

Table of Contents

- 2** **Editor's Column**
Bruce A. Ware
- 3** **Executive Director's Column**
Randy Stinson
- 4** **Was Junia Really an Apostle?**
A Reexamination of Romans 16:7
Daniel B. Wallace and Michael H. Burer
- 12** **Does the Father Submit to the Son?**
A Critique of Royce Gruenler
Randy Stinson
- 18** **Overview of *Two Views on Women in Ministry***
Todd L. Miles
- 24** **Review of *Two View on Women in Ministry***
Thomas R. Schreiner
- 31** **The Way It Is — A Sermon on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16**
James Merritt
- 35** **Annotated Bibliography for Gender Related Books in 2000**



THE JOURNAL FOR BIBLICAL MANHOOD AND WOMANHOOD

is a biannual publication of The
Council on Biblical Manhood
and Womanhood

JOURNAL STAFF

Editor

Bruce A. Ware

Managing Editor

Rob Lister

Assistant Managing Editor

Todd L. Miles

Layout and Design

Jared Hallal

CBMW

President

Bruce A. Ware

Vice President

Wayne A. Grudem

Executive Director

Randy Stinson

Editorial Correspondence JBMW

Attn: Bruce A. Ware

journal@cbmw.org

Orders and Subscriptions

Single issue price \$10.00. Subscriptions available at \$15.00 per year. Canadian Subscriptions \$20.00 per year. International Subscriptions \$25.00 per year. Ten or more copies to the same address, \$12.00 per year.

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)

The purpose 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 and the National Association of Evangelicals.

Editor's Column



Bruce A. Ware
President, Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood;
Senior Associate Dean,
School of Theology
Professor of Christian Theology
The Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary
Louisville, Kentucky

Clearly the work of CBMW is vital. No one could rightly say that the question of the nature of manhood and womanhood is of marginal importance to our culture or to the Church. And within this question, such deeply troubling proposals are being offered. What is needed now, more than ever before in the history of the Church, is clear, biblical, faithful, relevant guidance in regard to a set of gender issues over which much is at stake.

To the end, then, of offering greater clarity and biblical fidelity on some matters that are important to a correct understanding of gender, we are very pleased to be able to present in this issue of *JBMW* what we believe to be a rich offering of fine contributions. Daniel Wallace and Michael Burer offer a scholarly and insightful reexamination of Romans 16:7. Some egalitarians have suggested that this verse contributes weighty evidence for their view that women, with men, may hold any ecclesial position, since in most translations Junia is referred to as an apostle. Wallace and Burer give substantive reason to think this is not what the apostle Paul intended. Their argumentation is compelling, and we invite readers to think deeply and afresh about this text. CBMW's executive director, Randy Stinson, offers a very fine interaction with and refutation of another common egalitarian view, that the Son's submission to the Father was limited only to his incarnational mission. *JBMW's* previous issue (6.1) dealt at length with a correct

understanding of the Trinity and its relation to male headship, and here Stinson interacts particularly with Royce Gruenler's proposal, showing that Jesus' submission to the Father exhibits an enduring Father-Son relationship. Authority and submission are rooted in the God-head, and this pattern finds its expression in male-female relationships.

A highlight of this issue is our focus on a new book, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, published by Zondervan. Todd Miles offers a very careful, yet brief, overview of this volume, endeavoring to represent as faithfully as possible the positions of its various contributors. Following Miles' summary, Thomas Schreiner (one of the contributors to the Zondervan book) presents a point-by-point review of the argumentation, particularly, of the book's egalitarian contributors. Readers will find Schreiner's article a virtual summary of solid complementarian responses to the most common egalitarian arguments.

We are pleased to offer a fine sermonic defense of the complementarian commitment to male-female equality of *person* with differentiation of *position*. James Merritt, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, navigates through 1 Cor. 11:2-16 and shows well how to balance these two crucial truths.

Literature on gender matters, and specifically on the nature of manhood and womanhood, continues to grow. As readers of *JBMW* will know, in the previous issue (Vol. 6, No. 1, Spring 2001) we began a major new feature in which we provide for our readers a substantial annotated bibliography of the past year's *journal articles* (listed and annotated in the *spring issue* each year), and of the past year's *books* (listed and annotated in the *fall issue* each year), that deal with issues of gender. In this fall 2001 issue, then, we include a lengthy listing and annotation of books published within the broad Christian faith (i.e., Catholic and mainline Protestant, as well as evangelical) in the year 2000 on matters of manhood and womanhood, manifesting both the depth of interest on this web of issues as well as the range of opinion among those of us who would use the name "Christian" to describe our own commitment. Special thanks goes to Todd Miles and Rob Lister for their careful and diligent work to provide this resource.

Our constant hope and prayer is that this journal would be used by the Lord to inspire his people to greater and stronger fidelity to Him and to the clear guidelines and commandments of His word. May our lives as men and women reflect God's good design, and may *JBMW* be used, by God's grace, toward this end. ■

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Donald Balasa
 S. M. Baugh
 Timothy B. Bayly
 James Borland
 Austin Chapman
 Jack Cottrell
 J. Ligon Duncan, III
 Steve Farrar
 Mary Farrar
 Wayne A. Grudem
 Daniel Heimbach

H. Wayne House
 Elliott Johnson
 Peter Jones
 Rebecca Jones
 Mary Kassian
 Heather King
 George W. Knight, III
 Robert Lewis
 C. J. Mahaney
 R. Albert Mohler, Jr.
 Dorothy Patterson
 John Piper

James A. Stahr
 Bruce A. Ware
 Stu Weber

BOARD OF REFERENCE

Danny Akin
 Gary Almy
 Gleason Archer
 Hudson T. Armerding
 Wallace Benn
 Tal Brooke
 Harold O. J. Brown

Edmund Clowney
 Nancy Leigh DeMoss
 Lane T. Dennis
 Thomas R. Edgar
 Jerry Falwell
 John Frame
 Paul Gardner
 W. Robert Godfrey
 Bill H. Haynes
 Carl F. H. Henry
 David M. Howard
 R. Kent Hughes

James B. Hurley
 S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.
 Paul Karleen
 Charles & Rhonda Kelley
 D. James Kennedy
 Beverly LaHaye
 Gordon R. Lewis
 Crawford & Karen Lorits
 Erwin Lutzer
 John F. MacArthur, Jr.
 Connie Marshner
 Richard Mayhew

Marty Minton
 J. P. Moreland
 J. Stanley Oakes
 Stephen F. Olford
 Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr.
 J. I. Packer
 Paige Patterson
 Dennis & Barbara Rainey
 Pat Robertson
 Adrian & Joyce Rogers
 Robert Saucy
 James Sauer

Siegfried Schatzmann
 Thomas Schreiner
 Bob Slosser
 F. LaGard Smith
 R. C. Sproul
 Joseph M. Stowell, III
 Larry Walker
 John F. Walvoord
 William Weirich
 Luder Whitlock
 Peter Williamson

Executive Director's Column

Exposition of the Danvers Statement: Affirmation 4



Randy Stinson
*Executive Director,
 Council on Biblical Manhood
 and Womanhood
 Louisville, Kentucky*

The fourth affirmation of the Danvers Statement deals with the Fall and its primary effects on the relationship between men and women.

4. The Fall introduced distortion into the relationships between men and women.

The Fall introduces a vast array of distortions to the good and wise design of male headship that God intended. This is a key distinctive in the complementarian position. Those who oppose the Danvers Statement typically argue that the Fall brought about headship and submission between men and women and that this is overcome in Christ. The Danvers Statement argues that even prior to the Fall there was male headship in marriage and the Fall distorted this understanding of role relationships. This can be seen in the fact that no new relationships were introduced after the Fall; they are presumed.

First, with regard to Eve, there are two areas affected – childbearing and her relationship with her husband (Gen. 3:16). Her childbearing (in principle, an ability present before the Fall) will now be marked by pain. Her willingness to embrace the provision and protection of her God-given head (present before the Fall) will now be marked by a sinful desire regarding this headship. Egalitarians have wanted to say that the woman's curse by which her "desire" will be for her husband is the introduction of a wrongful, sinful sense of her submissiveness. But how can it be sinful to desire to help and to serve? Rather, the key to interpreting this text comes from Gen. 4:7 where the same wording is used. Here, sin's "desire" is clearly to take control of Cain, so God tells Cain he must

master it. In Gen. 3:16, then, the woman's desire is for illegitimate control, attempting to resist her husband's God-created male headship over her.

Second, with regard to Adam, two areas are affected – work and his relationship with his wife (Gen. 3:16-17). His work (present before the Fall) will now be marked by hardship and difficulty. His role as head (present before the Fall) will now be marked by the necessity to rule in the relationship. Notice that before the Fall, the man could lead without the need to "rule over" the woman, because before the Fall, she willingly and joyfully followed his leadership. But now with sin, he is challenged, and he is faced with the necessity to rule.

In these areas – motherhood, work, and marital relationships – no new relationship is introduced. It is presumed that they existed prior to the Fall and then were distorted afterward, as a result of sin. The Danvers Statement elaborates as to what these distortions may look like in the home and church.

4a. In the home, the husband's loving, humble leadership tends to be replaced by domination or passivity; the wife's intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility.

To the extent that one partner dominates the relationship, various scenarios may be true. For instance, if a wife is a strong usurper, the husband may have a tendency to abdicate. If the husband is harsh and domineering, the wife may tend to adopt a servile position. The proper relationship, explicit in affirmation four, involves the "loving, humble headship" of the husband and the "intelligent, willing, submission" of the wife (1 Pet. 3, Eph. 5).

4b. 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.

In the Church, the root problem is the same: a sinful resistance to biblically prescribed roles. For men, it takes the form of domination and power. The Bible teaches that the leadership positions of the church are to be held by men (1 Tim. 2) but this leadership should be governed by the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5) and by the example of Christ's relationship to the Church (Eph. 5). For women, it tends toward dissatisfaction and rejection of biblically ordained responsibilities. The Bible clearly prohibits women from teaching or having authority over men (1 Tim. 2) but certainly affirms the role of women in particular ministries especially as they relate to other women (Titus 2). ■

Was Junia Really an Apostle?

A Reexamination of Romans 16:7^{1,2}

Daniel B. Wallace and Michael H. Burer

*Professor of New Testament Studies and
Adjunct Professor of New Testament Studies, respectively
Dallas Theological Seminary
Dallas, Texas*

In Romans 16:7, there are two issues relevant to biblical ‘gynecology.’ First is whether Ἰουνιαν is a man’s name or a woman’s. Second is whether this individual is part of the apostolic band. This first issue has garnered a great deal of attention, with quite a bit of evidence enlisted on both sides. But the second has been the object of almost no substantive discussion; indeed, most commentators simply assume a particular viewpoint that has surprisingly never been demonstrated. We will address the first issue briefly, as it is somewhat tangential to our overall thesis.

The name Ἰουνιαν can be accented in one of two ways: Ἰουνίαν with an acute accent on the penult, which is feminine, or Ἰουνιᾶν with a circumflex accent on the ultima, which is masculine. The majority of patristic commentators regard this as a feminine name.³ Origen seems to cite the name once as masculine and once as feminine, though the masculine is most likely a later corruption of his text.⁴ Although most commentators believe that the patristic evidence through the first twelve hundred years or so universally supports the feminine name,⁵ one patristic writer is inexplicably overlooked. Epiphanius (c. 315–403 CE), bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, mentions Junias in his *Index discipulorum* 125: Ἰουνιᾶς, οὗ καὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Παῦλος μέμνηται, ἐπίσκοπος Ἀπαμείας τῆς Συρίας ἐγένετο (‘Junias, whom Paul also mentions, became bishop of Apameia of Syria’). That Junias is masculine here is evident from the masculine relative pronoun (οὗ) following the name.⁶ Epiphanius’ reference is unusual in that he only indirectly alludes to Rom. 16:7, but adds additional information about Junias, perhaps preserving an independent tradition.⁷ However, Epiphanius’ testimony here ought not to be weighed

too heavily, for he calls Prisca in the previous sentence a man, too!⁸ A search of TLG⁹ for the text string Ἰουνία at the beginning of a word yielded only one viable hit outside of biblical or patristic citations, and this name is obviously feminine: Ἰουνία γὰρ ἀδελφῆ Βρούτου συνώκει Κάσσιος, mentioned by Plutarch.¹⁰ BAGD cites this name (as used in Rom. 16:7) as masculine,¹¹ but the forthcoming edition (to be known as BDAG) argues that the form Ἰουνία is to be preferred.¹² This is in keeping with the current trends of scholarship as well, for in the past two decades the tide has swung decidedly over to the side of the feminine form. To remove paraphrasis and reduce cumbersome expressions—and because we lean toward this understanding as well—we will treat this name as feminine.

A Brief History of Junia’s Apostleship

Whether Ἰουνιαν is male or female is not the only contribution of this verse to biblical gynecology. The relation of Junia to the apostles is also in view. On this issue, there is a growing consensus: Junia *is* an apostle. That is, the text is read as follows: “Greet Andronicus and Junia, my relatives who were in prison with me, who are *outstanding among the apostles*.” The expression in question is ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. The vast bulk of translations and commentators today regard this line as indicating that Andronicus and Junia *were* apostles, though not in the most technical sense of that word. What is interesting is that battle lines are almost always drawn along the gender of Ἰουνιαν, as though it were already a settled issue that this individual finds a place among the

apostolic band. It is the assumption of Junia's apostolic status, however, that we wish to challenge.

Before we get into the evidence, it might be helpful to note the history of the discussion. Frankly, this will not take very long.¹³ To be sure, there is an abundance of secondary material which discusses the various questions arising from Rom. 16:7. But by and large, the identification of *Ἰουνιαν*—whether this name refers to a man or a woman—is the question most often discussed in the literature, with Paul's intended sense of *ἀπόστολος* a close second. Only rarely is the syntax of *ἐπίσημος* with its adjuncts discussed at all.

For convenience' sake, we will label the two views regarding Junia's apostolic status. The approach that regards Andronicus and Junia as in some sense apostles we will call the *inclusive* view; the interpretation that regards them as non-apostles we will call the *exclusive* view.¹⁴ The inclusive view is thus represented in the translation “outstanding *among* the apostles” while the exclusive view is seen in the translation “well known *to* the apostles.”

The vast bulk of commentators follow the inclusive view; most of those who do, see *ἀπόστολος* used in a broad sense.¹⁵ And almost always, the inclusive interpretation is simply assumed, with little or no support. For example, Dunn states that “the full phrase almost certainly means ‘prominent among the apostles’” citing *other* authorities as his defense.¹⁶ Cranfield, after admitting that the exclusive view is “grammatically possible,” goes on to say, “it is much more probable—we might well say, virtually certain—that the words mean ‘outstanding among the apostles...’”¹⁷ enlisting patristic *assumptions* on his behalf. Rengstorff lays the blame at Paul's feet: “If Paul had meant the second [the exclusive view,] he could and should have expressed himself more clearly!”¹⁸ Schreiner notes merely that the inclusive interpretation is “the consensus view,” and that it “is almost surely right, for this is a more natural way of understanding the prepositional phrase.”¹⁹

Some commentators do appeal, however, to other lines of evidence to bolster this approach. Fitzmyer accepts that Andronicus and Junia were apostles largely on the basis of patristic testimony, but only discusses the meaning of the prepositional phrase *ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*.²⁰ Godet accepts the majority view (*viz.*, that Andronicus and Junia were apostles), but adds a negative line of reasoning: Paul does not mean “well known by the apostles” because *ἐν* most likely does not carry the meaning “in the eyes of.”²¹ Sanday and Headlam add a positive line of reasoning to accept this interpretation: *ἐπίσημος* has a literal meaning of “stamped” or “marked” and this would most naturally refer to “those who were selected from the Apostolic body as ‘distinguished’.”²² The most detailed argumentation for the view that Andronicus and Junia were regarded as apostles comes from Moo. If this phrase were to mean “esteemed by the apostles,” *ἐν* would have to have an

instrumental force or be equivalent to the Hebrew “in the eyes of.” However, “with a plural object, *ἐν* often means ‘among’; and if Paul had wanted to say that Andronicus and Junia were esteemed ‘by’ the apostles, we would have expected him to use a simple dative or *ὑπό* with the genitive.”²³

The kind of certainty embraced by the inclusive camp may well be traced back to Lightfoot. He states: “Except to escape the difficulty involved in such an extension of the apostolate, I do not think the words *ὄτινες εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις* would have been generally rendered, ‘who are highly esteemed by the Apostles’.”²⁴ Although Lightfoot offers *no support* other than that the inclusive view was adopted by the Greek fathers, his reputation as a careful grammatical exegete was legendary, prompting Schmithals to claim that Lightfoot has shut the door on the exclusive view: “J. B. Lightfoot has already *established* that *ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις* does not mean ‘regarded by the apostles’ but rather ‘regarded as apostles’!” He adds that this translation “is the only natural one.”²⁵ The same sentiment, though not necessarily eliciting Lightfoot by name, is found in numerous commentaries that espouse the inclusive view.²⁶

Commentators who adopt the exclusive view—that is, that Andronicus and Junia were well known or esteemed by the apostles but were not apostles themselves—tend to supply a little more evidence as a whole since they are in the minority, although they still generally do not address the full grammatical evidence. Hodge argues that Paul uses *ἀπόστολος* only “in its strict, official sense.”²⁷ The article *τοῖς* before the term “seems to point out the definite, well-known class of persons almost exclusively so called.”²⁸ Murray also argues that this is the preferred interpretation because of Paul's limited use of the term.²⁹ Lenski argues along these lines but adds to the evidence:

In the first place, Paul never uses “apostle” in the wider sense; in the second place, when it is so used (Barnabas, Acts 14:4, 14), the word still keeps its meaning: “one commissioned and sent,” even as Barnabas was commissioned together with Paul (Acts 13:2-4), and is never used concerning men (or women) who go out of their own accord ... Thirdly, *ἐν* states *where* these two were considered illustrious: “in the circle of” the Twelve at Jerusalem (“by” is incorrect).³⁰

Zahn accepts this minority interpretation based upon one major line of negative evidence: if Andronicus and Junia were well-known apostles, it is remarkable that scripture is otherwise completely silent about them: “Der Ausdruck und der Umstand, daß wir sonst nichts von einer solchen Bedeutung dieser Leute hören, machen es doch wahrscheinlicher, daß damit gesagt sein soll, daß sie im Kreise der älteren Apostel, welche Pl auch Gl 1, 19; 1 Kr 15, 7 die Apostel schlechthin

nennt, in gutem Ansehen stehen.”³¹ And again, “Warum schrieb Pl dann nicht ἀπόστολοι ἐπίσημοι? Das Praes. εὖσίν [*sic*] würde bei jener Deutung voraussetzen, daß sie zur Zeit des Rm noch immer in hervorragender Weise als Missionare tätig waren. Um so wunderlicher wäre das Schweigen der AG und der anderen Briefe.”³²

On the whole, “exclusive” commentators do not adequately discuss the syntax of ἐπίσημος with its adjuncts. When the construction is discussed, focus is on the prepositional phrase ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις and the meaning of ἐν, not the collocation of ἐπίσημος with prepositional phrases.³³

The situation with specialized studies concerning the role of women in the church is much the same. The vast majority of authors favor the inclusive view, but most studies do not deal with the grammatical evidence of ἐπίσημος with its adjuncts. Like the commentaries cited above, many studies simply argue that the name refers to a woman and that ἀπόστολος is used here in a general sense, i.e., as one sent by the church for an appointed task.³⁴ Yet some claim, without supporting evidence, that “the natural meaning in Greek is that they were outstanding as apostles.”³⁵ Some are more nuanced in their argumentation concerning the meaning of ἀπόστολος. Grenz and Kjesbo, for example, argue that there are four different possible meanings for ἀπόστολος: the Twelve, witnesses to the resurrection whom Jesus commissioned into special ministry, those commissioned by a congregation to spread the gospel, and those commissioned by a church for specific tasks. They classify Junia as an apostle of the third type, accepting the interpretation that she was considered an apostle.³⁶ Other studies assess the meaning of ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις but do not specifically address the relationship of ἐπίσημος to its adjuncts.³⁷ Cervin is more detailed in that he does address some of the grammatical evidence, but only concerning the prepositional phrase: “the [translation] ‘by the apostles’ expresses the agent of a passive verb (or in this case, adjective)” and would only be valid if the Greek were ὑπό plus the genitive case. The Greek text is “ἐν + the dative case, which is used to denote impersonal instrument or means.”³⁸ Only a few studies accept the exclusive view, but the reasoning is incomplete and does not deal with the lexical or syntactical evidence.³⁹

Modern translations, as would be expected in light of the exegetical literature, usually view Paul’s friends here as part of the apostolic band. The NIV and NASB say that Andronicus and Junia(s) are “outstanding among the apostles”; TEV has “well known among the apostles”; the NRSV and NAB say they are “prominent among the apostles”; Reina Valera has “muy estimados entre los apóstoles”; Phillips speaks of them as “outstanding men among the messengers”; Nouvelle Version Second Révisée (NVS) has “très estimés parmi les apôtres”; the REB has “eminent among the apostles”; Luther Revision (1985) has “berühmt sind unter den Aposteln”; NJB says, “Greetings to those outstanding apostles”; New Century

Version calls them “very important apostles.” Some translations seemed a bit more ambiguous, however: KJV reads “who are of note among the apostles,” as does the ASV, RSV, NKJV, and Douay-Rheims. Only a handful of translations took the construction to mean that Andronicus and Junia were not apostles: the CEV has “highly respected by the apostles”; Amplified reads “They are men held in high esteem by the apostles”; and the New English Translation (NET) calls them “well known to the apostles.”

In sum, over the past three decades the exclusive view has been only scarcely attested in translations or exegetical and theological literature. Yet the arguments against it are largely a kind of snowballing dogma that has little of substance at its core.

Evidence that Junia was not an Apostle

The thesis of this article is that the expression ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις is more naturally taken with an exclusive force rather than an inclusive one. The lexical and syntactical evidence seem to support this hypothesis.

First, the lexical issue. ἐπίσημος can mean “well known, prominent, outstanding, famous, notable, notorious.”⁴⁰ The lexical domain can roughly be broken down into two streams: ἐπίσημος is used either in an *implied* comparative sense (“prominent, outstanding [among]”) or in an elative sense (“famous, well known [to/by]”).

Second, the key to determining the meaning of the term in any given passage is both the general context and the specific collocation of this word with its adjuncts. Hence, we turn to the ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. As a working hypothesis, we would suggest the following. Since a noun in the genitive is typically used with comparative adjectives, we might expect such with an implied comparison too. Thus, if in Rom. 16:7 Paul meant to say that Andronicus and Junia were outstanding *among* the apostles, we might have expected him to use the genitive⁴¹ (τῶν) ἀποστόλων. On the other hand, if an elative force is suggested—i.e., where no comparison is even hinted at—we might expect ἐν + the dative. It should be noted that this is merely a working hypothesis, and one that is falsifiable.

As an aside, some commentators reject such an elative sense in this passage because of the collocation with the preposition ἐν;⁴² but such a view is based on a misperception of the force of the whole construction. On the one hand, there *is* a legitimate complaint about seeing ἐν with the dative as indicating an *agent*: such a usage is rare to nonexistent in the NT. Thus, to the extent that “well known by the apostles” implies an *action* on the apostles’ part, such an objection has merit.⁴³ On the other hand, the idea of something being known by someone else does not necessarily imply agency. This is so for two reasons. First, the “action” implied may actually be the passive *reception* of

some event or person (e.g., in texts such as 1 Tim. 3:16, in which ὡφθη ἀγγέλοις can be translated either as “was seen by angels” or “appeared to angels”; either way the “action” performed by angels is by its very nature relatively passive).⁴⁴ Such an idea can be easily accommodated in Rom. 16:7: “well known to/by the apostles” simply says that the apostles were recipients of information, not that they actively performed “knowing.” Thus, although ἐν plus a personal dative does not indicate agency, in collocation with words of perception, the construction (ἐν plus) dative personal nouns is often used to show the recipients. In this instance, the idea would then be “well known to the apostles.” Second, even if ἐν with the dative plural is used in the sense of “among” (so Moo here, *et alii*), this does not necessarily locate Andronicus and Junia *within* the band of apostles; rather, it is equally possible, *ex hypothesi*, that *knowledge of them* existed *among* the apostles.

