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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The status and role of woman is a delicate issue which should not be treated without extensive Biblical research. Many feminists, however, have totally disregarded God's Word as if it were irrelevant. Some individuals within evangelical circles, who claim to adhere to God's Word, are reinterpreting Scripture to develop a teaching quite opposed to that which is regarded as traditional, Biblical teaching.

I. The Need For This Study

The past generation has witnessed more evangelical approaches to this subject than ever before. Confusion abounds. The traditional interpretations and guidelines have been set aside. Many who are willing to follow the Bible are becoming confused as to what it really says, much less how it applies. Surely more definitive Biblical answers are demanded by society and deserved by women. Conservatives cannot in ignorance merely claim a safe, moderate approach concerning the role of woman. Any unbiblical bondage upon Christian women should be removed. Any unbiblical liberation must be refuted.

Several approaches are currently being propounded in order to reinterpret the Biblical data on woman. One
approach is to regard the Scriptures as errant and fallible. The feminist theologian Robin Scroggs considers Ephesians, Colossians, and the Pastorals as non-Pauline. Likewise, she considers First Corinthians 14:33b-36 as a gloss added to that epistle. Thus, she blots out most of the New Testament data which would offend her. Now the other New Testament passages can be considered "isolated" and so can be minimized. Thus, Paul is seen as a philogynist (lover of women); he becomes "the one clear voice in the New Testament asserting the freedom and equality of woman."

Another approach regards Paul as a misogynist. The apostle is viewed as a woman hater, or at least as one who accepts their inferiority. Paul allegedly must be understood and interpreted in the light of his rabbinic past and oriental background. Paul Jewett believes that the cultural differences justify a radical change in woman's present role from her New Testament role. Jewett also considers these


2 Ibid.

3 William O. Walker, "I Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views regarding Women," Journal of Biblical Literature, 94 (March, 1975), pp. 94-97. Walker allows this attitude to carry him to the point of considering I Cor. 11:2-16 as non-Pauline even without manuscript support. Walker also considers Paul a philogynist.


passages on woman's role as errant. He writes that the Apostle Paul has an "uneasy conscience" about these writings which cause him to speak out of both sides of his mouth or to "hint" the opposite of what he says.\(^1\) Krister Stendahl regards culture as so great an interpretive element in regard to the role of woman that it is naive to play "First-Century Bible Land.\(^2\)

One approach evidenced in Virginia Mollenkott's writings might be described as a neo-orthodox approach.\(^3\) The neo-orthodox practice of accepting the great, Biblical doctrines while rejecting the apostolic witness to these doctrines is employed. Thus, feminism seeks a foundation upon the doctrines of the trinity, creation, incarnation, and regeneration, rather than upon the explicit words of Paul and Peter.

The theological implications of the various approaches will be evaluated in chapter eight. The diversity of interpretations and procedures for resolving the Biblical data is evident. Thorough Biblical analysis and exegesis are necessary. This research will be directed primarily toward those who claim to be evangelical, but who appear to reject the Biblical data.

\(^1\) Paul K. Jewett, *MAN as Male and Female*, p. 113.


II. The Scope of This Study

The scope of this dissertation is limited to the Biblical data, intending that all such data should be analyzed. The study will not seek to interact with all secular and non-Biblical approaches to feminism. Rather, feminists who claim to be evangelical will be confronted.

The presuppositions or convictions which lie behind this research and the interpretation of the Biblical data are elementary, yet vital. First, this writer believes the Bible to be the inerrant and authoritative Word of God. Second, he believes that the human authors were superintended by the Holy Spirit when they wrote, rather than by their own wills (2 Peter 1:20-21). These prophecies were not the human author's own personal explanation or ideas (ἐπιλύσεως). Thus, since the Holy Spirit is the unseen author of the entire Bible, its message is harmonious. One must discern the harmonious theme concerning God's intended role for woman, and then he should develop it by starting from the Old Testament and continuing throughout the New.

As one seeks to correct the wrongs regarding the Biblical role of woman, two traps must be avoided. It is easy to approach the subject emotionally. Some women have certainly been exploited; Biblical principles have been ignored or misunderstood. Yet, an "affirmative action"

1The word "feminist" will in this paper be used apart from its social and economic elements of equality. The concern is only with those who reject the existence of a subordinate role.
approach could be equally as unbiblical. The second trap is
the rationalistic idea of thinking that the present genera-
tion understands God's timeless plans better than the apos-
tles did. It is to think that the apostles presented truth
through a culturally tainted filter whereas today's under-
standings are not affected by today's culture.

III. The Problems to be Solved
by This Study

The primary problem of this study concerns the na-
ture and duration of woman's subordination to man. Clearly
the Biblical data set forth some kind of subordinate role
for woman. But is this subordination to continue throughout
all history? Could not culture modify or redemption remove
the reason for this submission? Is the Biblical witness
authoritative and relevant or has culture changed the role
of woman?

What is the foundational truth underlying the subordi-
nate role which the Bible ascribes to woman? Is it
creation? Is it the Fall? Or is it one's culture? Further,
is the Biblical nature of woman's subordination clearly
understood? Have the stipulations and limitations which
have been placed upon women always been in harmony with the
Biblical intent of this subordination?

Similarly, four terms demand precise definition to
resolve these problems. They are: headship, subordination,
prophecy and authoritative leadership. These terms will be
analyzed and defined as they become pertinent within the
development of this study.

Once the primary problem regarding the nature and duration of woman's subordination is resolved, many other secondary questions can be answered. Woman's relation to God and man will be discernable. Her role within her home, her church and her society will be more understandable and meaningful.

IV. The Method of Procedure for This Study

Since all of Scripture is a unit, one cannot study the Biblical role of woman by noting only the teachings of Paul or the example of Jesus Christ. The total revelation of God must be scrutinized. Such a procedure provides a more comprehensive understanding, and it removes the topic from an alleged cultural stalemate.

Yet this study must and will be directed toward God's final revelation concerning woman's role—that recorded by the Apostle Paul. First Corinthians 11:2-16 has been chosen as the most significant passage for determining the present role of woman due to several substantial reasons. First, the foundational teaching for any relevant doctrine must consider the last word in progressive revelation and, thus, must turn to the teaching of the New Testament epistles on the subject. Second, this passage precedes the other Pauline passages regarding the role of woman and so prepares the reader for the proper interpretation. Third, it is subsequent to and thus acknowledges,
Paul's great teaching on the equality of male and female—Galatians 3:28. Fourth, it provides the clearest and most extended context regarding woman's role. A study of this passage cannot legitimately be regarded as an argument based on a "proof-text." Fifth, it deals with decisive issues, such as woman's relation to man (head) and her relation to service (prophecy). Sixth, it contains some very problematic teachings. Finally, this passage has received less attack from critics than the other Pauline passages concerning woman and its textual problems are minimal. This passage should be accepted by almost everyone who gives credence to the Bible.

To prepare for and to present this exegesis the procedure will be as follows: 1) the Old Testament perspective on woman; 2) the gospel perspective concerning woman; 3) the cultural perspective regarding woman; 4) the exegetical perspective—First Corinthians 11:2-16; background studies; 5) the exegetical perspective—First Corinthians 11:2-16; thought development and significance; 6) the New Testament perspective on woman; 7) the current theological perspective involving woman; and, 8) a summary and conclusions.
CHAPTER II

THE OLD TESTAMENT PERSPECTIVE ON WOMAN

Studying the practices of Christ or the teachings of Paul is not sufficient for developing the Biblical role of woman. To lay the Biblical framework for the teachings of Christ and His apostles one must begin with the revelation which God has provided in the Old Testament—through the creation, the Fall, and the Mosaic law. Both Christ and Paul refer back to God’s order for man and woman as established at creation. The Fall and the law also support the argumentation.

This chapter will disclose the Old Testament witness regarding the role of woman. The material is presented according to the five following topics: 1) the creation; 2) the Fall; 3) the Mosaic law; 4) the practices of Old Testament women; and, 5) a conclusion.

I. The Creation

The study of creation must involve an analysis of both the first and second chapters of Genesis. Chapter one

1See Mt. 19:4,5.
2See I Cor. 11:7-12 and I Tim. 2:13.
3See I Tim. 2:14 and I Cor. 14:34, respectively.
speaks primarily concerning woman's relation to God; chapter two presents her relation to man. Chapter one records woman's creation in the image of God; chapter two records her creation from man as a helper for man.

The First Chapter of Genesis

The account of God's creative act as recorded in chapter one stresses the distinction between man (male and female) and the animal creation—man was created in God's image. The presentation of God's revelation in Genesis one concerning man in God's image will be developed under two discussions: the unity and meaning of the words expressing image, and the implications of this image.

The unity and meaning of the words expressing image

The statements in Genesis concerning the creation of man are instructive.

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them (Gen. 1:26a, 27).¹

And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground. . . . And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone: I will make him an help meet for Him. . . . And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man (Gen. 2:7a, 18, 22).

This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of

¹The quotations of the English Bible will be from the King James Version unless otherwise noted.
God made him; Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created (Gen. 5:1,2).

Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man (Gen. 9:6).

The word "man" (Adam) which is used in each of these passages is the equivalent of ἄνθρωπος in Greek or man in English when it is understood as mankind. It is not understood as man opposed to woman, but man in distinction from other creatures, whether animal or angelic. Male and female are both called ἄνθρωπος by God (Gen. 5:2).

The significant revelation from these passages does not exist in the distinction of image (αὐτός) and likeness (δύναμις). In fact, Buswell along with most contemporary theologians considers the terms virtually synonymous in this context.¹ In verse twenty-six both terms are used, but in verse twenty-seven only ἀνθρωπός is used. In Genesis five only ἄνθρωπος is used to describe man's creation,² whereas in Genesis nine only ἀνθρωπός is used. Likewise, the New Testament never distinguishes between image and likeness.³ Jewett, therefore, speaks of them as "essentially parallel," and states that "the movement from one to the other probably

---


²But contrast verse 3 which speaks concerning the transmission of this image from Adam to his posterity wherein both terms are used together again, as in Gen. 1:26, but in reverse order.

³Consider 1 Cor. 11:7, Col. 3:10, and Jas. 3:9.
reflects the author's desire for explanatory qualification.\(^1\) Jewett prefers the idea of "correspondence" or "reflection" to "replica" or "duplicate."\(^2\)

Clark identifies God's image in man as reason. For him this one word best epitomizes that image.

The image must be reason because God is truth, and fellowship with him—a most important purpose in creation—requires thinking and understanding. Without reason man would doubtless glorify God as do the stars, stones, and animals, but he could not enjoy him forever. Even if in God's providence animals survive death and adorn the future world, they cannot have what the Scripture calls eternal life because eternal life is to know the only true God, and knowledge is an exercise of the mind or reason. Without reason there can be no morality or righteousness: these too require thought. Lacking these, animals are neither righteous nor sinful.\(^3\)

Feinberg believes Clark's definition is too narrow, too confining, since man is so complex.\(^4\) The image of God must constitute all that differentiates man from animals. Feinberg states:

> It has in mind the will, freedom of choice, self-consciousness, self-transcendence, self-determination, rationality, morality, and spirituality of man. The ability to know and love God must stand forth prominently in any attempt to ascertain precisely what the image of God is.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\)Jewett, Male and Female, p. 21, footnote 1.

\(^2\)Ibid.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 246.
Men have not always understood the image of God so clearly. Both the Greek and Latin Fathers distinguished the terms, referring דָּם to the physical aspect and נַפְעָלָה to the ethical aspect of the image. ¹ Irenaeus understood דָּם to mean man's freedom and reason, and נַפְעָלָה to involve the gift of supernatural communion with God. ²

The neo-orthodox view as expressed by Karl Barth conforms to none of the historical views. Barth originally denied that God created man in his own image. Since God is "totally Other," there can be no similarity. In his later writings Barth does acknowledge this image, but because of his view of God, he cannot accept this image as rationality. Rather this image involves the sexual distinction between man and woman. ³ Clark contends that since this distinction occurs in animals also, "one wonders how it can be the image that sets man apart from the lower creation. And since there are no sexual distinctions in the Godhead, one wonders how this can be an image of God at all." ⁴

Thus, the terms image and likeness synonymously describe man's rational, moral and spiritual likeness to God. Man being in God's image does not make him male and female, yet it does fit with the image of God as will be.

¹Ibid., p. 237.
²Ibid. This is still the official view of the Roman Church.
³Clark, "The Image of God in Man," p. 221.
⁴Ibid.
explained immediately.

The implications of this image

One stress of these creation verses appears to be that **male and female** are in the image of God. Twice this is expressly stated (1:27; 5:2), and in Genesis nine it is obviously implied. Two important implications of this phrase are equality and fellowship.

First, the equality of male and female which is implicit in the Genesis accounts is explicit within New Testament revelation. The **locus classicus** is Galatians 3:28.

For all are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have clothed yourselves with Christ; therein is neither Jew nor Greek; therein is neither slave nor free man, therein is not male and female; for you all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:26-28, writer's rendering).

The Apostle Peter alludes to the equality of male and female believers by stating: "as being heirs together of the grace of life" (1 Peter 3:7b). Christ's words concerning His true brothers and sisters may, likewise, imply this equality: "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mt. 12:50; cf. Mk. 3:35 and Lk. 8:21).

Second, along with the equality of male and female resulting from the divine image is the element of fellowship. Fellowship between male and female due to God's image might easily be overlooked. Paul Jewett writes:

In the Genesis narrative it is not declared expressly that God's creating Man in his image means he created
him male and female. Yet the latter is brought into such close conjunction with the former as to imply the most intimate relation between Man's existence in the image of God and his fellowship as male and female. The two, therefore, should never be discussed separately. So far as Man is concerned, being in the divine image and being male and female, though not synonymous, are yet so closely related that one cannot speak biblically about the one without speaking also about the other, even though, surprisingly, for centuries theologians have sought to do so.¹

Jewett's conclusion that being male and female is so much a part of the divine image that they should never be discussed separately goes too far. Never in the New Testament do the apostles in speaking of God's image in man refer to the quality of being male and female.² Jewett views Genesis 1:27b, "male and female made he them," as an exposition of 1:27a, "in the image of God created he him."³ He does believe, however, that Karl Barth has gone too far when Barth equates being male and female with being in God's image, yet he regards Barth's overstatement as a wholesome antidote for the neglect of centuries.⁴

Fellowship between the persons of the God-head is indeed emphasized in Scripture,⁵ and it seems to be an

¹Jewett, Male and Female, pp. 45-46.


³Jewett, Male and Female, p. 33.

⁴Ibid., p. 46. Also George Tavard (Women in Christian Tradition, [Notre Dame, Ind.: Uni. of Notre Dame Press, 1973], p. 190) expresses the same concept that man or woman cannot be in God's image without the other.

⁵See 1 Jn. 1:2-7 & Jn. 10:30.
emphasis in Genesis 1:26-27. Here, quite unexpectedly in the passage, the plurality of God is emphasized: "Let us make man in our image." In such a context the idea of fellowship cannot be regarded as foreign, yet neither should it be regarded as equal to the divine image. It seems to be a product of that image. The fellowship of husband and wife is a result of the image of God.

Following Barth, Jewett sees man in God’s image as "Man-in-fellowship." This, Barth states, obligates man-kind to live as man or woman, and as man and woman. There should be no attempt to transcend or confuse the sexual distinction, and there should be a proper stress of fellowship between the sexes.

Jewett tends to minimize the role of marriage in this male/female fellowship (probably because of an emphasis which he feels is misplaced or exaggerated). Nonetheless, the fellowship of husband and wife is indeed stressed in the creation accounts.

Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth... (Gen. 1:28). Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh (Gen. 2:24).

---

1Ibid., p. 49.


3Jewett, *Male and Female*, pp. 29, 171, 24, 34, 46.

4To be single is good and proper and honorable in certain situations (1 Cor. 7:1-9).
Marriage is far more than sex, of course, yet the physical oneness of marriage pictures the immaterial oneness of this true fellowship. It reflects the oneness of the Trinity. Probably no human fellowship can be greater than that of husband and wife.

Therefore, this image results in fellowship like that within the Trinity. God is a being of fellowship; His unity is so perfect that He is one. Male and female become one in marriage and yet remain "they." Still, the most perfect human complement to any person should be his husband or wife.¹

The Second Chapter of Genesis

Whereas Genesis one distinguished man from the animals, Genesis two distinguishes man from one another as male and female. Genesis two is probably the most crucial chapter in the Old Testament concerning male/female relationships. It establishes with chapter one this relationship and subsumes it within creation. Chapter three, the Fall, explains conditions as they are, but chapter two shows the derivation of the human order. Since the order originates from God's created pattern it rightly is called creation order.

Genesis two has been severely attacked by feminists. Thus, this section of the study will present a statement of

¹Paul states that when a man loves his wife he loves himself (Eph. 5:28). This implies that the oneness of man and woman is much more than the physical aspect. See Eph. 5:28-31.
creation order, the attack upon creation order, and then provide a defense for this order.

The statement of creation order

A third element (along with equality and fellowship) concerning the creation of man as male and female is subordinate order. Genesis one gives no hint of subordination, nor does it speak explicitly regarding egalitarian relations. One can either argue from silence or understand creation in the light of chapter two and the rest of the Scriptures which do interpret it. Genesis 2:18 reads, "I will make him an help meet for him," and Genesis 2:22 states that God made woman out of the rib which He had taken "from man." The New Testament commentary is much more explicit. The Apostle Paul gives as his first principle for the subordination and silence of woman in the church the creation order: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve" (1 Tim. 2:13). Also, 1 Corinthians 11:3 manifests that the relation of male and female reflects the relation of Christ and the Father: "the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God."

Genesis two, with the corroborating testimony of the rest of Scripture, presents both the ontological nature of male and female and the role of each. As to the innate nature of male and female, they are each in God's image and thus ontologically equal. Yet as to their roles or functions, God at the time of their creation decreed a difference. The
role of the male is leadership or headship which is to be accomplished through love. The role of the female is supportive which is to be accomplished through willing subordination. Barth interprets the Genesis account of the relation between Adam and Eve as follows.

Humanity for them was not an ideal beyond masculinity and femininity. But masculinity and femininity themselves, in their differentiation and unity, constituted humanity. Thus neither masculinity or femininity could be sub-human—a weakness which had to be endured and concealed. So long as neither tried to assert itself in abstracto, both were valid in concreto. So long as man's supremacy was only the expression of a claim first raised, not by himself, but by God and therefore legitimate, it could not be blamed and he was not compelled to hide it from woman. And so long as the subordination of woman to man was only the expression of the help which in her person made the male man and man a male, this did not involve any humiliation for her, nor did she have to reproach man that she was wholly and exclusively his helpmeet. How could one work of God be ashamed as such before another?  

The attack upon creation order

Several arguments are raised to destroy Paul's statement of creation order. One such argument proclaims that Paul's reasoning is fallacious about creation order in Genesis two. Scanzoni and Hardesty write: "If beings created first are to have precedence, then the animals are clearly our betters." Jewett likewise asks: "Who would argue that the man is subordinate to the ground because taken from it?"  

1 Barth, Church Dogmatics, III, I, 309-10.  
2 Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, All We're Meant To Be (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1974), p. 28.  
3 Jewett, Male and Female, p. 126.
Knight answers these objections by expressing the point of Paul's arguments as "not mere chronology but also the question of derivation and relationship."¹ This point is demonstrated in Paul's comments in First Corinthians 11.

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 (1 Cor. 11:8,9 NASB).

Another means of attack upon creation order is to consider Genesis two as poetic narrative rather than a historical event.² Genesis two reads:

And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him. And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not an help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesht instead thereof; And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man (Gen. 2:18-22).

Virginia Mollenkott argues that Genesis two cannot be taken in complete literalness. The chronology of the verses cannot be followed. One must see, she says, only the relationship of Adam and Eve--they are "one flesh."³

Are we intended to take Genesis 2 in complete literalness? Are we supposed to regard Genesis 2 as a

negation of the statement in Genesis 1 that male and female were created simultaneously and both in the image of God? Are we to insist on the literalness of Adam’s being made out of a handful of dust, and that this happened before trees were made to spring up, and before the wild beasts and birds were made, and before Eve?1

Mollenkott sees verse 19 as the essence of the chronological problem.2 After describing man as being alone, verse 19 begins: "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; . . ." Mollenkott argues that if Genesis two is taken literally and chronologically, then Adam was created first, then the vegetation and animals, and finally Eve.

Mollenkott and other feminist face two problems with this approach to Genesis two. First, if Genesis two is not to be interpreted literally, what basis is there for saying that Genesis one, which implies the equality of the female, is to be understood literally? Second, even if Genesis two could not be understood literally, if it says anything authoritatively, it still introduces a relationship between male and female which involves roles of priority and support, headship and subordination. She has not provided meaningful evidence for her egalitarianism.

Genesis two, including verse nineteen, is not difficult to harmonize with chapter one. Verse nineteen needs only to be understood as a summary statement of what God had


already done with reference to animal creation. Not all animal life is referred to in verse nineteen, only those which are appropriate in the context—those Adam would name. The "game and tame" animals of the field which God created on that sixth day and the birds which He created on the fifth day—these alone are mentioned.¹ This is a summary of related events.

Keil and Delitzsch regard the formation of the beasts and birds with the creation of Adam, connected by means of an imperfect with a waw consecutive, as no conflict with Genesis one.

The arrangement may be explained on the supposition, that the writer, who was about to describe the relation of man to the beasts, went back to their creation, in the simple method of the early Semitic historians, and placed this first instead of making it subordinate; so that our modern style of expressing the same thought would be simply this: "God brought to Adam the beasts which He had formed."²

The defense of creation order

If one does not believe in verbal, plenary inspiration and literal or natural interpretation of Scripture, he may either accept Genesis one or Genesis two (or neither) as a correct account of man's origin. In defense of creation order let it first be noted that the Apostle Paul


²Ibid., p. 87. Keil and Delitzsch also illustrate this Semitic pattern from 1 Kings 7:13.
accepts both as accurate accounts of God's creation and collates the two in First Corinthians 11. He says that man is in God's image (v.7; cf. Gen. 1:26), and that woman is created from man (v.8; cf. Gen. 2:21,22) and for man (v.9; cf. Gen. 2:18). Paul also demonstrates his understanding of Adam's headship in that Adam, not Eve, was responsible for sin within humanity (Rom. 5:12-19).

Second, the word "helper" is often used to demonstrate the subordination of woman in Genesis two. Care must be taken, since this word does not innately imply subordination. Most of its twenty-one occurrences in the Old Testament refer to God as the helper of His people. It is a very fitting word to describe accurately the role of female to male. Genesis two in no way implies any kind of slave concept. Woman, as God intended, is to be a help, an assistant. She is part of man and she is in the image of God as man is.  

Many contextual facts demonstrate that the use of "helper" in describing Eve in Genesis two involve a subordinate role. Though this word is most often used of God, a superordinate, this does not disallow a different nuance of meaning when related to humans. First, the context suggests that the "helper" was made for Adam. Eve was a help suited for

---

1 Ex. 18:4; Deut. 33:7,26,29; Ps. 20:2; 33:20; 70:5; 89:19; 115:9,10,11; 121:1,2; 124:8; 146:5; Hos. 13:9.

2 Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 11 is never founded upon "helper". He does say that both need the other (11:11).
Adam. Knight suggests that if one person is created to be the helper of another, the one receiving the helper must have a certain authority over the helper.¹ Second, the context clearly states that Eve was made through Adam's flesh, rather than a new, independent substance (2:22).² Third, chapter two states that she was made from Adam—thus fitting his needs.

A third argument in defense of creation order comes from the context. Adam uses his God-given authority to name her, as he had done with the animals.³ Yet Mollenkott states that "there is nothing in the text of Genesis 2 which implies subordination."⁴ The New Testament writers saw it there.⁵

II. The Fall

The second area of Old Testament data regarding the role of woman involves the Fall of humanity. The Biblical data is contained in one verse—Genesis 3:16.

Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

³Ibid.
⁴Mollenkott, Women, p. 100.
⁵The subordination of 1 Cor. 11, Eph. 5 and 1 Tim. 2 is taken from the text of Genesis 2.
This verse is the pronouncement of God's judgment upon woman. Only the last part of this divine pronouncement has significance concerning the Biblical role of woman.

The role of woman as revealed after the Fall will involve two subjects: 1) the meaning of Genesis 3:16 and, 2) the relation of the Fall to subordination.

The Meaning of Genesis 3:16

The phrase, "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," has created difficulty for many interpreters. The problem focuses on the word desire (πληρέω). Three common views will be discussed and then an alternative interpretation will be offered.¹

Three common views

One view is to understand πληρέω as referring to sexual desire. Thus the woman's physical desire for her husband will be so strong that she will disregard the pain of childbearing which would result. This view harmonizes the second half of verse sixteen with the first half. The English translation of the connecting waw as "yet" does suggest this interpretation within some versions.² "In pain you shall bring forth children; yet your desire shall be for your husband" (NASB).

¹See Susan T. Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?" Westminster Theological Journal, XXXVII:3 (Spring, 1975), 376-83. Foh sets forth concisely and forcefully many of the points presented in this section.

²For example, RSV and NASB.
Although this view does fit the context of this verse it contains several weaknesses. First, a greater sex drive for one's husband hardly fits the characteristic of divine judgment. It might seem then that the Lord is rather proclaiming a new and greater bliss for wife and husband.¹ To regard this desire as a consolation for woman because of the pain of childbearing is incongruous with the nature of the curse. Neither the serpent nor the man receive any consolation. Further, history reveals that woman's sexual desires are not always toward her own husband. Third, and most significantly, a later study of שַׁחַרְיָהֹת will show that this interpretation does not fit well with the other Old Testament occurrences of this word.

A second view suggests that שַׁחַרְיָהֹת implies a psychological desire which the wife will have for her husband. It could be described as a "deep natural attraction."² This attraction results from certain aspects which are lacking in her own nature. It is her desire for man's protection.³ Keil and Delitzsch describe it as a morbid desire bordering upon disease.⁴

The main weakness of this view is that it likewise removes the hardship of God's punishment in Genesis 3:16b,
if woman would submit willingly. Thus there would be no need for God's indictment: "He shall rule over thee." The submission and the ruling would be so natural that there would be no conflict. This pronouncement, then, is regarded not so much as a curse as it is a compensation for the sorrow of childbirth. This leaves a loose relation between the desire and the pronouncement that man shall rule over her. Like the first view this view makes the curses incongruous by providing consolation for the woman alone. Second, it inadequately fits with the New Testament admonition which frequently exhorts wives to submit (Eph. 5:22; Col. 3:18; Ti. 2:5; 1 Pet. 3:1). If submission were natural and willing no command would be needed.

The third view understands as a subservient desire where the woman desires only what the husband desires. She has no will or desire of her own. Calvin understood the phrase as saying: "Thou shalt desire nothing but what thy husband wishes." Though this view harmonizes the phrase, "thy desire shall be to thy husband," with its following phrase, "and he shall rule over thee," it possesses the other weaknesses of the second view.

1 Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?", p. 379.
2 Stitzinger, "Role of the Woman from Genesis," p. 19.
3 Davis, Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis, p. 94.
An alternative interpretation

In all of the preceding interpretations of נֶפֶשׁ in Genesis 3:16, the idea prevails that by means of the woman's desire for her husband, he rules over her. The interpretation about to be proposed suggests a totally different relation between woman's desire and man's rule.

Several significant problems hinder the interpretation of נֶפֶשׁ. First this word occurs only three times in the Old Testament: Genesis 3:16; 4:7 and Song of Solomon 7:10. Since Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 are so close in context and so parallel in form, they must be observed together. The Hebrew is identical except for necessary changes in person.

KJV . . . and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.
   . . . and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

NASB . . . Yet your desire shall be for your husband, And he shall rule over you.
   . . . and its desire is for you. but you must master it.

NIV " . . . Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you."
   " . . . it desires to have you, but you must master it."

The King James Version does acknowledge the parallel between the two passages, but fails to communicate the message of the second (and probably that of 3:16 also). Foh

---

1 Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?", p. 377.
correctly observes the problem to be that "Cain does not in fact rule, whether the antecedent of 'him' is sin or Abel. Therefore, the future indicative or predictive translation ('shall rule') of Genesis 4:7 is incorrect."¹ The New American Standard Bible and the New International Version do meaningfully communicate the language of Genesis 4:7, but do not precisely translate the more abstruse Genesis 3:16. The use of the preposition "for" in the latter versions is more accurate than "to" or "unto" (KJV), yet their renderings allow several interpretations.

Like these translations, E. J. Young notes the parallel constructions but allows his comprehension of what Genesis 3:16 means to halt a parallel translation and interpretation.

As we examine the language of the Lord, we note that it is capable of two interpretations. First of all, however, it is well to compare it with the similar language in Genesis 4:7. In that verse we read, "and his desire is unto thee." The meaning in this context of the fourth chapter is that what sin desires is what Cain will carry out. His desire is unto Cain in the sense that Cain is a slave thereto, and must perform whatever sin's desire may be. In the present verse Gen. 3:16 we may render, "and unto thy husband is thy desire." It is obvious that the meaning here is the reverse of what it was in the fourth chapter. Is it not clear that the woman is not here pictured as a despot who compels the man to do the things she desires? Plainly, this is not the meaning of the text (emphasis added).²

The two interpretations to which Young alludes are

¹Ibid., p. 380.
those already described as psychological desire and subservient desire. He prefers the latter.

Thus, the second problem is that none of the common understandings of the desire in Genesis 3:16 fits well the understanding of the parallel passage, Genesis 4:7. Many contemporary scholars, like E. J. Young, understand a possessive desire for sin over Cain in Genesis 4:7, but they will not allow such a desire of woman over man in Genesis 3:16.

A third problem which interpreters have with נַפְּשׁוֹן is that even lexicographers are uncertain as to its root meaning. Brown, Driver, Briggs derive it from the root פִּלְעַ which they relate to the cognate Arabic word سَقِ (sāqa), meaning to attract or desire. This is the usual understanding given to its usage in Genesis 3:16. But, since the phonemic equivalent for the Hebrew נ is س in Arabic, G. R. Driver proposes that the proper Arabic etymology would be سَقِ (sāqa), meaning to urge, impulse, or drive. Brown, Driver, Briggs acknowledge this problem, yet they seem content to give this meaning secondary significance. Foh comments:

1Ibid., p. 127.


One must suspect that the major influence which made BDB willing to contradict the usual phonemic equivalence and associate נִיְמֹן with the Arabic ـاذا was the notion that נִיְמֹן was a reference to sexual desire. The sounder lexicography may have been overruled by a commitment to the understanding of the passage.¹

Koehler and Baumgartner apparently prefer Driver's opinion since they cite him and express the meaning as "impulse" or "urge."²

Thus, the translation of נִיְמֹן as desire may imply too much of a positive nuance. Probably the word drive would be a more exact translation than desire. Desire implies only a positive concept, such as attraction. Drive can imply both positive and negative concepts. Desire implies an impulse for; drive allows an impulse either for or against. The drive of Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 could be sexual, psychological, subservient, or it could be over (possessive) or against. So Foh argues that the parallelism of 3:16 and 4:7 supports the idea that as sin's desire or drive is to be over Cain, so woman's desire is to be over man to possess or to control him.³ Foh's interpretation will be evaluated shortly.

Several other arguments support the lexical evidence for the meaning of נִיְמֹן as a drive rather than only a desire. First, the reading of the Septuagint at Genesis

¹Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire," p. 378, note 12.
³Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire," p. 381.
3:16 and 4:7 is helpful.\(^1\) The usual Greek word for desire, ἐπιθυμεῖν, is not once used for πράξῃ.\(^2\) Rather, the uncommon word ἀποστροφή is used in both Genesis 3:16 and 4:7.

This word involves a twisting, turning away from, escape, or a bending back.\(^3\) The ideas of desire, attraction, or longing for do not harmonize with the Septuagint rendering. The broader meaning of πράξῃ as a drive does fit both Septuagint passages. The Septuagint thus suggests that the drive of woman is against (or from) man just as the drive of sin is against Cain.

The use of πράξῃ in Song of Solomon 7:10 (verse 11 in the Hebrew text) probably was understood differently by the Septuagint translators in that they translate it with ἐπιστροφή. Unlike ἀποστροφή, it denotes a positive rather than a negative idea. Like στρέφω, ἐπιστρέφω denotes a positive character, yet with a greater thrust.\(^4\) So

---

\(^1\) Although the Septuagint is a translation its witness is profound because of its antiquity. Even the witness of the Arabic is less significant, since it is chronologically the last in the line of the cognate languages. The LXX antedates by many centuries any other witness regarding this problem (c. 280 B.C. for Genesis 3:16 and 4:7).

\(^2\) The verb ἐπιθυμεῖν is consistently used for the normal Hebrew word for "to desire," תָּמִּי. See Deut. 5:21, "Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbor's wife" (תָּמִּי/ ἐπιθυμεῖν). Compare Song of Solomon 2:3 and even Genesis 2:9 and 3:6.

\(^3\) Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, a new (ninth edition, rev. and aug. by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzil (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 220. Clement of Rome uses this word (I Cl. 4:5) in commenting on Gen. 4:7, but he sheds no further light.

\(^4\) George Bertram, "στρέφω" et al., Theological
Solomon's lover says, "I am my beloved's and his desire (ἐπιστροφή) is toward me."¹

The context in both the Hebrew and Septuagint texts forcefully expresses a drive or desire which is against another at Genesis 3:16 and 4:7. In both languages the two contexts have parallel form. By contrast, both languages use a different syntax for the Song of Solomon. There both languages express a drive or desire for someone as a study of the prepositions will demonstrate shortly.

Susan Foh sees the drive of Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 as a possessive desire, a drive to possess or control. Woman allegedly desires to control man as sin desires to control Cain.² Her opponents attack her argument in two areas. First she appears to ignore the Song of Solomon usage in her treatment, and, second, her argument is weakened by the prepositions which are used. If Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 involve a possessive desire, then the preposition ἐπι (over) would have been used as it is in Song of Solomon 7:10, rather than ἐπὶ (to).³ Indeed, Foh has gone too far and thus her premise is weakened. What the contexts do suggest is not a


¹For a related treatment of this subject with different conclusions see David R. Nicholas, What's a Woman to Do . . . In the Church? (Scottsdale, Arizona: Good Life Productions, Inc., 1979), pp. 8-20.

²Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?", pp. 381-2.

³Nicholas, What's a Woman to Do, pp. 16-20.
drive or desire over, but a desire against. A study of the prepositions, thus, becomes imperative.

The second supportive argument that drive is the meaning of נפש in involves the prepositions used in the several contexts. It is the preposition more than the meaning of נפש which demonstrates the precise nuance of Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 and which distinguishes these from the Song of Solomon usage. The use of נפש in Genesis with "desire" obviously would express the idea of "to" or "for." But if נפש does not express the positive idea of desire or longing for, but the idea of a drive which could be either for or against, and in fact demands the negative idea in the Septuagint (ἀποστροφῆς), then נפש takes on the negative idea of against.\(^1\) Indeed, in this very context נפש is translated "against." Genesis 4:8 reads: "... Cain rose up against (גאון) Abel his brother and slew him." The Greek preposition also is most fitting. Like נפש, πρὸς, which is used in 3:16 and 4:7, positively means to or for, but negatively it means against.\(^2\) In the Song of Solomon where the passage speaks of man's drive or desire, the prepositions expressing over (גאון and ἐπὶ) are used. But in Genesis נפש is the better preposition.


So, in the Song of Solomon the syntax might well express Solomon's drive to be over his beloved, but in Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 the syntax expresses a drive against. Sin's drive was against Cain to destroy him. Woman's desire would be against man, not to control him, but rather to be uncontrolled by him. Genesis 3:16 does not seem to suggest that woman's desire will make her more submissive to her husband, so that he may rule over her; neither does it mean that her drive will be to rule him. Rather, her drive will be for independence; her drive will be to gain freedom from man's authority.

The last phrase of Genesis 3:16, "he shall rule over you," should likewise be understood with its parallel in Genesis 4:7; "but you must master it" (NASB). The Hebrew imperfect verb, which is used in both passages, should not be understood as a predictive futuristic imperfect, stating that man will rule. The context suggests rather a modal imperfect, showing simply what is desired though contingent (what should take place), and stating that one should master something. ¹ Genesis 4:7 is not a prediction that Cain would master or conquer sin; it is a statement that he should overcome it lest it overcome him.

Adam must rule Eve lest she free herself from him.

The two phrases of Genesis 3:16 are antithetical. Both the

presence of and the preverbal position for the personal pronoun לְמַא suggests a contrast.\footnote{Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?" p. 382.} Thus, woman's desire would be against man, but he must rule over her. This writer's literal rendering of Genesis 3:16b would read: "and against your husband is your drive, but he must rule over you."

