot sustain the same level of contact as those of men (see Michael Sokolove's *Warrior Girls* for much more on this point).

The Western tradition shows that people have for centuries recognized the body differences and role distinctions between men and women. Women have rarely fought on battlefields, for example. Now, our modern instincts teach us to be biased against that point (simply because it's the overwhelmingly historic position), but it stands nonetheless.

Thanks to Title IX and other factors, women today regularly engage in contact sports—basketball, soccer, football, wrestling, and more. These endeavors encourage women to be less feminine and more masculine, a mindset that is bleeding over into the broader culture. As women attack one another, groveling on the ground, punching one another in the face, men do nothing. Or, maybe after a while, they wade into the conflict, hesitatingly breaking it up, fearful of being branded “macho.”

We're in a bad situation today. Men are weak, hesitant, unsure of themselves, depressed, dragging through life, dropping out of school, abdicating their authority, letting their children run wild, barely raising their voice above a whisper. Meanwhile, women run themselves ragged, get into fights, struggle to both provide for the family and run the home, and grow frustrated with the shadow-men they everywhere encounter.

Christian men, we need to wake up. We need to show the world what manhood looks like. We need to reclaim ourselves. We need to lift our voices, get off the couch, take a strong and stern lead in the discipline of our children, work ourselves hard to provide for our families, teach our girls to treasure their God-given femininity, teach our boys what it means to be robustly masculine,

serve in the church, and generally live for the Lord. We need to be those who deploy our manhood for the good of women.

Femininity is a gentle, fragile thing. It is a precious thing. It must be guarded and preserved. It is inherent to a woman. You can't put a girl into all of the same activities as a boy and expect that she'll still possess her full femininity. If you do so, you will compromise aspects of her God-given womanhood.

Women do not need to be weak or willowy. But neither should they be vicious and manly. We are teaching our daughters the wrong lessons today. One that we must consider is sports and general decorum. For the glory of God, girls should look and act differently than boys. For the glory of God, parents should teach girls to treasure and preserve their womanhood.

— Owen Strachan

New Catholic Commentary on 1 Timothy

With all the efforts to get around 1 Tim 2:11-15 today, the discussion provided in George Montague's *First and Second Timothy, Titus*, the inaugural volume in the *Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture* (Baker, 2008), is refreshing. After acknowledging various efforts to understand the background of the text, he argues that the text plainly forbids authoritative public teaching of men by women and that women are forbidden to hold positions of authority over men. He then writes, “If this is the correct way to understand this difficult passage, it means that leadership and teaching authority in the Church is not modeled after secular society but on Christian marriage—and this is within the context of the broader sacramental symbolism of the Church as the bride of Christ” (68).

This is such a key point often missing even in churches today. Montague goes on to state, “We are in the realm of symbols, which the contemporary mind sometimes finds difficult to understand. But for the Church, the marital relationship between Christ and the Church is not mere metaphor; it is essential to the structuring of the Church” (70).

This truth goes beyond the gender debate—e.g., our difficulty with appreciating symbols, the marital metaphor impacting how we structure

church. The church today needs more reflection on these important issues as well.

Moving to 1 Tim 2:15 on the reference to women being saved through childbearing, Montague states,

In our day, when women have assumed more public roles both in society and Church, the idea of “salvation by motherhood” may seem antiquated. Yet perhaps, after the advancement of women in professional fields formerly dominated by men, it is appropriate to recall that the role of mothers is crucial for the healthy psychosocial development of children and is more than a profession. It is a vocation divinely sanctioned and divinely blessed (71).

This is a needed word today, affirming the incredible value of the divinely ordained vocation of motherhood.

– Ray Van Neste

Some Gender issues in Recent Children’s Books

Typically you can know what to expect from certain publishers when it comes to addressing gender issues in children’s books. In recent months, however, I found a positive surprise in yet another good book for boys, which has come across from the U.K. (a previous one was *The Dangerous Book for Boys*). *Amazing Tales for Making Men Out of Boys* by Neil Oliver (William Morrow, 2009; previously published in the U.K. by Michael Joseph, 2008) is a collection of the sorts of stories that used to always be passed down to boys. Included are D-day and Omaha Beach, the Charge of the Light Brigade, the Alamo, Shackleton’s Journey, Scott in the Antarctic, John Paul Jones, and Thermopylae and other stories. These lines from the book’s back cover capture the essence of the book well:

Stories of heroism, exploration and sacrifice that will inspire boys to be courageous, honorable and open to adventure. **TALES OF BRAVE AND SELFLESS DEEDS** used to be part of every boy’s education. We grew up sharing stories

with our fathers, uncles and grandfathers of how great men had lived their lives, met their challenges, reached their goals and faced their deaths. Becoming a young man was about comradeship and standing by your friends whatever the circumstances. And it meant that sometimes it was more important to **DIE A HERO THAN LIVE A COWARD’S LIFE.**

Some of the Amazon reviews complain about the focus on warfare and death. This is to be expected. We do not claim that these are the only aspects of manliness, but they are an aspect. And boys are well served by seeing the examples of selfless heroism of the past. I was delighted to find this book for my boys, and they are enjoying it.

– Ray Van Neste

Interaction with Philip Payne

Late last year I enjoyed a friendly exchange with egalitarian scholar Dr. Philip Payne, author of the recent book *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters* (Zondervan, 2009). In particular, Dr. Payne wished to discuss my brief note about his remarks at a Wheaton Theology forum (“Odds & Ends” *JBMW* 13.2 [2008], 5-7) and about Andreas Köstenberger’s rejoinder to Dr. Payne’s 2008 *NTS* article on 1 Tim 2:12 (“The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12: A Rejoinder to Philip B. Payne” *JBMW* 14.2 [2009], 37-40). Though our differences over the interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 remain, Dr. Payne wishes me to pass along his clarification of his remarks from the Wheaton Theology conference. He writes,

As I have re-read your transcription of my unprepared remarks presented off the cuff, which I did not know were being recorded, I realize that I misstated my intent. I wish to issue a sincere apology for use of words I should not have used. In particular, I wish to retract the word “lies” since it can be used to entail the intent to deceive regarding what one knows to be false, and I do not know people’s hearts as our Lord does, and

also since it can imply a habit. Similarly, I wish to retract “in order to convince,” “commitment to truth,” and “scholars have been willing to say, ‘The end justifies the means. I can twist the data in order to make it say what I think it means’” since each of these attributes motives rather than identifying objectively identifiable statements.

For readers who wish to follow-up on the conversation between Köstenberger and Payne on the syntax of 1 Tim 2:12, both articles are available for free online. Köstenberger’s article can be downloaded at the JBMW website (<http://www.cbmw.org/journal>). The original PDF of Dr. Payne’s *New Testament Studies* article may be downloaded free from www.pbpayne.com. Just click on “Publications,” then “Articles,” then “1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea.”

– Denny Burk

Boys Wearing Skirts to School? What's Going On?

R. Albert Mohler Jr.

President

*The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, Kentucky*

“Clothes are never a frivolity—they always mean something.” Thus spoke James Laver, a famous costume designer and interpreter of fashion. He is right, of course. Clothes always mean something, which is why *The New York Times* gave major attention to an issue facing many schools: “Can a Boy Wear a Skirt to School?”

The article, right on the front of the “Sunday Styles” section of the paper, announced, “When gender bends the dress code, high schools struggle to respond.” The story reveals a confusion over gender that goes far beyond the dress code.

As Jan Hoffman reports, high schools generally have very specific rules about clothing these days. Boys are forbidden to wear muscle shirts and saggy pants, and girls cannot wear midriff-exposing tops or skirts that are too short. But what happens when a boy wants to wear a skirt?

“In recent years, a growing number of teenagers have been dressing to articulate—or confound—gender identity and sexual orientation,” Hoffman reports. “Certainly they have been confounding school officials, whose responses have ranged from indifference to applause to bans.”

This is no longer an issue limited to isolated examples. Districts across the country have reported teens who have attempted to cross the gender line in dress. Many of these cases have captured media attention, with highly publicized controversies. In other cases, the challenges have been more quiet.

The cases are, to say the least, both interest-

ing and troubling. Boys are making news for wearing skinny jeans, makeup, wigs, and skirts. Girls are bending gender in their own way by, for example, wearing a tuxedo for the school picture or to a school event.

Jan Hoffman does a good job of setting the issue in perspective:

Dress is always code, particularly for teenagers eager to telegraph evolving identities. Each year, schools hope to quell disruption by prohibiting the latest styles that signify a gang affiliation, a sexual act or drug use.

But when officials want to discipline a student whose wardrobe expresses sexual orientation or gender variance, they must consider antidiscrimination policies, mental health factors, community standards and classroom distractions.

Well, that certainly presents a very complicated challenge. Diane Ehrensaft, an Oakland psychologist cited in the article, states the obvious, “This generation is really challenging the gender norms we grew up with.... A lot of youths say they won’t be bound by boys having to wear this or girls wearing that. For them, gender is a creative playing field.” She added that adults then “become the gender police through dress codes.”

As Hoffman makes clear, these challenges to dress codes can quickly become legal skirmishes

pitting students (and often their parents) against school administrators. Kay Hymowitz of the Manhattan Institute argues that this is one reason that so many schools have shifted to students wearing uniforms.

“It’s hard enough to get students to concentrate on an algorithm,” she reminds, “even without Jimmy sitting there in lipstick and fake eyelashes.”

That sets the issue in a very clear instructional perspective. Schools are about teaching and learning, and both teachers and administrators face daunting challenges. The last thing they need is the added distraction of gender-bending teenagers on parade.

And the issues can be far more troubling than classroom distractions. Hoffman reports that some schools have faced boys wearing “pink frilly scarves” and makeup and girls trying to dress like male gang members. In Columbus, Ohio, a boy wore girl’s clothing but used the boys’ bathroom. Jeff Grace, faculty advisor for the school’s gay-straight alliance club told Hoffman, “One day I heard a student say, ‘Man, there was a girl in the guy’s restroom, standing up using the urinal! What’s up with that?’” Another student then quipped, “That wasn’t a girl. That’s just Jack.”

These adolescents represent the younger face of a society that is giving itself over to a confusion about gender and dress that reveals a much deeper confusion about gender, sexuality, and the limits of self-expression. The controversy also reveals an even deeper cultural and moral divide over the same issues.

Should a boy who shows up at school dressed as a girl be celebrated for self-expression and transgressing the boundaries of gender roles, or should he be seen as signaling a need for help and adult-imposed rules? The widely divergent answers to that question reveal the great worldview divide in postmodern America. This controversy cannot be isolated from the movement to normalize homosexuality, and that movement cannot be separated from an effort to remove all notions of fixed gender roles and sexual identity.

The controversy over boys wearing skirts to school is a symptom of our loss of sexual sanity and the will to preserve any reasonable and healthy

understanding of gender. These teenagers are telling us something important—we are losing our sexual sanity.

For Christians, the issue is a matter of biblical concern. The Bible reveals a concern for respecting and honoring gender as God’s gift. In the Old Testament, the Law taught respect for these distinctions and roles. In the New Testament, we find similar expectations. As the Apostle Paul writes in 1 Cor 11:7-15:

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. For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. 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. Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered? Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering.

While addressed to the specific concerns of a church setting, this text also generalizes the point by making a specific reference to what nature teaches concerning the recognition of the difference between males and females. The Creator is honored and glorified when men and boys dress and present themselves as males and when women and girls dress and present themselves as females. Culture by culture and generation by generation the specific form of this distinction may change, but the point remains.

God made human beings to show His glory, and an essential part of that glory is the visible difference between males and females that is reflected even in the public presentation of dress. We should be able to tell the difference between a boy and a girl by the way they dress and present themselves in public.

As James Laver reminded, clothes always tell us something. This article from the “Sunday Styles” section of *The New York Times* tells us something as well—something we need to hear.

Marriage as It Was Meant to Be Seen: Headship, Submission, and the Gospel

Jason Hall

*Director of Communications
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, North Carolina*

Peter R. Schemm Jr.

*Associate Professor of Theology
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, North Carolina*

The debate among Christians about the interpretation of Eph 5:21–33 is often presented as one of secondary, not primary, importance. Belief in the gospel itself is what is of first importance (1 Cor 15:3–4). That’s true as far as it goes, inasmuch as the gospel itself does not require one to believe in male headship in one’s confession of faith in Jesus as Lord.

However, the more we reflect on what the apostle is arguing in Ephesians the more we realize that even though the gospel itself may not appear to be at stake, the *right and true display* of the gospel certainly is. This discussion, then, belongs front and center in evangelical churches, because evangelical churches are those that affirm the centrality of the Word of God for doctrine and practice in Christian community (if the adjective evangelical does not mean at least this, it means nothing). So, what follows is a brief reflection on Paul’s connection between headship, submission, and the gospel in Ephesians 5. We propose three related observations.

Observation #1: The submission of wives to husbands is not forced, coerced, or even cajoled; it is given freely. To us this is the implication of vv. 22–24, when the wives’ submission is said to be of a kind offered “to the Lord” and is analogous to the submission the church owes its bridegroom, Christ. The submission of Christians to God is not one of domination or involuntary enslavement, and

a wife’s submission to her husband is also not one of domination or involuntary enslavement. The proper motivation for any act of submission in the Christian faith is “reverence for Christ” (v. 21).

Observation #2: The husband’s headship should be of a kind that invites voluntary submission, not discourages it. Husbands are exhorted to love their wives sacrificially and in a self-emptying way; the point is obvious enough in the text and we will not take the time here to develop it much further. What seems to be missing, though, from so many expressions of male headship is a winsome and inspiring invitation to follow. There is something incredibly inspiring about following someone who has demonstrated a willingness to die for your provision. As Jesus invited followers, a husband also hopes to invite and inspire a willingness to follow through the Christ-like giving away of himself.

We also want to highlight here that the goal of a husband’s self-emptying love is analogous to Christ’s work on the cross: “so 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” (v. 27). Theologically, it seems the analogy is one of purpose and intent. The husband’s desire for his wife should be her sanctification, holiness, and purity. In this way husbands will “love their own bodies” (v. 28) or, theologically speaking, preserve their own holiness.

So whether it is matter of headship or submission, it is always a matter of the gospel and our display of it.

Statement #3: Marriage is for the gospel.

Toward the end of the passage, we believe the question becomes *what is at stake in this unique relationship* or *why does this matter?* Paul's answer to this question lies in vv. 31–32. His answer is the primary reason why we are and will remain complementarians, and why we will (by the grace of God) always lead our families to worship in churches that affirm a complementarian attitude to male/female relationships. So, what is at stake? “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.” This mystery is profound, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church” (vv. 31–32). In pointing back to Genesis 2 and saying that it refers to “Christ and the church,” Paul is making a statement about marriage: Christ's winning of his bride, the church, by his work on the cross is theologically prior to the institution of marriage, and *marriage itself was created to point to this greater and higher truth of Christ, that is, the gospel*. And it is not just any marriage that makes this remarkable claim. *Only a marriage with loving, Christ-like headship and loving, Christ-like submission truly and fully displays the gospel in everyday life*.

So when we opened by claiming that the right and true display of the gospel is at stake in this debate, we meant that according to Paul's understanding of Genesis 2 and the creation of marriage itself, marriage lived to the glory of God reflects the multifaceted gospel of grace in large part because of the headship and submission found there. With all respect to egalitarians (and even some complementarians), if mutual submission is the way to read this passage, it does not display the gospel in the same way. This does not mean that egalitarian marriages cannot reflect the gospel at all, but they cannot do so as fully and as convincingly.

Anyone who has shopped for a television in recent years has likely been approached with the hi-definition (HD) sales pitch. While it may be debatable whether or not the HD upgrade is worth the price tag, the difference in quality is undeniable:

deeper colors, crisper close-ups, sharper images. Like the sales pitch goes, this is television as it was meant to be seen. The old 27-inch chunky box in our houses does not compare.

A marriage that displays the gospel through Christ-like headship and submission is marriage as it was meant to be seen. It is a more captivating and compelling display of the gospel. We don't want our friends and acquaintances to see our marriages and walk away underwhelmed. Instead, we want them thinking about how deep, crisp, and beautiful the gospel is.

At the end of the day, we are complementarians because we want our marriages to faithfully display the glory of God and his gospel.

“Husbands, Love Your Wives . . .” A Practical Suggestion and Tool for Husbands to Use in Leading their Marriages for the Glory of God

Rob Lister

*Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology
Talbot School of Theology, Biola University
La Mirada, California*

Thanks to Jiffy Lube, most of us know the drill by now: either do it yourself, or take your car in for a regular tune-up and oil change every three months or three thousand miles. Fail to maintain your vehicle in this fashion, and you run the risk of your engine locking up and stranding you on the side of the road somewhere in the middle of rush hour traffic.

How odd, then, that many of us would be so committed to the routine maintenance of our vehicles, and yet so often overlook the necessity of giving similar routine attention to our marriages. Clearly, one of the main purposes of marriage is to function as a means of grace in the sanctification of Christian couples. But, in order for marriage to function this way, we must be strategic, pro-active, and intentional. If husbands, in particular, are fundamentally passive, we should expect that our marriages will dissipate, much as we would expect our car engines to wear down and eventually lock up in the absence of routine maintenance.

With that in mind, I offer the following as one practical suggestion of something that Christian husbands may wish to consider as a tool to use in a more routine and intentional effort to lead their marriages for the glory of God.

The Tool: A Spiritual Discipline, of Sorts, for Marriage

In the simplest terms, this “tool” is a man-

ageable list of questions that I have attempted to consolidate over the years for regular use in our marriage.¹ The goal of using this tool, in the context of a covenantal marriage relationship, is simply that we would routinely revisit these questions together with honesty, love, and encouragement, so that, over time, this marital spiritual discipline might serve as a means of grace in enabling us to become more and more like the husband and wife that God desires for us to be. As a tool, this list of questions is certainly not definitive, but I do believe that it can be useful. If you, as the reader, find it helpful, then I recommend adapting it for the best possible usage in your marriage.

The Mechanics: How to Put this Process in Motion and Avoid Viewing it as a Drudgery

As far as putting this procedure in motion, I recommend setting aside two occasions a year to do this sort of review and assessment of how things are going in your marriage. In our case, we alternate four times a year between doing this review of our marriage and a similar kind of assessment of shepherding our children. In any case, when it comes to this marriage “tune-up,” one gets paired with our anniversary celebration, and the other gets scheduled six months later. I suggest scheduling all the dates in advance, planning for babysitters if needed, and committing to these times, so that there’s no last minute scrambling about when, or

even, whether to do this.

At the same time that committing to these regular “tune-ups” can be valuable, we also want to avoid viewing them as a routine, but unpleasant necessity like going to the dentist. So here’s a suggestion to that end: try to plan these occasions in such a way that they involve an outing that is, perhaps, a little nicer than usual, so that you will have additional reasons to look forward to these times with a sense of anticipation.

When coinciding with our anniversary, for example, we have often tried to make special arrangements for a getaway that extends over a couple of days. With advanced planning and a willingness to swap childcare services with other couples (if grandparents aren’t nearby), this is not terribly difficult to accomplish.² Nor does it have to be ultra-expensive. There have been years when all we could afford was a night at the local Holiday Inn because gas money for a road-trip in addition to a hotel would have been too expensive. We still benefited from changing the scenery, going to dinner, and having a bit more of an extended time to be relieved of our parenting responsibilities and focus in on our marital tune-up. One nice thing about having a more extended time is that the conversation can flow more easily without feeling the pressure of the clock to get home.³

On the non-anniversary occasions, I still plan for an enjoyable evening, by going for dinner at a place that may be a little nicer than we would ordinarily consider. Again, these kinds of periodic “extras” are meaningful occasions for a husband to demonstrate his on-going courtship of his wife. In this kind of setting, the occasion now becomes a romantic dinner and evening of conversation and not merely a chore to complete one night after the kids have gone to bed.