Finally, to make sure we are “comparing apples with apples,” the substantival adjunct (i.e., either the noun in the genitive or the object of the preposition ἐν) should be *personal*. This gives us the closest parallels to Rom. 16:7. However, because of the potential paucity of data, both personal and impersonal constructions will be examined.

We now turn to the actual data. A search of TLG, the published volumes of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Tebtunis papyri, and the digitized collections of papyri from Duke University and the University of Michigan—a grand total of more than 60 million words of Greek literature⁴⁵ from Homer to AD 1453—produced several hundred pages of text. ἐπίσημος and cognates are not uncommon forms. We manually narrowed the search to include only two identifiable patterns: ἐπίσημος with ἐν plus the dative, and ἐπίσημος with a genitive modifier.⁴⁶ These were examined further for their relevance to the present passage. Obviously irrelevant texts were eliminated—such as passages in which ἐπίσημος refers to the stamp of a coin.⁴⁷ What remains are a few dozen passages, containing illuminating information and definite patterns.

Taking our starting point from biblical and patristic Greek, we notice the following. When a comparative notion is seen, that to which ἐπίσημος is compared is frequently, if not usually, put in the genitive case. For example, in 3 Macc. 6:1 we read Ελεαζαρος δέ τις ἀνὴρ ἐπίσημος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας ἱερέων (“Eleazar, a man *prominent among the priests* of the country”). Here Eleazar was one of the priests of the country, yet was comparatively outstanding in their midst. The genitive is used for the implied comparison (τῶν ἱερέων). In *Pss. Sol.* 17:30 the idea is very clear that the Messiah would “glorify the Lord in a prominent [place] in relation to all the earth” (τὸν κύριον δοξάσει ἐν ἐπισήμῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς). The prominent place is a *part* of the earth, indicated by the genitive modifier. *Mart. Pol.* 14:1 speaks of an “outstanding ram from a great flock” (κρίδις ἐπίσημος ἐκ μεγάλου). Here ἐκ plus the genitive is used instead of the simple genitive, perhaps to suggest the ablative notion

over the partitive, since this ram was chosen for sacrifice (and thus would soon be separated *from* the flock). But again, the salient features are present: (a) an implied comparison (b) of an item *within* a larger group, (c) followed by (ἐκ plus) the genitive to specify the group to which it belongs.

But in *Add. Esth.* 16:22 we read that the people are to “observe this as a *notable* day *among* the commemorative festivals” (ἐν ταῖς . . . ἑορταῖς ἐπίσημον ἡμέραν). In this text, that which is ἐπίσημος is itself *among* (ἐν) similar entities. It should simply be noted that impersonal nouns are used here, making the parallel to Rom. 16:7 inexact.

When, however, an elative notion is found, ἐν plus a personal plural dative is not uncommon. In *Pss. Sol.* 2:6, where the Jewish captives are in view, the writer indicates that “they were *a spectacle among* the gentiles” (ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). This construction comes as close to Rom. 16:7 as any we have yet seen. The parallels include (a) people as the referent of the adjective ἐπίσημος, (b) followed by ἐν plus the dative plural, (c) the dative plural referring to people as well. All the key elements are here. Semantically, what is significant is that (a) the first group is *not* a part of the second—that is, the Jewish captives were not gentiles; and (b) what was ‘among’ the gentiles was the Jews’ notoriety. This is precisely how we are suggesting that Rom. 16:7 should be taken. That the parallels discovered conform to our working hypothesis at least gives warrant to seeing Andronicus’ and Junia’s *fame* as that which was among the apostles. Whether the alternative view has semantic plausibility remains to be seen.

To sum up the evidence of biblical and patristic Greek: Although the inclusive view is aided in some *impersonal* constructions that involve ἐν plus the dative, every instance of *personal* inclusiveness used a genitive rather than ἐν. On the other hand, every instance of ἐν plus *personal* nouns supported the exclusive view, with *Pss. Sol.* 2:6 providing a very close parallel to Rom. 16:7.

The papyri can be dispensed with relatively quickly, as there are only a few examples of ἐπίσημος in them. But four texts are noteworthy. P.Oxy. 1408⁴⁸ speaks of “the most important [places] of the nome” (τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις τῶν νομῶν). In this text that which is ἐπίσημος is a *part* of the nome; the genitive is used to indicate this.⁴⁹ On two other occasions this same idiom occurs, each time with a genitive modifier: τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις τόποις τ[ῶ]ν κωμ[ῶν] (“the most conspicuous places in the villages”) in P. Oxy. 2108⁵⁰ and τ[οῖς] ἐπισημοῖς τοῦ νομοῦ τόποις (“the well-known places of the nome”) in P. Oxy. 2705.⁵¹ In each of these instances, that which is ἐπίσημος is compared to its environment with a partitive *genitive*; it is a part of the entity to which it is being compared. This was a sufficiently common idiom (though occurring only these three times in the *Oxyrhynchus* papyri) that the editors conjecture the reading in the lacuna at P. Oxy. 3364, line 22⁵²:

[τ]ῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸ ἀντίγραφον ἔν τε ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπίσημοις τῶν νομῶν τόποις; ([Place] “the copy of the letter in the cities and in the public places of the nomes”). Now, to be sure, these parallels are not terribly strong. The constructions are impersonal, and they are only roughly contemporary with the NT. But at least they do provide evidence of the *idiomatic* nature of ἐπίσημος belonging to its group as specified with the genitive case. This same idea is also found in the LXX in a couple of places with ἐν plus the dative.⁵³

The inscriptions can likewise be examined quickly. An idiom noticed in several inscriptions is even more relevant. In TAM 2.905.1 *west wall. coll. 2.5.18* we read the description of a man who is “not only foremost in his own country, but also well known to the outside population” (οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι πρώτου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει ἐπίσημου).⁵⁴ Here the person who is ἐπίσημος is called such only in relation to outsiders (πρώτος is used in relation to his own countrymen). It is not insignificant that ἐν plus the dative personal noun is used: the man is well known to a group of which he is not a member. Similar idioms are found in *Asia Minor TAM 2.1-3.838*; TAM 2.1-3.905 *west wall. coll. 3.12*; and *Fd Xanth 7.76.1.1.1.4*. In each instance the group that the individual is well known to but is not a part of is mentioned with ἐν plus the dative.⁵⁵ Although these data are not plentiful, they are excellent parallels and point in but one direction: ἐπίσημος followed by ἐν plus personal datives does not connote membership *within* the group, but simply that one is known *by* the group. Thus, the inscriptions, like biblical and patristic Greek, supply a uniform picture of ἐπίσημος with personal nouns: when followed by ἐν, the well-known individual is *outside* the group.

In literary texts the evidence is not quite so uniform. Nevertheless, the pattern that has emerged from our study thus far is still generally maintained. Beginning with the classical period: Lycurgus speaks of the Spartans making the punishment of their king, Pausanias, “evident to all” (πᾶσιν ἐπίσημον ἐποίησαν τὴν τιμωρίαν).⁵⁶ Although an impersonal use, the dative is clearly exclusive. Euripides speaks in a similar way, when he has Dionysus declaring Pentheus “manifest to all men” (ἐπίσημον ὄντα πᾶσιν), to which Pentheus proudly proclaims “For this I come” (ἐπὶ τὸδ’ ἔρχομαι).⁵⁷ The king is clearly distinguishing himself from the masses, and the dative carries this exclusivity well. In a similar vein, Euripides speaks of the goddess Aphrodite as “glorious among mortals” (κάπσιμος ἐν βροτοῖς).⁵⁸ Aphrodite is not a mortal, but her fame is certainly found among mortals. Here is an excellent illustration that has all the constituent parts found in Rom. 16:7: a personal construction with ἐν plus the dative. And the meaning is obviously an exclusive idea.

Hellenistic texts are a bit more varied in their nuances. On the one hand, there are the impersonal constructions that go both ways. For example, there are a few texts similar to the passage in *Add. Esth.* we saw earlier—that is, inclusive notions

with ἐν plus the dative. Thus, Lucianus can speak of the veins that stand out on the neck.⁵⁹ Philo can speak of form as having distinction in the universe.⁶⁰ But Galen can also speak of a conspicuous body part among others, using the genitive.⁶¹

There are several examples with personal nouns in hellenistic literature. Lucianus speaks of Harmonides the pipe-player craving fame for his musical abilities to the extent that he wants “glory before the crowds, fame among the masses” (ἡ δόξα ἢ παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τὸ ἐπίσημον εἶναι ἐν πλήθει).⁶² He clearly sees himself as set apart from οἱ πολλοί!⁶³ Elsewhere he uses the genitive to indicate an inclusive idea: “Show me the men of old, and particularly the famous ones among them” (τοὺς ἐπίσημους αὐτῶν).⁶⁴ Lucianus thus shows the same patterns that we saw earlier, viz., an exclusive notion with ἐν plus the dative and an inclusive notion with a genitive modifier. But he is not consistent in this. On at least one occasion his words unmistakably have an inclusive force for ἐν plus the dative. In his work *On Salaried Posts in Great Houses*, he offers advice to servants: “... you must raise your thirsty voice like a stranded frog, taking pains to be conspicuous among the clique and to lead the chorus” (ἐπίσημος ἔση ἐν τοῖς ἐπαινοῦσι. . .).⁶⁵ This is the first parallel to Rom. 16:7 we have seen that could offer real comfort to inclusivists. It is unmistakable, it is personal, and it is rare. We have noticed, in fact, only one other text that clearly bears an inclusive meaning with ἐν plus dative personal substantives. In Josephus *B. J. 2.418* we read of certain leading citizens who dispatched some representatives, “among whom were eminent persons, Saul, Antipas, and Costobar, all members of the royal family” (ἐν οἷς ἦσαν ἐπίσημοι Σαυλὸς τε καὶ Ἀντίπας καὶ Κοστόβαρος. . .). But even this text is not a clean parallel: the relative clause is expected to consist of ἐν plus the dative, and the adjective is almost functioning as a technical term, without any notion of comparative force.⁶⁶ It is at least quite different from Rom. 16:7 in several important respects.

Conclusion

In sum, our examination of ἐπίσημος with both genitive modifiers and ἐν plus dative adjuncts has revealed some surprising results—surprising, that is, from the perspective of the scholarly consensus. Repeatedly in biblical Greek, patristic Greek, papyri, inscriptions, classical and hellenistic texts, our working hypothesis was borne out. The genitive personal modifier was consistently used for an inclusive idea, while the (ἐν plus) dative personal adjunct was almost never so used. Yet to read the literature, one would get a decidedly different picture. To say that ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις “can only mean ‘noteworthy among the apostles’”⁶⁷ is simply not true. It would be more accurate to say, “ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις almost certainly means ‘well known to the apostles’.”⁶⁸ Thus Junia, along with Andronicus, is recognized by Paul as well known to the apostles, not as an outstanding member of the apostolic band.⁶⁹

There is a broader implication to this study than simply Junia's relation to the apostles: one has to wonder how there could be such a great chasm between the scholarly opinion about Rom. 16:7 and what the data actually reveal. Our sense is that the unfounded opinions of a few great scholars of yesteryear have been, frankly, canonized. Bishop Lightfoot especially has influenced the present climate—from a brief note in his commentary on *Galatians*. This is not the first time such has happened in biblical scholarship, and it won't be the last. ■

though Epiphanius' identification of Junia as a man is almost surely incorrect (see below), his voice must be accounted for in the tabulation of patristic evidence.

⁸ *Index discipulorum* 125: Πρίσκακ, οὐ καὶ αὐτοῦ Παῦλος μέμνηται, ἐπίσκοπος Κολοφῶνος ἐγένετο. Again, TLG accents the name Πρίσκακ. It should be noted that the masculine pronouns alone presuppose the masculine name since ἐπίσκοπος is a double terminal adjective, used substantivally for both men and women.

⁹ TLG, or *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* CD ROM. D, is a digitized database of Greek texts from Homer to 1453 CE, currently comprising some 57 million Greek words (Los Altos, CA: Packard Humanities Institute, 1993). Produced under the auspices of the Packard Humanities Institute, it is now marketed by the University of California at Irvine. Although we have not yet received our copy, CD ROM. E has been recently released (February 4, 2000); it contains 6,625 works from 1,823 authors, and a total count of 76 million words of text. The cover letter to TLG subscribers notes that "This is a significant expansion compared to the 57 million words (from 831 authors and 4,305 works) included in CD ROM. D." We do not know on what information Piper and Grudem based their statement that the previous version to the one we are using, CD ROM. C, "contains 2,889 authors and 8,203 works" (Piper and Grudem, "Overview," 79).

¹⁰ Plutarch *Brut.* 7.1.4.

¹¹ See "Ἰουνιάς", 380: "The possibility, fr. a purely lexical point of view, that this is a woman's name ... is prob. ruled out by the context..."

¹² See "Ἰουνία" and "Ἰουνιάς" in BDAG.

¹³ We have already noted that the patristic authors are preoccupied with whether Ἰουνίαν is male or female, giving little substantive attention to what Paul has to say about this individual's relation to the apostolic band. That they seem to assume a particular view, without interacting over the force of the Greek, is hardly a sufficient reason to adopt their view, as Lightfoot, Fitzmyer, *et al.* have done. This situation is akin to modern English preachers assuming that Rev. 3:20 speaks of the risen Christ penetrating a person's heart—in spite of the fact that such a view is not even based on a careful reading of the English text, let alone the Greek! (On this text, cf. D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996] 380-82.)

¹⁴ We are taking our cue from R. S. Cervin, "A Note Regarding the Name 'Junia(s)' in Romans 16.7," *NTS* 40 (1994) 470.

¹⁵ So J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (1540; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 546; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St Paul to the Galatians* (London: Macmillan, 1865) 96, n. 1; A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1965) 399-400; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (HNTC; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1957) 283-84; J. Huby, *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains* (Paris: S. Lyonnet, 1957) 499-500; C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (Fontana; London: Collins, 1959) 240; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 475-76; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975-1979) 2.789; E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 414; U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT; Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener und Zürich: Benziger, 1978-1981) 3.135; L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 534.

J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC 38AB; Dallas: Word, 1988) 2.895, takes a narrower view of ἀπόστολος while maintaining the inclusive view. He argues from the phrase οὐ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναι

¹ This article was originally published in *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 76-91, and is used by permission of *NTS*. Slight editorial changes have been made, but the substance of the original article has not been affected.

² We wish to express our gratitude to Professor C. F. D. Moule and Dr. D. H. Wallace for their valuable input on this essay after looking at a preliminary draft.

³ J. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993) 737-38, mentions Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Rufinus, Jerome, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Ps.-Primasius, Oecumenius, John Damascene, Haymo, Rabanus Maurus, Hatto, Lanfranc of Bec, Bruno the Carthusian, Theophylact, Peter Abelard, and Peter Lombard.

⁴ Junia occurs in *In epistola ad Romanos* 10.21 (PG 14.1280), but Junias occurs in 10.39 (PG 14.1289). Rabanus Maurus in *In epistola ad Romanos* (PL 111.1607-8) cites Origen *In epistola ad Romanos* 10.39, but uses the feminine form. Because of this some have asserted that Origen's text here is corrupt. Moo notes that Rufinus' translation of Origen's commentary in PG 14.1281B and 1289A reads a masculine name. "But Migne's text (notoriously corrupt) is probably in error; Origen apparently read a feminine name here..." (D. J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996] 922).

⁵ Aegidius of Rome (1245-1316 CE) called both Andronicus and Julian men in his *Opera Exegetica*, Opuscula I.

⁶ TLG (see n. 8) inexplicably accents the name Ἰουνιάς.

⁷ J. Piper and W. Grudem, "An Overview of Central Concerns: Questions and Answers," in J. Piper and W. Grudem, eds., *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991) 80, argue: "The Church Fathers were evidently divided.... Epiphanius assuming [Ἰουνία] is masculine, Chrysostom assuming it is feminine. Perhaps somewhat more weight may be given to the statement by Epiphanius, since he appears to know more specific information about Junias (that he became bishop of Apameia), while Chrysostom gives no more information than what he could deduce from Romans 16:7."

As recently as April 2000, this evidence continues to be overlooked. S. Schreiber, "Arbeit mit der Gemeinde (Röm 16.6, 12). Zur versunkenen Möglichkeit der Gemeindeleitung durch Frauen," *NTS* 46 (2000) 212, asserts, "Entscheidend jedoch ist, daß in der Antike lediglich der weibliche Name Junia bezeugt ist und die kirchliche Tradition von den Vätern bis zu den Kommentaren des Mittelalters von Junia als einer Frau ausgeht; der lateinische Name 'Junia' ist zeitgenössisch geläufig. Das ist in der gegenwärtigen Forschung längst aufgewiesen und nahezu Allgemeingut." The author cites much of the standard literature but does not mention Grudem and Piper's evidence to the contrary. In all fairness, even

ἐν Χριστῷ and from 1 Cor. 15:7 that Andronicus and Junia “belonged to the closed group of apostles appointed directly by the risen Christ in a limited period following his resurrection.”

¹⁶ Dunn, *Romans* 2.894.

¹⁷ Cranfield, *Romans* 2.789.

¹⁸ K. H. Rengstorf, “ἐπίσημος,” *TDNT* 7.268, n. 1

¹⁹ T. R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998) 796.

²⁰ Fitzmyer, *Romans* 739-40.

²¹ F. L. Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Funk & Wagnall’s, 1883) 492. *Contra* R. Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1896) 776-77.

²² W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 423.

²³ Moo, *Romans* 923, n. 38.

²⁴ Lightfoot, *Galatians* 96.

²⁵ W. Schmithals, *The Office of the Apostle in the Early Church* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969) 62 (italics added), citing only Lightfoot, *Galatians* 96.

²⁶ Besides the commentaries mentioned, older works such as those by Luther, Bengel, and Tholuck held the inclusive view as well. Note also Cervin, “Junia(s),” 470: “he wrote οὐτινὲς εἰσὶν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις which can only mean ‘noteworthy among the apostles.’” Our impression is that within two or three decades of the publication of Lightfoot’s commentary on Galatians, and largely because of it, the inclusive view became the majority opinion. But the situation was decidedly different shortly after it was published. C. Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, rev. ed. (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1883) 449, notes that “the majority of commentators” held to the exclusive view in his day.

²⁷ Hodge, *Romans* 449.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959-1965) 2.229-30. So also H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistle to the Romans*, rev. ed. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1889) 568, with special reference to 1 Cor. 15:7; F. A. Philippi, *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer*, 2d rev. ed. (Frankfurt: Heyder & Zimmer, 1856) 622, with special reference to Acts 14:4, 14.

³⁰ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961) 906-7.

³¹ T. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1910) 608.

³² *Ibid.*, n. 61.

³³ Cf. also S. T. Bloomfield, *The Greek Testament, with English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical*, 5th American edition (Philadelphia: Perkins & Purves, 1844) 2.91, n. 7; W. M. L. de Wette, *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*, 4th rev. and augmented ed. (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1847) 2.197; W. G. T. Shedd, *A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans* (New York: Scribner’s, 1879) 426-27. Cornely, *Romanos* 776-77, states, “Similiter dissentiunt interpretes, quo sensu ratio illa intelligenda sit, ob quam Paulus illos suo nomine salutari velit: οὐτινὲς εἰσὶν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις (quia sunt illustres in apostolis). Cum Orig. et Chrys. enim antiquiores et iuniores plerique... eos inter apostolos latiore sensu, i.e. inter evangelicos operarios praeclaris suis laboribus eminuisse et in Ecclesia illustres fuisse arbitrantur. Praeaeuntibus autem Haym. et Tolet. moderni haud

pauci... eos apud Apostolos (stricto sensu) illustres fuisse, i.e. ab eis magni aestimatos esse tenent. Quam alteram sententiam praeferimus, non tantum quia definita locutio οἱ ἀπόστολοι non nisi de Duodecim aut saltem de Apostolis stricto sensu in Scripturis semper adhibetur, sed etiam quia iuxta hanc interpretationem ultimum membrum (qui et ante me fuerunt in Christo i.e. Christiani) aptius adiungitur.”

Among the older commentators not already cited who embraced the exclusive view are Beza, Grotius, and Fritsche. Schreiner’s assessment is on the mark when he states, “Murray (1965:230) is virtually alone among *modern* commentators in understanding it [ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις] as ‘outstanding in the eyes of the apostles [italics added].’”

³⁴ M. Adinolfi, “Le Collaboratrici Ministeriali di Paolo nelle Lettere ai Romani e ai Filippesi,” *BeO* 17 (1975) 31; B. Brooten, “Junia... Outstanding Among the Apostles’ (Romans 16:7),” in L. Swidler and A. Swidler, eds., *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration* (New York: Paulist, 1977) 141-144; P. K. Jewett, *The Ordination of Women: An Essay on the Office of Christian Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 70-71; D. M. Scholer, “Paul’s Women Co-Workers in the Ministry of the Church,” *Daughters of Sarah* 6.4 (1980) 5-6; E. M. Howe, *Women & Church Leadership* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982) 34-36; M. J. Evans, *Woman in the Bible: An Overview of All the Crucial Passages on Women’s Roles* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1984) 124; B. J. Brooten, “Women and the Churches in Early Christianity,” *Ecumenical Trends* 14.4 (1985) 52; K. Giles, “Apostles Before and After Paul,” *Chm* 99 (1985) 249-50; E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “Missionaries, Apostles, Coworkers: Romans 16 and the Reconstruction of Women’s Early Christian History,” *WW* 6 (1986) 430-31; P. Richardson, “From Apostles to Virgins: Romans 16 and the Roles of Women in the Early Church,” *TJT* 2 (1986) 238-39; C. S. Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992) 241-42; J. Thorley, “Junia, a Woman Apostle,” *NovT* 38 (1996) 18-29; R. M. Groothuis, *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997) 194-96.

³⁵ So Scholer, “Women Co-Workers,” 6. Cf. also Keener, *Paul, Women, and Wives* 242, whom Groothuis simply quotes with approbation (*Good News* 195); similarly, V. Fàbrega, “War Junia(s), der hervorragende Apostel (Rom. 16,7), eine Frau?” *JAC* 27-28 (1984-1985) 48; R. R. Schulz, “Romans 16:7: Junia or Junias?” *ExpTim* 98.4 (1987) 110. Giles dogmatically states, after agreeing with Schmithals that the inclusive view is “the only natural one,” that “the only basis for objection to the inclusion of Junia among the apostles is one which rests on the premise: no woman by definition can be an apostle” (“Apostles,” 250).

³⁶ S. J. Grenz and D. M. Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1995) 92-96. So also E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “The Apostleship of Women in Early Christianity,” in Swidler and Swidler, eds., *Women Priests* 135-140, although her wording and terminology are slightly different.

³⁷ J. B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981) 121-22; Piper and Grudem, “Overview” 79-81. A. B. Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985) discusses the adjective and preposition in the same paragraph—even arguing erroneously that “the preposition *en* always has the idea of ‘within’,” but does not produce any instances of the collocation (185).

³⁸ Cervin, “Junia(s),” 470.

³⁹ H. W. House, *The Role of Women in Ministry Today* (Nashville:

Thomas Nelson, 1990) 77; M. A. Kassian, *Women, Creation, and the Fall* (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway, 1990) 129-30.

⁴⁰ BAGD 298 s.v. ἐπίσημος; LSJ 655-56; L&N 28.31.

⁴¹ Either the simple genitive, or one after the preposition ἐκ.

⁴² Moo, for example, writes: “if Paul had wanted to say that Andronicus and Junia were esteemed ‘by’ the apostles, we would have expected him to use a simple dative or ὑπό with the genitive” (Moo, *Romans* 923). Cf. also Cervin, “‘Junia(s),’” 470.

⁴³ Cf. Wallace, *Exegetical Syntax* 163-66, where it is indicated that the only clear texts in the NT in which a dative of agency occurs involve a perfect passive verb; in the discussion of ἐν with the dative (373-74), it is suggested that there are “no unambiguous examples” of this idiom. Cf. also BDR 154 (§191), who admit that Luke 23:15 contains the lone genuine example of dative of agency in the NT.

⁴⁴ Wallace, *Exegetical Syntax* 165, n. 72, states, “It is not insignificant that virtually every time ὄφθη is used in the NT with a simple dat., the subject of the verb consciously *initiates* the visible manifestation; in no instance can it be said that the person(s) in the dat. case initiate(s) the act. In other words, volition rests wholly with the subject, while the dat. noun is merely recipient. Cf. Luke 1:11; 22:43; 24:34; Acts 7:2, 26, 30; 13:31; 16:9; 1 Cor. 15:5, 6, 7, 8. (The only problematic texts are Mark 9:4 and its parallel, Matt. 17:3; but even here the appearance of Elijah and Moses was clearly not anticipated by the disciples.)”