The Relation of the Fall to Subordination

Though much opposition is raised by evangelical feminists concerning woman's submission based upon creation order, less is expressed concerning submission due to the Fall. Several factors explain this greater acceptance of the Fall curse upon woman. First, the statement of Genesis 3:16 is very explicit: "He must rule over you." Second, if subordination is only the consequence of sin, it is supposed that this consequence can be completely removed by the new order within redemption, so that the hierarchal authority of man is no longer needed.

Is the Fall the cause or the corrupter of the role relation between woman and man? Genesis two reveals that the Fall was not the cause, for the subordinate relationship was established at creation. The New Testament repeatedly verifies this fact, for it bases female submission upon Genesis two (though it may strengthen that claim from Genesis three as in 1 Tim. 2:14). More significantly, the Fall is demonstrated to be the corrupter by the fact that redemption does not remove woman's subordination. The New
Testament does not admonish the unsaved woman to submit being under the old order. Rather the apostles lay great emphasis upon Christian wives submitting willingly to their husbands. Christian women and men have been freed from the corrupting power of sin; they have not been removed from God's creation order. There should no longer be a fight for headship or independence. The Christian woman's desire to contend with her husband for the leadership should now cease. The despotic lordship of the husband should now become a leadership controlled by love.

Knight labors well to demonstrate that the Fall was not the cause but only the corrupter of the submissive role of woman.

The order as Paul says is evidenced by the Genesis 2 account is presumed immediately in Genesis 3 as lying behind the judgment of God on Man's sins. The Genesis 3 account presumes the reality of childbearing (Gen. 1:28) as that in which the woman will now experience the effects of the fall and sin (3:16). It presupposes the reality of work (Gen. 1:28 and 2:15) as that in which the man will now experience the effects of the fall and sin (3:17ff). And it presumes the reality of the role relationship between wife and husband established by God's creation order in Genesis 2:18ff as that in which woman and man will now experience the effects of the fall and sin (3:16). "He shall rule over you" expresses the effects of sin corrupting the relationship of man's headship over his wife. Just as the other realities are seen to be established before the fall and corrupted by the fall and sin, so this relationship was understood to be in existence and to be corrupted by it.¹

The effect of the Fall was crushing to humanity. Man has tried ever since to alleviate these effects--from

the use of anesthesia in childbirth to the use of herbicides to lessen man's labor. Therefore, why not eliminate the authority of man over woman? The fallacy of such argument stems from a confusion of effect and reality. The alleviation of the Fall curse is not accomplished by removing the realities, such as childbirth, work, and woman's role, but "by alleviating that which corrupts the reality."¹ Thus, the New Testament urges husbands to love, honor and not be bitter toward their wives; it does not urge them to cease being head of the household.²

III. The Mosaic Law

The term "The law of Moses" is Biblically used in several senses. It may refer to the five books of Moses, the Pentateuch (Lk. 24:44), or even to the entire Old Testament.³ In this chapter it will refer to God's covenant given through Moses to Israel, beginning at the Exodus. Its contents are found in the books from Exodus through Deuteronomy.

To understand its contents regarding woman, the nature of the Mosaic law will be discussed first and then its specific precepts which explain woman's role will be evaluated.

¹Ibid., p. 15.
²Ibid.
³Note 1 Cor. 14:21 where Paul quotes from Isa. 28:11, 12 and calls it the law. Or note Jn. 10:38 wherein Jesus quoting Ps. 82:6 calls it the law.
The Nature of the Law

By noting God's plan for the law and the work which it performed, the essence of the law becomes more meaningful.

The Mosaic law was never intended as God's perfect plan for governing the affairs of mankind. It was neither His first plan nor His last. Galatians 3:19 establishes both points quite clearly: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." The New Testament repeatedly states that God replaced the law with a better covenant (Hebrews, chapters 3-10). Galatians 3:19 (with vv. 23-25) states that the law was given until the time that faith in Christ comes. When a person exercises saving faith in Christ he dies to the law and enters into a new life with Christ (Gal. 2:19-20; Rom. 7:4-6).

Further, Galatians 3:19 shows that the law was not even God's first plan, for it was added because of sins. God placed Israel under massive regulations because Israel would not exercise self-regulation. All unsaved people are still under its moral regulations (1 Tim. 1:8-11).

The law deals with man as he is in his natural state—a depraved sinner. The law's work is to manifest sin; it makes man aware of sin (Rom. 3:20). It shows man the terrible nature of sin (Rom. 7:8-13). It causes man to restrain sin (1 Tim. 1:9-10). It is God's means of restraint until genuine freedom should come through Christ (Gal. 3:23-24).
Thus the law presupposes the sinfulness of humanity. It deals with and regulates mankind according to the results of Genesis three. Jesus when pressed by the Pharisees concerning divorce directs their thinking back to God's perfect plan of Genesis two concerning creation order (Mt. 19:3ff). After rejecting Christ's answer of life-long faithfulness, the Pharisees appeal to the statement within the Mosaic law which granted divorce. Jesus answers: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so" (v. 8). A precise interpretation of the commandments of the law is contingent upon an understanding of mankind's fallen, sinful condition.

The law clearly presupposed that man is the head of the family. He is responsible. To him the commandments are directed. When the second person pronoun "you" is used, it is the man who is being addressed. The commandments to women are in the third person.1 This may account for some of the alleged prejudice of the law. Since the law was spoken to the man as head of his household, naturally its statements will not be fifty percent for the husband and fifty percent for the wife. The male is given both more blessings and more curses.

The law was not given to provide perfect equality, but to provide order and restraint. The foreigner, for example, is not regarded equally with a citizen of the

---

1For example, note Ex. 22:24 and Lev. 18, especially v. 23.
nation (Deut. 23:3-8). Yet there are some restrictions. He was not to be contemnuously treated as the Jews of Christ's time did. Likewise, the slave must serve as a slave. But when his debt was repaid or the sabbath year came, he was freed. No man could through manstealing be made a slave. Thus, there were role differences, but men were treated humanely. The poor remained poor, yet they were protected and assisted. The Levites, unlike the other tribes, did not receive a portion of the land, but they were justly cared for. The law confronted man in his fallen state and protected him from himself and others. Likewise, woman is understood as possessing a subordinate role, but she was protected within a sinful society.

The Precepts of the Law Which Explain Woman's Role

Most statements in the law pertaining to women involve moral issues or the procedures of marriage and divorce. It is not the purpose of this study to set forth the specifics of those procedures. Rather this paper seeks to show how the law regarded woman and therefore how this affected her life.

Though the laws of divorce seem to favor the male, two facts must be remembered. The male alone appears to initiate the divorce, presumably because the law was written to him and naturally would deal with his situation or

1 Ex. 21 and Deut. 15.
side. Second, even if the male alone could initiate the divorce, it was the woman who was protected from the godless actions of such a man. These laws no more favored the husband than they protected the wife. Similarly, adulterers and adulteresses equally received the death penalty (Lev. 20:10).

A woman's property rights show that she was not merely property herself. Conversely, they demonstrate that she did not have "equal rights." Though the woman did not receive the land inheritance, neither did she go out empty. When there were no sons she would inherit the land (Num. 27:1-8), but she must marry within her tribe (Num. 36:2-13). The double-portion inheritance of the firstborn son (Dt. 21:15-17) demonstrates further that sex is not the major factor behind the inheritance laws; preservation of the family and tribal units was the prominent factor. By contrast, under the Mosaic law both men and women who because of debt were serving another were considered his property (Ex. 21:21). Even these slaves had human rights (vv. 26, 27). A man's wife or daughter was never considered his property to be disposed of as he willed.

The law's teachings concerning the taking of vows help establish what woman's status was under the law (Num. 30:1-16). Women could make vows (even the Nazarite vow, Num. 6:2), but if the husband or father annulled it on the day he heard of it, it would not stand. He could not annul it at a later time. Thus a woman's outward devotion
to God was influenced by the father or husband. The man had a leadership responsibility in spiritual matters.

Phyllis Bird summarizes the Old Testament woman as a legal non-person, dependent, and inferior. It is true that the Mosaic law did not regard woman with the same rights or responsibilities it gave to and placed upon man. But the law itself did not degrade woman. It honored her like it honored her husband—"Honor thy father and thy mother" (Ex. 20:12). Many degrading practices which men because of sin practiced did not possess the sanction of the law.

IV. The Practices of Old Testament Women

Woman's subordinate position did not diminish her worth. She was respected and revered. Often the Old Testament alludes to the honor women received. The Biblical data concerning the Old Testament practices of women will be organized under the subjects: 1) prophetesses and leaders, and 2) other honorable women.

Prophetesses and Leaders

Five women in the Old Testament are called prophetesses. Three are of great importance to this study: Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah. Concerning the other two,

---


2 The rabbis regarded 7 women as prophetesses: Sarah, Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, Abigail, Huldah, and Esther. The Babylonian Talmud, IX (Megillah 14a), 81.
there is a false prophetess who opposed Nehemiah (Neh. 6:14), and there is the wife of Isaiah (Isa. 8:3). Since no record exists of Isaiah's wife prophesying, the context may best explain why she is called a prophetess. No other prophet's wife is so designated. Isaiah's wife appears to prophesy only in the passive sense in that her son serves as a prophecy for the Lord. In verse one Isaiah is commanded of the Lord to write "Maher-shalal-hash-baz," meaning "swift is the booty, speedy is the prey." Verses three and four state:

So I approached the prophetess, and she conceived and gave birth to a son. Then the Lord said to me, "Name him Maher-shalal-hash-baz: for before the boy knows how to cry out 'my father' or 'my mother,' the wealth of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria will be carried away before the king of Assyria (NASB).

Verse three is the result of God's command of verse one as the word "so" suggests. The child's birth and naming served as a prophecy of God's judgment.

Miriam is the first of the Old Testament prophetesses. She is so designated in Exodus 15:20: "And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances." The Brown, Driver, Briggs lexicon describes her as "of the ancient type endowed with gift of song." ²

¹Jezebel is one of the two women called a prophetess within the New Testament (Rev. 2:20). Ezekiel 13:7 appears to speak of false prophetesses also: "Likewise, thou son of man, set thy face against the daughters of thy people, which prophesy out of their own heart; and prophesy thou against them."

Of great importance to this study is the relation between prophesying and leadership. This crucial question will be examined in a later chapter. At this point the important question is: were these women God-ordained leaders in Israel? Nowhere is Miriam represented as a leader of the nation—either spiritually or politically. She may be a prophetess only through her poetic songs. She could have been a mouthpiece of God’s revelation (Num. 12:2). But her leadership is mentioned only in relation to women. When she undermined God’s appointed leader, her brother Moses, God smote her with leprosy (Num. 12:1-15).

The other two prophetesses, Deborah and Huldah, appear to prophesy and lead. The significant information concerning Deborah is located in Judges, chapter four.

Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lappidoth, was judging Israel at that time. And she used to sit under the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim, and the sons of Israel came up to her for judgment. Now she sent and summoned Barak the son of Abinoam from Kedesh-naphtali, and said to him, "Behold the Lord, the God of Israel, has commanded, 'Go and march to Mount Tabor, . . . ." Then Barak said to her, "If you will go with me, then I will go; but if you will not go with me, I will not go." And she said, "I will surely go with you; nevertheless, the honor shall not be yours on the journey that you are about to take, for the Lord will sell Sisera into the hands of a woman." Then Deborah arose and went with Barak to Kedesh (Jud. 4:4-6, 8-9 NASB).

Obviously God had revealed His will and plans to Deborah. She did prophesy. What is not clear is whether God at any time ordained her to lead His people. The impression this passage leaves is that men placed her in the position of leadership. It seems neither God-ordained, nor
self-ordained. The people came to her dwelling place for judgment (v.5). Barak, not Deborah, was the one who demanded that she go to the battle (v.8). Whereupon, God immediately revealed His plan to honor another woman rather than Barak and his men (v.9). Indeed it appears to be a sad day in Israel's history that no men would be willing to lead in God's work.

Huldah is briefly mentioned in 2 Chronicles 34:22 and its parallel passage, 2 Kings 22:14.

So Hilkiah and those whom the king had told went to Huldah the prophetess, the wife of Shallum the son of Tokhath, the son of Hasrah, the keeper of the wardrobe (now she lived in Jerusalem in the Second Quarter); and they spoke to her regarding this. She said to them, "Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, 'Tell the man who sent you to me,' thus says the Lord, 'Behold, I am bringing evil on this place and on its inhabitants, even all the curses written in the book which they have read in the presence of the king of Judah'" (2 Chron. 34:22-24 NASB).

The evidence is not as complete as it is with Deborah, nevertheless Huldah seems to be one receiving and communicating revelation from God. As with Deborah, the passage does not reveal God-ordained or self-ordained leadership, only God-ordained prophesying.

Now the rabbis strongly disapproved of both Deborah and Huldah, saying: "There are two haughty women and their names are hateful."¹ Deborah is reproached because she sent for Barak instead of going to him; Huldah is reviled because she said, "tell the man" rather than, "tell the king."

¹The Babylonian Talmud, IX (Megillah 14b), 85.
Thus conclude the Old Testament data concerning prophetesses.

Other examples of women in leadership exist, but all lack any evidence of God's approval, much less His ordination. Two queens ruled in the times of the monarchies—Maacah and Athaliah. Both queen mothers ruled by force. They were wicked and were dethroned when the opportunity arose (1 Ki. 15:13; 1 Ki. 11:1-16).

Other Honorable Women

The Old Testament demonstrates that women often had great influence upon men. Women such as Sarah, Rebekah, Abigail, Deborah, Huldah, and the wise woman of Abel-Beth who saved her city (2 Sam. 20:16-22) could be cited. Solomon as a young king paid great honor to his mother. The Scriptures read:

Bathsheba therefore went unto king Solomon, to speak unto him for Adonijah. And the king rose up to meet her, and bowed himself unto her, and sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king's mother; and she sat on his right hand (1 Ki. 2:19).

The book which speaks the most concerning the honor of woman is the book of Proverbs.

A gracious woman attains honor, And violent men attain riches (Prov. 11:16 NASB).

An excellent wife is the crown of her husband, But she who shames him is as rottenness in his bones (Prov. 12:4 NASB).

Hear, my son, your father's instruction, And do not forsake your mother's teaching (Prov. 1:8 NASB).
Most outstanding is the tribute to the godly Old Testament woman in Proverbs, chapter thirty-one. Some have seen this woman as only hypothetical. She has even been described as a sort of Bionic Woman. Whether or not she was a specific or hypothetical woman, this passage describes the liberty and honor given by God's Word to the Old Testament woman. Whether most or few men treated women so, this is God's declaration. These probably are the teachings Solomon received from his mother; God has preserved them.

This godly woman is not bound to the house. She is at liberty even to buy property and to develop it (v.16). She is industrious (vv.13-15,27). Much is stated concerning her honor and worth; her value is far above jewels (v.10). She is clothed in dignity (v.25). Both the children and her husband honor her (v.28). Her life and labors bring praise to her even in the city gates (v.31).

V. Conclusion

One may leave this chapter wondering whether women were second-class citizens, God-appointed leaders, or something else. The Scriptures do provide further light concerning this problem, but first the total Old Testament picture should be briefly reconstructed.

The clearest proclamation of woman's ontological being or her nature is Genesis 1:27 with Genesis 5:1,2. She

is in God's image. The result of that image is her equality with man and their reciprocal fellowship. No statement in the Old Testament contradicts or abolishes that equality. It was established by God at creation.

Another aspect of this creation order is the subordination role or function of woman. Genesis chapter two speaks expressly to the relationship between man and woman. It, like chapter one, is a literal (and quite certainly a chronological) account of the events upon the sixth day of creation. This writer sees within that chapter, as did the apostles, a creation order involving woman's supportive role to man.

Genesis chapter three describes the Fall of mankind and the pronouncement of the divine curse upon creation. Verse sixteen records this curse upon woman. This writer understands it to say: "Against your husband is your drive, but he must rule over you." The woman's drive, because of corrupting sin within her husband and herself, is no longer for her husband but against her husband. Yet, whether woman's drive be for or against her husband, God's order involving woman's subordination to man remains unchanged.

The Fall is not the cause of woman's subordinate role, as many feminists believe, rather it is the corrupter. For example, Patricia Gundry exhorts that one must not center his understanding of woman's role on chapter three while omitting chapters one and two. This is true. Yet she appeals only to the incomplete statements of chapter one and
ignores chapter two, thus saying "there is no indication of subordination of woman in the beginning."¹

The redemption of the life of a believer does not remove the subordinate role of woman, for that role was God's original plan for mankind. Redemption ought, however, to remove the sin which corrupts the relationship between man and woman—the struggle for independence. It should alleviate the condition of the curse, but the role remains.

The law, confronting people as they are—sinful flesh, is full of minute regulations which are necessary when the love/submission principle is not followed. The law does not degrade woman, nor does it give to woman man's role. It deals with man and woman in the light of Genesis 3:16. The demeaning position of woman within the law manifests the Fall curse which resulted in man ruling over woman. This conclusion is supported by the fact that neither Christ nor the apostles refer back to the statutes of the Mosaic law as a basis for the Biblical role of woman.

Significantly, the law never exhorts husbands to love, and wives to submit.² Possibly the reason lies in the fact that the law, which had to be fulfilled through human flesh, could not attain that standard (Rom. 8:2,3).


²But Paul states that the law teaches the subordination of women (1 Cor. 14:34). That problem will be discussed in chapter six within the section dealing with 1 Cor. 14.
Women were, no doubt, often gravely mistreated in old Testament times, as they are today. Yet sufficient examples exist to manifest that women were also highly honored. One or two appear to have received and proclaimed revelation from God. At times some were put into positions of leadership. Never was this leadership allowed or practiced in the religious worship of Israel. It was at times expressed in the political or governmental realm.

Was God the author of such leadership? The passages which were examined provided no conclusive answer. Yet one verse recorded in the book of Isaiah further reveals the mind of God. If some reject the inspiration of Scripture, this verse may seem to express only Isaiah's male bias. If it is the Word of God as Isaiah claims, then it expresses God's mind. In chapter three Isaiah describes the terrible coming days when God will remove all of Israel's leaders (vv.2,3). God will make children their princes; babes, that is, unpredictable children, will be their rulers (v.4). Conditions will grow so bad that a man will lay hold on his brother to force him to rule, yet he will not do so (vv.6,7). In this dismal and derogatory context Isaiah 3:12 is spoken.

As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err.

---

1See Isa. 1:1,10,18,24; 2:1; 3:15,16.
CHAPTER III

THE GOSPEL PERSPECTIVE CONCERNING WOMAN

The Gospels say relatively little about woman's nature or role. Nevertheless what the Gospels do record is very important, for from these much is deduced concerning Jesus' view of women. A legend is being created concerning Jesus' unique treatment of women. Often feminists see in Jesus an attitude and practice which is foreign to that of the apostles. Dorothy Sayers appears to be one of the first to raise the idea that Jesus alone in Bible times treated women as humans.

They had never known a man like this Man—there never has been such another. A prophet and teacher who never nagged at them, never flattered or coaxed or patronised; who never made arch jokes about them, never treated them either as "The women, God help us!" or "The ladies, God bless them!"; who rebuked without querulousness and praised without condescension; who took their questions and arguments seriously; who never mapped out their sphere for them, never urged them to be feminine or jeered at them for being female; who had no axe to grind and no uneasy male dignity to defend; who took them as he found them and was completely unself-conscious. There is no act, no sermon, no parable in the whole Gospel that borrows its pungency from female perversity; nobody could possibly guess from the words and deeds of Jesus that there was anything "funny" about woman's nature.¹

It is true that Jesus alone is without sin. But to regard the writers of the Scriptures, the prophets before Him

and His apostles who follow, as guilty of that which Sayers suggests, is far from true.¹ Such an attitude has caused feminists to believe that only Jesus should be seriously heeded.² Although such an extreme position is unfounded, what Christ said and did has an important place in the study of the Biblical role of woman.

This third chapter will involve four parts: 1) the teachings of Jesus, 2) the practices of Jesus, 3) the training of His apostles, and 4) a conclusion.

I. The Teachings of Jesus

Both the authority for and the content of Christ's teachings are important to discern His instruction regarding woman's role.

The Authority for His Teaching

From the very beginning of Christ's public ministry the people marvel at His teaching, because He teaches as one having authority and not as the scribes (Mk. 1:22). Obviously Jesus was not bound by the rabbinic teachings of His day, nor did He develop a new and radical theology concerning woman. Stendahl, nevertheless, sees Jesus as accepting and working within Jewish culture rather than transcending it.³ Stendahl fails to distinguish between first-century

¹Ibid.
Jewish culture and Old Testament divine revelation. Jesus does not submit to the first, but most certainly He is grounded in the latter.

Jesus does not accept the rabbinic norms of His day as preachable truth. Continually He seeks to remove the traditions of men which cloud divine revelation (Mk. 7:7,8). Likewise, concerning male/female relationships He labors to remove tradition from truth (Mt. 5:27,31). Jesus is not seeking to create a new theology, rather He is working to reveal the genuine essence of that revelation already given. Jesus says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Mt. 5:17). The one example which the Gospels preserve concerning male/female relationships reveals that the authority to which Jesus turns regarding these relationships is God's creation order recorded in Genesis two (Mt. 19:3-9). That which was given in the beginning is still authoritative. What the rabbis have subsequently added must alone be removed.

The Content of His Teaching

Jesus does not ignore women in His teaching. On the contrary, His teachings reveal that women are a substantial part of His audience. Frequently His illustrations and applications involve the routine of women. His parables are often filled with the anxieties and joys of a woman's life. In the kingdom parables of Matthew thirteen Jesus narrates the stories both of the mustard seed which a man took and
sowed in his field (vv. 31-32), and of the leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal (v. 33). In Luke fifteen He relates the joy of the man who found his lost sheep, and the woman who found her lost coins. Similarly, He speaks of a widow's anguish (Lk. 18:2-8) and of the joys of wedding festivities (Mt. 25:1-12).

Christ speaks kindly concerning women; there are no derogatory words. Just as important, there are no derogatory words about men. There are however words of derision saved for the hypocritical leaders.

Jesus teaches very little concerning woman's nature and role. Likewise He speaks of woman's equality only in a very limited manner. This equality could only be implied from His statement that the one who does the will of His Father is Christ's mother and brother and sister (Mt. 12:50). Never does He abolish the subordinate role of woman. Rather, He establishes it by His silence and His reference to creation order. Though He confronts the rabbis concerning many issues, never does He clash with them concerning woman's rights.¹ To base egalitarianism upon the teachings of Jesus would be very precarious.

II. The Practices of Jesus

The teachings of Jesus offer little regarding the role of woman. Significant data, however, can be gleaned by noting His practices. Both His horizontal and vertical

¹Jewett, Male and Female, p. 94.
relationships are significant. Horizontally, He treated all mankind, His creation, with dignity; vertically, He submitted willingly to God the Father with whom He was equal.

He Gave Dignity to All

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden" (Mt. 11:28). These words of Jesus succinctly speak concerning His relation to all people. He welcomed the sickly and the despised, the sinner and the contemptible tax collector. He reached out to the poor and to the lowly child. No human was too low for His touch. Christ was neither hindered nor directed by culture. He was motivated by His love for mankind.

His association with women often broke from the customs of His day. He speaks in behalf of women by condemning those who extort the houses of widows (Mk. 12:40). He does not chauvinistically condemn the harlot who is placed before Him for judgment (Jn. 8:3-11). He converses with a Samaritan woman, while seeking to redeem her (Jn. 4:6-27). The woman is amazed that Jesus would speak with her since she is a Samaritan (v. 9); His disciples marvel that He would speak with her since she is a woman (v. 27).

More unusual is that which Jesus does at the home of Martha and Mary (Lk. 10:38-42). Two facts stand out. First, Jesus allowed Mary to sit at His feet to learn from His teaching. Whether others were also present or this was a private lesson the context does not make certain. Verse
at least implies others were also being taught. Second, and more significant, is Christ's commendation of Mary for leaving the domestic chores in order to be taught the Word of God.

Christ's dealings were culturally radical but not scripturally radical. He treated all people, including women, as God's Word had always taught. To love one's neighbor was not new (Lev. 19:18). Jesus through the parable of the good Samaritan revealed the extent to which that commandment was to be practiced. It especially included those whom one might despise. Beyond that, Christ does not strive to change any role from that which the Word of God had originally revealed. Concerning the poor, Christ did not attempt to eliminate poverty. He did seek to alleviate the problem. He did exhort the young, rich ruler to sell his goods and give them to the poor (Mt. 19:21). When anointed, however, with very expensive ointment which could have been sold to help the poor, Jesus states: "the poor you always have with you; but you do not always have Me" (Jn. 12:8 NASB).

Though Jesus received the children whom the disciples had been trying to hold back, He did not suggest that from this point on their role had changed. The principle of obedience and honor was still to be rendered to one's parents (Mt. 19:19). The one change that Jesus was demanding

---

1 Its value was equivalent to a working man's yearly wage (v. 5).
of His hearers was that of righteousness—to sin no more.

To understand Jesus as a liberator of woman is proper. He was a liberator of all people. But to imagine that Jesus was changing woman's role is surely not supported by the Gospel data. To teach that Christ was removing an order established at creation and continued throughout the Old Testament, one must reject many obvious statements within the Gospel narratives.

Christ also established a very uninhibited, untainted relation with women. Women traveled within the company which followed Jesus, and some women of wealth financially supported Him (Lk. 8:2,3). While these practices by Jesus may or may not have conformed with contemporary standards, they did conform with God's standards. None were incongruous with the role of woman established at creation.1

The events at Christ's resurrection are likewise given much importance by those who scrutinize Jesus in order to establish a feminist view from His actions. Scanzoni writes: "If Jesus entrusted the resurrection message to women, I can't believe he hasn't called female messengers

---

1 An interesting situation occurs twice in Scripture (Lk. 7:36-50; Jn. 12:3-8). Jesus allows two women to cleanse His feet with the hair. In both situations He receives criticism. The criticisms are directed toward the women (one for wickedness; one for waste), but really seem intended for Christ. Jewett sees these as very liberated actions since the women let down their hair in the presence of men (Jewett, Male and Female, p. 99). Ironside sees a picture of women casting their glory at Jesus' feet (H. A. Ironside, Addresses on the First Epistle to the Corinthians New York: Loizeaux Bros., 1938, p. 339).
today as well."

Does Christ's action of appearing first to women suggest that He was initiating a new ministry for women? What indeed is the significance of this unusual event? The events seem natural enough. The women because of their devout worship and service were those who lingered at the cross and who rose early to care for Jesus' body in the tomb. Thus, they were rewarded with being the first to witness the resurrection.

This honor should not be equated with the notion that Jesus was initiating a new ministry for women. He had not called them to serve as "official witnesses." In First Corinthians 15 where Paul does mention the many witnesses to Christ's resurrection, the women are omitted. Bruce endeavors to explain Paul's omission in the following manner: "Outside Christian circles, the evidence of women would have been dismissed of little value. Had it been adduced, it would have been ridiculed as the fantasies of excitable females." Of equal significance is Knowling's observation

---

1Letha Scanzoni, "Others Say . . . Woman's Ordination," Christianity Today, 19:18 (June 6, 1975), p. 32, and Dorothy R. Pape, In Search of God's Ideal Woman (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), pp. 63-66; 80-83. Also Jewett states that the New Testament "points beyond this limitation of an all-male apostolate" and his first supporting evidence is that these women were commissioned at His first resurrection appearances to tell the disciples (Paul K. Jewett, "Why I Favor the Ordination of Women," Christianity Today, XIX:18 June 6, 1975), p. 10.

2Peter likewise omits them (Acts 10:40-42).

that Paul has only mentioned by name those whose name would carry authority. Nothing would be aided "to lay stress upon the testimony of women whose names, however valued elsewhere, would carry little or no weight in Corinth."¹

Had Christ intended that any of these women should serve as an "official witness" of the resurrection, the opportunity to appoint one would arise in a matter of days. Yet, as the eleven seek the Lord's will in a replacement for Judas, not one woman (not even Mary) is considered (Acts 1:13-26). Christ could have appointed a woman before His ascension if He believed that His apostles would make a prejudiced choice. Ryrie aptly summarizes this matter.

Jesus allowed the women to follow Him, He taught them and He honored them with the first announcement of His resurrection. But, equally important, He limited their activity by not choosing one of them for official work. Thus we may say that, while Jesus granted great freedom to women and placed importance on their ministrations, He limited the sphere of their activity. . . .²

**He Practiced Submission in His Life**

Since man and woman were created in the image of the triune God, one can look to that Trinity to understand better man/woman relationships. A divinely-revealed analogy of these relationships is contained in the Scriptures. As the Father is the head of Christ so man is the head of the woman (1 Cor. 11:3). Christ willingly submitted to the Father, in


the same sense, woman is to submit to man (Col. 3:18). Two significant facts become evident from this analogy: 1) the compatibility of equality and submission and 2) the precise nature of submission.

The compatibility of equality and submission

The example of Christ is profoundly instructive concerning the relation of equality and subordination. Christ perfectly understood His equality with the Father (Jn. 10:30), yet just as certainly He speaks of His subordination to the Father: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (Jn. 4:34). Paul expands this doctrine of the true kenosis in Philippians two. Christ emptied Himself of the independent exercise of His divine attributes. He in no way, however, became less God—inferior to the Father: "And when all things are subjected to Him, then the Son Himself also will be subjected to the one who subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:28 NASB).

Jesus submitted not only to the Father, but even to Mary and Joseph. "He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them" (Lk. 2:51). The same word, ὑποτάσσομαι, which is used of Jesus here, is consistently used throughout the New Testament regarding the submission of

---

1Also see Jn. 5:18-23,30; Jn. 17:4; Mt. 26:39; Heb. 10:7.

2Jesus likewise submitted to human authority (Mt. 17:24-27).
woman.  Possibly Christ submitted Himself to help men and women understand that they need to accept willingly the subordinate roles into which they have been placed.

Jewett repeatedly stresses that woman's subordination and equality are incongruous, so that both cannot exist. He regards the view of traditional Christianity to be that of inferiority (not equality) and subordination. Did Christ ever regard Himself as inferior to the Father? to Mary and Joseph? to human leaders due to His subordination? Differences in role do not denote differences in quality or essence. More will be expressed concerning this equality when Ephesians 5 is discussed.

The precise nature of submission

The word, ὑποτάσσομαι, which is used consistently throughout the New Testament for the woman's relation to her husband merits careful attention. The active voice of this word, ὑποτάσσω, means "to place under." The deponent form, ὑποτάσσομαι, expresses basically the idea of "to subject oneself" or "to be subjected." This deponent function

---

1This usage is unusual since all Biblical texts use ὑπακούω (to obey) as the proper word for the relation of other children to parents.

2Jewett, Male and Female, p. 69ff.

3Ibid., p. 69.


5Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, p. 855. Arndt and Gingrich identify all forms as passive; Delling calls them middle ("τάσσω," pp. 40,42).
appears to denote in every passage but one (i.e. Lk. 10:17, 20) a voluntary subordination.¹

Subordination requires a motivating factor. Within the New Testament that motivation varies from absolute authority to merely humbleness of mind or consideration for others.² Slaves are instructed to submit to their masters (Tit. 2:9; 1 Pet. 2:18).³ The authority motivating such submission is great.⁴ Similarly, authority is surely a factor for one's submission to government (Rom. 13:1-2; Tit. 3:1; 1 Pet. 2:13), and to God (Jas. 4:7). Subordination to God is motivated by a superior rank; subordination to pagan leaders does not imply innate superiority, only authority. Paul never implies that the Christian is inferior to Claudius or Nero, yet subordination is demanded.

Where two people submit reciprocally to one another, other motivating factors are surely required. Humility is one prerequisite for this subordination. Peter exhorts: "Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble" (1 Pet. 5:5).⁵ The filling of the Holy Spirit likewise effects this mutual submission (Eph. 5:18-21).

¹Delling, "τάσσω" p. 40  
²Ibid., p. 45.
³But Paul uses the word obey (ὑπακούω), in Eph. 6:5 and Col. 3:22.
⁴Even Luke 10:17 which Delling regards as different is similar in the sense that the absolute authority of Christ's name brought about a ready submission by the demons (p. 42).
⁵Compare Phil. 2:3.
In the light of this broad Biblical usage for ὑποτάσσομαι, what is its significance for the wife's subordinate role to her husband? Is she to be subordinate because of her husband's authority over her? or because of a mutual submission which each is to have to the other?

Jewett demands it must be the latter (as would most feminists), because he cannot reconcile equality and subordination. Yet, they can be reconciled as has already been demonstrated. This submission does indeed involve some authority as several Biblical factors reveal. First, God has indeed given a certain authority or headship to man which extends back to creation (1 Cor. 11:3-10). This is not merely a Fall curse which can be eradicated since one may now be "in the Lord." Second, since all previous revelation has been founded upon that relationship, unless it is clearly stated, one should not expect ὑποτάσσομαι to introduce silently some new concept. Third, not one of the contexts which speak to the subordination of the wife ever commands the subordination of the husband. Rather husbands are commanded to love (Eph. 5:25), to honor (1 Pet. 3:7), and not to be bitter (Col. 3:19).

Thus, that relation might best be described as a love/subordination relationship. Mollenkott is incorrect in implying that dominance/submission is the traditional view

---

1Jewett, Male and Female, pp. 71ff.

2Eph. 5:22-29; Col. 3:18-19; Tit. 2:5; 1 Pet. 3:1-7.
of Scripture.\textsuperscript{1} It surely is not the Biblical view. Never are wives commanded to obey (ὑπακούω) their husband in the New Testament. The word which is consistently used (ὑποτάσσομαι)\textsuperscript{2} lays more emphasis upon the voluntary nature of that relationship,\textsuperscript{3} whereas ὑπακούω implies too much concerning the authority or right of the other person. Husbands are never told to command; wives are never commanded to obey.\textsuperscript{4} Love and subordination is the Biblical relationship.

John Yoder offers several meaningful suggestions as to the proper translation of ὑποτάσσομαι.\textsuperscript{5} He considers "subjection" a poor rendering because that implies being thrown down and run over. "Submission" is weak since it implies passivity. The idea of "subordination" is better for it implies "the acceptance of an order, as it exists, but with the new meaning given to it by the fact that one's acceptance of it is willing and meaningfully motivated."\textsuperscript{6}

So, by analogy, the practices of Christ do teach and illustrate much concerning equality and a subordinate role. As Christ is equal to His head, the Father, so woman is equal

\textsuperscript{1}Mollenkott, Women, p. 122.

\textsuperscript{2}Even Tit. 2:5 uses ὑποτάσσομαι for "obedient to their own husbands."

\textsuperscript{3}Delling, "饶κούν," pp. 41-42.

\textsuperscript{4}First Peter 3:6 states that Sarah obedient Abraham, but it does not say that Abraham was instructed to command.


\textsuperscript{6}Ibid.
to her head, man. As Christ was able to subordinate Himself to His equal, so woman must subordinate herself to her equal. As Christ was genuinely the Second Person of the Trinity, not a second-class person of the Godhead, so woman in Christ's image is not a second-class person.

III. The Training of His Apostles

Feminists often try to polarize the teachings of Jesus from those of His apostles. One gets the impression that he should listen to Jesus but not to Paul or Peter. Paul is described by Jewett not as an authoritative apostle but as an indecisive theologian who is unable to fit his newly learned truths with his old hang ups. So he "hints" the opposite of what he says. His "uneasy conscience" causes him to speak out of both sides of his mouth.¹ Mollenkott implies a similar conflict between the teachings of Jesus and Paul by stating that Jesus chose to treat women with such respect and honor "that His disciples could never understand it, let alone emulate it."²

Pape drives the wedge further by stating that Paul uses derogatory expressions concerning women which Jesus never would have used. Paul speaks of Eve being deceived, of silly women, and old wives' fables. She concludes, "This sounds rather different from any of Christ's words about

¹Jewett, Male and Female, p. 113.
women." Paul's words are not an attack against woman. These are charges against sinful women. Paul describes sinful men in terms just as severe. His confirmation of the poet's statement that "The Cretians are alway liars, evil beasts, slow bellies" (Tit. 1:12-13) is surely equal to any of his comments concerning evil women. Paul's comments on his own past life are likewise severe (Tit. 3:3).