Then, over the course of dinner, we use the time to take a serious look at how we are doing in our roles as husband and wife, by conversing our way through the questions below (as well as any other items that come up.) We have found this to be a helpful time, both in the way that it exposes and helps root out sin, and in the way that it reminds us of the many things each of us appreciates about

the other. Both of those dimensions give us many reasons to be thankful to God. Inevitably, there are moments of laughter, shared joy, fond recollections, words of encouragement, apologies, and exchanges of forgiveness. And when the date is done, we leave realistically aware that there are many things yet to work on. But we also leave these occasions with a sense of refreshment and renewed intimacy, as well as a deep gratitude to God that he has sustained us in his grace for another six months.

Some More Context

Permit me to offer a few more big-picture suggestions before attending to the conversation and questions specifically.

(1) Lest there be any confusion, I want to state explicitly that I am not commending only talking to your spouse about things that matter twice a year. The point is that these two occasions become fixtures on the annual calendar, where we may more formally and deeply get into matters that we discuss on more of an ad hoc basis from week to week. I firmly believe in the importance of a more regularly recurring date night as well—an occasion, which in my view, should be designed mainly to enhance communication and personal engagement. So, while going to the movies can be an enjoyable leisurely activity together from time to time, if that’s all we ever do, we should stop to consider whether that really serves to enhance our communication with one another. Might it not be better to exchange dinner and a movie for dinner and a walk on some of those occasions?

Here, again, finances need not be a major obstacle. At a stage in life with young children, we have neither the time nor the budget to pay for a babysitter so that we can go for an evening out every week. But our house does have a balcony. So a couple times a month, instead of going out, we have a “balcony date” in our own home after the kids have gone to bed. No T.V. No DVDs. No answering the phone. Just a candle-lit evening of coffee and conversation right there on our own balcony after the kids are asleep.

(2) In the time leading up to the conversation, be in prayer—both together and individually—that

God would use this time in significant ways. These questions are just a tool. There's nothing magical about them. The grace comes from God, and we should be sure to place our hope for our marriages in him.

(3) A succinct list of questions is a usable list of questions. In using a tool like this, there are many ways to go. I have seen some lists of questions that run on for pages. The advantage of a longer list, of course, would be in the attention to detail. My fear, however, would be that such lists could be daunting in their length, either discouraging the attempt to use them in the first place, or leaving one feeling rushed to get through the list in the allotted time.

(4) Husbands, it is your responsibility to bless your wife by taking this kind of initiative. If you make this type of marital spiritual discipline a priority and listen well to your wife's answers, she will be blessed by it. I believe that most wives would rejoice for their husbands to lead them in this fashion. Just think of the gifts of security and love your bride will receive from you if you take this kind of godly initiative. It is hard to imagine that many wives would cringe at the prospect of receiving those gifts.

Guidelines for the Conversation

Here are a few suggestions to remember during the conversation itself: (1) Obviously, both husband and wife should take a turn answering each question. So, when it's your turn to listen, listen. One reason this practice can be especially helpful is because it gives clear license to the other person to say what's on his/her mind—especially when he/she knows that the other person is really going to listen. Do not rush to debate or self-defense. Start by listening. Your spouse loves you and knows you very well. There is likely to be quite a bit of truth in what he/she says about you. You would be wise not to scorn their counsel or reproof (Prov 12:1; 15:31–32).

(2) When it's your turn to talk, say it with love, but speak honestly. Your spouse certainly cannot heed your concerns if he or she does not know your concerns.

(3) Share criticisms, if need be, but share

encouragement too. No one is going to look forward to doing this regularly, if he always and only gets beat up by it. To this end, I suggest trying to open and close the conversation with statements of several things that the husband and wife love and appreciate about the other. But, the individual questions should also be looked at as opportunities to share encouragement and thankfulness as well as critique.

(4) Be quick to confess sin and quick to forgive. If you do, the whole conversation will be enhanced all the more as it becomes clearly centered on the cross.

(5) Come with a notepad handy. I always jot down our responses, areas for growth, and new issues or questions to factor into consideration in subsequent evaluations. Don't waste the opportunity for growth that can come from this conversation by neglecting to make note of those things that need some attention.

(6) Because you're both sinners, don't expect that you will ever achieve perfection, and don't become discouraged, over time, when such perfection inevitably does not come. Instead, approach this spiritual discipline with the mindset that you will seek to use it, by God's grace, to promote a progression in growth over time.

The Questions for Discussion

After praying and seeking God's blessing on our time, we turn our attention to the following questions:

(1) On a scale of 1–10, give your overall assessment of our marriage in the past six months. To be sure, this is a very broad and subjective item, but I have found it helpful to open the conversation with an item of this kind of breadth, because it helps to prime the pump. Obviously, you won't hit on a ton of specifics with this one—that's what the rest of the questions are for—but I have been truly amazed at just how much discussion this assessment alone can generate, as various issues come to mind. From there, we're off and running. Follow-up questions in the event that the conversation fails to gain traction initially: What have been the strengths of the past six months? What would make your

assessment higher?

(2) How has the husband's leadership been over the past six months? The wife's support? Follow-up: How can I improve in fulfilling my respective role?

(3) How is your walk with God, both personally and as a couple?

(4) Where do you see ungodliness in my life?

(5) Do I have any unconfessed sin that needs to be shared with my spouse?

(6) Are we guarding meaningful time together? Prayer? Conversation? Date Night?

(7) How is our sex life?

(8) What could I do to make you feel more loved/secure/respected?

(9) How can I serve you better?

(10) What are the issues that we need to anticipate in the upcoming six months?

(11) What's your greatest personal disappointment and your greatest satisfaction in the last six months?

(12) How can I best pray for you?

(13) What are our major upcoming mutual prayer concerns?

(14) Spend a few moments, in an encouraging fashion, sharing several of the things that each of you loves and appreciates about the other.

(15) Then close, by spending some concerted time in prayer for those prayer concerns you just shared, as well as thanking God for his faithfulness to you as a couple over the past six months.

The Resultant Day-to-Day Benefits of this Practice

Not surprisingly, when this practice becomes incorporated routinely into your relationship, there are potential day-to-day benefits as well as the more periodic ones. Here are several that come to mind.

First, these periodic conversations can stimulate reminders of the daily ways that you can minister to your spouse's needs. Second, the regular interaction offers one means of accountability to you, in that it can help highlight areas of sin in your own life that might otherwise go unnoticed without the benefit of someone else shining the spotlight. Third, these discussions can also help to

increase intimacy within marriage. After all, you're not just business partners. And conversations about balancing the checkbook, while necessary, are not the most important component of your marriage. To the degree that God uses these kinds of discussions to help you lift your gaze from the daily grind, they can help you recalibrate your marital priorities, so that you feel and live more like what you are, namely, covenant companions modeling, albeit imperfectly, the relationship between Christ and his church. Fourth, these conversations can provide a context for issues to be discussed as they come up on a more ad hoc basis. That way, when your wife reiterates one of her concerns in the middle of the week, it doesn't appear to be coming out of the blue with the result of making you defensive. Instead, that concern now comes with a context.

In the end, my hope is that God will enable you to use this or some other similar tool to the end of more faithfully honoring him in your marriage. May God grant us all the needed grace.

ENDNOTES

¹These questions are not all unique and original to me. Since I originally developed this tool for personal use some years ago, I do not remember the "historical origins" of all of these questions. Some have been picked up along the way from other sources or conversations with other people. Some have been adapted to suit our purposes. And I have arrived at some of them independently. But, as the questions themselves are rather simple, I'm certain that other couples have asked all of them before, even if they've not put them in print. One of the most thought-provoking and helpful resources that I can commend for more fruitful reflection along these lines is C. J. Mahaney, *Sex, Romance, and the Glory of God: What Every Christian Husband Needs to Know* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2004).

²Understandably, overnight getaways are harder to come by when there is an infant in the home.

³Here's a suggestion to older, more financially stable couples (and even to grandparents): if there's a young family in your church that you love and mentor, find out when their anniversary is and bless them, either by giving them \$100 for such a getaway, or by offering to keep the kids for an overnight retreat. That's a very practical way to bless younger couples. Speaking from experience as a recipient, I can say that the value of such a gift is truly inestimable.

Whither Men?

A Response to a Recent Barna Study on the Increase of Female Pastors in Protestant Churches

Owen Strachan

Managing Director

Carl F. H. Henry Center for Theological Understanding

Assistant Director, Jonathan Edwards Center

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Deerfield, Illinois

A recent Barna study, entitled “Number of Female Senior Pastors in Protestant Churches Doubles in Past Decade” and encompassing a survey of over 600 Protestant pastors, presents findings by the Barna Group that show that the percentage of female pastors in Protestant churches has doubled in the past decade.¹ Now, says the group, 10 percent of all Protestant pastors are female, up from 5 percent between 1990 and 1999.

Though the group has not released data related to the study, it asserts that 58 percent of the women pastors minister in “mainline” churches. This crop of pastors is not young and is aging—the average age is 55, an increase from 50 some ten years ago. The women in question are well-trained, with 77 percent possessing a seminary degree (versus 66 percent of male Protestant pastors). Women ministers earn less than their male counterparts—roughly \$45,000 per annum for women versus roughly \$48,000 for men. One factor likely related to this statistic is that women pastors lead an average of 80 people in their churches, while men lead over 100 people in theirs. In general, however, church attendance in Protestant churches covered by the survey is dropping. The average Protestant church now has 101 people attending, as opposed to 109 a decade ago.

As noted above, the Barna Group has not

released information related to the study. It nonetheless deserves analysis and commentary. What does this survey tell us about Protestant churches? Are there connections to be made in the data? Can we discern lessons for our churches today? In this brief essay, we will address these questions. As we will see, these are not esoteric matters, but rather issues of first importance that lead us to consider the very nature of the Lord’s church.

For our purposes, we zero in on the major swath of churches identified by the study that have called women as their pastor. The majority of these churches are found in the mainline. Many of us have dear friends and colleagues in the mainline. We know of biblically faithful churches within these denominations, assemblies and individuals courageously contending for the gospel, and we applaud and pray for those that are taking steps to confront compromise.²

With that qualification stated, the mainline, speaking generally, is awash in compromise. A large number of churches have appointed women as pastors. These churches are struggling greatly to survive, with an average attendance of roughly 80 per week. The movement away from Scripture and toward the culture has not brought the spiritual harvest that some thought it would. Instead, it has contributed to the long, slow death of the mainline.³

Many other churches outside of the mainline are appointing women as pastors as well—42 percent according to this survey. This figure demands our attention. Protestants of all kinds are liberalizing on the gender issue. In a way that might surprise many Christians, Protestants are showing a strong affinity for women pastors. This move, however, is not contributing to the health of churches in this branch of Christianity. Attendance is steadily dropping. Critics of complementarians might decry the connection we've drawn between compromised gender roles and lower attendance. But it seems plain as day, staring us in the face, demanding our response.

The study leaves it to the reader to draw such conclusions. However much we might interrogate this particular study and to whatever degree we might seek to moderate our hypotheses, two things are abundantly clear: first, Protestant churches are liberalizing at a steady clip on the gender question; second, they are generally struggling, with closing in the offing. This is to say nothing of the parallel trend of homosexual inclusion and advocacy. In the same way that many churches embraced the cause of female ordination as a righteous one, a large number of congregations march in step with the culture in embracing homosexual pastors and congregants. The Barna study does not comment on this particular trend, but discerning observers cannot help but note a second major shift away from Scripture that will cause massive harm to denominations and assemblies that embrace it.⁴

Though some may feel the temptation to downplay the importance of this survey, such disregard would be unwise. As we have noted, the problems sketched above belong not only to mainline churches, but Protestant churches more broadly, including, presumably, doctrinally conservative ones. This problem is not far off. Trouble has come to our house.

Perhaps one of the major threats for conservative churches is not simply a full-scale frontal assault from feminism as has happened in the last several decades, but a contemporary backdoor attack that weakens our churches without our knowing it. In other words, danger lies not simply in stoutly ideological feminism—a major threat—but in passive,

fully orthodox, do-nothing conservatism. While many churches act upon the clear scriptural teaching that men are exclusively called to the pastorate and to eldership (1 Tim 2:9–15; 1 Timothy 3:1–7), one wonders if far fewer churches celebrate it.

What do we mean by this? We may appoint men to be our pastors, but do we cultivate the next generation of male leaders? While never privileging manhood over womanhood, do older men model and pass on a vibrant, gospel-driven vision of manhood? To put this even more plainly, are the men of the church quick to lead, quick to evangelize, quick to clean up, quick to protect and cherish their wives, or do they sit back, heels up, content to let the women of the congregation work themselves to the bone?

One wonders if this is not the case in many professedly biblical churches. No generation, we might say, has the ability to rest on its laurels. No church can assume that boys will simply inhabit gospel-wrought manhood. Example is essential, but so is teaching, plain teaching, especially in our modern age, so hostile to biblical manhood as it is. Our schools and TV shows do not ennoble men; they infantilize them, sneer at them for their masculinity, mock them for taking initiative, tranquilize them with one lesson after another showing the inherent adolescence of every man and the natural maturity of every woman. Where we do not shepherd boys through the many obstacles they face to become men of Christ, we leave them to flounder, flame out, and even lose their souls.⁵

Churches are suffering. They are closing. They are, most importantly, compromising on scriptural matters. Where men are not disappearing from leadership, they are simply fading away. They are replaced by a well-educated crop of women, many of them gifted, who in many cases preside over dwindling congregations unable, despite their cultural acquiescence, to retain youth.⁶ The amazing thing about this situation, this great glacier sliding into the ocean, is that it transpires with so little discussion. Where one might think that the members of Protestant and mainline churches would wring their hands and cry out for change, there seems to be little outrage, little conversation, and little hope.

There is hope, however. There is more hope that we can get our arms around, to be precise. Like the rediscovery of the law in Nehemiah's day, many Protestants need a radical discovery of the absolute authority and boundless wisdom of the Word of God. We need a fresh vision of the grandeur and glory of God. We don't need the same old boiled-down pieties and formalities, the tried-and-true programs and initiatives. We need a breathtaking, spine-crackling glimpse of the Almighty. Like news of a comet bursting across the sky in a predawn morning, we need to rediscover the sovereign majesty and absolute authority of the Lord we worship. We need to chase this God like we would pursue that comet, roaring down the freeway in desperate search of the One of whom we have heard.⁷

We need a Kierkegaardian existential crisis, a rediscovery of our fundamental sinfulness and dependence on the holy Lord of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.⁸ We need the man Jesus of Nazareth ever before us, His holy, Spirit-inspired example creating fresh faith in us through the gospel. We need the divine Son of God overshadowing us as He hangs on a cross, overwhelming us in His personal payment of the cost love must pay to conquer wrath. We need an encounter with the biblical local church, the tangible outpost of God that He has tailored to us to render us holy, joyful, and faithful before Him. We need to exhume the doctrine of the image of God and to remember that, in a way we struggle to fully comprehend, we bear God's handprint, and thus with all people—with every man or woman—we possess dignity and a touch of glory. These things we must have, or like David in Psalm 69:1–3, we will die. For so many of our churches, the waters have come to our neck. Embracing the culture and shunning the Word, we have stumbled into a rushing flood, and it sweeps over us. There is no refuge save for God alone.

We would give God glory, and see our churches come alive, by celebrating biblical manhood and the call of men to serve our churches as pastors, leaders, and elders. We do not seek some sanctified Cult of the Man; we would avoid the temptation to over-react to our secularized culture and to equate the cultivation of godly men through

the power of the gospel with that gospel itself. We would, however, recommit ourselves to what will seem a strange errand to many around us. The Lord has called men to lead His people since Adam was dust of the earth. From the first, man led woman; in ancient Israel, men almost exclusively led God's chosen in a wide range of offices and roles; in the era of Christ, all of His apostles were men; and the plain teaching, it seems to me, of those same apostles is that men are called to be the leaders of God's church. There seems to be some physical and emotional grounds for this reality, but the clearest reason given in Scripture for this situation is that it pleased God to order the home, church, and to an extent society in this way.⁹

What, then, do we need to do to fulfill this end? We need, in whatever movement we find ourselves, to celebrate and cultivate male leaders. We need to teach the men of our congregations that contrary to what popular figures like Adam Sandler, Tiger Woods, Alex Rodriguez, Mark Sanford, and many others teach them, men are not tall boys.¹⁰ They are not idiots. They are not supposed to perpetuate what we might call boy culture when adults (and, in point of fact, when boys). They are fundamentally called to turn away from their sin and to embrace Christ in joyful adoration and humble contrition. The gospel is the only means by which they can please God and glorify Him. It frees them from hell, primarily, and from a life of enslavement to the sins and passions of their flesh, some of them common to all people, some of them common to men.

Though equipped with varying temperaments, tastes, physiques, gifts, and minds, men who believe the gospel are called to marshal all their faculties to work for the blessing of others to the glory of God. They are called to serve as leaders in the church, home, and, with different qualifications, society. Men have the awesome privilege of emulating their Savior and laying their lives down for their families and churches.

In order to address the foregoing, it seems that pastors must take special care to raise up male leaders, whether these men will be pastors or not. It may be true for many of our conservative churches

that we have so prioritized certain callings of the pastor that we have not emphasized pastoral training nearly enough. A momentous task like the passing of leadership from one generation to the next does not happen by accident. If we think it does (and many of us seem to), we are kidding ourselves. Do we really think that a lukewarm portrait of Christianity, which the human heart is already trained by sin to reject according to Rom 3:10-18, can compete with a conception of manhood offering our unsaved boys the opportunity to tune out and live for themselves? Faced with opportunities to run a killer Fantasy Football league, to ogle at girls through raunch culture films like *The Hangover*, and to goof off with fellow guys on *Chatroulette*, do we really think most guys who do not have excellent parents and vibrant churches will somehow opt in to the way of the cross? Can we really expect our poor youth pastors to compete, like the last man in the Alamo, with the multi-billion dollar industries of modern life urging young men to live selfishly and stupidly?

Godly development of young men happens, it seems, when fathers take spiritual responsibility for their sons and when godly pastors identify, train, and aid young men, cultivating their faith, celebrating their gifts, releasing them as Paul did Timothy to turn the world upside down for Christ. Our shepherds must also train the men of the congregation to do this on their own with boys from their own homes, from the church, and from the broader community.¹¹

The trends revealed in the Barna study did not come from nowhere. Many churches have accepted the tenets of ideological feminism outright. Others have resisted the age-old pressure to ideologically accommodate the culture but are doing so in practice. As a result, there are countless young men in our churches today who are not receiving training. Whether in the mainline, mega-churches, or the confessional movement, they need advocates. Trained by the culture, they stand to wilt, to grow feminine, to exude passivity, to shirk responsibility. Trained by the gospel-driven church, given a stunning vision of God and an exciting plan for their lives as men, they bear incredible hope and promise

for the future flourishing of God's people.

ENDNOTE

¹Find the study at <http://www.barna.org/barna-update/article/17-leadership/304-number-of-female-senior-pastors-in-protestant-churches-doubles-in-past-decade>.

²The recent move by formerly ELCA churches like St. Mark Lutheran Church (Lindenhurst, IL) to leave the denomination in light of its embrace of homosexual ordination, for example, is an example of a mainline church opposing unscriptural teaching.

³For more on this trend, see Dave Shiflett, *Exodus: Why Americans Are Fleeing Liberal Churches for Conservative Christianity* (New York: Sentinel, 2005).

⁴Wayne Grudem has made this connection in *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2006).

⁵For a good cultural overview of this trend, see Christina Hoff Sommers, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

⁶We are reminded here of a fascinating chapter by Richard Wightman Fox entitled "Experience and Explanation in Twentieth-Century History" in the technical historical work edited by Harry S. Stout and D. G. Hart, *New Directions in American Religious History* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1998), 398-413, in which Fox muses out loud about whether liberal Christianity was destined by its culturally accommodating nature to phase itself out by adopting contemporary thought. See especially 398-406. The point is by no means proven, and Fox (and Stout and Hart) has no bone to pick on the gender question before us, but this is a matter worthy of consideration as we think about the fate of liberal Christianity and Protestantism more broadly.

⁷To develop your understanding of the holiness of God, see R. C. Sproul, *The Holiness of God* (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2000); and Bruce A. Ware, *Big Truths for Young Hearts: Teaching and Learning the Greatness of God* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2009).

