QUADRUM

JOURNAL OF THE FOURSQUARE SCHOLARS FELLOWSHIP

Vol. 1 Issue 1 JANUARY 2018

EDITORIAL

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

Quadrum, Foursquare Scholarship, and the Essentiality of Women in Ministry Leadership

Jeremy Wallace, D.Min.[1]

Welcome

On behalf of the Foursquare Scholars Fellowship (FSF) and the executive committee of the FSF, I want to welcome you to the inaugural issue of *Quadrum*: *Journal of the Foursquare Scholars Fellowship*.[2] As you can imagine, the production of this journal has come at no small cost in terms of the time, deliberation, planning, prayer, and hard work of the many FSF committee members, the many supporters of the FSF, and, of course, the contributors to this inaugural issue itself. It is our hope that this journal will not be the *terminus* of Foursquare scholarship, but rather (and ideally), a catalyst, outlet, and exponent for it. As you read through these pages, please do so with an inquisitive mind, a hungry heart, and an attentive spirit. Please consider this, as well, an invitation for you to ponder for yourself how you too might engage in Foursquare scholarship at a deeper level.

Quadrum

What exactly is *Quadrum*? The word itself is Latin in origin, meaning "square," "foursquare," or "that which is in proper order." Our sincere desire is that the scholarship presented in this journal would be both "Foursquare" and "in proper order." In other words, *Quadrum* is a scholarly journal intentionally designed to be both *substantive* and *accessible*. The content herein is meant, on the one hand, to highlight robust scholarship produced by scholars in our Foursquare family and it is, on the other hand, intended to be accessible to the laymen and academician alike. Simply put, we hold a shared-desire to showcase the scholarly efforts and works of scholars in our Foursquare family and we seek to do so in such a way that

---

[1] Jeremy Wallace (jeremy.wallace@tku.edu) is the Executive Director of *Kerygma21* and teaching pastor at Encounter Church Tulsa (Tulsa First Foursquare). He teaches theology and biblical studies for The King's University & Seminary, Northwest University and Life Pacific College.

[2] The Editorial Committee of the Foursquare Scholars Fellowship is indebted to our authors, peer reviewers, and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. Special thanks to Jodie Jones for her careful proofreading of this manuscript. Quadrum would not have come to fruition were it not for these wonderful brothers and sisters in Christ. Finally, above all, we thank our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, to whom all work is humbly dedicated.

simultaneously glorifies the Triune God of Scripture while empowering and emboldening the Foursquare church to walk in her calling and mission, and fulfilling her unique place within the Body of Christ. The preponderance of articles you will find in this issue (and issues to come) will have been produced *by* Foursquare scholars *for* the Foursquare family and beyond. From time to time, select articles from contributors outside our denomination may appear in *Quadrum*. This fact, in some respects, is a reflection of our value and desire to be "interdenominational in spirit." We are grateful to these contributors for their investment in our movement.

Foursquare Scholarship

The Lord has uniquely gifted members within the Foursquare community whose scholarly ambitions and contributions have encouraged, empowered, and resourced the body of Christ in its Mission. Scholarship within the Foursquare family has its place. The Academy has never been, and will never be, a replacement for normal congregational life, for the fellowship of the Saints, and the vital milieu for worship. The Church, however, can be (and is) greatly aided in its mission through the unique role that the Academy has to offer. As scholars, it is our hope and desire to foster and encourage Foursquare scholarship wherever it may be found, in all its avenues and expressions.

In the present author's view, it is a sad commentary to observe the unfortunate occurrence of anti-intellectualism (frequently manifested in anti-education) within the history of the Pentecostal tradition of the Church. Fortunately for the Foursquare church, Sister Aimee was one who sought to make positive use of biblical and theological education as long as it was used to serve the church in her mission, as opposed to becoming a means to its own end. In essence, she chose to eschew the false dichotomy of "*either* education *or* fidelity." No such dichotomy has ever truly existed in the history of the Church. Jesus *taught* his disciples and told His followers to do the same. As a result of reading this journal, we not only hope that you "add to your faith, knowledge," but that you are encouraged, enlightened and stirred to know God deeper.

The Foursquare Scholars Fellowship officially began in 2009. According to the FSF organizational guidelines, *"The Foursquare Scholars Fellowship exists to provide scholarship in service of the Foursquare church."* In order to fill this purpose, six concrete objectives were laid out and are as follows: (1) FSF provides a venue for the discussion and publication of scholarly research in keeping with its purpose; (2) recognizing that there are a variety of ways that scholarship can serve the church, FSF promotes a wide range of scholarly interaction from the practical to the theoretical as it intersects the life, faith, and mission of the Foursquare church;

(3) acknowledging that the life, faith, and mission of the Foursquare church touches on numerous fields and issues, FSF seeks to engage in *interdisciplinary* dialogue; (4) affirming that the Foursquare church is global, FSF fosters the development of high-level international scholarship; (5) FSF seeks to raise awareness and appreciation within the Foursquare family for the scholarly work being produced by Foursquare scholars; and (6) FSF seeks to be an identifiable scholarly resource base for our denominational leadership, pastors, and educators. *Quadrum,* as you can see, is a concrete expression of the stated purpose of the Foursquare Scholars Fellowship.

The Essentiality of Women in Ministry Leadership

Somewhat unsurprisingly, it is often surmised that Foursquare's support of women in ministry and leadership is due in large part because the founding of the denomination was, in point of fact, by a woman. It would, I suppose, seem incredulous, if not hypocritical, to advance a position to the contrary. It seems to me a bit petty, however, to simply dismiss a denomination's stance on women in ministry solely based on the gender of its founder. It is, I presume, the *modus operandi* of some to do so, but we find it important to not only challenge the complementarian position regarding women in ministry not sorely because it is different, nor because it is not in keeping with our denomination's position, but simply and foremost because it is unbiblical and not in keeping with God's revelation and mission.

The subject of women in ministry leadership is relevant, important and essential. It is relevant for numerous reasons, not the least of which concerns the enormity of the Mission bestowed upon the Church. Expediency is of no small concern when it comes to the Great Commission for souls are hanging in the balance. What is needed is not only male leadership to get the job done, but female leadership as well. Secondly, this issue important. Taking a neutral stance on the matter will not suffice. Failing to contend for a fully biblical and missional position is not only spurious, but imprudent. Finally, the issue of women in ministry leadership is essential. It is essential in terms of Mission. It is essential in terms of ethics. It is essential in terms of fidelity and vitality of full-orbed discipleship. The decision to launch *Quadrum*'s inaugural issue by centering attention upon the theme of women in ministry leadership should not only signal our movement's interest in the topic, it should furthermore serve as a reflection of our denomination's dedication to raise up leaders – female and male – in the service of *missio Dei*. Namely, the "sent-and-sending God" is sending out his followers—young and old, male and female, educated and unlettered, timid and zealous—not because we have the answers, but because we know The Answer and His arms are open wide.

Breaking the Silence:
Background for the Silence of Women in 1 Cor. 14:34-35

Craig S. Keener, Ph.D.[1]

ABSTRACT:
What Paul already said in 1 Corinthians 11 shows that he is not mandating all kinds of silence for women in 14:34-35. What circumstances then is he addressing? Analysis of the particular sort of speech he specifies--asking questions--fits a known activity in ancient lectures. Women interrupting lectures with such questions, however, violated social convention, especially given women's lesser access to education in that era.

Very few churches today take 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 to mean all that it could possibly mean. Indeed, any church that permits women to participate in congregational singing recognizes that Paul was not demanding what a face-value reading of his words might imply: complete silence as a sign of women's subordination. But beyond this near consensus, church traditions and interpreters diverge: just *how* silent must women be?[2]

Various Interpretations

Interpretations vary considerably: Some scholars, for example, argue that Paul cites a Corinthian position here which he then refutes, as he sometimes did earlier in the letter (e.g., 1 Cor. 6:12-14); verse 36 does not, however, read easily like a refutation of preceding verses.[3] Others propose that, following synagogue practice, husbands and wives met in different parts of the church, requiring women to disrupt the worship particularly noisily by asking questions. This proposal fails on two counts: first, synagogues were probably not segregated in this period.[4] Second, although the Corinthian church started in a synagogue (Acts 18:4) it now met in homes (Acts

---

[1] Craig S. Keener (craig.keener@asburyseminary.edu) is Thompson Professor of Biblical Studies at Asbury Theological Seminary in Wilmore, Kentucky.

[2] This essay is reprinted from the book *Discovering Biblical Equality* with permission from InterVarsity Press and IVP-UK.

[3] I cite documentation for all these positions in *Paul, Women & Wives* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 74-80; for the sake of space I omit most documentation here.

[4] S. Safrai, "The Synagogue," pp. 908-44 in *The Jewish People in the First* Century, 2 vols., ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974-76), p. 939; B. J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), pp. 103-38.

18:7)—which would hardly afford the space for such gender segregation!

Some scholars remove the troublesome passage altogether, noting that it contrasts with its context and Paul's usual teaching.[5] The early Western textual tradition has these verses in a different location, which some think means that early scribes were still debating the best place in Paul's writings to insert it. But though the passage certainly *does* interrupt the context, none of the ancient manuscripts *lack* these verses, and they can make sense as a brief literary digression (a practice common enough both in Paul and other ancient writers).[6]

Trying to fit the passage into the immediate context is admittedly not simple. Some suppose that Paul is silencing women's practice of spiritual gifts like prophecy or prayer in tongues; while this proposal does pay attention to the context (which regulates public use of the gifts), however, it is difficult to square with Paul's acceptance of women praying and prophesying in church earlier in the same letter (1 Cor. 11:5). Others, often nonegalitarians (though the proposal itself need not entail a nonegalitarian conclusion), argue that Paul simply prohibits women from *judging* prophecy (1 Cor. 14:29). But judging prophecy is a task assigned to all who prophesy (1 Cor. 14:29), probably the gift of discerning spirits (1 Cor. 12:10); and again, women can prophesy (1 Cor. 11:5). The only kind of speech specifically mentioned here (asking questions) seems little related to evaluating prophecies' accuracy.[7]

Some readers interpret this passage as prohibiting women from teaching the Bible publicly, based on their understanding of 1 Timothy 2:11-12. This is, however, the least defensible position. Unfortunately, the Corinthians could not simply flip over in their Bibles to 1 Timothy (which had not been written yet) to figure out what Paul meant, and unlike regulations concerning prophecy or tongues, teaching does not even appear directly in the present context! Of course, if Paul enjoins complete silence on women, that silence would necessarily include teaching; but it would also

---

[5]Argued by F. F. Bruce, Wayne Meeks and others; but the most persuasive exponent of this position is Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699-705; most fully, *God's Empowering Presence* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 272-81.

[6]Cf. D. A. Carson, "'Silent in the Churches': On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36," pp. 140-53 in *Manhood and Womanhood*, p. 142. For digressions, see e.g., Jos. *Apion* 1.57; *Life* 336-367; Livy 9.17.1-9.19.17; Cicero *Finibus* 2.32.104; *Orator* 43.148; *Ad Atticus* 7.2; Arrian *Indica* 6.1; Sallust *Catil*. 5.9-13.5.

[7]Although people asked questions of oracles (*P. Oxy*. 1148-49, 1477) or "inquired of the Lord" (e.g., 1 Sam 9:9), this was not a method of *evaluating* prophecy.

include public prophecy and prayer (contradicting Paul's earlier remarks) as well as congregational singing.

What Situation Was Paul Addressing?

When Paul named various people in the church in Corinth, he did not have to explain to his readers who these people were (e.g., 1 Cor. 1:11, 14, 16; 16:17). The Corinthian Christians already knew them. Likewise, he can refer to practices like food offered to idols and women wearing head coverings with no concern that twenty-first century readers might struggle to reconstruct the situation. After all, the verse that tells us that Paul was writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 1:2) is just as inspired as more popular parts of the letter, and the letter genre itself invites us to consider his readers' situation.

Some readers today reject any interpretation of a passage that requires us to take the particular situation into account. Such readers are never consistent, however: few, for example, provide offerings for the Jerusalem church every Sunday (1 Cor. 16:1-4). Likewise, many do not require head coverings or holy kisses (1 Cor. 11:2-16; 16:20), recognizing that these practices meant something different to first-century readers than they would mean to us today.[8]

This inconsistency is important for egalitarians to recognize, if we hope to persuade a large part of the church. One may take culture into account yet not come to egalitarian conclusions; few Bible readers, however, will come to egalitarian conclusions on this passage without taking cultural setting into account. Christian scholars of all persuasions should labor to make Bible backgrounds more available to everyday Bible readers, but egalitarian scholars must give special attention to this necessary groundwork for even considering our position.

Paul can hardly mean that all women in all churches must be completely silent all the time; that would contradict not only even very conservative churches' practice today, but Paul's earlier words in the same letter (1 Cor. 11:5), not to mention his valuing of women laborers in the gospel (Rom. 16:1-7, 12). What clues does he offer us in the text itself concerning the reasons for the silence? The context addresses not simply spiritual gifts but order and propriety in house church meetings (1 Cor. 14:27-

[8]For the cultural practices involved here, see my "Head Coverings," 442-47; and "Kissing," 628-29 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000). For further examples of the need for cultural sensitivity in interpretation, see my "Women in Ministry," 27-70 in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, ed. J. R. Beck and C. L. Blomberg (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 46-49, 55-57.

33).

More important, our verses themselves specify only one particular kind of noise that we can be certain that Paul addresses here. Unless Paul changes the subject from women's submissive silence (1 Cor. 14:34) to asking questions privately (14:35a) and back again to silence (14:35b), asking questions is at least a primary example of the sort of speech he seeks to forbid. In fact, Paul explicitly bases his injunction to ask questions privately on his command for silence (14:35b, "for").

But why would women have been tempted to ask questions during the service? And what problems would these interruptions have posed? Here it is helpful to note that questions were standard fare in all ancient lecture settings—except when asked by those insufficiently learned, who were expected to keep quiet. There is good reason to suppose that most of the women (even those raised in the synagogue) were insufficiently learned. Further, even their gender would have rendered their outspokenness offensive to conservative Roman men (probably even in the familial setting of a Corinthian house church).

Women's Silence and Questions in Public Settings

Reading our passage itself, I had always found most plausible the view that women were interrupting the service with questions.[9] But I never could imagine what circumstances provoked these public questions, until one day I was reading Plutarch's essay, *On Lectures*. That was when I realized that listeners regularly interrupted lectures with questions, whether to learn more about the subject or to compete intellectually with an inadequately prepared lecturer. I quickly realized that questions characterized Jewish settings as well, and were a regular part of ancient Mediterranean lecture settings in general.[10]

---

[9]Also e.g., Don Williams, *The Apostle Paul & Women in the Church* (Glendale, CA: G/L Publications, 1977), 70; Kevin Giles, *Created Woman: A Fresh Study if the Biblical Teaching* (Canberra: Acorn, 1985), p. 56.

[10]See e.g., Seneca *Ep. Lucil*. 108.3; Musonius Rufus 3, p. 38.25-26; 4, p. 42.34-35; 14, p. 90.24-25; 16, p. 101.20-21; 17, p. 106.20-21; Plutarch *Lectures* 11, *Moralia* 43B; Aulus Gellius 1.26.2; 12.5.4; 16.6.1-12; 18.13.7-8; 20.10.1-6; Eunapius *Lives* 460; tosefta Sanhedrin 7:10; Abot R. Nathan 6A; Martin Goodman, *State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132–212* (Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies; Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld, 1983), 79; S. Safrai, "Education and the Study of the Torah," 945-70 in *The Jewish People in the First* Century, 2 vols., ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974-76), 2:966; also intellectual conversation, e.g., Xenophon *Cyr*. 1.4.3; Polybius 31.23.9; Plutarch *Table-Talk* 2.1.2, *Moralia* 630BC.

But why would Paul have restricted questions coming specifically from women? The questions could represent an example of a larger kind of speech in the assembly prohibited by women; but then why does Paul permit the women to pray and prophesy in 11:5? Two possibilities make good sense.

The first is that ancient Mediterranean protocol would disapprove of an otherwise honorable woman addressing unrelated men.[11] Although many men considered women prone to gossip, social convention particularly respected women who were socially retiring and did not talk much with men outside their household.[12] Women who conversed with men laid themselves open to gossipers' complaints about their morality;[13] traditional Romans regarded wives speaking publicly with others' husbands as a horrible matter reflecting possible flirtatious designs and subverting the moral order of the state.[14] By contrast, women's meekness and shyness was considered honorable.[15]

Since women's public speech was generally shameful in Corinth, one cannot simply assume that Paul's claim that it is "shameful" for a woman to speak in the assembly (14:35) is meant to be transcultural.[16] Conservative Greek culture, for

---

[11]See here e.g., Christopher Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 274, 277; Craig Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 596-97; cf. James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 589, 592.

[12]See Plutarch *Bride* 31-32, *Moralia* 142CD; Heliodorus *Ethiopica* 1.21. Later rabbis felt Jewish men should avoid unnecessary conversation with women (m. Ab. 1:5; tos. Shab. 1:14; b. Ber. 43b, bar.; Erub. 53b), and the strictest felt that a wife who spoke with a man in the street could be divorced with no marriage settlement (m. Ket. 7:6); some felt that such verbal intercourse could ultimately lead to sin (Sir. 9:9; 42:12; Test. Reub. 6:1-2). Traditional Middle Eastern societies still view social intercourse as nearly the moral equivalent of sexual infidelity (Carol Delaney, "Seeds of Honor, Fields of Shame," 35-48 in *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, ed. D. D. Gilmore [Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987], 43).

[13]Theophrastus *Characters* 28.3; also (ibid.) if they answer the door rather than a husband or porter doing so (suggesting they have a paramour, Tibullus 1.2.7, 15-24, 41, 55-56).

[14]Livy 34.2.9; 34.4.18. A more progressive speaker argues that this behavior is acceptable under some circumstances (34.5.7-10).

[15]E.g., Sophocles *Ajax* 293; Demosthenes *Meid*. 79; Sir. 22:5, 26:14; see further my "Marriage," 680-93 in *Dictionary of Background*, 687-90; further discussion of gender in my *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* (4 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012-15), 597-638.

[16]Walter L. Liefeld, "Women, Submission and Ministry in 1 Corinthians," pp. 134-54 in *Women, Authority & the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), 140-

example, regarded a wife talking with a young man as "shameful" (the same Greek term).[17] While Paul challenges some social conventions of his day, he supports others (including gender-related conventions like head coverings), presumably for strategic reasons.[18] A wife's behavior reflected on her husband's status, and certainly neither spouse should risk shaming the other (cf. 11:3-9; Prov 12:4; 31:23, 28).

Paul also has reason to be concerned for the church's reputation in the larger society (1 Cor. 6:6; 14:23), a concern which, incidentally, becomes all the more prominent in his later writings (1 Tim 3:7; 5:14; 6:1; Tit 2:5, 10).[19] It seems likely that he supports here the cultural expectation of honorable matrons' verbal self-restraint. Exceptions could be made, as they were even in pagan religion, for divinely inspired utterances, and perhaps Paul regarded freedom to pray in the house church meetings as a nonnegotiable right of all believers (1 Cor. 11:4-5; cf. Judg. 4:4).[20] But the general expectation was dominant, and Paul is usually reticent to divide Christians over cultural or personal issues (cf. Rom 14:15; 1 Cor. 8:9, 13; 9:12).

Ancient culture reflects this general expectation far more pervasively than the

---

142, who finds here the idea of glory and disgrace, as in 11:7, related to decorum or "order" (cf. 12:23; 11:34; 14:40); he notes that unnecessary social criticism could hinder the spread of Christianity. Speaking was "shameful" when inappropriate (e.g., in the case of a shameful speaker, Aeschines *Timarchus* 28-29). The designation of "shameful" behavior often applied to sexual immorality (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.78.5; Diodorus Siculus 5.55.6-7; 10.31.1; 12.15.2; 12.21.2; 32.10.9; 33.15.2), which was the opposite of appropriate womanly meekness (Arrian *Indica* 17.3), or gender mixing (Diodorus Siculus 4.4.1). But some observed that not all cultures shared the same sense of shame on such matters (Arrian *Indica* 17.3; Diodorus Siculus 5.32.7).

[17]E.g., Euripides *Electra* 343-44, though there are two men. Liefeld, "Submission," 142, points out that Plutarch and Livy viewed it as disgraceful for women to "express themselves visually or vocally in public."

[18]For Paul's strategic approach, see e.g., my "Paul: Subversive Conservative," *Christian History* 14 (3, 1995): 35-37.

[19]See *Paul, Women & Wives*, 139-48; Alan Padgett, "The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1-10," *Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (1, January 1987): 39-52, 52.