Did the apostles go beyond Christ? stop short of His teachings? or follow a totally different course? Richardson suggests that Paul did not push Jesus' new views concerning woman any further, but retreated when faced with local oppositions in order to preserve the struggling churches. Luke, by contrast, states through the Holy Spirit that all that which Jesus began to do and to teach the Holy Spirit carried on through the apostles (Acts 1:1-2). The statement of Hebrews 1:1-2a that God has "in these last days spoken unto us by His Son," implies that Christ initiated all the revelation which the apostles later proclaimed. Christ presented the embryo; the apostles preached the fully-developed body of truth. Peter and Paul do not conflict for they develop the same embryonic message. They are neither retreating nor going counter to Christ's message concerning women.

Paul based the subordinate role of woman upon

---

1 Pape, In Search of God's Ideal Woman, p. 103.
Genesis two (1 Cor. 11:1 Tim. 2) just as Christ had done when He spoke concerning the issues of woman (Mt. 19). Paul, like Christ, did not base his teachings upon the Mosaic law (which some would consider chauvinistic) nor was he hung up on a rabbinic past.

Paul's dealings with woman were likewise similar to Christ's dealings. Paul in Philippi spoke to women with no men in attendance (Acts 16:13). When Lydia, his first European convert, invited him to her home he went (v. 15). Paul worked with many women and considered them as fellow-workers (Phil. 4:3; Rom. 16:1-2,3,6,12,15).

To reject Paul and to hear Jesus is wrong. To reject Jesus and to hear Paul is likewise wrong. No conflict is evidenced from the Biblical data. Conflicts only arise when theological or societal molds demand reinterpretation.

IV. Conclusion

Jesus in His teachings says nothing expressly about the equality of woman with man. Stendahl suggests that Jesus understood the equality and egalitarian position of woman but did not teach it due to His regard for current Jewish culture. That is hardly convincing since Jesus does speak out on cultural issues involving women. He condemns, for example, popular Jewish attitudes toward adultery and divorce

1Also Paul and Peter sometimes wrote directly to women when exhorting them (Col. 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:1). This was not true in the law.

Jesus cannot be considered a proponent of feminism from either His teachings or His practices. He truly does treat women with dignity and respect. He likewise treats children (and all people) with dignity. Yet, He never implies that children are free from obedience to their parents, nor that wives are free from submission to their own husbands. Rather, Christ's submission to the will of the Father, with whom He is equal, and His submission to His earthly parents exemplify a pattern of subordination which is inherent within God's creation order.

All Biblical evidence supports the thesis that the apostles do indeed carry out the teachings of Jesus. For example, none of the New Testament writers appeal to the statutes of the Mosaic law when teaching concerning the role of women. Like Jesus Christ, Paul appeals to creation and Fall authority. If indeed the apostles were male chauvinists they most certainly would have appealed to the ordinances of the Mosaic law. Its precepts, as feminists readily point out, give men an advantage.
CHAPTER IV

THE CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE REGARDING WOMAN

In order to interpret properly the influence which culture exerted upon New Testament teaching, cultures which were contemporary with the early church must be surveyed. Three cultures confronted the first-century church: Greek, Roman and Jewish.

The intent of this chapter is to describe as accurately as possible the customs which prevailed during the early years of the church age. Ideally the purpose will be to reconstruct the cultural situations in the city of Corinth at A.D. 55. The customs of greatest significance for this study are those involving the dress of men and women, their head coverings, and their hair styles.

Many problems hinder this goal. First, often the data which are available cover immense time spans, which leads to anachronisms. Second, practices sometimes differed from city to city—especially in ancient Greece. Third, even within one region cultures differed from race to race, from social class to social class, and from city life to country life.

The procedure for setting forth the data will be as follows: 1) Greek and Roman culture of the first century;
2) Jewish culture of the first century; 3) post-apostolic Christian culture; and 4) a conclusion.

I. Greek and Roman Culture of the First Century

Greek culture, being older than Roman culture, will be studied first. It influenced the later Roman culture, yet the Roman culture was more universal and thus more relevant to the early church age.

Greek Culture

Greece through its extensive literature and art has preserved much from its ancient cultures. Vase-paintings have been of great help regarding dress and hair customs. The principal weakness of such records for this study is that much of it involves eras which greatly antedate the New Testament times.

W. A. Becker, who has prepared a scholarly work on the customs of ancient Greece, states that the Attic (or Athenian) life "must serve as the norma for the rest of Greece."¹ Sparta, often bizarre in its customs, frequently did things differently from the rest of Greece. Athens set the pattern. After the time of Alexander the Great, the customs familiar at Athens became quite universal.

Greek men held great regard for their hair. It often distinguished one in regard to his status or rank as well as

¹W. A. Becker, Charicles or Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks, trans. by Frederick Metcalfe (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911), pp. xvii-xviii.
his age. It contributed greatly toward one's attractiveness and nobility, and the Greeks were adverse to covering it in any manner.\(^1\)

An example of the Spartan and Athenian differences is evident in the hair style of boys. In Sparta young boys wore their hair quite short. When they reached the age of an ephebos (a youth who had just become a citizen), they were allowed to let it grow full. The opposite was true at Athens and elsewhere. The young boy's hair grew long, but was cut off when he became an ephebos. This cutting of the hair became a solemn act involving a religious ceremony. Epheboi are always seen in art with their hair cropped short and smooth.\(^2\)

In manhood the hair was allowed to grow into a longer, more fashionable cut which served as an indication of a polished gentleman. In Sparta it was longer; in Athens it was not so long. Most of the extant works of art depict the men with short, curly hair.\(^3\) Thus, before the New Testament era began, Greek men regarded their hair style as indicative of their character. It was full, but like the Athenian custom, not long. A man's hair was as important to him as was the fit and adjustment of his \(\text{μάλλων}\) (robe).\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 453. \(^2\)Ibid.


\(^4\)Becker, *Private Life of the Ancient Greeks*, p. 455. Cf. on short hair Heroditus 1,82,7.
The hair and head-dress of Greek women, likewise, was important. No particular fashions seem prevalent; their hair was worn in manifold ways. Their long and luxuriant hair is usually not depicted as braided or curled. When no headcovering was worn, the hair was gathered and tied behind or over the head in a knot. Often the forehead was well covered, that style being considered beautiful. Vase-paintings usually depict the hair as held together "by a bandeau, a cap, a net or something of the kind."¹

Greek women, therefore, commonly wore their hair up in some fashion and uncovered. The idea that Paul was merely following the Hellenic or Hellenistic customs when he wrote to the Corinthians about the men being uncovered and the women being covered in church (1 Cor. 11) is tenuous. Though they often wore the peplum (shawl), it was drawn over the head only for inclement weather and for special occasions such as match-making, marriage, mourning, and the worship of chthonic deities. It is wrong to image that Greek women were under some compulsion to be covered in public.² Oepke writes more specifically that "the mysteries inscription of Andania (Ditt. Syll.³, 736), which gives an exact description of woman taking part in the procession, makes no mention of the veil. Indeed, the cultic order of Lycosura seems to

¹Ibid., p. 459.
forbid it."\(^1\) Though the vase-paintings of the fifth century B.C. show several women still wearing coverings, in the later periods these were practically unknown. The fashion was to curl the hair and put it up in various ways.\(^2\) No evidence suggests any substantial change of these customs at A.D. 55.\(^3\)

**Roman Culture**

Since Corinth and the rest of the Mediterranean world were under Roman rule, Roman culture certainly influenced the native customs. Corinth had been defeated by Rome about 146 B.C. and totally destroyed. Julius Casear re-founded the city as Colonia Laus Julia Corinthisiensis in 46 B.C. and populated it with Italian freedmen and dispossessed Greeks.\(^4\) By the time Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthian church, one hundred years of Roman culture had influenced the Greek ways.

Roman men groomed their hair as did the Greeks. Styles changed with time and varied with years of age, yet

\(^1\)Ibid.


\(^3\)"A veil of lighter tissue than the peplum was often worn by females. It served both as an appendage of rank, and as a sign of modesty. On the first account it is seen covering the diadem of Juno, the mitra of Ceres, and the turreted crown of Cybele, . . . on the latter account it is made, in ancient representations of nuptials, to conceal the face of the bride" (Thomas Hope, *Costumes of the Greeks and Romans* New York: Dover Publications, 1962, p. xxxiii).

hair customs among Greek and Roman men were not radically different. When a Roman boy assumed his toga of manhood, his long locks were cut off, often with great formality and religious significance, similar to the Athenian practice.

The wealthy and prominent men had both hair and beard attended to by their own slaves; the very poor usually went unshaven and untrimmed, which was the cheap and easy fashion. During the time of Nero (A.D. 54-68) men's hair was carefully kept, being allowed neither too long nor too short. If they were bald a wig was often worn; sometimes bald spots were even painted over. Only in times of mourning and when facing a criminal charge was a man's hair permitted to grow long.

---

1 The toga was "the distinctive city dress of the Roman citizen, and its use was forbidden to foreigners. The Emperor Augustus was exceeding strict about its being worn in public, especially on state occasions, and it was considered disgraceful for a magistrate to appear on the bench without it. In the country it might be discarded, and this was a relaxation hailed with delight by many, since the toga was a large and rather heavy woolen wrap, and must have been somewhat of an encumbrance, especially in summer" (A. C. Bouquet, Everyday Life in New Testament Times (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953, p. 64).


3 Ibid.


Interestingly, Josephus describes the normal appearance of a Jewish man charged to appear before the Sanhedrin as having on mourning garments with his hair long and dishevelled. But Herod the Great, who was accused of murder (before he became king), when he appeared before the Sanhedrin, came dressed in purple "with the hair of his head finely trimmed" (Ant., XIV, 9,4).  

Exceptions did exist. Slaves, depending upon their special duties, might have either long hair or their head shaved. Following the time of Marcus Aurelius, the fad of shaving the head began to spread. Still, the normal, moderate custom of short beards and hair was the practice of the early Roman Christians. This is further verified by catacomb art. The oldest representation of Jesus which has been preserved is in the Cappella Greca chamber of the Catacomb of Priscilla. This painting of the Resurrection of Lazarus, dating from the second century, portrays Jesus as youthful, beardless, and with short hair. He is also dressed in a Roman tunic and pallium. Though this picture may not

---

2. Paoli, Rome-It's People, Life and Customs, p. 110.
3. Ibid.
5. The pallium was the Roman cloak parallel to the Greek himation. Its usage covers many centuries and it was adopted as the cloak used by Roman Christians. See Lillian M. Wilson, The Clothing of the Ancient Romans (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938), pp. 78-82.
accurately represent the dress and hair style of Jesus, it
certainly speaks to the manner of dress and hair style of
Roman Christian men of that early era.

Roman men of the upper classes ordinarily wore no
head covering. Workmen who were out of doors all day wore a
conical felt cap which was called a pilleus.¹ Also, for pro-
tection against rain and cold a garment with a pointed hood,
called a paenula, was worn.² Even the upper class when out
in the country wore a broad brimmed felt hat for protection,
and in later times these hats were worn by all classes at
the outdoor theaters.³ Thus, head coverings were not custom-
ary by men except for outdoor protection.

The fashion of the Roman woman's hair changed quite
often. They gave much attention to it through the use of
coloring, garlands, jewels, and false hair. Their styles
never favored short hair.⁴ They never wore hats, but head
coverings were used in varying degrees throughout the cen-
turies.⁵

The most significant part of a Roman woman's public

¹Köhler, A History of Costume, p. 118. This felt cap
was also worn by the Greeks. During the intertestamental
period a high Priest named Jason brought hellenistic customs
and practices into Jerusalem, including the wearing of the
Greek caps by the young men (2 Maccabees 4:12).

²Wilson, The Clothing of the Ancient Romans, p. 82.


⁴Paoli, Rome-Its People, Life and Customs, p. 111.

⁵Johnston, The Private Life of the Romans, p. 190.
attire was the palla. Lillian Wilson has written extensively concerning its description and usage. She states:

It was made in different sizes, but the one ordinarily worn by the matron in public was large enough so that when wrapped about the wearer the upper edge could be brought up over the head while the lower edge would extend about to the knees.¹

Married women were not supposed to appear in public without it. Horace (65-8 B.C.) states that the only part of a married woman which showed was her face since her long stola reached to her feet and her palla enveloped the rest of her.² This large palla was the essential part of a woman's street dress for several centuries. By the third century after Christ, Roman women had begun to emancipate themselves of this large palla except when it was actually needed for warmth. Even during the times of the New Testament church, reliefs depict elite Roman women with some being covered, some not. In some of the art the palla is drawn up to cover the head, in others veils or the smaller pallae were used.³

It would seem that most first-century Christian women in Italy, at least, would wear the palla to the church meetings. All, however, may not have had it drawn over their heads. The men probably would have been bare headed since indoors.⁴

²Ibid., p. 148.
³Ibid., p. 150.
⁴To cite Virgil's Aeneid (III, 545) as an evidence
II. Jewish Culture of the First Century

When the study of cultural practices relating to the role of woman is directed toward Jewish customs, confusion abounds. Several factors seem to create this problem. First, Oriental culture is often equated with Jewish culture. Oriental culture is sometimes far different from Biblical custom. Second, the teachings of the Talmud are often far later than New Testament times and may represent the view of one or several rabbis rather than a consensus of rabbinic teaching. Often it is not the Mishnah nor Gemara which is alluded to as proof of an opinion, rather the peculiar view of an isolated, subsequent rabbi. Even the Gemara, which contains the comments of the rabbis upon the Mishnah, dates from A.D. 200 to 500. Most of the Babylonian Talmud is made up of the rabbinic comments which are even much later. Thus, to provide an indisputable first-century Jewish culture is more difficult than it at first appears.

of Roman or Greek men covering their heads during sacrifices is precarious. Though Virgil wrote this national epic of ancient Rome shortly before Christ's birth, it describes the ancient travels of Aeneas, a Trojan war hero, who sails to Italy to found Rome. Several factors make this writing difficult to relate to historical culture. It could describe ancient Greek customs since Virgil borrowed heavily from Homer's Iliad and Odyssey. Or it could describe Roman customs of Virgil's own era. Or, third, it may only reveal Virgil's ideal of what should be practiced, since he expresses high "religious" ideals. One reason the men were to cover their heads during the sacrifice was that an enemy's eye might meet theirs and so make the omens void. To found any historical custom upon this is tenuous. See The Aeneid of Virgil, trans. by Allen Mandelbaum (Berkely: University of California Press, 1971), pp. 75 and 192.
The Oriental Culture

The first detailed record of the eastern veiling custom is to be found in the so-called Assyrian Laws which date from about the time of Moses.¹ These laws proclaim precisely who must not be veiled as well as who must be. Though some of the regulations have not been preserved, generally it is apparent that wives are to be veiled; prostitutes and slaves are not. More is said about the penalty for those who illegally veil themselves than the opposite.² For instance, a prostitute who was veiled was to be seized, given fifty lashes and have asphalt poured on her head. If a man saw her but neglected to seize her, he would receive the fifty lashes and other punishments. Because of these many ordinances against wearing the veil, it seems that the veil was not as much a sign of ownership as it was a sign of protection and security for wives and other moral women. Whether it showed that she belonged to someone was not the point. The veil per se involved protection. Thus, the female slave, though owned, was not afforded the protection of the veil. For her to wear it was illegal. These laws reveal the antiquity of veiling and its extensive regulation in the ancient east. By contrast, the Mosaic law records nothing concerning the veil. There are no Mosaic regulations.


On the other hand, the teaching regarding the seclud-
ing veil, which covered the face, was of very late origins.
It also was non-Jewish, being introduced into Mohammedan and
other oriental lands through the influence of the Koran. 1 It
reads as follows:

O Prophet, say to thy wives and daughters and the believ-
ing women, that they draw their veils close to them; so
it is likelier they will be known, and not hurt. God is
All-forgiving, All-compassionate (XXXIII, 59). 2

The Biblical references to face coverings are few.
Rebekah covered herself with a veil or shawl (גַּלְגְּלוּת) when
Isaac approached (Gen. 24:65). 3 Tamar used the same covering
when she played the part of a harlot (Gen. 38:14,19). Only
these three usages of this word occur in the Old Testament.
Another word is used to describe the veil that Moses placed
upon his face (גֶּגֶר). A third word is used once with Ruth
(3:15) and a fourth word in Song of Solomon 5:7 and Isaiah
3:23. The last two references speak of the shame of having
the veil ripped away.

Several conclusions demand attention from such limit-
ed usage. First, the word used with Rebekah and Tamar is
never used of the ordinary, married woman. It describes the
situation of one bride and one harlot. Second, the word

---

1 Dwight M. Pratt, "Women," The International Standard
Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. V, ed. by James Orr (Grand Rapids:

2 The Koran Interpreted, trans. by Arthur J. Arberry

3 Brown, Driver, Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon
of the Old Testament, p. 858.
which describes Moses' face covering is never used in the Old Testament with women, only with Moses (Ex. 34:33-35). All of these references are early in Jewish history; never are they mentioned in the New Testament era. Veils were evidently part of Israel's culture, but were never part of the Mosaic Law.

Just as significant as the few references to veils are those passages which imply no veil. The account of Abram and Sarai in Egypt (Gen. 12:10-14) implies that Sarai did not have a face covering at least for "the Egyptians beheld the woman that she was very fair" (v. 14). These are not merely Egyptian women who saw her, for "the princes" saw her (v. 15).

Within the New Testament two identical incidents stand out. Twice Jesus' feet are dried by the long, loose hair of women (Lk. 7:37-50; John 12:3-8). Two things seem noteworthy. First, Jesus does not condemn either of these women for appearing as they do before Him. Even though these are acts of worship, would Jesus overlook this deed if it were ungodly and indecent? Rather than speaking rebuke or holding reserve, Jesus praises Mary saying, "Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done be told for a memorial of her" (Mt. 26:13). Second, and more significant, is the silence of the critics regarding the loose and uncovered hair. Both crowds are hostile toward the women. In Luke seven they attack the woman for her sin and then Jesus for letting her touch Him. Nothing is said about a covering. In
John twelve Mary is attacked for wasting so much money but not for having her head uncovered. The Scriptures do not appear to demand the covering of women when in the presence of men who are outside the family. The ancient oriental and later Mohammedan cultures did.

This oriental custom was also widely practiced during the time of the first-century church. Ramsay, in demonstrating that Tarsus was an oriental city rather than a Greek city, relates the orations of Dion Chrysostom in Tarsus about A.D. 110. He was a Greek of Bithynia on an informal mission for the Emperor Trajan. He was struck with the oriental nature of Tarsus. Ramsay writes:

Only one Tarsian characteristic does he praise unreservedly, and that he praises, though it was, as he says, utterly different from the Hellenic custom. He was much pleased with the extremely modest dress of the Tarsian women, who were always deeply veiled when they went abroad. As Tarsian ladies walked in the street, you could not see any part either of their face or of their whole person, nor could they themselves see anything out of their path. They were separated from the public world, while they walked in it.¹

Obviously the situation at Tarsus was novel to be so noteworthy. Still it does depict the westward influence of oriental customs. About a century later Tertullian observes that the Jewish women were easily recognized on North African streets because they wore veils ("De Corona," IV).² Thus,

the oriental customs were not accepted by the gentiles in North Africa, yet the Jews conspicuously observed them. Surely, they were likewise practiced by the Jews in the East.

The Talmudic Teachings

Few individuals, after even a cursory examination of the Babylonian Talmud, would fail to note the restricted status of woman. The Talmud goes far beyond the teachings of the Old Testament in limiting the role of woman to the house. Contact with women was discouraged. Occupations were despised which brought one into frequent contact with women (Kiddushin 82a). One must remember from the start that many of these interpretations involve merely a few biased rabbis and may not represent the whole. The rabbis do not speak as a body, but as independent individuals. Yet, all agree on the subordinate role of woman. Some may speak with bias; some speak with concern for God's law.

Sometimes their statements are removed from the setting. The often quoted phrase: "Blessed be God, King of the Universe, for not making me a woman," is often stretched beyond its intent. Judith Hauptman summarizes the situation well.

The earliest written record of this blessing dates back to the second century. In the Tosefta, Rabbi Judah comments that this blessing expresses a man's gratitude for being created male, and therefore for having more opportunities to fulfill divine commandments than do women, who are exempted from a good many. Given this interpretation, the words lose most of their sting. They merely reiterate the social facts of life, namely, that a woman's primary concern was with husband and children, and that she was instructed to give familial obligations
priority over religious ones.

Another interpretation of this blessing is that it is simply expressing the joy any man feels at being exactly who he is. Similarly, the ancient Greek used to express his thanks for being born a man and not an animal, male and not female, a Hellene and not a barbarian. . . . Such feelings are natural to all human beings. This understanding of the blessing, too, is not inflammatory, because nothing negative is being said about women, only something positive about men.

Only when this blessing is removed from its context in the prayerbook and divested of its historical background does it assume the pernicious content that is currently read into it.¹

No uncertainty exists in the Talmud regarding veiling. The rabbis agree that married women must have their heads covered when out on the street or even in the small alley between courtyards.² Failure to obey becomes cause for divorce. The entire Talmudic veiling regulations are based upon one Old Testament verse—Numbers 5:18. When a spirit of jealousy comes upon a husband feeling his wife has been immoral, this verse instructs him to take her to the priest to go through the "water of bitterness" test.

The priest shall then have the woman stand before the Lord and let the hair of the woman's head go loose, and place the grain offering of memorial in her hands, which is the grain offering of jealousy, and in the hand of the priest is to be the water of bitterness that brings a curse (Num. 5:18 NASB).

The loosing of the hair implies the releasing of it from its covering. Therefore, to the rabbis this implies that it must have been covered all other times. So they


For the purpose of setting up some general guidelines relating to woman and the commandments of the Law, the Talmud makes the following distinctions: first, it divides the commandments into those which are active and those which are passive (or positive and negative). The positive are then further divided into those commandments which are time-bound (related to a specific time) and those which are not. Women must obey all negative commandments, such as the Ten Commandments, for they will never interfere with a woman's duties. Positive commands might require a woman to be away from the home or children when she cannot, so only non-time, positive commands apply to her. Feasts are usually time controlled, so the wife is omitted from these. Exceptions do exist as might be expected.  

The Talmudic teaching concerning man's covering is also significant to this study. Unlike the Jewess' practice of being veiled when outside the home, the Jewish man was covered only in the presence of the teachers of the Law or possibly the Law itself. As with the women, only married men were required to wear the covering. The sudarium, the head covering distinctive to scholars, was worn out of

---

1 Hauptman, "Images of Woman in the Talmud," p. 190.

2 It appears that the sudarium was the predecessor of the great tallith (prayer-shawl) which is still worn by Orthodox Jewish men. Cf. Bouquet, Everyday Life in New Testament Times, p. 58.
respect for the Law and the teacher of the Law. All, men and women, were to cover their head when they crossed paths with a rabbi.

Several incidents will help to manifest the purpose and ramifications of this custom. When a young man of twenty years old appeared before a rabbi and was asked why he had no headcovering, he replied that he was not yet married. To this the rabbi responded, "See to it you do not appear before me again before you are married."\(^1\) A grandfather is likewise scolded for wearing only a plain cloth on his head, rather than a sudarium, when he took his grandson to the synagogue for study. It was a disgrace because he stood as Moses before his grandson.\(^2\)

The extreme to which some rabbis pressed the Talmudic teachings can be observed here also. Rabbi Huna, the son of Rabbi Joshua, would not walk four cubits bareheaded, saying, "The Shechinah is above my head."\(^3\) But this was not the common practice concerning the sudarium. Normally it was worn only when a married man was studying the law or around a rabbi. This writer found no other indication within the Talmud itself as to the reason for\(^4\) or the time\(^5\) of its founding.

\(^1\)The Babylonian Talmud, Vol. 17 (Kiddushin 29b-30a), p. 142.

\(^2\)Ibid., (Kiddushin 31a), p. 150.

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)But Deut. 22:12 is the Scripture provided for its usage.

\(^5\)Robertson and Plummer doubt if the prayer scarf
III. Post-Apostolic Christian Culture

This section is important to this chapter on culture and customs for, though it stands after the time of the first century church, it undoubtedly speaks to customs shared by both apostolic and post-apostolic churches. This study separates easily between the Apostolic Fathers and the other Ante-Nicene Fathers.

The Apostolic Fathers

The term "Apostolic Father" should not convey with any certainty the implication that these writers were directly acquainted with the apostles. Some were. What this class designates are those writings from the end of the first century and the beginning of the second. That which they describe and imply reveals conditions which existed shortly after the New Testament era.

First and foremost among these writers is Clement of Rome who wrote his first epistle to the church at Corinth about the turn of the century, possibly earlier.¹ This letter is most significant for it was written less than fifty years after Paul's letter to that very church which is of (tallith) was in use in Paul's day. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians in The International Critical Commentary ed. by C. A. Briggs et al., 2d ed. (Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1914), p. 229.

greatest significance for this study—Corinth. Observe these relevant passages.

And to the women you gave instruction that they should do all things with a blameless and seemly and pure conscience, yielding a dutiful affection to their husbands. And you taught them to remain in the rule of obedience (ὑποταγή) and to manage their households with seemliness, in all circumspection (1:3).

Let us lead our wives to that which is good. Let them exhibit the lovely habit of purity, let them show forth the innocent will of meekness, let them make the gentleness of their tongue manifest by their silence (21:6,7).

But all work together and are united in a common subjection (ὑποταγή μιᾶς) to preserve the whole body.

Let, therefore, our whole body be preserved in Christ Jesus, and let each be subject to his neighbor, according to the position granted to him. Let the strong care for the weak and let the weak reverence the strong. Let the rich man bestow help on the poor and let the poor give thanks to God, that he gave him one to supply his needs (37:5; 38:1,2).

Many women have received power through the grace of God and have performed many deeds of manly valour (55:3)."1

Clement manifests no bias nor bitterness toward women. He praises them for their noble deeds. All he asks is their subordination to their husbands (even as the apostles had). When he speaks of mutual submission he does not relate it to husbands and wives, but to one's neighbors—to the strong and the weak, to the rich and the poor. One emphasis which is obvious upon reading this epistle is the often repeated submission to be rendered to the bishop. Clement's alleged second epistle contains nothing relevant to this study.

Ignatius, a contemporary of Clement, makes several

1Ibid., I, 11, 47, 73, 103.
statements of significance. In speaking for the honoring of the youthful bishop, he always refers to bishops as men (Magnesians 3 & 4).\textsuperscript{1} In his epistle to Polycarp, Ignatius writes: "Speak to my sisters that they love the Lord, and be content with their husbands in flesh and in spirit. In the same way enjoin on my brothers in the name of Jesus Christ 'to love their wives as the Lord loved the Church'" (5:1).\textsuperscript{2} No indication of misogyny exists here. What does exist is the adherence to the husband/wife relationship as recorded by the Apostle Paul.

The other writings of this early time: Polycarp, The Didache, Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and several others add little to the subject at hand. The Didache does speak to the role of the church prophet, but that will be noted later.

The Other Ante-Nicene Fathers

From the many writings which antedate the Council of Nicea in A.D. 325 several impressions will be noted.\textsuperscript{3} Clement of Alexandria writes several things regarding male and female relationships. First, he sees an equality existing between men and women. He writes that "the virtue of man and woman is the same" and "marriage an equal yoke." Men

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., I, 199-200. \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., I, 273. \textsuperscript{3}To these could be added the Shepherd's vision of a maiden, the Church, "'adorned as if coming forth from the bridal chamber,' all in white and with white sandals, veiled to the forehead, and a turban for a head-dress, but her hair was white" (The Shepherd of Hermas, Vision IV,II,1). Lake, The Apostolic Fathers, II, 63.
and women "have common graces and a common salvation."¹ Second, he, like the apostles, sees the role distinction, for he instructs women to be veiled when going to church, "since it is becoming for her to pray veiled."² He further provides very specific rules regarding dress and the fashioning of the hair.³

Tertullian (about A.D. 200) wrote profusely concerning women and veiling practices. Most significant for this study is his treatise, "On the Veiling of Virgins."

Throughout Greece, and certain of its barbaric provinces, the majority of churches keep their virgins covered. There are places, too, beneath this (African) sky, where this practice obtains; lest any ascribe the custom to Greek or barbarian Gentilehood. But I have proposed (as models) those churches which were founded by apostles or apostolic men . . . (Explanations given by translators).⁴ Several statements from this and other treatises are noteworthy. Tertullian understood Paul to teach that all women were to be veiled in the church service. This included virgins as well as wives. He regarded veiling highly; he considered it proper in public as well as in church. Yet he manifests that public veiling was not a common Christian practice in North Africa. This is evidenced by his statement that Jewesses are conspicuous upon the streets because of their veils.⁵ Obviously the Christian women were not.

²Ibid., II, 290.
³Ibid., II, 286.
⁴Ibid., IV, 28.
Tertullian, therefore, regarded some form of veiling as a Biblical requirement for all women during the church service and as desirable for the street.

Tertullian even alluded to the uncovered heads of the men when he wrote: "we lift our eyes, with hands outstretched, because free from sin; with head uncovered, for we have nothing whereof to be ashamed."¹

Also significant are the regulations for church services which are found in the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles." Though it was written over three hundred years after Paul (about A.D. 380), it may provide illumination on the post-apostolic times.

In accordance with their arrangement, let the laity sit on the other side, with all quietness and good order. And let the women sit by themselves, they also keeping silence. In the middle, let the reader stand upon some high place: let him read the books of Moses ... and the Epistles of Paul ... and the Gospels ... In the next place, let the presbyters one by one, not all together, exhort the people, and the bishop in the last place, as being the commander ... let every rank by itself partake of the Lord's body and precious blood in order, and approach with reverence and holy fear, as to the body of their king. Let the women approach with their heads covered, as is becoming the order of women. (II, 57).²

By the end of the fourth century the church service has become quite sedate. No speaking in tongues or prophesying are evidenced here. Instead of the exercise of these spiritual gifts presbyters exhort the people. The congregation is divided by sex. Both sides are silent. Women have

¹Ibid., IV, 42.

head coverings, but only for the observance of the Lord's supper are they commanded to use them.

IV. Conclusion

Corinth, being in Greece, certainly contained many Greek customs. Yet since the Roman culture was more relevant and universal at the time of the early church, its customs also surely influenced this Roman-built city. In most aspects the two cultures meshed easily. The dress, head coverings, and hair styles for men were very similar. The dress of the women had similarities, but their headdress was quite different, though not incompatible. By New Testament times Greek women styled their hair extensively and thus preferred it uncovered. Roman women by this time had begun the trend of abandoning the head covering, but often did wear it.

Jewish culture presents a greater problem. The Old Testament provides very scant evidence that the ancient oriental customs were consistently practiced by the Jews. The Talmud often agrees with the ancient practices and thus not with the tenor of the Scriptures. Does the Talmud represent the customs of New Testament Jews? Indeed, does it even represent the teachings of the rabbis of the New Testament era? To some extent it does. History clearly verifies the veiling of Jewish women following the New Testament era. It does not verify the same concerning the sudarium (male covering).

To regard Paul as a man who imposed his rabbinic hangups upon the early church seems difficult to imagine. To accuse Paul of such, one would first have to show direct par-
allels between rabbinic teaching and Paul's. The evidence does not suggest this at all. Regarding the covering of man's head the two teach opposites. Concerning woman the occasions requiring (and probably the reasons for) the head covering are clearly distinct in the rabbinic writings from those in Paul's. Second, one must show that such a teaching was not also part of God's revealed will. This is virtually impossible.

This writer would understand the cultural situation at Corinth about A.D. 55 to be the Greco-Roman practice of very little public covering of the head by woman, with some covering by Christian woman and more by Jewesses. In the assembly most would use the head covering. Possibly a few (most likely Greek women) were breaking that pattern by not covering the head when required. Nevertheless, Paul bases the practice of the head covering in First Corinthians eleven upon important doctrinal principles not upon uncertain, changing cultural practices, whether Jewish or Gentile.

The post-apostolic regard for the status of woman by some of the Fathers is disappointing. Gnosticism with its dualistic approach to life corrupted the thinking of several church Fathers. Since the flesh was regarded as evil, women were regarded as detrimental to the Christian life. Human thinking and culture often distort the status of woman, leading to both ungodly liberations and suppressions. The Word of God alone will assure both men and women of a proper understanding of the role of women.
CHAPTER V

THE EXEGETICAL PERSPECTIVE--1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16:
BACKGROUND STUDIES

This chapter and the next provide the core for this study. Any Biblical study of woman's role must treat 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 seriously. This chapter prepares the reader for that exegesis which follows by first showing the primacy of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 to all other passages involving woman's role. It will provide, in the second place, a background for the subsequent exegesis by noting its context. The reader will then be presented with an analysis of the Biblical doctrine of headship, and, finally, the Biblical function of prophesying will be investigated.

I. The Primacy of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16

First Corinthians 11:2-16 has been chosen as the crux of this study for many substantial reasons. First, the principle of progressive revelation directs this study to the New Testament epistles. The last word given by God must be the final and complete message on that subject. The thorough study of women's role surely cannot terminate after a study of Genesis. Indeed it cannot cease even after the gospels are scrutinized. Second, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 precedes most of Paul's teachings concerning woman, and so prepares
the reader for a proper, harmonious interpretation of all. Third, the passage is subsequent to Galatians 3:28 and thus acknowledges Paul's profound teaching that in Christ there is neither male nor female.

Fourth, it provides the clearest and most extensive context regarding woman's role. Other passages regarding women often are found as secondary elements within another context and are incidentally mentioned in one or two verses, such as Galatians 3:28 and 1 Corinthians 14:35. Or else the passages involve the more limited roles of husband and wife, such as Ephesians 5:22-23, Colossians 3:18,19 or 1 Peter 3:1-7. Those passages do not provide the broad base for doctrinal truth that 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 does. A doctrine based upon 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 cannot legitimately be considered a doctrine founded upon a "proof-text." If the doctrine of a Biblical role of woman could only be developed upon these other passages, the accusation would have some substance.

Fifth, it deals with some very debated yet decisive issues. It describes man as the head of the woman. The extent of that problem will be noted shortly. This passage also speaks concerning what some might describe as woman's ministry--prophesying. Does this passage allow women to preach or to pastor? Answers must come from 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.

Sixth, this passage contains some very problematic phrases. Women are told to have authority upon their heads
which is quite an interpretative problem. The same verse (v. 10) says that this authority must be on woman's head because of the angels, which indeed is enigmatic. Equally difficult is the question regarding the head covering. Likewise, many lesser questions involving interpretation arise from within these verses.

Finally, this passage has received less attack from critics than the other Pauline passages involving woman. Most passages which give an impression of "male supremacy" have long been seriously questioned. Thus, First Timothy 2:8-15 and Titus 2:3-5 are widely considered as non-Pauline; and by a smaller number of critics Ephesians 5:22-23 and Colossians 3:18-19 are removed.¹ First Corinthians 14:34-35, which forbids women to speak, is also discarded as a post-Pauline gloss. The only objective, textual basis for even considering such an action is that a few Western manuscripts contain these verses after verse forty.² The subjective arguments which are often cited are included in Chapter Seven of this dissertation where First Corinthians fourteen is discussed.

Once the trend was started of rejecting the Pauline passages which were offensive because of woman's role, there were few reasons for not proceeding to the conclusion.

¹ Walker, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views regarding Women," pp. 94-95. See also Chapter One of the dissertation, pp. 1-3.

² Ibid., p. 95.
William Walker has taken that step. He writes about it as if it were a rewarding triumph.

I propose in the first place, that the entire passage, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, is an interpolation.¹

As far as I have been able to determine, no one has ever suggested this for the passage as a whole. J. Weiss suggested that v. 3 is an interpolation.²

The most compelling reason . . . is the fact that it so obviously breaks the context of the letter at this point.³

Walker confesses two significant truths. First, he alone, at the time of his writing, was of that opinion. No doubt by now some have ventured out beyond him. Second, he admits that his opinion is not based upon objective data. There is no manuscript evidence; there is his estimation that Paul could not have said this. He ingenuously untangles three pericopae which he believes were woven into Paul's epistle.⁴ His views on feminism and of Paul as a philogynist appear to be his main grounds for dismissal of Pauline authorship. The textual basis, therefore, for rejecting the authenticity of 1 Corinthians 11 is nil.

Nearly as nonexistent are the textual problems within these fifteen verses. Two minor textual questions exist. One is minor because of its insignificance; the other is minor because of its certainty within the text. First, in

¹Ibid., p. 97.
verse two some manuscripts add the word brethren (διδόλαφοι).