⁸See C. Stephen Evans and Sylvia Walsh, *Kierkegaard: Fear and Trembling*, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy (Cambridge University, 2006).

⁹Andreas Köstenberger and David Jones offer helpful biblical exegesis and counsel related to these spheres in *God, Marriage & Family: Rebuilding the Biblical Foundation* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2004).

¹⁰For a scorching popular take on the infantilism of contemporary men, access the recent sermon on 1 Pet 3:1-7 by Pastor Mark Dis-coll of Mars Hill Church (Seattle, Washington) at marshallchurch.org/sermons.

¹¹For a primer on what to teach a boy, see R. Albert Mohler Jr., *From Boy to Man: The Marks of Manhood* (online at albertmohler.com).

Galatians 3:28: Grammar, Text, Context, and Translation¹

Wayne Walden

Author

Nashville, Tennessee

Though Paul himself was concerned primarily with the “neither Jew nor Greek” component in this trilogy of pairs, more recent discussion has become occupied with the “no male and female” part. Conclusions drawn from the latter range from those who accommodate homosexuality² to others who see no more in the verse than that the pairs should learn to be compatible.³ The present study comments upon the unusual wording of the verse, which has been only slightly, if at all, reckoned by translators and commentators but which is, nevertheless, vital to the meaning (which is irrelevant to gender roles). Given the deluge of material written on this verse, it comes as somewhat of a surprise that practically no attention has been given to even the most elementary rules of exegesis.⁴

Two grammatical oddities call for comment. First, the word “is” in the clause “there is neither ... nor” is not a form of the usual word “to be” (εἰμί) but is, rather, from the not-so-common ἔνναιμι. Four synonyms are, in various contexts, rendered by some form of “to be” in NT Greek, yet none is exactly synonymous with any of the others. Paul employs them all. First from the group, γίνομαι frequently indicates that some change is taking place and thus often means “occur” or “happen”:⁵ χριστός ... γινόμενος ... κατάρα (Gal 3:13; “Christ ... becoming ... a curse,” NIV, NSRV); ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν (3:24, “the law was our disciplinarian,” NRSV).

The most common word for “be” or “exist” is εἰμί:⁶ Τίτος ... Ἕλληνας ὢν (2:3, “Titus ... was a

Greek,” NIV, NRSV); οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον (5:18, “you are not under law,” NIV). If one wants to emphasize resources for existence, a third synonym, ὑπάρχω, is employed, and helping words such as “actually” or “really” better bring out the meaning:⁷ Σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων (2:14, “You, though a Jew,” NRSV). Lexica are in agreement on the above distinctions among these frequently occurring synonyms.

The rarer word ἔνναιμι, however, is found in only four other NT passages.⁸ ἔνναιμι has a usage all its own among verbs in the “to be” semantic range. The word means “to be or exist in a certain context.”⁹ Louw and Nida give the definition “to exist, with respect to particular circumstance,” and cite Luke 11:41, where τὰ ἐνόντα means “what is in (your plates and cups).”¹⁰ Newman concurs that it means “to be in or inside” and cites the same passage.¹¹

The lexical definition is corroborated by other NT εἰμί compounds, all of which maintain separate meanings: ἄπειμι, “be absent,” (2 Cor 10:1),¹² the impersonal ἔξεστιν / ἔξον, “be permissible,” (1 Cor 10:23),¹³ παρίμι, “be present,” (Gal 4:18),¹⁴ σύνιμι, “be with,” (Acts 22:11),¹⁵ and the hapax συμπάριμι, “be present with,” (Acts 25:24).¹⁶ If ἔνναιμι, (“be in [here]”) were not semantically distinct from εἰμί, it would be the unique case among εἰμί compounds.

Other NT passages confirm the usage of ἔνναιμι when focusing upon the immediate situation: 1 Cor 6:5 asks, οὕτως οὐκ ἔνι ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς

σοφός, “Is it possible that there is nobody among you wise enough?” (NIV). The contextually reinforcing word οὕτως precedes οὐκ ἔνι (Col 3:11 similarly employs ὅπου, as will be noted later). James 1:17 describes God as the one παρὶ ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι ... ἀποσκίασμα (“with whom there is no ... shadow,” NRSV), referring to his being “father of lights.”

Judging, then, not only from lexis but also from ἐμί synonyms and compounds as well as NT contextual usage, one may conclude that the evidence favors seeing the distinctiveness of ἔνιμι as calling attention to the matter at hand and against those who see only a (perhaps emphatic) synonym of ἐμί.¹⁷ The latter word expresses more general kinds of truths in the NT, including Galatians (1:11; 3:12, 20; 5:23).

The question then becomes, “What is the contextual matter under discussion in Gal 3:28 to which ἔνιμι calls attention?” Since neither of the pairs “servant–free” and “male–female” is mentioned again in the book, we are brought back to the first pair (Jew–Greek) as the subject of this and every chapter (1:13, 16; 2:7–9, 12–15; 3:14; 4:8, 21; 5:6; 6:15). Since Paul is obviously upset (1:6; 2:6; 3:1; 4:11, 16, 19–20; 5:12), it is helpful to inquire into who and what the problem is. Literature on the subject is abundant.¹⁸ Briefly stated, there is no reason to look beyond the “Pharisee believers” of Acts 15:5 (from Judea, 15:1) for the (type of) troublemakers. Galatians 2:4 calls them ψευδάδελφοι (“false brothers”). Though scholarly attempts are made to be more politically correct when dubbing Paul’s opponents (including Hay’s “missionaries”¹⁹), it is more exegetically helpful to adopt the point of view of the writer himself who describes them as “agitators” (οἱ ταρασσόντες, 1:7; so 5:10 and Acts 15:24; Gal 5:12 says they are οἱ ἀναστατούντες [“those causing a disturbance”], a word used in Acts 21:38 of a “revolt” [NIV, NRSV]).

As to specifics, the rebels are attempting to impose Jewish rituals (νόμος, 2:16 + 32 times in Galatians), calendar observances (4:10), kosher food laws (2:12) and circumcision (2:3 + 12). In objecting to these rules, Paul argues for faithfulness to Christ (πίστις, 1:23 + 21; πιστεύω, 2:7 + 3; πιστός, 3:9), which includes baptism (3:27) and

proper conduct (5:13–6:10).

Our present pericope indicates that how one gets “into” Christ (εἰς Χριστόν, vv. 24, 27), who can be “in” Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ, vv. 26, 28) and who “belongs to” Christ (Χριστοῦ, v. 29) continues to be the subject. Verse 28 gives examples by eliminating some restrictions. One does not have to be Jew, free, or male; Greeks, servants, and females are also eligible. The latter is significant because of the importance some were attaching to circumcision.

A textual variant is enlightening in this regard, namely that the word “one” (“you are all one”) is omitted in the oldest MS (P⁴⁶) as well as in \mathfrak{s}^* and A. The variant was not noted in the UBS Greek NT until the fourth edition (1994) and is perhaps too hastily dismissed by the committee as a haplography (ὁμοῖς εἰς ἔστε).²⁰ Even if the reading is not the original, the variant sheds light upon how early copiers and their readers understood the passage. Instead of εἰς ἔστε ἐν Χριστῷ, P⁴⁶ and A have ἐν Χριστοῦ (“you belong to Christ”).²¹ The important concept was not the word “one”; rather, it was “being in” and “belonging to” Christ, which concurs with the emphasis of verses previous and following.

If one wants to know who is eligible to be “in Christ,” Gal 3:28 is relevant to the discussion; but if one wants to know about gender roles and responsibilities, one should go to epistles that have a context on that subject, including 1 Corinthians (11:1–16; 14:34–35), Ephesians (5:21–33), Colossians (3:18–19), 1 Timothy (2:8–15), Titus (2:1–8), and 1 Peter (3:1–7). Galatians 3:28 is also not “a ‘window’ text through which to assess and adjudicate other Pauline texts.”²² Neither our clause, the verse, the pericope, the chapter nor the book of Galatians addresses gender roles.²³

Translators could help clarify this verse by attending more carefully to the wording and context. Among other items (and in the interest of an “equivalent” philosophy of translation in meaning and structure where feasible), οὐκ ἔνι occurs before each of the pairs, and this rhetorical emphasis should be preserved (per the KJV tradition, Moffatt, NAB, NJB, Chas. Wms., NCV, TNIV) instead of translating it only one time and then listing the pairs (JB, NLT, NEB, REB, CEV, Holman, TEV, NIV).

Secondly, the special nuance of οὐκ ἔνι is worthy of exploration. Translations that sound as though gender differences do not exist (“there are no more distinctions between” [JB] or “There is no such thing as” [NEB, REB]) are misleading. The common “There is no/neither” ([N]KJV, NAB, [T] NIV) or equivalent is not helpful either. Moffatt (“There is no room for”), Young’s Literal Translation (“there is not here”), and NRSV (“There is no longer”) are among rare attempts to call attention to the immediate subject.

More of this kind of effort has been made in the closest parallel to our verse, Col 3:11. As in 1 Cor 6:5, οὐκ ἔνι is preceded by a reinforcing word—in this case ὅπου. The renderings of NEB and REB (“there is no question here of”) and CEV (“It doesn’t matter if you are”) can well instruct translators of Gal 3:28. Other possibilities are “This is not a matter of whether one is,” “It makes no difference whether one is,” or similar in Gal 3:28.²⁴

Colossians 3:11 is also instructive as to how οὐκ ἔνι is to be understood. Genders are not included in the best MSS of this list, but social roles are (δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος). Unlike Galatians, Colossians does have a *Haustafel* pericope in which separate instructions are given to the parties in the pair (vv. 22–25), showing that οὐκ ἔνι still allows for distinction and structure. The context concerns conduct (v. 5), the point being that the Creator’s standards apply to everyone regardless of status or lack thereof (v. 10).

A second, and final, neglected grammatical feature of Gal 3:28 is the gender of a series of adjectives. With the exception of the noun Ἑλλήν, the entries in the pairs, as well as the word “one,” are all adjectives. All are masculine except “male” and “female,” which are both neuter! All are without nouns, thus are substantival or, as some prefer, “independent.”²⁵

What also escapes the usual reader is that the word “one” (εἷς) is not the same gender as employed, for example, by Jesus when he says, “I and the Father are one” (John 10:30) and that his disciples should be the same (17:11, 21–22). John’s word is the neuter ἓν. Neuter is the broader category of the three genders and may encompass not

only the other two but entire sentences, pericopes, and subjects as well. Jesus says (Matt 10:27), ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἵπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί (“What I tell you in the dark, speak in the light”). When Paul wants to affirm, not his person but his office of apostleship, he says χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὃ εἰμι (“but by the grace of God I am what I am,” 1 Cor 15:10).²⁶ John’s First Epistle begins with this same neuter ὃ but clearly says in the same verse that the subject is λόγος (masculine) and ζωή (feminine), a “grammatical incongruity.”²⁷ It is the whole business “about” (περὶ τοῦ) the logos that he wants to present and thus employs the all-encompassing neuter: “That which,” or “the matter about.” “O (neuter) is the content of the ἀγγελία (feminine), “message” (v. 5).²⁸ In the Gospel, Jesus and the Father are “one thing,” that is, together as a unit and about the same business, a matter he wishes for his disciples.²⁹

This broad scope covered by the neuter gender also best accounts for its employment in the words “male” and “female.” The phrase in our verse (and in practically all Judaeo-Christian Hellenistic references to “male and female”) echoes the LXX of Gen 1:27, where the words are also neuter.³⁰ The subject is broader than just the original individuals, for they are representative of the human race (ἄνθρωποι) existing in two modes. Similarly in Galatians, the subject of maleness and femaleness is irrelevant to being admitted “into Christ.”

Another gender observation in our verse is that the “one” is masculine, that is, “one person” (NEB, REB, Cassirer, New World). Taking the words contextually, again, instead of literally, individuals in the list have all done the same thing, and God views the matter as though it is the same person, without additional prerequisites, who has come into Christ and is clothed with Christ (v. 27) and who, consequently, belongs to Christ, is Abraham’s progeny, and therefore an heir to the promise to Abraham (v. 29).

Galatians 3:28 supports no view of gender role issues, “egalitarian,” “complementarian,” or otherwise. Unlike other NT books, Galatians has no pericope addressing *Haustafel* responsibilities. It does address qualifications for admission into the

household—who can be “in Christ.” Translators yet have work to do attending to the two grammar matters discussed in this article: the contextual emphasis inherent in the verb ἔνεμι and the gender of the adjectives in the verse. In view of the above, the following is proposed as a translation:

Whether one is Jew or Greek is irrelevant to the matter. Whether one is servant or free is irrelevant to the matter. The subject of “maleness and femaleness” is irrelevant to the matter because, with Christ Jesus, all of you are one and the same person.

ENDNOTES

¹This article has been adapted with permission from the author’s “Galatians 3:28: Grammar Observations,” *Restoration Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (2009): 45–50.

²E. Louise Williams, “The Broken Walls of Galatians 3:28,” *Word and World* 20, no. 3 (Summer 2000): 231.

³Elizabeth Behr-Segel, “Orthodox Tradition as a Resource for the Renewal of Women and Men in Community,” in *The Community of Women and Men in the Church Report of the WCC’s Conference in Sheffield, England, 1981* (ed. Constance F. Parvey; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 63.

⁴Among monographs is Talitha Wiley, *Paul and the Gentile Women: Reframing Galatians* (New York: Continuum, 2005); and Richard Hove, *Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1999). For essays and periodical literature, Gal 3:28 competes for the most number of contributions on a single verse. Watson E. Mills, *Bibliographies for Biblical Research*, NT Series 9, *Galatians* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1999), 38–45, lists forty-two entries published on just the verse, with another twenty-three on the pericope. Since Mills’s (incomplete) listing, another twelve items on the verse and five more on the pericope have appeared, per my count via New Testament Abstracts. Items overlooked by Mills include eleven on the verse and one on the pericope. When contributions doubtlessly overlooked by all are added, the total publications on this passage may well come to a hundred items.

⁵BDAG, 197.

⁶Ibid., 282.

⁷Ibid., 1029.

⁸In addition to our verse, cf. Luke 11:41; 1 Cor 6:5; Col 3:11; Jas 1:17.

⁹BDAG, 336.

¹⁰Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: UBS, 1989), 157.

¹¹Barclay M. Newman Jr., *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1993), 60.

¹²BDAG, 100.

¹³Ibid., 348.

¹⁴Ibid., 773.

¹⁵Ibid., 968.

¹⁶Ibid., 958.

¹⁷E.g., F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 187.

¹⁸Views, with bibliography, are summarized by Richard B. Hays, *The Letter to the Galatians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2000), 181–200. For various rhetorical analyses based on Hellenistic parallels, cf. Mark D. Nanos, *The Galatians Debate* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002).

¹⁹Ibid., 185, where it is adopted from J. Dunn.

²⁰Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998), 526.

²¹Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Galatians* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1999), 6:45.

²²David M. Scholer, “Galatians 3:28 and the Ministry of Women in the Church,” *Covenant Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (1998): 8.

²³Concurring with Hove, *Equality*, 141, 145, et al.; and Peter Barnes, *A Study Commentary on Galatians* (Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, 2006), 181. Literature on a subject is sometimes more revealing about interests at the time of the literature than about the subject. Of the one hundred items (see n. 4 above) published on the Gal 3:28 pericope, practically all have appeared since 1985. All the while vigorous academic discussion is going on (summarized by Carroll Osburn, *Women in the Church: Reclaiming the Ideal* [Abilene, TX: ACU, 2001]), consequences are ignored. In searching for the cause of escalating abortions, divorces, elderly neglect, homelessness, homosexuality, and female vulgarity and violence that is fast filling up women’s prisons, the trail does not lead to Mennonite homemakers. Cf. James Garbarino, *See Jane Hit: Why Girls are Becoming More Violent and What We Can Do About It* (NY: Penguin, 2006); Marci Putman, “Uprooting Feminism,” *Homeschooling Today* 17, no. 2 (March–April 2008): 28–32; and Elisabeth Elliot, “The Essence of Femininity: A Personal Perspective,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem; Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1991), 394–99.

²⁴Concurring with Edward L. Miller, “Is Gal. 3:28 the Great Egalitarian Text?” *Expository Times* 114, no. 1 (Oct., 2002): 11, “It is not a matter of ...”; and with Arichea and Nida, *Translator’s Handbook*, 85, “there is no difference between how this takes place for Jews and Gentiles.”

²⁵Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 294.

²⁶Ibid., 338.

²⁷C. Haas, M. de Jonge, and J. L. Swellengrebel, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Letters of John* (New York: UBS, 1972), 22.

²⁸Rudolph Bultmann, *A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles* (Hermeneia; trans. R. Philip O’Hara; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 8.

²⁹BDAG, 291.

³⁰Hove, *Equality*, 67.

Godliness and Gender: Relating Appropriately to All (1 Timothy 2:9–12)¹

James M. Hamilton Jr.
Associate Professor of Biblical Theology
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, Kentucky

Let's pray together: Father, your Word is truth, and we pray now that you would sanctify us by your word. Lord, we pray that you would give us contrite hearts that are humble and that tremble before what you have spoken because, Lord, we fear you. We ask that you would do this; we pray that you would give us attentive hearts. We pray that your word would speak and that we would understand. And we ask this in Jesus name and by the power of the Spirit. Amen.

Introduction

There is a discrepancy between C. S. Lewis's book, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and the movie based on the book. The discrepancy appears when Father Christmas presents gifts to the children. He gives Peter a sword and shield. To Susan, he gives a bow and arrows and a horn. He then tells her, "You must use the bow only in great need, for I do not mean you to fight in the battle." Next, he gives Lucy a bottle and a dagger and says, "The dagger is to defend yourself at great need. For you also are not to be in the battle." Lucy responds, "Why sir? I think—I don't know—but I think I could be brave enough." To which Father Christmas replies, "That is not the point. But battles are ugly when women fight." During the battle at the end, Peter and Edmund—not Susan and Lucy—are the ones waging war against Aslan's enemies.

For some reason, the movie version edited

the comments of Father Christmas. *World Magazine* got the scoop from the film's director, Andrew Adamson:

Father Christmas gives weapons to the children but tells the girls, "I do not intend you to use them, for battles are ugly when women fight." Mr. Adamson, considering the line sexist, told Mr. Gresham, "C. S. Lewis may have had these dated ideals but at the same time there's no way I could put that in the film." The two compromised, Mr. Adamson said, with Father Christmas on-screen saying, "I hope you don't have to use them because battles are ugly and fierce."²

It is remarkable that things have changed so much since the publication of *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* in 1950.

If we are to be faithful to God and live godly lives, we must understand what God intends us to be as men and women. The main point of this message is that godliness is, as defined by Paul in this first letter to Timothy, relating appropriately to all people given their station in life and, among other things, their gender. If we are going to be godly, we are going to embrace what Paul says about relating appropriately to all people. Godliness is showing

due reverence to God and relating rightly to other people given our stations in life.

Let me set up the context of 1 Tim 2:9–15 by showing you the way that Paul describes godly behavior toward all people in 1 Timothy.

Godliness in 1 Timothy

The Greek word for godliness has to do with keeping an appropriate distance between oneself and others. With relationship to God, this means that a person worships well (*eusebia*, good worship) by showing proper reverence and not transgressing his holiness. With relationship to other people, godliness means recognizing who we are, where we stand, how we fit with respect to other people, and then behaving appropriately.³

Perhaps you're aware that Paul is writing to Timothy because there are false teachers in Ephesus. So Paul says in 1:3, "charge certain persons not to teach any different doctrine." So this is what godliness looks like for Timothy in relationship to the false teachers: Tell them "not to teach any different doctrine."

A List of Instructions

Then we get down to 2:1, and what we see is that Paul is going to begin a list of instructions. So he says, "I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all people" (1 Tim 2:1). Toward outsiders, Timothy, this is how you instruct the church to relate to them: Pray for them.

In 2:8, Paul says, "I desire that in every place the men should pray." Those are instructions for men: pray without anger and quarreling. Then, v. 9 says, "likewise also that women...." Elders are addressed in 3:1: "If anyone aspires to the office of overseer...." What follows then is what godliness looks like for the elders. In 3:8, Paul says, "Deacons likewise must also be dignified...." In 2:11, Paul addresses deaconesses. The NASB has "the women likewise." In the ESV, this is rendered "the wives likewise." I believe it should be "the women likewise." So I would understand 3:11 to refer to women deacons (cf. Rom 16:1).