[20]Pagan prophetesses were common; most abundant are references to the inspiration of the mythical Sibyl (e.g., Ovid *Met*. 14.129-53; Virgil *Aen*. 6.77-102; Juvenal *Sat*. 3.3; Heraclitus *Ep*. 8; Sib. Or. Passim; also her historic successors in Diodorus Siculus 4.66.6) and the historic Delphic priestess (e.g., Longinus *Sublime* 13.2; Callimachus *Hymn* 4.89-90; Valerius Maximus 1.8.10; Cicero *Divinatione* 1.36.79; Plutarch *Oracles at Delphi* 21, *Mor*. 404E; *Dialogue on Love* 16, *Mor*. 759B; Dio Chrysostom *Personal Appearance* 12; Pausanias 2.2.7).

suggestion to which I now turn (for which I argued in *Paul, Women & Wives*). Indeed, even on its own it could explain Paul's prohibition. Nevertheless, given this general expectation in antiquity, the specific circumstances probably implied in the text would have further exacerbated the local problem. The second complication, therefore, is that some kinds of questions were considered inappropriate,[21] particularly questions that revealed that the questioner had failed to master the topic sufficiently.[22] I sometimes compare this to students whose questions reveal that they had not done the assigned reading before class.

This suggestion, however, raises an issue: Why would women be less likely to ask learned questions than men would? One could argue that this unlearned behavior reflects a transcultural, genetic limitation in women's ability to interpret Scripture. I have been a Bible professor of enough students of both genders over the years, however, to state unequivocally that such a claim is by empirical standards demonstrably false.[23]

More reasonably, women on average *were* less educated than men, an assertion that no one genuinely conversant in ancient literature would doubt. To be sure, one can collect examples of many educated women in antiquity (normally from wealthier families), but on average they were far less likely to be educated than men.[24] More to the point, even among the Jews and God-fearers who constituted the initial nucleus of the congregation (Acts 18:4-5), women would have less opportunities than men for training in Scripture. Although they would learn alongside men in the synagogues, they lacked special training some of the men would have. More critically here, whereas Jewish boys were taught to recite Torah growing up, the

---

[21] Distracting others from a lecture by one's conversation was also considered rude (Plutarch *Lectures* 13, *Moralia* 45D), as were hostile interruptions (4, *Mor*. 39CD; Rhet. Alex. 18, 1432b.35-40; Pliny *Ep*. 3.20.3-4; 3.9.25; Aulus Gellius 8.10). Concerning silence for novices, see the extreme example of the Pythagoreans in Seneca *Ep. Lucil*. 52:10; Aul. Gel. 1.9.3-4; Philostratus *Life of Apoll*. 1.1.

[22]See e.g., Plutarch *Lectures* 18, *Moralia* 48AB; Lucian *Demonax* 28; Diogenes Laertius 7.1.19; cf. Arius Didymus *Epit*. 2.7.5g, p. 32.14-15.

[23]Scientific studies would also undermine this claim; see Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, *Gender & Grace* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990), 75-105; also note the averages in Gregg Johnson, "The Biological Basis for Gender-Specific Behavior," pp. 280-93 in *Manhood and Womanhood*, ed. J. Piper and W. Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991), 290.

[24]See e.g., James S. Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), 249, 255-56.

same was not true for Jewish girls.[25] The teachers and primary questioners in the house churches probably came mostly from men who had been part of the synagogue.[26]

But why does Paul appeal to the law as confirming his case (14:34)? Paul cites the law as teaching that women or wives should submit themselves (presumably, to their husbands), and perhaps also that it enjoins their silence. Josephus seems to have understood the law in the same way, though as part of his apologetic appeal to the broader Greco-Roman world.[27] What is surprising in light of this is that the law nowhere commands either women's silence or their submission! Interpreters differ as to whether Paul appeals to a particular passage in the law, most likely the verdict at the fall (Gen 3:16), or to the general status of women in the period treated in the Pentateuch.[28] In either case, the texts *describe* women's subordination rather than prescribe it. Biblical law worked within a broader cultural milieu and, like any civil law, limited sin rather than creating the kingdom ideal (cf. e.g., Ex. 21:21; Lev. 19:20; Mk. 10:5).[29]

Assuming (as I do) that Paul would have known this, he must appeal to the law as allowing rather than mandating this situation. God challenged some aspects of ancient Near Eastern patriarchal tradition, but nevertheless worked within patriarchal societies (cf. also 1 Pet. 3:5-6). The law demonstrated that God remained able to work within patriarchal societies, including the Greco-Roman patriarchalism of Paul's day. This hardly mandates the continuance of such structures today when the

---

[25]See e.g., *Paul, Women & Wives*, 83-84; for women and the law in general, cf. e.g., Jos. *Ant*. 4.219; m. Aboth 5:21; Hag. 1:1; Suk. 2:8; tos. Ber. 6:18; b. Qid. 34a.

[26]Ancient writers could state general rules with the understanding that these sometimes permitted specific exceptions (see Quintilian 7.6.5; my *...And Marries Another* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1991], 24-28).

[27]Jos. *Apion* 2.201.

[28]An appeal to creation could be possible, as in 1 Cor 11:8-9 (though only those who press literally Paul's mandate head coverings should press literally the claims of this text). But one is hard-pressed to find women's subordination in the creation narrative itself, and when Paul appeals to the creation narrative his appeals do not force us to read it this way (see Keener, "Women in Ministry," 58-63; Joy Elasky Fleming, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Genesis 2-3 with Implications for a Theology of Man and Woman," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Strasbourg, 1987).

[29]Cf. *Paul, Women & Wives*, 188-93. All students of the Old Testament are familiar with the repetition of many of the categories of casuistic law found in earlier Mesopotamian legal collections.

spirit of Paul's teaching militates against them, any more than we would maintain slavery today (e.g., Eph. 6:5-9).

Paul's Solution

Rather than let the women learn by asking questions in the church, Paul admonishes them to ask their husbands at home. (From what we know of the culture, most of the women would have been married, and most such statements can address the general group, without denying the existence of exceptions.)30

To modern ears, this proposal sounds sexist, but in Paul's own social context it could have functioned in the opposite direction. Paul implicitly makes the husbands responsible for their wives' tutoring, but Plutarch tells us that most men did not believe that their wives could learn anything. (This would be especially true of Greek men, who averaged a decade or more older than their wives.) Plutarch regards himself as one of the most progressive voices of his day because he instructs a young man to take an interest in his wife's education—though Plutarch then goes on to note that this is necessary because if left to themselves women produce only base passions and folly![31] Happily, Paul's concern for the women's private tutoring does not cite such grounds!

Paul avoids the social impropriety by advising the women to avoid questioning other men during the Christian education component of the gathering, but he is not against their learning. Yet as we noted above, their lack of learning may have been precisely part of the problem. With greater understanding, they might become better able to articulate themselves intellectually in the same assemblies in which they could pray and prophesy. Viewed in this setting, the real issues are not gender but propriety and learning—neither of which need restrain women's voices in the church today.

Conclusion

Scholars have read this passage from various angles. Most likely, the passage addresses disruptive questions in an environment where silence was expected of new learners (which most women were). It also addresses a broader social context in which women were expected not to speak much with men to whom they were not

---

[30]For the married status of most women, see *Marries Another*, 68-74; "Marriage," 680-93 in *Dictionary of Background*, 680-81; for general statements allowing exceptions, see *Marries Another*, 24-28.

[31]Plut. *Bride* 48, *Mor*. 145BE.

related, as a matter of propriety. Paul thus upholds church order and avoids appearances of social impropriety; he also supports learning before speaking. None of these principles prohibit women in different cultural settings from speaking God's word.

Scripture, Women and Men, and Church Leadership[1]

Jim W. Adams, Ph.D.[2]

ABSTRACT:
The depictions and portrayals of women and men in Scripture have been traditionally interpreted in a hierarchical paradigm. This essay explores the diverse depictions of women and men within Scripture along with the interpretive angles guided by the various literary genres contained therein. From the author's analysis, the writers of Scripture depict both women and men equally in the image of God, envision both as unique in gender while equally corresponding to one another, portray both equally hearing from God, equally teaching for God, equally embraced as disciples of Jesus Christ, equally participating in all facets of ministerial responsibilities in the community of God, and equally empowered by the Holy Spirit.

Introduction

The equality of women within the Church of Jesus Christ is a passion of mine which derives from several sources. First and foremost, it comes from the biblical text itself. The more time I spend in the text, the more convinced I have become that God clearly envisions and equips woman to occupy leadership roles at any and all levels inside and outside the Church. I do not believe that I am reading the biblical text with a particular feminist slant as I am not alone in my conclusions among both female and male scholars across varied schools of thought. Over the last number of years, I have been a student of numerous female professors and scholars who have challenged my own male biases as well as provided unique insight into the biblical text. Like Timothy, I too am the product of strong godly grandmothers and a mother without whom I would not be the person I am today. I am married to an exceptional woman of God who is truly my better half, which I am reminded of by my family and friends on a daily basis, lest somehow, I forget. My sister is an industrious woman who is a servant in her community as she labors to provide for the practical and spiritual needs of immigrants and refugees. During my life, I have also been inspired by and have had the privilege of serving with godly women who are gifted by the Holy Spirit in all types of leadership capacities. My passion also stems from the countless young

---

[1] Parts of this article were presented by the author at *Kaleo: A Women's Leadership Intensive* on May 10, 2010.

[2] Jim W. Adams (jwadams@lifepacific.edu) is Professor of Biblical Studies at Life Pacific College in San Dimas, California.

women I have had the honor to teach and learn from who have demonstrated time and again unparalleled leadership skills. My enthusiasm is fueled, though, by the amount of recommendation letters I have written for many of these same women who find themselves limited to secretarial and administrative jobs within the Church despite their sense of calling to other better-suited roles.

Before proceeding, most of us are more than aware of the clear and strong examples of women leaders found within the Bible. Women such as Miriam the prophetess, Deborah the prophetess who judges Israel, Huldah the prophetess, Esther the deliverer of Israel, Priscilla teacher and co-worker of Paul, Junia an apostle and co-worker of Paul, and Phoebe a deaconess and co-worker of Paul. These important examples, though, are not typically considered as convincing evidence for women to participate in leadership within the Church. This conclusion characteristically derives from an interpretive paradigm that places higher value on explicit and direct commands and assertions over narrative and poetical type texts. However, such a hermeneutic is problematic as it operates according to the presupposition that a preferred canon within the canon of Scripture exists. In other words, such an interpretive grid arbitrarily places greater weight on privileged parts of Scripture in distinction to other parts. Taking these examples of female leaders for granted, my essay focuses on analyzing specific literary units within both Testaments often interpreted and used to promote a hierarchal relationship between men and women as well I will explore other texts and theological themes not typically taken into account.

A Word on Patriarchy

Patriarchy has become a tricky word to define these days as it conveys different ideas for various people in diverse historical periods and cultures and is especially problematic when describing gender relationships in the ancient texts of the Bible.[3] I will use this term in this essay to refer to humanity organized in a hierarchal relationship that privileges men over women. This type of patriarchy has been the defining aspect of societies, the Church of Jesus Christ, and is even found within the pages of Scripture. Men play a dominant role within the biblical text and also appear to be the primary writers of the Bible. Men have also controlled how Scripture should be interpreted and taught inside the Church as well as in the scholarly academy. Consequently, this patriarchal viewpoint has predominantly dictated how we must

[3] See Carol Meyers, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 24-46.

relate to and interact with God and one another.

Regarding the biblical text itself, we can easily see overt patriarchal views expressed. For example, the target audience of the Book of Proverbs is male as the teachings are primarily given by a father to his son. Consequently, women are virtually ignored as worthy recipients of such wisdom. In Proverbs, women are portrayed as either a help or threat to the male. Lady Wisdom leads to life whereas Lady Folly leads to death. Perhaps the most famous section in Proverbs is chapter 31 with its description of the ideal wife, given by a mother to her son. I was often told by my mother that I needed a Proverbs 31 woman and I believe I found her (although she is growing weary of rising up during the night). What is curious, however, is that there is no Proverbs 31, or even Proverbs 32, husband. Apparently, every man counts as a perfect candidate for a husband with no seeking required. Conversely, there are only a select few women who fall within this category, and apparently, they are extremely difficult to find. Turning my above observations on their head, though, by Proverbs exclusively focusing on men one could conclude that it is men who require instructions in wisdom, not women! Thus, it is safe to assume that as in the same way it is quite challenging to find a good wife so it is with a truly wise male.

One does not have to read Scripture very intently to quickly surmise that God is always referred to with masculine pronouns (e.g., "he," "him"). For some, this is an obvious and direct result of men who governed society and arrogantly constructed God in their own image. Men, and even some women, have also used this fact of masculine terminology to claim male superiority over women. Both these extreme conclusions are biblically and interpretively short-sighted. In the cultural setting of the Old/First Testament (O/FT), sexuality was part of the divine realm and most specifically associated with female deities. The sexuality of the goddess, and especially her ability to reproduce and regenerate, was intimately tied to her oneness with creation and ongoing creative activity. The goddess's power in nature was defined by sex. Fertility in nature occurred through the sexual activity of the deity.[4] Conversely, the biblical writers vigilantly distinguished Yahweh from his created world in this respect. They depict God with hands, a face with eyes, ears, and a nose, and a back, but they never describe God having genitals. God is never depicted as a sexual male even in instances of marriage and husband imagery (e.g., Hosea 2:14-23). For Ezekiel, to use "male" (זָכָר *zākār*) imagery to worship Yahweh engages

[4] See e.g., Tikva Frymer-Kensky, *In the Wake of the Goddesses* (New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1992), cf. 45-57.

Israel in unfaithful harlotry (16:17). Yahweh is never described as participating in sexual activity; God is not a sexual being.[5] Sexuality as well as death belong entirely to the human realm.[6] In the end, although the biblical writers use masculine as well as feminine imagery (e.g., Num 11:12; Deut 32:18; Isa 42:14; 49:15; 66:13) to depict God, Yahweh is neither male nor female, "'man' nor 'woman' (Deut 4:16)"[7] and particularly Yahweh is not a male. God is not identified as a "male" (זָכָר *zākār* or אִישׁ *ʾiš*); he is in fact the opposite of a male (Num 23:19; 1 Sam 15:29; Hos 11:9). By using masculine pronouns, then, the biblical writers further distance Yahweh from the typical sexual activity of the divine realm and specifically the primary sexual function associated with *female* deities. Because Yahweh is never depicted in such sexual terms, he is also distinguished from what exclusively characterizes human beings. Drawing all this together, God described in masculine terms does not support the superiority of the male gender, but rather demonstrates his own distinctiveness to and transcendence from the created world.[8] Thus, masculine terminology for God does not reflect a patriarchal agenda, but derives from an intentional theological decision by the writers of Scripture to directly contrast typical notions of deity in their revelatory depiction of the one true God. Appealing to the masculine imagery of God to demonstrate and enforce in any way and in any context male preeminence over females is a grave biblical and theological error.

Diversity of the Biblical Portrayal of Women

Within a patriarchal paradigm, women are described or thought of in one-

---

[5] According to Frymer-Kensky, "God is asexual…God does not behave in sexual ways…God is not imaged in erotic terms, and sexuality was simply not part of the divine order…God is not sexed, God does not model sexuality, and God does not bestow sexual power" (*Goddesses*, 188-89).

[6] See Frymer-Kensky, *Goddesses*, 188-89; John Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology Volume 2* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 47-48; Mark S. Smith, "Like Deities, Like Temples (Like People)," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. J. Day; New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 14-16.

[7] Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Yahweh the Patriarch* (trans. by F. J. Gaiser; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 83.

[8] So also John N. Oswalt, "Theology of the Pentateuch," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* (eds. T. D. Alexander and D. W. Baker; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 845-59 (848-49); for a different theological angle on the masculine terminology used for God see Walter Brueggemann, "Israel's Social Criticism and Yahweh's Sexuality," in *A Social Reading of the Old Testament* (ed. P. D. Miller; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 149-73.

dimensional terms which are usually not favorable. Although extreme for some, Ben Sira or Ecclesiasticus in the Apocrypha espouses such sentiments:

> "Better is the wickedness of a man than a woman who does good; it is woman who brings shame and disgrace" (42:14)
>
> "From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die" (25:24)

However, such a flat, biased, and negative understanding of women does not reflect the biblical depiction as a whole. There is no single, consistent image of women found within the pages of Scripture. As with men, the Bible contains a varied and complex picture of women. As with men, women are presented in both positive and negative lights. For example:

> So Bathsheba went to King Solomon to speak to him for Adonijah. And the king arose to meet her, bowed before her, and sat on his throne; then he had a throne set for the king's mother, and she sat on his right (1 Kgs 2:19)
>
> Indeed, I brought you up from the land of Egypt
> and ransomed you from the house of slavery,
> and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam (Mic 6:4)
>
> A constant dripping on a rainy day
> and a contentious woman are alike (Prov 27:15)
>
> Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lappidoth, was judging Israel at that time. 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 (Jud 4:4-5)
>
> The peasantry ceased, they ceased in Israel,
> until I, Deborah, arose,
> until I arose, a mother in Israel (Jud 5:7)
>
> My people, children are their oppressors,
> and women rule over them.
> My people, your leaders mislead you
> and confuse the course of your paths (Isa 3:12)
>
> How long will you go here and there,
> O daughter who turns away?
>
> For the LORD has created a new thing in the earth;
> A woman protects (lit. encompasses) a man (Jer 31:22)

A certain woman threw an upper millstone upon Abimelech's head and crushed his skull. Then he called quickly to the young man, his armor bearer, and said to him, “Draw your sword and kill me, lest men say about me, ‘A woman killed him’” (Jud 9:53-54)

What my son? . . . Do not give your strength to women
or your ways to that which destroys kings (Prov 31:2-3)

If a woman conceives and bears a male child she shall be unclean for seven days . . . But if she bears a female child she shall be unclean for two weeks (Lev 12:2, 5)

Anyone who curses his father or his mother shall surely be put to death (Lev 20:9a)

A woman of strength, who can find?
Her worth is far more than rubies (Prov 31:10)

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor fee, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ (Gal 3:28)

When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she cried out with a loud voice and said, “Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! And how has it happened to me that the mother of my Lord would come to me?” (Lk 1:41-43)

Now a Jew named Apollos…began to speak out boldly in the synagogue. But when Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they took him aside and explained to him the way of God more accurately (Acts 18:24, 26)

The angel said to the women, “Do not be afraid; for I know that you are looking for Jesus who has been crucified…Go quickly and tell his disciples that he has risen from the dead” (Matt 28:5, 7a)

While he was in Bethany at the home of Simon the leper, and reclining at the table, there came a woman with an alabaster vial of very costly perfume of pure nard; and she broke the vial and poured it over his head. But some were indignantly remarking to one another, “Why has this perfume been wasted?”…But Jesus said, “Let her alone; why do you bother her? She has done a good deed to me…Truly I say to you, wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world, what this woman has done will also be spoken of in memory of her” (Mk 14:3-4, 6, 9)

From this small sampling, women are depicted across a wide-spectrum. In certain cases, women were deemed worthy of highly esteemed leadership roles over both men and women while in other instances women were considered far less valuable than men and even the possessions of men to do with as they please. Consequently, a one-dimensional understanding of women from the Bible is an impossible interpretive conclusion, but a selective, biased reading. The fact that there is no single description of women in the Bible, therefore, must cause us to pause when we set out to describe the nature, capabilities, and divine gifting of women from a biblical perspective.

Genesis 1:27 within Genesis 1:1-2:4a

> God created the אָדָם (*ʾādām*) in his image
> and in the image of God he created it.
> Male and female he created them.

This verse is found in the literary unit of 1:1-2:4a, wherein God's creative activity reaches its pinnacle with the creation of the *ʾādām* in 1:26-30. Here God creates a singular creature identified as *ʾādām* consisting of two species, "male" (זָכָר *zākār*) and "female" (נְקֵבָה *nəqēbâ*) (cf. v 27b), not an androgynous being. In this unit, *ʾādām* obviously refers to humanity not simply male (cf. Gen 5:2). The *ʾādām* as a whole is made in the "image" (צֶלֶם *ṣelem*) of God. As the image of God, the *ʾādām* represents the Creator and functions as his vice-regent who is assigned to "rule" (רָדָה *rādâ*) over creation on his behalf (vv 26, 28). It is true that the "male" or "female" are never identified in this section as God's image individually or separately; however, as Phyllis A. Bird concludes, "if the divine image characterizes and defines the species as a whole, it cannot be denied to any individual of the species. To be human is to be made in the image of God. And if to be human means also to be male *or* female (the plural of v. 27 also works against any notion of androgyny), then *both* male and female must be characterized equally by the image."[9] Thus, the image of God does not only occur when the two species are joined together in some way (e.g., in marriage), but each are equally the image of God as they individually constitute the *ʾādām*. The male and female are unified as they image God while at the same time are diverse in gender. As each constitutes the image of God, in their gender distinction each reflects facets of God differently and

[9] Bird, *Missing Persons and Mistaken Identities* (OTL; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 123-54 (153).

uniquely than the other.

Significantly and in contrast to numerous theologians, the sin of humanity in Genesis 3 does not cause an eradication, ruining, shattering, bending, tarnishing, blurring, etc. of the image. The "image" dimension of humanity remains intact as Genesis 9:6 clearly indicates. Thus, post-sin in the Garden women and men equally maintain their status as the image of God. Both of the species retain their delegated commission to represent him and specifically to multiply, rule over, and subdue the earth.