Metzger explains it as an interpolation because of the similar (but genuine) readings in 10:1 and 12:1 which also begin new sections.¹ It is easier to explain its inclusion at 11:2 in some manuscripts because of the parallel patterns in 10:1 and 12:1, than it is to explain its omission at 11:2 in other manuscripts. There would be reason for some to insert it; there seems to be no reason for anyone to omit it if indeed it were genuine. This problem has no bearing upon the authenticity of the passage or upon its interpretation.

The second problem does have interpretive bearing upon the passage, but like the first it has no bearing upon the genuineness of the text. Verse ten speaks of the authority (ἐξουσία) which is to be upon a woman's head. Internal difficulties seem to be the sole cause of the problem. No Greek manuscripts contain any other reading, yet, several versions and some Church Fathers suggest the reading "veil," apparently for the reason that it thus is more easily interpreted. The United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, however, gives ἐξουσία an "A" rating,² which means the reading is "virtually certain."³ First Corinthians 11:2-16 should be accepted by anyone who gives credence

---


³Ibid., p. X.
to the Bible. The primacy of this passage as a witness to the Biblical role of woman is evident.

II. The Context of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16

To exegete and to analyze properly one must carefully consider the context, that is, those verses and chapters surrounding the text under consideration. Such a study will be presented here under general and internal context.

The General Context

The Apostle Paul began the church at Corinth during his second missionary journey about the beginning of A.D. 50.\(^1\) Though Corinth was an immoral city, Luke describes in Acts eighteen the wonderful ways the Lord worked in establishing that church. When opposition from the Jews became severe Paul was forced to move his new band of believers from the synagogue. But Paul moved no farther than next door to Titus Justus' house (v. 7). God rewarded this action with the conversion of Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue. Later when trials arose God in a night vision encouraged Paul to continue his work in Corinth for many more people lived there whom God wanted Paul to reach. Paul remained for well over eighteen months, which was far longer than he had to that time stayed in any other mission church.

In about A.D. 55, during Paul's three-year labor in Asia (Acts 19:10 with 20:31), the church at Corinth wrote to

\(^1\)Finegan, *Light From the Ancient Past*, II, 363.
him concerning several problems: cases of marriage and divorce (7:1ff), eating food sacrificed to idols (8:1ff), and concerning spiritual gifts (12:1). Further, members of the house of Chloe (1:11) and others (5:1) had informed him of additional problems: divisive cliques (1:11ff), exaltation of human wisdom (1:18ff), immorality (5:1ff), saints battling saints in public courts (6:1ff), desecration of the Lord's Supper (11:17ff), and some problem concerning the appearance of women, and maybe men, while praying and prophesying (11:2ff). This first letter to the Corinthians is concerned with problems--problems of practice and conduct.

Chapter eleven is somewhat of a transitional chapter. Following it are those problems which related directly to the church meeting: the Lord's Supper, spiritual gifts, and false doctrine. Prior to chapter eleven most, but not all, of the problems concerned difficulties in the lives of the saints: immorality, legal conflicts, marriage, and giving offense in one's personal conduct. This series of subjects deals with the church's moral life and its public testimony. In the midst of all these problems and regulations Paul interjects the important principle of Christian liberty (chaps. 6-10), a liberty to be proclaimed, but not always practiced. Love and consideration must always regulate it (6:12; 8:9).

The Internal Context

The essence of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 concerns the
doctrines of woman's Biblical role, her relation to man, and the practice which demonstrates that relation—the wearing of a head covering. Paul's teaching concerning the equality of man and woman in Christ may have been taken by some at Corinth to mean that woman could now declare herself independent of man.

These women were not belligerent as Glen would suggest.¹ There is no indication that these ladies were wearing the head covering in public but taking it off in the assembly. In fact, two factors suggest that this problem was not at that time a major problem at all. First, apparently the church had not even brought up this question when they wrote to Paul. Second, Paul seems to be expressing genuine praise for them as he begins this treatise.² This is quite a contrast with his harsh words regarding their handling of the man who had committed fornication (5:1-6).

The words leading up to 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 could have great bearing upon the interpretation of the passage even though the break in thought between them is obvious. These preceding verses read:

Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ (1 Corinthians 10:32-11:1).


²For proof of these points see the exposition of vv. 2 and 3 in the next chapter.
This writer's rendering of the text is as follows.

2) Now I praise you because you remember me in all things and, even as I delivered the traditions to you, you hold (them) fast. 3) Now I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is (the) head of woman, and God is (the) head of Christ. 4) Every man, having (a covering) upon his head while praying or prophesying, disgraces his head; 5) but every woman, praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, disgraces her head; for she is one and the same with the one who has shaven herself. 6) For if (it is a fact that) a woman is not covering herself, cause her also to clip herself; and if (it is a fact that) it is a shame for a woman to clip or to shave herself, cause her to continue to cover herself. 7) For man is obligated not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man. 8) For man is not out of woman, but woman out of man: 9) for also man was not created for the sake of the woman, but woman for the sake of the man. 10) Because of this the woman is obligated to have authority upon her head for the sake of the angels. 11) Nevertheless, neither is woman without man nor man without woman in the Lord: 12) For as the woman is out of the man, thus also the man is through the woman; but this all is out of God. 13) Judge in your own case: is it proper that a woman should pray to God uncovered? 14) Even nature itself teaches us that if a man should have long hair, it is a dishonor to him, does it not? 15) but if a woman should have long hair, it is a glory to her, is it not? because long hair has been given to her for a covering. 16) Now if (it is a fact that) anyone thinks it fitting to be contentious, (so be it); we do not have such a practice, neither the churches of God.

III. The Problem of Headship

In dealing with the problem of headship, the material will be organized under three headings: the problem, the Biblical data and the application.

The Problem

It is easy for everyone to imagine that he understands the meaning of the word "head." Such may not be true. Since Paul's doctrinal development of woman's role
rests heavily upon that word, precise word meaning is vital. Due to modern man's understanding of the central nervous system, it is easy to recognize that the word head might be used to mean: to rule, to direct, to control, to make the decisions. Stephen Bedale has suggested that to consider the head as that which directs the body must be understood as an anachronism.¹ The Old and New Testament people apparently lacked such scientific insight. With this cue many feminists have sought to revamp Paul's use of the word head when it concerns woman. Often the only concept allowed to remain is that of source or origin. Woman has man as her head merely as a stream has its head.² This is a very restricted usage of the word.

Within the metaphorical or figurative use of head, Bedale acknowledges the concept of priority. This priority possesses a two-fold significance: a chronological priority involving "source" and "origin", and a resulting positional priority involving the notion of "chief among" or "head over."³ Bedale stresses the idea of "origin" within headship. He has difficulty with the concept of authority, so


²Mollenkott, Women, pp. 111-12.

he makes the authority a resultant idea.¹

The Biblical Data

The usage of head (κεφαλή) in classical Greek is rather limited. Beyond its anatomical meaning, it represents the whole person, or top, or source or sum.² It was further regarded as the prominent member of the body "which determines all the others."³ In Greek anthropology "the head takes precedence over all other members; it is, or in it lies, the authoritative principle, the reason."⁴ Usage beyond these meanings was very rare.

However, the Hebrew usage of head (וֶילה) was more extensive. William Martin aptly demonstrates this broad usage within the Old Testament.

The literal meaning of רֹֽאֵס (head of an animate creature) was apparently early extended to include the description of inanimate objects (Gen. 8:5 "the head of the mountains appeared"; Gen. 11:4 "a tower whose head will be in the heavens"). Then it is extended to rank (Num. 1:4 "a man who is head of the house of his fathers"; 1 Sam. 15:17 "head of the tribes of Israel"); it is used to express totality (Num. 31:26 "Take the sum of the plunder"). It is used to describe the seat of responsibility (2 Sam. 1:16 "thy blood be upon thy head; 1 Ki. 2:44 "God will return your evil on your head"). It is not expressly used as a linguistic term

¹Ibid., pp. 213,215.
²Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, I, 944.
for the "seat" of thought, but its use to describe the activity of the wise man (Ecc. 2:14 "the eyes of the wise man are in his head") is clearly metaphorical and must refer to his rational faculty. There is, too, the reference in Daniel 4:2 (E.V. verse 5) to "visions" of the head. In Hebrew, however, thought is predominantly associated with the heart, in a psychological, not, of course, in an anatomical sense. The passages that could have influenced Paul in the selection of the word are those in which it is applied by transference to rank, and particularly those where it is used specifically of God or the Messiah, such as 1 Chronicles 29:11 ("the One exalted as head above all") or in Psalm 118:22 ("the stone . . . has become the head of the corner") or even those passages in which a diminutive form of ὀρος (rison) is used (Isa. 44:6, 48:12).¹

Some of the breadth of this usage passes into the Greek language through the Septuagint. The use of κεφαλή is virtually limited to ἴδιος. The opposite is not true, for many other words are also used to translate ἴδιος, such as ἀρχή, ἀρχηγός and other words meaning "leader."² For the first time κεφαλή is employed to refer to the head of a society.³ It is thus used to refer to relationships between people.

So both κεφαλή (Jud. 11:11; 2 Sam. 22:44) and ἀρχή (Ex. 6:25) are used in the Septuagint to translate ἴδιος where the sense is "chief" or "ruler." Bedale adds that though κεφαλή and ἀρχή have nothing in common in classical Greek, yet because of their common connection with ἴδιος they become


²Schlier, "κεφαλή," III, 675.

³Ibid., p. 674.
closely related in Biblical Greek. Both of these Greek words connote the idea of authority, an authority which Bedale says "in social relationships derives from a relative priority (causal rather than merely temporal) in the order of being." This may be true in an etymological sense, but the New Testament clearly demonstrates that headship involves authority. That authority is not derived from other contextual factors but is inherent within the established headship.

Only three books use κεφαλή in the metaphorical sense of headship. All are Pauline—First Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians. The passages are as follows.

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God (1 Cor. 11:3).

And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all (Eph. 1:22-23).

But speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in all aspects into Him, who is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body, being fitted and held together by that which every joint supplies, according to the proper working of each individual part, causes the growth of the body for the building up of itself in love (Eph. 4:15-16 NASB).

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing (Eph. 5:22-24).


2Ibid., p. 215.
For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence (Col. 1:16-18).

And in Him you have been made complete, and He is the head over all rule and authority. . . . and not holding fast to the Head, from whom the entire body, being supplied and held together by the joints and ligaments, grows with a growth which is from God (Col. 2:10 and 19 NASB).

The one factor which stands out in each of these passages concerning headship is not chronological priority, source, or origin with a resulting positional priority, which Bedale has inferred. True, chronological factors often do exist within these Pauline passages, but not in all. What does seem obvious is the "positional priority." That does exist in each. This positional priority involves authority.

Within all of these passages Christ is regarded as the Head of His creation and of His redeemed people, the church. And in all of these the Headship in relation to the church is either stated or implied. In relation to the church, Christ does have a chronological priority (Col. 1:18), yet it is his positional priority as Savior (Eph. 5:23)

1Clearly the Father's headship over Christ (1 Cor. 11:3) involves a positional priority rather than a chronological priority for the Father is not the source or origin of the Son (Jn. 1:1-3). Their relationship is one which is positional. The Son has willingly submitted Himself to the authority of the Father (Jn. 4:34; Heb. 10:7; 1 Cor. 15:28; Phil. 2:5-8).
that makes Him Head. Christ has a chronological priority with His creation (Col. 1:15,17), but it is His positional priority as Creator and Sustainer (Col. 1:16-17) which makes Him Head.

As Head, Christ is the provider and the leader. For His creation he provides (Col. 1:17); for His body, the church, He supplies (Eph. 4:15,16; Col. 2:10,19). He has authority over His creation for it was made by Him and for Him (Col. 1:16). He, of course, has authority over His church. He never misuses that authority, but He does command and sharply rebuke His church.\(^1\) Christ is Head because of who He is, because of His positional priority.

Attention must be focused upon the two passages which speak concerning man's headship for that indeed is the heart of the problem. Does Paul base man's headship upon a chronological priority or a positional priority? Is man head simply because he was created a short time before woman? In First Corinthians eleven this appears so at first glance, for verses eight and nine refer to Genesis two. Woman was created from man and for man. Yet upon closer study that does not appear to be Paul's reasoning. What appears immediately following verse three serves as the basis for Paul calling man the head of the woman. Verses four through six help reveal the basis. These verses demand two things,

\(^1\)Note the rebukes which Christ speaks to His churches in Rev. 2 and 3. It is Christ who is speaking (1:11-12).
not one. If they only required the covering of woman then creation order would seem to be the reason for man's headship. But, since man is just as emphatically commanded not to be covered as woman is to be covered, more than creation order lies behind it. The headships of verse three are what produce the commands for the man to be uncovered and the woman not to be uncovered. The immediate reason for man's headship is because of God's headship and Christ's headship.

Verses eight and nine explain verse seven; they do not explain verse three. Woman is not under the headship of man because she was created from and for him. She is the glory of man because she was created from him and for him. Paul does not base the headship of man in 1 Corinthians 11 upon any chronological priority. It is a positional priority which God gave to him even as He gave it to the Son.

The second passage involving man's headship (Ephesians five) also agrees with this analysis. Ephesians five most certainly does not base man's headship upon chronological priority. Again it bases it upon the parallel headship of Christ. Here the headship is confined to the marriage relation. The husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church (Eph. 5:23). Likewise the authority of the headship is clearly revealed here. As the church is subject to Christ so the wife is to be subject to her husband (Eph. 5:24).
The Application

The headship of man is always expressed in the context of the headship of Christ. It must be patterned after Christ's. It possesses the positional priority which Christ's headship possesses. It is not a chronological priority which can be removed by rejecting Genesis two or minimizing creation order. As Christ's headship is unconditional, so is man's. Paul makes no exceptions. Just as certainly, though, it must be expressed as was Christ's. This headship not only gives the authority to lead, but equally it gives the responsibility to supply. Man's role is not described as Κύριος; he is not lord. He must not dictate or make all decisions and regulations unilaterally. Rather he is to love and treat his wife as he does himself, his body (Eph. 5:28). As Head, Christ gave Himself for His body, the church, so as head, man must give himself for woman (Eph. 5:25). Boyer writes:

It should be understood clearly that the term "head" and its corresponding opposite, "subjection" (cf. Eph. 5:24) have to do with rank, position, authority; not at all with ability. They denote positions in the governmental or administrative organization of affairs. They do not in any way reflect inferiority or inequality. Proof of this is seen in the relationship attributed within the Godhead. Christ is every bit as much God as God the Father. He is equal in essence. . . . In another realm, an army captain may not be a better man, either physically or intellectually or morally, than the private. But he is superior in rank and function. So the Christian wife, even though she may be superior to her husband in ability, in personality, even in spirituality, yet she recognizes his headship and "ranks herself under" him in the divine economy of the home.1

1James L. Boyer, For a World Like Ours: Studies in
IV. The Problem of Prophesying

The mention of women prophesying in 1 Corinthians 11:5 presents a situation which cannot be understood or properly evaluated without more extensive study. The whole subject of the New Testament prophetic gift must be understood. This study of the prophetic gift is not only pertinent but appropriate since First Corinthians chapters eleven through fourteen say more about that gift than the rest of the New Testament combined. In order to evaluate the New Testament gift of prophecy and woman's relation to it, these points will follow: 1) the word usage in the New Testament, 2) the practice by women, 3) the nature of prophecy, and 4) the present inactivity of the prophetic gift.

The Word Usage in the New Testament

The word προφητία (prophetess) is used only twice in the entire New Testament. Neither usage refers to women of the church age. The first usage describes Anna, the old widow prophetess who served God in the temple with prayers and fastings (Lk. 2:36). The other occurrence is used to describe the Jezebel who deceives the church at Thyatira and calls herself a prophetess (Rev. 2:20).

By contrast, the word προφητὴς is used almost 150 times.¹ Eighty percent of these occurrences are in the Corinthians (Winona Lake, Indiana: BMH Books, 1971), p. 104.

¹The Textus Receptus contains 149 occurrences; see J. B. Smith, Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament
gospels and Acts. Almost all of these refer to the Old Testament prophets. Only three books refer to church-age prophets: Acts, First Corinthians, and Ephesians. Other books refer to the gift of prophesying but only these three refer to the ministry of the church-age prophet. The book of Acts refers to these prophets in four passages: Agabus with others (11:27; 21:10); some leaders at Antioch (13:1); and Silas and Judas (15:32). The books of First Corinthians and Ephesians refer to church-age prophets exclusively. Ephesians contains three references (2:20; 3:5; 4:11); First Corinthians contains six—all of which are in chapters twelve and fourteen.

Beside these usages which refer to the person of the prophet, the verb, adjective and noun which describe the act of prophecy occur about fifty times in total. About half of these refer to the New Testament gift.¹ The tabulation of these statistics suggests at least that women play a very minor role as prophetesses in New Testament times. No woman is identified as a prophetess of a church.

¹Noun, προφητεία (19 times) N.T. gift—Rom. 12:6; 1 Cor. 12:10; 13:2,8; 14:6,22; 1 Thess. 5:20; 1 Tim. 1:18; 4:14; 2 Pet. 1:20(?); verb, προφητεύω (28 times) N.T. gift—Acts 2:17,18; 19:6; 21:9; 1 Cor. 11:4,5; 13:9; 14:1,3,4,5, 24,31,39; Mt. 7:22(?); adjective, προφητικός (2 times) N.T. gift—2 Pet. 1:19(?).
Did women possess the prophetic gift in New Testament times? Several factors can be cited to answer that question. First, several Old Testament women appeared to possess that gift in their day as the Scriptural data have shown. Deborah and Huldah received and transmitted future happenings, and they are called prophetesses (Jud. 4:4-9; 1 Chron. 34:22). Also, but to a lesser degree, Miriam can be cited (Ex. 15:20). Second, at the time of Christ's birth another prophetess is mentioned.

And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser; she was of a great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity; And she was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day. And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem (Lk. 2:36-38).

She, like the first three, fits into the Old Testament era, even though she is spoken of by a New Testament author with church-age understanding.

Isaksson says that she spoke "publically to all" who were looking for salvation, even as the prophetesses in the church would do. His choice of the word "publically" implies too much. She was not an official member of the temple staff. She did not conduct services. The intent of

---

Luke 2:38 might better be expressed by the word "personally." She personally spoke to all who looked for salvation. Friedrich agrees when he writes: "If she is called a prophetess, this does not mean that like the ancient prophets she came before the people with a message of grace and judgment. She was probably called a prophetess because she had the gift of foreseeing and foretelling the future."\(^1\) Nothing indicates that Anna had a ministry like the men prophets had. She, like the three women before her, did, nonetheless, possess the prophetic gift.

The third factor which indicates that New Testament women did genuinely possess the prophetic gift is found in Acts 21:9.

And we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven; and abode with him. And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy (Acts 21:8,9).

Here, for the first and only time, is a statement regarding specific women who possessed the prophetic gift during the church era. They correctly are not called prophetesses but those who prophesy, for no office is attributed to them.\(^2\) Nowhere are these four women connected with the ministry of the church at Caesarea. Just as quickly as they appear here, they disappear from the Biblical record. Their fame seems to arise from their uniqueness rather than from

---

\(^1\) Friedrich, "προφητης," VI, 836.

\(^2\) The use of the present active participle of προφητεύω rather than the feminine noun προφητής suggests that these daughters possessed no church office.
their ministry. They alone among women are clearly identified with this gift.

The last and most important evidence that women did legitimately possess the gift of prophecy is God's own promise. The experiences on Pentecost (Acts 2) provide important data. Whether Mary and the other women in the upper room (1:14) were involved in the charismatic experiences of chapter two (v. 4) has been debated. The comments are not explicit enough to form any doctrine from that verse alone. Yet Peter's sermon is explicit. In order to explain that which is happening Peter quotes from the prophet Joel saying:

And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy (Acts 2:16-18; emphasis mine).

Twice within these verses Peter states that women will demonstrate the outpouring of the Spirit with the specific gift of prophecy.

The problem does exist as to when the Joel prophecy was to be fulfilled. The context of the Joel prophecy includes the physical calamities identified by Revelation, chapters six and sixteen, as occurring at the time of the eschatological event known as Armageddon. Yet Peter also sees Pentecost as that described by Joel for he says "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel" (Acts 2:16). This writer would harmonize the statements by suggesting
that Peter, with the arrival of Pentecost, sees the end
times as present. Had the sun turned into darkness and the
moon into blood, Peter would not have been surprised (v. 20).
He expected Jesus to return shortly (3:19-21 NASB). After
waiting nearly two thousand years, present-day Christians
have a difficult time seeing Peter's perspective. Because
of this long duration it might be best to describe the out-
pouring of God's Spirit at Pentecost as the beginning of
that which will be consummated at Christ's Second Coming.¹
What appeared compact to Peter has manifested itself to be
a very lengthy extension for the fulfillment.

Whether or not one agrees with this interpretation
of Joel's fulfillment is not greatly significant at this
point. Whether or not this allows Mary and the other women
at Pentecost to possess the prophetic gift is likewise not
the most significant factor. What is significant is that
God reveals the gift of prophecy to be congruous with wo-
man's role in creation order. Either she already has had,
or she will someday receive, the gift of prophecy. The
gifts of the Spirit were given to all.² Thus these four
factors (the three Old Testament women, Anna, the church-age
daughters of Philip and the Biblical promise of Joel and
Acts) suggest that the gift of prophecy was consistent with

¹See F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts, in
The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Wm.

²See 1 Cor. 12:11-13; 14:31; compare Gal. 3:28.
women's Biblical role.

The Nature of Prophecy

The Arndt and Gingrich lexicon attributes the three common aspects of prophecy to the New Testament word προφητεύω.\(^1\) First, it can mean to proclaim to others a divine revelation which one has received. It need not involve prediction. Second, it is used for the making known of something which is hidden to someone or many. This involves the telling of things which goes beyond natural ability. Samuel's finding of Saul's donkeys serves as an Old Testament example (1 Sam. 9:19-20). The word has this meaning in the New Testament where the Roman soldiers blindfold Jesus and ask Him "to prophesy" who smote Him (Mt. 26:28). The third usage is that one which is most commonly associated with prophecy—to tell the future. Agabus (Acts 11:17-18) and Caiaphas (Jn. 11:49-51) serve as examples.

Though the Old Testament and New Testament usages of the verb are virtually synonymous as to its revelatory nature, differences are great as to the actions and the ministry of each. The ecstatic element which is prominent within the Hebrew word, נָנַשׁ,\(^2\) seems to be lacking in the New

---


Testament usage of προφητεύω. The New Testament prophet is not one who lacks control of his senses for his spirit was always subject to him (1 Cor. 14:29-33). Alienation and raving are unknown to him even though he may feel rapturous delight.¹

More outstanding is the difference in ministry between the Old and the New Testament prophet. The New Testament prophet like the Old was a revealer of truth. But unlike the Old Testament prophet "he is not an unrestricted ruler over the others. He is subject to their judgment. He does not stand above the community; like all the rest, he is a member of it."² Herein lie the vital differences. The Old Testament prophet was an authoritative leader. In the New Testament the gift of prophecy was to be desired by all (1 Cor. 14:1,12,29), and was practiced by many (1 Cor. 14:29,31). The gift was given to the membership in general, not merely to the leaders. The gift did not place one over the others for his message was assessed by them (1 Cor. 14:29).³

Further, the prophetic office and the prophetic gift may be distinguished. Many members of the congregation evidently had this gift during the apostolic era, yet very few are identified as prophets, as the statistics demonstrated

²Ibid., p. 849.
³See the discussion of 1 Cor. 14 in chapter seven.
earlier.

The gift of prophecy did not give any member of the New Testament church authority to rule over another. It did not make him a leader. Neither did it make anyone a teacher. The gift of prophecy was like teaching in that it edified, exhorted and consoled (1 Cor. 14:31). But it was unlike teaching (or preaching) in that teaching is the product of the teacher's understanding, opinion, or thought, whereas prophesying was to a great degree passive.¹ Teaching involves a preparation including analysis and organization; prophecy did not. Friedrich states that the New Testament teacher expounded Scripture and explained the fundamentals of the faith, whereas the prophet spoke on the basis of revelations.² F. F. Bruce writes: "the gift of prophecy in the apostolic church was like the gift of tongues in that it was exercised under the immediate inspiration of God."³ Prophecy, thus, involved a revelatory act. The gift of prophecy involved the immediate receiving of a revelation from God. Yet the one prophesying was not an authoritative leader or teacher. The prophetic message did not become authoritative because of the one who spoke it, for he was to


²Friedrich, "προφήτης," VI, 854.

³Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts, p. 242.
be judged by the hearer (1 Cor. 14:29). The prophet controlled the hearer no more than the hearer controlled the prophet. The prophecy being a revelation from God was authoritative, whereas the prophet was not. To prophesy must not be equated with to rule, to teach or to preach.

The Present Inactivity of the Prophetic Gift

This dissertation cannot do justice to the proposal that certain gifts of the Spirit are no longer operative, yet the inactivity of the prophetic gift must be noted or all Biblical data regarding woman cannot be evaluated. In the midst of Paul's treatise on the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12-14), he inserts a discourse on the fruit of the Spirit (ch. 13). He describes in the first several verses the superiority of the fruit (love) over several gifts of the Spirit (especially tongues and prophecy). Love is superior because of its essence, its outreach to others. But it is likewise superior because the spiritual gifts of prophecy and knowledge will become inoperative, whereas love will not fail but will endure (vv. 8,13).

---

1 This may help to explain Paul's resolve to go to Jerusalem despite the prophetic warnings (Acts 20:22-21:14).

2 The analysis of 1 Cor. 14:29-35 in chapter seven will provide further support for these statements.

First Corinthians 13:8 uses the verb καταργεῖν to describe the future of the prophetic gift. It will become inactive or idle. Smith reveals the significant connotation of καταργεῖν when he states that it is "an appropriate word for describing the laying aside at darkness of a work which will be resumed the following day." Evidently, the usage of this verb suggests that though prophecy will become inoperative when "that which is perfect is come", it will again become active at a later time. Scripture verifies this. God, as Joel 2:28-32 predicts concerning the last times, will reinstitute the prophetic gift after the completion of this church age.

Verses nine and ten of First Corinthians thirteen clearly express that the time when the prophetic gift would become inactive as the time when "that which is perfect" would come. The word translated "perfect" (τέλειος) more precisely expresses the idea of "complete" or "mature." The only two plausible events that this phrase could refer to

1First Cor. 13:8 uses πάυω in the middle voice to describe the cessation of tongues, but it uses καταργεῖν for both prophecy and knowledge. The verb πάυω means to stop or cease. Smith concludes that the middle voice imparts the idea that tongues "shall cease of themselves" (Tongues in Biblical Perspective, p. 83).


3Smith, Tongues in Biblical Perspective, p. 81.

4See Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 816-17.
are the completion of the Scripture in about A.D. 96 or the
time when the believers stand before God, whether this be
understood as the Rapture or the Second Advent.¹ Since
prophecy will occur during the Tribulation (Rev. 11:3,6) and
at the time of the Second Advent (Joel 2:28-32), it seems
that the obvious time for prophecy to become inactive would
be with the completion of the Scriptures.

History also demonstrates this inactivity of the
propheic gift following the completion of the Scriptures.
The Apostolic Fathers say little concerning New Testament
prophets. Clement of Rome says nothing. Ignatius briefly
mentions that they deserve honor ("to Philadelphians" V:2).²
The Didache presents some very specific statements and in-
structions concerning the prophets.³ They were placed along
side the apostles and were to be regarded as one's high
priest. Unlike the Scriptural teaching, it was the prophet
who was to be evaluated not his prophecy. He was not to be
tested or examined, but if he stayed more than three days or
if he asked for money, he was a false prophet. When a church
did not have a prophet, they were to give what would be
necessary for his support as alms to the poor. Thus, the
prophets were outsiders and not every congregation even had
one. Obviously there was a decline in the gift of prophecy

¹Smith, Tongues in Biblical Perspective, pp. 73-74.
²Lake, Apostolic Fathers, I, 243,245.
³Ibid., I, 327,329.
if not a total inactivity of the gift by the beginning of
the second century. What did exist at that time did not
harmonize with Scripture.

Later history speaks even less concerning prophets.
Very few are even mentioned outside of those given in the
New Testament. Friedrich concludes that "with the repudi­
ation of Montanism prophecy came to an end in the Church."¹
As might be expected the prophets survived longer than the
prophetic gift. Nothing which this writer has seen in the
Fathers demonstrates that the genuine prophetic gift ex­
tended into the post-apostolic period. Jesus prepared His
followers for this very problem. False prophets would
come who would even sincerely believe they were God's
prophets.

Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's
clothing. . . . Not every one that saith unto me,
Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven;
but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in
heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord,
have we not prophesied in thy name? . . . And then
will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart
from me, ye that work iniquity (Mt. 7:15, 21-13;
emphasis mine).

The New Testament gift of prophecy was a spiritual
gift given to the apostolic church. The Scriptures provide
no evidence of its existence today. The New Testament
prophetic gift did not make one an authoritative leader over
the congregation. He was merely a fellow member within it.
His revelation from God edified, exhorted and consoled, but

¹Friedrich, "προφήτης," VI, 860.
he was not an authoritative teacher for his message was to be judged by another. Though women possessed this gift they never were leaders or teachers because of it.
CHAPTER VI

THE EXEGETICAL PERSPECTIVE--1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16

THOUGHT DEVELOPMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

An exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is imperative since the meaning and significance of the passage is often unseen or ignored. Some parts of the passage appear puzzling, but when properly analyzed they complement the total thought development. This exegesis will seek to construct that picture. This chapter will be developed according to the analysis of the passage. The development includes: 1) the proposition: decreed headship, verses 2-3; 2) the result: different roles, verses 4-6; 3) the reasons: different glories and authority, verses 7-10; 4) the caution: beware of independence, verses 11-12; 5) the logical arguments: other appeals, verses 13-16; and 6) the significance.

I. The Proposition: Decreed Headship, Verses 2-3

Verses two and three divide easily into two parts: Paul's praise of the Corinthians and the proposition for their consideration. This writer's translation of the verses is as follows.

Now I praise you because you remember me in all things and even as I delivered the traditions to you, you hold (them) fast. Now I want you to know that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is (the) head of woman, and God is (the) head of Christ.
The Praise

Paul begins this section with words of commendation to the Corinthian Church for their observance of those teachings which were delivered to them. This praise is the essence of verse two, so the exegesis of the verse will develop around it. The major problem confronting the exegete concerns the genuineness of this praise. Is Paul's praise of the Corinthians only a figure of speech? Is he using irony or even sarcasm and thus deriding them rather than commending them? Many things within the context demand that this is genuine praise.

First, Paul normally praises his readers whenever he can. Almost every letter to the churches begins with praise, as does this letter. In chapter one Paul praises them for their grace, their enrichment, their abundant gifts, and their anticipation of the return of the Lord (1:4-7). So praise is Paul's custom.

Second, the subject which Paul presents within these verses is not one which they had written about, asking because of a problem. Chapters eight and twelve do discuss such subjects. The church had asked Paul concerning the eating of things which had been offered to idols and concerning spiritual gifts. Paul answers these questions within chapters eight and twelve, respectively. In both chapters Paul begins with \( \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \delta \varepsilon \) ("Now concerning . . ."). Here Paul begins simply with \( \delta \varepsilon \). If Paul had heard of a problem at Corinth regarding head coverings, it must have
been minor for his approach with praise is certainly different from that in other chapters, such as chapter five, in which he writes concerning the highly publicized immorality.

This passage appears to be a comprehensive treatise not founded upon some unknown problem at Corinth. It is not enigmatic or unintelligible, being only one half of a conversation, for the church evidently had not written concerning head coverings.¹ If it were in response to a private message, then the church at Corinth lacked the other half of the conversation just as the reader today. Such supposition is not justifiable. There may be some confusion due to incomplete understanding of customs and practices, but not due to only half of a correspondance. God's Word is lucid and understandable even in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.

A third reason for declaring Paul's praise in verse two to be genuine is found in verse seventeen. Verse seventeen literally states: "Now when commanding this, I do not praise because you come together not for the better but for the worse" (writer's translation and emphasis). Their conduct at the Lord's Supper merits no praise, and gets none. Paul's positive statement in verse two can hardly have the same negative connotation which this negative statement only a few verses later does.

Fourth, Paul in verse two states two reasons for

this praise: "because you remember me in all things (παντα μου μεμνησθε), and you hold fast the traditions even as I delivered them to you." Although μεμνησθε is a perfect tense verb it always has the full sense of a simple present.\(^1\) This present perfect expresses a state which these Corinthians are in. They remember. Further, though παντα is in the accusative case, μου which is in the genitive must be regarded as the object of the verb. They remember Paul. Never in the New Testament does this verb take its object in the accusative case, but rather in the genitive, as is common with other verbs of remembering.\(^2\) The accusative παντα is an adverbial qualifier—"in all things."\(^3\) There was no break in communication or falling out between Paul and the Corinthians. He could praise them for they remember him in all things. He could also praise them, for they have held fast τας παραδοσεις. According to Vine the presence of the article suggests that these traditions were of apostolic authority for all the churches.\(^4\) They had done well in


\(^4\)W. E. Vine, 1 Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Zondervan
observing the practices which Paul had taught them.

Fifth, the ἤ which connects verses two and three is not adversative (but), rather it is transitional (now). That which Paul begins to present does not conflict with their thinking; it adds to it.

Finally, although he could praise them, the need was somewhat pressing for he did not leave it unsaid until he could come to Corinth. He intended to come shortly and did. In verse thirty-four as Paul concludes the next problem, involving the Lord's Supper, he says: "And the rest will I set in order when I come." Apparently he could not do that (at least the Holy Spirit did not allow him to do that) with the problem of verses two through sixteen. Thus, Paul's praise and their obedience would signify that these women were not discarding their head coverings. Paul is not confronting a problem of practice or culture. Rather it seems that the Holy Spirit has chosen to record the significance and importance of the head covering.

The Proposition

In verse three Paul sets forth the proposition of this discourse: Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of woman, and God is the head of Christ. It is in this context that Paul establishes the proposition of the headship of man to woman. It is a decreed role; it is positional. It was founded upon the order ordained between the

Father and the Son, and between Christ and man. This headship of man is not the result of Adam's appearance prior to Eve's. Just the opposite, the creation events (Adam first, Eve second) are the result of God's plan and His order. Creation does not even enter Paul's context until verse eight, and there it is cited as the reason for something other than man's headship. Yet this headship was decreed and therefore does fit with the chronology which God established at creation.¹

The headship of Christ over man could either be the result of creation or of redemption. Christ is head both of creation (Eph. 1:22) and of the redeemed (Eph. 4:15,16; 5:23). Some see the relation here as with the redeemed since the relation is specifically to Christ, the Redeemer.² Yet, to the same degree it is through Christ that God is related to His entire creation (Col. 1:15,16). The headship established through creation is more likely, because that is the headship which is over "every man." The following context also bears this out. Both saved and unsaved men come under Christ's headship. For the saved man it has a two-fold significance.

The use of ἄνὴρ (man) and γυνὴ (woman) allow two interpretations. When these two words are used together

¹This positional priority of man was previously discussed in chapter five under the problem of headship.

they often mean husband and wife. Indeed these are the only terms used in the New Testament for husband and wife. Is Paul speaking only of husband-wife relationships, as in Ephesians five? or is this far broader in its outreach? The context demands the more general usage. In the first place, the context will not allow husband and wife relationships in all verses. In verse eight Paul asserts that woman is out of man. He means Eve was out of Adam, not that the wife is out of her husband. Likewise in verse twelve Paul argues: "For as the woman is out of the man, thus also the man is through the woman." The man-woman relation of the second clause is that of mother and son, not of wife and husband. Again the more general usage is required. Equally convincing is the statement of verse fourteen that it is a shame for men to have long hair. One can hardly imagine that Paul is rebuking only husbands for long hair. Also in a less direct sense, the context argues against the husband-wife interpretation, since it involves what happens in public rather than what happens in the home.

One further area of definition needs to be observed from this passage concerning man as head over woman. Could this relationship involve only unsaved people? In other words, could not redemption remove woman from this "degrading" relationship? It cannot, for Paul is speaking to the redeemed regarding their conduct (praying and prophesying) amongst others who are redeemed. Does this headship then omit the unsaved? No, for the context has described the reference as to "every" man.
This headship does not, however, imply subordination of all women to all men, "because they are woman" as Jewett would assert.\(^1\) That thesis is never stated in Scripture. Grosheide aptly notes that "head lacks the article, nor does woman have the indefinite pronoun every. That means that man's headship over the woman is not as absolute as Christ's headship over all things" (his emphasis).\(^2\) Though no women are in the position of authority, neither are they under men who are not in authority. For example, a man's wife is not innately under the authority of her male neighbor. It may be more aptly stated that no man is under any woman in God's order. Yet that does not mean that within society man will never be in a subordinate position to woman. No doubt many men in history from slaves to lords have been required to live within such a reversed order and have submitted "in the Lord."