⁴⁵ Besides TLG, we also examined the first 65 volumes of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, the first two volumes of the Tebtunis papyri, and Packard Humanities Disk #7 containing the Duke University and University of Michigan papyri data.

⁴⁶ A profound debt of gratitude is owed to Chris Bradley of Princeton University who spent much of the summer of 1999 gathering the data, isolating the relevant constructions, translating many of the texts, and offering his preliminary assessment of their value.

⁴⁷ E.g., P. Tebt. 121, *recto* 1.9, 2.3, 2.10; P. Oxy. 722, 2843.

⁴⁸ AD 210-14.

⁴⁹ The editors emended the text by adding τόποις after νομῶν calling the lacuna “a mistaken omission in the original.”

⁵⁰ AD 259.

⁵¹ c. AD 225.

⁵² The MS is dated by the editors 25 February, AD 209.

⁵³ 2 Macc. 15:36 is somewhat similar. At the same time, ἐν plus the dative is sometimes used this way, as in 1 Macc. 11:37 (ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐν τόπῳ ἐπισήμῳ [“in a conspicuous place on the holy mountain”]) and 1 Macc. 14:48 (ἐν περιβόλῳ τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τόπῳ ἐπισήμῳ [“in a conspicuous place in the precincts of the sanctuary”]).

⁵⁴ ἔθνεϊ here evidently refers to outsiders—that is, a group to which this man does *not* belong. This is evident from the strong contrast between the two phrases (οὐ μόνον. . . ἀλλὰ καί), with the man’s fame receiving the laudatory note with the ascensive καί hinting that such a commendation is coming.

⁵⁵ There is one other inscription that is relevant to the discussion: *Peloponnesos* 1.G.5.2.8. It is similar to the other inscriptions mentioned here, except that παρά is used instead of ἐν. This individual was also highly respected “not only in his own country, but was also well known to the Greeks.”

⁵⁶ Lycurgus *Against Leocrates* 129.

⁵⁷ Euripides *Bacch.* 967.

⁵⁸ Euripides *Hipp.* 103.

⁵⁹ Lucianus *De Meretri* 1.2. For a similar example, cf. Rufus Medicus *Quaestiones Medicanales* 20.

⁶⁰ Philo *Fug.* 10 (ἐπίσημον δὲ πάλιν καὶ ποικίλον ἐν μὲν τοῖς ὄλοις

τὸ εἶδος).

⁶¹ Galen *De Methodo Medendi* 14.10.242.

⁶² Lucianus *Harmonides* 1.17.

⁶³ The text goes on to indicate his desire for distinction: Harmonides wants “to be pointed at, and on putting in an appearance anywhere having everyone turn towards me and say my name, ‘That is Harmonides the outstanding piper’” (LCL translation).

⁶⁴ Lucianus *Peregr.* 6.1. Cf. also Herodian 1.7 for an inclusive personal ἐπίσημος with a genitive.

⁶⁵ Lucianus *Merc. Cond.* 2.8.

⁶⁶ There is one other passage in Lucianus that, on first blush, suggests an inclusive notion for the ἐπίσημος ἐν construction, but it may have a different force (*Peregr.* 22.2). It shows some similarities to this text of Josephus’ in its use of the adjective.

⁶⁷ Cervin, “‘Junia(s),’” 470 (italics added).

⁶⁸ Professor Moule, in personal correspondence (letter dated 30 June 2000), noted the following: “It seems to me that you have *demonstrated*—by all available analogies—the fact that Grk idiom points to the exclusive view, though the idiom still surprises me.” He further asked, “Why, on the ‘exclusive’ view, should the *apostles* be mentioned? Why not the community at large, or *all* the Christian communities (like διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν in 2 Cor. 8¹⁸)?”

In response, when Paul speaks of all the churches or the community at large, he is especially referring to *his* churches (cf. Rom. 16:4, 6; 1 Cor. 7:17; 14:33; 2 Cor. 8:18; 11:28). But when he speaks of the apostles in an absolute manner, as here, he is referring in particular to the leaders in the Jerusalem community (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. 9:5; 15:7; Gal. 1:17, 19). And the probable meaning of οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ in Rom. 16:7, coupled with the link to the ἀπόστολοι, says nothing about Andronicus and Junia’s fame among Paul’s churches but rather that they were known even among the leaders of the Jerusalem church. Psychologically, this makes good sense too: “Even the apostles know Andronicus and Junia!” is the implied ascensive notion.

⁶⁹ Those who hold to the inclusive view for this passage have to ascribe a broader semantic range to ἀπόστολος, when used without adjuncts, than is normally accepted for the *corpus Paulinum*. However, if the exclusive view is correct, the semantic range of the absolute use of ἀπόστολος remains rather restricted within the Pauline epistles. As Hodge argued long ago (*Romans* 449), “...the word *apostle*, unless connected with some other word, as in the phrase, ‘messengers (apostles) of the churches,’ is very rarely, if ever, applied in the New Testament to any other than the original messengers of Jesus Christ. It is never used in Paul’s writings, except in its strict official sense. The word has a fixed meaning, from which we should not depart without special reason.” Taking into account the slight exaggeration and pre-Saussurean linguistic description, our study is further evidence that this sentiment is on the right track, and, further, that treatments of ἀπόστολος in Paul need some revision.

Does the Father Submit to the Son? A Critique of Royce Gruenler

Randy Stinson

*Executive Director,
Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
Louisville, Kentucky*

Today, in the theological realm, there is a renewed interest in the study of the Trinity. In fact, it has been called one of the “most important developments in the field of theology.”¹ In the last nine years alone, Catherine Lacugna, Thomas F. Torrance, Colin Gunton, Millard Erickson, Christoph Schwobel, Donald Bloesch, and Alvin Kimmel have authored or edited significant works dealing with the doctrine of the Trinity. According to Thompson, “Feminists, liberationists, process thinkers, and more traditionalist Catholic and Protestant theologians as well as Eastern Orthodox,” are concerned to present an understanding of the Trinity that will increase its affect on the practical aspects of the Christian life.²

In recent years, those involved with the gender role debate have been appealing to the Trinity in various ways in order to assist in articulating their view, thus intertwining two of the major movements in theology today.³ One evangelical feminist in particular, Royce Gruenler, has appealed to the Trinity in order to teach that there is some sort of mutual submission between males and females in the home and in the church. The novelty of his view is in the claim that within the Godhead, not only does the Son submit to the Father, but the Father also submits to and is dependent upon the Son, hence, for Gruenler, there is mutual submission/dependence among the eternal triune relations of the divine persons.

Gruenler’s Presuppositions and Theological Assertions

Royce Gruenler, in his *Trinity in the Gospel of John: A Thematic Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*, has attempted to evaluate the Gospel of John as it explicates the

interrelationality of the persons of the Godhead.⁴ Gruenler is upfront from the outset of this work that he sees the Trinitarian teaching of John as supporting an egalitarian viewpoint. Understanding the issue of authority and submission within the Trinity and its meaning with regard to human relationships is of crucial importance. He states, “if one wishes to say, using the language of Jesus in the fourth Gospel, that within the inner relationship of the eternal Trinity the Father always commands and the Son and the Spirit always obey, that only the Father authoritatively speaks and the Son and Spirit always passively listen, but never the other way around, and yet at the same time neither is principally inferior or superior to the other, then language has failed me at some point . . .”⁵ He argues that if this were true, then the Son and Spirit would be eternally cast as passive listeners and this would be “absurd,” not to mention the fact that it fails to take into consideration those passages in John where the Father does the “bidding” of the Son.⁶

Gruenler is reticent to embrace the Cappadocian “two-category solution.”⁷ That is, he is uncomfortable with the concept of unity of substance in the Trinity coupled with “inequality on the level of subsistence as intercommuning persons.”⁸ He goes on to say:

If the language of Jesus is to be exegeted properly as the expression of his relationship to the Father then it must be recognized that his statements of subordination (he is sent, he listens, he obeys) are the language of the incarnate son who has voluntarily assumed a subordinate role in time and space for the work of salvation. The subordination of Son and Spirit to the Father is for the time of redemp-

tion only . . . On the testimony of the fourth Gospel it is clear to me that unity and coequality are integral to the personal interaction of Father and Son (and by implication, of the Spirit), and that even the apparent subordinationist language of Jesus can be seen ironically to attest a characteristic attitude of mutual disposability and deference that flows from unity with the Father.”⁹

The heart of Gruenler’s assertions regarding the mutual subordination of the members of the Trinity can be seen in the following statement:

Our study describes one of the characteristic modes by which the members of the Triune family disclose their interaction in the redemptive process. The incarnate Son subordinates himself to the will of the Father for the work of salvation, and the Holy Spirit subordinates himself to the will of the Father and the Son in carrying out the work . . . But it is also clear from Jesus’ complementary claims to equality with the Father (10:30; 17:11) and his intimation that the Holy Spirit shares equally in the carrying out the work of salvation (14:16-17; 16:13-15) that such subordination is voluntarily assumed and flows out of dynamic and mutual hospitality of the divine Family as a unity.¹⁰

He goes on to say:

The interpreter must be alert at this point to analyze all the data carefully and observe that there are sufficient clues in the Gospel of John that allow us to speak of a subordination within the Trinity that is mutual, voluntary, and loving, but not of a subordination in which the Son and the Holy Spirit are second- and third-class members of the Family. Jesus’ claims to equality with the Father should make it clear that his subordination as incarnate Son is voluntarily assumed for the work of redemption, and that this voluntary sense may be extrapolated to the equally subordinate role of the Holy Spirit in the redemptive process.¹¹

Gruenler equally rejects this kind of argument with regard to human relationships, especially in the home. He begins by asserting the problems with a hermeneutic derived from the New Testament texts on headship.¹² In his view, these texts teach one thing on the personal level, i.e., the husband lovingly commands and the wife respectfully obeys, while, on a spiritual level, something else is taught, i.e., “all differences are transcended” (Gal. 3:28).¹³ For Gruenler, it is logically difficult to believe that one person should command and the other should obey without also believing that one is superior and the other is inferior.¹⁴ He goes on to say, “that may be well and true and necessary in view of the presence of sin in the present age. But when applied to the Trinity, that principle lands one

flatly in subordinationism in respect to the interpersonal relationship of Son and Spirit to Father who must perforce be seen as the superior member of the Triune Family.”¹⁵

Thus he affirms a mutual and voluntary subordination among the members of the Trinity. However he cautions against mistaking voluntary submission for necessary submission. The latter would inevitably regress into the one-way subordination that he wishes to avoid.¹⁶ He asserts that Jesus, in the fourth Gospel, lifts all relationships to a higher family level where mutual service takes precedence over any hierarchical model of simple command/obedience.¹⁷ So for Gruenler, the Trinity is the perfect example of mutual deference and mutual subordination.

Gruenler’s Understanding of John 5:18-30

The following section will address John 5:18-30 as a representative passage of Gruenler’s effort to teach that the Father submits to the Son.¹⁸ Gruenler’s whole intention in dealing with the Gospel of John is to demonstrate that there is “mutual loving, generosity, glorification, equality, availability, disposability, and deference,” within the relationship of the members of the Trinity.¹⁹ This is what he has in mind as he expounds on John 5:18-30.²⁰

He begins by explaining that in 5:18, Jesus disturbs the authorities by not only asserting that God does not observe the Sabbath when it comes to healing but also that his work is equivalent to the work of the Father. Gruenler claims that on the heels of this expression of equality with God, Jesus now, in verse 19, teaches that there is “coordinate unity” in the actions between he and the Father. The Son acts just like the Father and “would never think about doing anything without being in one accord with him.”²¹ Similarly, in verse 20, (For the Father loves the Son, and shows him all that he himself is doing; and greater works than these will he show him, that you may marvel) Gruenler says that love binds the Father and the Son together in mutual love “so that Jesus discloses the continuous working of the divine Community as his ministry unfolds.”²² He then goes on to verses 22-27:

- (22) The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son,
- (23) that all may honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him.
- (24) Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life.
- (25) Truly, truly I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live.
- (26) For as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself,

(27) and has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man.

Verses 22-23, for Gruenler, provide the key information necessary in order to make his claim that the Father submits to the Son. He notes, “The Father also defers to the Son in giving him all authority to judge. The Father submits to the good judgment of the Son and trusts his judgment completely.”²³ Therefore, Jesus makes statements of equality (v. 18), the Father is shown to defer and submit, and finally, in verse 23, Jesus acknowledges that he is sent by the Father, thereby showing his own deference to the Father. This is what Gruenler means by mutuality within the Godhead.

Gruenler’s comments on verses 26-27 are equally explicit with regard to his contention that there is mutual interdependence between the Father and the Son. This is further shown as Jesus describes the generosity of the Father as he is willing to share life equally with the Son. Jesus is clear about his sharing of authority with the Father in the act of judging. Gruenler says, “[Jesus] implies that because he has been willing to represent the divine Family as the Son of man, he is worthy of executing divine judgment, hence the Father willingly subordinates himself to the Son.”²⁴ In other words, because the Father has delegated the authority to judge, he has put himself in a position of submitting to the decisions of the Son; hence the subordination of the Father to the Son. Finally, in verse 30, Gruenler acknowledges that Jesus expresses his submission to the Father but this is just a demonstration of “one of the most remarkable characteristics of the divine Community,” namely, to assert authority and at the same time to become completely subordinate to one another.²⁵

Critique

This section will broadly critique Gruenler’s arguments in three major areas. First it will show that he has misunderstood the broad context of the Gospel of John by claiming that a primary theme is that of mutual submission between the members of the Trinity. Second it will show that he has mis-handled the text by using it as an example of how the Father submits to the Son. Finally, this section intends to show that Gruenler has misrepresented the concept of delegated authority by claiming that one who delegates authority subordinates himself to the one to whom he delegates.²⁶

Gruenler’s misunderstanding of mutual submission as a theme in John. Gruenler wrongly understands the fourth Gospel to be predominately about the mutuality and disposability of all of the members of the Godhead. The broader context of John deals not primarily with the mutuality or disposability between the members of the Godhead, but with the dependence of the Son upon the Father, the same Son who is co-existent and essentially equal to the Father. J. Ernest Davie contends that the relationship of Jesus to the Father

pictured in John is one that is characterized by trust, dependence, obedience, and love.²⁷ The primary characteristic however, is that of dependence. In fact, he claims, “there is no more remarkable element in the Fourth Gospel than the consistent and universal presentation of Christ, in His life and work and words and in all aspects of His activities, as dependent upon the Father at every point.”²⁸ For Davie, those who have studied the fourth Gospel with care will see that:

Christ depends upon the Father for His *power*—John 5:19 . . . for His *knowledge*—John 8:16 . . . for His *mission*—John 7:28 . . . for all *necessary instructions*—John 14:31 . . . for His *message*—John 7:16 . . . for *life*—John 5:26 . . . for the *destinies of life*—John 18:11 . . . for His *authority*—John 17:2 . . . for *love*—John 10:17 . . . for His *glory*—John 17:24 . . . for His *disciples*—John 6:37 . . . for *testimony*—John 5:37 . . . for the *gift of the Spirit*—John 3:34 . . . for *all other gifts*—John 17:7 . . . for *guidance*—John 11:9 . . . for *union and communion with the Father*—John 8:29 . . . and the same dependence is manifested in Christ’s *obedience*—John 4:34 . . . and witnessed to by His *prayers*—John 17:15.²⁹

In fact, it is Davie’s conclusion that the very word, “Son” implies the continual dependence “upon the Father as the source of life and of practically all else that is the Son’s.”³⁰ He goes on to argue that this concept of dependence of the Son on the Father is an eternal arrangement.³¹ While the eternal subordination of the Son to the Father is another theological matter,³² what is clear is that there is no hint of subordination of the Father to the Son.

Davie’s conclusion is the opposite of Gruenler’s belief that mutual and voluntary subordination is a theme of the Gospel of John. Mutual and voluntary submission between the members of the Godhead is not a theme of the Fourth Gospel and is not even a theme of the example passage. In fact, Barrett notes, “the main theme is solemnly, constantly, almost wearisomely, repeated. As v. 17 foreshadowed, there is complete unity of action between the Father and the Son, and complete dependence of the Son on the Father.”³³

The entire theme of sending speaks to the broader context of John. The idea that Jesus is sent by the Father is referenced throughout John, and this unique relationship conveys the idea of the dependence of the Son on the Father. Likewise it communicates the clear authority of the Father as the One who sends. Köstenberger argues that the Gospel of John characterizes Jesus as the “Sent Son.”³⁴ This concept centers upon various themes of obedience and dependence. In fact, “the sending language underscores the fact that the Son, the Sent One par excellence (cf. 9:7), carried out his mission in obedience and dependence upon his sender, the Father.”³⁵

Contrary to Gruenler, when looking at the general theme and intention of the Gospel of John, it can be seen that John is not arguing for a mutual dependence, but for a unidirectional reliance of the Son on the Father. This unidirectional concept does not negate the equality of the Father and Son, which of course is also affirmed within the text of John. It simply helps to round out the assertion that within the Godhead there is equality of essence but subordination of the Son to the Father with regard to role and function. This understanding is more in line with the intention of the Gospel of John.

Gruenler's mishandling of the text. Gruenler has also mishandled the text of the Gospel of John as presented in John 5:18-30. The designation of Son is not just a temporary name but reflects an eternal relationship between the Son and the Father. D. A. Carson reflects this sentiment.³⁶ Carson is concerned to present a proper understanding of the love of the Father for the Son and the love of the Son for the Father. In his summary statements concerning the passage in question (John 5:18-30) he first asserts that this relationship is eternal.³⁷ He argues that in spite of the fact that there are some who would claim, from this passage, that the title "Son" is to be considered for the incarnation only, he is convinced that the passage teaches the eternal nature of the relationship. The passage teaches that the Son does whatever the Father does, and Carson contends that the "whatever" is comprehensive, which would also include the act of creation (John 1:2-3).³⁸ This makes way for the assertion that the title of the Son is an eternal designation. Further, he notes that passages such as John 3:17 ("For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world but to save the world through him") teach that the person who was sent was the Son at the time of the sending.³⁹ In his understanding, "the 'Son' is an alternative appellation for that Word, not that this is a tag only for his incarnational existence."⁴⁰

He goes on to claim that John 5:26 should be viewed as an eternal "grant" from the Father to the Son which "inherently transcends time and stretches Jesus' sonship into eternity past."⁴¹ It is significant that God, who has "life in himself" has "granted to the Son to have life in himself."⁴² Gruenler claims that this part of the passage teaches that the Father is "generous" in sharing life with the Son. He further argues that this text implies that since Jesus was willing to represent the divine Family as the "Son of Man," it makes him worthy of carrying out divine judgment. This in turn paves the way for the Father willingly to subordinate himself to the Son. Contrary to Gruenler, this passage does not teach the generosity of the Father but actually helps to establish the fact of an eternal relationship between the Father and the Son. Therefore, the Sonship of Jesus is not limited to the days of his incarnation. According to Carson, then, "It follows that the love of the Father for the Son, and the love of the Son for the Father, which we have been considering, cannot be restricted to the peculiar relationship that pertained from the incarnation on, but is intrinsically intra-Trinitarian."⁴³ This leads Carson into his argument that there is a clear distinction between the love that the Son has for the Father and the love that the

Father has for the Son.⁴⁴ He states:

The Father commands, sends, tells, commissions—and demonstrates his love for the Son by 'showing' him everything such that the Son does whatever the Father does. The Son obeys, says only what the Father gives him to say, does only what the Father gives him to do, comes into the world as the Sent One—and demonstrates his love for the Father by such obedience. Not once is there any hint that the Son commissions the Father, who obeys. *Not once is there any hint that the Father submits to the Son or is dependent upon him for his own words and deeds.*⁴⁵

This passage cannot be used to argue for the subordination of the Father to the Son. At each turn it is the Son who continually states that whatever he has comes from the Father. This idea is inconsistent with Gruenler's attempt to draw out the notion of the Father's submission to the Son.

Gruenler's misrepresentation of delegated authority.

Not only has Gruenler misunderstood and mishandled John 5:18-30, he has also misrepresented the concept of delegated authority. Gruenler claims that when the Father gives all judgment to the Son, he is somehow submitting himself to the authority of the Son. He has eliminated the sense of agency and delegation. Craig Keener contends that in John 5:18-30, the Father is greater in rank and the Son submits to His will.⁴⁶ The Son is God but "he is also the agent of God the Father."⁴⁷ This image, in the culture to which this was written, would have carried with it an understanding of the subordination of the agent, even if it only applied to the particular task at hand.⁴⁸ According to Keener, Jesus actually begins his argument in verse seventeen by claiming that God regularly works on the Sabbath. From this, Keener argues that "by implying his minor premise that he is God's agent (he uses 'my Father' in a special sense that allowed him to act on the Father's authority), he concludes that he is therefore permitted to do God's work on the Sabbath."⁴⁹ This is the point at which Jesus' opponents express their objection. They agree that God regularly superseded the Sabbath, but they are not prepared to acknowledge the equality of Jesus with the Father. Keener asserts that while Jesus did make claims of deity (John 8:58, 20:28-29) he regularly denies equality of rank with the Father.⁵⁰ The manner in which Jesus does this is by calling attention to his role as a sent agent. Therefore Jesus is not claiming equal rank with the Father but is acting in obedience and on delegated authority.⁵¹ He continues:

Agency represented commission and authorization, the sense of the concept which provides a broad conceptual background for early Christian agency . . . Agents bore representative authority, because they acted on the authority of the one who sent them . . . the servant of a king held a high position relative to those the servant addressed but was always

subordinate to the king. Although commissioned agents in the first century were not always of lower social status, they relinquished their own status for the commission given them, in which they were authorized by the status of their senders. Even when one sent one's son (Mark 12:6), the messenger position was necessarily one of subordination to the sender.⁵²

In other words, the very concept of agency requires some sort of subordination by the agent to the one who does the sending. In this case it would be inconceivable that the Father would submit to the Son merely because he has delegated authority to judge. This implies that the Son still has to be accountable and answer to the Father.⁵³ Keener rounds out the discussion by calling the reader back to the reality of the deity of the Son by stating, "Although the concept of agency implies subordination, it also stresses Jesus functional equality with the Father in terms of humanity's required response: he must be honored and believed in the same way as must be the Father whose representative he is (John 5:23)."⁵⁴

This concept would be true for another key biblical relationship as well. God delegates the naming of the animals to Adam in Genesis 2:19 which says, "He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name." Here one can see that even though God has given Adam authority over the naming of the animals, it would not be plausible to also assert that God somehow had submitted himself to Adam. And even more, how wrong it would be to cite this passage in support of the mutual dependence and mutual submission of Adam and God. Along with the idea of delegated authority comes the concept that it actually emphasizes the subordinate role of the one to whom the authority is delegated.⁵⁵

Regarding delegated authority, the sending language used by John is instructive once again. Throughout the Gospel of John, the idea that Jesus is sent by the Father underscores not only the submission of the Son, but also the clearly delegated authority of the Father. The Son is the agent of the Father.⁵⁶ The fact that Jesus was sent implies the authorization of the Father and the "sphere of his authorized activity on behalf of his Father is clearly defined (that is, those activities, such as creation and judgment, which are peculiarly God's sphere) . . ."⁵⁷ The passages in John that reflect this idea are many:

Generally, the sent one is: to bring glory and honor to the sender (5:23; 7:18); to do the sender's will (4:34; 5:30, 38; 6:38-39) and works (5:36; 9:4), to speak the sender's word's (3:34; 7:16; 12:49; 14:10b, 24), and to be accountable to the sender (especially chapter 17). He is to bear witness to the sender (5:36; 7:28-8:26), to represent the sender accurately (12:44-45; 13:20; 15:18-25), to exercise delegated authority (5:21-22, 27; 13:3; 17:2; 20:23); and finally the sent one is to know the sender

intimately (7:29; cf. 15:21; 17:18, 25), live in a close relationship with the sender (18:16, 18, 29; 16:32), and follow the sender's example (13:16).⁵⁸

Part of Gruenler's argument that the Father submits to the Son, stems from his reading of 5:22-23. He claims that since the Father gives the responsibility of judging to the Son, he is somehow submitting to the authority of the Son. This interpretation of the text betrays the proper understanding of delegated authority. The one who delegates does not make himself subordinate to the one to whom he delegates.