In 1 Tim 3:14–15 Paul gives to Timothy his purpose statement for the whole letter. This is why

Paul is writing to Timothy. He's not there, and he says, "I hope to come to you soon" (and I think the implication is "to help you address some of these situations"), "but I am writing these things to you so that if I delay, you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God which is the church of the living God, a pillar and buttress of the truth." So why is Paul writing to Timothy? He's writing to Timothy so that Timothy will know how it is necessary to behave in the church.

We keep going and we get to chapter four, where in the first few verses, again, Paul addresses false teaching, saying that "some will depart from the faith," following "deceitful spirits and teachings of demons" (1 Tim 4:1).

Teach These Things

Because Paul is giving what amounts to a list of instructions, beginning in 2:1 with "First of all" and continuing through 4:6, when he says, "If you put *these things* before the brothers," it seems that he's referring to everything that he's said to this point. So Paul is writing to Timothy so that Timothy will know how to conduct himself in the church (3:14–15), and then he says to Timothy, "Here's what I want you to do." First, he says, the men are to pray. Then, for women, likewise, this is how they are to conduct themselves. (We'll come back to 2:9–15). This is what you do with elders (3:1–7); this is what you do with deacons (3:8–13). And now, Paul says in 4:6, "If you put these things before the brothers, you will be a good servant of Christ Jesus."

Paul wants Timothy to be a good servant of Christ Jesus. Timothy can't do that if he sets aside Paul's instructions. As we continue in the letter, look at 4:7 where at the end of the verse Paul tells Timothy, "Train yourself for godliness." And this word "godliness" is going to come up again and again as we go forward (cf. also 3:16).

Verse 11 of chapter 4 shows what Paul understands godliness to look like for Timothy: "Command and teach *these things*." Compare 4:6, "if you put *these things* before the brothers," with 4:11, "Command and teach *these things*." This is what Paul wants communicated.

The List of Instructions Continued

Relationships. In 1 Tim 4:12 Paul writes, “Let no one despise you for your youth but set the believers an example in speech, in conduct, in love, in faith, in purity.” And then, in 5:1, we continue with godliness instructions on how the church ought to relate to its members given their various stations in life. In 1 Tim 5:1 he says, “Do not rebuke an older man, but encourage him as you would a father. Treat younger men like brothers, older women like mothers, younger women like sisters in all purity.” Godliness means relating appropriately to all people, given who they are, given what gender they are, given their station in life.

True widows. In 1 Tim 5:3–4, we continue with these instructions, “Honor widows who are truly widows. But if a widow has children or grandchildren, let them first learn to show godliness to their own household,” by taking care of their elderly.

Teach these things. Then look down at 5:7, again, “Command *these things* as well.” Look at how seriously Paul takes his own commands in 5:8, “If anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for members of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.” If you don’t do what Paul says to do, in a sense, you are denying the faith, and you are worse than an unbeliever.

Younger widows. The message of 1 Tim 5:14 is not popular today, but this is what Paul understands to be the role of younger widows. He says, “I would have younger widows marry.” So that’s his fundamental statement. You should get married if you are a younger widow, “bear children, manage their households, and give the adversary no occasion for slander” (1 Tim 5:14). This is very consistent with Paul’s teaching over in Titus, 2:3–5, where he tells the older women in v. 4, “train the young women to love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the Word of God may not be reviled.” Paul’s teaching is very consistent.

Elders again. We continue through 1 Timothy, and we see in 5:17 that Paul addresses the “elders who rule well,” how they ought to be treated

by the church. Then in 5:20, he explains how the elders who persist in sin need to be dealt with.

Slaves. First Timothy 6:1 instructs slaves on how they should conduct themselves, in line with “the teaching that accords with godliness” (6:3). That’s how the slaves need to conduct themselves. Then look at 6:2. In the middle of the verse, Paul says again, “Teach and urge *these things*.” Paul wants his instructions to be communicated.

The rich. Finally, Paul addresses how the rich ought to conduct themselves in 6:17.

So all through the letter of 1 Timothy, what Paul is addressing is how people should relate to one another. It is as though Paul is saying, “Timothy, this is how you need to instruct the people in the church in their various positions to conduct their lives.”

1 Timothy 2:9–15

What I want to do at this point is look at chapter 2, where we will see Paul’s instructions regarding women. We want to look at what he says regarding women, and we want to look at why he says what he says regarding women.

So in 1 Tim 2:9–10, what we will see first are Paul’s instructions for how women should dress. Second, in 2:11–12, Paul’s instructions for how women should conduct themselves in the church. And then, in 2:13–15, we’ll see the reasons Paul gives as to why women should dress this way and why women should conduct themselves in the way he instructs them.

Appropriate Adornment

In 1 Tim 2:9–10 we read, “Likewise also, that women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hair and gold or pearls, or costly attire, but with what is proper for women who profess godliness—with good works.” So, some people look at a text like this, and they say, “You people who want to urge complementarian gender roles, you want to keep verses eleven and twelve, but you don’t want to keep verses nine and ten, because look at the way your women dress at church.”

Well, I hope that if you come to a church

where complementarian gender roles are taught, you won't find immodestly dressed women, and I hope you won't find women about whom the most significant thing you see is the expense, or the gaudiness, or the faddishness, or the trendiness, or whatever it may be, of their clothing. I hope that if you come to a church that teaches these complementarian gender roles, what you find is that the most significant thing you see about the women there is that they profess godliness. They are characterized by good works. Hopefully that's what you see. If that's not what you see, the problem is not with complementarianism. The problem is that the Bible is not being obeyed.

And so, ladies, here's an easy point of application for us: are you dressing modestly? This is what it means to be godly. This is what it means for you to relate appropriately to the young men around you and to the older men around you. You don't want them to look at you as an object. You don't want them to look at you and have desires that you're not really wanting to provoke. You're just trying to look nice! So you want to be careful. You want to dress modestly. That's what godliness looks like for young ladies. Dress modestly, respectably. Verse 9 reads, "not with braided hair or gold or pearls, or costly attire." I don't think that means "never wear gold, never braid your hair, and never wear costly attire." I don't think that's what it means because in a parallel text over in 1 Peter 3, Peter says, regarding the women, "do not let your adorning be external." And then he goes on, "...the braiding of hair, the wearing of gold, the putting on of clothing" (1 Pet 3:3). Now Peter is not suggesting that women should never put on clothing! He's suggesting that clothing should not be what you are characterized by. And so the point is not, "Never wear gold. Never wear pearls. Never braid your hair. Never wear anything that's expensive." The point is "don't make that the most significant thing about your appearance." Be a person whose character is evident in your life. Be a person who's professing godliness (1 Tim 2:10), and make sure your clothing is fitting for the godliness that you profess, a person who's marked by good works. That's how the women should dress themselves.

Appropriate Instruction and Authority

Then we come to 1 Tim 2:11–12: "Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness." Now, the first thing here, "Let a woman learn quietly," I don't think that means never speaking, because if we look right above this at 2:3, Paul says that he wants the people to pray "for kings, and all who are in high positions, that we may lead a peaceful and *quiet* life." This is the same Greek word. So living a quiet life doesn't mean never speaking. Nor does learning quietly mean never speaking. It means speaking when appropriate, and it means speaking in a way that is (the next word in verse 11) submissive. So there are two things here: learning and then being submissive.

Those two things come up again in v. 12, where Paul says, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet." So, v. 11, "let a woman learn with submissiveness," and then those two things are restated negatively, in v. 12, "I do not permit a woman to teach over a man, and I do not permit a woman to exercise authority over a man."

Now perhaps some of you are looking at your Greek New Testament, and you can see that the words "to teach" and "to exercise authority" are both infinitives, and they both relate to the main verb, which is negated: "I do not permit." So, grammatically, this cannot mean, "I do not permit a woman to teach authoritatively." Nor, grammatically, can it mean, "I do not permit a woman to teach in a usurping way." That's not what Paul means. If that's what Paul wanted to communicate, he would have used a very different grammatical construction.

He's not addressing false teaching here. If he were addressing false teaching, he would have used the word he used in 1 Tim 1:3 to refer to false teaching: *heterodidaskaleo*. But that's not the word that he uses here. He uses a positive word. The word teaching is always used positively in the pastoral epistles.

So, Paul doesn't want women teaching men, and he doesn't want women exercising authority over men. I don't think he means, "Well, if you've got a male senior pastor, you can have women teaching men." I don't think that's what he means.

If that's what he meant, I believe that's what he would have said. What he says is, "The women should not teach men, and the women should not exercise authority over men."

Now, this seems offensive. This seems counter-cultural. And it is. And let me say that what is said about gender roles in the New Testament is counter-cultural, and it's to *advance the gospel*.

Do you know that more marriages fail in this country because men and women reject what the Bible says about gender roles than they fail for other reasons. If you examine marriages, the reasons people don't get along is they are living like Gen 3:16. The woman is seeking to run the household. And then the man is either responding with excessive harshness, or he's not responding in the way that Christ would. So what Paul says here is very significant for us. It's significant for us in the church.

Gender elsewhere in Paul. Paul addresses similar things in Ephesians 5 with regard to marriage. In 1 Corinthians 11, he addresses how women should conduct themselves in the worship of the church. In 1 Timothy 3, he addresses the leadership of the church, where in vv. 1–7 he limits eldership to men, and then he allows women to be deacons in vv. 8–13.⁴

The Trans-Cultural Grounds for Paul's Instruction

Paul grounds his instruction that women not teach or exercise authority over men in 1 Tim 2:13–15. And this grounding that Paul gives for this instruction is very significant because he argues in the same way against homosexuality. In Romans 1, Paul also appeals to the created order to argue against homosexual behavior, or really, to condemn homosexual behavior. He says that it's against nature (Rom 1:26). And here, in 1 Timothy 2 he's going to argue from the created order, from nature, to support what he has said about women not teaching or exercising authority over men.

Adam was formed first. So, in v. 13, Paul says, "For Adam was formed first." So this is the first reason that Paul gives as to why women should not teach men. Adam was formed first.

Now there are some who scoff at this, who think that this is not very good logic. There are

some today who say, "This is bad logic. That's no reason!" But those of us who believe that Paul was inspired should not make such suggestions. Paul, I believe, was a very careful, a very thorough thinker. Paul read Genesis 1–3 as Moses intended it to be read.⁵

So, when Paul says, "For Adam was formed first," there's a whole biblical theology behind it that says God created Adam, (and this comes out in 1 Cor 11:8), "to work the garden and keep it" (Gen 2:15). And then, he put Eve in the garden to help the man (Gen 2:18). So this statement, "For Adam was formed first" (1 Tim 2:13), is a shorthand for a holistic reading of Genesis 1–3 that sees Adam as the leader and Eve as the helper.

Adam was not deceived. God is a thoughtful God who thinks about what He does before He does it. And surely, if He makes the man first, there's a reason for that. And that's the way that Paul is reading Genesis. So "For Adam was formed first, then Eve" (1 Tim 2:13), and then in v. 14 he says, "and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor." Now this argument, I think, is Paul's way of saying that there was in the garden a structure of authority, and that structure of authority grows out of the fact that God had given the command not to eat of the fruit of this tree to the man (Gen 2:17). And then the man's responsibility was to communicate that charge to the woman. The man's responsibility was to keep the garden (2:15), which some suggest included keeping out unclean serpents.

So this statement that Adam was not deceived but the woman was deceived (1 Tim 2:14) is Paul's way of saying that Satan subverted the created order by approaching the woman. Satan did not fight fair! He deceived the woman. And then you'll remember that God's response to this is not to say, "Eve, what have you done?" But to say, "Adam, where are you?" (Gen 3:9). So God holds Adam responsible for what took place. And Paul, reading this correctly, says in Rom 5:12, "through one *man* sin entered the world and death through sin." So for Moses and for Paul and for God, Adam was the authority in the garden. He was responsible for the Fall. Paul cites this as evidence for why the woman

should not teach or exercise authority over men. It's a very strong biblical argument.

Saved through childbearing. And then Paul says in 1 Tim 2:15, "yet she will be saved through childbearing." You might look at this and say, "Well, that's a strange thing to say. She'll be saved through childbearing? What about the women who are barren, who can't have children?" Well, Paul continues, "She will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self control."

Those of you who have studied Paul at all know that he believes that justification is *by faith*. Justification does not come as a result of some meritorious work, whether it be childbearing or anything else. So Paul is not suggesting that women will earn their salvation by childbearing. I think what he's saying is, "Women, if you embrace your role as women, (and what he's done is picked the one thing that men cannot do!), if you will embrace your gender, women, and continue in faith, then gladly accepting whom God has made you to be as a woman will be *evidence* of your faith. And the grounds of your salvation will be your faith. The evidence of your faith will be that you accept your role as women, which includes the bearing of children.

Conclusion

In closing, let me draw your attention to what Paul urges Timothy at the end of his letter, in 1 Tim 6:20. He's given to him all these instructions about what godliness looks like, how Timothy is to instruct the members of the church to relate appropriately to other people given their station in the church, given their gender, given their age, and at the end of the letter, he says, "O Timothy, guard the deposit entrusted to you." And that deposit includes this letter. "Guard the deposit entrusted to you. Avoid the irreverent babble and contradiction that is falsely called knowledge, for by professing it some have swerved from the faith. Grace be with you."

Let's pray together: Father, I pray that your Word would be allowed to speak. And Lord, I pray that by your Spirit you would convict our hearts and give us gladness and joy to accept the treatment that Jesus

*promised we would receive if we kept his Word. And Lord, give us a winsome love for people and an ability to teach and rebuke and correct and to train with all patience and gentleness. Lord, we don't believe these things because we make them up or because we prefer them. We believe these things because you have spoken. You have revealed yourself in your Word. And we ask that you would give us the ability to guard the deposit entrusted to us. We love you; we praise you in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.*⁶

ENDNOTES

¹This sermon was delivered at a chapel service on April 4, 2007, at Northwestern College in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

²Andrew Coffin, "The Chronicles of Making Narnia," *World*, December 10, 2005, cover story [cited April 2007]. Online: <http://www.worldmag.com/articles/11336>. I am thankful to Eric Schumacher, on whose blog (<http://scripturealone.blogspot.com>) I saw this item.

³My attention was drawn to this by Elizabeth Vandiver's Teaching Company lectures on Virgil's *Aeneid*. Vandiver noted that Aeneas is often called "pious," and she explained "piety" along the lines that I have described "godliness" in this paragraph. Compare BDAG's entry on *eusebia*: "piety, reverence, loyalty [exhibited towards parents or deities], fear of God" . . . cp. Diog. L. 3, 83: the pious follow sacrificial custom and take care of temples; hence Aeneas is repeatedly called 'pious' in Vergil's *Aeneid*."

⁴I owe this consolidation of Paul's teaching to a comment made by J. Ligon Duncan III in his presentation at the Different by Design Conference, audio available online at <http://www.cbmw.org/Different-by-Design-2007>.

⁵See the discussion in James M. Hamilton Jr., "What Women Can Do in Ministry: Full Participation within Biblical Boundaries," in *Women, Ministry and the Gospel: Exploring New Paradigms* (ed. Mark Husbands and Timothy Larsen; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2007), 32–52.

⁶I wish to express my gratitude to my wife, who transcribed this sermon from the audio file.

Philip Payne on Familiar Ground

A Review of Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ:
An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters.*
Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009, 511 pp., \$29.99.

Thomas R. Schreiner

*James Buchanan Harrison Professor of New Testament Interpretation
Associate Dean, Scripture and Interpretation
The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology
Louisville, Kentucky*

Introduction

Philip Payne has studied and worked on the issue of the role of women in the home and the church for thirty-six years. It can be said, then, that this work is the culmination of a lifetime of study and represents his *magnum opus*. Those who are familiar with Payne's work will know that he is an egalitarian, and here he argues forcefully for an egalitarian reading of all the major texts in Paul. Payne's approach differs from William Webb's, for the latter endorses a complementarian reading of the major texts but argues on the basis of his trajectory hermeneutic that the application of the biblical text must go beyond the scriptural word. Payne never mentions Webb and contends instead that the biblical text from the beginning to the end supports an egalitarian reading. In Payne's view, then, there is no need to go beyond the Bible. In that sense he is an old-fashioned egalitarian, for he thinks a straightforward reading of the Bible supports his interpretation.

Much of what Payne says in the book is not new, representing arguments that he and others have made for many years. A multitude of arguments are given in support of the proffered thesis. It not surprising, then, that Payne concludes that the evidence supporting his view "is as strong as an avalanche" (462). Since most of the arguments

made by Payne have been rehearsed many times, I will interact with him throughout the review as I present his interpretation.

Influences on Paul

Payne begins the book by contrasting Paul to the Hellenistic and Jewish culture of his day, maintaining that Paul's view of women was more progressive. According to Payne, a progressive view of women was already present in the OT where women functioned as political leaders and prophets. They did not serve as priests, for female priests in pagan religions were associated with prostitutes and the Lord desired his people to be pure. Payne gives twenty (!) reasons why men and women were equal in both essence and role in Genesis 1–3. He rejects typical complementarian interpretations of Genesis 1–3. For instance, the creation of man first does not designate male authority because then animals would have authority over humans since they were created first. Woman being created as a helper (Gen 2:18) does not signify her subordinate role since the noun helper is never used of an inferior helping a superior. The naming of the woman is not determinative, for God grants both males and females rule over the animals, and Adam does not assign a proper name to the woman. The Lord calling Adam to account first does not imply

male headship since Eve was also responsible for her sin. Payne also considers Jesus' impact on Paul, for Jesus appeared to women first after his resurrection, treated women with dignity, and upheld their rights with his theology of divorce. Why didn't Jesus select female apostles? If he traveled with women, there would be serious moral questions raised about Jesus and the apostles.

Complementarians agree with Payne that women are equally made in God's image and likeness so that there is no ontological inferiority. Furthermore, we agree that women functioned as prophets in both the OT and the NT. Such a gift reminds us that women are gifted for ministry, and we must celebrate and promote their ministries in the church. Against Payne, it is quite significant that women never functioned as priests and that Jesus appointed only male apostles. Payne attempts to explain these omissions in the OT and Jesus' ministry by appealing to cultural and moral factors. But there were pagan female prophets as well, so it seems significant that the priesthood is limited to men. Male leadership cannot be established decisively from an all male apostolate in Jesus' day or from OT priests being male, but the pattern is suggestive, and it carries over to the NT where women served as prophets but never as elders/overseers/pastors.

Payne's arguments against indications of male headship in Genesis 1-2 do not wash. He fails to read the narrative on its own terms and in its canonical context. The creation of animals before human beings is a red herring. It is obvious from the narrative that human beings are the crown of creation (Gen 1:26-27) and in a different category from animals. Hence, the reader is invited to consider the significance in Genesis 2 of the man being created before the woman. The narrator wants to add another point here, which does not contradict the fundamental equality of men and women. The creation of man before woman signifies the headship of men. Such a reading fits with a canonical reading of the scriptures, for Paul appeals to this very order when he posits a distinction in role between men and women (1 Cor 11:8-9; 1 Tim 2:12-13). The woman being made as a "helper" fits the pattern of male leadership (Gen 2:18). It is true

that Yahweh often helps his people, but the verbal form of the word "help" is also used to designate a subordinate helping a superior (e.g., 1 Chron 12:1, 22-23; 22:17; 2 Chron 26:13), and so the use of the word "helper" does not rule out a subordinate role for the one who helps. One of the key principles of word study (which Payne too often ignores) is that words derive their meaning from context, and in the context, where woman is created after man, the word "helper" suggests that the woman was created for the sake of the man (1 Cor 11:9).