Genesis 2:4b-3:24

> And Yahweh God said, "It is not good for the *ʾādām* to be alone. I will make for him a helper corresponding to him" (2:18)

This text is found in the literary unit of 2:4b-3:24 which is related to as well as distinct from 1:1-2:4a. This is one of the primary texts Complementarians use to justify a hierarchical view of men and women inside and outside the Christian community. This paradigm derives from several interpretive conclusions. First and foremost, the male is created first (2:7) and the woman second (2:22). With this so-called "created order," God has thereby established a hierarchal relationship between men and women with women occupying a subservient role to men. Because of this order of creation, some Complementarians also argue that the man is now God's firstborn son with all the rights thereunto (i.e., primogeniture).[10] The primary problem with integrating such a notion into this literary unit centers on the fact that the male is never described in such primogeniture terms. Bringing such a concept to this text assimilates a completely foreign idea into the interpretive process which ends up forcing the text to say something it clearly is not concerned with.[11] Holding to a so-called "creation order" runs into additional problems if we simply look back to Genesis 1 wherein human beings are clearly created last. Following this "created order" line of thinking, are we to deduce that human beings, both male and female, are inferior to the animals? Such a conclusion would most assuredly receive a resounding "No!" from Complementarians. Moreover, if we follow the "created order" of Genesis 1 then we should naturally infer that the woman is the pinnacle of

---

[10] See e.g., Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 461.

[11] See further Richard S. Hess, "Equality With and Without Innocence: Genesis 1-3," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* (eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 79-95 (84-85).

God's creative work in Genesis 2 as she is created last. Those who adhere to this order of creation school of thought would additionally and obviously reject such a conclusion. In the end, Complementarians arbitrarily isolate Genesis 2 and their interpretively derived "created order" grid to define the male and female relationship; however, no overarching hierarchal "created order" organizing the female and male relationship can be found in Genesis 1-2. Reading the narrative story of Genesis consecutively, one cannot logically conclude that a hierarchy exists between the male and female in Genesis 2 as both are equally in the image of God who uniformly function in their authoritative roles of governing creation. Following the narrative sequence of Genesis 2, the woman is created after it becomes quite apparent that no suitable helper can be found among the animals to match the man (v 20). The narrator directly contrasts the woman from the animals, not the woman from the man! The woman is created following the animals, not because of her inferiority, but rather because of her superior compatibility over and against any other created being. Only another human being is suitable for the male. Yahweh creates the woman from the same substance as the man, "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh." The "man" אִישׁ *ʾîš* names the "woman" אִשָּׁה *ʾiššâ* (2:23) because he discovers and recognizes their sameness; not to demonstrate or because he has authority over her.[12] Correlating to Gen 1, Yahweh does not create a single androgynous being, but two unique gendered human beings; male and female who are versions of the same type of being perfectly corresponding to one another.

Second, in 2:18 and 20, the woman is described as a "helper" (עֵזֶר *ʿēzer*). When a person is described as an *ʿēzer* this does not convey inferiority;[13] rather, the person in need of a "helper" is inadequate in and of her/himself. This noun and its corresponding verb are often used to describe God as a "helper" for Israel.[14] Throughout the pages of the O/FT, Israel is constantly in a place of needing

---

[12] See George W. Ramsey, "Is Name-Giving an Act of Domination in Genesis 2:23 and Elsewhere?," *CBQ* 50 (1988): 24-35; see also Hess, "Equality," 87-88.

[13] *Contra* Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 461-62. Grudem supports much of his argument on the conclusions of David J. A. Clines ("What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Irredeemably Androcentric Orientations in Genesis 1-3," in *What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament* [JSOT: Supp 94 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990], 25-48). However, Clines does not include in his analysis the numerous texts describing God as a "helper" (e.g., Gen 49:2; Ex 18:4; Deut 33:7, 26, 29); so also Hess, "Equality," 86.

[14] See Allan M. Harman, "עֵזֶר" in *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis* (ed. W. A. VanGemeren; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 3: 378-79.

assistance because of its own lack of ability to deliver itself from trouble. In response, Yahweh "helps" Israel by delivering it from danger. Because of this usage, the man in Genesis 2 is naturally understood as inadequate by himself. This is confirmed by Yahweh's own observation that "it is not good for the *ʾādām* to be alone" (the first time God says that something is "not good"!). It is the woman who perfectly matches and fills the man's inadequacy. I think it is interpretively going too far, though, to claim that because Yahweh is a "helper" then correspondingly the woman should be considered superior to the man. The term "corresponding to him" (כְּנֶגְדּוֹ *kənegdô*) conveys identity, mutuality, and equality. As Phyllis Trible observes, "According to Yahweh God, what the earth creature needs is a companion, one who is neither subordinate nor superior; one who alleviates isolation through identity."[15] Both the man and the woman are inadequate in and of themselves without the other. Both perfectly complement each other which finds its ultimate expression in a mutually committed marriage relationship (3:24).

Third, hierarchy is argued from the fact that God approaches the man first and then the woman following their disobedient decisions and actions. This interpretive conclusion runs into a number of problems[16] with the literary sequencing the most noteworthy argument against such a notion:

A	Snake			
	B	Woman		
		C	Man	
			D	Yahweh God
		C'	Man	
	B'	Woman		
A'	Snake			

This concentric literary structure is a very common poetic technique found throughout the Bible and demonstrates that a hierarchical created order is not the reason for God's approaching the man first, but the poetical nature of the text.[17] This concentric structure places Yahweh God and his fundamental role as Creator and Judge at the *center* of this section (3:1-13). Yahweh God becomes the *central* focus

---

[15] Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (OBT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 90.

[16] See Hess, "Equality," 89-90.

[17] On the concentric structure of the entire literary unit of Gen 2:4b-3:24 see John E. Hartley, *Genesis* (NIBC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 58.

here, not a so-called "created order."[18]

Lastly, following the actions in the garden God pronounces judgment upon the snake and then the woman and finally the man, which results in the man now becoming the woman's master (3:16). The word מָשַׁל (*māšal*) here is a common term "to rule as a master or king." The woman's "desire" (תְּשׁוּקָה *təšûqâ*) in 3:16 is not best understood as "sexual desire" but rather "to dominate" or "rule over" the man just like sin "desires" (*təšûqâ*) for Cain which he must then "rule over" (*māšal*) (Gen 4:7). In other words, as sin desires to rule over Cain so the woman desires to rule over her male master.[19] The harmonious mutually committed relationship between the woman and the man has now become an antagonistic power-play. Nevertheless, this aberrant rupture between the man and woman is a *consequence* not a *commandment*; a *description*, not a *prescription*. These consequences "are not God's decisions on how things must be, such that violation of them would be sin."[20] Thus, the relationship between women and men need not be defined by the consequences described in Genesis 3, but should rather be aimed at the original mutuality presented in Genesis 2. The second chapter depicts God's intended world whereas the third chapter describes a broken world. At the same time, how the male does *māšal* remains open to interpretation. Power is amoral; the one authorized with power ultimately determines the nature of that power. In the same way, the verb here is defined by its subject, not by the verb itself. In other words, the verb is neutral, the subject determines how it will be defined. Thus, the male decides how he will *māšal* either as an oppressive task-master or as a liberating servant.

As a final note, the only description of authority or dominion before the transgression of the male and female is the shared dominion given to the image of God, the male and female in Genesis 1. As the narrative of Gen 2 describes God obviously created in a particular order, but this sequence of creation does not thereby ordain a hierarchical organization between the man and woman. The loss of harmony between the two involves authority, but the wielding of such power remains negotiable. Following the sin of the couple, human beings have been exiled east of Eden, but the canonical text of Genesis 2 continues to implore and instruct us to live according to the original intent of the female and male relationship found in Eden.

---

[18] Similarly Hess, "Equality," 90.

[19] See Susan Foh, "What Is the Woman's Desire?" *WTJ* 37 (1975): 376-83.

[20] Hess, "Equality," 92.

Beyond the Plain Sense of the Text

As I mentioned above, patriarchal views are expressed within the Bible itself. Typically, though, such points of view within a particular literary unit are not the topic of discussion. Because of this, such perspectives typically hover just below the surface of a text without the narrator providing any explicit commentary either endorsing or rejecting such views. The narrator often simply *shows* such patriarchy waiting for the interpreter to weigh in on such thoughts and/or actions. In other instances, God and the biblical writers indirectly subvert such patriarchal viewpoints leaving interpretive trajectories for the reader to follow and thereby change her/his worldview and actions.

Hagar (Genesis 16:1-16)

> Then Hagar called on the name Yahweh who spoke to her, "You are God of my seeing" (16:13a)

The story of Hagar in Genesis 16:1-16 provides an example of the narrator remaining silent while at the same time displaying God subverting patriarchal mindsets. Hagar is a female slave of both Sarah and Abraham. Upon conceiving Abraham's child, Sarah mistreats Hagar and she runs away (16:6). Who seeks and finds her? Yahweh via his messenger (16:7). Following God's command to Hagar to return to Sarah as well as giving her similar promises as to Abraham (v 10), God tells her to name her child "Ishmael" (יִשְׁמָעֵאל *yišmāʿēʾl*) which means "God hears" and specifically because he *hears* her affliction (v 11b). God is intently aware of and speaks with a woman here. Most significantly, though, Hagar becomes the first person in the Bible to give God a name. Following God's speech to her, Hagar says, אַתָּה אֵל רֳאִי "you are God of my seeing" which contextually conveys that God sees her and that she has seen God simultaneously (v 13). With this utterance, Hagar is the first theologian in the Bible.[21] Remarkably, within the canon of Scripture it is a woman, and a female slave at that, who becomes the first human being to give God a name; not a man, but a woman.

Manoah's Wife, the Unnamed Mother of Samson (Judges 13:1-25)

> And there was a certain man of Zorah from the family of the Danites and his name was Manoah and his wife was barren and she had not given birth. Then a

[21] John Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology Volume 1* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 243.

> messenger of Yahweh appeared to the woman and said to her, "Behold now you are barren and have not given birth, but you shall conceive and give birth to a son" (Jud 13:2-3)

This literary unit provides a salient example of both God and the narrator subverting patriarchal views. On the literary surface, Judges 13:1-25 does not appear like anything more than an extended birth narrative of the last judge of Israel, Samson. However, looking more closely one can see an additional agenda. The central character of this passage is a woman, but in typical fashion she goes unnamed; she is simply referred to as "Manoah's wife" or "the woman." We never discover her name; she is another nameless woman within the Book of Judges. However, the narrator and God do not play by the same patriarchal rules as others do. As a result, this story is full of irony and even humor. Yahweh, through his messenger, visits, speaks, and instructs the unnamed woman, not the man. Manoah's wife, then, speaks on behalf of Yahweh as she relates his message to her husband (vv 6-7). Following, Manoah entreats Yahweh to come again to "us" and teach "us" about the boy to be born (v 8). Yahweh listens to Manoah, but answers his prayer in part by only appearing again to the woman (v 9). Manoah's wife, then, quickly finds her husband and he *follows* her to the messenger (vv 10-11). Manoah inquires the messenger about what to do for the boy and his response was for the *woman*, not him, to listen and follow the instructions he gave to *her* (vv 12-14). Although the narrator adopts the typical patriarchal mode of not naming the woman, he also subversively presents her as the central character of the narrative as well as the spiritually insightful one in contrast to her husband. The unnamed woman clearly recognizes who and what this visitor is, Yahweh's messenger. Conversely, Manoah does not have a clue about this messenger; he only recognizes the identity and nature of Yahweh's messenger when he miraculously disappears. Manoah's wife also has to reassure her husband that they will not die because of this visitation (vv 22-23). In this seemingly unassuming narrative, God and the narrator take to task the patriarchal stances and structures within Israelite society and even our own. As Mary J. Evans concludes, the story of "Manoah's wife stands as a clear refutation of any impression that the society, contemporary or future, might have that women were intrinsically incapable or, indeed, less capable than men of hearing from God, understanding God's ways or speaking for God."[22]

---

[22] Evans, "Women," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books* (eds. B. T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson; Downers Grove: InterVaristy, 2005), 989-99 (991).

Jesus as Social Revolutionist

> Now as they went on their way Jesus entered a certain village and a certain woman named Martha welcomed him into her home and she had a sister called Mary and while sitting at the feet of the Lord she listened to his word (Lk 10:38-39)

Before, during, and after Jesus was on the earth there were many men who claimed that they were in fact the Messiah. Accompanying these self-proclaimed Messiahs was the promise and attempts to overthrow the Herodian and Roman domination in Palestine.[23] In contrast to these individuals, Jesus as the Christ/Messiah did not come as a military revolutionist. Among other agendas, he came instead as one who turned upside down the typical societal structures. Not in the sense of overturning the actual societal and political systems inherent in the society of the day through social activism or military means. Rather, in his preaching of the Kingdom of God he invited people to enter into a relationship with God that called women and men to operate and relate in new ways that countered and consequently subverted the current societal structures, e.g., "the last will be first and the first will be last" (Lk 13:30). Within his teachings as well as his actions, Jesus Christ redefined social relationships that forever dismantled barriers between those identified as clean and unclean, rich and poor, slave and master, and insiders and outsiders of the community of God. Jesus also redefined the relationship between women and men. Jesus rarely, if ever, directly commanded or made statements on how a man should treat a woman in the community of God. He never describes how women and men should relate in the Church. Jesus, instead, *shows* and *demonstrates* how men should relate to women, how God thinks about women, and the significance and value of women among the people of God. In addition to this, the Gospel writers never explicitly identify women followers of Jesus as "disciples" (μαθήτης *mathētēs*), but these same writers *show* that they are in fact true disciples.

When it comes to women, Jesus as a male is utterly unique in his time and cultural setting during which women were typically viewed in negative terms. Conversely, Jesus treated women with dignity and worth. Jesus engaged in conversations with women (e.g., Jn 4:7-26) and healed them (e.g., Mk 1:29-31). Jesus highlighted women as positive examples in his teachings and distinguished them as strong examples of faith (e.g., Lk 4:26; Matt 15:21-28) while in his parables

---

[23] See W. J. Heard, "Revolutionary Movements," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds. J. B. Green et al.; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 688-98.

women represented God (e.g., Mt 13:33; Lk 13:20-21; 15:8-10). As with Yahweh, Jesus described himself in feminine terms as well (e.g., Mt 23:37; Lk 13;34-35).

A woman's place during Jesus' time was often relegated to the domestic roles of wife and mother. In contrast, Jesus invited women to become his followers on equal standing as with men. During Jesus' time and culture, it would be inconceivable for a Messiah to have female disciples. Again, however, Jesus does not play by the same societal rules. An important description of Jesus' stance towards women occurs when Mary of Bethany sits *at the feet* of Jesus as a pupil listening to him while her sister Martha busies herself with "domestic hospitality" (διακονία *diakonía*) (Lk 10:38-42). Mary here clearly assumes the posture of a disciple who eagerly *listens* to and *learns* from her rabbi teacher. Significantly, Luke's description of Mary παρακαθεσθεῖσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ κυρίου "sitting *at the feet* of the Lord" virtually matches Paul's description in Luke's second volume of him παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ πεπαιδευμένος "being educated *at the feet* of Gamaliel" (22:3),[24] who was a prominent first-century Pharisaic teacher (Acts 5:34). It is also important to recognize that this story of Mary and Martha occurs early on in Luke's literary Journey to Jerusalem section (9:51-19:44) which contains a high concentration of unique Lukan material. In this unit, sometimes coined as the *Gospel for the Outcast*, Luke presents stories about and teachings of Jesus Christ that convey the theme of *reversal* and *surprise*: humble *outsiders* receive blessing and/or commendations while conversely arrogant and prideful *insiders* suffer rebuke and/or loss (e.g., Who is my neighbor? [Lk 10:29-37]; cf. 14:11).[25] Being taught *at the fee*t of a master sage was exclusively reserved for male disciples of a particular rabbi as we see with Paul and Gamaliel whereas in this story Jesus overtly *reverses* such conventional norms by teaching a humble female *outsider*. Further, by adopting such a posture Mary is without a doubt being trained by Jesus to then *teach* others.[26] Quite remarkably, Jesus does not rebuke Mary for taking such an outrageous and shocking position while at the same time he corrects Martha's assumptions concerning traditionally defined female domestic roles. Martha desires for Jesus to return Mary back into her socially delineated place. Jesus, however, refuses to do so and thereby forever

---

[24] In the Mishnah, *'Abot* 1:4 reads: "Let your house be a gathering place for sages and wallow in the dust of their feet and drink in their words with gusto"; see also 2 Kings 4:38.

[25] See Mark L. Strauss, *Four Portraits, One Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 274.

[26] See Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 218.

redefines the potential applicants for his disciples as also including women. As we learn in John, Martha is also in fact a disciple who confesses her belief that Jesus is the Messiah and Son of God (11:27) which virtually matches Peter's all-important confession (Matt 16:16) which the Church will be built upon (v 17).

Some often claim that for Jesus women could not exercise authority over men because he appointed only twelve men as his primary or innermost disciples. Within his cultural setting of the day, it would have been effectively impossible to include women among the Twelve. That said, Jesus logically appoints twelve Hebrew men in order to directly link them to the twelve patriarchs who represent the twelve tribes of Israel (e.g., Num 1:4-16). The Twelve, then, symbolize the twelve patriarchs who in turn also represent the newly constituted people of God (Matt 19:28; Lk 22:30).[27] Jesus' selection of the Twelve was a strategic and missional decision not a result or flaunting of patriarchal preference. Although the Twelve functioned in leadership roles within the early church (e.g., Acts 6:2), the NT never sets up the Twelve as the sole form of leadership, especially at the exclusion of women functioning in such capacities (following the replacement of Judas in Acts 1 the final Twelve remain as *The Twelve* with their unique positions never subsequently held by anyone else). Others also point out that Jesus did not appoint women to offices within the church, but nor did he appoint men either! The single highest call and role offered by Jesus was that of being his disciple and for Jesus both women and men were equally invited to embrace this vocation and in turn make disciples of others (Matt 28:18-20).

What is extremely astonishing is the role of women and the Gospel message. It is women who function as the primary interpreters of the birth of Jesus, the Savoir (cf. Lk 1:39-56). Before, during, and after the crucifixion of Christ, it is his female followers who faithfully remain close by whereas his male disciples essentially vanish from the scene. On Christ's resurrection day, the first ones he appears to are his female followers, not the Twelve men. Jesus reiterates the words of the angel of the Lord for the women to go tell his disciples of his resurrection (Matt 28:1-10). The first preachers of the Good News, then, were women while the first recipients of their message were men who, according to Luke, did not believe their report (Lk 24:10-11, 22-24). In sum, it is women who remain faithful to Christ in all circumstances, he appears to them first, they unhesitatingly believe, and are the first

---

[27] See further Aída B. Spencer, "Jesus' Treatment of Women in the Gospels," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* (eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 126-41 (135-37); see also Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 188.

preachers of the Gospel message. Amazingly, the first person in the Scriptures to give God a name is a woman and the first preachers of the Gospel are women.[28]

Paul and Women in Leadership

> [11]A woman in quietness should learn in all submissiveness [12]and I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in quietness. [13]For Adam was created first, then Eve [14]and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived became a transgressor; [15]but she will be saved through the childbearing, if they remain in faith, love, and holiness, with modesty (1 Timothy 2:11-15)[29]

Among numerous biblical interpreters, Paul trumps Jesus when it comes to ministerial leadership within the Church. As I stated earlier, such a hermeneutical decision is typically based on placing greater weight on direct commands and assertions over narrative and parables. Similarly, particular sayings of Paul even trump other sections within his own letters. In the case of 1 Timothy 2:9-15, Paul's instructions here provide for these same interpreters his definitive position on women in leadership within the Church.[30] Moreover, this text provides the absolute and universal conclusion on women's role in the Church.[31] Ironically, though, Paul himself does not present a consistent position on women in Church leadership within the corpus of his own writings.

To begin, Euodia and Synthche are not rebuked for occupying leadership roles within the Philippian church. Instead, Paul exhorts them to live in harmony *as* they lead (4:2). Importantly also, Paul identifies these two women as part of his "fellow workers" (συνεργῶν *synergōn*; 4:3). Outside of this letter, Paul includes among his "fellow workers" both men and women (e.g., Rom 16:3-16). In 1 Corinthians 16:16 and 1 Thessalonians 5:12 Paul requests from his letter readers that they submit to his

---

[28] Thanks to Michael Salmeier for his help and insight in developing this section.

[29] I am assuming here that Paul wrote 1 and 2 Timothy as well as Titus. For a defense of this position see in particular William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), xlvi-cxxix

[30] E.g., G. W. Knight III, *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), 29.

[31] See e.g., Douglas Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority over Men?: 1 Timothy 2:11-15," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (eds. J. Piper and W. Grudem; Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1991), 179-93, 495-99.