Conclusion

This article attempts broadly to critique the argument of Royce Gruenler that not only does the Son submit to the Father, but the Father also submits to the Son. An attempt has been made to demonstrate that Gruenler is mistaken in his assertions and that he fails in his effort to argue biblically that the Father submits to the Son. He has misunderstood the broader context of the Gospel of John, mishandled the text, and has misrepresented the concept of delegated authority. The broader intention of John in his Gospel is to demonstrate the coequality of the Son with the Father while at the same time demonstrating the dependence of the Son on the Father. Further, John 5:18-30 does not in any way teach the subordination of the Father to the Son. Finally, Gruenler has betrayed common sense and biblical interpretation by claiming that delegated authority somehow forces the source of authority to submit to the one to whom he has delegated.

What John 5:18-30 illustrates so beautifully is the full equality of the Son to the Father along side his uniform desire to submit to the will, word, and ways of his Father. All that the Son has can be traced back to the Father. The Son can do nothing unless he sees the Father doing so. The Son cannot judge unless the Father gives him all judgment. The Son does nothing on his own initiative but carries out everything in accordance to the will of the Father. There is a clear order of relations that does not diminish or negate the mutual, essential equality between the Father and the Son. Further, this coexistence of equality and order is not temporal (for the purposes of redemption only) but is an eternal reality.

¹ John Thompson, *Modern Trinitarian Perspectives* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994) 3.

² *Ibid.*, 3.

³ For some examples of this see Paul K. Jewett, *Who We Are: Our Dignity as Human: A Neo-Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996); Gilbert Bilezikian, "Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping: Subordination in the Godhead," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (March 1997) 57-68; 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 (September 1999) 461-476.

- ⁴ Royce Gruenler, *The Trinity in the Gospel of John: A Thematic Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986).
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, xiii.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, xv.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, xiv.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, xiv.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, xiv-v.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xvii.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, xvii.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, xv.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, xv.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, xv.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, xv. Although this article will not deal specifically with the issue of the coexistence of authority and equality, it must be said that this is one of the primary egalitarian presuppositions. That is, they argue there can be no submission without deeming the subordinate inferior. This has been dealt with extensively by Peter R. Schemm, Jr., "North American Evangelical Feminism and the Triune God: A denial of Trinitarian relational Order in the Works of Selected Theologians and an Alternative Proposal," (Ph. D. dissertation, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC, 2001) 20-99. Further, the idea that positing a relational order within the Godhead leads automatically to the heresy of subordinationism is likewise false. The Fathers who articulated the Trinitarian doctrine did so in a way that affirms the equality of essence but acknowledges a functional, relational order. This is true for Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Hilary, and Augustine. See Randall Lee Stinson, "A Critique of Selected Key Aspects of the Egalitarian View of Paul Jewett," (Th. M. thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 1999).
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, xviii. In fact, he actually states about the Son, "He can say that he is sent by the Father and that he listens to the Father, but that suggests an essential and necessary subordination only if he has to be sent and he has to listen because otherwise he would not wish to go or hear what the Father has to say," (xviii).
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, xx.
- ¹⁸ Space will not permit me to address all of the pertinent passages. Nor does this article imply that this one passage represents the heart of Gruenler's book. He certainly is trying to communicate much more than the subordination of the Father to the Son. This passage does however give a good example of how Gruenler deals with the key texts to which he turns in order to make the argument of the subordination of the Father to the Son. Other passages where Gruenler makes this same type of assertion include, but are not limited to, John 3:35, 6:55-58, 8:14-18, 11:40-42, 14:9-12, 14:26-31.
- ¹⁹ Gruenler, 23. He defines disposability as "being there for the other as servants who place themselves at the other person's disposal in an act of hospitality and generosity."
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 36-38.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 36.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ *Ibid.*, 37.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 38.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*
- ²⁶ It is likely that some would prefer that a full exegesis be presented here and it is acknowledged that, for another project, this would have considerable value. But it is the intention of this article to present its case in a broader fashion, possibly laying the groundwork and showing the need, for a more detailed exegesis and further elaboration on each of the subheadings.
- ²⁷ J. Ernest Davie, *The Jesus of St. John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958).
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 90.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 77-78. Italics his.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 158.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 164.
- ³² See Kovach and Schemm, "A Defense of the Eternal Subordination of the Son."
- ³³ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (London: SPCK, 1955) 257.
- ³⁴ Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus & the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 107.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*
- ³⁶ D. A. Carson, *The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2000).
- ³⁷ Although the entire argument is not pertinent to the discussion as to whether or not the Father submits to the Son, Carson's argumentation reflects a progression that is important to see here. Therefore the broader argument will be included.
- ³⁸ Carson, *The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God*, 37.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.* Carson answers the charge that this may be anachronistic by claiming that in most cases an anachronism is clear from the context.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.* See also, D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 246-59.
- ⁴¹ Carson, *The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God*, 37. See also, C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, Second edition (London: SPCK, 1978) 262. He says that the act of giving life describes "the eternal relation of the Father and the Son."
- ⁴² John 5:26.
- ⁴³ Carson, *The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God*, 39.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 40. Italics mine.
- ⁴⁶ Craig Keener, "Is Subordination Within the Trinity Really Heresy? A Study of John 5:18 in Context," *Trinity Journal* 20 (1999) 39-51. It is especially significant that Keener is an egalitarian but still affirms the eternal subordination of the Son to the Father.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 42.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, 45-46. Keener eventually argues for some sort of eternal subordination of the Son to the Father. While this is significant in its own right, for the purposes of this article, it is only important to show that whatever the case may be, it is clear that the Father does not submit to the Son.
- ⁵³ This understanding of subordination is also echoed in the writing of Stephen Clark. See Stephen Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Man and Woman in the Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980) 23. He says that subordination, "refers to the order of relationship in which one person, the subordinate, depends upon another person for direction."
- ⁵⁴ Keener, 47.
- ⁵⁵ I do realize that Adam and Jesus are different in their standing since I would also affirm the eternal sonship of Christ. The point is, of course, that delegated authority does not require that the person who delegates the authority is somehow then under the authority of the one to whom it was delegated.
- ⁵⁶ A. E. Harvey, "Christ as Agent," in L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright, eds., *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) 241.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁸ Köstenberger, 108.

Overview of Two Views on Women in Ministry

Todd L. Miles

Assistant Managing Editor,
Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
Louisville, Kentucky

Two Views on Women in Ministry. Edited by James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001, 383 pp., \$16.99.

Two Views on Women in Ministry, edited by James Beck and Craig Blomberg, features essays by egalitarian scholars Craig Keener and Linda Belleville and complementarian scholars Thomas Schreiner and Ann Bowman. The editors introduce the book with the conviction that while the evangelical church has not yet arrived at a clear-cut consensus, when the debate is conducted with integrity and a generous spirit, the church can only benefit. Beck and Blomberg offer reflections on both the egalitarian essays and complementarian essays, followed by some concluding thoughts. Blomberg also provides, as an appendix, an essay on gender roles in Paul, written for another volume.

The following presents a summary of the argumentation and positions that the contributors offer in this book. No critique is offered; rather summary statements within each section are meant to reflect the author's own position and perspective.

Craig S. Keener (Egalitarian)

To Keener, the reason believers hold different views on the issue of women in ministry is because "different passages, taken by themselves, seem to point in different directions" (27). For example, different passages permit women's ministry

under "normal circumstances" while others prohibit it only under "exceptional circumstances" (29). He argues the one biblical passage that prohibits women from teaching "is addressed to the one church where we specifically know that false teachers were effectively targeting women" (29).

Keener then provides biblical examples of the ministries conducted by women, emphasizing the role of prophet and apostle. Keener structures his argument as follows: In the Old Testament, the most common form of ministry with respect to declaring God's word was the prophetic ministry. Although the priestly office in the Old Testament did carry numerous restrictions, the prophetic office "depended on personal calling and on gifts" (31). By virtue of these gifts, he reasons, "in the biblical period some women held an office more directly influential than offices now frequently denied them," because a "prophetic commission connotes some sort of authority or authorization" (31-32). Deborah is cited as the leading example. Because of a prophet's authority, the prophet is the closest equivalent to the New Testament apostle. Although one would not expect to find many female apostles because of cultural obstacles, the existence of Junia in Romans 16:7 confirms that a woman could hold the office. Arguments that Junia was not an apostle are unpersuasive to Keener. The only reason someone would deny that Junia is a woman "is the assumption that Paul cannot describe a woman as an apostle" (35). Therefore, if 1 Tim. 2 is not read back into the texts, there is "no reason to doubt that Paul accepts women in ministry" (40).

Some contend the prohibition in 1 Tim. 2 refers to authoritative teaching, namely that of the senior pastor. But

Keener argues that the grammar of the verse likely indicates that women may not teach *or* hold authority. However, he finds three problems with this straightforward reading. First, the text seems to suggest *all* kinds of biblical teaching. Second, Paul would not reduce the authority of women when he supports women's ministry in other passages. Third, to limit the meaning to senior pastor is to impose a modern understanding of church leadership on the text. Keener argues that although there are no female senior pastors named in the New Testament, neither are any male senior pastors named. He also believes Paul's teaching that elders were to be the husband of one wife (1 Tim. 3:2) is descriptive (written to the majority of elders in the day) as opposed to prescriptive. Therefore, if we can accept women as prophets and other ministers, there is no reason to exclude them from the pastoral office (45).

There are two texts which can be used to prohibit women's ministry: 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and 1 Tim. 2:11-14. Keener cautions that although all Scripture is universally applicable, it is written in culture and language-specific ways. "Because Paul always sought to be sensitive to his readers' situations . . . we dare not presuppose that every command applies in all circumstances" (49).

In 1 Cor. 14:34-35, Paul cannot mean *complete* silence, because earlier in the same letter he allowed women to pray and prophesy (1 Cor. 11:5). The problem was not that women were teaching, but that women were learning too loudly. "In the first generation church in Corinth, most women were novices and therefore should learn quietly. Paul's short-range solution, then, is to call for an end to the women's public questions" (51).

1 Timothy 2:11-14 is part of a broader set of instructions for public worship in the Ephesian church. A straightforward reading of the text does forbid all teaching of Scripture by women to men and all instances of women having (usurping) authority over men, but the passage addresses a particular situation. "The one passage in the Bible that specifically prohibits women from teaching is addressed to the one church where we know false teachers were effectively targeting women. . . . If women as a rule were less educated than men, they would become a natural target as those particularly susceptible to such false teaching" (53-54). The general principle is "Those most susceptible to false teaching should not teach" (55). Keener questions whether one can be consistent in applying biblical texts without taking into account the dramatic cultural differences. If all of 1 Timothy must be interpreted transculturally then even the most conservative churches are falling woefully short. Therefore, since 1 Tim. 2:12 should be understood as a prohibition relevant only for women in a specific historical circumstance, then women who are not in that position and who have experienced the call of God to pastor should be given opportunities to preach and teach.

Keener rejects the claim that Paul's citation of the creation narrative gives the prohibition transcultural force because Paul sometimes applies Old Testament texts to local situations. A universal prohibition based on gender would be a statement about women's ontological inferiority in discerning truth. Paul is actually drawing a local analogy between Eve and the easily-deceived women in Ephesus. Universalizing a biblical text by analogy is typical of Paul, where Keener understands Paul to use Scripture in an ad hoc fashion at times (61). Because the "creation order" argument is used in 1 Cor. 11:8-9 to admonish wives to cover their heads in church, transculturally prohibiting women from teaching or holding authority without requiring married women to cover their heads in church would be inconsistent. In creation order, man and woman are both *imago dei*. A "suitable helper" points to male and female correspondence, not to one partner's subordination (63).

Regarding the biblical pattern of male headship in the home, Keener believes that Paul's standard is one of mutual submission and servanthood. Both husbands and wives should practice submission though it is specified for the wife, just as both should practice love though it is specified for the husband. The subordination of the wife stems from the Fall and issues of women's ministry and gender roles in the home are distinguishable (64).

Though Keener's interpretation of these passages is not consistent with the majority interpretive view through the history of the church, he explains that the church has often missed or even suppressed truths that are clear enough in Scripture. He therefore concludes, "the majority view in the church throughout history — the view that came down to most of us through tradition — reflects the restrictive cultures of human history in which the tradition was formed rather than the clearest reading of biblical evidence" (66).

Linda L. Belleville (Egalitarian)

Belleville begins by noting the issue between egalitarians and complementarians is not whether women can minister, but whether women can hold positions of leadership in ministry. Her essay seeks to answer four questions pertinent to the debate (80).

First, do women occupy leadership positions in the Bible? Belleville finds many instances of women holding leadership positions in Scripture. In the Old Testament, women ministered in Israel as prophets, counselors, mourners, and at the tabernacle. Through the entirety of Scripture, women most consistently exercised the gift of prophecy (86). In the New Testament church, women were involved in the ministries of teaching, patronage, and evangelism. Teaching would have been a strongly countercultural gift for a woman, but "Jesus' instruction of Mary and the inclusion of female disciples . . .

set the stage for women to have an instructional role in the church” (87). Most noteworthy to the discussion is the presence of female apostles, such as Junia, and female deacons.

The second question is whether women assumed the same leadership roles in the Bible as men. Belleville believes that gifting to ministry does not necessarily make one a leader, but the ministry roles enjoyed by women in the Bible does warrant the label of leadership over men. The Old Testament examples of Deborah, Huldah, and Noadiah give “no hint in the Bible that female leadership is wrong” (94). New Testament examples are more difficult to find, but virtually every leadership role that names a specific man also names a woman. “The only role lacking specific female names are overseer/bishop . . . But then male names are lacking as well” (95). Ministry roles filled by women that constituted leadership over men were house patrons, prophets, teachers, deacons, and overseers.

The third question is whether the Bible limits women from taking certain leadership roles. To many, the issue is whether a specific ministry activity is authoritative (104). Belleville questions whether authority actually lies in a ministry activity. Church leaders do not exercise authority over the congregation. Rather, they are to minister to it and equip it for ministry. “No leadership position or activity in the New Testament is linked with authority” (105).

Belleville suggests that only 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and 1 Tim. 2:11-15 “are worthy of consideration” regarding the question of limits on the leadership roles of women (111). Because of 1 Cor. 11:2-5, Paul cannot be addressing women who are exercising their spiritual gifts by contributing a teaching, a revelation, etc. The key to understanding 1 Cor. 14:34-35 “is in grasping the educational limits of married Greco-Roman women” (116). Women, who to this point had not had opportunities to learn, were asking questions and causing disorder during corporate worship. In this context, to be submissive is to be silent. “Control over the tongue is most likely what Paul is talking about” (119).

1 Timothy 2:11-15 is best understood as a historically specific prohibition on “teaching that tries to get the upper-hand (not teaching per se)” (127). Belleville suggests the women in the Ephesian church may have been teaching in an authoritative manner because of an Artemis influence - where Artemis and all her female adherents were superior to men. Just as the manner in which a woman is to learn is the issue in 1 Cor. 14, the manner in which a woman is to teach is the issue in 1 Tim. 2 (130).

Finally, Belleville addresses the question of whether the Bible teaches a hierarchical structuring of male and female relationships. The starting point for men’s and women’s roles is Genesis 1-2. The primary thrust in the creation narrative is the sameness of male and female (140). Both are created in God’s

image and have a sameness of function in God’s sight. Belleville contends that there is nothing in the term “helper” that implies subordination — particularly since the term is used of God. She denies that there is any authority implicit in naming something, or in the creation order. Rather, Genesis 1-2 emphasizes the human completeness after the creation of woman. Because male rule is not mentioned outside of Genesis 3, it has “no place in the theology of the Bible” (145). Male and female relations are to be lived out in light of God’s intent to create two sexually distinct beings in partnership. The root of Eve’s sin was not a desire to take the lead, but a desire to be wise like God. The curse actually involved a woman’s yearning for personal intimacy while man’s rule takes the form of sexual demands. “Dominion of one over the other was not the intent. This is gender dysfunction, not gender normalcy” (148).

Thomas R. Schreiner (Complementarian)

Schreiner begins with a brief discussion of the history, hermeneutics, and terminology of the debate over women’s roles. Tradition is not infallible, but the fact that women have been prohibited from serving as pastors and elders across confessions throughout most of church history should lay the burden of proof upon those who want to challenge the historic interpretations. Although detached objectivity is certainly impossible, it must not be assumed that one cannot “gain a substantial and accurate understanding of the Scriptures in this age” (180). Further, the debate should not be framed as a choice between opposing texts. Rather, one must attempt to interpret all texts in context. All the texts in question have a basic teaching that is not difficult to grasp. One text is not more fundamental than another is. Finally, the issue is not over the ordination of women, but whether a woman can function as a pastor, overseer, or elder (which Schreiner believes to be the same office). It is Schreiner’s thesis that although all believers are called to ministry, women are not called to be pastors, elders, or overseers (183).

In the next section, Schreiner affirms the dignity and significance of women. Women are equally made in the image of God and are prominently featured in the ministry of Jesus and the rest of the New Testament. This confirms the truth of Gal. 3:28 which in context teaches that all believers have equal access to God. Furthermore, men and women are equal heirs in the salvation God has promised.

Schreiner believes it is “a fundamental mistake to so concentrate on the Scripture passages that limit women in ministry that we fail to see the many ministries in which women were engaged in Bible times” (188). For example, women functioned in both the Old Testament and New Testament as prophets. Prophecy is not preaching and it is distinct from teaching. It is the spontaneous reception of revelation or oracles from God. The presence of women

prophets does not neutralize the prohibition against pastoring. Schreiner does believe that women can and should serve as deacons (194). Women have the spiritual gift of teaching and men should be open to receiving biblical instruction from women, just as Apollos was. However, neither the office of deacon nor the act of instruction should be confused with the office of elder or functioning as the regular teacher of a gathering of men and women. The argument for Junia as an apostle is far too ambiguous to make a case for female leadership in the early church. Schreiner believes Junia probably was a woman but points out that recent scholarship suggests the verse actually means Junia was outstanding in the eyes of the apostles. Even were Junia an apostle, it is also likely that “apostle” does not have a technical meaning but refers simply to itinerant missionaries (199).

Schreiner believes there is no contradiction between equality of person and the differentiation of roles. There are six indications from the first three chapters of Genesis that such roles were established at creation, although the six arguments are not equally persuasive (201). First, Adam was created before Eve. Second, the garden command was given to Adam, not Eve. Third, Eve was created as Adam’s helper. Fourth, Adam names Eve. Fifth, the serpent approached Eve rather than Adam, thereby subverting the male ordained pattern of leadership. Sixth, Adam was responsible because he was rebuked by God first. Greater responsibility was given to Adam and he is named in Romans as the originator of sin. “It is crucial to see that these six arguments relate to the relationship between Adam and Eve before the Fall” (209). The creation narrative is especially important because it establishes God’s intentions regardless of what sin has done to the model.

A difference in roles is taught in the texts concerning marriage. This is particularly relevant since the teaching on the family forms the fabric for the teaching on the church (210). If husbands are assigned a leadership role in the family, it makes sense that men would be given the responsibility for leadership in the church. Men are to love their wives as Christ loves the Church, but the leadership of the husband is not canceled out by the command to serve and love. Interacting with common egalitarian arguments, Schreiner contends that the context for the mutual submission prescribed in Ephesians 5:21 is to be the church, not the family. *Kephalē* means “authority over” in almost every case, although in some instances it could mean both “authority over” and “source.” Even if *kephalē* does mean “source” it does not change the fact that the wife is supposed to submit to the husband for that reason. *Hypotassō* does mean “obey” but 1 Cor. 7:3-5 reminds us there is mutuality of authority in the marriage relationship. Although some argue that the command for wives to submit is culturally conditioned just as slavery is culturally conditioned, Schreiner counters that there is no parallel between marriage and slavery because marriage is a creation ordinance and slavery is an evil human institution that is regulated by God. It has always been the plan

that all marriages should reflect Christ’s love for the church. To fail to do so is to see marriage from a secular mindset (218).

Just as there are different roles for the sexes in the family, Scripture teaches there are to be different roles for the sexes in ministry. Women should not fill the role of pastor/elder/overseer. In 1 Tim. 2, Paul prohibits two distinct activities — teaching and exercising authority over men (221). This prohibition applies to the tasks of an elder. Paul appeals to creation, so the prohibition is not culturally bound. Furthermore, Paul gives no indication that lack of education is the problem. Schreiner believes that most egalitarians skate over the reason given and appeal to one that is not even mentioned (222). If lack of education were the problem, Paul could have easily mentioned it. The reason for basing the prohibition in Eden is not that Eve was less educated or intelligent, but that the serpent took the opportunity to deceive Eve to subvert the pattern of male leadership.

The principle behind the teaching on head coverings in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 is deference to male leadership. Clearly, women are to pray and prophesy in church. Schreiner also believes the distinction between public and private to be a modern invention (228). But prophecy is not the same as preaching. Apparently the refusal of the Corinthian women to abide by the custom was shocking. Shameful adornment in women is a symbol of rebellion against male leadership. Today, wearing a veil is not a signal of such deference. Parallels are difficult, but Schreiner suggests a modern equivalent would be the taking of the husband’s last name in marriage. The principle behind 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 is much the same. “Women are not to speak in such a way that they arrogate leadership. As in all other churches, they are to behave submissively and reserve the exercise of the pastoral office to men” (232).

Ann L. Bowman (Complementarian)

Ann Bowman’s essay reflects on the nature of ministry itself, suggesting applications to the particular issue of women’s roles. She begins with an overview of the New Testament teaching on ministry. All believers, regardless of gender, are called to minister first to God and then to others. All believers are under the general call to minister by the Great Commission. Every individual Christian also receives a specific call to ministry from God. With this, God provides specific preparation for the ministry to which He calls Christians. God prepares the whole person for ministry, primarily through the process of sanctification (250). It is from this cooperative work of sanctification that ministry flows. “We minister out of who we are and who we are becoming” (252).

God prepares believers for their particular ministry by five means: 1) an intimate personal relationship with God Himself, 2) a thorough and ever-increasing knowledge of

Scripture, 3) identification of personal natural abilities, 4) identification and cultivation of spiritual gifts, 5) the training and experiences through which God sovereignly leads the believer (253-263). Bowman is convinced that ministry has always taken place in the context of relationships. Therefore, community is vital to ministry. Although the calling to ministry is individual, each Christian still needs a local body of believers for support, protection and the authority to minister (266-267).

Along with preparation for ministry, God provides other resources available to every believer. These include equal standing before God in ministry, equal empowering for ministry, and equal spiritual gifts available for ministry. Because both men and women are created in the image of God, they are equal in their relationship with God (268). To each is given the commission to be fruitful and multiply and to rule over the earth. Women and men share equality in the new creation and share equal access as believer priests. Both have equal spiritual resources for ministry because power for ministry comes from a Christian's relationship with Jesus and the filling of the Holy Spirit. Bowman contends that gifting is not gender based, though gifting is not the same as calling to office (271).

God equips the Christian for ministry primarily through the giving of spiritual gifts. These are special abilities that are sovereignly distributed to believers by the Holy Spirit. Every gift is valuable because God has sovereignly determined each. "God alone selects various people to fulfill needed roles because he knows perfectly how the parts can best fit together at any given time" (276).

From this understanding of the nature of ministry, Bowman is convinced that women and men must minister together. Women were featured prominently in the ministry of Jesus and were instrumental in the New Testament church. Paul calls women his fellow workers and makes the "theological statement" that women and men work together to extend the kingdom of God (279).

Women in the New Testament ministered in their areas of gifting. Not all believers have the same ability to teach, but women (e.g., Priscilla) taught in a variety of settings. Women were prophetesses in the early Church and Junias is listed as an apostle — one who takes the gospel to new places. Other women's ministries in the New Testament are service and hospitality.

Bowman believes the roles of elder and deacon are not spiritual gifts, although God would give those called to the office certain gifts such as leadership, teaching, and pastoring. The deacon ministers in areas of practical service. It was a role that entailed some leadership, and it was certainly filled by women. The office of elder is the primary leadership role discussed in the New Testament. Since an elder was to be the husband of one wife, this fact carries the presupposition that an elder would be a male and married. In the patriarchal society of

the Greco-Roman world, this would have been the normal situation. There are no New Testament examples of female elders and the reference in 2 John is too vague to be a sufficient basis for female elders. But it is critical to understand that all authority is delegated by God. The Christian leader is called to shepherd. When this is done correctly it enables church members to exercise their gifts. Because of the delegated nature of leadership, women can serve in leadership positions in the church under delegated authority (286).