No one doubts Payne's contention that both men and women are to rule the world for God. The issue is whether there is more to be said. Contra Payne, the naming of the woman cannot be waved away so easily (Gen 2:23). The naming of the animals (Gen 2:18-19) and their classification represents one way that Adam exercised rule over creation. Payne says that Adam does not give Eve a proper name until after the fall (Gen 3:20), but how is that relevant? Surely Adam did not give the animals proper names either. He classified them as lions, tigers, and bears. He did not call the tiger "Tony"! So too, he recognized the uniqueness and distinctiveness of woman by calling her such, and hence expressed his leadership in the relationship. Payne says that Eve was also accountable for her sin. Quite right. But it seems that God coming to Adam first, even though Eve sinned first, supports the idea that Adam bore primary responsibility for sin. This fits with Paul's contention that sin is passed on to all human beings through Adam (Rom 5:12-19).

Paul's High View of Women in Ministry and His Theological Axioms

Payne considers women who served in ministry roles during Paul's day and highlights central theological axioms in the Pauline view of women. He argues that women were deacons (1 Tim 3:11) and that Phoebe was a deacon and even a leader of Paul (Rom 16:1-2). Priscilla is always named before her husband, and she taught Apollos and hence Priscilla's example demonstrates that women may teach men (Acts 18:26). Junia (Rom 16:7) is clearly a woman and is identified as an apostle, and since

she served as an apostle, no ministry is off-limits for women. Mary, Tryphena, Tryphosa, and Persis are commended for gospel ministry in Romans 16. Euodia and Syntyche were co-workers in the gospel (Phil 4:2–3). Paul also teaches that both men and women are equally made in God's image, that they are equally in Christ, and they are to submit to one another mutually (Eph 5:21). Since women have received all the gifts of the Spirit, and even have a gift greater than teaching (prophecy), they are free to exercise all the gifts, including leadership gifts. Payne argues that the requirement that elders be one-woman men (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:6) does not preclude women from serving as elders since the same logic would exclude single men or married men without children from serving as elders. Payne thinks it is significant that there are no masculine pronouns in 1 Tim 3:1–12 and Titus 1:6–9.

Complementarians would again endorse much of what Payne says here. Women are surely called to serve in ministry, which is a truth that we should all rejoice in and foster in our churches. The issue is whether they are called to serve as elders/overseers/pastors and should teach men. I would argue in due course that 1 Tim 2:11–15 prohibits women from teaching men and from the office of elder. The requirements for elders in 1 Tim 3:1–7 and Titus 1:6–9, including the statement that they are to be one-woman men, does not necessarily in and of itself preclude women from serving as elders, but it does fit with such a conclusion and hence accords with the whole of biblical revelation where men exercise primary leadership.

I agree with Payne that Phoebe was a deacon and that women served as deacons (1 Tim 3:11), but they never served as elders. Two qualities required of elders, i.e., ability to teach (1 Tim 3:2; 5:17; Titus 1:9) and the gift of leading (1 Tim 3:5; 5:17; Acts 20:28), are not required of deacons. The elders, not the deacons, have the responsibility for doctrinal purity and leadership of a church. The deacons are responsible for ministries of mercy and service in the church. It is significant that 1 Tim 2:12 prohibits women from teaching and exercising authority over men. Women are excluded from the two activities that distinguish elders from deacons

(teaching and exercising authority). Women can and should serve as deacons, but they should not occupy the pastoral office, which involves teaching and exercising authority. To say that Phoebe served as Paul's leader (*prostatis*) is quite improbable. The Romans are instructed to assist (*parastēte*) Phoebe wherever she needs help because she has been a "helper" (*prostatis*) of many, including Paul himself (Rom 16:2). The play on words between "help" (*parastēte*) and "helper" (*prostatis*) assists us in discerning Paul's meaning. Phoebe is commended here as a patroness who probably helped many with her finances. Paul is scarcely suggesting that she functioned as his leader or as the leader of the church. Paul even declared his independence from the Jerusalem apostles (Gal 1:11–2:14), and so it is impossible to believe that Phoebe was his leader.

Priscilla was clearly gifted in remarkable ways, and she did instruct Apollos, and hence men should be open to biblical instruction from women. Still, the import of the text is often exaggerated by egalitarians. Priscilla taught Apollos privately, not in a public teaching setting. Junia was almost certainly a woman, and Paul identifies her as an apostle. But even Payne says that she was a missionary. It is highly doubtful that she was an apostle in the same sense as Paul and the twelve. Ernst Käsemann rightly suggests that Junia's ministry in a patriarchal world was probably with other women, for "the wife can have access to the women's areas, which would not be generally accessible to the husband."¹

Payne rightly argues that men and women are equal in essence and one in Christ. But his view of mutual submission from Eph 5:21 should be rejected. It is most implausible that 5:21 functions as the thematic verse for the household code (Eph 5:22–6:9) for Paul is not suggesting that parents and children (Eph 6:1–4) and masters and slaves (Eph 6:5–9) should mutually submit to each other; nor is there any text in scripture that says that husbands should submit to wives. Of course, husbands are called upon to love their wives sacrificially, but this should not be confused with submission. Nor does the reference to prophecy prove Payne's thesis. Even though prophets declare the Word of God, the gift of prophecy should not be equated with

the regular teaching and preaching of God's Word. Paul teaches that prophecy involves the spontaneous reception of oracles from God (1 Cor 14:29–32). Such a definition of prophecy accords with the gift of prophecy in Acts. The Lord revealed to Agabus that a famine would spread over the world (Acts 11:27–28), and he also prophesied that Paul would be bound and delivered over to the Gentiles (Acts 21:10–11). These prophecies were not prepared messages but revelations that came spontaneously from the Lord. Prophecy and teaching are distinct gifts. Teaching involves the explanation of tradition, whereas prophecy is *new* revelation. As complementarians we rejoice that the Lord has given spiritual gifts to women as well as men, but the scriptures in their totality instruct us as to *how* those gifts are to be exercised. Women who have teaching gifts should exercise them with other women (Titus 2:3–5) and children (cf. 2 Tim 1:5; 3:14–17).

1 Corinthians 11:2–16

Head

Payne devotes nine chapters to 1 Cor 11:2–16, and hence his exposition is crucial for the argument of his book. Payne argues that the word *kephalē* means “source” in v. 2, giving fifteen reasons to support such a translation. For instance, the LXX only uses the word “head” as leader six out of 171 times. So, he concludes that Paul's readers would not have considered the meaning “authority over” since this was not a standard meaning in Greek literature. By way of contrast, he argues that “source” was a common meaning for the term “head,” arguing his case from a number of examples. Payne thinks that elsewhere in Paul's letters the word typically means “source.” In 1 Cor 11:3 “authority over” does not fit since unbelievers do not acknowledge Christ's authority, whereas “source” works since Paul thinks of the creation of Adam. Furthermore, if one adopts the meaning “authority over,” then Christ is subordinate to God and such subordinationism is heresy since it denies the ontological equality of the Father and the Son. Payne goes on to say that the reference to “God” in 11:3 and 11:12 refers to the “Godhead” and cannot be restricted to the Father.

He suggests the same reading in 15:28 so that subordinationist christology is precluded. The claim that God is the “source” of Christ in 11:3 refers to the incarnation. In the same way, vv. 8 and 12 teach woman's source from man, while v. 10 asserts the woman's authority rather than the man's. Finally, vv. 11–12 proclaim equality not hierarchy, showing that any notion of subordinationism earlier in the text must be rejected. Payne also maintains that this text does not refer to husbands and wives but men and women since there is no clear evidence that husbands and wives are in view.

I agree with Payne that the text refers to men and women rather than husbands and wives. Surprisingly, however, he does not interact with the alternative view defended by Bruce Winter. Payne's discussion of the word “head” does not advance the discussion. First, he underestimates the evidence from the LXX, for there are more than six instances where *kephalē* has the meaning “authority over.” The evidence of the LXX is crucial since Paul often cites it in his letters. Second, there may be a few examples where *kephalē* means “source,” but Payne actually gives very few examples (which are themselves debatable) to substantiate his thesis. By way of comparison Grudem has carefully sifted the evidence in three major articles, showing that the meaning “authority over” for *kephalē* is well attested.² Third, Payne's treatment of the NT evidence is singularly unconvincing. He suggests the meaning “crown” for Eph 1:22 and Col 2:10 where the meaning is obviously “authority over” since Paul refers to Christ's headship over demonic powers. Furthermore, it is clear that “head” means “authority over” in Eph 5:23, for the wife is to “submit” to her husband as the head (Eph 5:24). The call to submission fits perfectly with the idea that husbands are the authority over their wives. Fourth, *kephalē* may denote source in some texts (Eph 4:15; Col 2:19), but even in these instances, in accord with Hebrew thought, the one who is the source is also the authority. Fifth, to say that the term cannot mean “authority over” in 1 Cor 11:3 since not all acknowledge Christ's authority misses the point. Christ *is* the authority over all men even if they don't recognize it. Sixth, Payne says that 1 Cor

11:3 points to Christ being the source of Adam, but the text says that Christ is the “head of *every* man.” There is nothing about Adam in particular in this verse. Paul speaks universally here. Seventh, Payne wrongly charges those who think there are economic distinctions among the members of the Trinity with the subordinationist heresy. Such a charge represents a distortion and misunderstanding of those who see a role distinction between the Father and the Son.³ Eighth, the idea that 1 Cor 15:28 refers to “the Godhead” rather than the Father is rather strange and fits awkwardly with the idea that Christ submits to God. Is the verse saying that Christ submits to himself insofar as he is God? Such an interpretation seems quite improbable. To sum up, Payne’s discussion of *kephalē* is unpersuasive and should be rejected.

The Cultural Practice in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16

Payne argues that men are prohibited from wearing long hair (not veils or shawls), since in the Greco-Roman world long hair was considered to be effeminate and would suggest homosexuality, though surprisingly and inconsistently he defines “nature” (1 Cor 11:14) in terms of the “established order of things” (204). One would think that his arguments on homosexuality would lead him to see the reference to nature as similar to what we find in Rom 1:26–27. Perhaps Payne is right about the focus being on the length of hair on men, but he has a tendency to omit evidence that calls into question his conclusions. The exact same Greek expression used in 1 Cor 11:4 with reference to men (*kata kephalēs*) is used of Haman in Esth 6:12. Remarkably Payne never even discusses this text,⁴ which seems to refer to a covering of some kind.

Payne engages in a long discussion of the custom pertaining to women in 1 Cor 11:2–16. He argues that there is no evidence that it was dishonorable for a woman to pray without a head covering in Greco-Roman or Jewish culture. Paul’s statement in 1 Cor 11:15 demonstrates that the issue is hair rather than a veil or shawl of some kind. It was considered shameful for a woman to let her hair down loose, and hence putting up one’s hair on one’s head with “a clasp, hairnet, headband, rib-

bon, or some other utensil” (150) was required. Furthermore, the braiding of hair and the many portraits and sculptures of women from the Greco-Roman world where there are no head coverings demonstrate that shawls or veils were not required or common. Roman women would pull garments over their head in worship, but so would Roman men, so it is unlikely Paul has that practice in mind here. Payne thinks that Paul may be responding to Dionysian practices where women let their hair hang down loosely and engaged in sexual sin. In the OT an adulteress was required to let her hair hang down loosely (Numbers 5). Payne may be correct about the custom practiced here, though one’s judgment on this matter does not speak to whether complementarianism or egalitarianism is correct, so it is not vital to the main thesis offered in the book. Perhaps there is some truth in seeing a reference to both hair and a utensil that held hair up, since hair was held up on the head with something like a hairnet or headband. If this is the case, Payne’s reading of the custom could stand, and we could account for the emphasis on hair and on the use of some kind of device to keep hair up on the head.

Other Features in the Text

To say that woman is man’s “glory,” says Payne, means that she is his pride and joy (1 Cor 11:7). His reading here seems improbable. It is far more likely that the language of glory in the text is tied to the honor and shame language in the text, so that Paul teaches that women were created to bring honor to men. Strikingly, Payne says almost nothing about 1 Cor 11:8–9; he devotes only one page to it in nine chapters on 1 Cor 11:2–16! This is quite striking since these verses most naturally support a complementarian reading. Paul’s argument is not merely that men need a sexual partner different from them. What Paul says here is tied to the issue of the proper adornment of women and their being the glory of man. They are to adorn themselves properly because of the pattern of creation (1 Cor 11:8–9; cf. also 11:3). Woman came from man, and she was created for man’s sake. Therefore, they must adorn themselves and speak and pray in such a way that they do not violate male headship.

The meaning of 1 Cor 11:10 is difficult. Payne argues that women exercise authority over their head by putting their hair up, and they should follow this custom because angels are present when believers worship. Payne is probably right about the role of the angels in worship, and he rightly sees that the authority is related to women's adornment. But he waves aside too easily the idea that the authority on the head may be symbolic. What is worn on the head may function symbolically. For instance, in Rev 12:3 the seven crowns on the dragon's head symbolize his power (cf. Rev 19:11–12). Diodorus Siculus (1.47.5) refers to a statue of the mother of King Osymandias, "There is also another statue of his mother standing alone, a monolith twenty cubits high, and it has three kingdoms on its head, signifying that she was both daughter and wife and mother of a king" (1.47.5). The three diadems (i.e., "kingdoms") represent someone else's authority—namely, her father the king, her husband who was also a king, and her son who was a king as well.

Payne rightly argues that vv. 11–12 teach the fundamental equality of men and women in Christ, but he wrongly concludes that such teaching on equality precludes a role difference between men and women in vv. 8–9. Against Payne, Paul teaches both differences of role and equality of essence in these verses. Payne falls into the error of thinking that if a text teaches equality then role differences are precluded. Such a view, though exceedingly common among egalitarians, does not follow biblically or philosophically.⁵

1 Corinthians 14:34–35

Payne surveys various interpretations and argues that 1 Cor 14:34–35 is a later interpolation and therefore not part of inspired scripture. Payne insists the verses must be interpolated, for the disruption in the context is too severe for the verses to be original. Furthermore, only the interpolation theory explains why the verses were added after 14:40 in the Western text. Payne says, "It is not just that the interpolation is plausible; it is the only adequate explanation of the position of 14:34–35 in the entire Western text-type tradition" (228). No scribe, asserts Payne, would have moved vv. 34–35

after v. 40 if the verses were originally after v. 33. He also claims that we do not see such a large block of text moved to another location elsewhere.

Other evidence, says Payne, supports an interpolation. We find in Codex Vaticanus a distigma ("two horizontally aligned dots in the margin," 232) right after v. 33, pointing to an interpolation. Payne disputes Curt Niccum's contention that the distigmai probably originated in the sixteenth century, contending that fifty-one distigmai (including 1 Cor 14:34–35) match "B's original ink color" (235), and that the bars marking the text also indicate an interpolation. Payne appeals to the work of Paul Canart who argues "that fifty-one distigmai match the apricot color of the original ink of Vaticanus" (241). He concludes that the distigmai were original to Vaticanus or were added in the scriptorium very early.

Codex Fuldensis was corrected by St. Victor Bishop of Capua. Payne argues that a marginal note indicates that vv. 34–35 were not original. Furthermore, since vv. 36–40 are reproduced in the margin, they were intended to replace all of vv. 34–40, showing again that vv. 34–35 were interpolated. Another manuscript supports an interpolation according to Payne. In MS 88 v. 36 immediately follows v. 33, and the scribe inserted vv. 34–35 after v. 40. The double-slashes on MS 88 show, according to Payne, that MS 88 was originally copied from a manuscript that lacked vv. 34–35. Payne defends this interpretation because MS 88 is non-Western, and hence its inclusion of vv. 34–35 cannot be attributed to Western influence. Payne also posits that Clement of Alexandria's text of 1 Corinthians lacked 14:34–35 since he never cites these verses, and we would expect him to refer to women being silent. Similarly, none of the Apostolic Fathers cited these verses.

Payne argues that internal evidence points to an interpolation with a number of arguments. First, 1 Cor 14:34–35 contradicts 11:5 where women are encouraged to speak in church. Second, the verses interrupt the flow of Paul's argument. Third, the vocabulary is used in a way that does not fit the remainder of the chapter. Fourth, why would Paul command wives to ask their husbands at home

when their husbands may be unlearned and even unbelievers? Fifth, the reference to the law does not fit the Pauline pattern elsewhere, for no specific verse in the OT is specified, and Paul never appeals to an OT verse for the practice of the church. Sixth, Paul usually takes the side of the weak but here the weak are suppressed. Seventh, the similarity to 1 Tim 2:11–14 suggests that a later scribe modeled what was said here after 1 Timothy 2 but made the text more restrictive. The motive of the interpolation was to silence women in the church. A long interpolation is quite possible, given John 7:53–8:11 and the longer endings of Mark. Payne suggests that the gloss was added after the Pastorals were written, perhaps when Paul’s letters were collected as a codex near the end of the first century.

Payne argues vigorously for an interpolation, but at the end of the day his arguments fail to carry water. It should be noted, incidentally, that even if these verses are judged to be secondary, the complementarian case would still stand on the basis of many other texts. Still, 1 Cor 14:34–35 is part of the fabric of the biblical teaching, and the claim that it is not part of the original garment does not succeed. Readers should recognize first of all that the disputed verses are not missing from *any* of the manuscripts Payne discusses. The textual evidence is overwhelming for their inclusion in the original text. The verses are displaced in some manuscripts in the Western tradition, but they are not missing in any Western manuscripts. Payne asserts that no scribe would move the verses after v. 40 if they were original. But by moving the verses scribes would keep the verses on prophecy together (vv. 29–33 and vv. 36–38), and hence the displacement is not so astonishing, nor is it inexplicable. Furthermore, we must beware of overconfidence in explaining scribal habits. Scribes (or a scribe) may have had reasons for the transposition that are now obscure to us. Payne insists that the transposition here is unprecedented, but Jeff Kloha argues in a forthcoming work that there are other witnesses where verses are moved to another place such as we find in 1 Cor 14:34–35, and he argues that such displacements “occur in the same witnesses that move 14:34–35.”⁶

Payne’s argument from the distigme in Codex

Vaticanus has not been clearly established. I should note first of all that vv. 34–35 are *not missing* in Vaticanus. What Payne argues, however, is that the distigme points to evidence of an interpolation. Kloha argues that the “bars” point to the evidence of a new paragraph, not an interpolation.⁷ According to Kloha, the umlaut points to a textual variant, but what is most likely is that the scribe was signaling that *didaskō* followed *hagiōn*. Peter Head also critiqued Payne’s thesis at SBL in New Orleans (2009). Tommy Wasserman summarizes Head’s conclusion on the Evangelical Textual Criticism blog:

In conclusion: Peter presented a convincing argument that the distigmai were added late, probably in the 16th century as Niccum has proposed,⁸ based on the relative chronology of marginal features in the manuscript, and on a close match with Erasmus’ edition. In my opinion, this in itself does not entirely exclude the possibility that some of the distigmai were very early, but I do agree that Peter’s explanation is the more economical (Occams’ razor), so that only one explanation for the origin of the distigmai is necessary, regarded as one unified system.⁹

One of the primary planks of Payne’s argument, therefore, is severely undermined.

Nor is the argument from Codex Fuldensis decisive. Again, the disputed verses are in the manuscript. The issue is whether the marginal notations indicate that the scribe thought vv. 34–35 were interpolated. Both Niccum and Kloha maintain that the correction in the margin demonstrates an awareness that some manuscripts placed vv. 34–35 after v. 40.¹⁰ The corrections should not be interpreted to say that the scribe thought the verses were secondary. Payne’s arguments from MS 88 do not hold up either. Kloha points out that MS 915 is in the same textual tradition as MS 88. Significantly, 915 has features which make it impossible to conclude that 915 copied 88. What is important to note is that 915 also places vv. 34–35 after v. 40, but it lacks any notations that signal questions about the text. Since MS 915 is non-Western, the

idea that only Western texts place vv. 34–35 after v. 40 is falsified. In addition, Payne is too simplistic in thinking that Western readings could not be found in manuscripts that are non-Western since scribes read other manuscripts and sometimes inserted readings from other text traditions in the process of copying a manuscript. Kloha remarks,

What took place in 88 is easily described when we have knowledge of 915. The scribe wrote v. 36 immediately after v. 33, before he realized that the verses were in an unfamiliar position. He added a superscript double slash at the beginning of v. 36, as well as in the margin, to mark the location at which the verses should be placed. He then continued writing until the end of v. 40, where he placed a double slash both in the text and in the margin. He continued with vv. 34–35. This is precisely what stood in his exemplar, now known through 915. Payne had described this as a possibility before ruling it out.¹¹

I conclude that Payne's arguments from both Codex Fuldensis and MS 88 do not demonstrate the presence of an interpolation in 1 Cor 14:34–35.