"fellow workers," which would obviously include women. Throughout his letters, Paul uses identical descriptors for men as he does for women leaders. Both are equally "fellow prisoners," "fellow workers," and "hard workers" who have "labored side by side" with Paul "in the gospel."[32] Paul does not discriminate among those who choose to labor in the gospel. Paul also names specific women who served in primary leadership roles within the Church: Phoebe is a "deacon" (διάκονον) not a deaconess! (Rom 16:1); Junia is an apostle (Rom 16:7).[33] In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul encourages women, as with men, to pray and prophesy (11:5) which more than likely functioned as an authoritative teaching role.[34] His central concern here is for women to dress appropriately,[35] not that they are publicly prophesying! With all this, if Paul does not universally rebuke women in leadership with the churches he has either founded or writes to and in fact endorses women in leadership, then we are compelled to look at this text in 1 Timothy as something specific and occasional.

Turning to the text itself, what we clearly know is that Paul exhorts women in this Ephesian church to dress and act appropriately (vv 9-10). Paul also wants these women to be "in quietness" during Church gatherings. In the literary sub-unit of vv 11-12 he uses the prepositional phrase "in quietness" twice which essentially forms an *inclusio* or bracket around his instructions. With this Paul clearly emphasizes such quiet demeanor as the posture for the women to adopt while they learn. In v 12 Paul asserts that the women are not to "teach" (διδάσκω *didaskō*) or have "authority" (αὐθεντέω *authenteō*) over a man. It is quite evident that Paul instructs the Ephesian women to learn in quiet submissiveness and not to teach; however, Paul does not use a common word for "authority" here, but chooses an atypical term that only occurs in this instance. This term has proven quite difficult to define,[36] but it seems to

---

[25] See Linda L. Belleville, "Women Leaders in the Bible," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* (eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 110-25 (124).

[33] On Junia see Belleville, "Women," 116-20.

[34] See e.g., David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

[35] On 1 Cor 11 see e.g., Gordon D. Fee, "Praying and Prophesying in the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* (eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 142-60; Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 19-69.

[36] For an updated summary of the scholarly analysis of this term see Mounce, *Pastoral*, 123-30.

convey a negative connotation of authority in the sense of usurping or domineering.[37] It appears, then, that the women were somehow usurping the authority of the men.

An important interpretive approach to any biblical text involves inquiring about the reason and purpose for the document. Although we believe that Paul's writings are Scripture, they are also occasional and situational letters**.** In all of his letters, Paul addresses specific situations and typically problems within a particular Christian community. Looking at Paul's first letter to Timothy, our question of reason to Paul is immediately answered following his traditional opening: male false teachers are spreading dangerous ideas contrary to the gospel of Jesus Christ (1:3-11). Such men are teaching these strange notions for personal gain (6:3-10). Among other things, their teachings instruct their adherents to abstain from food and marriage (4:1-5), quite possibly because they believe that the final resurrection has already taken place (2 Tim 2:18). For Paul, such ideas are demonically inspired (4:1-2). Food and marriage have been created by God and thus should not be rejected (vv 3-5). Significantly, these teachings have been embraced by particular women in the Ephesian church (2 Tim 3:1-9, cf. vv 6-7) and they are in fact spreading these erroneous ideas (5:13). For Paul, to adhere to and teach such heresy is tantamount to following after Satan (v 15). Another and related concern for Paul in this letter is the reputation of the Ephesian church within its larger setting within society. According to Paul, the church must maintain a "good reputation with outsiders" (3:7) and "not give the enemy an opportunity for slander" (5:14b) so that ultimately "our teaching may not be slandered" (6:1). In order to combat this heresy and to maintain a good reputation for the sake of the gospel, Paul instructs Timothy on "how people ought to conduct themselves in the household of God" (3:14-15).

So, why did Paul write this letter? To provide clear instructions for Timothy to eradicate this false teaching and set straight the household of God. Why, then, did Paul include these instructions on women in 2:9-15? To address this same situation of false teachers who have targeted women, typically uneducated and untrained in the Scriptures, who are apparently usurping authority and spreading this false teaching. These women were stepping outside their usual roles within the Church, misrepresenting the truth of the gospel, and consequently tarnishing the reputation of God's household to those on the outside. Paul's instructions in vv 11-12 are

---

[37] For a recent examination on the term conveying authority in a negative sense see Linda L. Belleville, "Teaching and Usurping Authority: 1 Timothy 2:11-15," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* (eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 205-23 (209-19).

"directed against women who, having been touched or captivated by false teachings, are abusing the *normal* opportunities women had within the church to teach and exercise authority."[38]

Paul supports his exhortations on women's behavior in the Church with a brief and selective synopsis of Genesis 2-3. For Complementarians, Paul argues here in v 13 for a timeless hierarchical created order as "Adam was created first, then Eve." However, Paul does not defend or expand on this terse statement at all and it does not factor in as part of the overall concerns expressed in his letter to Timothy. Also, as presented above, Genesis 2 does not depict a hierarchal relationship based on the sequential ordering of the man and woman. Moreover, in Galatians 3:28 Paul asserts that the equality and mutuality expressed in Genesis 1 and 2 is realized once again for those now "in Christ."[39] The focus for Paul here more reasonably lies with the *deception* and *transgression* of Eve (v 14) as these ideas directly relate and apply to the false teaching and its female adherents. The women in Ephesus are being deceived through this false teaching with some having already turned to follow Satan (5:15) while others are potentially in danger of forfeiting their salvation. Before moving on, Paul's use and description of Eve's deception has been used to support the traditional view that women are unfit for leadership because they are by nature more prone to deception than men. This interpretive conclusion is biblically ignorant and in fact absurd as both genders are clearly shown equally deceivable throughout both Testaments, not to mention the evidence found throughout church history as well as our own human experience.

Paul's final part of his answer to this problem is expressed in v 15. With these two lines, Paul has created a number of interpretive difficulties because of his complex, and frankly awkward, grammar. In v 15a, Eve is naturally the subject of the third-person singular verb "she will be saved" (σωθήσεται *sōthēsetai*). Whereas in v 15b the women addressed in vv 9-12 are the obvious subject of the third-person plural verb "they remain" (μείνωσιν *meinōsin*). With this strange sentence structure, Paul subtly and ingeniously parallels the women with Eve. The women in the Ephesian church are being deceived in the same way as Eve while both were untrained in the commands of God to one degree or another. The women "will be saved" through their faith and model godly behavior and good works (v 10) which

---

[38] David M. Scholer, "I Timothy 2:9-15 & the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," in *Women, Authority & the Bible* (ed. A. Mickelsen; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), 193-219 (203; italics mine).

[39] On Paul's use of Genesis 1-3 see Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15," 208-12.

would include for some marriage and bearing children (5:14). Paul is not arguing here that women are saved through bearing children in distinction from men who are saved through faith. Rather, both women and men are saved through faith (Paul remains consistent with this throughout his letters), but their faith is evidenced by appropriate godly actions and for the women this would involve embracing their God-given roles as females.

Because Paul's instructions here are given as commands, his hierarchal overtones, the numerous difficulties of his grammar, his distinct choice of terms, and selective use of Genesis 2-3, a consensus of what exactly Paul says here will probably never be reached. Nevertheless, what is interpretively important for me centers on three things. First, in certain instances Paul unashamedly adheres to particular culturally accepted norms (e.g., female head coverings in 1 Cor 11:5). In the first century, the primary social currency was the values of honor and shame. Women within this social paradigm were not "seen as an independent entity or agent but as embedded in the identity and honor of some male," either her father or husband.[40] When married, a woman should speak only to and through her husband. A "woman's words are for her husband's ears, not for the public ear."[41] With this in mind, one of Paul's primary concerns in his first letter to Timothy was to maintain a "good reputation with outsiders." Paul here instructs Timothy to reestablish order in the Ephesian church which included realigning the women and men within their socially accepted spheres and roles.

Second and as discussed above, outside this letter Paul authorizes and endorses women leaders without restrictions to that role within the Church. Finally, Paul wants the Ephesian women "to learn" (μανθάνω *manthanō*) (v 11). As I mentioned above, women were typically uneducated and illiterate during this time and thus obviously untrained in the Gospel and Scriptures.[42] Learning presupposes that these women will at some point *learn*. In the same way that Mary adopts the posture of a disciple in order to *listen* and *learn* from her teacher Jesus, so Paul instructs women to also *listen* to the male teachers in order to *learn* which would naturally lead to teaching, as Paul allows other women in Church settings to do. As Craig S. Keener

---

[40] David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 34.

[41] deSilva, *Honor*, 35.

[42] See Keener, *Background*, 611; see also Ben Witherington, "Women (NT)," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. N. Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992), VI: 957-61.

puts it, "Paul . . . provides a short-range and a long-range solution. The short-range solution is: They should not take ruling positions as teachers in the church. The long-range solution is: Let them learn. Again, Paul affirms their ability to learn, and he proposes educating them as a long-range solution to the current problem."[43] Learning and forbidding to teach are temporary solutions to the central and current problem of false teaching in Ephesus. In light of Paul's endorsement of women in Church leadership and the fact that he wants the women here to learn, Paul's goals must be that he desires these Ephesian women to learn the truth and thus avoid the dangerous outcome of deception and in turn teach others correctly. Similarly, Paul instructs the women in Corinth to stop asking apparently unlearned and disruptive questions during formal teaching sessions. They should remain silent in the Church and ask their questions to their own husbands while at home in order to again "learn" (μανθάνω *manthanō*) (1 Cor 14:34-35). Upon gaining more and more knowledge and understanding of the things of God they can then engage more appropriately during these teaching times in the same way they have already been praying and prophesying in the Church (1 Cor 11:5).[44]

One final word here is necessary. Paul exhorts Timothy in his second letter to identify faithful "people" (ἀνθρώποι *anthrōpoi*) he can entrust the gospel to so that they can correctly "teach" (διδάσκω *didaskō*) others (2:2). It is extremely significant that Paul does not tell Timothy to entrust his teachings to "men," but *anthrōpoi.* Paul has carefully and intentionally used the typical terms for "woman" (γυνή gynē) and "man" (ἀνήρ *anēr*) throughout 1 and 2 Timothy. Here, though, Paul instructs Timothy to identify faithful *anthrōpoi* who will then teach others. As he has consistently done outside of 1 Timothy, Paul clearly involves and authorizes *anthrōpoi* women and men, to teach the word of God.

The Holy Spirit: The Great Equalizer

> And it will come about after this I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh
> and your sons and daughters will prophesy,
> your old men will dream dreams
> your young men will see visions.

---

[43] Keener, "Man and Woman," in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (eds. G. F. Hawthorne et al.; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 583-92 (591).

[44] See further Craig S. Keener, "Learning in the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 14:34-35," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* (eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 161-71.

And also upon male and female servants
in those days, I will pour out my Spirit
(Joel 2:28-29; [Heb 3:1-2])

In the O/FT all of Yahweh's *people* are impacted by the Spirit of God. God's Spirit is one of the ways the writers describe the presence of God. The Exodus narrative highlights the presence of God being with and guiding Israel from Egypt (e.g., 12:12-13, 23; 14:18, 21-22) through the wilderness (e.g., 16:10) to Sinai (19:9-23; 24:9-18) culminating with the filling of the tabernacle (40:34-38) which dwells in the midst of Israel (Lev 16:16). In the book of Isaiah, the prophet uniquely describes how Yahweh put his *Holy* Spirit in the midst of Israel following the Exodus event (63:11b) and how Israel grieved the Holy Spirit with its subsequent rebellion (v 10a). The psalmist cries out for God to "create for me a clean heart" (51:10 [Heb v 12] and "do not send me from your presence and do not take away your Holy Spirit (v 11 [Heb v 13]) which infers that the Holy Spirit was intimately connected with the psalmist. Analogous to the psalmist requests, the prophets recognize the problem of Israel and humanity's sick and sinful condition (e.g., Jer 17:9) and the need for a new heart. In particular, Yahweh in Ezekiel 36 promises to Israel: "I will sprinkle clean water on you" . . . "and I will put my Spirit within you" . . . "and I will save you from all your uncleanness" (vv 25a, 27a, 29a). This, and other promises, is fulfilled with the NT notion of a person being born again (e.g., 1 Pt 1:3). All the NT writers agree that at conversion every believer is regenerated, born again, as a result of the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the transforming work of the Holy Spirit. Jesus himself proclaimed, one must be born anew, born of water and the Spirit to see and enter into the kingdom of God (Jn 3:3, 5). Paul similarly (and resembling Ezekiel 36) describes the Holy Spirit as the actuator of the believer's conversion as he cleanses her/him characterized by both regeneration and renewal (Titus 3:5). For Paul, the distinctive mark of the new Messianic people of God is the Holy Spirit (Rom 2:28-29; see also Col 2:11) which directly contrasts the identification mark of circumcision for the people of God Israel solely reserved for men (Gen 17:10-14). For Paul, humanity falls into two groups: those who have the Spirit and those who do not (1 Cor 2:10-16). The Spirit is the quintessential and universal characteristic of *all* those "in Christ"; those who belong to Christ in contrast to those "outside Christ." Clearly the women and men of Israel were significantly impacted by the Holy Spirit, but now equally both female and male converts of Christ are born again by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and thus constitute the temple of God (1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16) and bear the mark of the new people of God. For all the NT writers, because of the atoning work of Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the people

of God are truly a democratized community: Gentile and Jew, female and male, slave and free, children and old (cf. Gal 3:28).[45]

This democratization nature of the Messianic community also transpires on the level of the charismatic empowerment of the Holy Spirit as primarily presented by Luke and Paul. In the O/FT, typically men were anointed with the Spirit of Yahweh to judge (cf. Jud 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 15:14) and rule over (cf. 1 Sam 10:1, 6-12; 16:13) Israel. The "prophet" (נָבִיא nəbîʾ) in Israel is also empowered by Yahweh's Spirit explicitly and implicitly to confront, challenge, and encourage Israel (e.g., Micah 3:8; Ezk 2:2-7; 3:24-27). Prophets were typically male, but as I introduced above, Miriam (Ex 15:20), Deborah (Jud 4:4), and Hildah (2 Kgs 22:14) are each identified as a "prophetess" (נְבִיא nəbîʾ). In the Torah, Moses desires that all of Yahweh's *people* were prophets and that Yahweh would place his Spirit upon them (v 29b). Moses' hope of both female and male prophets corresponds to Joel's above vision. We see Moses' hope realized in Luke's first volume as he reports both women and men "being filled" (πληρόω) with the Holy Spirit or him leading and coming upon them, and enabling them to prophesy (e.g., John the Baptist [1:15]; Elizabeth [1:41]; Zacharias [1:67]; Simeon [2:25-35; and Anna [2:36-38]). For Luke, Joel's prophecy is fulfilled in these instances and explicitly, through the mouth of Peter, on the Day of Pentecost with Judean women and men filled with the Holy Spirit evidenced with charismatic empowerment (Acts 2:1-40). Luke parallels this Day with the filling of Gentile women and men with the Holy Spirit in the Cornelius episode (10:1-11:18). Jesus' pouring out the Holy Spirit, then, creates a charismatic community of female and male prophets as envisioned by Joel who will witness about the Messiah.[46] In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul instructs women and men to equally participate in all the gifts of the Spirit within the gathering of the

---

[45] Paul's assertion in Gal 3:28 has prompted a few interpreters to conclude that Paul asserts that gender distinctions disappear once "in Christ" and thus envisioning humans becoming androgynous (see in particular D. Boyarin, "Paul and the Genealogy of Gender," in *A Feminist Companion to Paul* [FCNT 6; ed. A. Levine; London: T&T Clark, 2004], 13-41; see also Robert M. Grant, "Neither Male nor Female," *BR* 37 [1992]: 5-14). Yet, for Paul converts now "in Christ" remain Jew (e.g., Gal 2:15) or Gentile (e.g., Rom 11:13), slave or free (1 Cor 7:21-24), female/wife or male/husband (1 Cor 7:2-4; 11:2-16; Eph 5:22-33). Paul's overarching point, then, is that although racial, societal, and gender distinctions persist, any privileged status derived from being a Jew, free, or male no longer exists for those now "in Christ" (see further e.g., Gordon D. Fee, "Male and Female in the New Creation: Galatians 3:26-29," in *Discovering Biblical Equality* [eds. R. W. Pierce and R. M. Groothuis; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005], 172-85).

[46] See further Roger Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers* (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010).

church community (12 and 14). Paul desires that all earnestly pursue the gifts of the Spirit and especially prophecy (14:1). For Paul, the Holy Spirit autonomously works through both women and men for the building up of the body of Christ (12:7-11). Paul never even hints at a hierarchy within the community of Christ with the engagement of spiritual gifting. It is the Spirit who determines who operates in his charismatic gifts, not gender!

The Holy Spirit is the Great Equalizer as all of God's people house the presence of God (cf. Eph 2:19-22). There is no ethnic, gender, economic, social privilege within the community of Christ. In particular, the Spirit fills and empowers both women and men to equally operate within his charismatic gifts. The writers of Scripture never envision androgyny, rather women and men retain their unique gender identities while equally participating in the Spirit's gifting and equipping. Importantly, the biblical and experiential reality of the Holy Spirit's autonomous empowering of women and men transcends the categories of Complementarianism as well as Egalitarianism!

Conclusion

I am convinced that God does not discriminate between genders when it comes to functioning in any and all leadership roles within the Church of Jesus Christ. As I began, the Bible presents us with a number of examples of women operating in major roles of responsibility for the people of God. Correlating with these examples, the biblical writers also leave us with interpretive trajectories that point us in specific directions that we can either follow or continue to suppress. In doing so Scripture offers us questions and in particular questions for those who continue to adopt a hierarchal mindset: Will we see and listen to Hagar? Will we acknowledge and listen to the unnamed woman who is visited by, hears from, and speaks for God? Will we listen to and believe women disciples who proclaim the Gospel message? Will we follow Jesus Christ and therefore willingly embrace women as mutually equal followers of him? Will we listen to Paul and his co-workers or just give selective privilege to particular sections of his letters? Will we submit to the Holy Spirit's sovereign gifting and empowering of women to prophesy, give words of wisdom and knowledge, working of healings and miracles? Will we live in Eden or east of Eden where the other oppressors reside?

Has Paul Really Said? Intertextuality in 1 Timothy 2:8-15

Ryan Lytton, M.A.[1]

ABSTRACT:

1 Timothy 2:8-15 has long been the center of controversy. Complementarians claim the simplest reading of the text. Egalitarians say it is not quite so simple. This article explores implications concerning the interpretation of two prominent features: the influence of the cult of Artemis, and Paul's allusion to Genesis. With these two features in mind, the simplest reading of this passage is the egalitarian one.

Introduction

Can women preach? Can they hold leadership positions in the church? At first glance, several Pauline passages[2] seem to answer *no*, ostensibly requiring complete silence.[3] However, there are other passages that discuss how women ought to pray or prophesy in the church. Certainly, their doing so would break complete silence. Craig Blomberg, a complementarian,[4] has noted that although 1 Corinthians 14:33-38 appears to be a prohibition of women teachers, it is only three chapters from an affirmation of their ability to publicly pray in service. Thus, "[u]nless we assume Paul gratuitously contradicted himself in the space of three chapters…we cannot take [this passage] to mean Paul was telling women never to utter a word in church!"[5]

---

[1] Ryan Lytton (rlytton@ignite.lifepacific.edu) is the Director of Academic Services at Ignite-Life Pacific College in Christiansburg, Virginia.

[2] While the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is debated, that debate lies outside of the scope of this essay. While Pauline authorship is assumed in this essay, it does not substantially affect the conclusions. For an excellent conversation on Pauline authorship, see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Anchor Bible*, vol. v.35a, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 13-15, 55-99. For a brief survey of how position on authorship has at times affected interpretation, see J. M. Holmes, *Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2.9-15*. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 18-21.

[3] Most notably 1 Corinthians 14:33-38 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

[4] This refers broadly to the position which would restrict women from some form of ministry based on the aforementioned passages. For more on Blomberg's position specifically, see his chapter in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, rev. ed., ed. Stanley N. Gundry and James R. Beck, Counterpoints (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005).

[5] Ibid, 161. There is debate regarding Pauline authorship of 1 Cor 14:33-38. This debate has recently been reignited by Philip Barton Payne's article *Vaticanus Distigme-obelos Symbols*

This essay will focus on Paul's words to Timothy in 1 Timothy 2:8-15,[6] as it is the "sheet anchor" for a complementarian perspective.[7] While this passage has generated an immense body of literature from a variety of perspectives,[8] for the sake of length, this essay will only focus on the intertextual elements found in (1) allusions to the early chapters of Genesis, as well as (2) echoes of the cult of Artemis through usage of specific vocabulary and their thematic emphases. A careful examination of these two elements reveals Paul's intentions, which support the egalitarian position.[9] Paul is instructing Timothy how to handle a situation in Ephesus that mirrors the

---

Marking Added Text, Including 1 Corinthians 14.34–5 in *New Testament Studies* 63 (2017) 604-625.