Therefore, the following conclusions concerning man's headship stand forth from this passage. First, it is founded upon and similar to the headships of God the Father and Jesus Christ. It is positional; it is decreed; it is sacred. Every Christian man must exercise this headship as Christ does. The positioning of man's headship between Christ's and the Father's puts man's into the proper

\(^1\) Jewett, *Male and Female*, p. 131; cf. p. 71.

perspective immediately. Christ thus serves a perfect example for both men and women—as a head and as One under a head. Second, this headship extends beyond the home (husband and wife) to all men and to all women. Similarly, it is not limited to unsaved or to saved. It is inclusive of all.

II. The Result: Different Roles, Verses 4-6

This section will present the purpose behind headship, the head covering required by these verses, and the commands contained therein.

The Purpose

Paul's statement that men must not be covered while praying or prophesying whereas woman must be covered while praying or prophesying, serves as the basis for the thought of these verses. The purpose of these three verses is not to correct public impropriety but to show the result of the headship which was declared in verse three. That headship affects both men and women. It is not simply a power which has been given to man. It is an order; it is a responsibility. If Paul had dealt with only one side of the subject, that is, woman's need for a covering, the passage could possibly be regarded as Paul's reaction to a cultural problem. That is not the implication here.

Paul starts in verse four with man's responsibility.

1See page 102 for this writer's literal rendering of vv. 4-6.
This does not imply that men were creating the most trouble in Corinth. One must remember that no evidence exists that Paul's treatise here is problem-oriented. It was not induced by the erroneous actions of either the Corinthian men or women. Though Jewish men have covered their heads while praying for many centuries, no proof exists to demonstrate that this practice existed during New Testament times.¹ Much less is there evidence that Christian Jews were covering their heads in the church assembly.

Paul is all inclusive and emphatic in expressing the differences. Every man must be uncovered (v. 4): every woman must be covered (v. 5). The implication is that nothing, including background or culture, should influence their obedience to these differences, for these differences are role differences which result from the headship of man.

The Covering

The phrase, κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἐξω, is unique to the New Testament but is common in secular Greek, meaning simply to

have something down over the head.¹ Some refer this simply to the hair rather than to an artificial covering.² Thus the Old Testament will provide help at this point. This phrase, κατὰ κεφαλῆς, is used in the Septuagint at Esther 6:12 of Haman after his humiliation. The Hebrew here is most helpful: שָׁפַךְ עָלָיו. The verb, רָבַן, from רָבַּנְתָּ is a Qal passive participle with a connecting waw. The verse reads: "But Haman hasted to his house mourning, and having his head covered." The Hebrew suggests that κατὰ κεφαλῆς means "having something upon the head." This same Hebrew phrase is also found in 2 Samuel 15:30 and Jeremiah 14:4. In 2 Samuel 15:30 the phrase is somewhat different but the verb is identical (רָבַּנְתָּ וַיָּכְבּוּ) "and the head belonging to him covered," or "having his head covered." In all three passages the context involves the covering of the head because of sorrow and shame. In 2 Samuel 15:30 Absalom had stolen the throne and David fled weeping and having his head covered. The Septuagint follows the Hebrew form more closely here using a perfect passive participle: καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπικεκαλυμμένος, "and the head covered (or veiled)." The second half of the verse describes the similar action of all the people with David. Here the Qal perfect form is used and the Septuagint follows precisely with an aorist indicative (ἐπικαλυπτέω from ἐπικαλύπτω). The third passage

¹Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, I, 945.
²These views will be discussed at the end of this chapter.
follows precisely the same patterns in the Hebrew and Greek which 1 Samuel 15:30b does: ἐπεκάλυψαν τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν, "they covered their heads." Thus, the comparison of these Old Testament passages demonstrates that the abstract phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς does not refer to hair whether it is "put up" or allowed to hang loose.

Since Paul used several words and phrases to express the covering and the uncovering of the head, κατὰ καφαλῆς (v. 4), ἀκατακαλυπτὸς (v. 5), κατακαλυπτὸς (v. 6), ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς (v. 10), and περιβόλαιον (v. 15), these should suggest that Paul had no specific cultural practice in mind to which he was asking conformity. The use of one noun might have forced Paul's teaching into a specific cultural practice which was prevalent at that time.

Verses four and five describe the disgrace or shame one brings upon his head when not observing God's differentiating roles. Whether this shame falls upon one's own head (literal use of word) or upon that one who is his "head" (figurative usage) is unclear. Either seems justifiable.¹ This writer sees no reason why Paul might not be referring to both through some form of paranomasia.

The Commands

In verse six Paul begins to command. Each of these

¹Most contemporary commentators understand it to be figurative; some old commentaries present it as literal. See Godet, Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, p. 113.
are third person imperatives or relayed commands. Thus the imperatives are directed to the "head" or another authority but involve the woman. This writer's translation of verses five and six reads:

Every woman, praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, disgraces her head; for she is one and the same thing with the one who has shaven herself. For if a woman is not covering herself, cause her also to clip herself; and if it is a shame for a woman to clip or to shave herself, cause her to continue to cover herself.

The four imperatives and infinitives of verse six are probably in the middle voice rather than the passive, since the aorist verbs require the middle (κειράσθω, κείρασθαι). The present forms would allow either (ξυράσθαι,2 κατακαλυπτέσθω), so consistency would suggest the middle for all forms. What Paul commands, then, is not that the men forcibly do these things, but that the women themselves be consistent. The men are to press for that consistency. If a woman does not feel the shame of being uncovered at such times, let her learn that shame by clipping (cutting short) or shaving her hair. If she wants to appear before God as a man, let her know the shame by shaving her head. The physical shame will communicate the unseen spiritual shame.

1 Compare 1 Cor. 12:11, ξυ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ("one and the same Spirit").

2 Some regard this verb also as Aorist, understanding it as from the later word, ξυρω, rather than from ξυράω. See Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources, p. 435.
The two imperatives are likewise different tenses. The first is aorist; the second is present. So, if she will not cover herself, cause her to clip her hair.¹ The Aorist indicates that this need not be protracted or repeated. The last command reads: "if it is a disgrace for a woman to slip or to shave herself, cause her to continue to cover herself." This is to be continued, hence the present tense. Chrysostom suggests that if she would throw away the covering appointed by divine law, she should also throw away the covering appointed by natural law.²

III. The Reasons: Different Glories and Authorities, Verses 7-10

Paul's thesis of woman's role is revealed in verse seven. Verses eight and nine develop that thesis by showing the reasons for its existence. Verse ten speaks to the authority given to woman.

The Thesis

Verse seven is the most important of these four verses. It provides more answers to the question, Why is the man not to cover his head, whereas the woman is to cover

¹The present practice of many Hasidic (ultra-conservative) Jewesses is to clip the hair upon marriage and thereafter to wear a wig, often styled in the latest coiffure. These are worn to conceal their real hair from the eyes of men as prescribed in their ancient Talmudic laws. See Harvey Arden, "The Pious Ones," National Geographic, 148:2 (August, 1975), 279.

²Chrysostom, Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians, p. 152.
hers? than any other verse. It reads: "For man is obligated not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man" (writer's rendering). The essence of verses seven through ten is placed in relief by the parallelism of form. Man is obligated not to cover his head because he is the glory of God; woman is obligated to have authority upon her head because she is the glory of man. Man has one primary reason for not covering his head—he is the glory of God. Woman has one primary reason for covering her head—she is the glory of man. This understanding of Paul's thought should make the difficult phrase, "authority upon her head" more easily understood when it is developed later.

The grounds for man's uncovered head lies in the phrase, "εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ ὄπλωχων." Causation may appear uncertain here since Paul uses a circumstantial participle. Yet, when ὄπλωχω is used with predicate nouns, as image and glory are, it commonly takes the causal idea: "since he is. . . ."¹ The image and glory of God thus are the grounds for something.

Paul's words, image and glory, seem very carefully selected. Clearly the creation account is in Paul's mind. Yet the wording of both the Hebrew and Greek texts clearly reads image and likeness in Genesis 1:26. No passage in the Old Testament, or elsewhere for that matter, contains the

---
¹Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, p. 846.
reading, "image and glory." One passage, however, does in the opinion of this writer manifest those two ideas. Psalm eight contains the amazement of David that God has taken any cognizance of man. When the psalmist considers the universe, he asks, "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" (v. 4). Then the psalmist turns his eyes from creation to God's Word, even to Genesis 1:26. When the texts are placed together, one can visualize David writing his commentary on Genesis 1:26.

And God said, Let us make men in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth. . . . " (Gen. 1:26, emphasis mine).

". . . and hast crowned him with glory (δόξα in LXX) and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet: All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas" (Ps. 8:5-8; emphasis mine).

Paul says that man possesses the image and the glory of God. Because of this glory, man represents God in displaying His majesty, goodness, and power. Christ as head over creation and head over man, gives authority to men to have dominion over creation. Man as the glory of God is to radiate that glory back to God.

Paul, as he begins speaking of woman, is obviously making a direct parallel. The Greek structure is revealing. Paul has consistently used ὅτι as the normal conjunction throughout these verses. He also uses it to introduce the final clause of verse seven: "the woman is the glory of man."
Here, however, the structure is quite different. With δὲ he uses its correlative μὲν. When correlated the idea becomes "on the one hand," and "on the other hand," or simply "but." Thus, "on the one hand, man is obligated not to cover the head, since he is the image and glory of God; on the other hand, the woman is the glory of man."

If indeed Paul is proposing this emphatic parallelism, why does he not say woman is the image and glory of God? Does not Genesis 1:26-28 state this in no uncertain terms? Yes, it does. But the subject of man's headship over woman is the theme of this passage, and the passage says more than Genesis one or even Genesis two. Both chapters in Genesis support the truth, but neither is the final commentary on this headship. Just as the headship of Christ makes man the glory of God, so the headship of man makes the woman the glory of man. To speak of woman's image at this point would only detract from the argument. To say she is the image of God would not further the point. For it is her relation to man, not her relation to God that is under consideration. To say that she is the image of man would further Paul's point, but that is totally false as Paul's silence suggests. It is a man's son, not his wife, who is in his image (see Gen. 5:3).¹

The emphasis is upon glory, not image, for glory is the counterpart to headship. Glory is the radiance of the head. Headship does not involve mastery, dominance, or

¹Robertson and Plummer, First Corinthians, p. 231.
receiving. It is a giving of authority and dominance. The glory is the reflecting back of that gift to the head. The head is over and the glory under. The glory is dependent to the head. Every woman ought to be an example to every man that man also is in a position of dependence to his Head.

The Reasons

Verses eight and nine provide two reasons for the statement of verse seven concerning woman as the glory of man. Both reasons are based upon creation order; these now are from Genesis two. Only indirectly do these arguments from Genesis two speak to man's headship of verse three. Paul uses them rather to support the counterpart of that headship--woman as the glory of man. Yet, even these reasons are not marshalled so much to provide the grounds for the roles of man and woman as they are given to provide reasons for the differences regarding the head covering.

The different roles have been determined by God alone. The roles are not based upon Paul; they are not even based upon creation order. Adam being created first did not determine his role. God, having determined man's role, created Adam first. Creation order itself does not determine the different roles. The events of woman's creation in Genesis two only reveal and illustrate the roles of man and woman.

The use of γὰρ to begin both verse eight and verse nine allows no uncertainty. Woman is the glory of man for
she is out of (ἐκ) man (v. 8). To emphasize the point and to show the forcefulness and validity of the argument, Paul also states the opposite truth—man is not out of woman. Further, woman is the glory of man for she was created for the sake of (διά with acc.) man. Again, the emphatic negative is included—man was not created for the sake of the woman. Often, the opposite of a positive or negative statement is not true. Paul leaves no loopholes in his argumentation. He proclaims both the positive and the negative.

In verse eight Paul appeals to the initial (ἐκ) cause and in verse nine to the final (διά with acc.) cause.¹ The first involves derivation; the second involves purpose. Both demonstrate that woman is the glory of man.²

**The Authority of Woman**

The goal of verses seven through ten is attained in verse ten. The woman is the glory of man and under his headship, so "because of this the woman is obligated to have authority upon her head because of the angels." Two problems immediately surface: What is the authority? and Why are angels mentioned?

The "authority upon the head," ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ, is a

¹Ibid.

²In v. 8 Paul's argument is abstract; in verse 9 it is focused upon the Gen. 2 account by two means. First, Paul uses the word, created, which is not found in v. 8. Second, Paul uses the article twice after διὰ in v. 9, but no article after ἐκ in v. 8. Robertson and Plummer suggest that its presence may specify Adam and Eve in v. 9, Ibid.
very unusual expression in Greek, which Turner states is "clearly influenced by the construction with memshālā (Hebrew) or shallit (Aramaic)."¹ Though uncommon in secular Greek, by means of Hebrew and Aramaic, ἐξουσία with ἐπί is not unusual in the New Testament.² Always ἐπί locates the realm of that authority. Here it is directed to the woman's head.

Four views regarding this authority have been suggested. These, however, provide only two real options: is this man's authority? or is it woman's authority? Two views fall under each. First, it could represent the husband's authority over his wife. This interpretation fits the context of these verses very well. But how can verse ten say such a thing since it reads: "Because of this the woman is obligated to have authority upon her head." Should it not rather say that the woman is obligated to have a covering upon her head, or submission upon her head? One view is to regard ἐξουσία (authority) as metonymy for the sign of authority.³ Metonymy is a figure of speech involving substitution or relation, such as the sign for the


² ἐξουσία and ἐπί with a genitive noun—Mt. 9:6; Mk. 2:10; Lk. 5:24; 1 Cor. 11:20; Rev. 2:26; 11:6b; 14:18. With an accusative noun—Lk. 9:1; Rev. 6:8; 13:7; 16:9; 22:14. Also see Lk. 19:17 with ἐπί ἄνω, and Jn. 17:2 with gen. noun only.

³ Note the translation in NASB: "the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head."
thing signified, or cause for effect. But to say that authority represents a sign of authority involves a problem. The figure must be put in reverse. Normally metonymy would replace the thing signified with its sign. Uncle Sam would be used to illustrate the United States. The United States would not be used to illustrate Uncle Sam. Yet, this view sees the thing signified (authority) as substituted for the sign. To avoid that problem one might understand this as cause for effect, authority for submission. This may be more appropriate, but it still fails to satisfy the contextual demand of a head covering.¹

The second view, which also understands the authority as man's, regards ἑγουσία as the veil itself. Gerhard Kittel in his Religious History of Early Christianity supposed that ἑγουσία is the "literal translation of the Aramaic shiltonayya(h) which according to a tractate of the Talmud (y. Sabb. VI 8b bot.) signified a veil or head-band."² To support this view it is recounted that some early translations and some Latin Fathers regard καλύμμα (veil) as the proper reading instead of ἑγουσία. But, as was demonstrated in the preceding chapter, this reading has virtually no justification. The disadvantage of Kittel's view is that

¹See above, "The thesis" (v. 7).

²Kittel is cited by J. W. Roberts, "The Veils in 1 Cor. 11:2-16," Restoration Quarterly, 3:4 (1959), 194-195. The stem shalt is associated with shalat which means "to have power," thus, "veils" would allegedly be a proper translation in English.
Paul's readers in Corinth would quite certainly not know what Paul was talking about (just as English readers have trouble understanding "authority" in verse ten today).

Similar to Kittel's approach is one proposed by Whedon. He suggests that έξουσία may have been the Greek name for some head covering. To support his argument, since there is none in Greek, he cites Olshausen as saying that in the Middle Ages the name for a woman's head dress was imperium (the Latin equivalent of έξουσία). Such interpretation seems precarious. Even if such a name existed in the Middle Ages it could be the result of 1 Corinthians 11:10 rather than a Greek head covering which predated this Epistle.

The third and fourth views regard the έξουσία as the woman's authority or power. One view sees this as a magical power that a veiled woman possesses to ward off the attack of evil spirits. The only merit of such a view is that it does relate to the immediate phrase: "because of the angels." There is a total lack of evidence from antiquity that woman's veil was ever regarded as having such a function.

More meaningful is the fourth view which, like the


3 Ibid.
third, regards έξουσία as woman's authority. Unlike the magical power over the angels of view three, this is an authority like man's. It is a derived authority. As man, who is the glory of God, has received authority and dominion from his Head, so woman, who is the glory of man, received authority and dominion from her head (vv. 7-10). The realm of woman's derived authority may be extensive. Here Paul regards it as her right to pray and prophecy if covered. Even though έξουσία refers to woman's authority it does not remove the context of the head covering.

The advantage of this view is not only analytical; it is likewise grammatical. This, unlike the first two, allows έξουσία to be used in its natural sense. If it referred to man's authority it must take a passive idea, which Ramsay says any Greek scholar would laugh at except in the New Testament. Then it would mean submission and not authority or right. But taken actively, as referring to woman's authority, it then conforms to all other uses of the word. It especially fits Paul's usage in this Epistle. In the preceding chapters it means the right or freedom to act; it speaks of Christian liberty.

---

1 Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul; Their Influence on His Life and Thought, p. 203.
2 See above, those passages which use έξουσία ἐπί.
3 See 7:37; 8:9; 9:4,5,6,12,18.
4 Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 257.
Ramsey understands this verse as teaching that the woman who wore a covering upon her head wore authority upon her head. He writes:

Such power as the magistrate possesses in virtue of his office, was meant by the word ἔξουσία. So Diodorus, i. 47, describes the statue of the mother of the Egyptian king Osymandyas, wearing three royalties upon her head, i.e. she possessed the royal dignity in three different ways, as daughter, wife, and mother of a king. . . . In Oriental lands the veil is the power and the honour and dignity of the woman. With the veil on her head, she can go anywhere in security and profound respect.1

Thus, Paul is describing the right a woman has since she is the glory of man. Her covering is her power. While wearing it she can pray and prophesy publicly. This view does not violate the authority of man nor does it dismiss the necessity of the head covering.

Paul's use of διὰ τοῦτο to introduce woman's authority attaches it securely to verse seven. It is stronger than οὐ and introduces a special, exclusive reason: "precisely for this reason she is obligated to have authority upon her head because of the angels."2

The problem concerning angels remains to be discussed. The ambiguity which surrounds this phrase has been well publicized. The idea that these are lustful angels in this context hardly merits comment.3 Why would evil angels...

---

1 Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought, pp. 203-204.
2 Robertson and Plummer, First Corinthians, p. 232.
be present among the saints when in assembly? Paul's previous references to angels in this letter appear to be of no help. Nevertheless, three possible solutions commend themselves to this text.

First, angels may be referred to here for they also are under authority and therefore must be covered. One support for this view is Isaiah 6:2: "Seraphim stood above Him, each having six wings; with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew" (NASB). The Septuagint uses the same word, κατακαλύπτω, as is used in 1 Corinthians 11:6. But the similarity goes no further. No other passage speaks of angels covering their heads. In fact, this one says only that they cover their faces. Further, are not angels the glory of God, like man? If they should be covered, should not men? This view does not fit well with what Paul is saying in verses seven through ten.

Second, the reference to angels may involve their presence in the church services. Women should be covered when using their authority in the assembly because angels are there. Hebrews 12:22-23 in a nebulous way may suggest


1 In 1 Cor. 4:9 the apostles are exhibited as men condemned to death, thus a spectacle to the world, angels and men. In 1 Cor. 6:3 the Corinthians are told that they should have known that they will judge angels (fallen).

2 The parallel creatures in Ezek. 1:11 have 2 wings spread above their heads, 2 covering their bodies, but none covering their heads or faces. Compare also Rev. 4.
the presence of angels in the services of the saints, as might 1 Peter 1:12. Since angels have been sent to minister to men, (Heb. 1:14) it should not seem strange to expect that they would gather where the saints gather.

In support of this view the ancient Jewish beliefs as recorded in the Dead Sea Scrolls can be cited. A two-column fragment found in Cave I at Qumran (I QSa) meticulously describes how no man is to enter into the assembly who possesses any uncleanness, nor can any man hold an office who gives any indication of a physical defect, including lameness, blindness, skin blemish or even old age. The reason these are not to appear is "because holy angels are in their congregation." Likewise, column seven in the War Scroll (I QM VII.6) states that no one with a physical blemish is to go to war, for holy angels accompany their armies.

These Qumran beliefs demonstrate that at least some Jews about Paul's time believed angels attended the assemblies of the saints. Cadbury develops an interesting parallel between Qumran and Corinth. He writes: "At Corinth as at Qumran the angels are to be thought of as present. And for this reason persons of physical defect are forbidden to appear in one case, persons deficiently clad (according to


2Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. 11:10," p. 55.
This interpretation fits the context of 1 Corinthians 11:7-10, but not very convincingly. It does not develop Paul's argument involving creation order.

The third tenable view as to why Paul includes angels in this context is because angels know and understand God's creation order. Job 38:7 states that the angels were present when God created the earth. They saw and were witnesses of the order of creation as recorded in Genesis two. The phrase, ὁλὰ τοὺς ἄγγελονες, probably contains more significance than the translation, "because of the angels," allows. The use of ὁλὰ in verse nine is parallel to the usage here. Both are used with accusative nouns. As verse nine states, "the man was not created for the sake of the woman, but woman for the sake of the man," so verse ten, "the woman is obligated to have authority upon the head for the sake of the angels." The covering is for their benefit also. Surely this phrase is tied closely to the preceding verse. The priority of man in creation is the immediate basis for verse ten. The angels are well aware of this order. For their sake women must cover themselves, acknowledging that order.

Waltke believes the correct approach is to take the best of several views and to synthesize them. Surely there is merit in such an approach, for the angels are present in

2Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," p. 54.
the assembly of God's people. Still, the offensiveness of violating God's order must stand forth as the prominent idea within the text.

In conclusion, verses seven through ten provide a vital part in the portrait of man and woman. Matching the headship of verse three is the glory of verse seven. Each head has its corresponding glory (radiance and reflection). The headship of the Father is exalted by Christ's glory. He is the glory of the Father (Jn. 1:14,18; Col. 1:19; Heb. 1:3). The headship of Christ is exalted by man's glory. He is the glory of Christ (2 Cor. 8:23). Man's headship is exalted by woman's glory. She is the glory of man (Prov. 12:4).

Headship involves sharing, the sharing of authority. The figure of authority upon the woman's head is not a poor figure. Indeed it gives power to woman, yet it carefully directs that authority. The fact that the authority is upon her head reflects the authority to the man. If that authority had been placed in any other realm, the picture would be destroyed. If that authority were in her hands or upon her shoulders, then that authority would not be reflected to her "head."

Though Paul is frequently attacked as a male chauvinist, these verses do not reveal such a spirit. No negative or degrading terminology is used. In describing the

\[1\text{Compare also Rom. 3:23 and 1 Cor. 10:31.}\]
subordinate role of woman which God decreed, Paul uses terms like "glory" and "authority" to describe it.

IV. The Caution: Beware of Independence, verses 11,12

After the Apostle Paul has emphatically stressed the role differences of man and woman, he injects a note of caution. This warning is abruptly introduced by παντεστη, meaning "nevertheless" or "however." Paul knew that such a caution would be needed. He will not allow it to go overlooked.

Man and woman mutually need each other; both are dependent upon the other. "Neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman (v. 11, NASB). Paul's motive for adding these words is not because he has an uneasy conscience about proclaiming the headship of man and the subordination of woman. He is concerned that men do not despise women; and that women do not underrate themselves. Their interdependence is of God's design. It is "in the Lord."

Again Paul warns, "For as the woman is out of the man, thus also the man is through the woman; but this all is out of God" (v. 12). As woman came from (ἐκ) man in creation, so also man in natural generation comes by means of (δύα) the woman. Vine states that the first preposition (ἐκ) points to the initial, single creative act; the second (δύα) points to the continuing process of birth.² Every man

¹Vine, 1 Corinthians, p. 150. ²Ibid.
since Adam has had a mother. Even Christ by God’s design came through a woman to be like other men ("God sent forth his Son, made of a woman," Gal. 4:4).

Finally, Paul adds, "but all things are out of (ἐκ) God." Their initial cause is God. Is Paul merely saying that God is the cause of all things? That does not seem very pertinent. Lenski suggests quite rightly that τὰ πάντα is more specific than "all things." Without the article it would have that meaning. With the article it becomes more definite. It must relate to the things at hand. He would translate τὰ πάντα as "this all."¹ In other words, again Paul drives home the most important point. God is the originator of all that has been discussed. God has decreed the headship of man and the derived glory and authority of woman. He has established the distinction between men and women regarding the head covering.

In concluding Paul’s caution, it seems appropriate to cite the age-old words of Peter Lombard. God did not form woman from Adam’s head, lest she become his ruler, nor from his feet, lest she become his slave; but she was taken from his side that she might be his companion and friend.²


²Cited by Eileen Power, Medieval Women, ed. by M. M. Postan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 34. Contrast the rabbinic exposition of Genesis two. "God did not form woman out of the head lest she should become proud;
Paul’s concluding comments simply ask the Corinthian believers to think. His arguments involve their customs and the authority of others.

An Appeal from Customs

Verses thirteen through fifteen deal with matters of culture. In verse thirteen Paul appeals to their own inner sense. "Judge in your own selves," or "Judge in your own case."¹ He is not asking them to solve a universal problem here, just their own problems following their own customs. Should they not as Spirit-indwelt saints (1 Cor. 6:19) be able to make spiritual judgments (1 Cor. 6:2-5)? Immediately before this Paul had already appealed to their ability to judge. "I speak as to wise men; you judge what I say (1 Cor. 10:15 NASB).

By contrast to verse thirteen, Paul in verse fourteen appeals to nature, φύσις: "Even nature itself teaches us that if a man should have long hair, it is a dishonor to

¹See Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 257-258; cf. 1 Cor. 9:15.
him, does it not?" But what is nature? Because of verse fifteen, which speaks regarding woman's long hair, nature might refer to the natural endowment of woman for greater growth of hair than men. More likely, however, it refers to the law of nature—natural order. Paul's use of ϕύσις in the early chapters of Romans manifests this usage. God gave up men and women because they changed that which was natural "into that which is against nature" (Rom. 1:26). They changed God's order within nature. Romans 2:14 speaks of the Gentiles doing lawful deeds, even though they have not the law, because of nature. Nature is God's innate teacher, so Paul appeals to it. The use of ϕύσις within this Greek question suggests a positive answer. Nature indeed does teach. What does it teach? It teaches nothing about prayer or prophecy. The spiritual discernment of the Corinthians should instruct regarding prayer (v. 13), yet nature can teach natural principles. According to verses fourteen and fifteen it teaches something concerning the length of hair. It sets no precise standards, but what Paul mentions here it does do. Even among unsaved Romans, Greeks, and Jews, men wore shorter hair, women wore longer hair. And,

1Robertson and Plummer, First Corinthians, p. 235.
3Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, p. 877. Of the 14 occurrences of ϕύσις, 11 are in Paul's writings.
generally speaking, in all other cultures as well, woman's hair is longer than man's. That is the order of nature. Nature teaches, therefore, a distinction in sexes with regard to length of hair.

Verse fifteen continues the positive question of verse fourteen. Nature teaches that it is a shame for a man to have long hair, doesn't it? Now verse fifteen asks: "But if a woman should have long hair, it is a glory to her, is it not?" Then Paul gives God's reason for the order of nature, "because long hair has been given to her for a covering."

The vital question of verse fifteen is whether or not woman's long hair serves as a replacement for the covering demanded in the earlier verses. Usually the argument centers on the meaning of the preposition ἀντί. Three basic ideas are ascribed to ἀντί: 1) "in place of;" 2) on behalf of" (like ὑπέρ); or 3) "for the sake of," or "because" (like διά with the accusative case). Of twenty-two occurrences, fifteen fit well into the first idea of replacement. Only one fits number two; six fit number three. But the six uses which mean "for the sake of" are united with either ἰν

---


2Mt. 17:27.

or τοῦτο. Thus, number three is immediately excluded. In fact, both numbers two and three communicate no rational thought in the present verse. The problem lies in determining the precise meaning of number one: "in place of."

Büchsel suggests four denotations: a) actual replacement, b) intended replacement, c) mere equivalent in estimation, or d) similarity.¹ All are very close in meaning. Thirteen of the fifteen passages which mean "in place of" could mean an actual replacement. Most are involved in contexts like, "an eye for an eye," or "not rendering evil for evil."² Hebrews 12:16 is not far removed in meaning, where Esau accepted, for the moment, a meal as equivalent to his birthright. The idea of similarity for ἀντί is not clearly seen within the New Testament outside of 1 Corinthians 11:15, yet Büchsel places it under that meaning and justly so.³

Four things justify this nuance involving similarity. First, Paul uses ἀντί uncoupled from the pronouns ἄν or τοῦτο only three times. To develop from three occurrences Paul's usual denotation is almost impossible. Second, Liddell and Scott reveal that ἀντί does denote equivalence or similarity, especially in Homer. The following phrase serves as an example: δουλεύειν ἀντί ἀργυρωπητῶν (to serve

¹ Büchsel, "ἀντί," I, 372.

² Mt. 5:38 (2); Rom. 12:17; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9 (2); Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45; Lk. 11:11; Jn. 1:16; Mt. 2:22; Jas. 4:15; Heb. 12:2 (?).

³ Büchsel, "ἀντί," I, 372.
just like bought slaves). Third, the most important reason is context. Always context must be the major factor for determining the precise prepositional idea. When a conflict arises between a preposition and the context there is no question as to which to follow. The context determines the proper nuance of the preposition. Prepositions are pliable and must fit the context.

The logic of the context will not allow hair to be understood as a substitute for the required covering. Verses four and five refer to something special; they involve a special time and occasion. When praying and prophesying men must not have the covering. Evidently there are times, then, when men can wear a covering. Yet if that covering is long hair, it does not harmonize with Paul's appeal to nature for men to wear short hair. Verse fourteen cannot possibly mean it is a shame for men to have long hair only when they pray. Likewise, Paul is not saying in verses five and following that women need long hair only when they pray. Verse fifteen does not allow such reasoning. What Paul is saying is that even nature agrees that women need a covering whereas men do not. What God asks of

---

1 Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, I, 153.

2 Compare for example the English preposition "with."
During W.W.II the U.S. fought with Germany (i.e. against). During W.W.II the U.S. fought with England (i.e. together with). During W.W.II the U.S. fought with bazookas (i.e. by means of). During W.W.II the U.S. fought with courage (i.e. an adverbial idea--manner). See Eugene Van Ness Geotchius, The Language of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 147.
woman is only reasonable. At the special time of praying and prophesying women need a special covering, one which is fitting even with the order of nature.

Fourth, even Paul's use of περιβόλαίον (covering) in verse fifteen suggests that long hair is not a replacement for the special covering while praying. The primary significance does not lie in the meaning of this covering, for the word is very general. It is used of almost any kind of covering: grave clothes, a head covering, a bed covering, a chariot cover, a wrap-around garment, even of lustful acts as a covering.¹ The significance lies in the fact that for all of the previous verses expressing the covering of the head Paul does not use περιβόλαίον, nor does he use any of the earlier expressions here. Hair is not the covering referred to earlier, rather it fulfills a purpose similar to that which demands the artificial covering for those appointed times.

Thus, this phrase in verse fifteen might be translated: "because long hair has been given to her just like (or "as", or "for") a covering." Only when one is looking for an alternative for the special head covering could ἀντί meaningfully express "in place of" in this context.

An Appeal from Outside Authority

Paul's final appeal is stated in verse sixteen:

"Now if anyone thinks it fitting to be contentious, (so be

¹Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, II, 1369-70.
we do not have such a practice, neither the churches of God." Before that authority can be heard several problems must be resolved. First, the idea of ὄρκεῖ with εἶναι does not express: "seems to be." Inclination or appearance has nothing to do with the meaning. It would better be translated "thinks it fitting,"¹ This deals with attitude. Compare 1 Corinthians 3:18: εἴ τις ὄρκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι. The idea is not "If any among you seemeth wise" (KJV), but, "If any man among you thinks that he is wise" (NASB). The preceding phrase makes this clear. "Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you thinks that he is wise . . ." (NASB).²

What attitude is being expressed? It is one of contention (φιλόνεικος), which etymologically means a "lover of strife." This word is found only here in the New Testament and also only once in the Septuagint. In Ezekiel 3:7 it is used to describe the whole house of Israel as stubborn or contentious (Heb.--"hardheaded").

The major problem of verse sixteen, however, is found in the next phrase: "we do not have such a practice" (συνήθεια). What is the antecedent of συνήθεια? Is Paul saying that he has no practice of contention? or that he has no practice of disregarding the head covering? At first glance Paul seems to say that he has no practice of contention. But that is hardly true nor would these verses allow

¹Lias, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 127.
²Compare 1 Cor. 14:37 as well: "If anyone thinks that he is a prophet. . . ."
that reading. Paul does not need to defend the actions or integrity of the apostles. And it certainly would be a ridiculous ending to an arduous presentation if Paul simply says, "I would not argue over this."¹

Paul's language is remarkably different in chapter seven where he presents the propriety of remaining single. In verse six he says "I speak by concession (κατὰ συγγνώμην) not by command" (κατ' ἐπιταγήν). Verse seventeen reads, "And thus I direct (διατάσσομαι) in all the churches."

Again, verses twenty-five and twenty-six read:

Now concerning virgins I have no command (ἐπιταγήν) of the Lord but I give an opinion (γνώμην) as one who by the mercy of the Lord is trustworthy. I think (νομίζω) then that this is good in view of the present distress, that it is good for a man to remain as he is" (1 Cor. 7:25,26 NASB).

Paul's speech in chapter eleven, only a few chapters later, sounds totally different.² Several statements in chapter seven offer godly suggestion: this statement in chapter eleven contains an apostolic decree. Chapter seven has strong evidence that contemporary elements affect its application: chapter eleven lacks these elements totally.

The enigmatic "practice" to which Paul refers in verse sixteen may find its solution in Paul's grammatical usage of ellipsis. Possibly Paul has simply omitted the


²Compare also 7:10,12,29,35,40 and then contrast 14:33b-38.
apodosis (fulfillment clause) of this condition. Since the apodosis would say little, it may have seemed unnecessary to Paul. If such were true the verse might read: "Now if anyone thinks it fitting to be contentious, (so be it); we do not have such a practice, neither the churches of God." Paul might well be declaring that though some might say he allows women to be uncovered because of his teachings in Galatians 3:28, it is not his practice to disregard the head covering. When praying or prophesying women are to be covered. By "we" Paul no doubt means himself and those like him (the apostles). Paul appeals to the universal practice of the apostles and the churches.

VI. The Significance

In setting forth the significance of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 surely the emphasis which Paul labored to proclaim must be reviewed first. The main emphasis is that man and woman are different. They are ontologically different. They


2Kling sees the apodosis as present with ellipsis within it. He writes: "In the apodosis the expression is elliptical, and we must supply some such phrase as 'let him understand that.'" Friedrich Christian Kling, "First Corinthians," trans. and ed. by Philip Schaff, in Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, ed. by John Peter Lange, 24 Vols., reprinted (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 227. Compare 1 Cor. 3:18 and 14:37.
are ontologically equal but unique. God did not create woman to be another male. She is the glory of the man. Her role and functions are different. Her glory and authority are different. Creation order illustrates their differences. The order within nature teaches that difference. The appearance and actions of man and woman must likewise demonstrate it. Even in their redeemed state "in Christ" and in their approach to God, man and woman are different. Precise understanding of the cultural background might aid in the application of specifics regarding the covering of the head, but the argument remains clear: the roles and functions are different. Man is the head of the woman; woman is the glory of the man. Paul is not arguing for his native culture, or he would exhort them to be covered in all public situations. He is not arguing for Greco-Roman culture, or he would allow them to do as they please. He is proclaiming God's commands.

In order to apply this passage with meaningful significance for the present-day church, several questions must be resolved. They are: What is the significance of praying and prophesying? Where was the praying and prophesying occurring? and What was the head covering and its significance? Two approaches are often followed in interpreting the significance of praying and prophesying: the literal approach or the figurative approach involving synecdoche. As synecdoche they are understood as a part placed for the whole--to represent all worship. But no textual reason suggests that they need to be understood as anything but
literal. First, the activities of praying and prophesying were legitimate activities for men and women. Second, no other passage in Scripture uses those two terms to express worship. Prayer by itself may express worship since Jesus says His house is to be called a house of prayer (Mt. 21:13), yet this combination does not. Third, other activities express worship better than these. The communion service was a worship service. Why does Paul not mention it regarding the need for head covering since it is the very next problem he approaches? According to the fourth century document, "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles," communion was the one time women were to be covered. Finally, Paul's repeated emphasis upon those two activities suggests that they are to be understood literally. At those specific times women are to be covered. Since the gift of prophecy has ceased, public prayer remains as the one occasion when a woman performing it would be obligated to be covered.