When Payne appeals to the fact that vv. 34–35 are missing from Clement of Alexandria and the Apostolic Fathers, he relies on an argument from silence. Kloha points out that the verses are cited by Marcion, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Cyprian, and probably Origen. The argument from silence seems a bit desperate given the partial reference to biblical texts in the church fathers. The view that vv. 34–35 are interpolated should not be accepted on the basis of external evidence, for the arguments supporting an interpolation are untenable.

Payne's arguments from internal evidence are quite subjective and should be rejected as special pleading. First, the so-called contradiction with 1 Cor 11:5 can be resolved, for in 1 Cor 14:34–35 women are exhorted to quit interrupting the congregation with questions that contend with male leadership. Women are not prohibited from all speaking, but from the kind of speaking that under-

mines male leadership. Paul was careful in 1 Cor 11:2–16 to support women speaking when it was done in a way that was submissive to male leadership. Second, even if the verses are thought to interrupt Paul's argument, which is by no means clear, such "disruptions" exist elsewhere in Paul's letters. Nor with such a limited corpus is the argument from vocabulary valid. Third, Payne asks more from any text than is credible in saying that Paul would not exhort wives to speak with their husbands since some of the husbands might be unqualified. This kind of extraneous objection could be raised against just about anything in the scriptures, and it is quite surprising that Payne thinks the argument is worth stating. Payne's objection is easily parried. Either Paul assumes that all the wives have believing husbands or he generalizes and does not bother to state exceptions. Fourth, Payne's objection regarding the law is overly simplistic. Paul argues that the law is both abolished and fulfilled in Christ.¹² Elsewhere commands from the law are cited as authoritative (cf. Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14; Eph 6:2–3), and Paul appeals to the teaching of the law in general as well (Gal 4:21). Furthermore, Paul appeals to creation (the OT!) in 1 Tim 2:13 when he enjoins the women to be quiet in 1 Tim 2:12, so the parallel to 1 Cor 14:34–35 is quite remarkable. Finally, the notion that Paul supports the weak and hence would not write such words is remarkably problematic. Even Payne admits that what is written here is rather close to what we find in 1 Tim 2:11–14. Furthermore, Paul exhorts slaves to obey (cf. Eph 6:5–8), and hence commands are given to those who were "weak." I conclude that both external and internal evidence for an interpolation should be rejected, and therefore the verses are authentic. The text fits with what Paul teaches elsewhere. Women should be submissive to male leadership and should not speak in the assembly in such a way that male leadership is subverted.

Paul on Marriage

Payne argues that the call for wives to submit to their husbands is culturally limited, for Paul doesn't draw on creation in Eph 5:22–33 or Col 3:18–19. The Pauline resistance to hierarchy is evi-

dent in his call for Philemon to free Onesimus and for slaves to avail themselves of freedom if possible (1 Cor 7:21). The Pauline paradigm for marriage is mutual submission (Eph 5:21) and mutual love. The reciprocal pronoun “one another” in Eph 5:21 cannot mean that only some submit to others. The pronoun is comprehensive, so that all believers (male and female/slave and free) are called upon to submit to one another. The word “head” in Eph 5:23 means “source” since it is in apposition to the word “Savior.” Husbands, as the source of their wives, nourish and support their wives.

Payne rightly sees that Paul does not endorse slavery. Instead he regulates and modifies an existing evil institution. Nevertheless, it is quite unclear that Paul demanded Philemon to free Onesimus. Indeed, in 1 Tim 6:1–2 Paul exhorts slaves to serve their masters and does not command masters to free their slaves. It seems that Payne has a tendency to accept too easily readings that are palatable to our culture. He also seems to assume that if the pronoun in Eph 5:21 is reciprocal, then husbands should submit to wives. But this reading should be rejected, for as I pointed out above, does it also follow that parents should submit to children and masters to slaves? Some may answer in the affirmative, but such an interpretation betrays a modern mindset. Neither Paul nor any other biblical writer ever calls upon husbands to submit to wives, parents to submit to children, or masters to submit to slaves. Those in authority must love and treat well those who are under their authority, but they are never called upon to submit to them. I understand Eph 5:21 to speak of mutual submission in the church. As believers we are to submit to one another, but it does not follow from this that husbands should submit to wives. In other words, I agree with Payne that “one another” (*allēlois*) does not designate the submission of some to others, but it does not follow from this that mutual submission is enjoined for husbands and wives. Verse 21 specifies the need to submit to one another as fellow believers in the body of Christ. Such a calling does not yield the conclusion that husbands should submit to wives.

Payne’s support for the interpretation “source” is also flawed. He makes the mistake of thinking

that the word in apposition (“Savior”) demonstrates that the word “head” means source. But it also makes perfect sense to say that one’s “Lord” is one’s Savior. Other grounds are needed to determine the definition of the word “head.” Similarly, just because the husband as head nourishes and cherishes and supports the wife, it does not follow that the word “head” means “source.” Payne confuses function with meaning here, as if the former determines the latter. Once again, it makes perfect sense for Jesus as our master and Lord to support and nourish us. The arguments for “source” presented by Payne are not decisive. Indeed, the argument of the text tilts the other way. Wives should “submit” to their husbands because husbands are their authority, just as Christ is the authority over the church (Eph 5:22–24). Payne argues that the text on marriage is cultural since Paul doesn’t mention creation, but he fails to see that Paul grounds the marriage relationship in what is transcendent rather than in what is cultural. The mystery of marriage (Eph 5:32) is rooted in Christ’s relationship to the church. Astonishingly, Payne doesn’t even mention this interpretation, and so there is no reason for complementarians to be convinced by his interpretation of Eph 5:22–33. I should add at this point that Payne often fails to state, or addresses in a very cursory fashion, texts or arguments that support a complementarian view. Such omissions cast doubt upon the credibility of his own view.

1 Timothy 2:8–15

The Situation

Payne’s work on 1 Timothy 2 is not dramatically different from what is argued by many other egalitarian commentators, but it is the second longest part of his book. He devotes eight chapters to expositing 1 Tim 2:8–15. Payne maintains that the letter is authentic and that the key to understanding the text is to recognize that false teachers were threatening the congregation, and hence 1 Timothy should not be understood as a manual of church order. Women are prohibited from speaking because they were uneducated and purveyors of the false teaching (1 Tim 2:14). The terms used to discuss the false teachers, according to Payne,

encompass men and women. The reference to myths characteristic of old women also indicates that they were spreading heresy (1 Tim 4:7). Payne contends that 1 Tim 5:13 demonstrates that women were propagating the heresy. They were speaking out things that are not fitting, and the word *phlyaroi* in the verse designates an aberrant philosophy or teaching. The women were not merely busybodies; they were spreading the unhealthy teaching which was the object of Paul's concern.

Payne's arguments for the notion that women played a central role in spreading the false teaching come up short. Describing 1 Timothy as a manual of church order, as Payne suggests, does not fit precisely the purpose of the letter. It is directed to a specific situation, and yet what Paul teaches in the letter stems from his worldview and theology and thus is rightly used today for the life and practice of churches (cf. also 1 Tim 3:14–15). Payne does not emphasize this latter truth sufficiently. Even though Payne focuses on female false teachers in Ephesus, the only false teachers actually mentioned in the Pastorals are men (1 Tim 1:20; 2 Tim 1:15; 2:17; cf. 2 Tim 4:14). Paul does not concentrate on women spreading the false teaching. Instead, he focuses on their being *duped and deceived* by the false teachers (cf. 1 Tim 2:14; 2 Tim 3:6–9).

Some of the evidence adduced by Payne is quite strained. The reference to myths characteristic of old women (1 Tim 4:7) does not demonstrate that women were teaching the heresy. The expression should not be interpreted literally, as if women were actually propounding these myths. So too, if one is accused of propagating "old wives' tales" today, it does not follow that the person in view is necessarily female. Nor does 1 Tim 5:13 clearly designate that women were false teachers. Payne does not pay sufficient attention to the context and draws unwarranted deductions. Verse 13 emphasizes that the women were idle and busybodies, not that they were teaching falsely. Nor is it clear that *phlyaroi* points to false teaching. Payne's arguments here are quite weak. For example, in 4 Macc 5:11 the term modifies "philosophy," indicating that from the speaker's perspective the philosophy is foolish. But it does not follow from this that the

adjective itself denotes false teaching. Payne often makes mistakes like this in defining words. If I used the expression "foolish astronauts," it does not follow that when I use the word "foolish" in other contexts I am talking about astronauts. The women speaking what is not fitting (1 Tim 5:13), therefore, does not indicate that they were teaching heresy. The context indicates that they were involved in activities that were not productive. In the same way a mere reference to Satan does not prove that the women were actually promoting the false teaching. Payne thinks that the women were involved in false teaching because Hymanaeus and Alexander were handed over to Satan (1 Tim 1:20), and the women followed Satan (1 Tim 5:15), just as false teachers followed vain speech (1 Tim 1:6). But the parallels must be more specific and sharper to establish Payne's thesis. Human beings can turn aside to Satan in many ways, including sexual sin, gossip, false teaching, etc. We must be careful and discriminate in our scholarship, so that we do not claim to know more than is warranted. Perhaps women did spread the false teaching to some extent, but, if they did, Paul doesn't clearly tell us this. Payne seems too eager to prove his thesis, and as a result he relies on parallels and questionable exegesis (cf. his rather strange reading of "profess" in 1 Tim 2:10) to establish his conclusions.

Learning and Teaching

Payne emphasizes that the only command in the text is found in v. 11 where women are commanded to learn. Once women have learned sufficiently, they will be able to teach. A woman should learn quietly until they are instructed. The women are to be submissive to the truth of God's word, not to men or their husbands. The words "I do not permit" (*epitrepō*) in v. 12 do not represent a permanent command. The verb "permit" is regularly used to denote temporary restrictions according to Payne. It is illegitimate to derive from the present indicative a command that continues to be binding. Furthermore, teaching refers to an action not an office, and teaching cannot be limited to formal doctrinal instruction. Payne claims, e.g., that 2 Tim 2:2 refers to "personal discipleship" (326) rather

than formal teaching. The infinitive “to teach” in v. 12 is used broadly to designate any kind of teaching, and since women can teach according to other texts of scripture the prohibition can’t be universal here. Payne goes on to say that the teaching of younger women by the older women in Titus 2:4–5 shows that women can teach. The restriction to younger women does not show that women may only teach women since “purpose clauses are rarely exhaustive” (330), and Paul doesn’t say they can *only* teach women. Timothy was taught by his grandmother and mother, and there is no indication, says Payne, that this was limited to only his childhood (2 Tim 1:5; 3:14–17). We also see women teaching in Priscilla’s instruction of Apollos and in 1 Cor 14:26 and Col 3:16. Paul prohibited women from teaching in 1 Tim 2:12 because they were duped by and spreading false teaching and were uneducated.

Payne rightly says that women are enjoined to learn in v. 11, which complementarians also celebrate. Still, the emphasis of the verse is on *how* they learn, i.e., quietly and submissively. Women should submit to apostolic teaching, but that teaching is communicated by the elders/overseers/pastors, so Payne presents us with a false dichotomy. Against Payne, the present tense of “I do not permit” (v. 12) and the so-called intrinsic meaning of the term (as if the term itself denotes a temporary restriction) must not be pressed. Whether the command is binding long term must be assessed in context; it cannot be decided by the present tense of the verb or what the term means elsewhere. Payne piles up examples in an attempt to verify his view, but what he needs to do is to interpret the meaning of the verb in context. Payne’s discussion of *epitrepō* shows no indication that he is familiar with recent studies on verbal aspect. Since Paul grounds the exhortation in v. 12 in creation (v. 13), the injunction for women not to teach or exercise authority over a man cannot be limited to a specific situation.

Contrary to Payne, teaching in the Pastoral Epistles is the public transmission of authoritative material (cf. 1 Tim 4:13, 16; 6:2; 2 Tim 4:2; Titus 2:7). The elders especially are to labor in teaching (1 Tim 5:17), so that they are able to refute false teachers who promulgate heresy (1 Tim 1:3, 10; 4:1;

6:3; 2 Tim 4:3; Titus 1:9, 11). Payne thinks that 2 Tim 2:2 is just personal discipleship, but this probably reflects the popular evangelicalism of our day. What Paul has in mind is the correct teaching based on the apostolic deposit that should be passed on to the next generation (2 Tim 1:12, 14; 2:2).

Too often Payne seems too anxious to make his case, which doesn’t inspire confidence in his work elsewhere. For instance, even though Titus 2:4–5 says the older women should teach the younger women, Payne says that the purpose clause here is not exhaustive, and so men could also be taught by women. In the same way, he says that Timothy’s mother and grandmother continued to teach him when he became an adult. Does Payne really think these arguments are persuasive? His case seems even weaker when he advocates arguments like these, and it makes me less confident that he is right when I can’t verify what he says. Yes, there are contexts in which women can teach men. They can share informal instruction from the word in the assembly (1 Cor 14:26; Col 3:16) in the same way as all other believers. They can teach men in private settings (Acts 18:26), and they can teach women and children. But public and regular instruction is prohibited.

Oude in 1 Timothy 2:12

Payne also argues that the two infinitives joined by *oude* “express a single idea” (338). He argues from 1 Tim 2:12 that women are forbidden from “assuming authority to teach a man” (353). He contests Köstenberger’s study where the latter argues that the two conjoined actions or concepts are either both positive or both negative. Payne concludes that women are prohibited from assuming an authority that has not been delegated to them. Space is lacking to rehearse the evidence provided by Payne regarding *oude*, but Köstenberger has now responded to Payne, demonstrating that his analysis of the evidence is unpersuasive.¹³ Indeed, many egalitarian scholars have endorsed Köstenberger’s study. Köstenberger demonstrates that Payne’s study is not sufficiently nuanced, but he does not necessarily deny that the two actions specified in 1 Tim 2:12 may have a single coher-

ent idea. If there is a single idea, then the verse teaches “that women ought not to serve in authoritative church positions, whether by teaching men or by ruling (both functions are reserved for male elders)—two functions that are distinct yet closely related.”¹⁴ Seeing a single idea, therefore, does not clearly support Payne’s reading.

Authentein

Payne next considers the meaning of *authentein* in 1 Tim 2:12. He differs from both Knight and Baldwin in considering the meaning of the related noun in defining the verb. I do not deny that in many instances in Greek related nouns and verbs have the same meaning (see the comment on “help” above), but Payne needs to be careful, especially with a rare word, that he does not impose the meaning of the noun upon the verb. Payne insists that *authentein* does not mean “exercise authority” in Paul’s day and argues for the meaning “assume authority.” According to Payne, Paul teaches that women should not assume authority that has not been delegated to them. Space is lacking to interact with Payne’s study of *authentein* in detail. His valiant effort to wash out the meaning “exercise authority” is doubtful. Köstenberger’s study of the two infinitives comes into play here, and he has shown that both infinitives are *positive* in and of themselves in context. Paul prohibits women from teaching and exercising authority, which are in and of themselves good activities. It must also be remembered that words are colored by their context in taking on a shade of meaning. Hence, the word *authentein* in context could have a negative meaning (“dominate”) or a positive meaning (“exercise authority”). Assuming or taking authority is not necessarily a bad thing if one has a position of authority. The parallel with “teach” indicates that Paul refers to actions that are legitimate in and of themselves. Women are prohibited from teaching and exercising authority because such actions violate male headship.

The Appeal to Creation in 1 Timothy 2:13

Payne maintains that the “for” (*gar*) in v. 13 is illustrative rather than causal. Payne admits that

“for” may be giving a reason, but then says it is difficult to be certain what Paul is explaining. Nor, says Payne, is it clear what Paul is saying if he restricts women based on the created order, for elsewhere Paul argues for the equality of men and women. Furthermore, if Paul appeals to Genesis, how would this argument work since there was no need for preachers when Genesis was written? Payne concludes that woman should respect man as their source. Women should respect men and learn in quietness and should also show their respect by not promoting false teaching.

Verse 13 is a decisive verse, and Payne’s attempt to explain it is unsuccessful. Payne, like many egalitarians, throws up various objections to a complementarian reading. The difference between complementarians and egalitarians surfaces here. It seems that the logic of the verse is not hard to understand. Women are not to teach or exercise authority over men because of the created order. The Lord created man first to signify male headship in the church. Payne’s claim that there was no preaching in Genesis is irrelevant, for the order of creation communicates an abiding principle. When Payne says that women are to respect men as their source, he imports an idea that is not stated in the text. At the same time he washes away what the verse actually says, i.e., women are not to teach or exercise authority over men. The rock on which all egalitarian interpretations stumble is the wording of the biblical text. Scholars and lay people may voice many objections to the complementarian reading. But at the end of the day the complementarian reading is the most natural and plausible interpretation.

The Argument from Deception

Why does Paul mention Eve’s deception in v. 14? Payne argues that he does so because the women in Ephesus were duped by the false teaching. He argues that Adam’s sin involved deceit as well, but the point is that the serpent deceived Eve rather than Adam. Payne rejects the idea that women are more prone to deception than men.

Payne’s interpretation of v. 14 is on target in some respects but is not completely satisfying.

The verse does not suggest that women were disseminating false teaching, for to say that one is deceived is not to say that one is spreading error, but only that one is being led astray by it. Nor is it plausible to conclude that the women of Ephesus were banned from teaching because of a lack of education. Deception, after all, is not the same thing as lack of education, for the latter is remedied through instruction, while the former is a moral failing. Nor does it work to say that Eve was ignorant of the prohibition given to Adam. If she were ignorant because Adam failed to inform her of the command, then the blame would rest with Adam. On the other hand, if Adam distorted the command and did not explain it well to Eve, this would not fit with an injunction that encouraged men to teach rather than women. Surely Adam explained the prohibition to Eve, and it is difficult to see how she could have muddled it, since it is quite easy to understand what was prohibited. If Eve couldn't understand the command, then she was inherently stupid—which would explain why men should teach. But deception should not be equated with stupidity. Paul is not saying that Eve somehow lacked education or intelligence. He argues that she failed morally and was deceived by the serpent.

Saved through Childbirth

Payne rightly argues, given Paul's usage of salvation elsewhere in the Pastorals, that the salvation in view here is spiritual. A reference to safety in childbirth is also misplaced since Christian women are not promised physical protection when having children. According to Payne, the salvation here should not be understood either as preservation from Satan or being kept from taking on the role of men. He sees a reference to the birth of Christ, for Paul still has the Genesis narrative in mind and sees Eve "as representative of women in general" (420). A reference to the birth of Christ is possible here, but it is by no means clear that the incarnation is in view. If that is what Paul had in mind, he referred to it in a very indirect and unclear way. More likely, Paul promises women that they will be saved if they fulfill their role as women and continue in the faith. One obvious indication that

women are fulfilling their role is if they bear children. Paul does not teach that women must be married or have children to be saved on the last day (cf. 1 Corinthians 7). He selects bearing children because it represents in a concrete way that women are embracing their role as women.

Conclusion

Payne is to be thanked for the tone of his book, for he is fair and respectful (even though he feels very strongly about this matter!) with those with whom he disagrees. Furthermore, complementarians will be gratified to see his high view of scripture. I suspect that Payne's book will not have a great impact. Most of what he says is not new, and I have argued that his interpretations are unpersuasive at point after point. Surely he will convince some, for many in our culture today ardently desire egalitarianism to be true. But it will not hit the scholarly world like an avalanche. It is closer to being another drizzly day in Portland, Oregon.

ENDNOTES

¹Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 413.

²Wayne Grudem, "Does *Kephalē* ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59; idem, "The Meaning of *Kephalē* ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem; Wheaton: Crossway, 1991), 425–68, 534–41; idem, "The Meaning of *Kephalē* ('Head'): An Examination of New Evidence, Real and Alleged," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44 (2001): 25–65. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "*Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3," *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 52–59; idem, "Another Look at *Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3," *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 503–11.