[6] The concluding boundary in verse 15 is clear as Paul shifts to another topic in 3:1. Some interpreters set the initial boundary for this passage at verse 9. For instance, Andreas J. Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, eds., *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, third ed. (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2016), where it is briefly discussed on page 176. This is unlikely, if for no other reason than the main verb in verse 9 is elliptically assumed from verse 8, tying them together syntactically. It is noteworthy as well that UBS, SBL and NA28 begin the paragraph with verse 8. Kurt Aland, ed., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev ed. 7th printing (London: United Bible Societies, 2003), 716; Michael W. Holmes, *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition* (Lexham Press; Society of Biblical Literature, 2011–2013); Eberhard Nestle et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, 1993), 544. For a brief, but excellent, argument in favor of beginning the paragraph with verse 8, see Ben Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. vol 1, (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2006), 224. It is also worth noting as well that UBS shows no variants. NA28 shows no variants which significantly affect meaning. Kurt Aland, ed., *The Greek New Testament*, 716; Eberhard Nestle et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 544.

[7] N T. Wright, *Surprised by Scripture: Engaging Contemporary Issues* (New York: HarperOne, 2014), 78. A *sheet anchor* is something that is considered very reliable and considered a dependable last resort. David deSilva has a similar perspective. David Arthur DeSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 34-35, 230.

[8] For a comprehensive bibliography on this topic, see Philip Payne, "Selected Bibliography for Man and Woman: One in Christ," Philip B. Payne, last modified June 10, 2016, accessed June 22, 2017, https://www.pbpayne.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Bibliography-17-June-2016.pdf. There is also an excellent bibliography available in *Women in the Church*, 359-390. For a bibliographic synopsis of recent debates on this passage, see the footnotes on pages 119-122.

[9] While there is diversity within the egalitarian position (like any other theological position), for the purposes of this essay this position sees no gender-based limitations on any ministry position.

events in Genesis 3. The intertextual exegesis[10] of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 involves: (1) attention to the broad original contexts of Paul's allusion to other texts (Old Testament or otherwise); (2) an examination of relevant interpretive traditions surrounding the texts to which Paul alludes; and (3) an exegesis of the Pauline context that incorporates the insights gained from the previous two analytical foci, yielding an exegesis of Paul's rhetoric that is thoroughly informed by his intertextual intentions.[11] In short, Adam was taught properly by God, which is why Paul appeals to the order of creation. Adam then sits by quietly while Eve misrepresents, knowingly or otherwise, in conversation with the deceiver. It is Paul's concern that men in the Ephesian church are behaving either like Adam or the deceiver. They are sitting idly while false teaching abounds or actively engaged in teaching it. He is also concerned that Ephesian women are repeating Eve's mistake of entertaining the deceiver due to the influence of the cult of Artemis. Understood in this context, 1 Timothy 2:8-15 does not translate to a universal prohibition of women teachers. Instead it encourages active participation by those who have been taught in the process of teaching new believers to curtail the attempts of the deceiver.

Original Context: Genesis

Paul's intentions are tied up in Ephesian culture. The careful interpreter must remember that Paul is talking to a pastor, encouraging him to care for his flock and shepherd them wisely. It is in this context that he reminds Timothy of a story in the Old Testament as the grounds for his concerns. It is to that allusion that we now turn our attention. Timothy is raised by a Jewish mother, and as such Paul could expect

---

[10] There is considerable debate about the meaning and utility of the term *intertextuality*. Its use here is consonant with the definition set forth by Richard Hays: "the imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one." *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14. For more on Intertextuality, see Ibid, 14-24; Koptak, P. E. "Intertextuality" in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible* (London: SPCK, 2005), 332-334; and especially *Exploring Intertextuality: Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts* (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2016).

[11] Steps 1 & 2 will be followed for each of the intertextual elements (Genesis 3 & the Cult of Artemis). Step 3 will be used to synthesize all preceding steps and present a conclusion. This mostly follows the pattern set forth in Brian Abasciano, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1-9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2004), accessed November 3, 2017, Society of Evangelical Arminians; http://evangelicalarminians.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Abasciano.-Thesis.-Pauls-Use-of-the-OT-in-Rom-9.1-9.-One-File-Version.pdf.

a reasonable familiarity with Jewish scriptures.[12] It is therefore reasonable to assume that he would understand Paul's allusion to Genesis, and its implications in his current pastoral situation. One of the easier elements of the Genesis 3 story that is easy to miss is that Adam is present during the temptation.[13] Unfortunately, readers of English translations are left thinking that the dialogue is only between Eve and the Serpent.[14] However, it is clear on a careful reading of the Hebrew text that Adam is present. First, the syntax of 3:6b does not leave time for Eve to go get Adam. The last half of this verse is a succession of verb after verb, indicating the rapid succession of these events. See below (verbs are underlined):

וַתֵּ֣רֶא הָאִשָּׁ֗ה כִּ֤י טוֹב֙ הָעֵ֣ץ לְמַאֲכָ֔ל וְכִ֥י תַאֲוָה־ה֖וּא לָעֵינַ֑יִם וְנֶחְמָ֤ד הָעֵץ֙ לְהַשְׂכִּ֔יל וַתִּקַּ֥ח מִפִּרְי֖וֹ

וַתֹּאכַ֑ל וַתִּתֵּ֥ן גַּם־לְאִישָׁ֛הּ עִמָּ֖הּ וַיֹּאכַֽל׃

> *And the woman saw that the tree was good to eat and it was appealing to their eyes and that the tree was desirable to make one prosperous, she took from the fruit and ate it and gave it also to her husband who was*[15] *with her and he ate.*[16]

Also, the serpent always uses plural language when talking to Eve, and all of Eve's responses employ plural language. These details only make sense if Adam is present during Eve's conversation with the serpent.

Another easily missed element of the story is that Eve was not present when

---

[12] Acts 16:1.

[13] A fact missed by Schreiner and Köstenberger during their concluding *Roundtable Discussion.* One of their questions is, "What…does the scenario at the fall (the Devil approaching and deceiving the woman ***apart from her husband***) teach us…?", 323. Only one responder challenges the question (326).

[14] While there is some debate about whether the serpent is Satan, such a discussion does not directly impact this discussion and is thus beyond the scope of this essay.

[15] This is often translated, "…to her husband with her" (NASB), but this seems to miss the point of the Hebrew (וַתִּתֵּ֥ן גַּם־לְאִישָׁ֛הּ עִמָּ֖הּ וַיֹּאכַֽל). The translation here follows Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 74 (also ESV, NET).

[16] There is a slight change in the LXX here. ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ' αὐτῆς καὶ **ἔφαγον**. *She ate, and gave also to her husband with her, and* ***they ate.*** This seems to create a space between Eve's eating and Adam's eating where there does not seem to be that space in the Hebrew narrative. However, the next verse indicates their eyes were opened simultaneously. Josephus preserves the distinction. "Now when she had tasted of that tree, and was pleased with its fruit, she persuaded Adam to make use of it also." *Jewish Antiquities* 1.43, *Complete Works* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1960), 26.

YHWH gave the prohibition about the tree.[17] It is likely that Adam was entrusted to convey this prohibition to Eve;[18] however, even if he was not entrusted with instructing her, he was certainly expected to correct her if she erred. Adam knows the prohibition perfectly having received it personally from YHWH. Despite this, he watches the entire conversation and does not intervene even when Eve does not correctly repeat the prohibition of YHWH. Either she has done this herself, or she learned it this way from Adam. Either way, Adam should not sit idly by. Unfortunately, the text is silent regarding how Eve receives the prohibition. Early interpretive traditions are then incredibly valuable here.

Interpretive Tradition: Genesis

The Latin version of *The Life of Adam and Eve* supports the view that Adam was responsible for conveying the prohibition to Eve.[19] In this work, God's response to the fall is directed at Adam because he had "forsaken [God's] mandate" which God entrusted to him.[20] As Anderson points out, this interpretation goes back to the

---

[17] Cf. Genesis 2:17.

[18] James Kugel makes this suggestion (James Kugel, "Weekly Torah Reading, Bereshit, October 29, 2016," *Weekly Torah Reading* (blog), October 29, 2016, accessed October 30, 2016, http://www.jameskugel.com/weekly-torah-reading-bereshit-october-29-2016/), as does Ben Witherington - *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*., 229; and *Women in Leadership Ministry* (Los Angeles: Foursquare Media, 2007), 58-61. This is also supported by the medieval work, *Avot of Rabbi Natan*. Anthony J. Saldarini, *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 11, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abot de Rabbi Nathan) Version B: A Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 31-35.

[19] While some date this work at around the 3rd Century, others argue persuasively that it was either early enough for Paul to be influenced by it or the interpretive tradition that produced it was sufficiently early to impact Paul's thinking. For an earlier dating, see Roy Ciampa's chapter in Daniel M. Gurtner and Benjamin L. Gladd eds, *From Creation to New Creation: Biblical Theology and Exegesis* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2013), 109-112. Ciampa does not explicitly affirm an early date. Rather, he uses it "for the sake of comparison and contrast with another ancient Jewish author's way of reading Gn 1 and 3 together to understand the implications of the fall for the reign originally given to humanity" (112). However, he does make consistent use of John R. Levison's work which argues strongly for an early date. *Adam and Eve in Romans 1.18–25 and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. New Testament Studies, 50, 2004, 519-534.

[20] Gary A. Anderson and Michael E. Stone, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Literature*, 2nd ed., vol. 17, 38.

Patristic era, with authors like Origen, Ephrem the Syrian, and Augustine.[21] It can also be seen in apocryphal literature as well. For instance, the first century apocryphal 2 Esdras places the fault of the fall on Adam:[22]

> 3:7 – "And ***you laid upon him*** one commandment of yours; but ***he transgressed it***…"[23]

James Kugel, drawing on early interpretive traditions, argues that it was Adam's goal to protect Eve from even touching the tree, thereby ensuring that she would not eat it.[24] Adam's plan fails when the serpent touches the tree. This violates the prohibition Adam added, so when there was no apparent penalty, the prohibition of YHWH is undermined. The serpent then invites Eve to touch the fruit as well. When nothing happens to her, she reasons that "All the things my husband has told me are lies," and she takes a bite.[25] Rashi suggests that the serpent pushed her into the fruit and then said, "Just as there is no death in touching it, so there is no death in eating it."[26] This is the deception Eve mentions in her defense.[27] The serpent persuades Eve to eat. He is only able to do that because the prohibition of YHWH has been misunderstood. He asks for the words of YHWH: "Indeed, has God said…" (NASB). If these words were accurately reported or defended, no sin would occur. But Eve is

---

[21] For a brief analysis, see Gary A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 101-107. For Augustine, see *de Genesi ad Litteram Libri* 8.17, available at http://www.augustinus.it/latino/genesi_lettera/index2.htm.

[22] Everett Ferguson indicates this is a noteworthy element of the book. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003), 442.

[23] NRSV, emphasis added. It is worth noting that this verse also emphasizes that the prohibition was given to Adam. See also 2 Esdras 3:20-26; 4:30; 7:118. For other apocryphal literature in support of this view, see 2 Baruch 17:2-3, 23:4, 48:42, 54:15-19. This is not to say that all apocryphal sources agree on this point. For a contrary perspective, see Sirach 25:24. For a list and brief analysis of apocryphal literature on this topic, see James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 96-97.

[24] Based on *Abot de Rabbi Natan* (A), in Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 100-103. For the (B) recension, see Saldarini, *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,* 31-32.

[25] Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 103.

[26] "Genesis 3:4 with Rashi," Sefaria, January 29, 2014, accessed July 27, 2017, https://www.sefaria.org/Genesis.3.4.

[27] Genesis 3:13.

deceived. She is convinced to believe something that is not true.[28] Adam is not deceived[29] because he had received the words of YHWH directly from YHWH. He can call to mind what they were. He does not sin because of deception. The Genesis narrative makes it clear that he does so willfully.[30]

Thus, we have our model[31] which Paul will employ: deceived women (Eve) are following their deceiver (Serpent)[32] and the men who should know better (Adam) are willfully allowing it and even following along.[33] This is perhaps the part where the Genesis context is most easily misunderstood. Just as there are three participants in the story, there are likewise three roles in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Consequently, Paul is concerned with three types of people in his audience.[34] First, he is concerned with women who have not yet been taught properly.[35] This lack of teaching opens the door to deception. Second, he is concerned with men who are not speaking out when

---

[28] Cf. 2 Corinthians 11:3, also 31.12 ἀπατάω in Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1996), 366.

[29] Cf. 1 Timothy 2:14.

[30] George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI; Carlisle, England: W.B. Eerdmans; Paternoster Press, 1992), 144.

[31] Schreiner categorizes this as typological interpretation, and dismisses it solely based on that categorization. He even ties it to Philo's allegories of the Old Testament, ostensibly in the hopes that the negative reputation of such interpretations will be transferred over to his opponents. It is hard to see how this is not a genetic fallacy. Irrespective of whether this is typological interpretation, it is not as though Paul never engaged in typology (cf. Galatians 4). Thus, typology cannot be automatically discounted. *Women in the Church*, 201.

[32] Cf. 1 Timothy 5:13-15.

[33] This is contra Schreiner, who never proposes an explanation for how Eve was deceived if she was properly taught, and properly understood the teaching she received. *Women in the Church*, 211-213

[34] It is worth noting that Paul does not commend anyone in his first letter to Timothy and commends only a few who are in Ephesus in his second letter. Cf. 2 Timothy 4:9-22.

[35] There is some debate regarding the education of women in the Greco-Roman world. For more on Greco-Roman education for women, see Sharon Hodgin Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), 19-22; also, Philip Barton Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2009), 31-35. For a summary and excellent bibliography, see Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 77-79.

they ought and instead are either remaining silent[36] and joining the women in their error.

The third category is the most elusive. Paul is concerned with those who are playing the role of the serpent. He is concerned with deceivers. Paul spends more time in his letters to Timothy focusing on these men, even going so far as to single them out by name.[37] These men do not fill the role of Adam, first passively permitting and then actively joining in the sin of Eve. Instead, they are the serpent, turning aside from the commandment in favor of ignorant and idle talk,[38] actively pursuing and promoting false teaching, and using it to target women.[39] Just as the serpent used his deception of Eve to reach Adam, these false teachers are using their influence with the women to influence others. This results in the female false teachers about whom Paul is concerned.[40] They need to stop propagating the mistakes they have received from their deceivers. The easiest way to facilitate this is to ban them from teaching until the false teaching has been addressed. Consider the results on the Genesis narrative if Eve had not been permitted to speak to the serpent, or to relay his suggestions to Adam. The problem may have been solved. Simply put, a deceived person should not instruct others.

Eve is the prototype of the Ephesian woman, just as Adam is the prototype of the some of the Ephesian men, and the serpent is the prototype of the remaining men.[41] The teaching she received was deficient, and that deficiency led to sin.[42] Adam received sufficient teaching, but his actions did not match his teaching. Mounce briefly mentions this perspective, only to dismiss it: "If Paul was trying to teach that the untrained women in Ephesus should not teach until they learn, then

---

[36] It seems from Paul's exhortations to him that Timothy might fall in this category. Cf. 1 Timothy 4:11-16; 2 Tim 1:6-14; 4:1-5.

[37] Cf. 1 Timothy 1:20; 2:17.

[38] Cf. 1 Timothy 1:5-7.

[39] Cf. 2 Timothy 3:6-7. This also explains Paul's focus on widows (Cf. perhaps 1 Timothy 4:7; and certainly 5:1-16) and particularly money (Cf. 1 Timothy 2:9; 3:4-5; 4:8; 5:9, 18; and especially 6:5-12, and 6:17-19.). *Widow* (χήρα) is used eight times in six verses of 1 Timothy 5. By contrast, Paul uses it once in 1 Corinthians 7:8, and nowhere else.

[40] Cf. 1 Timothy 2:11-12.

[41] The serpent may be the prototype for men and women, though from context it seems the majority of the deceivers in Ephesus are male.

[42] Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ,* 297.

why would he cite a passage showing that Adam (corresponding to the Ephesian men who teach) was unable to teach?"[43] In dismissing this perspective, he fundamentally misunderstands the point. Paul alludes to this passage precisely because it mirrors the issue in the Ephesian church. Adam (and the Ephesian men) fail to properly correct Eve (and the Ephesian women) or rebuke the serpent (and the Ephesian false teachers) which results in sin (and more false teaching in Ephesus). The issue is not Adam's ability to teach. After all, it is not clear that he was responsible to teach Eve. But he is certainly at least responsible for correcting a misinterpretation (or misunderstanding) of God's prohibitions. Just as Adam fails to act during Eve's conversation with the serpent, some of the Ephesian men fail to act while the women give in to deception and follow Satan.[44] Adam is at fault for his lack of action.[45] In the same way, the Ephesian men are at fault for their lack of action. Adam received proper instruction from YHWH and is therefore not deceived when he sins. Paul indicates on several occasions that the male false teachers should know better.[46] These men are not deceived, and they have progressed beyond Adam's sin and moved on to emulate the behavior of the serpent, actively engaging in false teaching.

This is precisely what Paul wants to avoid. The women who have not been accurately taught need to address their ignorance, and the men who have been taught need to teach them properly. If this occurs, both can together guard against the schemes of the devil. The women avoid the mistake of Eve, the men avoid the mistake of Adam, and together everyone should resist the schemes of the serpent. Of course, the commands should not be seen as gender specific. For instance, Paul only told men to pray without wrath and dissension. But certainly, we assume women should avoid this as well.[47] Likewise, the issue of improper education in Ephesus lines up along gender lines because of cultural issues in the city of Ephesus. This

---

[43] William Mounce, *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 46, Pastoral Epistles* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 20), 134. Schreiner also dismisses this interpretation in *Women in the Church,* 186. However, the requirement for the text to spell out every detail is not met for any position.

[44] Cf. 1 Timothy 5:13-15.

[45] He may also have been at fault for incorrectly teaching Eve the prohibitions. However, Genesis 3 does not make clear how or why Eve misunderstands or misinterprets the prohibitions.

[46] Cf. 1 Timothy 1:20; 2 Timothy 2:16-18; 2 Timothy 3:6-7.

[47] Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 107.

does not mean that an improperly taught man is free to teach, just as women should not pray with wrath or dissension.[48] It is to this cultural issue that we will now turn our attention.

Original Context: Cult of Artemis

The Temple of Artemis is one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, which indicates the level of prominence it held not only within Ephesus but also within the larger Greco-Roman world.[49] Artemis was so closely tied to this city that in the first century, she was known as "The Ephesian."[50] It is easy to overlook the magnitude of the Artemis cult and others like it.[51] For example, there were cults to Artemis in two-thousand towns and cities in the Roman empire.[52] Part of the magnitude of this cult is due to its theological flexibility.[53] They were willing to adjust their theology to fit their culture. As such, specific practices can be quite difficult to pin down.[54] These mystery religions were not generally concerned with accurate beliefs as much

---

[48] Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles,* 133.

[49] Pliny the Elder, *Nat*. 16.213-14; 35.92-93; 36.95-97; Pausanias, *Descr.* 6.3.15-16; as cited in Baugh, *Women in the Church*, 36. For more on the significance of the Temple of Artemis, see Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 13; Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 198. For an excellent analysis of Ephesus from both historical and religious backgrounds, see Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 11-49; also see Baugh, *Women in the Church*, 25-64.

[50] Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 198. Cf. Acts 19:27. There are other significant cults in Ephesus, many of which share the female focus of the cult of Artemis. An excellent example is the cult of Mater (Latin for *mother*). For a thorough treatment of it, see Lynn E. Roller, *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1999).

[51] For an argument against the importance of the Artemis cult, see Schreiner, *Women in the Church*, 168-171. As he points out, many who emphasize the Artemis cult in their interpretation of this passage are missing compelling information. However, he does not account for Hoag's demonstration of parallels in vocabulary. Gary G. Hoag, *Wealth in Ancient Ephesus and the First Letter to Timothy: Fresh Insights from Ephesiaca by Xenophon of Ephesus* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015).

[52] Guy MacLean Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos: Cult, Polis, and Change in the Graeco-Roman World*, Synkrisis (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 6.

[53] Ibid, x.

[54] Ibid, 40. Despite this, Rogers does an incredible job wading through an incredible amount of historical data to provide concrete details where they exist. See also Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 31-49.

as they were focused on appealing to the emotions of their followers.[55] Nearly every mystery religion focused on a mother goddess who "subordinated her male consort."[56] This mother goddess universally shared the same focus on female over male, and emotional over rational. Given the emphasis on the female deity, it was commonplace for the figurehead of the cult to be female.[57] But perhaps the most significant aspect of the cult about which we can have a high degree of confidence is its emphasis on lay participation.[58] Priests in the Greco-Roman world were rarely professionals. "Theoretically anyone might perform priestly functions."[59] Coupled with a lack of emphasis on core doctrine, this left the cult of Artemis as a malleable religion that was only dogmatic about one thing: male subjugation to women.[60] For instance, male priests of Artemis in Ephesus were eunuchs.[61] The leader of the cult was almost always a woman,[62] and it was not uncommon for male worshippers to

---

[55] Samuel Angus. *Mystery-Religions*, 59. See also Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus,* 32-33. These religions are hard to define. For the purposes of this essay, *mystery religion* will refer in general to religious movements around the 1st century in the Greco-Roman world which emphasized secrecy and focused on a specific deity who was normally female. The cult of Mithras is something of an outlier. The Artemis cult falls within this paradigm, as do the cults of Isis, and others which are not directly relevant here. For fuller treatments, see S Angus, *Mystery-Religions* (over Publications: D, 2012), 33-60; and Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 297-300.