In 1 Tim. 2:11-15, Bowman believes Paul was singling out women in Ephesus who were struggling with false teaching. The opportunity to teach in the worship assembly would lend authority to their words. However, the passage is positive not negative - women are to learn. Women were to learn in quietness for two reasons. First, just as final authority rested with man in creation, Paul wants final authority in the church to rest with men. Second, because role reversal caused devastation in Eden, Paul wants to prevent role reversal from causing undesired problems in the church (289).

With regard to women in church leadership, Bowman believes "the person doing the teaching in the worship assembly typically would be the senior pastor, since this is the most public, influential role pictured in the local churches of the first century" (290). This senior pastor equivalent was a man and not a woman. Therefore, in today's church the role of senior pastor is reserved for men, but there is nothing to prevent a woman from being a staff pastor. Paul's injunction applies to women today just as in the first century. If women are causing disruption in a church service, they are to learn in quietness.

Bowman concludes by observing that differences in spiritual gifts and differences in culture will affect ministry and that cross-gender communication is a form of cross-cultural communication. Therefore, accurate communication between genders is vital for effective ministry. The best communicators are those who are comfortable with their own gender and who have been touched by the Holy Spirit (295).

Craig L. Blomberg (Editor's Essay)

Craig Blomberg's thesis is that "Paul was neither a classic hierarchicalist nor a full-fledged egalitarian" (330). Rather, Paul was coherent and consistent in traveling the middle ground between the two extremes.

To begin, Blomberg rejects claims that Paul was a strong egalitarian. There is currently no evidence that Paul could have inherited an egalitarian hermeneutic from his Jewish upbringing. Paul did not get an egalitarian perspective from Greco-Roman influences and though Jesus was counter-culture in many ways, he "stopped short of ever making any explicit

pronouncements about the equality of men and women” (335). The book of Acts does not provide any clue as to the interchangeability of roles. Therefore, if Paul was the first egalitarian his writing should reflect an egalitarian clarity of thought that could not be confused because such teaching would not have been familiar to the cultures it encountered.

In his epistles, Paul describes women as being deacons, patrons, and coworkers. Junia, a woman, was an apostle but this refers to missionary service rather than the apostolate of the 12. A small minority of women played significant roles in New Testament ministry, but no examples exist of women exercising ongoing authoritative teaching of God’s word (338).

For Paul, women and men alike are new creatures in Christ and have been given spiritual gifts without regard to gender. Although Galatians 3:28 affirms the full ontological equality of men and women, there is nothing in the verse that indicates Paul was seeking to abolish all role differentiation (340). Blomberg then examines five key passages from Pauline epistles.

1 Cor. 11:2-16. The controversy over *kephalē* is encountered in this passage. Although meanings of “authority” and “source” both exist in the extant literature, it is significant that it has not been demonstrated that *kephalē* ever means “source” or “origin” without “simultaneously implying some dimension of authority” (342). The contexts in Jewish and Greco-Roman worlds indicate that the female Christian, worshipping without a head covering, would have been sending “misleading signals suggesting sexual or religious infidelity” (344). Paul’s assumption that women will continue to prophesy gives to them tacit permission to preach, so long as they do so under male authority. Blomberg does differentiate between preaching as prophecy and the consistent teaching of the word of God by an elder/overseer. By grounding the teaching in the creation ordinances, Paul is promoting *some* kind of timeless relationship between authority and subordination (345). In summary, Paul does not see head coverings as a timeless mandate, “but he does see male headship, at least within marriage and perhaps more broadly, as defining a timeless authority structure . . .” (347).

1 Cor. 14:33b-38. Paul is not instituting a timeless absolute for silence since he allows female prayer and prophecy (which was identified above as a form of preaching). Blomberg dismisses the proposals that the limitation on speech is to the evaluation of prophecy and that uneducated women asking disruptive questions caused the prohibition. He believes Paul is insisting on proper roles of authority and subordination between men and women, or at least husbands and wives.

Colossians 3:18-19. Blomberg is impressed by the reciprocal responsibilities leadership figures are given in relationships of authority and submission. It is also apparent Paul did not feel the same tension that egalitarians do

between “programmatically mandated oneness in Christ and subsequent role differentiation” (353).

Ephesians 5:21-33. Paul preserves an irreversible hierarchy between husbands and wives but one that is constantly being recreated. It is to be wonderfully loving.

1 Tim. 2:8-15. The context is clearly false teaching, but Blomberg concludes there is not sufficient evidence for treating the teaching as either culture-bound or applicable to a specific situation only. However, the countercultural force of the command to allow women to learn must not be missed. Paul’s prohibition, barring contextual qualifications, is an absolute prohibition on one specific kind of authoritative teaching rather than two independent activities (364). The result is that “it seems highly likely that Paul is restricting women in one (and in only one) way: They must not occupy the office of elder/overseer” (364). The reason for the prohibition is that Adam was created first. Verse 14 should not be understood as a second reason for the prohibition but is the natural progression as Paul’s thoughts move from Genesis 2 to Genesis 3. Finally, verse 15 could represent Paul’s emphasis upon traditional mothering roles in the face of pressure in Ephesus to promote celibacy as the Christian ideal. Blomberg concludes that most churches would identify their senior pastor as the equivalent of the New Testament elder/overseer and that women “could then hold any other subordinate pastoral role” (369). ■

Review of *Two Views on Women in Ministry*

Thomas R. Schreiner

*Professor of New Testament,
The Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary
Louisville, Kentucky*

Two Views on Women in Ministry. Edited by James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001, 383 pp., \$16.99.

Introduction

As one of the contributors to this book on women in ministry, I am indulging in the pleasure of responding to the other writers in the book. Many books that present four or five views on controversial issues permit the authors to respond to the arguments of the other contributors. Beck and Blomberg chose not to include this feature. Instead as editors they provide an introduction and a conclusion, comment on both the egalitarian and complementarian essays, and include an appendix by Blomberg. The editors are egalitarian (Beck) and complementarian (Blomberg), and I believe they were fair and equitable in their assessment of the various views and essays. They did choose to use the word “hierarchicalist” in describing the complementarian view, and yet, they titled the historic position as “complementarian” on the cover of the book and in the section introducing the complementarian essays.

I want to begin by making some comments on the book as a whole. The editors chose to include two egalitarians and two complementarians. Craig Keener and Linda Belleville are the egalitarian contributors, and Ann Bowman and I wrote from the complementarian point of view. Including both a male and female to represent both positions gives the book a distinctive twist, guarding against any notion of an androcentric bias. On the other hand, if only two views were included the

contributors could have developed their arguments in more detail. The essays by Keener and Belleville overlap significantly, and perhaps readers would have been served better by one essay from each side. After all, we know that people read less and less today, and the length of the book may scare off some interested in the topic.

I agree with Beck and Blomberg that all of the essays are written with an irenic spirit. Further, they rightly maintain that neither side should be labeled heretical. The issue of women in ministry is important and emotions often run high. Pointed and spirited debate is fitting and even helpful. Nevertheless, we should avoid using the word “heresy” when debating the issue with evangelicals who cherish the inspiration and inerrancy of the scriptures. The debate over women in ministry does not address a non-negotiable issue, such as the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the substitutionary atonement, justification by faith alone, the personal and bodily return of Christ, etc. We must not confuse matters and treat the controversy as if the gospel itself is at stake. We are to show Christian love to those with whom we disagree. On the other hand, most would agree that the issue is also an important one. Churches must order themselves in accord with the word of God. Complementarians, like me, fear that societal pressures rather than the scriptures dictate the outcome on this issue for many. We believe that the church of Jesus Christ will be weakened if we stray from what the scriptures clearly teach. We are persuaded that different roles are prescribed both in the home and the church for men and women. If the church strays from the biblical pattern, both the home and the church will be damaged. The pathway to blessing and happiness for both men and women is submission to the revealed word of God.

Evaluation of Keener and Belleville

I begin my review with a response to the egalitarian essays of Keener and Belleville. It is not the purpose here to summarize their essays as a whole since a summary of the respective essays in the book is included elsewhere in this issue of the journal. Instead, I will respond to the central arguments proposed by Keener and Belleville.

Both Keener and Belleville begin by noting that women functioned as prophets and in other leadership roles, such as apostle and deacon. For instance, in Judges 4-5 Deborah exercises authority as a judge and even tells the commander, Barak, what to do. Junia in Romans 16:7 functioned as an apostle, say both Keener and Belleville, and hence no authoritative ministry role should be denied women today. There is no doubt that women in both the OT and NT functioned as prophets. Deborah received and proclaimed authoritative and inerrant words from the Lord. The NT confirms that women function as prophets of the Lord (Acts 2:17-18; 21:9; 1 Cor. 11:5). Egalitarians raise an important question. How does the prophetic role of women, clearly supported throughout the entire canon, square with the prohibition of 1 Tim. 2:12 (cf. also 1 Cor. 14:34) where women are forbidden to teach and to exercise authority over men? Keener argues that women in many churches today are denied positions that are less influential than the prophetic office (31). If women proclaim the word of God via prophecy, claim egalitarians, then every leadership role should be open to them.

The egalitarian argument from prophecy is the strongest one supporting their position, but it fails to persuade for several reasons. First, we should observe the pattern of biblical revelation. Women served as prophets in the OT but never as priests. Similarly, in the NT women served as prophets but never as apostles or elders/overseers/pastors (I understand these three terms to refer to one office). Second, the gift of prophecy should be distinguished from the gift of teaching. Those who prophesy receive revelations from God that are then transmitted to believers (1 Cor. 14:29-33). The gift is therefore, more passive in nature than the gift of teaching. Prophets transmit the word of the Lord; they do not study, prepare, and then deliver the word of the Lord. I am not denying that the prophetic word delivered by women is authoritative, though whether a prophecy is truly from God must be discerned by the church (1 Cor. 14:29; 1 Thess. 5:20-21). Third, 1 Cor. 11:2-16 casts important light on the prophetic ministry of women. Women are encouraged to pray and prophesy in the church, but Paul enjoins women to adorn themselves in a certain way because of male headship. Significantly, he begins the section by reminding his readers that “the man is the head of a woman” (1 Cor. 11:3). In other words, women are permitted to pray and prophesy in the assembly, but they are to do so in a way that indicates that they are submissive to male headship. I conclude that women possessing the prophetic gift does not lead to the conclusion that they can serve as pastors and teachers today.

Egalitarians, of course, object to the previous arguments. Belleville thinks that the word “head” (*kephalē*) means “source,” not “authority” in Ephesians 5 (though she maintains it refers to the one who has prominence or “pride of place” in 1 Corinthians 11). She does not interact with the work done by Grudem and Fitzmyer in which they demonstrate that the word regularly means “authority over” in the NT and in extra-biblical literature. Even if the word means “source” in a few texts (which Grudem seriously doubts), the conclusions drawn by Belleville still do not follow. If women are instructed to adorn themselves in a certain way because men function as their head, then, even if the word “head” means “source,” a role differentiation between men and women is established. Belleville is unconvincing in her explanation of “head” in Eph. 5:21-33 (137-139). She alleges there is no contextual support in Ephesians 5 for the notion that “head” means “authority.” But notice Paul’s argument in vv. 22-23. Wives are to submit to husbands because the latter function as the head. So, even if the word “head” means “source” here (which is exceedingly doubtful), wives are to submit to their source. The primary role of leadership (yes, loving and servant leadership!) for the husband is clearly taught here, just as the church is to submit to the lordship of Christ.

Keener raises another objection from 1 Corinthians 11, maintaining that if the text is transcultural then we should require women to wear something on their heads in church (47, 62). I must admit to being puzzled by this objection. Most egalitarians rightly argue that the *principles* of God’s word apply to our culture today. In fact, Keener is helpful in distinguishing between what is cultural and what is transcultural in his essay. We are not trying to reproduce the culture of the Bible in today’s world. We do not believe that we must greet one another with a holy kiss because that is what the Bible literally says (Rom. 16:16). Nor do we demand that those with stomach aches must drink wine in accord with 1 Tim. 5:23. We derive *principles* from these texts, concluding that we are to greet one another warmly and with affection, and that those with stomach problems should take an appropriate remedy for their discomfort. Similarly, most complementarians believe that the point of 1 Cor. 11:2-16 is not the literal issue of head coverings. Head coverings (or hairstyles—scholars do not even agree on what the cultural practice was!) or the lack thereof sent a particular message to those who lived in the Greco-Roman world of the first century. To apply the text to today’s world we seek to discern the principle of the passage. We do not try to reproduce the cultural world addressed. I would argue that the principle is that women should prophesy in a way that supports male leadership since Paul introduces the text by appealing to man as the head of woman (1 Cor. 11:3), and he also proceeds in the argument to refer to the creational differences between men and women (1 Cor. 11:8-9). Hence, it is *rhetorically effective* for egalitarians to say that women must wear head coverings today. But such a comment is *hermeneutically unpersuasive*, for the complementarian

argument from texts like 1 Tim. 2:11-15 is deeper than egalitarians apparently perceive. We are not saying that we must invariably reproduce the customs of the biblical text in our culture. We are arguing that there are *contextual indicators* (the order of creation in 1 Cor. 11:8-9 and 1 Tim. 2:13) that the regulations and prohibitions in these passages are transcultural.

Both Keener and Belleville note that women can serve in many ministries. Complementarians joyfully agree, and I sketch in the evidence in my own essay. Romans 16 is a beautiful passage in which women are praised as co-workers and laborers in the Lord. I also agree that women served as deacons (Rom. 16:1; 1 Tim. 3:11), and Belleville has a helpful discussion on this matter (89-90). Still, the office of deacon should be distinguished from that of elder, for teaching and authority are reserved for the latter (1 Tim. 2:12; 3:2, 4-5, 5:17). The argument between complementarians and egalitarians is not whether women serve in ministry. All agree that women (and all Christians!) have the joyful responsibility of serving in ministry. The question on which egalitarians and complementarians disagree is whether women can serve as pastors/elders. Both Keener and Belleville adduce the example of Junia (Rom. 16:7), claiming that she served as an apostle. Keener thinks that Rom. 16:7 is as hard for the complementarian position as 1 Tim. 2:11-12 is for egalitarians (6). The two texts, however, are not comparable. First Timothy 2:11-14 is *about* the role of women, but Rom 16:7 is a *greeting* to Andronicus and Junia—not a discussion on whether women can serve as apostles. It is now generally accepted that Junia was a woman, but it is unclear whether she is identified as an apostle here. Daniel Wallace and Michael Burer have recently written an article (printed in this issue of *JBMW*) in which they argue that the verse means that Andronicus and Junia were “outstanding in the eyes of the apostles.” If they are correct (and they present some significant evidence supporting their position), Junia is not even called an apostle in this verse. Even if Junia is identified as an apostle, the egalitarian case does not stand. As I point out in my Romans commentary, the term apostle is not invariably a technical term. Whether it refers technically to the authoritative apostles who served as the foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20) must be discerned from context. It is quite likely that Andronicus and Junia functioned together as a missionary team. Indeed, Ernst Käsemann is probably correct in suggesting that Junia ministered especially to women. The reference to Junia, then, is scarcely clear evidence for the egalitarian position. It is not comparable to 1 Tim. 2:11-14 in which the topic of women teaching and exercising authority is addressed directly.

Belleville presents a number of arguments supporting women in leadership that are unpersuasive. She apparently thinks that because the church met in a woman’s house that the woman in question functioned as a leader (95). She lists Mary, the mother of Mark, whose house was used by the early church (Acts 12:12) in support of her view. Functioning as a patron

does not necessarily indicate that one served as a leader. The leaders named in the Jerusalem church are the male apostles and the elders, not Mary. To claim that women patrons functioned as leaders is an argument from silence, and it is unclear that anything else in the NT suggests such a conclusion. Belleville is also unhelpful regarding teaching. She rules out any idea that some teaching is informal or private over against teaching that is formal and public (99). By doing so she can lift Priscilla up as a teacher since she instructed Apollos (Acts 18:24-26). Belleville falls into a logical error in her presentation. She rightly says that everyone in the NT was expected to teach at some level (Col. 3:16), but it does not follow from this that everyone had the same office as teacher. There is a difference between the instruction and mutual teaching all believers participate in, and public formal teaching. Life is complicated and multifaceted. Belleville in my judgment misconstrues the biblical evidence by lumping together verses such as Col. 3:16 with texts like 1 Tim. 2:11-15. Denying women the role of regular public teaching does not rule out the mutual teaching from the scriptures enjoined in Col 3:16. Complementarians must not fall into the error of failing to listen to wise words from women nurtured in the scriptures. Still, this is not the same thing as giving women the responsibility of teaching and exercising authority over men.

Belleville argues, however, that women functioned as elders, seeing an example of this in 1 Tim. 5:9-10. Her argument here is unconvincing. First, the passage is not about elders serving as leaders but about supporting widows in financial need (1 Tim. 5:3-16). Second, those sixty years old are to be helped because they need financial assistance in their old age, not because this is the age in which one could begin to serve as a leader. One wonders about the energy level of elders if they have to be sixty and over! Third, if Belleville were correct, then only widows could serve as elders, thus any older married woman would be excluded. Finally, v. 16 clarifies that the issue is widows who need financial help.

Belleville also argues that the church possesses authority, not individuals. Her thesis is artificial and divides what should be kept together. Ultimate authority does not reside in individuals but the gospel. Still, Belleville’s attempt to say that the authority of the twelve did not include their preaching (Matt. 10:1-8) wrongly separates their authority to heal from their authority to preach. She is certainly correct in saying that submission to leaders is voluntary in Heb. 13:17, but she does not see that the leaders still possess authority. They are not to coerce submission, but the position of elder does involve leadership (1 Tim. 3:4-5; 5:17; Tit. 1:9). Jesus modeled servant leadership, but he was still a leader.

First Timothy 2:11-15 is one of the central texts in the debate on women leaders. Interestingly, Keener endorses the conclusions of Andreas Köstenberger in his study of 1 Tim. 2:12. Köstenberger demonstrates from parallels in both extra-

biblical Greek and biblical materials that Paul prohibits two activities here—teaching and exercising authority. Both activities, teaching and exercising authority, are legitimate activities, i.e., there is nothing inherently wrong with teaching and exercising authority. Nevertheless, Keener thinks that prohibition against women teaching is not universal because of cultural factors in the text. Belleville, on the other hand, disagrees with Köstenberger, but her own analysis of the grammar is mistaken. She says the two infinitives “teach” and “exercise authority” function as nouns but she does not point out that they function as complementary infinitives to the verb phrase “I do not permit.” Further, she argues that the verb “teach” modifies the noun “woman,” but actually the noun “woman” functions as part of the object clause of the verb “permit” and as the subject of both infinitives in the object clause. Belleville ends up with two unusual proposals for the meaning of the verse: 1) “I do not permit a woman to teach in order to gain mastery over a man,” and 2) “I do not permit a woman to teach with a view to dominating a man” (127). She understands the Greek word *oude* to designate in the correlative clause a related purpose or goal. Such a reading is grammatically problematic and misunderstands the word *oude*, for introducing any notion of purpose here misconstrues the force of the correlative. Since Belleville demonstrates a misunderstanding of the syntax of 1 Tim. 2:12, her attempt to define the word *authentain* (“exercise authority”) must be judged as unconvincing.

Both Keener and Belleville maintain that the prohibition against women teaching is explained by women’s lack of education and promotion of the false teaching. It is not evident from 1 Timothy, however, that women were responsible for the false teaching threatening the church. The only false teachers named are men (1 Tim. 1:20). The sweeping prohibition against women teaching only makes sense if *all* the women were teaching heresy, but it is difficult to believe that this is the case. First Timothy says nothing at all about women spreading false teaching, for in context 1 Tim. 5:13 refers to gossip, not false teaching. Moreover, if egalitarians are correct, and both men and women were spreading false teaching, why does Paul only restrict women from teaching? Focusing only on women, within an egalitarian interpretive framework, seems rather sexist.

Belleville is even more specific than Keener, thinking that the women in Ephesus were influenced by the Artemis cult where the female was considered superior to the male. We can simply say in reply that there is no clear evidence in the letter that the Artemis cult played a role. Paul does not mention the cult, nor is there any specific notion in the text that shows the influence of the cult. Belleville reads such a background into the text and then interprets the text from the alleged historical situation, an example of arbitrary mirror reading. If we think about it for a moment, Paul could have easily written, “I do not permit women to teach or exercise authority over a man, for they are engaged in false teaching.” Or, he could have written,

“I do not permit women to teach or exercise authority over a man, for they are promoting teachings from the Artemis cult.” Instead, the reason Paul gives is rooted in the created order. The reason Paul prohibits women from teaching or exercising authority over men is rooted in God’s intention from creation (1 Tim. 2:13). He does not appeal to the cultural argument promoted by egalitarians. Both Keener and Belleville leap over what the text actually says and substitute their alleged backgrounds instead.

Belleville thinks that the language of Adam being created first simply designates sequence and nothing more (129). She fails to explain persuasively the meaning of the text as it stands. Paul is giving a reason in 1 Tim. 2:13 [for (*gar*)] women are not permitted to teach or exercise authority over men. Some of the other examples Belleville adduces do point to sequence (e.g., Mark 4:28), though even in those contexts the sequence has exegetical significance (cf. 1 Cor. 15:46; 1 Thess. 4:16-17). It is not difficult to see that Paul thought the order of creation was a pointer to God’s intention, but the significance of the sequence is missed by Belleville. Keener, on the other hand, argues that not all proof texts from the OT are transcultural, and that the OT could be used as an analogy, without any notion of a transcultural application. Keener raises an important and complex issue that deserves more discussion than is possible here. It should be said in reply that an argument from the OT based on the created order is almost certainly transcultural. Jesus argued from creation in defending monogamy and God’s intention that husbands and wives should not divorce (Matt. 19:3-9). Paul argued from creation in prohibiting homosexuality (Rom. 1:26-27). There is no reason, in the case of 1 Tim. 2:13, to think Paul is arguing analogically. Paul prohibits women from teaching and exercising authority over men because of God’s intention in creating men and women.

Another difficult text is 1 Cor. 14:33b-36. Keener argues that women are prohibited from learning loudly. Belleville devotes more attention to the text, but she agrees with Keener in thinking that married women were disrupting the public meeting of the church. The situation addressed in these verses is difficult to determine, and both Belleville and Keener rightly disagree with the view that these verses are a later interpolation. Further, I believe they are correct in saying that Paul is not prohibiting women from speaking in tongues, from prophesying, or even from judging prophecies. But both of them also miss a theme in the text that correlates with what we have seen from 1 Tim. 2:11-15. Wives are to quit being disruptive because their disruptive speech shows that they are not being submissive. The principle from the text, therefore, is not that women should be absolutely silent in church (as some conservatives allege). Such an admonition would contradict 1 Cor. 11:5 where women are encouraged to pray and prophesy. It was noted earlier that we must discern the principle in texts addressed to specific cultural situations. The principle in this case is enunciated in 1 Cor. 14:34. The women “are to subject themselves, just as the law

also says.” The transcultural principle, then, is that wives are to be submissive. In this situation their submission manifests itself in how they conduct themselves in worship. Paul locates the principle of submission in the “law.” Belleville argues that “law” (*nomos*) refers here to Roman law (119). Against this, there is no clear example elsewhere in Paul where the term “law” refers to Roman law. Paul uses the term “law” often, however, to refer to the OT. It is quite likely that he has the OT in mind here, and most likely he refers to the creation narratives, especially Genesis 2, where a role differentiation between men and women is implicit in the narrative.

This brings us to the creation narrative in Genesis 1-2. All agree that Gen. 1:26-27 teaches the fundamental equality of males and females. Both are equally created in God’s image. The issue is whether a role differentiation is taught or implied in Genesis 2. Belleville answers “no.” Complementarians reply that woman was made to be man’s helper, but Belleville notes that God often helps Israel and he is not subordinate to Israel! To reply to Belleville here, I will simply cite part of my essay in the same book. “Anyone who has read the OT knows that Yahweh is often portrayed as Israel’s helper, and thus the term ‘helper’ alone does not signify male leadership in Genesis 2. And yet words are assigned their meanings *in context*, and in the narrative context of Genesis 1-3 the word ‘helper’ signifies that Eve is to help Adam in the task of ruling over creation. Indeed, in some contexts in the OT, the word ‘help’ designates those who assist a superior or ruler in accomplishing his task” (cf. 1 Kings 20:16; 1 Chron. 12:22-23; 22:17; 26:13; Ezek. 12:14). “These examples show that context is decisive in determining whether the one who helps has a superior or inferior role. Egalitarians cannot dismiss the complementarian view simply by saying that Yahweh helps Israel, for in other texts it is clear that leaders are helped by those who are under their authority” (204-205.)