The second question involves the place where the praying and prophesying occur. Nothing in this context

---

1 Some suggest that women took off the covering only when praying or prophesying to be like the men (to express their freedom and equality of Gal. 3:28), and thus Paul refers to those specific times. The custom of veiling could suggest such an interpretation; the passage does not. Gal. 3:28 does not imply that role differences have ceased, so it hardly meant that to them then. See chapter seven.


3 See Ch. 5 under "The Present Inactivity of the Prophetic Gift."
places these events within the local church. The reference to every man and every woman may suggest every situation. Also, the distinct break at verse seventeen suggests a difference between this and what was happening in the assembly at the Lord's Supper.

But in giving this instruction, I do not praise you, because you come together not for the better but for the worse. For, in the first place, when you come together as a church, I hear that divisions exist among you; and in part, I believe it (1 Cor. 11:17,18 NASB).

Within 1 Corinthians 11:17-14:40, Paul repeatedly refers to being "in the church," and "coming together." In verse eighteen he states that their division is the "first" of the assembly problems with which he will deal.

Further, the nature of prophecy itself, being that of edification, requires some kind of public situation. So it seems best at this point to regard this action as public, but not as necessarily congregational meetings. Grosheide holds this view since it avoids a conflict with chapter fourteen.¹ This writer does not see a conflict with chapter fourteen, even if it be regarded as a church service. That problem will be faced in the following chapter.

The third and final question involves the nature and significance of the head covering. This question itself breaks down into three subordinate questions: 1) What was the head covering of the New Testament times? 2) What did it signify? and 3) What is its relevance for present day

¹Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 252.
places these events within the local church. The reference to every man and every woman may suggest every situation. Also, the distinct break at verse seventeen suggests a difference between this and what was happening in the assembly at the Lord's Supper.

But in giving this instruction, I do not praise you, because you come together not for the better but for the worse. For, in the first place, when you come together as a church, I hear that divisions exist among you; and in part, I believe it (1 Cor. 11:17,18 NASB).

Within 1 Corinthians 11:17-14:40, Paul repeatedly refers to being "in the church," and "coming together." In verse eighteen he states that their division is the "first" of the assembly problems with which he will deal.

Further, the nature of prophecy itself, being that of edification, requires some kind of public situation. So it seems best at this point to regard this action as public, but not as necessarily congregational meetings. Grosheide holds this view since it avoids a conflict with chapter fourteen.\(^1\) This writer does not see a conflict with chapter fourteen, even if it be regarded as a church service. That problem will be faced in the following chapter.

The third and final question involves the nature and significance of the head covering. This question itself breaks down into three subordinate questions: 1) What was the head covering of the New Testament times? 2) What did it signify? and 3) What is its relevance for present day

\(^1\)Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 252.
Several opinions exist as to what kind of head covering Paul has reference to in 1 Corinthians eleven. Some would regard it as the hair itself which hangs down.\(^1\) Primarily this view is based on two factors. First, the phrase in verse four, κατὰ κεφαλὴν, is understood as referring to the hanging down of man's hair. Thus Paul would be saying that man's hair ought not to hang down when he prays. Second, the clause in verse fifteen, κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δέδοται, is understood as meaning hair has now replaced the artificial covering. Several truths make this view insufficient. First, if verse four refers to hair, several problems arise.\(^2\) The verse does not state what is "down from the head." But if it is hair, then does Paul mean man can have long hair, but he must put it up when he prays or prophesies? Second, in verse fifteen Paul is not describing the head covering, but is demonstrating the reasonableness of having woman wear the artificial covering. It is natural; it fits with the order of nature, Paul says. Further, ἀντὶ cannot imply in this context that hair replaces the head covering.\(^3\) Nothing in the passage suggests that Paul is

---


\(^2\)The grammatical limitations of this phrase where demonstrated by using the Old Testament at the beginning of this chapter under the analysis of verse four.

\(^3\)See the previous discussion of v. 15 within this chapter.
replacing the artificial covering with the natural covering. If ἀντί were implying that hair is the replacement, then the earlier verses do actually refer to an artificial covering and verse fifteen should clearly state that Paul is introducing something new as a covering. Verse fifteen does not suggest that at all.

A second view is somewhat the opposite of the first. It regards the covering as the hair put up. In other words, the head covering refers to a particular hair style—the hair put up upon the head in a "bun." Thus, to be covered was to have the hair up; to be uncovered was to let the hair hang down. Hurley's argument for this view hangs upon one Septuagint reading (Lev. 13:45) and a cultural presupposition. He presupposes that Paul would not violate culture. If Paul teaches the covering of women and the uncovering of men, then he allegedly would be rejecting Jewish and Old Testament worship customs for men and imposing Jewish worship customs upon all women. The support from the Septuagint is the use of the word ἀκατακάλυπτος (used in 1 Cor. 11:5). The Septuagint renders the Hebrew יִרְאוּ by means of ἀκατακάλυπτος (to loose or uncover). Because of the context Hurley says it means to loose. The verse reads: "As for the


2 Ibid., p. 195.
leper who has the infection, his clothes shall be torn, and the hair of his head shall be uncovered (disheveled), and he shall cover his mustache and cry 'Unclean! Unclean!'" (NASB).

Several factors demonstrate the fallacy of this view. First, this view relies on a very poor presupposition. Paul is neither opposing nor retaining culture. He is presenting God-ordained principles; he is not rejecting Old Testament teachings regarding the covering of Jewish men. Hurley, rather, is confusing rabbinic teaching with Old Testament truth. Further, nothing indicates that this rabbinic practice even existed in Paul's day. Nor was Paul imposing Jewish customs on the Gentile woman. Jewish custom involved public veiling; Paul does not teach that. Second, his view rests upon weak assumptions.¹ Hurley assumes that Paul had reference to this isolated usage in Leviticus and that Paul's readers would naturally think of it, as if it were part of a technical, familiar phrase.² Third, the Hebrew idea of "unbinding the head" as in Leviticus 13:45 is found three other times in the Old Testament. In Leviticus 10:6 and 21:10 the Septuagint translators rendered the same Hebrew phrase with τὴν κεφαλὴν οὐκ ἀποκιδαρώσει (21:10), which literally involved the removal of the κίδαρις which


²Hurley, "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women?", p. 198.
was a head dress, not hair. Hurley ignores these passages. The fourth passage (Num. 5:18), refers to the "water test" given to a woman accused of adultery. Here ἀκατακαλυπτος is not used either, but Hurley explains this as the result of no verb form for the adjective, ἀκατακαλυπτος. Even if that is true, the manifold translations of the Hebrew phrase cannot support his theory. The Hebrew and the Greek word involve an uncovering of the head, or a revealing or loosing of the head. Only the context provides the resultant idea of loose hair. In the context of 1 Corinthians 11, the idea of loose hair is not fitting at all. For if that be true, Paul must say in verse four that it is a shame for men to have long hair flowing down (κοτα ΚΕΦΑΛΗΣ) and in verse five it is likewise a shame for women to have long hair flowing down (ἈΚΑΤΑΚΑΛΥΠΤΩ). The different terms and the context demand opposite concepts.

The only consistent view is that the head covering of 1 Corinthians 11 was an artificial covering. There is no contextual reason to regard these as face veils, but only as that which is upon the head, since the significance of this passage concerns headship.

The question concerning the significance of the head covering can best be answered from 1 Corinthians 11. If the reasons Paul has given were because it would not be an

---

1 It is interesting that the positive verb form κατακαλύπτω always means to cover or to veil. (Isa. 6:2; 1 Cor. 11:6,7; Hermas, Vision 4,2,1). Never does it mean to put the hair up.
offense in the church or because it would help to win the lost, then it would sound as if it were culturally based, and then Paul would also encourage it to be worn everywhere in public. Such is not the case. Rather, the reasons are identified as because of man's headship, and because woman is the glory of man, and because she needs authority upon her head, and because of the angels. That hardly sounds cultural. The covering does show the headship of man. Yet it shows not so much the authority of man as it does woman's own derived authority. It seems unlikely that it would symbolize her subordination to man, otherwise it would not be specified as necessary when praying or prophesying but as necessary at all times, since her subordination is unending. More likely the head covering was given to hide man's glory in the presence of God and the angels. Since man is the glory (radiance and reflection) of God, he needs to keep uncovered before God (1 Corinthians 11:7); since woman is the glory of man, she needs to keep covered in the special times of speaking to God publically in prayer or speaking for God publically through prophecy. At this time when woman's service before God borders upon the area of man's

1Waltke believes it does symbolize her subordination. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," p. 53.

service (public praying and prophesying) woman must appear distinct and different from man (and man from woman). ¹

The third question brings the matter to its full significance: What is its relevance for the Christian woman today? Clearly the head covering finds its significance not in cultural practice, but in God's ordained roles for man and woman, roles which glorify Himself. For that reason the principles remain as long as the present order of creation is allowed by God to exist. Barclay seems to miss the point of 1 Corinthians 11 entirely.

It must always be remembered that this situation arose in Corinth, probably the most licentious city in the world. Paul's point of view was that in such a situation it was far better to err on the side of being too modest and too strict rather than to do anything which might either give the heathen a chance to criticize the Christians as being too lax or be a cause of temptation to the Christians themselves. It would be quite wrong to make this passage of universal application; it was intensely relevant to the Church of Corinth but it has nothing to do with whether or not women should wear hats in church at the present day. ²

If head covering was not part of Corinthian custom even then, and if it was because of immorality that Paul commands the covering, surely such reasons argue for its continuance, not against.

Long hair is a glory to woman and magnifies the Lord twenty-four hours a day. But Paul's logic of 1 Corinthians

¹These apparently are the only two religious functions where woman's activity comes close to man's.

11 does not suggest that it replaces the special covering at the special times of public praying and prophesying. Prophesying has ceased; but public praying is allowed by God. At that time, at least, Christian women need a special covering.

Paul never so much as hints what kind of a covering is needed, only that it must be upon the head. Though Paul's exclusion of any noun for this covering in verses four through thirteen made interpretation more difficult at times, it has spared successive generations and cultures the stigma of an archaic, foreign covering. The covering used today need not be foreign to one's own culture. Whatever shows the headship of man and the glory of the woman, should be used. A hat or shawl or something else of similar significance would glorify God.
CHAPTER VII

THE NEW TESTAMENT PERSPECTIVE ON WOMAN

This chapter will compile the New Testament data in the light of the exegesis of First Corinthians 11:12-16. First, it will relate First Corinthians eleven to Galatians 3:28. This "Magna Carta" for feminism must carefully be studied and then related to First Corinthians eleven. Second, the relation between First Corinthians eleven and fourteen will be established. The teaching of silence in chapter fourteen does not contradict the rights given in chapter eleven. Third, the ministry restrictions of First Timothy two and Titus two will be collated with the rights of First Corinthians eleven. Fourth, Colossians three, Ephesians five, and First Peter three, which set forth the so-called haustafeln (household tables), will be evaluated with First Corinthians eleven. Last, the other New Testament texts which have a bearing upon woman’s role will be noted and evaluated.

I. The Relation of Galatians 3 to 1 Corinthians 11

In order to evaluate properly the message of Galatians 3:28 regarding woman's role, these points will be

\[1\] Jewett, Male and Female, p. 142.
noted: 1) the claims for Galatians 3:28; 2) the context of Galatians 3:28; 3) the analysis of Galatians 3:28; and, 4) the significance of Galatians 3:28.

The Claims for Galatians 3:28

Galatians 3:28 is often regarded as the key text concerning the New Testament teaching on woman. Within this brief allusion to woman is seen the foundation structure of the New Testament teaching on woman.¹

For all are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have clothed yourselves with Christ; therein is neither Jew nor Greek, therein is neither slave nor free man, therein is not male and female; for you all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:26-28, writer's literal rendering).

Scanzoni and Hardesty regard this as the one New Testament passage on woman which can be heeded, for it is within a theological context. All other passages are practical in scope and so are concerned with "maintaining the cultural status quo."² This passage, they say, sets forth doctrine; all others deal with particular situations which often are not fitted for the present. Thus, this one passage must receive primary consideration. Is it indeed different from all others? Is its teaching more universal? Is the doctrine which is taught here the doctrine of egalitarianism? The text must be allowed to speak for itself.

¹For example, see Mollenkott's forward in Jewett's, Male and Female, p. 12; and Jewett, Ibid., p. 142; and Scanzoni and Hardesty, All We're Meant To Be, p. 204.

²Scanzoni and Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be, p. 71.
The Context of Galatians 3:28

Paul's single-minded purpose for writing the Epistle to the Galatians was to demonstrate the superiority of the gospel of grace to the works of the law. In chapters one and two Paul stresses that his message, the message of the gospel of grace, is not inferior to the message of law proclaimed by the Judaizers (1:6-2:14). He then proceeds to proclaim this message of grace. The salvation which it provides is in every way superior to the works of the law (2:15-4:31). Lastly, he speaks concerning liberty. The liberty of grace far surpasses the bondage of the law (5:1-6:10). Even though Paul often compares the works of the law with the work of grace, there is no comparison. This Paul himself clearly shows in Galatians 1:6-9 where he emphatically states that there is only one gospel. Yet he uses the rhetoric of comparison to reason with those who had been influenced by legalism.

The immediate context for verse 28 involves the extended passage of Galatians 3:21-4:7. Within these verses Paul proclaims the change from slavery under the law to sonship through the gospel of Christ. Even the child who is heir of all, while he is under tutors, is like a slave (4:1-7). The law was man's spiritual tutor to restrain his sin, to withhold his freedom, and to cause him to hunger and thirst for the gospel and so the liberty of Christ (3:21-25). All are made sons, regardless of nationality, social status or sex (3:26-29). Verse 22 states that the Scripture has
shut up τὰ πάντα (all things) under sin in order that the gospel might be given to all who believe. τὰ πάντα\(^1\) does not merely refer to all men, or all people, and it surely does not refer to impersonal things. Evidently it refers to the classes identified in verse 28. All of these groups were under the hold of sin. The gospel frees all (Jew and Greek, male and female) from the hold of sin and law.

The Analysis of Galatians 3:28

Galatians 3:28 contains three sets of contrasting groups which all become one in Christ. This relation to Christ is described in verse 27 as being baptized into Christ and clothed with Christ. Paul used the conjunction οὐδὲ to connect each of the first two pairs, but he changes to καί for the last pair. The unexpected change to καί may indicate that Paul is quoting this phrase from the Septuagint at Genesis 1:27. The phrase ἀρσεν καὶ θηλυ (male and female) not only is identical with the Greek Old Testament, but also with the gospel record of Christ’s quotation of Genesis 1:27 (Mt. 19:4; Mk. 10:6). The form probably unites the phrase with Genesis one. Yet, other things as well distinguish the first two pairs (Jew and Greek; slave and free man) from the third (male and female). The first two describe national and social conditions which arose after and as a consequence of the Fall. The third involves the

\(^1\)See the discussion of τὰ πάντα at 1 Cor. 11:12 in the previous chapter, and cf. Col. 3:8.
distinction God Himself introduced at the time of creation. The significance of this will be demonstrated shortly.

Paul says that these all have known the consequences of sin (v. 22), and now these all can know the total redeeming work of Christ and be baptized into Christ to become one.

The Significance of Galatians 3:28

Several important observations need to be presented. First, it is noteworthy that the phrase, male and female, relates back to Genesis one. Genesis one states that God's image, His perfect plan, involves male and female; Galatians three says that in redemption there is no male and female. Now if Galatians three had voided Genesis two or three, feminists would have justification for appealing to Galatians 3:28 as teaching feminism. But the removal of Genesis 1:26-27 would be a hindrance to their argument. Nevertheless, Galatians three annihilates nothing, not even Genesis one. For it does not deal at all with role or societal relationships as feminists propose. Galatians three does not abolish sex distinctions within life. What it does is to place both male and female equally into Christ's redemption, making them both sons (υἱοί) and heirs.¹

The change from οὐδέ to καί for this third set results from more than a direct quotation of Genesis 1:27.

¹Compare 1 Peter 3:7.
The first two sets are social and so are alterable. The third is natural, that is, it is part of God's creation plan, and so is unalterable. Thus the parallel often made between slavery and woman's subordinate role\(^1\) is not congruous, as this passage helps to demonstrate. To suppose that since one opposes slavery he should also oppose the subordinate role of woman is unfounded, as even this passage suggests by keeping the sets grammatically distinct. That difference was immediately understood by the New Testament churches. Though a Jewish man was thankful that he was not a woman, he was likewise thankful that he was not a goy (gentile) or a slave. Their contempt of the gentiles was notorious. Yet in the early church slaves and gentiles possessed equal roles with Jews. That was not so with women. Their role was part of creation and unalterable. Both Paul and the New Testament church understood the principle.

Third, the context of Galatians does not support egalitarianism which feminists so strongly imply. Nothing in Galatians outside of this verse speaks concerning woman's role or equality. Though this passage may be doctrinal, it is not speaking concerning the doctrine of woman. It is speaking of the doctrines of justification and sonship. It does not reach to societal relationships. Not that these are unimportant to Paul, but, because they are insignificant to the subject at hand, they are omitted. This passage

\(^1\)Jewett, *Male and Female*, pp. 138f.
speaks to spiritual relationships. It does not remove slavery from society, yet it gives the slave a new liberty within it. It does not remove woman's role, yet it likewise gives her a new liberty. Nor does this verse remove all leadership from the New Testament church.\(^1\) Leaders were God-ordained and were to be followed. To regard Galatians 3:28 as the primary passage for what the New Testament teaches on woman, is to fall into the trap of using a "proof-text."

One may better understand the significance of the mention of male and female in Galatians 3:28 by comparing a parallel passage. Paul makes a similar declaration in Colossians 3:11. It reads:

where there is not Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, Barbarian, Sythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all things and in all (writer's literal rendering).

Here, Paul likewise speaks of the new position in Christ--the believer's condition as a "new man." Paul includes all the societal distinctions which are in Galatians and even adds a few more. But the omission of the male/female set is glaring. Could Paul have forgotten? Did Paul change his mind in this later epistle? The best answer must be the one which considers the contextual differences.

In Colossians Paul is speaking of the believer's position as a new man in Christ. It is personal. In Galatians the contextual background is more extensive, involving

---

\(^1\)Compare Heb. 13:17; 1 Thess. 5:12-13; 1 Peter 5:1-5.
the conflict of law and grace. The key may lie in verse 27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have clothed yourselves with Christ." The oneness of which Paul speaks in verse 28 is realized through the baptism into Christ's body. Paul might even be stressing the superiority of the gospel of Christ over Judaism by enunciating the initiatory rites which are involved. Circumcision included only the males; baptism involves both male and female.¹ This may explain why Paul includes the unusual phrase in Galatians whereas he omits it in Colossians.

Galatians 3:28 does not contradict 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. Paul is consistent and clear. He does not despise nor put down woman. In the eternal realm man and woman are one; both are sons and equal heirs with Christ. But in the Sitz im Leben, woman remains in a distinct role throughout all time. God's revelation from the time of creation has made this clear; Galatians 3:28 says nothing further about woman's role.

II. The Relation of 1 Corinthians 14 to 1 Corinthians 11

The study of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 will begin with a consideration of the textual question and then will proceed to its contextual setting. Thirdly, its teaching will be presented. Some proposals for harmonizing 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 will be discussed last.

¹Ryrie, Women in the Church, pp. 70-71.
These verses which restrict the leadership of women and demand their silence in the church have quite expectedly come under attack. Walker lists five reasons for considering them a post-Pauline gloss rather than words from Paul.

The arguments include the following: (a) the passage appears to contradict 1 Cor. 11:2-16, where it is clear that women do have the right to speak in Christian assemblies; (b) the verses break the context of ch. 14, which deals with the regulation of glossalalia and prophetic activity in assemblies; (c) Codex Claromontanus (D) and certain related Western MSS have vss. 34-35 at the close of ch. 14, which suggests that they may have originated as a marginal gloss and been inserted later into the text at different places; (d) the appeal to the law as authority in vs. 34 sounds un-Pauline; and (e) the idea is very similar to that of 1 Tim. 2:11-12, which suggests that the verses are a gloss originating from a circle such as that which produced the Pastoral. 1

Walker's arguments are very subjective. His first two arguments which state that verses 34 and 35 contradict Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 and likewise here in the context of chapter 14, involve the heart of this subject, so they will be answered within the discussion. The fourth argument, that Paul would not appeal to the law, finds the elementary answer which it needs within this very chapter. Paul had only a few verses earlier (vv. 21,22) appealed to the law to manifest the purpose of tongues. Walker's last argument for rejecting the Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 appears prejudiced indeed. Every reader who believes in the inspiration of Scripture and so the Pauline authorship of

---

the Pastorals must likewise, from that argument, see these two verses as from Paul. The only argument of merit involves the textual variations. Yet even here the evidence against the genuineness of this reading is minute. Only a few Greek and Latin manuscripts (D F G 88* itar,d,e,f,g) transpose these two verses to follow verse 40.¹ These manuscripts are chiefly of one text type—the Western. The massive number of manuscripts support the normal reading with both the earliest (Alexandrian) and the later (Byzantine) manuscripts opposing these few manuscripts. The transposing of these two verses within only several among many extant manuscripts (many of which are certainly older and more reliable) does not argue for non-Pauline authorship. Rather, as Metzger states, "such scribal alterations represent attempts to find a more appropriate location in the context for Paul's directive concerning women."²

The Context of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35

The context for these two verses involves the extended passage of chapters twelve to fourteen. The theme is immediately introduced. Paul states in verse one of chapter twelve: "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." In chapter twelve Paul proclaims the universal giving of the Holy Spirit Himself and of His

²Ibid.
gifts to each believer. These gifts were given to meet the needs of the entire body of God's people.

In chapter thirteen Paul shifts from the emphasis upon spiritual gifts to the fruit of the Spirit--to love. At Corinth many of the believers were envious of the spectacular gifts, especially the gift of tongues. In order to counter that problem Paul proclaims to them the diversity of the gifts and the necessity of each gift to the body as seen in chapter twelve. Now in chapter thirteen Paul shows the superiority of the fruit of the Spirit even to the phenomenal sign gifts. The fruit is better because of its nature and because of its endurance.

In chapter fourteen Paul repeatedly stresses the advantages of the gift of prophecy to the gift of tongues. The gift to be desired is prophecy, not tongues (vv. 1-12, 39). The gift of tongues should not be used to confuse people (vv. 13-19). Third, the gift of tongues is meant to be a sign (vv. 20-25). Then, Paul pronounces the limitations to be placed upon these two gifts when they are expressed. First, he prescribes the limitations for tongues (vv. 26-28), and then, immediately preceding the two verses under consideration, he speaks concerning the nature of prophecy and the limitations for expressing it (vv. 29-33). Following the two verses concerning women, Paul makes several concluding comments about the two gifts.
The Teaching of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35

Verses 34 and 35 read:

Let (or make) the women keep silent in the churches, for it is not permitted them to speak; but let them subordinate themselves, as also the law says. Now if they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands (men) at home, for it is shameful for a woman to speak in church (author's literal rendering).

Several suggestions commonly appear as to what these verses teach. One such teaching would be that this passage demands the absolute silence of women in the church. They must not speak; they must be silent. Another teaching says that the passage disallows the use of the gifts of tongues or prophecy in the church by women and, thus, logically forbids teaching or preaching by women. It proposes that verses 34 and 35 provide one more stipulation to be placed upon the exercise of the gifts of tongues and prophecy, even though it is not listed directly with the other stipulations.

Though these interpretations possess significant merit, this writer sees something different here. He sees the prohibition as specifically directed to one problem—the judging of the prophets. Though women were allowed by the Spirit to prophesy, they were forbidden from judging the other prophets. The evidence for this interpretation lies within the context. In order to understand the text, the immediate context must be noted carefully. It reads:

And let two or three prophets speak, and let the others pass judgment. But if a revelation is made to another who is seated, let the first keep silent. For you can all prophecy one by one, so that all may learn and all may be exhorted; and the spirits of prophets are subject
to prophets; for God is not a God of confusion but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints (1 Cor. 14:29-33 NASB; emphasis mine).

Verse 29 more than any other New Testament verse describes the New Testament act of prophesying within the apostolic churches. Only several prophets were allowed to speak during any one service. What is often overlooked is the practice of judging the prophecy.

The word which is used for "to judge" (διακρίνω) appears to have become a technical term. It can be translated to judge, distinguish, or assess,¹ and it became the normal term for expressing the judgment made of the prophet. Beside the verb usage here the noun form (διακρίσις) is used in chapter twelve. The one Spirit who gave gifts to the early church gave to one member prophecy and to another "discerning of spirits". The placing of prophecy and the assessing of spirits together in 1 Corinthians 12:10 also suggests the union of these two gifts. As tongues had its interpreter, so prophecy had its assessor. First Corinthians 12:10 reads: "to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues."

The Didache written several generations later speaks

concerning church prophets as was explained in chapter five.\(^1\) Though it distorts the New Testament teaching concerning prophets, it does refer to the practice of assessing or examining the prophet. The Didache instructed the churches not to test nor to examine (διακρίνω) the prophet (11:8).\(^2\)

Similarly, First Thessalonians five may refer to the same assessing ministry since it reads: "Do not despise prophetic utterances. But examine (δοκιμάζω) everything carefully; hold fast to that which is good" (1 Thess. 5:20, 21 NASB).

The question concerning who performed this ministry is important to this analysis. This ministry of judging or assessing the prophets may have been practiced by those who had the special gift of discerning the spirits (1 Cor. 12:10), or as the grammar of 1 Corinthians 14:29 suggests, this assessment may have often been performed by the prophets themselves. The prophet who was speaking appears to have been assessed by the prophets who were listening. The phrase reads: κοι ὁι ᾖλλοι διακρίνετωσαν ("and let the others judge"). The use of ᾖλλοι favors the concept that the judges are from the same class as those prophesying.

The ministry of διακρίνω is not precisely identified. The word itself allows two possible ideas: that of

---

\(^1\) See "The Present Inactivity of the Prophetic Gift."

\(^2\) Lake, Apostolic Fathers, I, 326,27.
judgment and that of evaluation. Both connotations are fitting with the act of prophesying and so may explain the choice of this word over ἐκπίστευμα or another word. First, a judgment had to be made as to whether the prophecy was from God or not (1 Cor. 12:10). Second, its message needed to be evaluated as to how it fit into the body of truth. Its meaning needed to be explained. The reference to learning in verse 31 suggests this evaluation.

Into this context verses 34 and 35 appear, teaching the silence of women. For many commentators these verses do not fit the context well and so are labelled parenthetical.¹ Apparently, even for a few ancient scribes these verses did not seem to fit, so they transposed them to follow verse 40.²

Several of the words which are used in verses 29-33 are repeated in verses 34-35, suggesting a close relation. Both passages speak of the need for silence (σιγάω) in certain situations. More meaningfully both speak concerning learning (μαθήματα). Verse 31 reads: "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn. . . ." It seems significant to this writer that Paul uses the verb μαθήματα rather than διδάσκω. Learning rather than teaching, and questions rather than lectures are the topics of discussion.


²See above, "The text of 1 Cor. 14:34-35."
Paul in verse 31 is not seeking to find a method in order that all may teach. The Word of God is demanding restrained prophecy and proper assessment that a godly order and pattern might prevail and learning may occur (vv. 31-33,40). Those who were examining (διακρίνω) by their questions and evaluations were providing the teaching element. In this setting women were, then, told to keep silent and to ask their questions at home.

If women possessed the prophetic gift as chapter eleven implies and were allowed to exercise it in the local assembly, they may have felt that they like their male counterparts also had the right of διακρίσις. Paul says no. The prophesying did not involve teaching or authority;¹ the judging or questioning of the prophet did. Though Robertson and Plummer do not suggest a technical sense for the assessing, yet they do note the authoritative problem involved in questioning. They write:

The women might argue that they did not always understand the prophesying: might they not ask for an explanation. Asking to be taught was not self-assertion but submissiveness. But the Apostle will not allow this: questions may be objections to what is preached, or even contradictions of it.²

The prohibition applies to women taking part in the assessment and discussion on what the prophets have said. The prohibition is against the women interacting with the men.

¹See chapter five under "The Nature of Prophecy."
²Robertson and Plummer, First Corinthians, p. 325.
The advantages of this interpretation are clearly twofold. It first harmonizes chapters 11 and 14 without straining the text of chapter 11. More significantly it harmonizes verses 34 and 35 with its own context. It may be that confusion abounds at 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 due to the nature of these events which have been unfamiliar to the church for many centuries. When prophecy ceased so did the διάκρισις of the prophet and his message and so did the understanding of this passage. As the gift of tongues was very obscure to Chrysostom (Homilies XXIX,1) only a few centuries after the apostolic age,¹ so also may be the situation in verses 34 and 35 regarding the assessing of the prophets and woman's silence in relation to it.

Another question which should be considered concerns whether or not the silence commanded of women could be the last of several stipulations which Paul places upon tongues-speaking and prophesying. The strength of this interpretation apparently proceeds from the presupposition that women did not possess (and thus were not to practice) the gifts of tongues or prophesying.

Three things cause this writer to reject this interpretation and to favor the one that has already been presented. First, the New Testament demonstrates that prophesying is not incongruous with woman's role. First Corinthians 11 forcefully implies that women could pray and prophesy.

¹Chrysostom, Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians, XII, 168.
publically. Second, this interpretation does not account for the manner in which the context is developed. Verses 34 and 35 seem as if they should have come earlier in the development, or else the other stipulations should have come later.

Third, it should be observed that this text does not begin with ἀκόμη or any other conjunction.¹ The closest verse in the preceding context to correspond to this asyndeton is verse 27. There the limitations or restrictions upon tongues and prophecy begin to be enumerated. As the limitations continue throughout the verses, they all begin with ἀκόμη, γάρ, or καί (vv. 28-33). Thus, it seems from the grammar that verse 34 is not simply giving another limitation upon tongues or prophecy.

A further consideration in the analysis of verses 34 and 35 involves the silence of which it speaks. Could it refer to absolute silence rather than to a precisely defined silence involving διάκρισις? Nowhere else does Scripture demand the absolute silence of women in the church. Since Paul within this verse refers his readers back to the law, surely what Paul is teaching is congruous with Old Testament practices. But not much is to be found. Possibly Hannah's prayer in the temple can be instructive (1 Sam. 1:10-19). Though the event does not refer to a service it was a time

¹Some would include the end of verse 33 with verse 34, which says, "as in all the churches of the saints." Either way no conjunction begins the passage.
of worship (cf. v. 19). And though it does not say women normally prayed audibly the implication is there (v. 13). Eli thought Hannah was drunk since he could not hear her even though her lips moved.

More convincing is the argument of the context itself. Verse 35 is a further development of the thought of verse 34 as the δέ (now) shows. It relates the silence to the learning situation as opposed to every situation. Godet seeks to minimize this idea by stating that the presence of εἰ with δέ here involves gradation, not simply explanation. Thus, he would translate this: "And even if they would learn something, they ought to abstain from asking in the congregation."¹ He thus gives to εἰ δέ the idea of concession and climacteric—"even if" or "although."² His point is that even in the most noble of situations—the desire to learn God's truth—woman is to be silent in the church. Thus, he says verse 34 is much more extensive, demanding silence from woman in teaching and prophesying. To demand εἰ δέ as concessive is wrong. With καὶ, εἰ normally has that idea but not with δέ. Paul's use of δέ (now) to begin verse 35 favors the idea that he is providing further explanation to the meaning of verse 34. Woman is to be silent in the learning activity of διάκρισις.

¹Godet, Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, p. 312.
Another aspect to consider in determining the teaching of this passage involves Paul's reference to the law. Paul says women are not permitted to speak, but are to subordinate themselves as the law says. The meaning of "the law" is significant. Some, including the feminist, Patricia Gundry, state that Paul has reference to the rabbinical teachings, not the Old Testament. That statement is significant since it proposes that Paul appeals to customs or human authority rather than divine authority. Granted, it is difficult to locate the Old Testament source. What is also amazing is that the rabbinic source cited is hardly more meaningful than some Old Testament passages which could easily be mentioned. The Talmudic passage Gundry cites reads as follows: "Our rabbis taught: All are qualified to be among the seven who read, even a minor and a woman, only the Sages said that a woman should not read in the Torah out of respect for the congregation." To make Paul's usage of the word "law" refer to the oral law of the Pharisees based on that reading is unjustifiable. More exegetically sound and more Scriptural is the procedure of checking the context first. In this very chapter Paul appeals to "the law" for another argument. Verse 21 reads: "In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear.

---


2 The Babylonian Talmud, Vol. 9 (Megillah 23a), p. 140.
me, saith the Lord." Since Paul makes a direct quotation in verse 21, the source is easily identified from the Old Testament. He is not quoting from the books of Moses but from Isaiah 28:11 and following. Thus, why should anyone expect the reading to which Paul refers in verse 34 to be outside the Old Testament? His usage in verse 21 opens up the entire Old Testament for its source. Often Genesis 3:16 is regarded as the source of this Old Testament command to subordination.¹ The account of woman's creation in chapter two could also be cited,² since Paul has used that passage so often to present woman's role. If indeed Paul were referring to Genesis two or three, he would hardly need to cite the source again since he just mentioned it in chapter eleven. Further, the possibility that Paul is referring to the tenor of the entire Old Testament need not be excluded.

Some Proposals for Harmonizing 1 Corinthians 11 and 14

Many views on how 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and 14:34, 35 are to be harmonized have been proposed.³ Most possess


the weakness of seeking to explain chapter eleven in the light of chapter fourteen without giving due regard to chapter eleven. For three reasons such a procedure is indirect and liable to error. First, the earlier passage, chapter eleven, by its position would suggest its priority and so Paul's development thereon. Second, of these two passages chapter eleven speaks far more explicitly regarding woman's role and service than does chapter fourteen. Third, the contextual problems of relating verses 34 and 35 to the rest of chapter fourteen weaken any dogmatic statements concerning its own teaching. Chapter fourteen should be considered in the light of chapter eleven.

Those views which suggest that Paul had a hangover of rabbinic thought, or that Paul forgot or changed his mind hardly merit comment. Paul clearly knew and let it be known that his authority was God. Within these verses Paul states that the things he writes are the Lord's commandments (14:37). Hardly could someone familiar with Paul's writings assume that he was inconsistent or illogical.

One view which finds common acceptance among those who allow women to teach or preach in the public service


1Views cited and opposed by Ryrie, "Is There Really a Reason for Not Ordaining Women?" p. 43.

2These ideas are opposed by Martin, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," p. 231.
proposes that the word \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega \) does not refer to orderly speaking but to **chatter** and whispering. Thus, chapter fourteen allegedly would not prohibit women from orderly preaching, but from disruptive calling to their husbands or whispering among themselves. In classical Greek \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega \) commonly refers to chatter or babble.\(^1\) Yet throughout the New Testament it means to speak. Only when it is used of inanimate things is its meaning different. Even then personification is used, so that \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega \) is still "speaking." The thunder sounds its voice (Rev. 10:3,4); the blood of Abel speaks (Heb. 12:24); the voice as a trumpet speaking, speaks to John (Rev. 4:1). Of the 295 occurrences of \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega \) in the New Testament\(^2\) none suggest the idea of chatter.\(^3\)

In First Corinthians fourteen alone, \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega \) occurs 24 times. In verses seven through nine, where Paul could use \( \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \omega \) with inanimate objects, he avoids using it. Every time it is used in this chapter it refers to speaking. Thus, there is no substantial lexical reason for considering the usage in verses 34 and 35 as chatter. Since the context likewise does not suggest such an idea (along with 1 Tim. 2:12) the case is feeble.

One proposal which seeks to harmonize chapters

\(^1\)Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 464.