[56] Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 34.

[57] Ibid, 35; see also Baugh, *Women in the Church,* 45-46. It has also been suggested that these priestesses were simply temple prostitutes. However, "…the modern myth that these were sacred prostitutes should be dropped once and for all." *Women in the Church*, 46fn55. See also S.M. Baugh, *Cult Prostitution in the New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal,* JETS 42, no. 3 (1999): 443-60; Stephanie Lynn Budin, *They Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

[58] Around the 3rd century BC, Lysimachos reformed the cult of Artemis so that the priests and priestesses were "not going to be the only ones to dictate what kind of goddess she was or for whom." Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos,* 85.

[59] Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 184.

[60] Artemis pursued male gods, instead of the other way around, and her followers were considered superior to men. Paul M. Zehr, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, Believers Church Bible Commentary (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 2010), 63.

[61] Roller, *In Search of God the Mother,* 253.

[62] Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesus,* 47; contra Baugh, *Women in the Church,* 37-41; Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 266.

castrate themselves during the frenzy of worship to a prominent female goddess.[63] Taken together, this paints a picture of a cult which held a powerful influence in the Greco-Roman world, but nowhere more powerful than Ephesus. Moreover, this cult placed no emphasis on doctrinal purity or exclusivity.

Interpretive Tradition: Cult of Artemis

Women figured prominently in the cult of the goddess Artemis, which centered on fertility.[64] Childbirth was a thematic emphasis in the cult of Artemis,[65] and when Paul tells Timothy that salvation will come through the birth of a child, there is strong irony.[66] For Ephesians who counted on their fertility cult to save them, Paul is claiming that a different birth altogether is the cause of their salvation.[67] Some interpreters take this to mean that women are saved through childbearing. However, rather than referring to salvation through the continued practice of giving birth, it is far more likely that this refers to the birth of Christ.[68] Sacrificing to Artemis does not result in salvation.[69] Instead, Christ has sacrificed himself for them. Here we find our second element of intertextuality. This is not only a reference back to God's promise to redeem Adam and Eve in Genesis 3:15,[70] but also tied to practices in the

---

[63] See Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 37-42.

[64] Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus,* 39.

[65] See Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus,* 39. Additionally, there was a remarkably high rate of death for both mother and child. See Baugh, *Women in the Church*, 42-43, 53.

[66] 1 Timothy 2:15 – *But she will be saved through the birth of a child, if they remain in faith, and love, and holiness with sobriety.*

[67] Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos*, 3-5.

[68] Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. vol 1, 229-230. For a good summary of alternatives see Lynn H. Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians: Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2009), 138-140; and Donald Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 14, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 92–93.

[69] Artemis is often called "the savior." See Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos,* 85, 266.

[70] See Thomas C. Oden, *First and Second Timothy and Titus*, Interpretation: a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: J. Knox Press, 1989), 100-102; Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 202-203; and especially G K. Beale and D A. Carson, eds., *Commentary On the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2007), 894; also contra Gordon D. Fee, *New International Biblical*

cult of Artemis, as the central celebration of the cult of Artemis was the celebration and reenactment of the birth of Artemis.[71]

There are marks of the cult of Artemis throughout our passage. At first glance verses 9-10 sound like a simple exhortation to a style or type of dress. However, the vocabulary used carried connotations in the local cults.[72] Specific words were particularly tied to the annual Artemisium, a festival dedicated to Artemis.[73] Paul forbids external similarity to Artemis, while encouraging internal similarity to Artemis. A priestess of Artemis was ritually decorated to represent Artemis to her followers. Each element of her attire was chosen to properly represent Artemis. Her overall appearance is described as *expensively dressed* (κεκοσημένας πολυτελῶς), the exact type of clothing Paul forbids: *costly garments* (πολυτέλεια).[74] Her hair was braided (πεπλεγμένη), which is the same root as the word Paul uses to caution against braided hair (πλέγμασιν).[75] Paul encourages women is to adorn themselves (κοσμεῖν) properly. One of the four titles associated with the priestess of Artemis was *adorner* (κοσμητειρα).[76] The priestess is regularly described as chaste (σωφροσύνη), which Paul uses twice to describe the proper behavior of a godly woman.[77]

Commentary, vol. 13, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 75.

[71] Fee, *1 & 2 Timothy, Titus*, 40; Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos,* 103. For more on connections to mystery cults in Ephesus, see Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 31-36.

[72] See M J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis: The Myth and the Cult* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 27, 74; Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 37-39; Hoag, *Wealth in Ancient Ephesus and the First Letter to Timothy*, 75-76.

[73] These parallels come through an examination of *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus, performed by Gary Hoag. *Ephesiaca* could be as early as the 1st century, but even if later most certainly represents cultic vocabulary of Ephesus in the 1st century.

[74] Hoag, *Wealth in Ancient Ephesus and the First Letter to Timothy*, 77-78. Cf. 1 Timothy 2:9.

[75] Ibid, 75. Cf. 1 Timothy 2:9.

[76] Baugh, *Women in the Church,* 47. See also Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 198; Hoag, *Wealth in Ancient Ephesus and the First Letter to Timothy*, 70, 73-74. Cf. 1 Timothy 2:9.

[77] Hoag, *Wealth in Ancient Ephesus and the First Letter to Timothy*, 77. Cf. 1 Timothy 2:10. While it is true that this word is commonly used as one of the four Platonic virtues (See Plato, *Republic* 4.430e; Knight, 134), it contributes to a cumulative case along with the rest of the vocabulary related to the worship of Artemis. Cf. also Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann,

Paul is addressing women who may consider Christianity like the cult of Artemis, where the display of their wealth was expected and where it might earn them status.[78] Paul's desire is to see women taught properly before they teach. By Paul's time, the cult of Artemis is a lay-led movement with no special teaching authority reserved for the priests. As such, any female converts from this cult to Christianity would have likely expected a similar state of affairs in a church. They would expect that extravagantly dress was encouraged and that anyone could assume a teaching role. This type of assumption would be exaggerated among the female population because of the emphasis on female leadership in the cult of Artemis contrasted with the subjugation of men. Followers of Artemis could not simply transport their beliefs into a Christian context and expect everything to function in the new religious environment.

It is possible that Ephesian women, due to an influence from the Artemis cult, viewed women as inherently better than men. This may be another aspect of what Paul intends by referencing the created order. Women came from man, not the other way around. So, women cannot claim primogeniture.[79] It does not follow that Paul then intended to subjugate women. That would make the same mistake in favor of men that he is attempting to avoid in favor of women. Rather, his intention is to balance the scales and preserve the unity and balance that God intended in Eden. By indicating fulfillment of the promise in Genesis 3:15, he is indicating that in Christ the curses of Genesis 3:16-19 have begun to unravel.[80] Rather than emphasizing that men work by the sweat of their brow, Paul encourages them to lift their hands in prayer.[81] Rather than emphasizing that women are subjugated to men, they are empowered to learn.[82] Also, rather than childbirth being punishment for women, it

---

The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 46.

[78] See Oden, *First and Second Timothy and Titus,* 95. Epigraphic evidence from the 1st century also seems to support this. See Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. vol 1, 219-220, 225.

[79] For more on this possibility, see Zehr, *1 & 2 Timothy, Titus,* 64. See also *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*, vol. 1, second ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2014), 147.

[80] Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. vol 1, 229-230.

[81] Cf. 1 Timothy 2:8.

[82] Cf. 1 Timothy 2:11.

has become the method through which God provides their salvation.[83]

Intertextual Exegesis

Before synthesizing the importance of Genesis 3 and the Cult of Artemis, it is important to establish some guidelines regarding what this passage can mean. Investigation into the intertextual elements is crucial because the plain reading of the text is impossible within the broader context not only of Paul's writings but also the rest of the New Testament. Thus, while it is both popular and easy to interpret this passage as an indication that women should never teach, that cannot be what Paul has in mind. First, his choice of words could indicate that this is a limited prohibition.[84] Additionally, *silence* (ἡσύχιος) is used earlier by Paul[85] and it clearly does not mean complete silence in that instance. Paul does not forbid women from prophesying (1 Corinthians 11:5) and possibly also teaching (1 Corinthians 14:26).[86] Therefore, 1 Timothy 2:8-15 cannot mean that women are to never make a sound in church, even though that is the plain meaning *remain in silence* (εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ). Therefore, we must allow for what John Stott calls "cultural transposition" the process by which we "discern in Scripture between God's essential revelation (which is changeless) and its cultural expression (which is changeable)."[87] This is true no matter what position we take in the egalitarian/complementarian debate. Every position interprets something in this passage. Complementarians who allow women to sing in church are interpreting Paul's command to remain in silence to mean something else. Unless one is prepared to forbid women from making any sound whatsoever, cultural transposition must be allowed to some degree. The intertextual insights presented above are considerably helpful in this process.

The natural objection to cultural transposition in this passage is that Paul appeals

---

[83] Cf. 1 Timothy 2:15.

[84] "Every occurrence of ἐπιτρέπω [*permit*] in the Greek OT refers to a specific situation, never to a universally applicable permission. Similarly, the clear majority of the NT occurrences of ἐπιτρέπω [*permit*] clearly refers to a specific time or for a short or limited time duration only." Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ,* 319. For opposing perspectives, see Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles,* 121-122; Screiner, *Women in the Church*, 188-191

[85] 1 Timothy 2:2.

[86] Fee, *1 & 2 Timothy, Titus*, 73.

[87] John R. W. Stott, *Guard the Truth: The Message of 1 Timothy & Titus*, The Bible Speaks Today (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 78–81.

to the created order to establish his instruction to women.[88] However, this is a reminder that Adam was the only one present for God's original prohibitions. Eve is not present in Genesis 2:15-17. She is not created until 2:21-22. Hence, Paul makes a point of mentioning the created order.[89] Eve is thereby more "susceptible to deception,"[90] not because of her gender, but because she was either not afforded the same teaching opportunity as Adam or she misunderstood it.[91] If her weakness to deception was a result of her gender, why would Paul does Paul only forbid her to teach men? "If women are by nature gullible, they ought to be disqualified from teaching anybody, not just men, whereas Paul refers to the special role of women in teaching both children and younger women."[92] Additionally, even though Paul's prohibition is grounded in the created order, that does not automatically make it transcultural. For instance, this principle is not equally applied to head coverings.[93] Beyond that, Paul's words are often not taken as literally as some might suggest. Paul commands that believers greet with a holy kiss,[94] and take up an offering for Jerusalem.[95] These commands are seldom, if ever, taken as universal. Instead, the informed reader engages in cultural transposition to determine what applies to them, and what does not.

There is also a great deal of controversy surrounding the meaning of have authority (αὐθεντεῖν from αὐθεντέω). It may not be a positive term for exercising

---

[88] For the best complementarian arguments on this passage, see Andreas J. Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, eds., *Women in the Church*, specifically 163-225. What follows is not a comprehensive counter argument to the claims made in *Women in the Church*. For more counter-arguments, see Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 109-113; Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ*, 31-462; McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 145-207.

[89] This is contra Schreiner, who believes egalitarians have failed "to provide a convincing explanation for v. 13." *Women in the Church*, 202. But he grossly misrepresents Keener as saying "the argument is hard to fathom," but neglects to mention that Keener provides three viable interpretive options. Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 116.

[90] Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. vol 1, 229.

[91] Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives,* 115-117.

[92] Stott, *Guard the Truth*, 80. Cf. Titus 2:3-5.

[93] 1 Corinthians 11:8.

[94] Romans 16:16, 1 Corinthians 16:20, 2 Corinthians 13:12, 1 Thessalonians 5:26.

[95] 1 Corinthians 16:1-3.

authority, but instead could be a term for domineering or usurping.[96] There are strong arguments and supporting data for most of the popular suggestions. For instance, Witherington suggests that Chrysostom used have authority (αὐθεντέω) to mean abuse power or domineer, but Wolters argues that Chrysostom did not use it that way.[97] Thus, the decision will not be made with lexicography alone. On this point, Wolters rightly suggests that "[t]he negative portrayal of the Ephesian women teachers as strident demagogues is, in fact, a speculative reconstruction of the situation at the time, and it certainly cannot be used as evidence that [have authority] αὐθεντέω carries a pejorative sense."[98] Indeed, this would be arguing in a circle. Reconstruction would determine the meaning of have authority (αὐθεντέω), which would in turn substantiate our reconstruction. That have authority (αὐθεντέω) does not automatically hold a pejorative sense is clear from its usage with God as its subject.[99] Even if Paul intended it in a pejorative sense, proving so would be nearly impossible.[100]

Therefore, weight of the egalitarian argument should not rest on a speculative definition of have authority (αὐθεντέω). Rather, the rest of Paul's works should inform a careful interpretation of this passage. For instance, Paul consistently affirms women in ministry positions.[101] Considering this, some interpret this phrase as a

---

[96] Ibid, 73. As such, there will not be extensive treatment or evaluation of the present debate. It is worth noting that both Louw & Nida (37.21) and BDAG define it as a pejorative. J P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, volume 1, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, second ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 474; Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 150. However, Burk argues convincingly that BDAG is "woefully dated" on this topic in his chapter on translation in *Women in the Church*. This specific argument can be found on 290-291. For the most up to date assessments of αὐθεντεῖν see Wolters' and Burk's essays in *Women in the Church,* 65-115, 279-296 (respectively).

[97] See Witherington, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*. vol 1, 227; Wolters, *Women in the Church*, 100-101.

[98] *Women in the Church,* 112.

[99] Wolters, *Women in the Church*, 91-92, 113.

[100] This has not kept many from trying. Wolters makes an excellent case against them throughout his chapter in *Women in the Church*, 65-115.

[101] For thorough analyses of women in leadership positions in scripture, see Scot McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet: Rethinking How You Read the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2008),

condemning a specific kind of female-over-male authority instead of a universal prohibition.[102] Additionally, "Paul does not assume that Timothy already knows this rule."[103] Elsewhere Paul refers to information that he expects Timothy to remember from their shared travels. If Paul consistently forbade women from preaching, why would Timothy be unaware of this prohibition? Why not just remind Timothy of this consistent teaching?

Another common argument is that Paul is referring to "functions that are carried out by the elders of the church."[104] However, this specific view of church governance is not abundantly clear.[105] Put simply, if this view of elder-led churches is false, the corresponding interpretation of this passage fails.[106] However, even if this view of church governance is true, it would then need to be demonstrated that women have not and should not hold the role of elder. However, it is clear from early church history that women did indeed hold the role of elder, as well as several other important authoritative roles in the church.[107] Additionally, regarding church

---

163-185; Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 237-257; and Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ,* 60-78.

[102] Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives,* 107-112; McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 186-196; Oden, *First and Second Timothy and Titus*, 97; Wright, *Surprised by Scripture*, 78-82.

[103] Ibid, 112.

[104] Wayne A. Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994), 938-939.

[105] Arguing proper church governance is well outside the scope of this essay. But the existence of such a debate is important. If the view put forward by Grudem were universally accepted, then his argument would have more weight. For a broad treatment of various church governance perspectives, see Peter Toon, *Who Runs the Church? 4 Views on Church Government*, Counterpoints (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2004).

[106] John Stott suggests that one's view of church governance often determines their conclusion in this debate. Stott, *Guard the Truth*, 81.

[107] A list of examples can be found in Chapter 8 of Carolyn Osiek and Kevin Madigan, trans., *Ordained Women in the Early Church: A Documentary History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 163-202. See also Carolyn Osiek, Margaret Y. MacDonald, and Janet H. Tulloch, *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2006), specifically (but not limited to) 230-233. For a creative and helpful survey of historical interpreters of our passage, see Gary A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 99-116.

governance, Paul consistently ranks prophets over teachers,[108] and it is abundantly clear in scripture that women can be prophets.[109] What then keeps them from occupying what is a lesser role? Schreiner, a prominent complementarian, concedes that this is a "more powerful objection against his position."[110] Surprisingly, he only lists one counterargument, and he goes on to admit that it is "probably incorrect."[111] His reader is left without a substantial reason to believe that a prophet's authority is not greater than or equal to a teacher, and therefore without sufficient reason to accept Schreiner's complementarian thesis.

Schreiner thinks that the complementarian view "has the virtue of adopting the simplest reading of the text."[112] This could not be further from the truth. All interpretations of this passage read something into the text. Egalitarians read context into the text that permits female teaching. Perhaps that context is wrong. Some complementarians, like Grudem and Schreiner, read a specific view of church governance into the text that maintain a prohibition of women teaching. Perhaps that view of church governance is wrong. "However one interprets these verses—and let's be honest enough to say they are difficult—if we make them an inflexible rule that women should always be silent, we have a flat-out contradiction to the Story of the Bible, to the practices of Priscilla and Junia and Phoebe, and to Paul himself."[113] Thus, the Egalitarian position has the virtue of adopting the view which holds the entirety of scripture in the highest regard. Paul was not opposed to women in ministry. Women were his constant colaborers, receiving twice as many specific commendations as men in his epistles.[114] But this does not mean that he favored women over men. He was an Egalitarian. He viewed genders equally.

Showing favor towards women could potentially elevate them above men, which happened in the cult of Artemis. Showing favor towards men could potentially elevate them above women, which happened in much of Rabbinic Judaism.[115] In

---

[108] Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 244.

[109] 1 Corinthians 11:3-16. Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles,* 48.

[110] *Women in the Church*, 193.

[111] Ibid, 193.

[112] Ibid, 201.

[113] McKnight, *The Blue Parakeet*, 196.

[114] Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 240.

[115] Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 114.

this passage, Paul balances both genders, encouraging the elevation of women to the level of fellow learner alongside men. Neither gender is given ultimate authority over the other. This is reflected in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. NT Wright summarizes:

> Now, if you were writing a letter to someone in a small, new religious movement with a base in Ephesus, and you wanted to say that because of the gospel of Jesus the old ways of organizing male and female roles had to be rethought from top to bottom, with one feature being that women were to be encouraged to study and learn and take a leadership role, you might want to avoid giving the wrong impression. Was the apostle saying, people might wonder, that women should be trained so that Christianity would gradually become a cult like that of Artemis, where women led and kept the men in line? That, it seems to me, is what verse 12 is denying.[116]

Put simply, if these women are properly taught, Paul would not stop them from conveying what they have learned to anyone in the church. In fact, if they have been properly taught, he would expect them to do precisely that.

[116] Wright, *Surprised by Scripture*, 80.

The Implications of the Bestowal of the Holy Spirit for Women in Leadership Ministry

Clayton D. Robinson, D.Min., Ph.D.[1]

ABSTRACT:
The bestowal of the Holy Spirit provides the context for women to serve in leadership and public ministry within the church. Contrasting Gal 3:25–29 and Gen 1:26–27, it is demonstrated that by faith in Christ both men and women are equally heirs of God. That full equality has been obtained is demonstrated through the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost where all received the Spirit equally and that in the Spirit all can prophesy regardless of age, gender or social status. Since 1 Cor. 11–14 demonstrate that women were allowed to pray and prophesy in public, Paul's restrictions on women later in 1 Cor. 14:34–35 are taken as exceptional and should be interpreted as bringing order within a specific unruly house-church so as not to create cultural barriers to the Gospel for outsiders. This is not, therefore, intended as a restriction placed upon all women in every other context throughout time.

Introduction

Many have questioned whether or not women should be allowed to serve in leadership ministry, especially within the context of a public worship service. It will be argued here that the bestowal of the Holy Spirit does indeed provide the context for women to serve in leadership and public ministry within the church.

Creation

In the account of creation given in Genesis, (Gen 1:26–27; 2:7, 18–23; 5:1–2), it is clear that at the very beginning God conceptualized humanity as existing in two complementary yet equal sexes, "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion…' So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; *male and female* he created them" (Gen 1:26–27; cf. 5:1–2).[2]

The word translated "man" in this passage represents the generic term "human"

---

[1] Clayton D. Robinson (clrobinson@lifepacific.edu) is an adjunct professor at Life Pacific College and the pastor of The Connection Foursquare Church in Lake Forest, California.

[2] The *English Standard Version* (*ESV*) is used throughout unless otherwise noted.

in the Hebrew, adam (אָדָם).3 The Septuagint (LXX), the Greek translation of the Old Testament dated from around 300 B.C., follows suit, using the generic term anthrōpos (ἄνθρωπος). To reduce confusion, it would be better to translate the passages using the more generic English term, human or humanity.4 Thus, "God said, 'Let us make humanity in our image…and let them have dominion.'" Further, the passage itself makes it clear that God's original intention for humanity was to exist in two sexes, both of which fully and equally carried the image of God, "So God created humanity in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them."5 Thus both male and female were conceived by God in the divine plan of creation as bearing God's image and having fellowship with him.6

As Westfall observes, what complicates the image of God as relating to women is that while Genesis 1:27 and 5:1–2 state that Eve was specifically created by God in his own image, Genesis 2:21–24 demonstrates that Eve also can be considered as being in the image of Adam, "because she was bone of his bones, flesh of his flesh, and one flesh in marriage." "Therefore, Eve is threefold in the image of God because Eve was formed directly by God in his image; she was formed from Adam, who bore God's image before the fall (in contrast to Adam, who was formed from dirt); and she became one flesh with Adam in their sexual union."7 The

---

[3] *TWOT* 25; *THWAT* 1:41–57; Howard N. Wallace, "Adam" *ABD* 1:62.