³See Bruce A. Ware, "Equal in Essence, Distinct in Roles: Eternal Functional Authority and Submission among the Essentially Equal Divine Persons of the Godhead," *The Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 13 (2008): 43–58; Christopher W. Cowan, "The Father and Son in the Fourth Gospel: Johannine Subordination Revisited," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49 (2006): 115–35; Robert Letham, "The Man-Woman Debate: Theological Comment," *Westminster Theological Journal* 52 (1990): 65–78; Stephen D. Kovach and Peter R. Schemm, Jr., "A Defense of the Doctrine of the Eternal Subordination of the Son," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42 (1999): 461–76.

⁴It is not listed in the index, and I did not find a reference to it in his book.

⁵For the philosophical coherence of the complementarian view on this matter, see Steven B. Cowan, "The Metaphysics of Subordination: A Response to Rebecca Merrill Groothuis," *The Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 14 (2009): 43–53.

⁶The material from Jeff Kloha stems from a part of his thesis, which was submitted to Professor Keith Elliott at the University of Leeds. The dissertation is being published by Walter de Gruyter. My thanks to Professor Kloha for allowing me to see some of his work before publication.

⁷Cf. also Curt Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Corinthians 14.34–35," *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 244–45.

⁸For Niccum's view, see *ibid.*, 245–46.

⁹"SBL New Orleans 2009 I: Peter Head Putting the Distigmati in the Right Place Pt. 1" and "SBL New Orleans 2009 I: Peter Head Putting the Distigmati in the Right Place Pt. 2," n.p. Online: <http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2009/11/sbl-new-orleans-2009-i-peter-head.html>; and http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2009/11/sbl-new-orleans-2009-i-peter-head_22.html.

¹⁰Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts," 246–47.

¹¹See note 6.

¹²See Thomas R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993).

¹³Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12: A Rejoinder to Philip B. Payne," *The Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 14 (2009): 37–40.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 38.

Two Egalitarian Paths toward the Same Destination

**A Review of *Four Views on Moving Beyond the Bible to Theology*, edited by Gary T. Meador.
Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009, 369 pp., \$19.99.**

Ben Reaach

Pastor

*Three Rivers Grace Community Church
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

The scope of this book encompasses a diverse selection of hermeneutical questions—indeed, too many to cover in a book review. Therefore, I will begin by giving a brief overview of the four contributors and then focus mainly on the portions of the book that relate closely to slavery and the gender debate. William Webb, one of the contributors, is the author of *Slaves, Women, and Homosexuals* (InterVarsity, 2001). One of the fascinating things to see in this *Four Views* book is the interaction concerning slavery, gender roles, and Webb's redemptive-movement hermeneutic. It is most intriguing to see two egalitarians, William Webb and Walter Kaiser, present opposing approaches for their conclusions. Therefore, I will narrow the focus of this review to these topics. For a more general response to the book, see Thomas Schreiner's review in *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 13, no. 4 (Winter 2009): 88–90.

General Overview

The book consists of the presentation of four hermeneutical models, each followed by responses from the three other contributors. Following this section of the book there are three “reflection” chapters offered by Mark Strauss, Al Wolters, and Christopher Wright.

Walter Kaiser presents a principlizing model of biblical interpretation. A key aspect of this approach is using the Ladder of Abstraction, which Kaiser defines as “a continuous sequence of catego-

rizations from a low level of specificity up to a high point of generality in a principle and down again to a specific application in the contemporary culture” (24). He illustrates this by citing the Old Testament prohibition against muzzling an ox (Deut 25:4) and showing how Paul applies that principle to the matter of financially supporting pastors in the church (1 Cor 9:9–12; 1 Tim 5:18).

Kaiser then addresses various issues in order to demonstrate the use of a principlizing model. He discusses euthanasia, women and the church, homosexuality, slavery, abortion, and embryonic stem cell research. In each case he seeks to show that principles within the Word of God are sufficient for our instruction concerning these matters. There is no need to *go beyond* the Bible.

Daniel Doriani commends a redemptive-historical model for hermeneutics. The focus here is on the progressive development and christocentricity of the Bible. Doriani strongly affirms the authority, sufficiency, and perspicuity of Scripture and the need for interpreters to be both technically skilled and spiritually sensitive. On the matter of Scripture's authority he states, “If Scripture says something I do not prefer, then so much the worse for my preferences” (77).

Doriani discusses two specific ways in which one may go beyond the sacred page. First, casuistry can be used to answer questions that are not addressed specifically in the Bible. Quoting Thomas Merrill, Doriani defines casuistry as the

“art of resolving particular cases of conscience through appeal to higher general principles,’ especially when one must act at a time when principles seem to be in conflict or when a new problem has emerged” (100). Second, we must go beyond the sacred page by asking the right questions, specifically having to do with duty, character, goals, and worldview (103). Doriani applies this approach to issues such as gambling, wedding planning, architecture, and women in ministry.

Kevin Vanhoozer presents a drama-of-redemption model for understanding Scripture. This position is very similar to the redemptive-historical model, but with an emphasis on our role as performers in the theodrama that continues to unfold. We hold a script, but it is also incumbent upon us to improvise in response to the unexpected situations that we encounter. Vanhoozer applies his method to the theology of Mary and the contemporary issue of transsexuality.

William Webb advances a redemptive-movement hermeneutic. He begins his chapter by qualifying what he means by moving beyond the Bible. He states that in one sense “we should never move beyond the Bible for it contains the sacred and cherished covenant with the God we have come to love deeply” (215). By moving beyond the Bible he means moving beyond the *concrete specificity* of the Bible, or the *time-restricted elements* of the Bible, or an *isolated* or *static* understanding of the Bible (215). Webb discerns redemptive-movement in the Bible by comparing biblical commands with the cultural norms of that time. For instance, comparing certain Old Testament injunctions with the norms of the ancient Near East will reveal the redemptive spirit of the biblical texts. Thus, certain texts that may be unsettling to us are seen in a new light. They can be seen now as liberating and merciful against the backdrop of the cultural norms of that day. Observing this redemptive spirit in the text, we can then follow that trajectory forward into our culture and seek the ultimate ethic to which the Bible points.

Webb developed this position extensively in his book *Slaves, Women, and Homosexuals*, arguing that the redemptive-movement of the Bible points, on the one hand, to the abolition of slavery and

the full liberation of women, but on the other hand points to the continuing prohibition against homosexuality. In this essay Webb summarizes his previous points concerning slavery and also develops his hermeneutical model in relation to two additional matters: war and corporal punishment. He draws from material that he has been working on for two forthcoming books, both to be published by IVP. One is entitled *Brutal, Bloody and Barbaric: War Texts That Trouble the Soul*. The other book, which will deal with spanking / corporal punishment, is entitled *The Rod, the Whip and the Meat Cleaver: Corporal Punishment Texts That Trouble the Soul*. On this latter issue Webb critiques evangelical scholars such as R. Albert Mohler and Andreas Köstenberger for their pro-spanking stance. These scholars claim faithfulness to Scripture but do not actually follow the biblical guidelines for corporal punishment, says Webb. Instead, they ought to recognize the redemptive-movement of Scripture on this matter and consider the validity of using “exclusively noncorporal methods of discipline” (240).

Slavery and the Gender Debate

Now I will focus on a few of the points made by Kaiser, Doriani, and Webb that specifically relate to slavery and the gender debate. The fascinating thing to see here is the drastically different (and opposing!) ways in which Kaiser and Webb defend the egalitarian stance. Doriani’s complementarian position helps to highlight these differences. Webb believes we must move beyond the “concrete specificity” of the Bible in order to arrive at abolitionism and egalitarianism. Kaiser sees both of these positions inherent within the biblical statements themselves.

Kaiser, through an interesting word study, concludes that Gen 2:18 should read “I will make a power corresponding to the man” (Kaiser’s translation, p. 30) rather than “I will make him a helper fit for him” (ESV). He then offers this alternate translation as a possible explanation for Paul’s wording in 1 Cor 11:10, “For this reason, a woman ought to have power/authority [Gk. *exousia*] on her head” (Kaiser’s translation, p. 31). As for 1 Cor 14:33b–35, he says that it “actually comes from a letter addressed to Paul from the Corinthian church and

therefore is not normative teaching” (32). Then on the pivotal text of 1 Timothy 2, Kaiser suggests that Paul is basing his instructions not on the “orders of creation” but on the “orders of education.” He bases this on the fact that Paul does not use his usual word for “to create” (*ktizō*) in verse 13. Rather, he uses the word “to form” (*eplastē*), which can carry the meaning of “shaping or molding educationally, spiritually” (35). Therefore, “since the woman had not as yet been taught, she was all the more easily ‘tricked’” (35). Kaiser’s reading of 1 Timothy 2, then, is that women should be taught and then allowed to teach and exercise authority over men. Thus, one need not go beyond the Bible to see the principles of egalitarianism.

Kaiser also addresses the issue of slavery, drawing a sharp distinction between biblical debt slavery and pagan slavery. He surveys various passages in the Pentateuch and shows the gracious nature of these instructions in comparison with the slavery found in pagan society. Then he points to Philemon as a conclusive biblical statement against pagan slavery. “Alas, despite the clarity of Paul’s statements, many do not believe the Bible ever finally took a stand against all forms of involuntary, that is, pagan, slavery” (42). It is at this point that Webb will sharply disagree with Kaiser.

Doriani defends a complementarian reading of 1 Timothy 2. One must conclude that the prohibition in this text is either temporary (the egalitarian position) or partial (the complementarian position). Doriani seeks to show that the prohibition is permanent but partial:

Women should learn the faith and share their knowledge in some settings, as Paul says in Titus 2:4. But they should not become primary public instructors and defenders of the faith in the local church’s pastoral positions, as Paul envisioned them in his instruction to Timothy. This division of gender roles has been God’s design from the beginning. So there is no reason to go beyond/against the plain sense of 1 Timothy 2 if we seek Paul’s guidance for the role of women in the church (112–13).

Doriani also compares the question of gender roles to the issue of slavery. He acknowledges that “the Bible does make concessions to cultural realities,” noting that “biblical law regulates and undermines the institution of slavery but does not forbid it” (118). Male leadership, however, is no such concession. As Doriani presents in his survey of biblical history, the principle of male leadership is present throughout the Bible and not a conclusion based on “a mere heap of texts” (118). Earlier in the chapter he also appeals to 1 Cor 7:21, 23 and Philemon 11–21, concluding (less emphatically than Kaiser) that “Paul’s opposition to slavery is not stated in the form of a frontal assault on the institution, but he clearly wants Christians to avoid or escape it if they can” (83). He then makes the critical observation that the way the Bible addresses slavery and the way it presents male leadership are fundamentally different. They are not parallel, as Webb asserts (and also John Stackhouse, *Finally Feminist*, which Doriani interacts with briefly). Rather, “the parallel is between male leadership of marriage and parental leadership of children. Both are grounded in creation,” “continue after the fall,” and “are reaffirmed after Christ accomplishes redemption” (83).

Webb, in his responses to Kaiser and Doriani, uses a significant amount of space to critique their statements about slavery. He first takes issue with Kaiser’s stark contrast between biblical debt slavery and pagan slavery. Webb asserts, “Debt slavery was part of the pagan scene, and permanent chattel slavery was part of the biblical scene at least for non-Hebrew slaves” (65). His more important criticism of Kaiser has to do with Philemon. Where Kaiser sees abolitionism, Webb sees nothing of the sort. He presents seven arguments for a nonabolitionist reading of Philemon and then, in a move reminiscent of his book, asks, “What if I’m wrong?” with regard to one detail of his argument (68). It seems that Kaiser too simply finds a solution to the slavery question, and Webb presents it as overly difficult.

In response to Doriani, Webb’s criticisms are similar. He argues against the idea that 1 Cor 7:21 provides any support for abolitionism and reasserts the same concerning Philemon. For Webb

there is simply no way of getting from the biblical text to an abolitionist ethic without the use of his redemptive-movement hermeneutic. “These texts are not simply there to regulate society, as Doriani suggests. We need to celebrate the incremental redemptive movement of both Old and New Testament slavery texts and permit their underlying spirit to carry us to an abolitionist position—using a logical and theological extension of Scripture’s redemptive spirit found within the slavery texts themselves” (137, emphasis original).

It is interesting that Webb does not discuss any of the gender passages in his chapter. He does not want his hermeneutical model to be equated with egalitarianism, as he states in his response to Doriani. Webb claims that “there are leading evangelicals who endorse a redemptive-movement hermeneutic approach (contra Doriani) and yet maintain some sort of contextually configured hierarchy, generally of a soft or light version, for today” (133–34, citing Darrell Bock, Craig Blomberg, and Mark Strauss). Nonetheless, Webb has made his views clear in *Slaves, Women, and Homosexuals*, and it seems to be a fundamental aim of his hermeneutic to uphold egalitarianism and undermine complementarianism.

There are many things I sincerely appreciate about Webb’s work. He is helpful in raising difficult questions that require a sensitive response. He certainly gives any reader much to ponder concerning those potentially troubling passages of Scripture. In addition to this, it is Webb’s desire to provide skeptics with an apologetic for the Scriptures, an intention which is to be commended.

The way in which Webb’s system comes together, however, seems misguided. As Al Wolters points out in his reflection chapter, it is curious that, “according to [Webb’s] scheme, the same text can have contradictory meanings” (307). He is referring to 1 Tim 2:12, which Webb agrees prohibits women from teaching or having authority over men, at least in the “concrete specificity” of the text. But then the redemptive-movement of the text reveals that the opposite is the case: women are free to teach and exercise authority over men. Wolters says, “In this way [Webb] can have his cake (hold

to contemporary values) and eat it too (claim faithfulness to Scripture)” (307). This, I believe, goes to the heart of the problem with the redemptive-movement hermeneutic. Webb desires to root his egalitarianism in the text of Scripture, but knows he must avoid the exegetical issues that Kaiser cannot successfully tackle. Thus, he concedes the complementarian exegesis and then moves beyond the “concrete specificity” of what the passage is saying. I believe this move will unavoidably loosen one’s foundation in the text.

Doriani’s response to Webb is helpful in seeing the differences between the redemptive-movement hermeneutic and a nuanced complementarian reading of the slavery issue and the gender debate. The question is not whether there is redemptive movement, but rather how much. “We agree that there is movement in the teaching on slavery and that there is not movement on homosexuality; we disagree about gender roles” (260).

We will have to watch in the days to come to see if egalitarians will move in a unified way to adopt Webb’s approach, or if many will continue to advance the more “traditional” egalitarian approach represented by Kaiser. The two scholars find themselves on different paths as they seek the same destination. Which path will egalitarianism take into the future?

A Lack of Balance

A Review of Steven R. Tracy, "What Does 'Submit in Everything' Really Mean? The Nature and Scope of Marital Submission," *Trinity Journal* 29, no. 2 (2008): 285-312.

Heath Lambert

Assistant Professor of Biblical Counseling

Boyce College

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Louisville, Kentucky

I was a senior in college when I met my wife. I was in the middle of a very intense game of Catch Phrase when I looked up and saw a beautiful brunette with blue eyes whom I had never seen before. She was wearing a red sweater, drinking a Diet Coke, and as I stared at her agape she ended the awkwardness by saying, "Hi. I'm Lauren." Within two months of that greeting I knew I wanted to take care of her for the rest of my life. Not long after that, we were married, and two years after that we had our first child. At this point, the Lord has blessed our home with two sons and a precious daughter. All of that time I have been serving various churches in some pastoral capacity.

I mention that because, as a husband, father, and pastor, I resonate with much of what Steven Tracy says in "What Does 'Submit in Everything' Really Mean? The Nature and Scope of Marital Submission."¹ In his article, Tracy seeks to encourage Christians (especially complementarian ones) to think critically about the issue of abuse against women, the limits of a husband's authority in marriage, and the issue of practical guidance for a woman who is being mistreated by her husband or else being asked to submit in an area where she feels uncomfortable.

I resonate with Tracy's concerns because as a husband I have never harmed my wife, and the thought of hurting her—or of anyone else hurting her—is sickening to me. Likewise I have never abused my children and am committed to rearing my boys in a way that teaches them to care for and

protect women. We are also working to rear our daughter so that, by God's grace, she will be drawn to a godly man who will love her and care for her the way I do. As a pastor, I have spent many hours sitting in rooms with abused women (and men!) trying to minister the gospel of grace to people who are spiritually and physically broken by the sinful aggression of violent persons.

I hate abuse. I can feel my heart breaking whenever I read the kind of information presented by Tracy that, "One-fourth to one-third of North American women will be assaulted by an intimate partner in their lifetime" (287). Those aren't just statistics. Those numbers stand for real people with real lives experiencing real pain and danger from people with whom they are closest (Ps 55:12-15). Biblical complementarians must never allow themselves to be desensitized to such information. Biblical complementarians can stand with Tracy as we work and pray towards an end to victimization against the weak. In this regard, Tracy gets a number of things correct in his article.

First, Tracy obviously cares about women and wants to protect them. Such caring concern for women and the weak is something Tracy learned from Jesus (Luke 8:1-2; 10:38-42; 13:10-16), and we complementarians need always to be sure that we are learning the lesson as well. The command to love God and neighbor means we not only love, teach, and proclaim God's good structure for marriage, but that we love and care for the individual parties in that structure. We need to be certain that

we clearly articulate that part of the goodness of complementarian marriage is the biblical care it entails for persons in those marriages.

Second, Tracy wants to think practically about how to help hurting people. Biblical love is not a pipe dream. It is not a wished-for commodity. James speaks well of the lifeless faith that wishes someone the best while doing nothing to actually help them (Jas 2:15-17). True love will always translate into practical and specific care, and complementarians resonate with Tracy in this regard. We honor Christ when we ensure that our call for wives to avoid harm and flee danger is matched with careful, thoughtful, loving, and specific action plans for women who are in trouble.

Third, Tracy wants complementarians to think carefully about the misuse of their position. Tracy's comments about the abuse and misapplication of Scripture by evil persons who would victimize the innocent are well taken (for example, 285-86). We complementarians have done a very good job of defending against the secular assault on authority in marriage. We do well also to heed Tracy's reminder to defend against unbiblical abuses of biblical authority.

Fourth, Tracy rightly reminds that the authority of Christ limits the authority of husbands. Writers in the complementarian movement have done an able job of articulating this, but it is always good to be stirred up by way of reminder (cf. 2 Pet 3:1).² Complementarians should always remember—especially we husbands—that just as our wives are called to submit to our headship (Eph 5:23-24), we are called to submit to the headship of Christ (1 Cor 11:3).

So there is much to be thankful for in Tracy's article. As good as the contributions are, however, there are also some areas of concern. In fact, as helpful as Tracy's principles for the love and care of women are, his articulation of what submission really means is not as helpful as it could have been. Christians should be concerned that Tracy's attempts to help us think through this important issue may actually lead many women astray.³ The following are several concerns I have about Tracy's proposals.

First, Tracy does not make clear that the fail-

ure of a wife to submit is just as sinful as the failure of a husband to be a loving head. There are a few times when Tracy gestures in the direction of the biblical principle of headship but he never calls women to radical, Christ-centered submission. I understand (and am experiencing!) the constraints of a short article but this omission is unfortunate because it overlooks what the Apostle Paul clearly says. Our (good and right) motivation to protect women does not make it necessary to remove the force of clear passages of Scripture. Paul does say, "Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands" (Eph 5:24). The Bible does articulate exceptions to this clear rule that Tracy rightly notes.⁴ But Tracy should also be careful to note that the emphasis of Ephesians 5 is on comprehensive submission, and exceptions to this are what prove the rule. The concern here is that Tracy's zeal to protect women will create a situation where women are safe from all forms of wrong submission to their husbands but incur the displeasure of God because they hardly ever submit at all. Our concern for women will not count for much if we fail to protect them from sin and its consequences.