\(^3\)The only passage which could imply chatter would be 1 Cor. 13:11: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, ..."
eleven and fourteen accurately points out that the silence demanded of women in chapter fourteen is within the church, whereas the prophesying of women in chapter eleven is not expressly stated as occurring within the church. Thus, the two chapters are harmonized by allowing women to prophesy but not in the church assemblies. Hodge concludes then that Paul is prohibiting the public exercise of this gift by women.\footnote{Charles Hodge, An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 305.} Without question, chapter fourteen refers to the church assemblies as verses 33, 34, and 35 state. The situation in chapter eleven is not so clear. Not once is ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ used in 11:2-16. But when Paul begins to discuss the Lord’s Supper in 11:17 he immediately places it as ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (v. 18) and five times he refers to them "coming together" (συνερχόμενοι—vv. 17, 18, 20, 33, 34). Further, in verse 18 he states that their division is the "first" of the assembly problems with which he will deal.

In the face of these contrasts it still appears necessary to regard chapter eleven as occurring publically rather than privately. The contrasts between the chapters do not suggest situations which are in the church (ch. 14) and in the home (ch. 11). Rather they suggest in the church (ch. 14) and in every situation (ch. 11). Paul is dealing with universal truths in chapter 11. He is dealing with the ontological differences between men and women. His
reference to every man and every woman (v. 3) suggests every situation. Further, the very nature of prophecy demands a situation which is something other than private. It seems necessary to regard the events of 11:2-16 as public, but not as necessarily ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, as referring to every situation not only the church situation. The difference is one of degree. Thus, chapter 14 is not an exception to chapter eleven involving the church assemblies. Chapter fourteen is one important, specific situation included within the "every situation" of chapter eleven. To say that Paul prohibits all public prophecy and prayer by women does not seem to be the best approach for harmonizing chapters eleven and fourteen.

A popular view proposes that chapter eleven does not approve of women prophesying, but that Paul is skirting the issue until the appropriate time, chapter fourteen.¹ This view proceeds from chapter fourteen, making the prohibition the norm and the permission of chapter eleven the exception.² As Ryrie says: "When he does come to the place in the epistle where he speaks his mind on that particular subject, he lays down a strict prohibition against women speaking at all."³ If women did speak at Corinth in the public

---

¹Ryrie, Women in the Church, p. 78, and Ryrie, "Is There Really a Reason for Not Ordaining Women?", p. 43.
²Ryrie, Women in the Church, pp. 76-77.
³Ibid., p. 77. Also see S. Lewis Johnson, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Wycliffe Bible Com-
service it was the exception\(^1\) and it was wrong.\(^2\) Robertson and Plummer go further by suggesting the possibility that the prophesying of chapter eleven was only hypothetical.\(^3\) Maybe Paul had not even considered that it could actually happen. In this manner this view harmonizes chapters eleven and fourteen by declaring the prophesying of chapter eleven to be either hypothetical or wrong, and thus by fittingly prohibiting women from speaking in tongues, prophesying or teaching, when in the church assembly.

The weakness of this view is that it minimizes the prophetic gift of women which chapter eleven does not do. Not only does chapter eleven sound as if women were doing it, Paul says nothing there to discourage it. Rather he praises them for their practices (v. 2). The main point of First Corinthians eleven is not merely head coverings but the distinction between the sexes. If prophesying was wrong for women in the early church, Paul's teaching on the distinction of the sexes could have been greatly enhanced by stating: men may prophesy, women may not. Likewise, since this was one of the two specific times the covering was required, the specific guidelines become confused, if

---

\(^1\)Ryrie, *Women in the Church*, p. 78.

\(^2\)Ryrie, "Is There Really a Reason for Not Ordaining Women?", p. 43.

\(^3\)Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, pp. 324-25.
prophesying by women was wrong or non-existent. Paul does not disapprove of Spirit-directed prophesying as long as the women are covered. In fact, he implies that both the covering of the head at such a time, and the command to be silent have the support of universal practice (11:16 and 14:33b). Shore in Ellicott's Commentary likewise demonstrates the logical weakness of this position.

It has been suggested by some writers that the command in chapter 14:34 does forbid the practice which is here assumed to be allowable only for the sake of argument; but surely St. Paul would not have occupied himself and his readers here with the elaborate, and merely forensic discussion of the conditions under which certain functions were to be performed which he was about subsequently to condemn, as not allowable under any restrictions what ever?

The view which this writer sees as necessary after exegeting chapter eleven is that Paul is genuinely dealing with a real situation. He is not laboring to correct a catastrophic problem involving the head covering. But he is taking the opportunity to teach the significance of that covering—the role differences of men and women. The gift of prophecy had been given to and was practiced by Corinthian women. The prohibition applies only to women taking part in the assessment and discussion on what the prophets

---


had said. The prohibition is against the women interacting with the men. The New Testament prophetic gift did not place one person over another. It was open to the scrutiny of all. Thus to allow women to prophesy in the assembly did not violate Paul's later admonition for women not to teach or to exercise authority over men.

Since the gift of prophecy is inoperative during the present age, the particular problem spoken of in chapter fourteen is also absent today. Yet, though the judging of the prophet has ceased, the principle of silence demonstrated there continues because of the more inclusive teaching contained in First Timothy two. The full extent of the silence which has been placed upon women in the church will be discussed presently.

III. The Relation of 1 Timothy 2 and Titus 2 to 1 Corinthians 11

These two Pauline epistles have much in common. They both were written to close fellow workers of Paul. These workers, Timothy and Titus, served as Paul's assistants representing him in the churches at Ephesus and on Crete. These two letters were written late in Paul's ministry and are called Pastoral Epistles, for they give advice to pastors. Similarly, they both have received severe attack by liberal critics. The basis for that attack,

\[1\text{Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple, pp. 155f.}\]
however, has been almost completely internal and thus sub-
jective. Those who accept the inerrancy of God's Word have
no reason to question the authenticity of these two epis-
tles. Those who do, already have another authority and will
not consider the Biblical data of this entire dissertation.

This section will present the material under two
parts: the context and the teaching. The study will focus
upon First Timothy 2:9-15 with Titus 2 used as a supplement.

The Context

The purpose for and the theme of First Timothy is
most clearly seen in chapter three. In verse fifteen Paul
writes to Timothy: "I write so that you may know how one
ought to conduct himself in the household of God, which is
the church of the living God, the pillar and support of the
truth" (NASB). Thus, the book concerns church order. That
order includes: doctrine (ch. 1); worship of men and women
(ch. 2); church officers (ch. 3); handling of false teachers
(ch. 4); care of all members (ch. 5); and, care which the
minister must give to his own life (ch. 6).

Paul begins chapter two by stressing the need for
earnest prayer. He concludes by admonishing the men to join
together in universal, harmonious prayer. Then verses 9-15
read:

Likewise, I want women to adorn themselves with proper
clothing, modestly and discreetly, not with braided hair
and gold or pearls or costly garments; but rather by
means of good works, as befits women making a claim to
godliness. Let a woman quietly receive instruction with
entire submissiveness. But I do not allow a woman to
teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet. For it was Adam who was first created, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into transgression. But she shall be preserved through the bearing of children if the women continue in faith and love and sanctity with self restraint (NASB).

It appears from the context that Paul is speaking regarding woman's role in the church. Such an understanding of the verses accords with the purpose and theme of the book. Paul says that this order involves the silence of women in the church. He makes no qualifying comments such as: "because of the present situation," or "due to the customs in Ephesus." The principle appears universal and timeless. Nevertheless, Langley calls this and other passages like it "isolated quotes" and would appeal to the examples of Phoebe (Rom. 16:1,2) and Priscilla (Acts 18:26) as normative and thus less isolated. Likewise Gundry writes: "All evidence that women did preach and teach in the early church is ignored in order to so apply this passage." These feminists who cry "proof-text" interpretation are those who do it the most. They do it by rejecting the many clear, obvious contexts in favor of one or two historical allusions. First Timothy two is an obvious and clear didactic passage regarding woman. Gundry here, as in each of the previous didactic passages, draws a red herring across the passage to divert attention and so to weaken the force of the


2Gundry, Woman Be Free!, p. 74.
teaching regarding women. She raises some technicality and then considers the passage as inadmissible evidence. With this passage the diversion is verse fifteen. Since one cannot be certain as to the meaning of "saved through child-bearing," she proposes that one can ignore the teaching of the preceding six verses.

Some regard these verses as a prohibition not against female leadership but against false female leadership. Scanzoni and Hardesty state that even though Paul says that he permits no women to teach, "in the early church many members, including women, had this gift and exercised it. The primary concern here is not so much the role of women as the possibility of false teaching." If these verses were found in chapter four where Paul deals with false teachers their point might have been well made. Being found in chapter two as they are, Paul's comments regarding woman concern her role in the assembly. Though Eve's easy deception is one of Paul's arguments for woman's silence in chapter two, it is not the basis for his discussion.

The Teaching

Paul passes from his admonition regarding men to his admonition for women with the word "likewise." The comparison, however, does not lie with the idea that as men are to

1Ibid., pp. 74-75.
2Scanzoni and Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be, pp. 70-71.
pray in public so women are to pray in public.\(^\text{1}\) The parallel is obvious in the grammar; the infinitives show the parallel.\(^\text{2}\) Like Paul wants men to pray properly, so he wants women to adorn themselves properly. Both are to manifest godliness (vv. 2, 8, 10, 15). A very important part of a woman's service for the Lord involves her appearance and her conduct (vv. 9-10). In speaking of woman's dress and hair, Paul provides no supporting reasons. He does not base it on culture, Old Testament pattern, or creation order. All he says is that it is fitting of godliness.

A second teaching is introduced by the omission of any connective to catch the attention of the reader.\(^\text{3}\) Unequivocally Paul states that women are to be silent in the worship of the church. Literally the Greek reads: "Let women learn in silence in all subordination" (v. 11). Immediately the extent of this silence again takes precedence in the consideration. Is this absolute silence? Verse 12 speaks regarding the nature of this silence and thus provides the principle for determining its extent. Verse twelve literally reads: "And I do not permit a woman to teach nor to have authority over man, but to be in silence." Paul's specific application of that silence involves

\(^\text{1}\)Ibid., p. 76.


\(^\text{3}\)Ibid., p. 561.
teaching and exercise of authority over man. The realm of silence involves the positioning of woman over man in the church. She may not teach him; she may not lead him. Thus, this silence does not deny women the opportunity of singing or sharing praise. It is not absolute. Likewise it does not deny the non-authoritative prophesying of First Corinthians eleven.

It has thus become the accomplishment of First Corinthians fourteen to relate First Corinthians eleven to First Timothy two. Teaching is premeditated, authoritative speech; the New Testament prophetic gift was not. So the prophetic gift was not forbidden by First Timothy 2:11,12. The assessment of the prophecy by women, forbidden in First Corinthians fourteen, would likewise be forbidden in First Timothy two.

Paul grounds his argument for woman's silence upon two reasons. These reasons likewise demonstrate that the silence of which Paul speaks is not absolute, but is a silence which stops all authoritative leadership and teaching by woman where it would involve man. Paul's first reason is in verse 13: "For (γυναῖκα) Adam was first formed, then Eve." Again Paul is consistent and unequivocal as to the reason for woman's submissive role. It lies in creation. But here, in the context of woman not ruling or teaching man, Paul marshalls a new argument. "And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell
into transgression" (NASB).\(^1\) The Fall is included as grounds along with creation. Paul's argument is that Eve alone was deceived by the Serpent. How Adam was involved is insignificant here; whether he was present at the time is unclear. If feminists hold even to the evangelical doctrine that the Scriptures are the authority in matters of faith, then Paul is authoritative here. This statement of Eve's sole deception is also found in Second Corinthians 11:3 and certainly was taught by Paul. This writer must follow the Apostle Paul as the proper interpreter of Genesis three, rather than present-day interpreters.

The universality of this mandate for woman's silence is demonstrated, therefore, from the timeless, non-cultural events of Genesis. This harmonizes totally with the context. Paul concludes this treatise with a word of comfort and hope (v. 15). The phrase, "she shall be saved through childbearing," does create difficulty since it seems foreign to the passage. Yet it is not irrelevant, for the preceding verse has just made reference to Genesis 3:1-6. Paul has just stressed the part Eve played in the Fall. Adam was responsible (Rom. 5:12-19), but Eve was equally guilty. The result of that sin created the conflict described in Genesis 3:16,\(^2\) including the pain of childbirth. Genesis 3:16 reads:

\(^1\)The intensive form of the verb which is used here (ἐξαπατέω) stresses Eve's deception even more forcefully in Greek.

\(^2\)See chapter two under "The Fall."
To the woman He said, "I will greatly multiply Your pain in childbirth, In pain you shall bring forth children; Yet your desire shall be for your husband, And he shall rule over you" (NASB).

The salvation mentioned with childbirth is not physical salvation, since many mothers, even Christian mothers, have died giving birth. It is spiritual salvation. But it is not salvation by means of childbirth for many women are saved who have borne no children and many are not who have given birth. Nor is it even a condition to salvation. The very next phrase, in harmony with all Scripture, will not allow these thoughts. It is spiritual salvation through or in the midst of the curse from the Fall. It is almost the idea of despite the pain. Grammatically, διά is used to denote attending circumstance. Or as Gill has said: "women shall be saved, notwithstanding their bearing and bringing forth children in pain and sorrow according to the original curse in Genesis 3:16." Though saved women also feel the pain of Eve's sin, they have the assurance of salvation through their godly life. These words have provided comfort for women down through the ages.

Passages from the parallel book of Titus, along with passages from this book itself, will further aid in understanding the Biblical role of woman. The authority and teaching which God has withheld from woman in the church He

1Arndt and Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon, p. 179.

has given to her in the home. Timothy himself had been trained in spiritual things by his mother and grandmother (2 Tim. 1:5; 3:15). Paul also speaks of that authority which woman has in the home when giving instructions concerning widows. "I will therefore that the younger widows marry, bear children, guide the home . . ." (1 Tim. 5:14). The word translated "guide the home," oikodeσπατέω, means to govern or to rule the house.¹

Titus is to instruct the older women to train the younger women to love their husbands and children, and "to be sensible, pure, workers at home, kind, being subject to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be dishonored" (Tit. 2:5 NASB).

God has given to woman the authority to rule and to teach in the home. It is the realm of her authority; it is a place where she can know the fulfillment which God intended. Though woman must not rule her husband, her husband ought to allow her the fulfillment of ruling over the affairs of her home. A man's house is his wife's castle.

IV. The Relation of 1 Corinthians 11 to the Household Tables: Colossians 3:18-19, Ephesians 5:22-33 and 1 Peter 3:1-7

The passages of Colossians three, Ephesians five and First Peter three share a common characteristic: each speaks concerning the various roles and responsibilities of

¹Compare the noun form which is used in Lk. 12:39; 13:25--"master of the house."
the different members of the first-century household. Along with the husband, wife and children were the servants. These lists of instructions were called in German (as early as Luther's time), *haustafel*, meaning household table or tablet.

According to some these "household precepts" were borrowed from the communities in which the early church found itself. Since the early church did not want to create social problems, it allegedly did not challenge the subjugation of women or the practice of slavery.\(^1\) Thus the conclusion is obvious. Since Paul drew from his community and culture, present-day Christians have been provided the precedent for doing the same. And today's community, they say, calls for the changing of these functional relationships.\(^2\)

These tables do indeed represent first-century society and fittingly speak to it. But to imply that society is the originator of all these roles is untenable. The roles of husband and wife, parent and child, clearly have existed from creation and originated from God Himself. Next, to state that Paul accepts the cultural teaching of the subjugation of woman as with slavery, contradicts all


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 169. Sampley goes so far as to say that though Paul used the *haustafel* he did not agree entirely with it. Thus, what he says is not what he believes (J. Paul Sampley. *And the Two Shall Become One Flesh* [Cambridge: University Press, 1971], p. 117).
Biblical revelation on the subject of woman's functional role. This conclusion is illogical and unscriptural. Paul does not argue for slavery; he merely tells slaves and masters to behave like Christians. He does, however, argue for the subordination of women and gives the reasons. Woman's role of subordination is founded upon creation order; slavery certainly is not.

This section will highlight the teachings of the three passages involved.

**Colossians 3:18,19**

This entire haustafel involves Colossians 3:18 through 4:1. Of primary interest are those verses involving the roles of wife and of husband.

> Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them (Col. 3:18-19).

Several statements within the preceding context are enlightening. First, more than just the haustafel makes Colossians three parallel to Ephesians five. The introductions are likewise similar. Compare Colossians 3:16-17 with Ephesians 5:18-20.

> Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. . . . giving thanks to God and the Father by him (Col. 3:16-17).

> But be filled with the Spirit; Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (Eph. 5:18-20).
In Colossians the spiritual life and the haustafel are all founded upon the indwelling Word of God; in Ephesians these are founded upon the controlling work of the Spirit of God. What is commanded in these passages must be realized through the work of God.

More significant is the fact that the "liberating" passage (3:11), which parallels Galatians 3:28, is within the preceding context. Galatians 3:28 contains three sets which become one in Christ. The first two are distinguished from the third (male and female) by grammatical form. They are further separated by the fact that Paul includes the first two (Jew and Greek; slave and free man) but omits the third set (male and female) in Colossians 3:11. That distinction was noted to be the result of alterable and unalterable roles: those founded subsequent to man's Fall and those founded at creation.¹ What appears significant is that in Colossians where the role of woman is discussed (which is not true in Galatians), Paul omits reference to woman as one with man. The obvious conclusion must be that the reference to male and female oneness in Galatians is not greatly significant for the study of the role relationship, nor does it nullify that role. If time should be considered a factor, Colossians is Paul's subsequent word concerning the subject, and he is still teaching role distinctions.

In studying the haustafel itself, it will be noted

¹Compare the earlier study of Gal. 3:28.
that the wife's role is different from the child's or the servant's. They are told to obey (ὑπακούω); the wife is to be subordinate (ὑποτάσσομαι).¹

Since the subordination of woman is often paralleled with slavery from these passages a few more thoughts must be added to what was stated earlier.² Slavery was a societal practice common in the New Testament times. Paul neither seeks to establish nor to maintain it as a system. Rather, he gives godly directions for those who are already within it. Knight's evaluation is most helpful.

The directions Paul gives concerning slaves in Ephesians and Colossians are like those God had Moses give about divorce: they are to regulate an existing situation that is a result of the hardness of man's hearts (cf. Mt. 19:8). As in the case of divorce, so also in the case of slavery, God directs the writers of Scripture to give directions to regulate them while they are being practiced. Not once does Paul appeal to either God's creation order or God's moral law as the grounds for the institution of slavery. This radically distinguishes the treatment of slavery from that of marriage and the family.³

Paul certainly proclaims the inherent worth of a slave and his innate equality with that of any other person (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11). Paul also in the companion letter which was sent to Philemon exhorts him to receive Onesimus the slave as a brother (Phile. 16). Paul goes so far as to reckon the slave as a free man and the free man as Christ's slave (1 Cor. 7:20-22). Paul seeks to improve the role of

¹See chapter three under "The Practice of Jesus."
²See Galatians 3:28 in this chapter.
³Knight, "Male and Female," p. 15.
the slave, yet he exhorts the slave to realize that he lives in a societal role which he cannot violate. Though slavery is not God's plan for humanity, in order to serve God, one must accept it (Col. 3:22-24). The Scriptures offer no affirmative action program. Servants who do wrong will suffer the same divine judgment as masters who do wrong. The words of Ignatius to Polycarp fifty years later make the same appeal.

Do not be haughty to slaves, either men or women; yet do not let them be puffed up, but let them rather endure slavery to the glory of God, that they may obtain a better freedom from God. Let them not desire to be set free at the Church's expense, that they be not found the slaves of lust (IV,3).¹

Just because Christianity did not overturn subordinate societal roles does not mean that all roles are parallel and need now to be reversed. Such thinking is unsubstantiated and illogical.

**Ephesians 5:22-33**

The household table in Ephesians is longer (5:22-6:9) and contains several significant differences. Within the husband/wife relationship is placed the Christ/church relationship. Also, Paul injects the subject of mutual submission.

The mutual submission of God's people is an important and well-founded doctrine. Peter says: "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you

be subject one to another and be clothed with humility" (1 Peter 5:5). The clothing of humility of which Peter speaks suggests the event of humility which Jesus impressed upon Peter's heart in John thirteen. After supper Jesus took the servant's towel and girded Himself. Peter in his false humility did not know how to respond. Yet Jesus was dramatically able to teach this principle of mutual subordination (Jn. 13:14-17). Paul often expresses this same truth. ¹ Here he introduces the haustafel of Ephesians with: "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God" (Eph. 5:21).

Mollenkott supposes that since Paul has just appealed for all to submit to one another, the following roles of wife and husband involve mutual submission. ² Thus the roles become equal and nondistinct. She writes:

Biblical remarks concerning husbandly "love" and wifely "submission" always occur in the context of the mutual submission of every Christian to every other Christian, and therefore that love and submission are to be seen as synonyms rather than as mutually exclusive categories. ³

Two facts must be noted. In the first place, love

¹Rom. 12:10—"Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another." Gal. 5:13—"ye have been called into liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." Phil. 2:3—"Let nothing be done through strife and vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves."


³Ibid.
and submission are _not_ always found in mutual submission contexts. In fact, only here in Ephesians is that even so. It is not mentioned in Colossians three or First Peter three. Women's submission and mutual submission cannot be equated easily. In the second place, love and submission are _neither_ synonymous _nor_ mutually exclusive. Though similar they are not synonymous. They do not remove role or functional distinctions. Never are husbands told to submit to their wives.¹ Though Christ humbled and gave Himself for the church He still remains its Head with authority over it. The church does not have authority over Him. By analogy, the members of the church are to submit to one another, yet the roles of human leadership and submission continue in the church (Heb. 13:17). In fact, many women are now desiring those positions of authority.

Equally wrong is the notion that love and subordination are mutually exclusive. Love, which is man's responsibility to woman, is a selfless act. Subordination, which is woman's responsibility to man is likewise a selfless act. In that sense, that which God asks of man and woman is equal and similar. Neither is easily performed. Sinful flesh loves itself and so must strive to love or to submit. Since the Fall this relationship has been corrupted. The law was given to restrain sinful flesh. Redemption in Christ

¹The closest thing to this idea is found in 1 Cor. 7:4 where concerning conjugal relations the wife does not have authority over her own body, nor does the husband have authority over his own body.
restores the capability to love and to submit. Redemption has perfected rather than removed that relationship. Selfless love does not stop short of Christ's self-giving love. "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church" (Eph. 5:28,29). Selfless submission, likewise, does not stop short of the church's complete submission (Eph. 5:24).

Gundry challenges the authority and application of Ephesians five on two fronts. She implies that the reason for the submission here is Roman law, rather than divine law.\(^1\) Such a proposal requires one to reject Paul's stated reason for the submission: "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church" (Eph. 5:23). In the second place, she challenges the literal application of the passage. Since Paul says women are to submit "in everything" (v. 24) the passage cannot be interpreted literally. She writes: "This extreme application is unacceptable to most Christians, so they compromise by saying that it means everything that is not wrong to do. This is a confusing solution, for who decides what is wrong?"\(^2\) Her implied conclusion is, Why try to understand it literally at all? Nonetheless, the context is clear. God has

---

\(^1\) Gundry, Woman Be Free!, p. 72.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 71.
provided the governor right in the text: "as unto the Lord."
What is wrong to do in submission to God, is surely wrong to
do in submission to one's husband.

First Peter 3:1-7

The third haustafel is located in First Peter three. The
colons of First Peter three are also different from
Colossians three. Peter omits the parent/child relation-
ship. He begins the "table" with commands for servants, not
with those for wives as Paul does (1 Pet. 2:18). In the
preceeding context (1 Pet. 1:13-25) Peter admonishes the be-
lievers to submit to all human government. He commences by
exhorting servants to submit. Peter's encouragement rests
in the promise that when one suffers for Christ wrongfully
he is blessed of God (v. 20). Then, as is Peter's practice
throughout the entire epistle, he encourages the believers
to suffer injustice even as Christ did (v. 21). Peter says
to follow Christ. As Christ did, so do ye.

At that point Peter writes, "Likewise, ye wives, be
in subjection to your own husbands" (3:1). Follow Christ's
example, Peter says, even if it involves injustices. Peter
deals first with the wife whose husband is unsaved. Like
First Timothy two, he appeals to the need for godly conduct
and adornment. He then sets up Sarah as an example of sub-
mition in that she obeyed Abraham.¹ Peter says women are

¹This is the only use of ὂπακούω (obey) in the New
Testament of a woman's relation to her husband. This is an
illustration not a command. See chapter three for the
significance of this.
to be like Sarah of the Old Testament in their submission. Further, they are to be Christ-like in their submission.

In verse seven, Peter also begins his admonition to men with "likewise." "You husbands likewise, live with your wives in an understanding way, as with a weaker vessel, since she is a woman; and grant her honor as a fellow-heir of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered" (NASB). What does "likewise" suggest? Does this mean husbands are to submit to their wives, as the wives are to the husbands? The verse speaks for itself. It does not say to submit to her, but to honor her. So, the reference for comparison appears to be 1 Peter 2:17. Honor her as you honor men. The admonition is two-fold: care for her and honor her.

Several points merit emphasis. The first is grammatical. Though the command "to submit" in verse one is expressed by a participle it should still be understood as a command. The same is true of the command, "to live with," in verse seven. Turner notes that participles are often used as imperatives in First Peter.¹ He notes also that the construction could be the result of either the participle being in periphrastic construction with ἵστη ("be") in ellipse, or being a Hebraism.² The commands stand: wives, be submissive; husbands, live with them according to

²Ibid.
knowledge.

Two points concerning the relation of husband and wife are most significant. First, there is no mention of mutual submission throughout this passage. The husband is only commanded to dwell with his wife showing care and honor. Second and more important, is the equality which Peter states the wife possesses. Equally they share the life of God. Soteriologically and eschatologically they are equal; in salvation and throughout eternity they will remain equal. Yet, she is the weaker vessel. This does not imply inferiority in her being in any sense. It does imply difference; it does imply a distinction which God has formed within the sexes. The physical difference is the most obvious and probably is that to which Peter refers. Man must acknowledge this difference and honor her within it. God does not honor the man who will not honor his wife. Man's requests of God, his Head, will go unanswered in some measure to the extent that he, as head, does not honor his wife's rights or care for her requests.

These three haustafel passages do accord with First Corinthians eleven. Though they deal exclusively with husband/wife relationships, they, like First Corinthians eleven, proclaim the distinction of the sexes. Further, the Ephesians five passage also mentions man's headship. The Scriptures are in harmony. These teachings are neither isolated nor taken out of context.
V. The Relation of Other New Testament Passages to 1 Corinthians II

It is the intent of this division to present those references within the epistles which might in any way further the New Testament revelation concerning woman's role. Since this material mainly concerns historical glimpses of women who are briefly mentioned, two problems face the interpreter. First, the historical passage must be recognized as just that. It is not didactic. If a historical reference violates the explicit teaching of the apostles, the interpretation of that event must be challenged. Such an event is not normative; it is not what God is teaching through His Word. Second, Scripture should be interpreted in light of the clear, rather than the obscure. The proof-text approach to Scripture often becomes the use of a brief reference which is obscure or taken out of its context.¹ Historical allusions can hardly serve as the foundation of a doctrine, especially of a doctrine which runs counter to the didactic teaching of the Word.

This division will consider the four topics of women as assistants, as deacons, as pastors and as apostles.

Women as Assistants

Historical references to the service of women with Christ and in the early church are abundant. Women

ministered to Christ physically and financially. They were allowed a wide spectrum for service. Their work must not be regarded as non-essential. Nor can their presence at the tomb and the first witness of His resurrection be regarded as insignificant. Likewise, their service in the early church was noteworthy. The freedom and dignity which the New Testament church gave them was unlike that which they knew in their surrounding cultures.

Even though redemption does not remove functional distinctions, it should indeed correct them as the early church witnesses. Paul was assisted by women as was Christ. He speaks highly of the women at Philippi when he says that they "have contended at my side in the cause of the gospel, along with Clement and the rest of my fellow workers" (Phil. 4:3 NIV). Scanzoni and Hardesty go so far as to say that "from the beginning women participated fully and equally with men." Though that statement is unprovable and untenable with Biblical data, their emphasis upon an active role by women is accurate.

**Women as Deacons**

Only two verses can be cited which might be used to suggest that women served as deacons. One is historical, Romans 16:1; one is didactic, 1 Timothy 3:11. Paul

---

1. See chapter three.
2. Scanzoni and Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be*, p. 60.
describes Phoebe as a διάκονος "of the church which is at Cenchrea." Since the word is here a second declension feminine noun it might be stated that she was a deacon. Before that can be legitimately done, however, the Biblical usage of the word must be observed. Of the thirty times this word occurs within the King James Version, twenty are translated "minister," seven are translated "servant," as it is here, and only three are translated with the technical meaning "deacon." It is a common word to describe one who serves or ministers. It is used of Christ (Rom. 15:8), of the Christian (Jn. 12:26), often of leaders since they primarily serve (Col. 1:7, 23, 25), and even of the state (Rom. 13:4). Thus, in Phoebe's case also, it is more likely that it merely refers to her role as one who has served and ministered to the needs of others. There is no evidence that she was in some formal position. In fact, Paul at the time he wrote concerning Phoebe had not even used within his writings the term διάκονος in its technical sense. Many were assisting or ministering in the early church, but the official role of the διάκονος is not evident until the later part of Paul's ministry (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:8, 12). It indeed would be

1 Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 183-184.

2 Smith, Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament, p. 84.

3 The word "minister" will be avoided since it denotes both official and unofficial ideas. To keep the ideas distinct, "servant" will be used for the unofficial function, "deacon" for the official function.
incredible if Paul first used the technical use of διάκονος with Pheobe.

The second passage which might be cited as teaching women deacons is 1 Timothy 3:11, which reads: "Women must likewise be dignified, not malicious gossips, but temperate, faithful in all things" (NASB). It is in the context of Paul's instruction concerning the qualifications of the pastor and the deacons that these women are mentioned. To decide whether Paul is speaking here of wives or women generally is difficult, for γυναῖκες equally refers to either. Since these women are exhorted right in the midst of the instruction concerning deacons (vv. 8-13), it is easy to imagine them as their wives. Yet if that be so, why is no instruction given for the pastor's wife? One solution is to regard the women both as wives and also as those serving—deaconesses. If these are women deacons, why are they not specifically identified as the men are with the title διάκονος rather than as γυναῖκες? Whether these are deacons wives, deaconesses, or even those who might be called διάκονος, one thing is certain. They possessed neither the position of leadership over men nor the teaching of men. It is impossible

---

1 See Robert Lewis, "The 'women' of 1 Timothy 3:11," Bibliotheca Sacra, 136:542 (April-June, 1979), 167-175. Lewis proposes that these women refer to none of the above but to unmarried assistants. His arguments are: 1) these women are mentioned in verse 11 because the qualifications of vv. 8-10 are fitting for these women, whereas those of v. 12 are not; 2) the churches of the 2nd-4th centuries used such women to aid. These women aided the deacons, so it was not considered a distinct office.
to hold that Paul in chapter two of this book unequivocally forbids women to exercise authority over men or to teach them, and then one chapter later permits it. At most these women had a ministry of assistance with and teaching among the women.

About this same time Paul did instruct the older women to teach the younger women (Tit. 2:3-5). Likewise in 1 Timothy 5:3-16 qualified widows were considered for what might be considered a prayer ministry (cf. vv. 5,12 NASB). Again, because of the context of 1 Timothy 2 these widows did not hold an office of leadership over nor teaching of men. To establish a doctrine of female leadership or of women deacons based upon Romans 16:1 or 1 Timothy 3:11 is most precarious.

Women as Pastors

Interestingly, the single bit of evidence for women serving as bishops or pastors involves this same woman, Phoebe. One must wonder into which office feminists would prefer to place her. The basis for considering her as a woman pastor rests solely upon the word προστάτις in Romans 16:2. The verse reads: "that you receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and that you help her in whatever matter she may have need of you; for she herself has also been a helper (προστάτις) of many and of myself as well" (NASB). Some feminists would contend that "helper"
should rather be translated "ruler."\(^1\)

The problem here is compounded by the fact that this word occurs only here in the New Testament and is uncommon elsewhere. But the verb from the same root (\(\pi\rho\omega\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\)) is used eight times within the New Testament. Its meanings range from "be concerned about" (Tit. 3:8,14) to the idea of "being at the head of" or "ruling."\(^2\) In the New Testament the meaning is not that of absolute rule, yet it does involve authoritative leadership. The masculine noun form, \(\pi\rho\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\), which is never used in the New Testament does occur in Jewish and pagan literature with the technical sense of a defender or guardian.\(^3\) The root idea of the verb simply means "to stand before." It need not involve the idea of authority or leadership, though it usually does in the New Testament. Yet equally significant is the fact that the masculine noun form has disregarded the connotation of authority for that of assistance or help as in "defender" and "guardian." Thus, \(\pi\rho\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\) could follow the verbal idea of leadership or the masculine noun concept of helper. The context, as usual, provides the nuance for this word.

---

\(^1\)Scanzoni and Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be, p. 62. Jewett, however, states that this "should hardly be taken to mean that Phoebe was a woman 'ruler.' Rather the meaning would seem to be that she was one who cared for the affairs of others by aiding them with her resources" (Male and Female, p. 170, n. 140).

\(^2\)Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 713-14.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 726.
Two factors within the context suggest the denotation of the word. The Greek for the second half of the verse reads: καὶ γὰρ αὐτῇ προστάτις πολλῶν ἔγενεν θη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ. Scanzoni and Hardesty suggest that it should be translated: "she was designated as a ruler over many by me."¹ That translation is not feasible for several reasons. First the two genitives need to be regarded as parallel as the καὶ would indicate: πολλῶν meaning, "of many," ἐμοῦ meaning, "of me." Paul could hardly be saying, "Phoebe has been designated a ruler over many and over me myself." Second, the verb γίνομαι has the normal meaning of "to be" or "to become"; the meaning "to be made" is less common. Thirdly, the use of two intensive pronouns is unusual and involves some emphasis here.² The first pronoun demands a look at the first half of the verse. Before that look, let this writer also suggest a meaningful translation. "For even she herself has been a helper of many and of me myself."

Now, in the first half of the verse Paul exhorts the Romans to receive and to help (παρίστημι—to stand beside) Phoebe, for she herself has become a προστάτις (verb—προϊστημι meaning, "to stand before"). The sense of the whole verse demands the idea of helper. Paul is not saying, help her for she has been a ruler over many. Especially

¹Scanzoni and Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be, p. 62.
with the presence of the intensive pronoun the idea must be, help her for she herself has been a helper of many and of me myself. Phoebe was one assisting others, not one leading others.

Women as Apostles

The question of the apostleship of Junia also comes from this chapter (Rom. 16:7). Feminists would like to interpret this verse to say that a woman named Junia was distinguished as an apostle. Yet, such a translation faces numerous obstacles. First, whether the name itself is masculine or feminine is impossible to tell. The name is in the accusative case, Ἰούνιά, which could come from either Ἰούνια (feminine) or Ἰούνιος (masculine). The reason some regard it as feminine is because the masculine name is very rare. But of equal merit is the fact that the person mentioned with Ἰούνια is a man. So one could expect Ἰούνια to be a man, unless this refers to a husband and wife team. Verse seven reads: 'greet Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are outstanding among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me.' In the second place, since Paul also describes this one as a fellow-prisoner, it is hard to imagine that this was a woman. Thirdly, even if this one were a woman (or man) it does not say she was an apostle, but only that Ἰούνιά was "distinguished among the apostles." This could as easily imply that this one was well known to the apostles as it could that this one
was distinguished as an apostle.\(^1\) One must ignore these obstacles and the clear teachings of the New Testament in order to call any woman an apostle. One must also ignore the fact that neither Jesus nor the apostles ever appointed a woman as apostle or pastor. Never did Paul, nor anyone else, lay hands on any woman to ordain her.\(^2\) Never are the leading women (Priscilla, Phoebe) even considered for ordination according to the Biblical record.

In conclusion, it must be repeated that no genuine evidence can be gleaned from these passages that women were in positions of authority which involved the leading or teaching of men. Yet, they were actively serving and assisting.

Elisabeth Elliot has aptly expressed the Biblical attitude and ministry for Christian women.

The fruit of the Spirit which is called meekness is, I believe, the ability to see one's proper place in the scheme of things. If I as a woman have been endowed with certain gifts that may be good for the "use of edifying," let me use them within the boundaries set, recognizing that the Spirit of God does not contradict himself. Any attempt to obfuscate the lines drawn will not only impoverish the one who makes the attempt but will also deprive the Body of Christ of depth, of variety, and of that maturity which is described as "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Ryrie, *Women in the Church*, pp. 55-56.

\(^2\) Compare these passages: Acts 6:6; 13:3; 1 Tim. 4:14; 5:22; 2 Tim. 1:6.