Belleville also rejects the idea that the naming of the woman suggests male headship, suggesting that only an act of memorializing or recognition is in view. The significance of naming, as with the word helper, must be discerned in context. In Genesis the naming of the animals is linked with the dominion of Adam over all of creation (Gen. 1:26, 28; 2:15). Therefore, we are justified in detecting a notion of male headship in the naming of the woman.

Finally, Belleville thinks Adam being created first is hardly decisive, for John the Baptist preceded Jesus, and Jesus himself teaches the first would be last, etc. Again, we must read the text in context. No one argues that order *always* signifies dominion. The basic rule of Bible study applies here which says that each text must be interpreted in context. What is clear is that in both 1 Tim. 2:11-13 and 1 Cor. 11:3-9 Adam’s priority in creation signifies a role differentiation between men and women. Many egalitarian interpreters of Genesis proclaim that the order of creation says nothing about role differences, but

such an interpretation slights the importance of reading the scriptures canonically, for Paul clearly understands the order of creation to signify a difference in function.

To sum up, the essays by Keener and Belleville are good examples of egalitarian exegesis. Keener’s work is more restrained than Belleville’s, but neither of them has convincingly made the case for egalitarianism. Role differences between men and women are rooted in the created order. No egalitarian has successfully explained how an argument from the created order can be culturally relative.

Evaluation of Bowman and Blomberg

It is not surprising that I would devote more attention to the egalitarian essays since we disagree profoundly on the interpretation of the biblical text. Therefore, my comments on the essays of Ann Bowman and Craig Blomberg will be briefer. The editors cast his view as neither hierarchicalist or egalitarian, suggesting that he inhabits a middle position. He does hold a position between the egalitarian positions and my own. Still, it is not really accurate to say that he is neither hierarchicalist or egalitarian. Blomberg is still a complementarian, for he believes in role differences between the sexes. His ultimate position does not differ significantly from Ann Bowman who is identified as a complementarian in the book. Blomberg and Bowman are both complementarians, though they would disagree with me on what biblical complementarianism involves.

Ann Bowman’s essay is an excellent description of Christian ministry and reminds us of the many ministry roles that women can fill. Ministry is multifaceted and every Christian is to be involved in ministry. The issue is whether women can serve as pastors/overseers/elders. Bowman’s essay is exceedingly brief in explaining why she draws the line where she does on women in ministry. She rightly celebrates the many ministries roles women can fill, but she does not argue her case exegetically. I must admit that I was surprised that she wrote her essay in the manner she did. There is much to learn from what she says about women in ministry in her chapter, but since the purpose of the book, as I understood it, was to argue exegetically for our respective positions, this essay contributes little to the overall case for complementarianism. Hence, I also wondered why the editors did not ask her to revise her contribution so that it fit the pattern of the other essays. Bowman concludes from 1 Tim. 2:11-15 that women can fill any role but that of the senior pastor. She concedes that the wording of 1 Tim. 2:12 does not clearly point to a senior pastor but maintains that the senior pastor who preaches and has the final responsibility for the affairs of the church suits well the wording of the text. We can delay our evaluation of Bowman’s position until our discussion of Blomberg, for Blomberg supplies the exegetical foundation for Bowman’s view.

Perhaps the editors decided to include Blomberg's essay because it provides exegetical support for Bowman's position. They are hopeful that the senior pastor only position is a modification of complementarianism that will chart a third course between complementarian and egalitarian positions (326). It seems, then, that the editors conceive of Blomberg's essay as the synthesis between the thesis and the antithesis, the middle way that has the potential of bringing harmony to evangelical churches. Before I discuss the matter exegetically, I want to address the issue pragmatically. I believe Beck and Blomberg misread our culture at this point. In Southern Baptist Seminaries the line is drawn specifically on the issue of whether women can be *senior pastors*. Hence, there is freedom to believe that women can inhabit all other ministry positions. I am not saying, of course, that all Southern Baptist professors and pastors *believe* that women can serve in all other ministry positions. The exact ministry roles women should fill is debated. My point is that the line is *officially* drawn at whether women can be senior pastors. Does it follow that Southern Baptists are viewed as charting the middle way in evangelicalism? Do we represent a modified complementarianism that impresses both sides? Hardly. Egalitarians lament the patriarchalism that excludes women from being senior pastors in the Southern Baptist Convention. Further, they are convinced that limiting women from this one office only is a peculiar example of men wanting to hold on to power. If women can teach men publicly and even preach to men in public, as Blomberg argues in his essay, then why are they forbidden to do this on a *regular* basis? Egalitarians think that the issue must be power. Men are not willing to give up the final authority of always preaching and teaching. I am no prophet, but I predict that the alleged middle way of Beck and Blomberg will have no affect at all in our culture, for it will not be perceived as a middle way.

The first thing that strikes one about Blomberg's essay is how much he has read on the topic! The essay is worth reading simply for the footnotes, and I was amazed that Blomberg had consulted so many different books and articles. Most of Blomberg's essay supports the complementarian view. He rejects an egalitarian reading of Genesis 1-3. He sees no examples of women who regularly had authoritative teaching roles. Galatians 3:28 cannot be used to nullify all gender roles. In 1 Cor. 11:2-16 the term "head" conveys the idea of male leadership. He thinks in 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 that Paul does not want women to ask questions that disrupt the evaluation of prophecies. He argues that the "law" in this text points to the created order and OT regulations about women. Paul himself did not feel that submission of the wife to the husband contradicted Gal. 3:28 or his programmatic statement in Col. 3:11. The parallel to slavery cannot stand at every point, insists Blomberg, or we would have to abolish marriage and parenthood. Ephesians 5:21 cannot be used to defend mutual submission in marriage. The link between headship and submission in Eph. 5:22-23 shows that Paul sees an authority

structure in marriage and calls upon women to submit themselves to their husbands, though he notes that Paul softens patriarchy in a loving way, and so redefines it in its cultural setting. In terms of 1 Tim. 2:8-15 he rejects the egalitarian view that the prohibition against women teaching and exercising authority can be explained by the cultural situation. Blomberg concludes that only one office is forbidden for women, namely, the office of elder/overseer. He argues that the prohibition is grounded in creation and hence is normative for today. Blomberg does offer a different explanation of 1 Tim. 2:14. He suggests that Paul does not offer a fresh argument for the prohibition in v. 12, and that Paul moves to a new subject, Eve's deception in v. 14. I am not persuaded by Blomberg's exegesis of 1 Tim. 2:14, but what needs to be emphasized here is that at point after point Blomberg basically agrees with complementarian exegesis. Some complementarians will disagree with where he draws the line—only at senior pastor, and there is also one place where Blomberg's exegesis could open the door to an egalitarian reading, which I will address shortly. Nevertheless, I simply want to remark again that it surprises me that Blomberg's view would be touted by the editors as the middle way, for he substantially agrees with complementarian exegesis.

Actually, I can see why Blomberg might see his position as a *via media*, for his position is less restrictive than that of many complementarians. I am surprised that Beck, as a coeditor and an egalitarian, would agree. Blomberg's bottom line is not different from Bowman's, and her view is on the complementarian side of the equation. I feel sure of one thing. Most egalitarians will not see Blomberg's view as a mediating position between the two views. Blomberg is allied too closely with complementarian exegesis for such a vision to become a reality.

And yet it is the case that Blomberg's essay charts a middle way in this particular book. I have two serious reservations about his essay. First, Blomberg (like Bowman) concludes that women cannot be *senior pastors*. In one sense I agree with the conclusion, for one could hardly be a complementarian and disagree. Still, what Blomberg and Bowman say here is problematic. The office of *senior pastor* nowhere exists in the Bible but reflects the practice in many churches today. I would argue that the term "senior pastor" is fundamentally unbiblical, for the NT, does not plot a hierarchy among the elders/overseers/pastors. We have clear evidence that a *plurality* of elders were appointed in every church. Acts 14:23 says that Paul and Barnabas "appointed elders for them *in every church*" (italics mine). James 5:14 also assumes a plurality of elders, for surely the elders visiting the sick are from only *one* local church. The pastoral office in the NT is not to be separated from the office of elder (cf. Acts 20:17, 28; Eph. 4:11; 1 Pet. 5:1-2). Hence, the notion that one pastor should be called the *senior pastor* cannot be sustained from the scriptures. I am not denying that there will be a first among equals. Such an arrangement is natural. And yet in every

church there should be a plurality of leadership so that no leader has “the final decision” apart from the other leaders and the church as a whole. Blomberg draws the line at senior pastor because most churches today do not have a plurality of elders. Still, it is not helpful to draw the line at senior pastor since using this terminology, even as a concession to modern practice, confuses the issue.

Another disagreement as to how to work out the biblical teaching on the role of women surfaces at this point. First Timothy 2:12 does prohibit women from serving as elders, for the responsibility to teach and exercise authority belongs especially to the elders (Acts 20:17, 28, 32; 1 Tim. 3:2, 4-5; 5:17; Tit. 1:9; 1 Pet. 5:1-3). It seems to me, however, that 1 Tim. 2:12 cannot be limited to the pastoral office. Here, Paul intentionally specifies that the functions of teaching and exercising authority, and not only serving as elders are denied for women. I would conclude from this that a woman should not teach an adult Sunday School class composed of both men and women. At least she should not teach such a class if the purpose of the class is to teach the scriptures or theology. Where to draw lines on these matters is difficult, but allowing women to teach adult men the scriptures crosses that line in my judgment.

Second, I do have one major exegetical disagreement with Blomberg, one that is actually more important than the difference noted above. Blomberg argues that the gift of prophecy includes the activity of preaching. Hence, he argues that women can preach in church if they do so under male authority (344-345). Now if Blomberg is correct here, Paul’s view seems rather strange. If women can preach to men occasionally, as long as it is under the auspices of male authority, why can’t they preach to men all the time as long as the elders give permission? If women have the gift of preaching and they can preach to men, then what rationale allows women to do such some of the time, but not all of the time. I think egalitarians will press Blomberg to be more consistent and to allow women to preach regularly. What practical difference does it make if women can preach regularly (under male authority) but they are prohibited from the office of elder? Or, if Blomberg were to say they cannot preach regularly but only occasionally, one wonders how this could be justified from 1 Cor. 11:2-16 and from the gift of prophecy in general. We would then be saying that women can sometimes exercise the gift of prophecy but they cannot always exercise that gift. This seems like a strange state of affairs. Furthermore, if Scripture prohibits women from teaching and exercising authority over men (as discussed above from 1 Tim. 2:12-14), then it would be out of line for the male eldership in a church to permit a woman to carry out (e.g., preach to a mixed audience) what God has forbidden.

I have simply raised some practical difficulties with Blomberg’s view in the preceding paragraphs. The fundamental problem with his view is exegetical. He does not provide

convincing evidence that preaching is part and parcel of the gift of prophecy. It is true, of course, that prophets exhort and speak the word of the Lord to people. Still, this should not be equated with preaching. Those who prophesy receive revelations from God and mediate those revelations to God’s people (1 Cor. 14:29-33). This is confirmed in the case of Agabus who receives two revelations in the book of Acts, in which he predicted a famine (Acts 11:27-28) and the arrest of Paul (Acts 21:11). In the early church women who had the gift of prophecy would declare authoritative and inerrant words of the Lord. Such prophecies are not the same as the gift of preaching, which is a combination of the gift of teaching and exhortation (1 Tim. 4:13). Those who prophesy are in a sense passive vehicles who transmit the revealed word of God. Teaching draws upon the apostolic tradition and explains that tradition to those gathered. The whole matter is immensely complicated and needs further explanation, but I would argue that the gift of prophesy (along with the gift of apostleship) has ceased (Eph. 2:20), and hence there are no authoritative and inerrant prophets today. Even if the gift of prophecy still exists, as some argue, the gift is distinct from the gift of teaching, and it is the latter gift that is fundamental to preaching. I conclude that the NT follows the pattern of the OT. In the OT women functioned as prophets but never as priests. So too in the NT women function as prophets but they do not preach or teach God’s word as elders, pastors, or overseers.

Conclusion

In conclusion, while this book is helpful in laying out the arguments for the egalitarian and complementarian views, the latter view continues to be more viable exegetically. Bowman’s chapter, as noted earlier, lacks this quality, for all the good it does in discussing areas of women’s ministry. Also, the attempt of the editors to provide a sort of *via media* as a result of this seemingly intransigent dispute does not really succeed. In my judgment, the complementarian view still stands on a much firmer basis exegetically, despite the effort of Keener and Belleville. Much is at stake, and we must pray that God will be merciful to his Church. May we read his word correctly and follow him faithfully. ■

The Way It Is

A Sermon on I Corinthians 11:2-16

James Merritt

Senior Pastor, First Baptist

Church of Snellville, Georgia;

President, Southern Baptist Convention

Editor's Note: The following sermon was transcribed from a sermon preached by James Merritt at the First Baptist Church of Snellville on June 25, 2000. It can be heard on audio at the CBMW website.

As we examine the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, we will find ourselves tackling a tough and controversial subject. I have titled this message "The Way It Is," and it may cause some of you to show your age when I explain.

How many of you remember Walter Cronkite? There was a time when Walter Cronkite was the plumb-line by which every news broadcaster measured himself. He was the giant in the news broadcasting industry. He was far and away the most watched television reporter in his day, and one of the reasons why is that he became associated with a trademark. At the end of every broadcast, he always closed by saying, "That's the way it is June 25, 19???. This is Walter Cronkite, CBS reporting. Goodnight."

Recently the SBC passed a revision to its confession of faith, called the *Baptist Faith and Message*. (If you don't know about that, you have probably just come out of a coma.) Now to me, the most significant part of that document was the statement made against racism. We, for the first time, put in our confession of faith, "We abhor racism in every shape form or fashion." Interestingly though, you didn't hear that in the news. What you probably did hear from the media was, "What about this issue of only men being pastors of the church?" Well, I want to suggest to you that according to the Scriptures, that's the way it is.

The question is not "what," but "why?" Why is it that

God, in his sovereign will, said that only the male should fill the role of pastor in the church? It is because of God's umbrella of authority. God has an umbrella of authority. In fact, we see it in 1 Corinthians 11 beginning in verse two. Paul said, "I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you." In the simplest terms, Paul said to these Corinthian Christians, "I want to brag on you, because when I brought God's traditions to you, you didn't gripe and complain. You simply said, 'That's what we are going to do.'"

The reason why Paul could wield authority, was because he knew how to yield authority. Notice verse 1: "Be imitators of me, just as I also am of Christ." He said, in essence, "I know how to be over because I have learned how to be under." We are bound to be tossed to and fro by the winds of the world if we are not linked to God's golden chain of command. We will drown in the storms of life if we are not under God's umbrella of authority.

Chuck Colson, has stated (I think rightly) that there is a politically correct feminist assault that is doing everything possible to erase any distinction between the genders at all. There is a movement that says that there is not one whit of difference between a man and a woman. Let me be honest with you. That is a direct attack on biblical authority, but beyond that it is an attack on common sense and empirical fact. Men and women are equal before God, but they are gifted, called, and equipped in different ways.

Paul is talking about authority, and he defines the principle of authority. Look in verse 3. "But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ." Now, nobody seems to think too much about the first statement. They don't totally understand that last statement. But the statement that really causes people to bristle is the statement "the man is the head of a woman." Paul plainly says that there is a Heavenly hierarchy. The word head there is a word that means authority; it means leader.

Some may say, "Now there goes the chauvinist Paul putting women in their place." But that is not what Paul is doing. Paul is not putting women in their place. Rather, Paul is putting God in his place. See, when you put God where God ought to be, then you put men and women where they need to be. This verse, ladies, does not teach inferiority. Submission here, has nothing to do with equality. Notice the last part of the statement. It says, "God is the head of Christ."

Let me ask you a question. Is Jesus Christ inferior to God the Father? No, Jesus is not inferior to God the Father. Yet the Bible says that "God is the head of Christ." In John 10:30, Jesus said, "I and the Father are One." So we see that Jesus is equal with God and that he and God are one.

Then, in John 14:28, Jesus said, “. . . the Father is greater than I.” Now wait a minute Lord. You said that you and the father are one. You said that you are equal with God. Then you turn right around and say, “the Father is greater than I.” Now what does this mean? When he said they are equal, he was referring to his person. His point was that in his essence and being, he is equal to the Father. But in his position, he had submitted to the Father’s authority. One refers to person, the other to position.

The reason why some men have no authority in their home and no authority over their children is because their wives show no respect for them. When a child sees his mom not respecting his father, it registers with him that he doesn’t have to respect him either. Let me share with you what I have learned. When you show disrespect for people who are over you, then people who are under you start showing you disrespect. Did you know that?

Mona Charen, one of my favorite columnists, gave this assessment of the women’s movement: “In dispensing its foils, women’s lib has given my generation high incomes, our own cigarettes, the option of single parenthood, rape crisis centers, and free love. In return, it has effectively robbed us of one thing upon which the happiness of most women rest . . . men.”

God said in his word that there are two institutions in which the man is to be the leader. One is the home, and the other is the church. Friend that is not chauvinism, that is not sexism, that is not fundamentalism, that is Bible. Now having said that ladies, let me reiterate a previous statement. This does not mean and it does not imply that women are inferior to men. I don’t know where we get this idea.

I heard of a man that walked into the library one time looking for a book. It seemed like he couldn’t find it. So the librarian walked over and said, “May I help you?” He replied, “Yes ma’am, I am looking for a book. Can you tell me what section it’s in?” She said, “What’s the title?” He said, “The title is *Man, the Superior Sex*.” She said, “That’s in the fiction section.”

I can tell you right now that women are not inferior to men and men are not superior to women. But the feminists out there just hate the statement that the man is the head of the woman.

Let me share an insight with you. The real problem that the feminist has, is not with men. That is not her problem. Her real problem is not with the “white, chauvinist male.” The feminist’s real problem is with God. Here’s why. Feminists have it figured out. If they don’t have to submit to men in God’s specified areas, according to his word, then neither do men or women have to submit to God. So, if they get rid of this idea of submitting to men, then they can get rid of this idea of submitting to God, because this was God’s idea from the beginning.

It is not coincidental then, that Gloria Steinem, who is the glorified head of the women’s liberation movement, made this statement about twenty years ago: “By the year 2000 we will, I hope, rear our children to believe in human potential, not God.” Their problem is not with me. Their problem is not with a male. Their problem is not with sexism. Their problem is not with chauvinism. Their problem is with the authority of God.

The key to understanding this passage in 1 Corinthians 11 is verses eight and nine, where Paul said, “For man does not originate from woman, but woman from man; for indeed man was not created for the woman’s sake, but woman for the man’s sake.” Now, Paul does something very interesting here, and this is the real crux of the message. Paul roots everything he says about men and women here in the fact of creation. He goes all the way back to Genesis. In effect he says, “Let’s just see how God intended it from the very beginning.”

So Paul goes all the way back to the Genesis account, and he points out a very simple truth. We already know this, but it bears repeating. Paul is here reminding his readers that God created Adam first. God did not create Eve first; God created Adam first. Now, some of you may be asking why that is such a big deal. To emphasize the point Paul is making, we ought to consider briefly 1 Timothy 2 as well. This is another one of those controversial gender passages.

Let’s look at why Paul says what he says. In 1 Tim. 2:13, Paul gives us the reason for not allowing women to teach or exercise authority over men. Notice that he does not offer his own opinion. Rather, he supports his assertion by an appeal to the order of the creation of Adam and Eve. Now what is the point? He said, in effect, “In creating Adam first, God was making a statement loud and clear. He was ordaining that the man be the head of this relationship.”

Prior order says that the man was created first. That is not cultural; that is not sinful; it is biblical. Now, let me defend Adam for just a moment. Adam did not apply for the job. Adam did not go to an interview. Adam did not turn in a resume. It was not the luck of the draw. It was simply a case of divine design, and that’s the way it is.

Elisabeth Elliot gives a wonderful explanation and illustration of what God did back in the Garden of Eden. She points out several key items about the man and woman in creation. First, woman was made for the man. Man wasn’t made for the woman. God made the woman the helpmate of the man. Second, the woman was made from the man. The first woman originated from the first man. He was her occasion for coming into the world. Third, she was brought to the man. God did not make a present of Adam to Eve. Rather, God made Eve a present to Adam. Fourth, she was named by the man. Now, some of you may be wondering why that is. After all, God named Adam. So why is it that Adam named Eve? It is because

in the Old Testament, whenever someone named something, it signified the responsibility and authority of the one naming for the one named. In giving Adam that responsibility, God was illustrating an important truth: Adam was not to serve the animal, but the animals were to serve him. Animals do not share the same ontological status as mankind. By comparison, men and women do share an ontological status as God's image bearers, but the man's naming of the woman indicates his authority nevertheless.

Returning to 1 Corinthians 11, we see that Paul not only defines the principle of authority, but he describes the picture of authority. Notice 1 Cor. 11:4-5: "Every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head. But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head, for she is one and the same as the woman whose head is shaved."

In other words, Paul was saying, "When a man prays (i.e., speaking to God) or prophesies (i.e., speaking for God), and he does so *with* his head covered, he dishonors his head." Indeed, Paul tells us that such a posture dishonors Christ, for the man's head is Christ. The woman, however, who prays or prophesies *without* her head covered dishonors her head, namely her husband or the man in the leadership position.

In the culture of the Bible, a covering was a symbol that the people understood that they were under authority and that they recognized that authority. Now, Bible scholars are very divided as to what that covering was. Some say it was a shawl, or a scarf, while others say it was just the woman's hair itself. To me, it doesn't make that much difference because the kind of head covering does not affect Paul's main point here. His main point, of course, was that creation dictates that we ought to use culturally appropriate expressions of masculinity and femininity, which in that setting happened to be a covering for the head of a woman.

Now if you understand that, then you can begin to make sense of verse thirteen. Have you ever wondered why the Bible talks about hair? Look in verse thirteen. "Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?" He didn't say that it was wrong for a woman to pray. He said it was wrong for a woman to pray with her head uncovered. Now, verse fourteen and fifteen: "Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her? For her hair is given to her for a covering."

Paul said, in effect, "If you don't think there is a difference between men and women, just look at their head. Nature itself teaches you that men ought to be ashamed to look like women and women ought to be ashamed to look like men." Custom dictates what that look ought to be. In Paul's day, it meant that men had their head uncovered and women

had their head covered. In today's society it might run: "Does not nature itself teach you that a man shouldn't wear a dress?" There is masculinity that a man should be proud of and femininity that a woman should be proud of.

Paul is not trying to get into a debate about when a man's hair is too long. His point is simply that hair is an outward expression of an inward submission. And so he was pointing out that the length of a woman's hair is God's way of reminding us that men and women have a specific relationship in his plan of authority. Has it ever occurred to you that long hair came into vogue in the 1960's? Why? That was the decade of rebellion: the Beatles, Hard Rock, Free Love, Woodstock, Vietnam Protest.

Paul not only gives the picture of authority, he defends the practice of authority. He reminds us of two facts. First, men and women are different. Notice verse seven. "For a man ought not to have his head covered, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man." Paul does not say that women are not created in the image of God. But he does say that men and women are different. The man came from dust; the woman came from man. They were obviously created, not to compete with one another, but to complete one another. But the reason they can do that is because they are different.

Have you ever noticed this? A man will pay \$2.00 for a \$1.00 item that he really needs. A woman will pay \$1.00 for a \$2.00 item that she really doesn't need. Why is that? Men look for results. Women look for bargains. God made us different so that we might complete one another.

Second, men and women are also dependent. Notice verses eleven and twelve. "However, in the Lord, neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. For as the woman originates from the man, so also the man has his birth through the woman; and all things originate from God." He's saying that without the first man, you would have never had the first woman. But without the first woman, there would have never been another man. Here's my point. There are two things God absolutely hates. God hates feminism, and God hates chauvinism. God does not want the woman to be a liberal feminist, and God does not want the man to be a radical chauvinist.