[4] *BDB* 9; *TDOT* 1:75–87; *BDAG* 81–2; *TDNT* 1:364–6.

[5] Cf. G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1), 32–3; Paul K. Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 29–30, H. Wayne House, "A Biblical View of Women in the Ministry Part 1 (of 5 Parts): Neither…Male nor Female…in Christ Jesus," *BSac* 145 (1988): 47–56. What the image of God exactly entails, however, has been a subject of much debate and "dissension" cf. Richard S. Briggs, "Humans in the Image of God and Other Things Genesis Does Not Make Clear" *JTI* 4.1 (2010): 111–126).

[6] It is noteworthy that God created the woman as part of his divine plan, and not as a reaction to sin which was to come later. Further, no mention of submission of the woman to man is made until the judgment handed out by God after the Fall (Gen 3:16). While the purpose and place of submission is beyond the scope of the current paper, it seems reasonable to surmise that before Eve and Adam ate of the forbidden fruit, they were in complete harmony and unity, with neither being subjugated by the other, instead they lived in mutual submission to each other in companionship (cf. Eph 5:21), cf. M Robert Mulholland, Jr. "Women and Men: Wives and Husbands," 1–17.

[7] Cynthia Long Westfall, *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 40.

possibility that humanity might not always exist in different sexes is found in a comment given by Jesus to some Sadducees who were questioning him concerning marriage.[8] Here Jesus states that when people rise from the dead, "they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven" (Mark 12:25).[9] This passage seems to imply that in the age to come sexual differentiation will no longer be relevant and humanity will exist in full fellowship with God and each other. Although it must be conceded that not marrying does not necessitate being sexless, leaving some scholars to contend that we will retain our sexual differentiation in eternity.[10] The importance here is that regardless of whether or not we retain our sexual differentiation, there seems to be full equality in eternity, presumably because all bear the image of God equally.

No Male and Female

Paul makes a similar declaration in Gal 3:25–29, "But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian, for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise."[11] Here Paul contends that those who have been baptized in Christ have been clothed with Christ and thereby all believers are "sons" of God through faith (in the sense of being equally heirs). As such, Paul

---

[8] For the similarity of Jesus' comments in Mark 12 to Philo, see F. Gerald Downing, "The Resurrection of the Dead: Jesus and Philo" *JSNT* 15 (1982) 42–50.

[9] Although not otherwise mentioned in Scripture, the belief that in eternity humanity will exist in a form similar to the angles is attested in Jewish Second Temple literature, e.g. 1 Enoch 104:4, 6; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 51; cf. C. A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34A) 255; A. Y. Collins and H. W. Attridge, *Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel of Mark* (Hermeneia), 561–2; J. R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark* (PNTC) 367–8.

[10] Cf. Jewett, Male and Female, 33–34; "No Male and Female…" *Reformed Journal* 24.5 (1974) 24–26; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC), 474.

[11] Some believe that this saying was originally a baptismal formula that Paul quotes, or at least refers to. Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," in *In Search of the Early Christians: Selected Essays*, ed. Allen R. Hilton and H. Gregory Snyder (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 3–54 (11–13); Brigitte Kahl, "No Longer Male: Masculinity Struggles behind Galatians 3:28?" *JSNT* 70 (2000) 37–49. See the full treatment of the issues in Bernard C. Lategan, "Reconsidering the Origin and Function of Galatians 3:28" *Neotestamenica* 46.2 (2012) 274–86.

declares that earthy divisions and distinctions have been removed, so that there is no longer any race/religious, economic/class, or gender divisions, but in Christ there is now "a new universality of oneness and a new relationship of being God's children."[12]

Paul notes in Gal 3:26–28 that all believers—including men and women—are co-heirs as "sons" of God. Had Paul said that they were sons and daughters of God, it might have implied a lessor role for women in the kingdom of God, for daughters of a king were lessor than sons, but as full heirs of God, all have equal standing before God. Yet that sonship exists even now, becoming the basis for living out salvation in community as equals before God, where there is a place and freedom in the Spirit for everyone, without exception. Paul challenges believers to rise above bigotry, class thinking and an air of superiority which often are so prevalent in society, instead challenging all to walk together as equals in "newness of life."[13]

In Gal 3:27 Paul contrasts three different classifications: Jew/Greek, slave/free, male/female.[14] All three are introduced by the phrase, "*ouk eni*" (οὐκ ἔνι), "there is not."[15] In the first two sets Paul uses the comparative "nor," "*oude*" (οὐδὲ) to contrast the two substantives, just as is expected. This gives a general meaning something like, "there is not Jew or Greek, there is not slave or free." But then Paul changes his construction, "there is not male *and* female," switching from *oude* to *kai* (καί). There is no reason grammatically for the change, which makes the Greek rather awkward. It seems that Paul is deliberately picking up the exact wording from

---

[12] R.N. Longenecker, *Galations* (WBC 41) 152).

[13] Monica Cooney, "Men and Women as Equal Partners in Christian Community: A Biblical Meditatioin with Special Reference to Galatians 3:28" *Ecum Rev* 60 (2008), 100–3; cf. Doug Heidebrecht, "Distinction and Function in the Church: Reading Galatians 3:28 in Context" *Direction* 34.2 (2005) 181–93; Christine Lienemann-Perrin, "The Biblical Foundations for a Feminist and Participatory Theology of Mission" *IRM* 93.368 (2004) 17–34.

[14] A similar three-fold contrast can be found in Hellenistic literature (human/beast, man/woman, Greek/barbarian) as well as in Jewish literature (Jew/gentile, man/woman, wise/boor). Cf. Meeks, 5; John E. Alsup, "Imagining the New Feminism: Galatians 3:28 and the Current Interpretive Discussion" *Austin Seminary Bulletin* (Faculty ed.) 105.2 (1990) 91–108.

[15] *Eni* (ἔνι) is either an emphatic form of the verb "to be" *estin* (ἐστίν) (Longenecker, 156), or a strengthened form *en* (ἔν) with an ellipsis of the substantive verb (J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London: MacMillan, 1896), either of which seem to strengthen the phrase to emphasize a complete lack of distinction between the contrasting elements (cf. Col 3:11; Jas 1:17). CF. Wayne Walden, "Galatians 3:28 Grammar Observations" *ResQ* 51.1 (2009) 45–50.

the LXX version of Gen 1:27; 5:2,[16] in the process implying that when one is clothed in Christ, a reversal of the sexual differentiation made at creation has been made.[17]

Note the exact phrasing between Gen 1:27 and Gal 3:28

Gen 1:27	**Gal 3:28**
So God created man in his own image,	For as many of you as were baptized
in the image of God he created him;	into Christ have put on Christ.
male and female he created them	There is neither Jew nor Greek
	there is neither slave nor free,
	there is no *male and female*,
	for you are all one in Christ Jesus.
ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς	οὐκ ἔνι ***ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ***·

Paul seems to imply here that the original creation of humanity as divided between male and female is no longer necessary in Christ, so that before God in Christ we are all one, having put on Christ.[18] The implication of this is significant; believers who have "put on Christ" no longer should be considered according to their gender, but according to their relationship to Christ.[19] As God's children, who are created in his

---

[16] Meeks 13–14; John E. Alsup, 91–108; J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 150; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC), 189; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 156; Walden, 45–50; Lienemann-Perrin, 23.

[17] Heidebrecht, 186; H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia, 1979), 195, contends that Paul names the sexes in the neuter gender, indicating that not only are the *social* roles between men and women changed, but the *biological* distinctions as well.

[18] This concept was later echoed in Gnosticism, which contended that ultimately humanity would revert to a pristine androgynous state, who claimed that Jesus said his kingdom would come, "When the two shall be one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female" (*Gos. Egy*. as quoted by Clem. Alex., *Strom*. 3:45, 63ff, 91). See Robert M. Grant, "Neither Male nor Female," *BR* 37 (1992) 5–14. Lightfoot, 150; Bruce, 189. Most scholars, however, reject the concept of an eventual androgynous state. Cf. Meeks 13–14, "Gal 3:28 does not invite one to a vision of the grand *neutrum humanum* as though sexuality/gender were to be gloriously abandoned in this mortal existence; rather, we are invited to imagine the New as life in the flesh where the latter is not the dominant reality for the people of faith."

[19] Klara Butting, "Pauline Variations on Genesis 2.24: Speaking of the Body of Christ in the Context of the Discussion of Lifestyles." *JSNT* 79 (2000) 79–90, notes that Gal 3:28 doesn't assert there is no longer men or women in Christ, but that the distinction between male and female "is no longer constitutive of the new community in Christ" where men and women can encounter one another simply as brothers and sisters. (87–88). Kahl, 43–4, adds that "Paul does not proclaim the erasure of sexual (or any other) difference, but the end of the social hierarchies

divine image, all are full heirs with Christ in the coming kingdom. But that understanding is not just for the future, here Paul boldly declares that those who have been baptized *now* should thus be considered! As Betz notes, Paul does not make these proclamations as "utopian ideals or as ethical demands, but as accomplished facts," literally, "there is not" rather than "there should not be."[20]

At the same time, Paul is not attempting to say that in reality there are no slaves, Gentiles or women,[21] but that in Christ these human distinctions no longer have the same meaning, for all have been "clothed with Christ" and are "sons of God" (Gal 3:26; 4:4–7).[22] As Westfall notes, "If there is no condemnation for those in Christ, then women should no longer bear a sense of guilt, shame, consequences, or restrictions for Eve's behavior any more than men do for Adam's behavior. If women are led by the Spirit, then they are identified with the life and righteousness of Jesus Christ; they are not identified with Eve's violation of God's command or any additional susceptibility to deception and sin."[23]

In other words, not only does Gal 3:28 demonstrate that all have equal availability and status in salvation and fellowship with God, the very declaration that in Christ all are one demands a social response that leads to a spiritual equality and access beyond the merely spiritual realm.[24] It seems here that Paul's overall concern is for consistency between the gospel message and how it is lived out between those

---

and exclusions (re)produced by it…Paul's concept of oneness in Christ…rejects hierarchy but not difference as such."

[20] Betz, 189.

[21] David M. Scholer, "Galatians 3:28 and the Ministry of Women in the Church" *CQ* 56.3 (1998) 2–18, notes that the three pairs (Jew/Gentile, free/slave, male/female) "represent three of the most important and critical social and status divisions in Paul's Greco-Roman culture."

[22] Cf. Adewale J. Adelakun, "Complementarians versus Egalitarians: An Exegesis of Galatians 3:28 from Nigerian Cultural Perspective" *Ogbomoso Journal of Theology* 17.3 (2012) 77–95. Scholer, 9, notes that the "triple pairing" is well attested in Greco-Roman and Jewish material, "What is stunning is that in the traditional formulas the triple pairing is clearly meant to show what is good or proper or desirable over against the alternative, whereas in Paul the triple pairing—remember a traditional cultural formula—is used in order to declare that it has been overcome and eliminated in Christ Jesus!"

[23] Westfall, 129.

[24] Cf. Jewett, *"No Male and Female…"* 24–26; Heidebrecht, 183; Scholer, 11. On the other hand, House, 54–5, contends that while women are equal in salvation, they are not equal in their God-assigned roles.

who have become the "sons of God."[25] Thus, in regards to Jewish/Gentile relationships, Paul challenged Peter for treating Hellenistic Christians differently in the presence of other Jews (Gal 2:11–14).[26] When dealing with those who were slaves, Paul encouraged them to gain their freedom if possible (1 Cor 7:21–22) and he encouraged Philemon to set his slave Onesimus free (Phil 21).[27]

When dealing with the relationship between men and women, Paul demonstrates that there are social implications within marriage as well, most notably by prescribing equality in sexual relationships unheard of in Greek, Latin or Jewish writings (1 Cor 7:3–5),[28] as well as providing context whereby a woman could pray or prophesy publicly (1 Cor 11:5).[29]

The NT condemnation of discrimination and partiality regarding Gentiles or those of lessor social status should also apply equally to women and those of different races (cf. Acts 10:34; Eph 6:9; Rom 2:11; Jas 2:1, 9; Jude 16).[30] Thus, if

---

[25] Heidebrecht, 183. Lienemann-Perrin, 23–4, notes that in the same way "no longer Jew nor Greek" has practical implications of no longer requiring circumcision and religious food restrictions, "What applies to the first opposing pair would have to be applied, by analogy, to the other two pairs."

[26] Cf. John Jefferson Davis, "Some Reflections on Galatians 3:28, Sexual Roles, and Biblical Hermeneutics" *JETS* 19.3 (1976) 201–8

[27] On the other hand, Madeleine Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11:11–12 and Gal 3:28: The NT on the Role of Women" *CBQ* 31.1 (1960) 50–58, contends, "The contrasting pairs stand for any privileged class over against an unprivileged class. Rich/poor, slave/free, Jew/Greek, male/female—each pair illustrates the basic contrast high status/low status. What Gal 3:28 is saying is that persons of both high and low position can be brought together in the Church. If so, then Paul was not calling for any social reforms; inequalities would continue to exist in the Church. Paul fully intended that women and slaves remain in the subordinate place in which he thought God had put them." Although, such a pessimistic view of Paul's intentions in Gal 3:28 is not generally shared by other recent scholars.

[28] Meeks, 20–1, "Paul presupposes and approves in the Corinthian congregation an equivalence of role and a mutuality of relationship between the sexes in matters of marriages, divorce, and charismatic leadership of the church to a degree that is virtually unparalleled in Jewish or pagan society of the time." On the status of women in Judaism, see the resources provided in Boucher, 52n7.

[29] Often so much focus is placed upon the requirement that a woman must wear a head covering that it is glossed over that here Paul was in fact noting the conditions upon which a woman *could* pray or prophesy.

[30] Marlene Crüsemann, "Irredeemably Hostile to Women: Anti-Jewish Elements in the Exegesis of the Dispute about Women's Right to Speak (1 Cor 14:34–35)" *JSNT* 79 (2000) 19–36, suggests that we read Gal 3:38 as a "social-historical and hermeneutical trinity," so that "when

in Christ men and women are no longer considered as "male and female," instead being regarded simply as "sons" of God, then there should be no distinction made in the ministry opportunities available to them; so that ultimately, a classless people should not have a leadership based solely upon class restrictions. Thus Scholer contends that Paul made this application himself throughout his ministry, "[Paul] actualized in the social-ecclesial realm the horizontal dimensions of the elimination of these three polarities in Christ Jesus" through his stress on the equality and mutual fellowship of Jews and Gentiles, as well as his inclusion of women in the ministry (such as Chloe, Apphia, Nympha, Persis, Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Phoebe, Priscilla, Euodi, Syntyche, and Junia, which constituted 20% of those Paul named as partners in ministry.[31] Davis, however, challenges the idea that women should be given equal place with men, noting that just because we have become one in Christ does not mean that everyone has become equal in all authority patterns.[32] Davis has a point in that while all believers are considered to be equal in Christ, yet all are required to submit to those in authority over them—whether Jewish, Gentile, rich, poor, owner, slave, male or female—all believers are to submit to Christian leadership (1 Thess 5:12; 2 Thess 3:14; Phil 2:12). Further, standing together as one in Christ, slaves are still to submit to their masters (Col 3:22), even believing ones (Phil), children are to obey their parents (Eph 6:1; Col 3:20) and wives are to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22–24; Col 3:18).[33] None of these relationships are meant to demean the other, but to provide order in human relationships.

On the other hand, what is at issue here is not whether submission still

---

New Testament texts are expounded from one of these angles, one should always bear the other two in mind. This threefold criterion for addressing these texts to a reality that is not perceived only selectively concerns the relationships of domination that are possible in each case."

[31] Scholer, 11–12, 18n.45.

[32] Davis, 203; Lategan, 283–5.

[33] Some have questioned in light of Gal 3:38, if a woman is still required to submit to her husband. The answer seems to spring from the nature of sin presently, in conjunction with the punishment given to the woman at the Fall. While certainly in Christ the results of sin have been atoned for and thus all are fully equal as sons/heirs of God, yet as Paul notes in Rom 6–7, believers still struggle with sin. Note Paul's conclusion in Rom 7:25, "So then, I myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin." Thus, in Christ we are fully equal, but because we all still struggle with sin and its effects, in a sense, we are still under the husband/wife (as well as parent/child) economy where "hierarchical authority structures still exist only as a consequence of the fall," although they "were not part of the original creation order" (Davis, 203–4, cf. Westfall, 107–41).

is required of believers, but whether women are to be excluded from the possibility of having a public role in ministry or hold leadership positions of authority. Few would contend today that Gentiles were forever precluded by God from public speaking or Christian leadership, even though that indeed was one of the greatest issues debated in the apostolic church. Some would have found the thought of slaves holding leadership positions in an Anglo church completely objectionable not that long ago in the U.S. It is true that even today a Jewish congregation might take offense and never allow a Gentile to be its leader, and in a classed society, high class people might not be willing to follow lower class leaders, but does that justify their discrimination as acceptable in Christ? In the same way, if Gentiles and slaves (people of low social status) have both equal standing and equal rights in the church of God, why would women be excluded simply because they are women? Is that what Paul was contending for in the passages where he speaks of women standing in submission to men?

If we truly believe that all are equal in Christ, we will show it through our respect for all within the Christian community, accepting everyone as being of equal worth and allowing equal membership in the family of God. As Sister Monica Cooney notes, Gal 3:28 implies a mutuality in the faith, which should be expressed in the full recognition and acceptance of one another, whether male or female, including all our sameness and differences, so that being respectful of one another, we will allow all to be led by the Spirit as equal partners working together in Christ. "This sharing can become a reality only when each recognizes the other as a full partner and allows space for their contribution in all areas effecting human life."[34]

Galatians 3:28 is consistent with proclamations Paul has made elsewhere. It speaks not so much of practical application and Christian practice than of clear theological understanding. As such, we agree with Bruce that Gal 3:28 should be understood as the ideal that we are reaching for, the controlling passage through which other passages are understood and interpreted. "Paul states the basic principle here; if restrictions on it are found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, as in 1 Cor. 14:34–35 or 1 Tim. 2:11–12, they are to be understood in relation to Gal 3:28, and not *vice versa*."[35] We will examine Paul's difficult passage in 1 Cor. 14:34–35 in

---

[34] Cooney, 103.

[35] Bruce, 190; cf. Lieneman-Perrin, 22–3; Scholer, 4–13; Jean-Yves Theriault, "La femme chrétienne dans les textes pauliniens" *ScEs* 37.3 (1985) 297–317, contends that the idea is stated in Gal 3:28 is the spiritual ideal, while the other passages dealing with women in the NT were

more detail shortly, but first let us examine the foundation of ministry that resulted from the coming of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost.

The Bestowal of the Spirit

Paul's understanding that all who are in Christ have the same standing before God stands in agreement with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:1–4.[36] In Acts 2:3, Luke relates that the Spirit sat upon "each one of them" (ἐκάθισεν ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν). The Spirit did not only come upon the leaders, or even the men, but upon all who were present in the community of believers—young and old, male and female, rich and poor, classed and classless (Acts 2; Gal 3:5). There was and is no differentiation in Christ; in fact, any such differentiation is strictly prohibited (cf. Jas 2:1, 8–9). While this newly formed "classless" society could be explored further, for the purpose of the current article let us confine ourselves to its implications for women in leadership ministry.

Acts 2:4

Acts 2:4 summarizes the result of the bestowal of the Spirit, "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." This is the second mention by Luke in this passage that the Spirit was poured out upon all, clearly important to him, but here he adds that bold prophetic speech was the resultant manifestation by all present.[37] Peter, standing up to address the arriving and bewildered/mocking crowd, proclaims that this is none other than

---

accommodations to current societal standard, the ideal versus the practical, contending that ultimately, the church should always strive for the ideal.

[36] For an in-depth treatment of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in the NT, my dissertation, Clayton David Robinson, "The Laying on of Hands, with Special Reference to the Reception of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament" (Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2008).

[37] The traditional translation "utterance," falls far short of the meaning of the Greek verb *apophthengomai* (αποφθέγγομαι). The word was used in the ancient world primarily of the inspired speech of prophets, exorcists, and other inspired persons and here would best be translated "*proclaim boldly and prophetically*" cf. *BDAG*, αποφθέγγομαι, 125; *TDNT*, "αποφθέγγομαι" 1:447. It is clear that Luke deliberately chose *apophthengomai* to convey that they were not just speaking gibberish or "glossolalia," but were speaking divine oracles through Holy Spirit empowerment. Luke makes this connection even clearer by again using *apophthengomai* in reference to Peter's following message to the ensuing crowd, demonstrating that whether through tongues or in clear language, they were now speaking divinely inspired prophetic oracles. It should be noted that *apophthengomai* is used only three times in the NT, two of them in this passage.

the fulfillment of Joel 2:28-32, "And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; even on my male servants and female servants in those days I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophesy" (Acts 2:17–18). The passage speaks not just of the outpouring of the Spirit, but also that the Spirit will be poured out in a way that clears away distinctions of age and gender.