\(^3\) Elisabeth Elliot, "Why I Oppose the Ordination of Women," *Christianity Today*, XIX:18 (June 6, 1975), p. 16.
CHAPTER VIII

THE CURRENT THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE
INvolving Woman

The theological scene within evangelical circles has certainly been influenced and is probably being remolded due to the subject of woman's nature and role. These current trends need to be noted and evaluated. As has been true throughout this paper, this chapter will be directed primarily to those who give credence to the Word of God. That is, it will be aimed at those who regard themselves as evangelicals. Yet those outside this circle must also be evaluated, for they significantly influence those within the circle. This chapter will discuss the motivational element, the hermeneutical approaches, and the resulting theology.

I. The Motivational Element

Every Spirit-filled Christian man surely desires God's will in regard to his view on woman. Is it possible that Christian men today have allowed their emotions or their bias to affect their thinking? Does the Bible teach what Christian men have claimed down through the ages or is there a psychological element which has blinded even godly men? It appears to this writer that there are in reality only two options to be pursued. Emily Hewitt and Suzanne
Hiatt, who accept the priesthood of women, also acknowledge only two options.

As Christians we are bound to ask seriously whether woman's "difference" is part of God's revelation and the divine order, or whether it is an accommodation to male ambivalence. If it is the former, Christians should deplore the changing role of women in society and reject any thought of women clergy. If it is the latter, Christians should be in the forefront of the people working to shape a new life for both women and men based on their common humanity.¹

This writer believes in the equality of woman with man and has presented a case for the compatibility of that equality with the subordinate role. He has not felt that emotions influenced the reasoning. Yet, could some psychological motivation cause the wrong conclusions to be reached? Colleen Zabriskie in dealing with that psychological aspect writes:

It is currently possible for someone to assume almost any position pertaining to women in such areas as their innate nature, the nature of their relationship to men, and the intention of God for their creation and ministry in the church and readily find validation for that position in the literature built on a basis of scriptural evidence. This indicates that something besides logical reasoning ability is operating and suggests the area of motivation may be an important determinant of the position maintained. Perhaps this will explain how two people, honestly searching the "truth" or "facts" in Scripture, can arrive at quite opposite positions.²

She describes this motivational factor as a defense or protective mechanism. This mechanism within humanity

causes one to see as compatible those facts which do not agree and causes one to have blind spots in one's reasoning. This mechanism can influence both men and women. What Zabriskie fails to mention are one's presuppositions. These also are the feelings and convictions with which one reasons. This is the starting point in one's whole logical process. The presuppositions which have been the primary motivation behind this writer's reasoning were stated in the introductory chapter. The Bible is infallible and lucid and therefore harmonious and understandable. This writer has tried not to let personal opinion and feeling lead him astray from the logical conclusions of the Biblical data. The conviction that the Bible is authoritative and relevant provides powerful motivation.

Zabriskie demonstrates her motivation or presupposition to be a feeling of rightness and a certainty that God would surely work "equitably." She asks: "What else beside the emotions as motivational factors could be so strong as to cause such pervasive principles as freedom and equality in the body of Christ to be set aside in lieu of contradicting principles which apply to only half of the human race?"\(^1\) This rationalistic idea is surely based upon feeling. This feeling is so strong it requires a theodicy, a defense of God. Surely God would not allow inequality within His Body.

Contemporary psychology and sociology proclaim the

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 306.
equality of men and women and imagine that sex distinction is discrimination. This may cause some to feel that the church is getting behind society so that changes must be made, when in fact the truth is that these two are going in opposite directions. Anyone who allows himself to be carried along by society while hanging on to the Word of God, must indeed fall behind secular society. Mollenkott argues also from this same sense of societal justice when she declares that "ordinary kindness and decency should lead modern Christians to choose in favor of equality." If it were a matter of choice, this writer might choose with Mollenkott. But it must not become a matter of choice; it is a matter of divine revelation. God has chosen for woman's equality and at the same time for her subordinate role upon this earth.

For both men and women to overcome defense mechanisms and emotional evaluations, each one must accept in faith the message of God's Word. Every person, man or woman, slave or free, will know fulfillment when he accepts God's plan or role for his life. When one is unhappy with his role in life he becomes bitter and self-defensive. One who values himself within his role in life need not defend himself. He will have no need to attack others. Christian women must feel and be made to feel their equality not an unfounded inferiority. Her subordinate role is not unbecoming, but honorable when willingly performed.

1Mollenkott, Women, p. 107.
II. The Hermeneutical Approaches

The hermeneutical approaches to be discussed are not hermeneutical systems, but they represent principles of Biblical interpretation which are frequently used by evangelical feminists. Obviously these approaches are developed to harmonize the Biblical witness with their belief that subordination is not part of God's revelation. These approaches primarily involve a reinterpretation of Biblical data due to alleged cultural and rabbinic influences. These procedures are not distinct but involve interrelated concepts. What they share in common is a low view of Biblical inspiration or authority.

First, the cultural-compensation approach to interpretation is of primary importance for it is the most deceptive and most frequently used method for reinterpretation. It is deceptive, for culture genuinely must be considered in interpretation. Any interpretation which ignores cultural influence is weak. So Davis writes:

We certainly recognize that revelation is conditioned by the thought forms of the culture in which it was given. This does not mean, however, that Biblical principles that are culturally conditioned (all are) and that may seem strange to twentieth-century people can no longer be authoritative. The Biblical doctrine of the substitutionary atonement is culturally conditioned and reprehensible to many enlightened moderns, but this does not establish its obsolescence and lack of authority.¹

Davis correctly notes the significant point that

culture does not negate authority. It is here that feminists and others err. Mollenkott says that "we are forced to recognize that the famous sections on women in the church are simply descriptions of first-century customs applied to specific situations in local churches."¹ If culture touches the message, it is merely archaic description, which, she says, today's Christian can discard. With that hermeneutical scepter all New Testament witness regarding women (except Galatians 3:28 and Christ's dealings with women) vanishes. Thus, to reconstruct a new interpretation becomes easy. Krister Stendahl acknowledges that Jesus and Paul presented truth as absolute, but they "shared the exegetical and cultural presuppositions of their time."² Therefore, they were necessarily bound by culture.

This cultural-compensation view must reject several very significant doctrines concerning the nature of God's Word. It rejects the verbal inspiration which affirms that the Holy Spirit directed the writers in their choice of words, not dictating those words but, nonetheless, controlling them within the framework of their personalities. Further, one who adopts this approach must hold mental reservations about the timeless nature and value of the Bible. A person who claims the name evangelical must surely hold some of these qualities of God's Word as vital. Do those who use

¹Mollenkott, Women, p. 102.
²Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women, p. 13.
culture to reteach Scripture think that God would not tell His people that His Word is irrelevant or outdated? Does He not tell His people such concerning the law? Did He not know that culture would change? or that women would gain a different status in the latter days?

This view must also consider that culture has not really changed. People are still depraved by sin. The curses of the Fall still exist. If submission was commanded for peace and order in home and church, must it not continue due to the thinking of an unsaved, depraved world and due to the many Christians who cannot understand this "liberation" nor see it within the Word of God? Should one not forego this "liberty," even if it should exist?

The principles upon which woman's subordination is based are not cultural but Christological.¹ This behavior functions "in the Lord," or "as to the Lord" not because of one's neighbors or teachers. Further, it is not due to relative cultural conditions, "for it is based on the headship of Christ over His church which is an everlasting relationship."² This cultural-compensation approach requires a low view of Biblical authority.

A second argument used by feminists for rejecting the Pauline witness to woman's role is that involving


²Ryrie, Women in the Church, p. 68.
rabbinic influence. According to this approach Paul must be understood in the light of his rabbinic past and oriental background. Jewett finds it easy to accuse Paul of rabbinic thinking when Paul applies Genesis two to the teaching of woman's subordinate role. The most that his statement can do is cast doubt. It can prove nothing. In the first place, Paul's life and teaching demonstrate that whatever negative influences the rabbis had on Paul were disclaimed after his conversion. God changed Paul's mind as well as his heart. Second, never does Jewett demonstrate that Paul's interpretation of Genesis two (or any passage) is indeed rabbinic. Where do the rabbis develop Genesis two in such a way to parallel Paul's teachings? Third, Paul's teachings must be demonstrated not only to be rabbinic in origin and content, but also to be contrary to God's revelation. As Cerling aptly states: "the equation rabbinic therefore wrong is false." Jewett has proven nothing; he has built nothing. He is seeking to tear down without building something more Biblical.

Jewett further suggests that his own approach to Scripture is not unscriptural even when he goes contrary to the teaching of Scripture. He implies that this third approach is a legitimate hermeneutical principle which he

1Jewett, Male and Female, p. 136.

calls "Scripture against Scripture." He seeks justification for such handling of the Word of God from Christ's example. So he writes:

Our reasoning is not unlike that of Jesus—though he did not appeal to any technical hermeneutical principle—when asked how his view of divorce harmonized with the Mosaic law (Mk. 10:3-5). In this place, Jesus, in a sense, appealed to Scripture against Scripture. While he did not deny that the Mosaic law allowed for divorce, he insisted that such a law did not express the true intent of the original creation ordinance of monogamous marriage. ... In other words, the commandment in Deuteronomy reflects the cultural, historical realities of life in Israel, not the will of God as originally revealed in the creation.

Several glaring fallacies exist within this reasoning. First, Jesus did not contradict Deuteronomy 24 to teach what He did. Rather, He clearly sets forth God's original plan for man and women from Genesis two over and against God's concession under the law. This is not Scripture against Scripture, but Scripture expanding Scripture as Jewett himself seems to acknowledge with his addition of the qualifying phrase, "in a sense."

Second, his point is neither logical nor parallel. Jesus took the Jews of His day back beyond the law all the way to God's creation plan. Jewett seeks to take modern readers back beyond Paul also to God's creation plan. The illogical nature of the argument is that this is exactly where Paul takes his readers. Jewett states: "to say that

1Jewett, Male and Female, pp. 136-37. 2Ibid.
a man may write a bill of divorce and put away his wife, or
to say that the woman by definition is subordinate to the
man, is to come short of the revealed intent of the Crea­
tor."¹ What Jewett must be saying is: "I know the Creator's
revealed intent: Paul did not." It would seem that the
apostle, under inspiration, would record the correct deci­
sion. Indeed he does, for he goes back to Genesis two, just
as Christ had done. Jewett will not. If Jewett would do as
Christ did, he would be doing as Paul did. Further, the
parallel does not hold, for woman's subordination did not
originate with the law as divorce did. The subordinate role
was corrupted through the Fall, but it antedated the Fall.

Knight's comparison of divorce with slavery² is a
much better comparison than Jewett's divorce with the sub­
ordination of woman. Both divorce and slavery were outside
of God's creation intent. Sin with its corrupting influence
upon human relationships necessitated laws to protect people
from their oppressors. God desires the cessation of both
divorce and slavery. He likewise desires the cessation of
man's forceful ruling of woman but not of a loving headship.
If woman's subordination had not been part of creation or­
der, Jewett's parallelism might have been accurate. Paul
bases woman's subordination upon creation order, for that is
where it exists and where it must be demonstrated.

¹Jewett, Male and Female, p. 137.
²Knight, "Male and Female Related He Them," p. 15.
Third, Jewett's statement that the Deuteronomy divorce law reflected "cultural, historical realities in Israel" is misleading. He is preparing his readers to make a mental parallel involving the idea that today's role for woman should reflect today's cultural realities. Instead, that statement ought to cause the reader to realize that the cultural problem is the universal sin problem. It has not yet ceased nor will it. Thus to follow Jewett's logic, divorce will be allowed by God to continue as will woman's subordination. Jewett did not intend to say that nor does this writer. The point is only that Jewett's reference to culture here is totally irrelevant.

The hermeneutic of Scripture against Scripture is not only incongruous with evangelical faith, it is similarly contrary to Biblical example.

Following this same disregard for the apostolic witness given within the Word of God, Mollenkott builds her teaching upon a fourth hermeneutical approach, the neo-orthodox approach. One major tenet of neo-orthodoxy is to accept the historical reality of the great doctrines of the Bible, without accepting the apostolic witness to those doctrines. This notion seems in part to cause Mollenkott to write that "biblical feminism should not seek to root itself in the citation of first-century practices. . . those practices remain to some degree patriarchal and sexist." She

1Mollenkott, Women, pp. 120-138. 2Ibid., p. 121.
proceeds to state that feminism must rather be based on the major Bible doctrines: the Trinity, creation in God's image, the incarnation, and regeneration, which also includes "the regenerative influence of the gospel in human society."\(^1\) Following Mollenkott's development of these doctrines, one gains nothing new in support of modern feminism. Subordination within the Trinity and creation is surely no aid. Christ's incarnation as man does more harm to feminism than it aids. Christ of necessity came as a male in order to be the Second Adam. The significant factor here is that Christ's coming as another Adam demonstrates the responsibility Adam (not Eve) had for all of humanity. Redemption not only restores man to God, but also makes possible the selfless love and subordination necessary between man and woman. Redemption does not produce the annihilation of role differences; it proclaims the genuineness of those roles for it provides the means for their fulfillment.

III. The Resulting Theology

The result of feminism within evangelical circles will be far greater than whether or not the next deacon or pastor will be a woman. For liberal churches that is all that is at stake. For churches which claim to be evangelical much more is involved. The whole question of inspiration, authority and interpretation lies behind this issue. To teach the non-distinction of roles between men and women

\(^1\)Ibid.
one must give up the natural method of interpretation and the inerrancy of Scripture. The teachings are incompatible.

For liberals it is only a matter of time. Time must be given for the thinking of people to accept the new and the foreign. The goals to be attained by the liberal feminist are limited only by his or her ambitions. Consider the words of one liberal feminist.

I consider the authority of my ministry to be rooted in the authority of possibility. I am delighted at this point of my life that I don't have any safety or niches in Scripture or in history or in myth or in structures; I am delighted in my present understanding that the authority of my ministry is rooted in futures and in possibilities, and in a Faith experienced so profoundly that "nothing in all Creation shall separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord . . ." not even Scripture, or history, or myth, or structure, or the masculine consciousness (emphasis added).

The certainty of feminine leadership within liberal churches need not even be questioned. Its procedure can be related concisely through the words of Rediger: "Denominational policies and social stereotypes will strain, then adjust to this gender shift. Doctrine and theology will catch up belatedly."

Wherever this happens in evangelical churches the pattern will be similar with similar results. The doctrine which must adjust will first involve the view of Scripture.

---


That point has already been made. Yet what is at stake is so essential that some repetition and new warnings hardly need to be justified.

Few evangelicals would explicitly state that they do not believe in some kind of infallibility for the Bible. It seems, therefore, more productive to allow their words to express their belief on inerrancy. Just like Jewett, Mollenkott holds a very low view of inspiration. In her book, *Women, Men and the Bible*, she affirms Paul's prejudice, superstition and bias.¹ She seeks to equate her view of Paul with the Biblical view of David's imprecatory psalms. She argues as follows.

I pointed out that just as recognition of David's hatred of his enemies in the imprecatory Psalms does not impugn our faith in the inspiration of the Old Testament, recognition of the record of Paul's struggles with his rabbinic socialization does not impugn our faith in the inspiration of the New Testament.²

Mollenkott's comparison of the imprecatory psalms with the doctrinal teachings of Paul is untenable. First, these psalms are poetry.³ Poetic language is often figurative language as it is here, involving poetic exaggeration or hyperbole. Second, it must be noted that these cries for vengeance are not merely personal but seem to represent divine vengeance as well. Notice, for example, that David's

words about Saul do not represent David's actual treatment of him. In Psalm 18:40 David wrote: "I destroyed those who hated me" (NASB). Yet in 1 Samuel 24:1-7 and 26:1-11 David treated Saul in a patient and restrained manner, refusing twice to harm him. This comparison of Scripture with Scripture confirms its hyperbolic nature.1

She also speaks of levels of inspiration, wherein sometimes Paul speaks his own mind and sometimes the mind of God.2 Here she confuses inspiration and revelation. Revelation has to do with source; inspiration has to do with the accurate recording of that truth, no matter what its source, so that it stands written without error.

Jewett and Mollenkott, in seeing repeated "conflicts" within Paul's teaching on women, feel these "conflicts" allow them to interpret the Word in two conflicting ways; during Paul's day as subordination, during the present day as equality. Indeed culture can affect interpretation, but to imagine that it reverses its whole meaning is unfathomable.

Clark Pinnock, an evangelical who does not hold to "the Warfieldian theory of perfect errorlessness,"3 sounds a

---


2Mollenkott, Women, p. 104.

concerned warning to evangelicals to the left of himself. So he writes:

What is there to prevent these evangelicals from handling the Bible like liberals do--assigning some texts into limbo, and canonizing the texts now held to be suitable and acceptable? . . . In a recent, well-publicized book, MAN as Male and Female, Paul K. Jewett put such a view into practice in the case of Paul's teaching regarding women. Seeing in Paul's epistles some evidence of male chauvinist views, Jewett concludes that Paul, being heir to both Rabbinic and Christian traditions, occasionally betrayed a sub-Christian viewpoint, and should not be followed where this happens. Jewett evidently rejects exegetical possibilities that these difficult texts can be harmonized with the clearcut feminism of Galatians 3:28. As a result, one is forced to conclude that in Scripture God does not always speak, requiring the reader to determine where he speaks and where he does not. In principle this seems to be liberal, not firmly evangelical, theological methodology, and therefore a disturbing doctrinal development.¹

Lindsell pronounces even a stronger warning for all evangelical feminists.

Once they do this, they have ceased to be evangelical: Scripture is no longer normative. And if it is not normative in this matter why should it be normative for matters having to do with salvation? Paul is the great advocate of the resurrection of Jesus. If he is wrong about wives obeying their husbands, how do we know that he is not also wrong about the bodily resurrection?

Anyone who wishes to make a case for egalitarianism in marriage (or in the church) is free to do so. But when he or she denigrates Scripture in the process, that's too high a price to pay. And if a case for egalitarianism in marriage (and in the church) cannot be made without doing violence to Scripture maybe the case isn't very strong to begin with.²

Evangelical feminists must give up egalitarianism or the Word of God. If one seeks to remain a traditional

¹Ibid., pp. 69-70.

feminist he or she cannot remain evangelical. That is, he cannot accept the inerrancy of the Word of God. If one remains an evangelical he cannot remain in the traditional feminist camp. Hermeneutics and views of inspiration cannot change this impasse.

---

\footnote{For example, Paul Jewett can no longer accept the inerrancy of Scripture nor the Pauline authorship of 1 Cor. 14:34,35 or of 1 Tim. Donna Lee Grimstead, "Women Convene at Fuller Sem." \textit{Moody Monthly}, 79:1 (September, 1978), p. 18.}
CHAPTER IX

A SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, a summary of the preceding chapters will be presented and then some final conclusions will be drawn.

I. A Summary

Woman's ontological being or nature has been revealed from the earliest time. Genesis 1:27 and 5:1,2 declare that woman is in God's image, as is man. The result of this image is her equality with man and their reciprocal fellowship. No statement in the Old Testament contradicts or abolishes this equality. It was established by God Himself. Another aspect of this creation, which is stated in Genesis two, is woman's supportive role to man. Genesis two states that woman was made from man and for man. Genesis three, in describing the Fall of mankind, records the pronouncement of the divine curse upon creation. Verse sixteen which records the curse upon woman could be translated: "Against your husband is your drive, but he must rule over you." The woman's drive (or desire), because of corrupting sin within man and herself, is no longer for her husband but against him. The Fall did not cause woman's subordinate role, but it did corrupt the fellowship and the harmony which God intended for
that role. Redemption neither in Old nor New Testament times removed the subordinate role of woman. Redemption does, however, remove the sin which corrupts the role relationships. It can alleviate the condition of the curse, but the role remains.

The law, which contains many minute regulations involving woman, confronts people with their sinful actions. It deals with men and women in the light of Genesis 3:16. The position of woman within the law manifests the Fall curse which resulted in man ruling over woman. The law does not degrade woman, neither does it allow her to share man’s role. Yet, sufficient examples exist to demonstrate that women were also highly honored. Some apparently possessed the prophetic gift. At times some were placed into positions of leadership. God, however, does not appear to be the author of such leadership, for God speaks of this leadership as weak and errant (Isa. 3:1-12). Never was this leadership allowed or practiced in the religious life (priesthood or temple worship) of Israel.

The Gospels depict Jesus as treating women with proper dignity and respect, as He does with every person including the very young, the very poor, and the very sinful. Yet the Gospels do not depict Jesus as a proponent of feminism either from His teachings or from His practices. Jesus never freed wives from their submission to their husbands. Rather, His submission to the Father (with whom He is equal) and to His earthly parents, exemplifies a pattern
of subordination which is inherent within God's creation order. As Christ is equal to His head, the Father, so woman is equal to her head, man. As Christ was able to subordinate Himself to His equal, so woman must subordinate herself to her equal. As Christ was genuinely the Second Person of the Trinity, not a second-class person of the Godhead, so woman in Christ's image is not a second-class person.

The study of first-century customs provides limited meaningful data. For example, Jewish culture cannot be equated with Biblical custom. The Jewish custom of women using the public veil during the first century is well documented. Yet neither the Old nor the New Testament gives substantial evidence of such veiling. Veiling was, nevertheless, recorded in the Assyrian Laws from the time of Moses. These laws so precisely proclaim who must not as well as who must be veiled that the purpose of veiling seems evidently to be that of protection for moral women. A prostitute who was veiled was to be seized, given fifty lashes and have asphalt poured on her head. If a man saw her but neglected to seize her, he would receive the fifty lashes and other punishments.

It seems that the situation at Corinth at about A.D. 55 would be the Greco-Roman practice of little public head covering for women. Most likely many Jewesses, however, did cover their heads. In the church services the cultural distinctions still continued with Jewesses being covered and Gentiles often not. Most important, though,
is the fact that Paul bases the practice of head coverings in First Corinthians eleven upon important doctrinal principles rather than upon uncertain and changing cultural practices, whether Jewish or Gentile.

The exegetical study of First Corinthians eleven has demonstrated that the New Testament teaching regarding woman's role has not changed from creation to the present. It is obvious that Paul does not speak of any new order which has changed God's original plan for male and female. What Paul does emphasize in these verses is that man and woman are different. The demand for man not to be covered and for woman to be covered demonstrates this role difference. It further implies that Paul is not merely dealing with a covering problem but an understanding problem--why do we do as we do? They are ontologically equal but uniquely different. God did not create woman to be another male. She is the glory of the man. Her glory and authority are different. Creation order illustrates their differences; the order within nature likewise teaches the differences. Paul does not, however, ground his teaching of woman's difference and subordination upon creation. He shows, rather, that God founded it at that time. Woman's role is not grounded in creation order but is illustrated by that event.

Man is the head of the woman; woman is the glory of the man. As head, man possesses a positional (not merely chronological) priority which causes Paul to state: "Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives
be to their own husbands in every thing" (Eph. 5:24). As head, man is also required to supply and care for the needs of the woman (cf. 1 Pet. 3:7). As the glory, woman is in the position of receiving power and authority and reflecting it back to her head.

First Corinthians eleven also reveals that God has allowed women the service of public prayer and prophecy. Prophesying was not incongruous with woman's role. The New Testament gift of prophecy was a sign gift which was given to the apostolic church. The prophet, whether man or woman, was not an authoritative leader over the congregation, but was a fellow member within it. His revelation from God edified, exhorted and consoled, but he was not an authoritative teacher for his message was to be judged by others. The judging involved human interpretation, the prophesying did not. The authority existed in the prophecy not in the New Testament prophet. Though women possessed this gift, they never were leaders or teachers because of it. When they were speaking to God publically in prayer or speaking for God publically through prophecy, they were to have their heads covered, since woman is the glory of man.

With First Corinthians eleven the other New Testament passages harmonize. Though Galatians 3:28 is frequently used as the locus classicus for feminism, its context will not permit such usage. This passage alludes to Genesis one rather than Genesis two. If it did negate any creation pattern, it would be the "image" teaching of chapter one,
not the subordination of chapter two. But it annihilates nothing. Galatians three does not abolish sex distinctions within life. Rather, it places both male and female equally into Christ's redemption, making them both sons and heirs (cf. 1 Peter 3:7). This passage does not speak about societal roles. Neither the verse nor its context so much as implies one thing concerning woman's role or function. Revelation must be sought outside this verse. To base a doctrine upon it would involve "proof-text" hermeneutics.

The silence of women at the church service is taught in both First Corinthians fourteen and First Timothy two. Both contexts demonstrate that this is not an absolute silence but a silence involving leadership and teaching. First Corinthians fourteen is the key for relating First Timothy two to First Corinthians eleven. Church teaching is humanly prepared, authoritative speech; the New Testament prophetic gift was divine revelation uninterpreted by the prophet. Thus, the prophetic gift was not forbidden to women by 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 or 1 Timothy 2:11-12. That which was forbidden in 1 Corinthians 14 was the assessment of the prophet by women. These three passages agree that women may speak in prayer and prophecy, but all speech involving authority over men or the teaching of men was prohibited. Titus two demonstrates that the leadership and teaching roles of women are limited to the other, younger women and to a ministry at home. Though this silence is not absolute, it is timeless and universal. Paul's exhortations
to silence are not founded upon culture or upon a present, local problem. He bases them upon the timeless, non-cultural revelation from Genesis.

The New Testament further relates the subordinate role of woman through the *haustafel* ("household table") passages (Col. 3:18-19; Eph. 5:22-23; and 1 Pet. 3:1-7). Each of these "table" passages speaks to conditions within first-century culture, yet that culture did not dictate these teachings. Slavery (Col. 3, Eph. 6, 1 Pet. 2) was a societal practice common in New Testament times. Paul neither seeks to establish nor to maintain it as a system. He rather gives godly directions to those who are within it. Woman's role, unlike slavery, is not of societal origin but part of the creation plan. To suggest that since the slavery role is wrong, the subordinate role of woman is wrong, is unsubstantiated and illogical.

The mutual submission of Ephesians 5:21 likewise does not remove the subordinate role of the wife. This passage does demonstrate an equality, but it does not demonstrate nondistinction of roles. Only here is mutual submission even included in the context of husband/wife roles. By contrast, wives are always commanded to submit and husbands are never commanded such. Though man's role is different, nonetheless it is equally demanding of self. He must love his wife as his own body and give himself for her. Such love is as equally selfless as is her subordination. Though the roles are distinct, they are equal in their
All of the didactic portions agree with First Corinthians eleven concerning the subordinate role of woman both at home and in the church. Thus, other passages are sought by feminists to establish egalitarianism. These passages demonstrate that women possessed an active role within the New Testament. Paul was assisted by women as was Christ. But these passages will not allow the thought that women were in positions of leadership. The two passages which are cited as support for women serving as deacons (Rom. 16:1; 1 Tim. 3:11) are weakened by the lexical and contextual evidence. Though Pheobe is called a διάκονος, Paul's usage favors the translation "servant" or "minister". Though 1 Timothy 3:11 has been interpreted as referring to women deacons, the preceding chapter unequivocally prohibits authority over or teaching of men by women. Whatever chapter three might allow it cannot violate chapter two. The two historical passages of Romans 16:2 and 16:7 which are used to teach that Pheobe was a pastor and Junia was an apostle are very obscure. All of these passages contain three weaknesses. They are isolated verses; they are historical glimpses of women; and, they are usually obscure, problematic statements. Any doctrine based upon such verses would be most precarious. To reject the didactic portions in favor of these is untenable.

Both men and women must evaluate their motives and presuppositions when they approach the Bible looking for
answers. It is easy to look for or to develop a hermeneutic which will provide the "answer" one is hoping for. For both to overcome defense mechanisms and emotional evaluations, each must accept in faith the message of God's Word. Each needs to be happy with his or her role in life or they will become bitter and self-defensive. The presupposition or feeling that God would surely work equitably—demanding freedom and equality for all—is a contemporary, sociological belief. It proclaims the equality of men and women and imagines that sex distinction is discrimination.

Several approaches are commonly followed to make the Biblical data compatible with feminism. One approach is to minimize the application for today of Old and New Testament teaching. The reinterpretation of Biblical data by means of cultural compensation is the most deceptive of these, for culture must always be considered in interpretation. So, for some, application to contemporary life can often be modified and conditioned by the interpreter. The Scriptures, however, never base the important teaching of woman's role upon culture. These teachings are Christological, not cultural.

Several other approaches involve a low view of inspiration. To speak of Paul as controlled by his rabbinic past or to speak of Scripture as opposing Scripture demands such a view.

What is at stake, resulting from "evangelical" feminism, is far more than the doctrine of ecclesiology, that
is, whether or not a woman will be the next pastor or deacon. The whole question of inspiration, authority and interpretation lies behind this issue. To teach the nondistinction of roles between men and women one must give up the natural method of interpretation and the inerrancy and authority of Scripture.

II. Conclusions

Even as the final conclusions are set forth, it must be stressed again that this study is not intended to suppress the genuine liberties which women should possess. They have often been subdued and enslaved, being the "weaker sex." They deserve every liberty concerning which Scripture speaks. To take from woman the honor and role which God has given is wrong. Yet it is equally wrong for Christian men to give to women, or for women to usurp for themselves, an honor and role which God has not given. To go either to the right or to the left of the divine plan is equally wrong (cf. Rev. 22:18,19).

A truly liberated woman is one who is happily fulfilling God's will in her life. This fulfillment is not innately associated with a husband or home. A single woman can wholly know this fulfillment, for it lies in one's relation to Christ and other people. Yet, for a married person it must also involve the home. Fulfillment comes for a woman when she no longer regards God's role for her as second class and when she no longer seeks man's role, imagining
that it is something superior.

God has made distinctions between the sexes. The physical differences mirror the immaterial differences. These are not vertical distinctions involving superiority and inferiority. They are horizontal distinctions involving one's functions. Their authorities are different; their honors are different; their ministries are different.

A second concluding thought concerns the primary problem of this paper: the duration and nature of woman's role. The functional role of woman will last as long as natural life. It was established by God at creation. The Fall has corrupted it without anulling it and, in like manner, redemption corrects it without annulling it. The nature of woman's role has been shown to be one of functional difference, not inferiority of being. In the home, she is not to be commanded about, ruled over, dictated to, but to be lovingly led. This does not mean that the wife is tied to the home. Yet the authority given her to govern the household ought to make the home a worthwhile and fulfilling place for her to be.

Mollenkott is correct in stating that "the Christian husband must lead the way in self-giving concern and deference toward his wife, to which the Christian wife responds with respect and deference in return."¹ Beyond that, the wife must give loving support and the husband as head must

¹Mollenkott, Women, p. 124.
supply and nourish in both spiritual and physical areas. Following Christ's example, both must realize they are not free. Man must give himself; woman must submit herself. The battle between the sexes will cease only if God alone is allowed to speak. When men or women set forth rules, conflict occurs. Neither is free to do his own thing.

In the church, clearly women are not to exercise authority over men (any man), nor are they to teach men. Thus the offices of pastor and deacon are excluded from her. Further, women should not teach adult classes. They should not direct the Sunday School ministry nor the ministry of music. Often churches have trouble being consistent, but if the principles of Scripture are followed the problems become less complicated. The Scriptures do not teach the absolute silence of women but silence whenever their teaching or authority would involve men. Whatever would violate this in precept or principle is prohibited.

This in no way means that women can have no ministry or that their spiritual gifts are being wasted. First, it is the Apostle Paul who in revealing the nature of spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 12-14) does so right in the midst of his teaching concerning woman's role (1 Cor. 11) and her silence (1 Cor. 14). Second, it is Paul who exhorts the older women to teach the younger women, and who exhorts mothers to teach their children. Many avenues for ministering to others are open to women.

The ministry of writing will serve as an example of
applying the principle of silence. Should a woman write? She may, for the principle of authoritative teaching or leadership is not violated. Writing would be comparable to the early-church gift of prophesying. Though both involve the impartation of truth, they both lack authority over the recipient.

Evangelical feminists must begin to consider First Corinthians eleven seriously. Indeed, all of God's people must consider it carefully. It presents many principles regarding woman's role both in the home and in the church.

The societal role of woman is less defined within Scripture than are her home and church roles. The principle of subordination seems most explicit in the personal relationship of marriage. It would seem that the less personal the relationship is between man and woman, the less the element of subordination is demanded. Three principles can, nevertheless, be gleaned from Scripture which aid in establishing woman's place in society. First, the Bible reveals that the home is the primary area for a woman's activity. She is to govern the home (Tit. 2:4-5; 1 Tim. 5:14). Obviously, much of what is regarded as part of woman's role has no Biblical directive—washing dishes, cleaning house, yet they are a product of woman's place within the home, which is commanded. The biological differences with which God created woman prepare her to serve best in the home (pregnancy, nursing, and lesser strength). These differences should not imply, as they do to some
cultures, that she is to till the soil (Gen. 3:17-19), nor should they imply to any culture that she alone is to rear the children (Deut. 6:6-7; 11:19; Eph. 6:4). At the same time though, this does not suggest that she is to be limited to the home. The godly woman of Proverbs 31 depicts the wife who has been given authority to govern affairs both within and outside of the home with God's evident blessing. Labor and activities outside the home can fit God's role for woman.

The next two principles regarding woman's societal role involve woman's exercise of authority over man in labor, politics and other social positions. Should Christian women seek positions involving authority over men? First Corinthians eleven demonstrates that God's role relationships for men and women involve all people at all times. Second, God's only didactic word concerning woman's societal leadership is negative (Isa. 3:12). Leadership by women in an unredeemed world will occur. Such positions, in the opinion of the writer, should not be sought. The situations of life will at times make application of these principles difficult. For example, should one vote for a woman in politics? If her opponent were godless in his politics or practices, one should vote for the woman. These three principles should guide one regarding the situations involving woman in society.

A third concluding thought must sound a warning against three subtle attacks upon the Bible resulting from
feminism. In the first place, the Bible does not contradict itself regarding woman's role as some feminists have said. Paul does not despise women or their feminine nature. In fact, Paul portrays himself as one who nurses young believers (1 Thess. 2:7,8). The Old and New Testaments are harmonious. Christ and His apostles are consistent regarding woman.

In the second place, the low view of Biblical inspiration suggested by some feminists must be challenged. To speak of the Scriptures as containing bias, prejudice and superstition does not allow for an inspiration involving inerrancy.

In the third place, that which is most subtle is the low view of Biblical authority which other egalitarians hold. When a Biblical passage confronts someone with a teaching he or she does not like, he can regard it as a local, temporal problem and remove its authority from today's situations. Or one might call it unclear and proceed to a more agreeable passage.

Scripture is neither culture-bound nor is it "ahistorical." Every setting within the Word of God has its place within a genuine historical background. These historical events are then used by the apostles to record timeless truth and principles. So one hermeneutical key for

---

1 As Jewett and Mollenkott.
2 As Scanzoni and Hardesty, Gundry, and Williams.
determining the relevance of any incident must be to determine the stated grounds of the writer's teaching. Does he base his argumentation upon local problems or upon something far greater? First Corinthians provides good examples of both.

Paul's teaching regarding temporary celibacy in First Corinthians seven is clearly based upon some local, present distress even as Paul informs his readers (vv. 26, 29). But Paul's teachings regarding woman's subordinate role and her silence in the assembly are always based upon such timeless, noncultural grounds as God's creation plan, the law, and the distinct glories and authorities of man and woman. The principles upon which woman's subordination is based are not cultural but Christological. Since the subordinate role is to function "in the Lord" or "as to the Lord," any new order in redemption has not transcended that role. Rather, all of Paul's arguments give positive proof that woman's role transcends local or first-century situations. In First Corinthians eleven Paul also furthers his argumentation with historical, cultural arguments (vv. 13ff), but he does not found his argument upon such things. The low view of Biblical authority which is expounded by feminists is not acceptable.

The traditional view employs the only hermeneutical approach which is consistent.¹ In an age when Satan

¹The argument that traditionalists are willing to take the kiss of greeting and the wine for the stomach as
already is doing everything imaginable to destroy the home and the family during this immoral generation, Christians must carefully study the Scriptures and faithfully accept their teachings.

__________________________
cultural and thus limited, whereas they will not do so with the subordinate role of woman, totally ignores the context of Scripture. For unlike the role of woman, Paul does not base these upon one's position "in Christ," creation order, or any other transcultural ground. For example, see Robert K. Johnston, "The Role of Women in the Church and Home: An Evangelical Testcase in Hermeneutics," in Scripture, Tradition and Interpretation, ed. by W. Ward Gasque and William Sanford LaSor (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), p. 242.
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