Lastly, Paul denounces the perversion of authority. Paul knew that there would be a lot of people mad over this. So, he hung his hat on three principles. First, the world of nature. Recall verses fourteen and fifteen. Remember the outward appearance is a sign of inward submission. It is a tragedy, Paul tells us, for a woman to do what she can to deny her femininity. The world of nature teaches that. Second, the Word of God teaches the same thing. Look at verse sixteen. "But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other practice, nor have the churches of God." In other words, if someone wants to

argue this, we must make it clear that we don't make the rules; we just report them. Third, the witness of the Church. Look again at verse sixteen. “. . . nor, have the churches of God.” He said, that's just the appropriate response of God's people. That's the way it always has been, and that's the way it always will be. That's just the way it is.

Let me close with this thought. I wish we could get this world to understand that whether we are talking about leadership in the home or leadership in the church, it is not an issue of gender superiority or inferiority. It is an issue of the Word of God, and an issue of the God-ordained authority in the home and in the church. Think about this. Only Jesus Christ has the authority to take you to heaven. Only Jesus Christ has the authority to change your life. Only Jesus Christ has the authority to give you eternal life. Only Jesus Christ has the authority to make you what you ought to be. Whether you are a man or a woman, you will never be all you ought to be, need to be, or can be, until you get under the authority of Jesus Christ. It is a matter of submission. It is a matter of authority. And that's just the way it is. ■

Annotated Bibliography for Gender Related Books in 2000

Compiled and Annotated by Rob Lister and Todd L. Miles
Managing Editor and Assistant Managing Editor, respectively
Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
 Louisville, Kentucky

In the most recent spring edition of *JBMW*, we introduced our readers to a new section in our journal, an annotated bibliography of gender related articles from the previous calendar year. Now, in the fall edition, we are similarly providing an annotated bibliography of gender related books published in the previous calendar year. As the Lord grants grace, this is a feature of *JBMW* that our readership may regularly anticipate.

We at *JBMW* are persuaded that this is yet another means of equipping pastors, laity, and scholars to help the church deal biblically with gender issues. Once again, the sheer quantity of literature published—and here the reader should note that even this is not a comprehensive compilation—on gender issues in the previous year should alert us to the fact that these matters are anything but dormant.

With that in mind, *JBMW* has again attempted to provide an appropriate classification and annotation of each of the following books. The annotations focus on reporting the content of the respective volume, but where appropriate, they also interact with the content in an effort to highlight valuable points or problematic thinking.

For the sake of continuity, we have followed the same classification procedure employed in *JBMW* 6/1. The books are classified according to their stance on gender issues.

Complementarian, Egalitarian, Non-Evangelical, and Undeclared once again comprise the headings. Our readership will find the **Complementarian** heading self-evident. By **Egalitarian**, we intend to classify evangelicals who do not see male headship in the church or home taught in Scripture. Under

the **Non-Evangelical** heading, we have classified important secular books as well as volumes that broach the subject of biblical gender issues from a non-evangelical point of view. Finally, under the **Undeclared** heading, we have listed those books that do not give sufficient indication of their fundamental stance for us to classify them more specifically.

It is also worth pointing out that our readers will soon have access to all of our bibliographical information on the CBMW website (www.cbmw.org). Check periodically to see when it gets posted, and then check back frequently as it will be an ever-expanding list. May God be pleased to use this compilation as a helpful aid as we attempt to think carefully and biblically through these vital matters.

Complementarian Authors/Books

Benton, John. *Gender Questions: Biblical Manhood and Womanhood in the Contemporary World*. Darlington, England: Evangelical Press, 2000.

Benton offers a survey of several key points (e.g. manhood and womanhood at creation, gender and the family, gender and church authority) in the on-going debate over the biblical teaching on gender worth and roles. In eminently readable fashion, Benton has provided a volume for those in the church (especially laymen) who need to understand the arguments and stakes of this debate, but who do not have the luxury of tracking its every development through the publications of academia. In addition to sound biblical interaction, Benton also engages in some helpful probing at the worldview level. Benton's volume is appropriately applicational throughout and offers several helpful sections specifically given to refuting common egalitarian objections.

Birkett, Kirsten. *The Essence of Feminism*. Kingsford, Australia: Mathias Media, 2000.

Kirsten Birkett examines the development and guiding thought-structures of feminism, and provides a devastating critique of the same. Interestingly, Birkett reports that she began her work on this volume as a "Christian feminist." Upon detailing the history and philosophy of feminism, however, Birkett goes on to demonstrate her conclusion that feminism has failed to deliver on what it promised and instead reaped a harvest of massive detriment for women. At its very root, argues Birkett, "feminism suffers from the disease of self, which the Bible calls sin. . . ." Moreover, according to Birkett, feminism counterintuitively establishes a criterion whereby the value of women depends on their behaving just like men.

Burke, H. Dale. *Different by Design: God's Master Plan for Harmony Between Men and Women in Marriage*. Chicago: Moody Press, 2000.

With a view to growing godly marriages, Dale Burke leads his readers through a study of the Bible's teaching on the marriage relationship. Peppered throughout with practical application, Burke interacts with the major texts on this issue and rightly concludes that God's intent includes equality and complementarity. Accordingly, he draws upon textual insights for demonstrating the respective needs and roles of husbands and wives, and he offers some great tips along the way for helping couples flesh out the biblical pattern in contemporary life.

Clark, Jeramy. *I Gave Dating a Chance: A Biblical Perspective to Balance the Extremes*. Colorado Springs: WaterBrook Press, 2000.

In *I Gave Dating a Chance*, Clark offers a response to *I Kissed Dating Goodbye* by Joshua Harris. Written by a youth pastor in a style aimed at youth, Clark argues that responsible dating can be a blessing to both parties if it is characterized by integrity, honesty, and a desire to honor God. He covers issues ranging from appropriate ways to ask a girl out to the boundaries couples should draw for physical involvement. The chapter entitled "Just for Girls, Just for Guys," where Clark interacts with issues such as defrauding, modesty, and the appropriateness of attire, is especially helpful. Ultimately, the subtitle and jacket promise more than the book is able to deliver. Clark acknowledges that 'dating' is not specifically addressed in Scripture. The Bible does have much to teach in the area of relationships however. It is from these teachings that Clark builds his case for proper dating relationships. In so doing, Clark fails to persuade that the courtship model is "extreme" from a biblical perspective and that his model for dating is more true to the biblical text. The book includes chapter discussion guides for individual or group study.

Grudem, Wayne. *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament and Today*. Rev. ed. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2000.

While this book is not fully given to a discussion of the issues surrounding women and prophesying, several extensive sections of the book do devote attention to this matter. Insofar as that issue is concerned, Grudem understands Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. 11 and 1 Cor. 14 to be compatible and not contradictory. He concludes that the women of the New Testament were encouraged "to participate fully in giving prophecies in the assembled church." The prohibition then, concerns the "spoken evaluation of prophecies." In this way, women

are encouraged to employ their spiritual gifts in a spirit that recognizes and honors God's pattern of male leadership in the church.

Harris, Joshua. *Boy Meets Girl: Say Hello to Courtship*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, 2000.

In *Boy Meets Girl*, Joshua Harris writes the companion to *I Kissed Dating Goodbye*. In it, he outlines his recommendations for a successful courtship which were borne out in his own courtship and subsequent marriage. Easy to read, the book contains numerous anecdotes that illustrate its principles. Harris begins by examining the motives that one should take into a courtship. He recognizes that the distinctions between 'dating' and 'courting' are not as important as the commitment to honoring God in the relationship by laying a foundation of communication, edification, and respect, rather than shame and self-gratification. In the second section he focuses on courtship itself. His recommendations are general rather than detailed but are all sound with scriptural support. Among other things, Harris suggests strong parental involvement and the necessity for the wisdom and accountability of others in the church. He also writes with a strong sense of the differing roles possessed by men and women in the courtship relationship.

Hunt, Susan. *Your Home: A Place of Grace*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2000.

In a clear and readable style, Hunt calls her readers back to God's timeless principles for building God-centered and grace dependent homes and families. In a way that honors Scripture and God himself, Hunt distills a wealth of applicational insights for raising the next generation.

Lewis, Robert. *Real Family Values: Leading Your Family into the 21st Century with Clarity and Conviction*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, 2000.

Lewis analyzes the current culture that is engulfing and poisoning the American family. He also helpfully discusses specific social challenges (homosexuality, racism, and abortion) that Christian parents face in trying to provide a Christ-centered home for their children. He challenges parents to define and write their own family values for their homes.

Ortland, Jani. *Fearlessly Feminine: Boldly Living God's Plan for Womanhood*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, 2000.

Ortland addresses the fears of femininity that assault today's Christian woman. She then explains how women are to live out their femininity without fear as a

single woman, wife, and/or mother, by living according to God's design for women.

Patterson, Dorothy Kelley. *BeAttitudes for Women: Wisdom from Heaven for Life on Earth*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2000.

Dorothy Patterson offers a devotional commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, with particular attention paid to application for women. Carefully exegeted and treated in context, Patterson moves through the text with a view to encouraging and challenging Christian women. Each of the chapters is laced with Scripture, capably illustrated, and helpfully applied. Then at the conclusion of each chapter, there is a set of recommended exercises aimed at aiding a deepened understanding of the passage through personal study and reflection.

Poythress, Vern S. and Wayne A. Grudem. *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2000.

Poythress and Grudem have provided the most helpful and thoroughgoing treatment on the issue of translating gendered language in Scripture. The findings of this effort are demonstrably rooted in manifold textual examples and careful grammatical observation. As a result of their findings, the authors convincingly reveal the failure of gender-neutral translations to preserve all the shades of meaning available to them from the original text. In so doing, Poythress and Grudem demonstrate that the driving factor behind appeals for gender-neutral translation is feminist pressure as opposed to sound grammatical argumentation. (For a fuller interaction with this book, see the overview in *JBMW* 6/1).

Prince, Derek. *Husbands and Fathers: Rediscover the Creator's Purpose for Men*. Grand Rapids: Chosen Books, 2000.

In an eminently readable style, Prince charts a biblical vision whereby men bless their wives and children as they fulfill God's mandate to be the Christ-centered leaders in their homes.

Thomas, Gary. *Sacred Marriage*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.

Subtitled, "What if God designed marriage to make us holy more than to make us happy," *Sacred Marriage* investigates the sanctifying aspects of the marriage relationship. The primary emphasis of this well-written book focuses on how God uses marriage to strengthen his relationship with each of the participants. This is not a book of instructions on how to build a perfect marriage; rather, it covers a range of topics that demonstrate how the challenges of marriage can better

foster a stronger relationship with the Lord. Based firmly upon biblical foundations, Thomas discusses how marriages can teach the participants to love, respect others, pray, build character, and become more aware of God's presence.

Wilson, Nancy. *Praise Her in the Gates: The Calling of Christian Motherhood*. Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2000.

Wilson discusses the calling of Christian motherhood from conception to the releasing of the son or daughter from the home. Her study includes chapters on teaching manners, establishing house rules, taking care of sick children, and the importance of education. The volume contains many helpful examples that represent the wisdom of a successful wife and mother. One caution is that the force with which some of the applications are recommended may outrun the biblical data.

Egalitarian Authors/Books

Belleville, Linda L. *Women Leaders and the Church: Three Crucial Questions*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

It is interesting to observe, in this volume, that Belleville falls prey to the exact charges she levels against complementarians. She throws down the gauntlet in the Introduction, charging complementarians with essentially only considering two texts (1 Cor. 14:34-35 and 1 Tim. 2:11-15), or worse yet, starting "with a thesis securely in hand" so that they mute any texts that contradict their thesis. Belleville then, sets up 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2 as the very difficult and highly controversial passages that ought only be examined at the end. To begin, such a claim is a massive misrepresentation of complementarians and thus, the construction of a mere straw-man. Yet, it appears by the way that she sets up the discussion and proceeds throughout, that Belleville herself is the one guilty of beginning "with a thesis securely in hand" and selectively arranging and interpreting the evidence to fit. In so doing, she draws some dubious conclusions, suggesting for instance, that worship in the early church was purely a function of the Spirit's indiscriminate prompting with no attention paid to roles limited to qualified males.

Cunningham, Loren and David J. Hamilton. *Why Not Women?: A Biblical Study of Women in Missions, Ministry, and Leadership*. Seattle: YWAM Publishing, 2000.

The author of the foreword suggests that the authors of this book are finally able to give us what no one else has, namely, "the integrity and experience we need in exploring this volatile subject." After establishing

Cunningham and Hamilton as the two most qualified men ever to broach this subject, Cunningham and Hamilton proceed to give the reader a solidly egalitarian interpretation. Not surprisingly, as egalitarians, they find it unconscionable that males and females can have full equality of personhood and yet be designated for different functions by God himself. Cunningham suggests that each of us only bears a portion of God's image. According to him the complete expression of God's image is only found in the union of males and females. Both authors repudiate the notion of eternal, functional subordination within the Trinity. And so they determine that God's "absolute principle" in the Trinity and in its bearing on the gender debate is "absolute equality." In the textual discussions the authors suggest reconstructed and speculated backgrounds rather than accepting the reasons and the conclusions specifically stated in the texts.

De Young, James B. *Homosexuality: Contemporary Claims Examined in Light of the Bible and Other Ancient Literature and Law*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2000.

De Young begins his work by explaining from Scripture why homosexuality is wrong. In doing so, he identifies the root cause of the behavior as pride and defends the biblical condemnation of homosexuality. De Young then provides a lengthy and thorough examination of the testimony against homosexuality in the Old Testament, the Pseudopigrapha, the Apocrypha, the Septuagint, the New Testament, and an extensive list of religious and secular law codes from the Ancient Near East. In doing so, he interacts with and refutes the claims of those who are attempting to revise the traditional interpretations in favor of an acceptance of homosexuality. He pays particular attention to the claim that the sin for which Sodom was condemned was inhospitality. He is able convincingly to refute the argument and demonstrate from the Old Testament, New Testament, and other literature that such an interpretation is inconsistent and false. De Young's thorough analysis, his exhaustive examination of the ancient literature, and his interaction with the current revisionist claims make the volume a valuable resource. The last chapter is especially helpful. The thorough analysis of the preceding chapters is summarized in the form of twenty questions. De Young provides both the revisionist answer and his defense of the historic interpretation.

Erickson, Millard J. *Making Sense of the Trinity: Three Crucial Questions*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

Clearly, the primary aim of Erickson's book is not to address gender issues. Nevertheless, it is true that one's Trinitarian understandings will impact one's view of the gender debate. This is true in Erickson's case, even

though he does not draw out the implications of his view for the gender debate extensively. Let it first be noted, that much in the book is helpful and right. What is most problematic, however, is his rejection of eternal, functional authority and submission within the Trinity. As this issue is too detailed to treat at length in the space of an annotation, the reader is referred to the three helpful articles (by Ware, Schemm, and MacArthur) addressing this issue in a detailed fashion in the previous issue (6/1) of *JBMW*, as well as Stinson's article in this issue.

Everist, Norma C. ed. *Ordinary Ministry: Extraordinary Challenge – Women and the Roles of Ministry*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000.

Ordinary Ministry: Extraordinary Challenge is a collection of essays written by female ministry leaders about their respective ministries. It is not a book that asks the question of ministry roles; it assumes female ordination. Female ministers, ranging from clergy to lay leaders, share their philosophy of ministry on a variety of topics including preaching, outreach, and inner-city ministry.

Grady, J. Lee. *10 Lies the Church Tells Women: How the Bible Has Been Misused to Keep Women in Spiritual Bondage*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2000.

Grady suggests that all who would deny women elder or elder-like roles are Pharisees guilty of "gender prejudice" and Scripture twisting. It would appear, however, that Grady is the one guilty of twisting the Scriptures. It is distressing to see the way he seeks (e.g., recreating dubious historical settings) to avoid the conclusions of the texts. Moreover, the book is rhetorically charged. The "lies" he has identified are often merely straw-men. On the whole, they certainly do not represent the intelligent arguments of any godly and thoughtful complementarians that I know. May God be pleased to allow Bible-loving pastors and their congregations the discernment necessary to see through the misdirected analyses of this book.

McMinn, Lisa Graham. *Growing Strong Daughters: Encouraging Girls to Become All They're Meant to Be*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

McMinn takes up the topic of raising Christian daughters from an egalitarian point of view. At the outset, she suggests that both the postmodern and traditional Christian worldviews offer helpful insights as well as glaring oversights into the raising of our daughters. The failures of these two worldviews, suggests McMinn, stems from a predisposition to favor "male ways of knowing, being, and doing. . . ." In an

attempt to solve this perceived dilemma, McMinn concludes from the fact that men and women equally bear the image of God, they should therefore indiscriminately have the access to the filling of identical roles. Accordingly, in her view, our daughters should be encouraged to do just that. Several of her sociological analyses appear to lack in charity and even-handedness.

Peterson, Eugene and Marva Dawn. *Unnecessary Pastor: Rediscovering the Call*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Via an exploration of the pastoral epistles and Ephesians, Peterson and Dawn attempt to offer guidance that will help free pastors from worldly expectations for the purpose of conducting a more biblical ministry. While their primary intent in this volume is not to advocate for the availability of the office of elder to both genders—indeed, their comments are not unilaterally directed at those who hold the office pastor, but are frequently directed to the ministering laity as well—their supposition that the office is open to both genders does surface occasionally. In particular, Dawn, over the course of a few pages interacts with Ephesians 5:22-6:9. In the course of her discussion, she conveniently dismisses the complementarian interpretations of most of the relevant Pauline texts as hyper-literalistic understandings that fail to consider the historical context adequately. Interestingly, however, as with most egalitarian objectors, Dawn builds her case on supposed historical reconstructions and not the groundings that are explicit in the text. (For helpful critiques of the prevailing egalitarian treatments of the Ephesus that supposedly stood behind 1 Tim. 2:9-15 for instance, the reader should see the chapter by S.M. Baugh in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* or his article “The Apostle Among the Amazons,” in *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994): 153-71. Copies of the article can be obtained by calling the CBMW offices and requesting the aforementioned title, reprinted with permission, in CBMW’s Foundations Series.)

Skillen, James W. and Michelle N. Voll, eds. *Women and the Future of the Family*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

This book is composed of Elizabeth Fox-Genovese’s Kuyper Lecture and the three responses to it. In her four chapters, Fox-Genovese offers some commendable analysis of the detrimental effects of radical feminism, sexual liberation, and the rise of the autonomous individual. In her advocacy of self-sacrifice on behalf of the family, she offers some

interesting data, and affirms, to some degree, that the measure of a woman in the home is not identity with the man. Though the three respondents (Stanley Grenz, Mardi Keyes, and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen) affirm that this radical individualism has had detrimental effects on the family, their chapters are, nevertheless, far more pronouncedly egalitarian in their treatments.

Thompson, Marianne Meyers. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2000.

Thompson claims that the emphasis upon the relationship of God and Jesus as framed by the Father/Son relationship follows a theological trajectory more dependent upon the creeds than upon the scriptural narrative. After examining the biblical data and other Jewish literature, she concludes that the address of God as Father is not unique to Jesus or the church, but regularly appeared in ancient Jewish writings. In the Old Testament, uses of the name ‘Father’ for God do not make any claim to ontological gender or a masculine essence. The name refers to the Father as the ancestor who gives life, the One who loves and cares for His children, and a figure of authority who is worthy of obedience. When Jesus addressed God as Father, He was placing Himself in the redemptive story of Israel - claiming to be the heir of the Kingdom and the Son of the Father through whom God would affect the redemption of Israel. Thompson concludes that to refer to God as Father is to confess God’s redemptive and faithful love toward his people.

Wakefield, Norm and Jody Brolsma. *Men are from Israel, Women are from Moab: Insights About the Sexes from the Book of Ruth*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

Writing at the popular level, Wakefield and Brolsma suggest a number of insights from the book of Ruth that they believe will help foster healthier (by which they clearly mean egalitarian) relationships between men and women. Surely, the authors have a legitimate desire to see healthy relationships fostered, but they fall prey to the notion that such a vision can only be realized through an egalitarian enterprise. Wakefield and Brolsma rightly identify sin as the root problem in relationships that go awry. But, at the outset, they wrongly (quoting Gen. 3:16) identify the effect of sin on male-female relationships as the introduction of gender distinctions, rather than noting that sin caused perversions of the gender roles that God designed into his good creation.

Non-Evangelical Authors/Books

Becker, Carol E. *Becoming Colleagues: Women and Men Serving Together in Faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Becker advocates the concept of mixed-gender leadership in church and church-related organizations. The impetus for this volume stems from the author's research of twenty-three mixed-gender leadership teams from a variety of religious traditions. From her research, Becker distilled nine criteria for "effective" mixed-gender leadership. Throughout her book then, she interwove a discussion of these nine principles with the stories of nine leadership teams that she deemed effective from her research. The reader should note that this book is primarily a sociology of religion. It is assumed (not defended) at the outset that men and women ought to occupy identical levels of leadership in the church. Her conclusions are drawn from her observations of the aforementioned leadership teams. Becker disavows the use of masculine language for God. And, interestingly, one member of the first leadership team identified as "effective" in the book, suggested that white, male senior pastors are a part of the problem which "has to change."

Brenner, Athalya. *A Feminist Companion to Samuel and Kings*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000

This collection of feminist essays on the Old Testament books of 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings assumes an androcentric authorial perspective and utilizes aggressive historical and text criticism techniques to ask and answer questions behind the biblical narratives.

Brown, Teresa L. Fry. *God Don't Like Ugly: African American Women Handing on Spiritual Values*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000.

Brown chronicles the transmission of spiritual values by African American grandmothers and mothers to generations of African American churches, families, and communities. In part autobiographical, the volume relies heavily upon the music, poems, and stories of African American women written in the last half-century. The book is written from a "womanist" theological and ethical perspective.

Browning, Don, Bonnie Miller-McLemore, Pamela Couture, K. Brynolf Lyon, and Robert Franklin. *From Culture Wars to Common Ground: Religion and the American Family*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2000.

An appendix has been added to this penetrating and helpful look at the roles that churches and government should play in the strengthening of the American

family. Although the authors support male responsibility in the home, they reject male headship in the home. There is little biblical interaction in the book other than to dismiss conservative interpretations of pertinent passages.

Cahill, Lisa. *Family: A Christian Social Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Cahill argues for a broadening of the definition of the constitution of a family away from the classical nuclear family created by kinship and marriage. While supporting the importance of strong nuclear family relationships, she believes that promulgating such an ideal discriminates against and punishes nonconforming families. She questions the ideal of the classical family from a historical and social perspective.

Callender Jr., Dexter E. *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Callender presents a historical-critical analysis of the biblical traditions surrounding the first human, Adam. Drawing from ancient near-East traditions, his work includes study of direct attestations to the creation of the "primal human" as a movement of history (Gen. 1-3), indirect attestations used ahistorically for the purposes of analogy (Ezek. 28 and Job 15), and vestigial allusions used for the shaping of other ideas (Ezek. 28 and Prov. 8). Callender argues throughout that the primal human traditions are important because in them the first human serves as the significant forerunner of humanity, defining the relationship between humans and deity.

Camp, Claudia V. *Wise, Strange and Holy: The Strange Woman and the Making of the Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Camp first examines the female figures of personified wisdom and the strange woman in the Book of Proverbs. These figures become a construct by which Camp analyzes biblical literature, studying the social and political tensions that surrounded the formation of the Hebrew Bible. Camp then studies the narratives of Samson and Solomon in light of the motifs established previously. Finally Camp examines the narratives of Miriam and Dinah. She finds that these women were "made strange" by the common priestly interests which pervaded the transmission process.

Doe, Michael. *Seeking the Truth in Love: The Church and Homosexuality*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 2000.

Doe examines the position of the Anglican church on homosexuality, particularly the Lambeth Resolution of 1998 which rejects homosexuality as "incompatible with Scripture." He explores the arguments from Scripture, tradition, reason and experience. Although Doe does mention the classical interpretations of the scriptural condemnations of homosexuality, he readily dismisses them, utilizing standard arguments of pro-homosexual advocates. He concludes by making an ambiguous call for the Anglican church to be more understanding, compassionate, and open to possible change.

Egendorf, Laura. ed. *Male/Female Roles: Opposing Viewpoints*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2000.

This collection of 27 essays offers contrasting viewpoints on issues surrounding gender roles. Most of the essays address a specific topic (causes of gender roles, oppression of women, favorable treatment of men in society, etc.) with a counter argument immediately following. There is little to no biblical interaction and most of the essays are utilitarian in their argumentation, but it does provide a balanced offering of the gender debate that is being waged in our society at large.