Second, Tracy does not make clear that the authority of Christ not only limits but also supports and strengthens a husband's authority. Tracy rightly notes, "Christ alone is the ultimate Lord of life, and Lord of the household. This concept in and of itself governs a husband's authority over the family" (299). Tracy is correct that the Lordship of Christ limits the husband's authority, but he misses the corollary truth that it is the Lordship of Christ that gives force to the command for wives to submit in Ephesians 5. Wives are called to examine the headship of Christ and then submit to their husbands in an analogous way. Quite frankly, it is unclear and unhelpful for Tracy to say that "husbands are not being identified with Christ [in Ephesians 5]" (304) since the clear purpose of Paul's analogy is to vividly link the headship of Christ to the headship of a husband in marriage. The concern is, again, that well-intentioned but misplaced zeal not keep us from seeing and submitting to the clear teaching of Scripture.

Third, in helping women seek to understand where they are not called to submit, Tracy uses imprecise categories. One example of this is when Tracy defines a violation of conscience as something that is “internally objectionable” (308). But, with that definition, few of us would ever submit to *any* authority. There are times when I find directives from the civil authorities, my superiors at work, and even God himself to be “internally objectionable,” but I submit anyway. In all honesty, there are times when I find prayer, Bible reading, and considering the interests of others “internally objectionable,” but I do it because I know it pleases Christ. Reading Tracy’s article, I could not help thinking that most wives would hardly ever submit if they had to overcome every internal objection. Tracy needs to be more clear that, in the context of Romans 14, a person violates her conscience when she does something that she believes to be *sin*. It is correct that husbands cannot ask their wives to violate their consciences and do something that they (rightly or wrongly) believe to be sin, but Tracy is incorrect that a wife should not submit if she has “internal objections.”⁵ Sometimes that is the essence of submission.

A second example of Tracy using imprecise language is when he places limits on a husband’s spiritual authority. Tracy says, “A husband has no right to dictate his wife’s relationship with Christ” (307). He defines what this means by saying, “A wife should not obey her husband if he tells her not to go to church or to a Bible study, forbids her from going to a counselor, pastor, or Christian advisor, or forbids her from spending time with a trusted friend” (308). As is his tendency in his article, his attempt to protect against abuses of the teaching of Ephesians 5 amounts to ignoring what the text actually says. In fact, spiritual authority is one of the main emphases of the Pauline teaching, “Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, so 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). Here Paul clearly teaches that one of the main ways that husbands are to

reflect the love of Christ is in loving their wives in a sanctifying way. This truth means that husbands must provide leadership in their wife’s spiritual life. Husbands are given the responsibility to lead in the spiritual realm so that their wives might look more like Jesus because they are married to them than they otherwise would. This will mean that husbands have a responsibility to encourage as well as control certain spiritual activities. A husband may not tell his wife that she cannot go to church since this would be asking her to sin (Heb 10:25), but he may tell her that she cannot go to a specific church that he believes to be spiritually harmful because of heretical teaching, unbiblical practice, or poor leadership—as well as other factors that we can imagine. A husband exerting wise, spiritual leadership could (and should!) limit his wife’s involvement with unbiblical Christian counselors and unwise and reckless Christian friends.⁶ Again, Tracy’s treatment here lets Christians down by being unbalanced, and therefore less helpful than it should be.

A third example of imprecision is when Tracy states, “A wife must not submit to her husband when obedience to him would compromise the care, nurture, and protection of her children” (308). Let me be very clear: I am not saying that husbands have the authority to harm their children. They absolutely do not. There are two problems with this statement though. First, it tends to assume the best of motives regarding a mother’s relationship with her children and the worst of motives regarding a father’s relationship with his children.⁷ Second, Tracy avoids the balanced truth that, though husbands may not sin against their children, childrearing is also included in a husband’s responsibilities to be a godly leader. Christians should be concerned that the combination of these two problems will encourage women to carve out their responsibility to their children as a unique area where their concern can trump their husband’s and eliminate headship.

Each of these imprecise categories has one thing in common: a lack of balance. Tracy’s intentions are commendable. He agrees with complementarians that wives must not sin in order to be submissive to their husbands, and so he tries to

carve out six specific examples where this is true. The problem is that in the examples listed here, he does not provide the biblical balance to the issues he addresses. His attempts at specificity often end up disconnecting exceptions from the larger context of a husband's authority. The biblical truth is the balanced expression that husbands do possess authority over their wives and so wives should submit to their husbands in everything except when doing so would be sinful because her supreme head is found in Christ. This truth means that husbands may not ask their wives to sin. Wives may not sin against Christ, against their husbands, against their children, against their own consciences, or in any other way. When a husband asks her to sin in any of these ways, she should respectfully decline and express a desire to submit to him whenever her submission to Christ allows her to do so. Biblical complementarians have done a better job of holding these two truths together than Tracy does in his article.

Christians who read Tracy's article should strive to have his heart for the protection of women and the weak. As true as that is, they should also work to articulate the biblical position of submission to authority more carefully than Tracy does. Doing so will allow Christians to be more equipped to protect women, to honor God, and to picture the gospel in marriage.

ENDNOTES

¹Steven R. Tracy, "What Does 'Submit in Everything' Really Mean? The Nature and Scope of Marital Submission," *Trinity Journal* 29, no. 2 (2008): 285–312.

²Examples could be multiplied, but a few are Wayne Grudem, "Wives Like Sarah, and the Husbands Who Honor Them: 1 Peter 3:1–7," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem; Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991), 194–208; Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More than 100 Disputed Questions* (Sister, OR: Multnomah, 2004), 490–99; Stuart Scott, *The Exemplary Husband: A Biblical Perspective* (Bemidji, MN: Focus, 2002), 75–83, 261–71; Russell D. Moore, "O. J. Simpson is Not a Complementarian: Male Headship and Violence Against Women," *The Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 12, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 2–6.

³At the end of his article Tracy gives six parameters for female submission (306–12). These six principles are the practical implications of what he discusses in the article and are what I am chiefly concerned to respond to here.

⁴Tracy is correct that "The Lordship of Christ in the Life of the

Believer" mitigates any human authority (Ibid., 297–301).

⁵I believe this is fundamentally the same point that Tracy makes in his first principle that, "A wife must not submit to her husband when obedience to him would violate a biblical principle (not just a direct biblical statement)." See Ibid., 306. This statement is also less clear than the Bible's own teaching in Rom 14:23, "Whatever does not proceed from faith is sin." A husband may not ask his wife to submit when to do so would violate her conscience.

⁶I once counseled a couple where the wife was spending time with her younger, divorced best friend. This friend was encouraging the man's wife to commit adultery and to pursue divorce so she could be "more free." Her husband would have been a poor spiritual leader indeed if he had failed to put his foot down about his wife spending time with such a one.

⁷Even when we consider the sobering abuse statistics cited by Tracy, it is important to note that most fathers will care for and not abuse their children.

Insightful but Flawed Look at Gospel Women

A Review of Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*.
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002. 364 pp. \$25.00

Owen Strachan

Managing Director

Carl F. H. Henry Center for Theological Understanding

Assistant Director, Jonathan Edwards Center

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Deerfield, Illinois

Richard Bauckham, emeritus professor of New Testament studies and Bishop Wardlaw Professor at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland, is a recognized expert in New Testament studies, having written well-regarded works on Revelation, the New Testament canon, and the testimony about Jesus.

Bauckham published his *Gospel Women* eight years ago. The text takes shape in eight chapters that generally tackle the role the named women of the Gospels played in the events of their day, though the chapters meander into other discussions—extrabiblical literature, the veracity of the Gospel accounts, and the structure of the texts, among others.

Chapter one covers how Ruth functions as a “Key to Gynocentric Reading of Scripture.” Bauckham expresses appreciation for feminist scholarship, which in his judgment has “made the women in the Gospels visible simply by attending to the evidence of the texts that generations of male scholars had (to put it charitably) not found very interesting or had not thought significant enough to deserve their labors” (xiii). Bauckham’s study is clearly a needed one.

Bauckham notes that his essays are “quite eclectic” and signals his intention to engage both “intertextuality” and “the distinction between androcentric and gynocentric perspectives in narratives,” which seem a good deal less obvious than Bauckham thinks (xvii, xix). His study, he says, has

caused him to realize that while “the Gospels are primarily the story of Jesus,” they also comprise “the stories of many individuals who encountered him and followed him” (xvii).

From there, Bauckham proceeds to analyze the “Gentile Foremothers of the Messiah” in chapter two. He looks into possible reasons for the inclusion of Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the wife of Uriah in the genealogy of Matt 1:1–17. He concludes the chapter by noting that Jesus functions as a New Joshua to the Canaanite woman of Matthew 15 and Mark 7, a nice theological insight (44–46).

In chapter three, Bauckham looks at Elizabeth and Mary from Luke 1. He argues that Luke 1:5–80 is, contrary to many of Scripture’s “androcentric narratives,” written in a “gynocentric” perspective (47). The exact makeup of this kind of text, it seems to me, is not immediately clear despite the discussion on 48. As he promised to do in chapter one, Bauckham zips through the canon, finding profitable connections between Hannah and Mary, for example.

Anna of the tribe of Asher occupies his focus in chapter four. Bauckham undertakes significant historical spade-work in this section as he attempts to ascertain where first-century Asherites—presumably one of the ten lost tribes—resided (short answer: Jerusalem). Bauckham incisively suggests that exegetes should not gloss over Anna’s Asherite status, which “ensures that the community represented in the narrative is Israel as a whole, northern

tribes as well as southern, exiles as well as inhabitants of the land” (98).

Chapter five, “Joanna the Apostle,” features more controversial fare. He develops the thesis that Joanna of Luke 8:3 and 24:10 was an apostle and not merely a disciple. Despite the scarce material on Joanna and other women disciples in the biblical text, Bauckham argues with considerable force that to assert that “the women cooked the meals, washed the dishes, and mended the clothes” is misguided (114). Bauckham’s language grows even stronger when he makes a case for Joanna being the Junias of Rom 16:7 and thus an apostle. He spends considerable effort in mounting a refutation of a 2001 *New Testament Studies* article by M. H. Burer and D. B. Wallace (who followed John Piper and Wayne Grudem) entitled “Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom. 16:7.” The discussion is technical and detailed, but ultimately Bauckham’s claim seems to rest on highly disputable evidence.

Bauckham studies “Mary of Clopas” in chapter six. Essentially nothing is known about this woman, so Bauckham attempts to figure out who Clopas was. He concludes that Mary was most likely the wife of Clopas (207). On this basis he asserts that Mary’s son was Simon or Simeon of Clopas, “the most important Christian leader in Palestine for half a century.” (209)

In chapter seven, Bauckham looks at Salome of Mark 15:40 and 16:1. He notes that Salome is a mysterious figure whose identity is developed in extrabiblical literature like *The Secret Gospel of Mark*. In some works (the *Pistis Sophia*, for example), Salome converses with Jesus. In others, like *Secret Mark*, she is enigmatically turned away by Jesus (247). The tour of the extracanonical literature is engrossing, even fascinating, though it seems to yield little rock-solid conclusion about the identity of Salome.

Chapter eight, “The Women and The Resurrection: The Credibility of Their Stories,” works through various issues related to the inclusion and exclusion of the post-resurrection testimony by female followers of Christ. Bauckham presents several helpful charts to diagram distinctions between

the Gospels and extracanonical sources. He helpfully points out that the (five) women named did not simply witness the resurrection and fade into the background, but “were well-known figures” in the post-resurrection Christian community (295). He seems to over-reach, however, when he argues that “what we have in the Gospel stories in which they appear is the textualized form of the stories they themselves told” (303). As he often does, he qualifies this strong claim a few sentences later, leaving the reader wondering how tensile the claim is.

Gospel Women is an engaging analysis of unjustly unstudied women. Bauckham has done valuable work in looking further into the stories of the women named in the Gospels (and a few others besides). His grasp of biblical history and extrabiblical literature is impressive; his exegesis is lively and creative; and he drops many rich insights along the way, a number of them already discussed.

However, it must also be said that in the judgment of this young reviewer, Bauckham often lets possible conclusions assume the place of proven ones. Though he generally holds pretty strong on the veracity of the text, Bauckham does reveal a penchant for adopting nontraditional and even unscriptural positions, as seen above in the matter of Junias’s identity. His desire to be needlessly unbounded by tradition—a sound desire, in theory—seems in practice to skew him in favor of what one could call the more generous conclusion. Finally, while one can glean insights from a variety of sources, and while his interaction with feminist scholars is not uncritical, his admiration for womanist hermeneutics and “gynocentric” readings of Scripture is problematic.

For these reasons, this often helpful text becomes one that the reader must work through with discernment and a sharp eye. It is difficult to write it off, but it is also difficult to recommend it unreservedly. Perhaps it is best to read it with a good deal of care—mining the good, chewing on the unproven, remaining aware of the flaws, standards that any writing, whether on so profitable a subject as the women of the Gospels or any other, deserves.

Fatherhood Is No Accident

Michael Lewis. *Home Game: An Accidental Guide to Fatherhood*.
New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2008, 190 pp. \$23.99.

Phillip R. Bethancourt

Director of Academic Advising and Research Doctoral Studies
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, Kentucky

In an age of abortion-on-demand and home DNA paternity tests, accidental fatherhood is not a new idea. But what about an accidental guide to fatherhood? That is precisely what best-selling author Michael Lewis seeks to offer in his book *Home Game: An Accidental Guide to Fatherhood*. Lewis has written on the economics of banking (*Liar's Poker*) and baseball (*Moneyball*), but this time he focuses on the economics of the home.

In *Home Game*, Lewis adapts articles written online for *Slate* magazine and weaves a tale of the experience of the American dad. He chronicles the eventful and, at times, overwhelming task of raising three children with his third wife, former actress Tabitha Soren. Though Lewis is a secular author, and the work contains some vulgarity in both its word choice and its subject matter, *Home Game* offers a window into the common American male's view of fatherhood that can help evangelicals evaluate the status of fatherhood in the church.

Several themes that shape Lewis's portrayal of American fathers can frame an appraisal of evangelical fatherhood. First, *Home Game* presents a noticeable, though inconsistent, pro-family message. The pro-family nature of the work should come as no surprise considering that Lewis penned the adoption-friendly book *Blind Side*, which later became a hit movie. Lewis recognizes that raising a child "especially when you don't want to, is transformative" (78). Yet, Lewis is pro-family in the same way many evangelicals are pro-life—enamored with the abstract theory but inconvenienced by the daily reality. As churches continue to develop men

as godly fathers, it is essential for them to instill the importance of consistency in this high calling.

Second, *Home Game* wrestles with the great expectations cast on the current generation of American dads. Lewis regards the present as the "Dark Age of Fatherhood" in which no established standard of behavior exists (10–11). Fathers endure a "persistent and disturbing gap" between what they are supposed to feel and what they actually feel about fatherhood (14). The result for many fathers, including Lewis, is that they respond to increased expectation by feeling bitter rather than blessed. Though expectations may shift in the culture, the Bible presents Christian fathers with an unwavering call not only to see fatherhood as a blessing but also to love their children as their heavenly Father loves them.

Third, *Home Game* reveals the guilt that accompanies contemporary fatherhood. Lewis races to the hospital as his three-month-old son fights for his life, and he is ravaged with guilt as he realizes he has changed only seven out of 600 diapers and skipped over 600 "daddyless" meals (156–57). Throughout the memoir, guilt serves as a primary motivation for his efforts at fatherhood. Yet, it raises the question, how many fathers in our churches are driven by guilt more than grace in their approach to fatherhood? Gospel-centered parenting must not be grounded in the guilt of failing to meet expectations but in the grace of being united with our victorious savior.

Fourth, *Home Game* evidences the immaturity and passivity that impoverishes the leadership of

many fathers. As Lewis laments the pressure for adults to have a defined purpose in life (24), he shows how fatherhood is at odds with the pursuit of perpetual adolescence glamorized in Hollywood. At the same time, he touts his passivity as a “gift for avoiding unpleasant chores without attracting public notice” (9). The allure of male passivity is as old as Eden itself. For evangelical fathers to lead and provide for their families, they must resist the temptation toward the culturally-permissible immaturity that Lewis exemplifies in his fathering.

Fifth, Lewis criticizes the consumeristic American parenting sub-culture. In addition to the relentless attempt to market products to paranoid parents, he notices a tendency in parenting literature to “gloss over the unpleasant aspects of parenthood” (66). Furthermore, he claims that “experts on child rearing, and books on fatherhood” fill the void whenever life experience is not shared between generations (187). Implicit in these statements is a refreshing call to the church to address the issue of fatherhood as a central aspect of male discipleship. When wisdom about fatherhood is passed down between generations, it can help to keep evangelicals from outsourcing the raising of their children.

The primary benefit of *Home Game* is not a Hebrews 12-like guide to godly fatherhood but a Romans 1-like insight into the common cultural mindset towards child-rearing. Those who read Lewis’s book will not only laugh out loud at his portrayal of parenting situations all of us have faced but also despair at his impoverished view of fatherhood. Though *Home Game* lacks some of the intentional insight found in Lewis’s other writings, it raises helpful issues for evangelicals to reconsider. In the end, it reminds the church of its call to raise up men to lead, provide, and protect so that fatherhood is no accident.

THE DANVERS STATEMENT

BASED ON OUR UNDERSTANDING OF BIBLICAL TEACHINGS, WE AFFIRM THE FOLLOWING:

1. Both Adam and Eve were created in God's image, equal before God as persons and distinct in their manhood and womanhood (Gen. 1:26-27, 2:18).

2. Distinctions in masculine and feminine roles are ordained by God as part of the created order, and should find an echo in every human heart (Gen. 2:18, 21-24; 1 Cor. 11:7-9; 1 Tim. 2:12-14).

3. Adam's headship in marriage was established by God before the Fall, and was not a result of sin (Gen. 2:16-18, 21-24, 3:1-13; 1 Cor. 11:7-9).

4. The Fall introduced distortions into the relationships between men and women (Gen. 3:1-7, 12, 16).

- In the home, the husband's loving, humble headship tends to be replaced by domination or passivity; the wife's intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility.

- In the church, sin inclines men toward a worldly love of power or an abdication of spiritual responsibility and inclines women to resist limitations on their roles or to neglect the use of their gifts in appropriate ministries.

5. The Old Testament, as well as the New Testament, manifests the equally high value and dignity which God attached to the roles of both men and women (Gen. 1:26-27, 2:18; Gal. 3:28). Both Old and New Testaments also affirm the principle of male headship in the family and in the covenant community (Gen. 2:18; Eph. 5:21-33; Col. 3:18-19; 1 Tim. 2:11-15).

6. Redemption in Christ aims at removing the distortions introduced by the curse.

- In the family, husbands should forsake harsh or selfish leadership and grow in love and care for their wives; wives should forsake resistance to their husbands' authority and grow in willing, joyful submission to their husbands' leadership (Eph. 5:21-33; Col. 3:18-19; Titus 2:3-5; 1 Pet. 3:1-7).

- In the church, redemption in Christ gives men and women an equal share in the blessings of salvation; nevertheless, some governing and teaching roles within the church are restricted to men (Gal. 3:28; 1 Cor. 11:2-16; 1 Tim. 2:11-15).

7. In all of life Christ is the supreme authority and guide for men and women, so that no earthly submission—domestic, religious, or civil—ever

implies a mandate to follow a human authority into sin (Dan. 3:10-18; Acts 4:19-20, 5:27-29; 1 Pet. 3:1-2).

8. In both men and women a heartfelt sense of call to ministry should never be used to set aside biblical criteria for particular ministries (1 Tim. 2:11-15, 3:1-13; Titus 1:5-9). Rather, biblical teaching should remain the authority for testing our subjective discernment of God's will.

9. With half the world's population outside the reach of indigenous evangelism; with countless other lost people in those societies that have heard the gospel; with the stresses and miseries of sickness, malnutrition, homelessness, illiteracy, ignorance, aging, addiction, crime, incarceration, neuroses, and loneliness, no man or woman who feels a passion from God to make His grace known in word and deed need ever live without a fulfilling ministry for the glory of Christ and the good of this fallen world (1 Cor. 12:7-21).

10. We are convinced that a denial or neglect of these principles will lead to increasingly destructive consequences in our families, our churches, and the culture at large.



2825 Lexington Road • Box 926
Louisville, KY 40280

NON PROFIT ORG
US POSTAGE PAID
LOUISVILLE, KY
PERMIT #1545