Fuchs, Esther. *Sexual Politics in the Biblical Narrative: Reading the Hebrew Bible as a Woman*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Fuchs' contention is that the Hebrew Bible promotes a male-supremist social and cognitive system. She reads the biblical narrative "as a political speech act, one that justifies the political subordination of women." Seeing the biblical narrators as intentionally manipulative, Fuchs writes from the vantage point of one who is cautious, suspicious, and as one who maintains her right to refuse the authority of the Bible. Her chapters include analyses of the narrator's portrayal of the biblical mother, bride, wife, daughter and sister.

Hartwig, Michael J. *The Poetics of Intimacy & the Problem of Sexual Abstinence*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2000

Hartwig's thesis is that the Christian commitment to abstinence for those not in a heterosexual marriage relationship is problematic and is actually harmful to those who are forced to endure long-term or lifelong sexual abstinence. He applauds the relatively recent positive teachings on human sexuality and the importance of healthy sexual intimacy within the marriage covenant. However, in Hartwig's view, such teaching does not go far enough. He believes that

holistic human health requires that one flourish as a sexual person. Describing sexual flourishing as a poetics of intimacy, Harwig claims that a chastity-based model of sexual virtue is inadequate and suggests that a covenantal model of mutuality would better fit the long term well-being of the married, divorced, single adults, gay men and lesbians, and those with mental and developmental disabilities. The thesis of the book seems driven by Harwig's liberal social ethic and pro-homosexual agenda rather than thoughtful interaction with Scripture. His conclusion that mandated sexual abstinence for those outside of heterosexual marriage compromises many features of Christian morality is entirely unpersuasive given that his only reference to Scripture is to recite the pro-homosexual interpretations of Peter Boswell and Victor Furnish on a few of the passages referring to homosexuality.

Hazel, Dann. *Witness: Gay and Lesbian Clergy Report from the Front*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2000.

Hazel tells the stories of gay and lesbian clergy and their struggles for acceptance in many denominations in American Christian churches. Part narrative and part polemic, *Witness* argues for the inclusion of homosexual clergy and the acceptance of homosexuality in the church as natural. Hazel's logic is based entirely upon the experiences of gays and lesbians who see themselves as living the lifestyle God created them to live. Missing almost entirely from *Witness* is the biblical witness. Only a few passing references to Scripture are made, usually to explain away the clear condemnation of homosexuality in the Bible.

Isherwood, Lisa. *The Good News of the Body: Sexual Theology and Feminism*. Washington Square, NY: New York University Press, 2000.

The Good News of the Body is a collection of essays written from a decidedly feminist theologian perspective. The anthology covers a range of issues that center upon the woman's body and female sexuality as the basis for incarnational theology. The volume is void of scriptural analysis or interaction.

Jordan, Mark D. *The Silence of Sodom: Homosexuality in Modern Catholicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.

A self-professed Catholic homosexual, Mark Jordan authors a book in which he attempts to expose the contemporary Catholic church as being homophobic and homoerotic. That is, according to Jordan, the official position of Catholicism opposes homosexuality, while he asserts that it has invested its liturgy, symbolism, and closed-door activity with

homoeroticism aplenty. Irreverent and unchristian, Jordan suggests, for instance, that the Catholic eucharist is shrouded in homoerotic symbolism as an “all-male clergy sacrifices male flesh before images of God as an almost naked man.”

Kass, Leon R. and Amy A. Kass. *Wing to Wing, Oar to Oar: Readings on Courting and Marrying*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000.

The Kassess have produced a fine volume on marriage and courtship. Pro-marriage and pro-courtship, they have compiled a variety of readings on these two subjects. The entries include both secular (e.g., Darwin) and religious (e.g., Genesis 24, the Song of Songs, and C.S. Lewis), literary (e.g., Homer, Shakespeare, and Tolstoy) and didactic (e.g., Aquinas and Plato). The Kassess have written a brief introductory section to each of the entries, and a lengthier introduction at the beginning of every major section. Their introductory essay at the beginning of the volume is a very fine piece of work. While it is clear that each essay is not tied to a biblical theology (intentionally so, according to the authors), and while it is therefore clear that our readers will not (and ought not) accord equal weight to every essay, this volume ought to be appreciated. It is very easily enjoyed.

Raab, Kelley A. *When Women Become Priests: The Catholic Women's Ordination Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

When Women Become Priests does not make arguments for the entrance of women into the Catholic priesthood. It is a collection of hypothetical insights into what would happen when/if women were ordained. In particular it addresses the issue of how women clergy will affect the celebration of the sacraments. Raab “wholeheartedly” supports the ordination of women into the Catholic priesthood. The implications, as she draws them, are large. For example, a woman delivering the eucharist in Catholic tradition calls for the revisioning of the gender of Christ. Seeking to provide a fresh perspective to the debate on the ordination of women, Raab depends primarily upon psychological methodology rather than an interaction with either Scripture or Catholic tradition. Influenced heavily by feminist theology, Raab is interested in how the presence of women priests would change the nature of the priesthood, the experience of the parishioner, the face of the church, and the content of theology.

Reuther, Rosemary Radford. *Christianity and the Making of the Modern Family*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.

Religious feminist Rosemary Ruether explores the development and role of the family through the history of Christianity. Written from a strongly feminist perspective, Ruether begins by locating the “anti-family and alternative-family messages of the New Testament” during the first century and traces the history of the relationship between Christianity and the family through the Patristic era up to modern time. She is especially critical of the “family values” movement, describing its ideology as “generally coded messages about women and how they should behave in relation to men.” She concludes by reimagining family roles, family policies, and the theology of marriage and family.

Sample, Tex and Amy E. Delong, eds. *The Loyal Opposition: Struggling with the Church on Homosexuality*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000.

The editors and contributors lament the position of the General Conference of the United Methodist Church on homosexuality and the ordination of homosexual people. The title describes the strategy of opposing the official position of the church while remaining loyal to the church and the Christian faith. The book begins with a call to action to change the United Methodist Church's official position on homosexuality. Another chapter offers a critical look at the interpretation of the Scriptures used to support the church's condemnation of homosexuality. The author erroneously concludes that the Levitical prohibitions on homosexual activity are part of the holiness code, without moral considerations. He also dismisses the Pauline condemnations of homosexuality in Romans 1 because Paul's presuppositions about same-sex orientation were wrong and are currently discredited. Other chapters fall under the categories of resistance and social principles, resistance and human rights, life in the church as resistance, resistance and ecclesial disobedience, and leaving the church.

Sands, Kathleen M. *God Forbid: Religion and Sex in American Public Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

This collection of essays from the ‘religious left’ explores the relationship between sexuality, religion, and public life. The volume is intended to challenge the control that religious conservatives hold over public morality in the current pluralistic society. In addition to offering alternative solutions to the current status of sexual ethics, the contributors often survey the history of both public opinion and public policy on specific issues, claiming that the conservative control of public moral policy is a recent phenomenon and is not

consistent with public opinion, cultural values, or religion in a pluralistic society. Included in the challenge are essays on family values, the definition of a family, homosexuality, and a call for the decriminalization (not legalization) of prostitution. With the exception of one essay on homosexuality by L. William Countryman, the book is void of any Scriptural interaction. The positions are driven by a liberal social ethic, rather than biblical exegesis.

Scales, T. Laine. *All That Fits a Woman: Training Southern Baptist Women for Charity and Mission, 1907-1926*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2000.

Scales attempts to document the history of the Women's Missionary Union Training School as it fit into the context of women's struggles in the Southern Baptist Convention. Scales suggests that although the Training School gave Southern Baptist women some unprecedented opportunities, it was created to provide "both formal course work and a home life designed to socialize women students into roles considered by Southern Baptists to be appropriate for their gender." In advancing her thesis, Scales categorizes those Southern Baptists who did or would limit certain roles in the church to men as hopeless fundamentalists.

Scharen, Christian B. *Married in the Sight of God: Theology, Ethics, and Church Debates over Homosexuality*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2000.

Scharen chronicles the debates over sexual ethics in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), particularly as it is related to formulating a policy that requires celibacy of its homosexual candidates for registered ministry. He is critical of the present position and critiques the "order of creation" argument by utilizing Michel Foucault's analytical tools of "archaeology" and "genealogy." Scharen argues that the ELCA should adjust its theological and ethical position on marriage and ordination for gay and lesbian people. He supports his contention mainly by applying Martin Luther's writings on sexuality and the marriage rights of clergy to the modern gay and lesbian situation. Scharen's interaction with Scripture is limited to repeating the interpretations of the problem condemning passages by advocates of homosexuality. He also makes a misguided appeal to Luther's hermeneutics to explain away creation ordinances in Genesis 1-2. (e.g. "Luther's proclamation that we should delight in God's handiwork gives a theological support to gay pride." p. 140)

Scirghi, Thomas J. *An Examination of the Problems of Inclusive Language in the Trinitarian Formula of Baptism*. Lewiston, New York: Edwin Meller Press, 2000.

Writing for an ecumenical audience (e.g., the World Council of Churches), Scirghi defends the retention of the "traditional" language of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian baptismal formula. He bases his argument, in part, on the fact that this language was revealed to us at the command of Jesus in Matt. 28:18-20. He further stresses that the traditional language provides us with a better understanding of the "perichoretic relationship into which we are invited through our baptism." With the exception of this issue, however, Scirghi is far too congratulatory towards feminists and feminist objectives.

Sommers, Christina Hoff. *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming Our Young Men*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 2000.

Sommers documents the feminist attempt to subvert masculinity by warring against boys. She notes the fabrication of feminist claims that our school system caters to boys. In actual fact, Sommers demonstrates, the reverse is true both in the classroom and in the rhetoric of feminists who would have boys "rescued from their masculinity." Her suggested remedy is not a knee-jerk reaction that would have boys exempt from discipline riding roughshod in their classrooms. Rather Sommers, calls for a recognition of the fact that boys and girls are not identical, and ought not be forced into the same mold. The masculinity of little boys, according to Sommers, is not a sickness from which they require deliverance, but an integral component of their boyhood that needs constructive training and guidance.

Stevenson-Moessner, Jeanne, ed. *In Her Own Time: Women and Developmental Issues in Pastoral Care*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

This collection of essays, written from the experience of female counselors, professors, and pastors, is based upon the premise that the gender differences between men and women necessitates different philosophies and methodologies in pastoral care for women. The book is broken into three general categories - developmental themes (broad themes such as body, socio-economic status, and early trauma), developmental passages (significant milestones in the lifetime of every woman), and developmental issues (specific issues that some women face such as race, sudden singleness, and disabilities).

Waite, Linda and , Maggie Gallagher. *The Case For Marriage: Why Married People are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Written from a secular viewpoint, this book takes on the current myths that divorce is better for children when the parents are unhappy, marriage is essentially for the good of children, marriage is good for men but bad for women, promoting marriage puts women at risk of violence, and that marriage is a private choice, not a public institution. The book contains scientific studies, surveys, and personal interviews. The book concludes with recommendations to strengthen marriage as a national institution for the good of society.

Undeclared Authors/Books

Anderson, Gary, Michael Stone, and Johannes Tromp, eds. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

The compilation of essays is divided into two parts. The first analyzes the traditions surrounding Adam and Eve following the fall. Both Jewish and Christian traditions up to the medieaval period are included. The second contains essays that were delivered at Leiden in 1998. These essays focus primarily upon "The Life of Adam and Eve."

Anderson, Kerby, ed. *Marriage, Family, & Sexuality: Probing the Headlines that Impact your Family*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2000.

This volume critically analyzes the issues that threaten marriages and families in contemporary society. In most cases, this involves exploding the myths that are perpetuated by the liberal left. Edited by Kerby Anderson of Probe Ministries, the collection of essays addresses issues such as homosexuality, feminism, the sexual revolution, divorce, and gender differences. Written for the popular audience, the essays are short, easy to read, and strongly integrate biblical teaching with cultural understanding.

Balch, David L., ed. *Homosexuality, Science, and the "Plain Sense" of Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

The organization of this collection of essays attempts to provide arguments from both sides of the debate over the church's response to homosexuality. The topics of the eleven essays are varied, including an ecclesiastical historical survey, Old and New Testament exegesis, the impact of scientific findings on the position of the church, theology, and hermeneutics. Stanton Jones and

Mark Yarhouse write a very compelling essay on the use, misuse and abuse of science and its impact on the debate over homosexuality within the church. Robert Jewett includes a strong denunciation of homoerotic behavior based on his exegesis of Romans 1:24-27 and his understanding of the context in which it was originally received. The book also includes contributions which deny the primacy of Scripture in determining Christian ethics, deny the condemnation of homosexual behavior in Romans 1 (alleging the condemnation is against passion), and deny the normative teaching value of the creation narrative.

Behr-Sigel, Elizabeth and Kallistos Ware. *The Ordination of Women in the Orthodox Church*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 2000.

Behr -Sigel briefly traces the history of women's ministry roles in the Orthodox church. She also provides a summary of the major points of the debate regarding ordination of women in the Orthodox church and makes a call for careful theological reflection on the issue with sensitivity to the unity of the Church. Bishop Ware summarizes the ministry roles that women have filled and can fill in the Orthodox church. He is more cautious as he examines biblical and patristic anthropology set in the context of the strong traditions of the Orthodox church.

Caldwell, Elizabeth F. *Making a Home for Faith: Nurturing the Spiritual Life of Your Children*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 2000.

Caldwell gives advice to parents struggling to raise their children in the Christian faith. She encourages parents to be active in a local congregation, be committed to nurturing the spiritual life of the child, and be willing to struggle with the questions children ask about the mysteries of God. Caldwell gives examples of possible questions and answers, but her discussion on the gender of God and the Trinity is confusing.

Collins, Raymond F. *Sexual Ethics and the New Testament*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2000.

Collins provides, not a systematic treatment of the New Testament teaching on sexual ethics, but an exegetical analysis of the major New Testament passages pertaining to sexual ethics. He employs a historical-critical method of interpretation that empowers him to search the motives of the New Testament writers and place heavy emphasis upon the cultural setting and rabbinical teachings of the day. Collins concludes that since all people are sexual beings, the disciple of Jesus is called to live out his sexuality in a manner different from the way that others live out their sexuality.

Because the sexual relationship can be both sanctifying and defying, there are relational, ethical, and moralistic implications involved. God will judge sexual misconduct and there is no place for sexual immorality within the Christian community. However, the story of the woman caught in adultery and brought before Jesus serves to demonstrate that “even the prototype of sexual sin is forgivable.”

Gill, LaVerne McCain. *Daughters of Dignity: African Women in the Bible and the Virtues of Black Womanhood*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 2000.

Seeking to alter the misconceptions and stereotypes of African American women, Gill studies the virtues of justice, love, faith, wisdom and perseverance. For each virtue, she tells the story of a contemporary African American woman who exemplified the virtue (e.g., Rosa Parks and Sojourner Truth), also drawing upon the examples of African women in the Bible (e.g., Hagar and Zipporah).

Grant, Brian W. *The Social Structure of Christian Families: A Historical Perspective*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000.

Grant traces the history of the Christian family and its praxis, from its foundation in biblical Judaism to modern times. Particular attention is paid to the sexual revolution and its impact on the family and the spiritual health of people. Grant asks many questions throughout the volume but offers far fewer answers. The book lacks a strong affirmation of many critical biblical teachings on the family, not the least of which is monogamous heterosexual marriage.

Holmes, J. M. *Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Holmes argues that the majority of interpretive work on 1 Timothy 2 has been found wanting because it is based upon faulty cross referencing with other problematic texts, unconvincing historical backgrounds, speculation, or unwarranted assertion. Her study employs four exegetical devices (immediate context, broader context, parallel teaching, and theological foundation). Each of the four is explicated in a separate section of the book. Holmes rejects the idea that the passage is a culture-bound mandate based on the specific historical situation, understanding the teaching to be universally normative. However, she concludes that 1 Timothy 2:12 does not prohibit women from teaching and having authority over men in the church assembly. Rather, women are to learn obediently and tranquilly without constantly directing or dominating men. The prohibitions are not bound to the church

assembly, but are about life in general. Holmes interacts with theologians of all traditions, but she fails to persuade that the results of her study are superior to those she criticizes. Two of her conclusions are especially unconvincing. First, she argues that 1 Cor. 14:34-35 offers an opposing viewpoint to 1 Timothy 2:11-12. Second, she suggests that 1 Timothy 2:13-15 offers neither foundation nor an illustration of need to 2:11-12 but is a conclusion to the whole of chapter two focusing on both genders. The bibliography is very helpful, providing a broad and thorough survey of exegetical writing on 1 Timothy 2.

Hoosier, Helen Kooiman. *100 Women Who Changed the 20th Century*. Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 2000.

Hoosier provides a glimpse of 100 women who influenced the history of the 20th Century. Her representatives are spread out over a variety of fields of influence and traditions. The entries are fairly brief. They give some biographical details, followed a discussions of their influence. Entries include women on both sides of the gender issue.

Jones, Stanton L. and Mark A. Yarhouse, *Homosexuality: The Use of Scientific Research in the Church's Moral Debate*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

Jones and Yarhouse provide a very helpful discussion of the scientific research pertaining to homosexuality. Throughout, they are careful to convey what the research demonstrates and what it does not demonstrate. Their findings show that the scientific evidence is not at odds with the teaching of Scripture on this matter. Jones and Yarhouse then conclude the book with a helpful survey of the biblical-theological landscape that lays out the parameters and guides our thinking in the development of a “Christian Sexual Ethic.”

Kent, Keri Wyatt. *God's Whisper in a Mother's Chaos: Bringing Peace Home*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

Kent provides encouragement to the mother of young children by providing aids and insights for the development of the spiritual life.

Kilner, John F., ed. *The Reproductive Revolution: A Christian Appraisal of Sexuality, Reproductive Technologies, and the Family*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

The Reproductive Revolution is a collection of essays that investigate contemporary controversies surrounding sexual ethics, bioethics, and human reproduction. Written by ethicists, doctors, and

theologians, the essays ask challenging questions and deliver a clear biblical perspective on issues surrounding infertility, human cloning, birth control, the status of embryos and human sexuality. On the subject of whether birth control pills cause abortions, opposing points of view are represented.

Kitzberger, Ingrid R., ed. *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*. London: Brill, 2000.

This collection of essays, written by both Christian and Jewish authors, focuses on the relation between Jesus and women as recorded in the New Testament and the Apocrypha. Special attention is given to a historical reconstruction of both the ancient near-East and the societal and religious roles of women during the second temple period. Topics range from investigation of particular biblical texts (Matt. 15:21-28, Mark 5:25-34) to the modern portrayal of Jesus and women in film. The essays fall into one of three categories: Literary approaches, historical reconstruction and contextualization, and actualization. These three categories can be explained as an investigation into the world in the biblical text, the world behind the text, and the world in front of the text. The final section in particular tends to place a strongly postmodern emphasis upon the experience and world of the reader, divorcing the biblical text from the intent of the author.

Luttikhuisen, Gerard P., ed. *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

The purpose of this compilation of essays is to look at the ways that the Jewish and Christian traditions have interpreted the creation of man and woman as recorded in the first two chapters of Genesis. Of particular interest is the first essay that compares the narrative structure of the Genesis creation account to other ancient near eastern traditions. There are also chapters on 1 Cor. 11:2-16, the aspects of woman typology in Genesis, and the utilization of the creation narrative in patristic literature.

Partner, Daniel and Margaret Partner. *A Cloud of Witnesses: Readings on 50 Women of Faith*. Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 2000.

The Partners have produced a book that combines devotional elements along with brief biographical sketches of fifty women of church history. Each entry begins with a quote from the woman in question, followed by the brief biographical sketch, and concluded with a suggested prayer and a recommended scripture reading. The women selected represent a variety of backgrounds and traditions.

Passno, Diane *Feminism: Mystique or Mistake?* Wheaton: Tyndale House, 2000.

Diane Passno briefly traces the history of the feminist movement in America by lauding its beginning, but lamenting its present state. She critically analyzes the feminist teaching on homosexuality, marriage, and motherhood. Filled with lively and penetrating anecdotes, Passno affirms male leadership in the home (although she finds the foundation of the patriarchal family in the fall) and provides hope and guidance for women in abusive situations.

Post, Stephen G. *More Lasting Unions: Christianity, the Family, and Society*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Social science affirms the need for marriage and family, but the present culture does little to support lasting marriages. Post examines the spiritual foundations historically affirmed as necessary for a long-lasting marriage bond and then demonstrates the need for those same Christian foundations if marriage commitment is to run deeper than the culture supports. Post examines the teachings of Jesus on marriage and family, and he makes a strong case for maintaining teaching on such themes as covenant, fidelity, and sacrificial love in parenting. Post's work has strong apologetic value for a Christian understanding of marriage and family. He helpfully documents society's need for long-term marriages and strong family units if individuals are to receive proper care throughout the entirety of the human life cycle. Concerns are a confusing ambivalence toward homosexual unions, a reference to imaging God as Father and Mother and his concern over the patriarchal biblical texts and patriarchal family structure.

Risk, William P. *Dating and Waiting: Looking For Love in All the Right Places*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2000.

Risk's highly readable volume is directed toward the particular concerns of single Christians. Throughout, his book is peppered with helpful insights. For example, Risk has a keen section critiquing the practice of Christians dating non-Christians under the rubric of "flirt to convert." Overall the book is very theocentric, evidenced by its frequent exhortations to trust God in his sovereignty. So far as that goes, it is a perspective that deserves our appreciation. In this reviewer's estimation, however, there are also a couple of weaknesses, the first of which, is that it appears, from the outset, simply to assume the validity of dating. While Risk does stress godliness during one's single years, his book gives very little attention to whether or not the "genre" of contemporary dating is a viable option for Christian

singles. One final criticism: at the end of each chapter, Risk invites reflection with a few brief questions, and at the end of chapter eight, he leaves the question of “how far is too far” far too open-ended saying, “Some Christians say that a couple should not even kiss before they are engaged; others say that almost anything short of intercourse is acceptable. What do you think and why?” Surely this could be misread to suggest that the parameters are left up to individual taste; a misreading that is all the more possible, since he did not go far at all in drawing out the implications of verses such as 1 Cor. 6:18 for the Christian dater.

Singh, Maina. *Gender, Religion, and “Heathen Lands”: American Missionary Women in South Asia (1860s-1940s)*. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Singh explores the encounters between female missionaries and the women of South Asia. She plays close attention to the interaction that took place at schools and hospitals established by missionaries. Her cross-cultural study includes analysis of the both the sending societies and the receiving cultures. The volume is not concerned with the efforts female missionaries made in Christian conversion. It studies the impact that women missionaries had on both the sending and receiving “patriarchal” cultures.

Trevett, Christine. *Quaker Women Prophets in England and Wales 1650 – 1700*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.

Christine Trevett’s study focuses on the first half-century of Quakerism and explores the role that Quaker women played during this time of religious history. To those outside the Quaker movement, the role of women in the Quaker church as prophets and preachers was always controversial. Trevett reveals the depth to which the controversy swirled within the movement itself. The book treats the subjects of prophecy and the self-understanding of Quaker women as being like prophets and apostles. Trevett’s volume also plays particular attention to the Quaker movement in Wales.

Watson, Francis. *Agape, Eros, Gender: Towards a Pauline Sexual Ethic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Watson explores three biblical texts (1 Corinthians 11, Romans 7, and Ephesians 5) to begin a Pauline sexual ethic. The recurrent theme is that agape, not eros, must rule in the public sphere, particularly in the church assembly. Therefore, boundaries must be placed upon eros to ensure the participation of the sexes in agape. Watson employs a liberal hermeneutic, employing redaction theory and the reading of other texts from authors as varied as Luce Irigaray, Sigmund Freud,

Augustine, and Virginia Woolf, to shed light upon the sexual ethic recommended by the Pauline texts. Watson’s conclusion to his analysis of 1 Corinthians 11 is that head coverings are to be worn by women as a symbol to men of their authority to speak in the church assembly. The head covering is meant to ward off the erotic look of the male that would prevent her voice from being heard. In his treatment of Romans 7, Watson explores the impact of both the fallen nature and the new man upon gender and sexual ethics, calling for the mortification of erotic desires and the hope for the rule of agape. Finally, Watson concludes that the model of Christ’s authoritative and sacrificial headship, and the apparent contradiction between the mutual submission of Ephesians 5:21 and the unilateral submission of 5:22 of wives to husbands points to the deconstruction, not the elimination, of patriarchal marriage, where agape is the rule and eros is transformed. ■