With the bestowal of the Spirit, now all have access to his power and presence, and consequently all have the same responsibility to walk in the Spirit (Rom 8:4; Gal 5:16–25; 1 Pet 4:6) and to release any spiritual gifts he has placed within their lives (1 Cor 12; Rom 12; Eph 4). It is clearly noted that the Spirit did not just fall upon men, or upon apostles, or upon divinely selected leaders, but upon all those who belonged to the community of faith. Thus, the manifestation of the Spirit's presence has become available to all, and it is the responsibility of every Spirit-filled believer to release the Spirit within the community of faith, as well as in the world at large. At no place is the manifestation of the Spirit limited in the NT to apostles, pastors, bishops, elders, evangelists, men, the wealthy and/or privileged, or by any measurable distinction! The Spirit is available to speak through whomever he desires. The only restriction is that the rest of the Spirit-filled community is to judge the purported manifestation of the Spirit (1 Cor 14:29).38

With the outpouring of the Spirit, the Old Testament promise of the people of God as a "kingdom of priests" (Exod 19:6) was fulfilled and we are amiss to the Scriptures when we attempt to limit that calling to only a portion of God's church—be it only to professional ministers, elders, recognized leaders, or men. Rather, both the promise and the gift of the Spirit were given to all—and not as a possession, but as an empowerment for ministry! The entire community of faith received the gift, and all are held responsible to release Spirit-empowered ministry as the Spirit sees fit!39 As Snodgrass notes, "Things cannot be the same after the coming of the spirit. The church lives in an eschatological framework and orders its life differently, and

---

[38] Heidebrecht, 184–6, makes a connection between Joel 2:28–29, Peter's message in Acts 2 and Gal 3:14, 26–29, suggesting that the baptism Paul refers to in Gal 3:27 ("For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ") is in fact the baptism in the Holy Spirit, thus interconnecting the outpouring of the Spirit, the removal of distinctions between people, and presumably, the equal opportunity to life in the Spirit (and gifts?).

[39] Heidebrecht, 187–8; Lienemann-Perrin, 17–34.

explicitly so with regard to women."[40]

Acts 8

This freedom is clearly carried through the book of Acts. In Acts 8, Peter and John freely bestowed the Holy Spirit to the Samaritans through the laying on of hands. As in Acts 2, it is clear that the Spirit was poured out upon all (Acts 8:14–18). A rebuke, however, was given to Simon for offering money for the ability to control the gift. To this Peter proclaims, "May your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain the gift of God with money! You have neither part nor lot in this matter, for your heart is not right before God" (Acts 8:20–21). More than just money was at stake here, but the thought that someone could control the Spirit for personal benefit. Peter's answer implies that if someone attempts to control the bestowal of the Spirit to others, that person has a wrong "heart" before the Lord! A natural progression would suggest that it is correspondingly wrong to attempt to control or hinder the appropriate moving of the Spirit in a Spirit-filled community of faith.

Acts 10–11

Luke mentions on a third occasion the Spirit being bestowed, this time upon Gentiles (Acts 10:1–11:17). Here Luke describes in detail the circumstances that brought Peter to the house of Cornelius, concluding "While Peter was still saying these things, the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word. And the believers from among the circumcised who had come with Peter were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out even on the Gentiles" (Acts 10:44–45). Luke has made it clear that the outpouring of the Spirit was by divine intention rather than through human means or decision, and that he fell upon *all those gathered*, which would have included women and children, possibly even servants and slaves.

There were some who were not pleased, however, that Peter had visited a forbidden group, allowing them to receive the Spirit and be baptized (Acts 11:2). They believed that Gentiles could not become a part of the believing community without first being circumcised and observing the law (Acts 15:1, 5). Luke again recounts Peter's story, emphasizing that it is God himself who intervened so that the Gentiles could receive both salvation and the promised Spirit without prejudice (Acts 11:4—18), "And the Spirit told me to go with them, making no distinction" (vs.

[40] Klyne Snodgrass, "A Case for the Unrestricted Ministry of Women" *CQ* 67.2 (2009) 26–44.

12).[41] Luke concludes, [Peter:] "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could stand in God's way? When they heard these things they fell silent. And they glorified God, saying, "Then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance that leads to life" (Acts 11:17–18).

We must not minimize the importance of these passages. If God has poured out his divine Spirit upon all, regardless of social position, age, race or gender, and as a result divine speech and gifts have poured forth, then we are compelled to give place to those very gifts in our midst by whomever the Spirit has chosen and empowered. When the church precludes or limits someone from releasing God's Spirit, has it not made the same mistake that the early Judaizers did by attempting to control whom God will be allowed to utilize as his spokesperson in the church? Here the words of Peter rephrased should be very instructive, "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us…who are we that we should stand in God's way?"

Paul, the Spirit, and Women in Ministry

Paul seems to grasp this clearly in Gal 3:28, as well as in his teaching on spiritual gifting in 1 Cor 12–14, where all are said to have received public gifts of manifestation (12:7) from the Spirit who "apportions to each one individually as he wills (12:11). From here Paul notes that the church is to be compared to a body where all were baptized into one body and made to drink of one Spirit (12:13). Every member of the body is said to be indispensable, where no part is unimportant or unintended (12:14–26). Paul notes that leadership is part of that appointing (apostles, prophets, teachers, workers of miracles, healers, tongue talkers, and interpreters), concluding that all should earnestly desire the higher gifts (12:27–31). Note especially that Paul *does not make* this challenge exclusive, namely, "all the men should desire these higher gifts while all the women should desire to watch in submission." No, the Spirit was given to all, and his gifts, even the "higher" ones, are to be desired by all. After an interlude on love as the mediator of the gifts, Paul repeats his challenge, "earnestly desire the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy" (14:1). If Paul had meant this as exclusive to the men only, he would have made it clearer. But indeed, Paul did challenge all those in Corinth to seek and desire

[41] *mēden diakrinanta* (μηδὲν διακρίναντα) which can be translated either to differentiate, discriminate or to doubt, hesitate. *BAGD,* "διακρίνω," 231.

all the gifts of the Spirit, even the public speaking and leadership gifts.[42]

Paul then moves from the idea, to the practical as lived out by the Corinthians. Here Paul notes that each one comes with a "hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation" (14:26). Indeed, the Corinthians were living out the presence of the Spirit as expressed through a multitude of spiritual gifts across the breadth of the congregation. The problem, however, was not in their spiritual giftedness, but in their practical application, where their zeal caused them to compete with each other, creating disorder and chaos in the process. To this Paul responds, "For God is not a God of confusion but of peace" (14:33) and "But all things should be done decently and in order" (14:40). But even with that, Paul still allows, "For you can all prophesy one by one, so that all may learn and all be encouraged" (14:31).

In the midst of these grand statements of inclusiveness, Paul seems to restrict the public manifestation of the Spirit only to men, "The women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church" (1 Cor 14:33–35; cf. 1 Tim. 2:12). On the surface, the passage seems to imply that women are forever forbidden from speaking within a church service.

There is a tension between Paul's comment in Galatians 3:28, where Paul clearly states that in Christ there is no distinction between man and woman, and 1 Cor 14:33–35, where Paul seems to contend that in fact such distinctions do exist. If Paul can be so clear regarding the equality of all believers—including men and women—what then does he mean in 1 Cor 14 and why is there so much debate on the issue of women in leadership ministry? As Eisenbaum notes, Paul himself is partly to blame, seeming both to provide an equal place for women (Gal 3:28, 1 Cor 7:3–4), while on the other hand putting man over woman (1 Cor 11:7; Eph 5:22, 24; Col 3:18).[43]

Over the course of debate, those who view Paul as inclusive tend to highlight those passages which demonstrate the equal place of women and ignore or explain away statements that controvert their egalitarian perspective, while conservative interpreters do the same, highlighting passages stating the submissive

---

[42] Meeks, 22, contends that Paul nowhere denies women the right to engage in charismatic leadership nor does he "advocate functionally inferior roles for women."

[43] Pamela Eisenbaum, "Is Paul the Father of Misogyny and Antisemitism?" *Cross Curr* 50.4 (2000-2001), 506–24.

place of women while ignoring or dismissing passages that don't align with their perspective.[44] Unfortunately, the problem is not merely that Paul is inconsistent, but the same passages can be interpreted in varying ways. As Eisenbaum notes, in Gal 3:28 where Paul states there is no longer Jew or Greek, slave or free, male and female, "does he mean to suggest that these distinctions between people should be eradicated…or does he mean that these distinctions are irrelevant as far as God and the church are concerned and thus Christians need not bother about them?"[45] Thus, should we aggressively work to eradicate any signs of discrimination and misogyny, or simply celebrate that God doesn't see a difference and encourage believers to take solace in that fact while they live out life in their assigned place?

Yet in Gal 3:28 Paul does not give a call to affirmative action, a rallying call to the faithful to respond to break down the barriers. Instead, he provides a declaration of our present fully achieved status before God; we already are one and there is no longer any distinction in God's eyes. Thus, rather than rallying in revolt, we are challenged to respond in personal ways, first, standing in our place boldly before God, as well as recognizing and affirming that same right in others.

Should there be differences between the various groupings? It seems that Paul's declaration that there is no Jew or Greek does not imply the loss of culture or acceptable cultural practices (as seen by Paul's contention that he acts like a Jew to Jews and like a Gentile before Gentiles (1 Cor 9:19–23). In Christ, we may be equal in our standing as the sons of God, but on earth, we still live our lives within gender and cultural differences, differences to be celebrated and appreciated, but not to be used to discriminate one against the other (1 Cor 7:17–20).[46] Thus, ultimately, people may be Jew or Greek, free or slave, male and female, but in Christ they are all the same. History demonstrates that in our human condition we still struggle with making distinctions between people, but in Christ these things should not be so, for all such distinctions no longer matter.[47] Thus, Jew, Gentile, rich, poor, free, slave, male, female—in Christ we all stand as equal—equal to receive salvation, equal in

---

[44] Eisenbaum, 510; Lienemann-Perrin, 21.

[45] Eisenbaum, 511.

[46] Cf. Eisenbaum, 512–22.

[47] Cf. Lategan, 283, who notes "The gap between theory and practice, between ideal and concrete behavior, is not only a theological, but an universal ethical problem…The dialectic between…principle and actual behavior is therefore not unusual. The successful internalization and implementation of principles and values are part of a dynamic process. As far as the practice of inclusivity is concerned, Paul seems to find himself at different stages during his ministry."

our standing before God and equal in the church of Christ.

Women Speaking in the Church

Back to the issue of Paul vs Paul. Many have tried to make sense of Paul limiting women from talking in 1 Cor 14:34–35, especially in light of the fact that he refers to women praying and prophesying in 1 Cor 11:5 and allows all the opportunity to prophesy in 1 Cor 14:31. While it is beyond the scope of the current paper to rehearse all the various perspectives and issues involved, a brief synopsis should lay the necessary groundwork.[48]

1 Corinthians 11

For context, in 1 Cor 11:34–35 Paul discusses men and women praying with heads either covered or uncovered, specifically noting women who "*pray or prophesy*" (11:5), clearly implying that Paul himself assumes that of course women *will* pray and prophesy within the public service.[49] Scholars generally agree that Paul is referring to an acceptable practice of women praying and prophesying in a public service so long as they cover their heads.[50] As Westfall notes, "The difference

---

[48] For in-depth treatments, see Terence Paige, "The Social Matrix of Women's Speech at Corinth: The Context and Meaning of the Command to silence in 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36" *BBR* 12.2 (2002) 217–42; Arthur Rowe, "Silence and the Christian Women of Corinth: An Examination of 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36" *CV* 33.1–2 (1990) 41–84; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC) 1150–61; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT), 664–72.

[49] Paul is addressing the *how* they are attired (e.g. wearing a head covering) *when* they pray and prophesy, thus clearly intimating that they indeed *will do* these things publicly. That a public venue is in mind is clear because no cultural concerns about head covering would be expected within the confines of a personal home. To argue otherwise would imply that Paul desired women to cover their heads when they prayed alone or with their husbands.

[50] For in-depth treatments, see Westfall, 26–43; Thiselton, 823–32. Westfall contends that veils were worn by upper class married women and thus had become a sign of honor, so that the Corinthian women would gladly have worn them, while the men would have been offended if the women of the lower classes wore them. If so, then Paul's admonition to the wearing of veils was more for the men than the women and in fact, functioned to create equality in Christ for all the women present. Thiselton, after reviewing the various scholarly perspectives on the meaning and place of Paul's reference to men/women wearing "head-coverings," concluded that most likely Paul was referring to men wearing long hair and women putting their hair down, allowing it to run freely (hair being the natural head covering God has provided). For men, this would be in accordance to the hair style worn by homosexuals, thus meaning that their hairstyle was portraying an effeminate (womanish) style and thus dishonoring their "head," which Paul here notes is Christ. For women, married women wore their hair up (or covered their head), so that

between men and women is not a distinction of roles in church, but rather how they function differently in those roles. Women and men may serve God in the same ministries, but there are different requirements that involve gender-specific apparel."[51]

1 Corinthians 12

As mentioned above, Paul then addresses the subject of public spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:1–11), where his focus is upon the Spirit as the determiner of spiritual gifting (rather than that being determined by church leadership). Here Paul clearly states that it is the Spirit "who apportions *to each one* individually as *he wills*" (12:11). The gifts Paul mentions are words of wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, distinguishing between spirits, prophecy, tongues and interpretation of tongues, all of which are given as a manifestation of the Spirit for the good of the believing community and which are available to *every Spirit-filled person* to release. There is no mention here of any restrictions (gender, age, class, race or position) being placed

---

by wearing their hair down the women were signaling that either they were not married and thus "sexually available" or that they were contending for an equal place with men, not dressing to show their submission to their husbands, in either case, dishonoring their "head," which is their husband. Paul's further rhetorical response that if such women continued to be contentious then they should be shaved/shorn could either mean that they should wear the hair style of a man (such as worn by lesbians of the day), or be shaved completely (which was the punishment for women convicted of prostitution). In all cases, contentious hair style would convey a lack of humility and submission, possibly even a lack of proper sexuality. Garland, 511–21, contends that Paul was referring to an actual head covering rather than simply one's hairstyle, but otherwise agrees that Paul's main concern was that Christians honor sexual decorum, avoiding culturally suggestive attire, concluding, "[Paul] is not trying to repress women and to restrain their expression of spiritual gifts but to impress on them the need to project modesty and virtue in their dress." On the other hand, Harold R. Holmyard III, "Does 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 Refer to Women Praying and Prophesying in Church?" *BS* 154 (1997) 461–72, contends that 1 Cor 11 deals with women praying and prophesying *outside* church meetings, while in services they are to remain silent.

[51] Westfall, 26. Meeks, 22, notes that Paul is most concerned about the symbols that distinguish between man and woman so that the proper symbolic attire is just as important for the male prophet as for the female (contrast 11:4,14). "If the passage places most emphasis on the female, that must be because in Corinth it is the charismatic women who are donning the attire of the opposite sex." Eisenbaum, 515–6, suggests that Paul's teaching about women wearing veils demonstrates that he believed that clothing and hair are determined by natural gender distinctions, symbols that are easily recognized by others and that should not too easily be changed (1 Cor 11:13–16). "Paul does not ascribe fashion to social convention. What men do they do because they are men; what women do they do because they are women."

upon these spiritual gifts as to who can publicly release them. But rather, Paul implies that *all* have received such gifts and should expect to release them. It seems that to forbid women (or anyone for that matter) from exercising the manifestation of the Spirit publicly is to hinder the work of the Spirit himself. This certainly gives perspective to why the women mentioned in 1 Cor 11:5 would be prophesying. Thus, throughout 1 Corinthians Paul seems to assume a public role for women in Spirit-empowered ministry.[52]

1 Corinthians 14

As noted above, in 1 Cor. 14:26–27, Paul discusses the process whereby spiritual gifts of instruction are to be operated within a church service, noting that "*each one* has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation" (14:26). Verse 31 summarizes by noting that *all* can prophesy one by one, so that all may learn, all may be encouraged. Again, there is no hint that this is limited to men alone.

Yet in 1 Cor 14:34–35 Paul commands women to be silent in church meetings (in assembly), which seems to create a contradiction with the other allowances in the passage. There have been many various approaches which have tried to explain Paul's intention in the passage, including: 1) that this particular passage is an interpolation into the text by a later scribe;[53] 2) that Paul was only limiting "uninspired" speech,[54] or conversely, 3) only limiting the prophetic evaluation of the prophecies of men by women;[55] 4) that Paul was forbidding women of asking informed (or uninformed) questions during the teaching time, 5) or of

---

[52] That there were women who prophesied in the apostolic church is documented by Luke, who mentions that Philip had four virgin "prophesying" daughters (Acts 21:9). The mention of Philip's daughters as being prophetesses, προφητεύουσαι, is in the present (continuous) case implies that they were active in their gift.

[53] Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. (Hermeneia), 246.

[54] Meeks, 23–4, contends that the restrictions on women talking is for those not otherwise gifted with prophetic or teaching gifts, in other words, not speaking from the Spirit but only from themselves. Cf. Crüsemann, 19–36 who reviews this line of thinking, although in the end she disputes any attempt to reconcile or explain away Paul's restrictions, which she declares as "irredeemably hostile to women."

[55] Adam D. Hensley, "σιγαω, λαλεω and ὑποτασσω in 1 Corinthians 14:34 in Their Literary and Rhetorical Ccontext." *JETS* 55.2 (2012) 343–64.

chattering during the teaching;[56] 6) Paul's comments relate only to the relationships between husband and wife,[57] such that 7) Paul was forbidding women from asking pointed questions about their own marriage, publicly shaming their husbands or from disputing the teaching of their husbands;[58] or conversely, 8) that Paul was limiting conversation between a married woman and a man who was not her husband;[59] 9) that the key issue was keeping order in the church and as such the women were not the only ones required to be "silent;"[60] and finally, 10) Paul intended these limits for any and all women under all circumstances, commanding them to be silent and not to speak or teach publicly during a church service, instead requiring them to be subordinate to any and all men who were present.[61]

After reviewing these various options, that which seems most plausible is that Paul was first and foremost, bringing order to a chaotic and disorderly environment. At the same time, he was attempting to keep the church within the acceptable bounds of the surrounding culture, so that those visiting church services would not be offended. Thus, all of Paul's restrictions are placed within the confines of being intelligible to the unbeliever (14:23–24). Within this context, whatever the women were doing and wearing, it seems to have been causing disorder and shame, something that was unacceptable to Paul. Thus, he concludes, "But all things should

---

[56] Westfall, 236–40, believes that the restrictions on women here should be taken within the context of the other restrictions found in the passage limiting people from all talking at the same time, consequently causing a state of disorder. Thus, the women might not have simply been "chattering" (not paying attention while gossiping with each other) but may actually have been discussing the teaching and asking appropriate questions among themselves or others, but that they were doing it in the midst of the service creating more "disorderly conduct."

[57] Mulholland, Jr., 1–17. In line with this, Massey, "Gender versus Marital Concerns: Does 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 Address the Issues of Male/Female or Husband/Wife?" *TynBul* 64.2 (2013) 239–56, contends that the command that a woman (wife) must wear a head covering is a reference to shaming her own head (her husband), because the veil was worn by married women as a sign of their unavailability to any looking for a wife.

[58] Rowe, 41–84. Cf. Butting, 79–90, who believes that Paul contended that within marriage, men and women should stay within cultural expectations when in the public realm, as well as when facing conflict, "women will accept the subordination that is their role."

[59] Paige, 217–42.

[60] Snodgrass, 34–6.

[61] Walter A. Maier, "And Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:33b–38" *CTQ* 556.2–3 (1991) 81–104; Cf. Crüsemann, 19–36, who contends for women's liberty but despairs of Paul's teaching on the matter.

be done decently and in order" (14:40).

A further issue worth noting here is that the church in Corinth seems to have been comprised of a number of different house churches, which has caused some to speculate that part of the difficulties they faced stemmed from the fact that that women in that culture had different expectations in private and public situations. In private, in their own home and among their own family, they were allowed to speak freely and they did not wear head coverings. But in public, generally a woman did not speak and wore a head covering. Thus, it is possible that with the church meeting in homes and believers being considered as the family of Christ, they were dressing and acting according to the standard expectations for behavior at home. But in fact, with outsiders attending, Paul felt that the rules for being in public should prevail. If the suggestion is received, then Paul was saying that cultural conventions must be upheld when in public so as not to bring upon the church unnecessary consternation and shame.[62]

Massey contends that the command to silence constitutes an entirely different type of talking by the women than the prophesying allowed in 11:5. With a detailed examination of Greek and Latin material, Massey establishes that Greek women were allowed to speak freely at home, but in public they were allowed to speak only when their husbands were present, and then where possible, to allow him to speak for her. Thus, Massey notes, "This kind of speech which 1 Corinthians 14:35 discourages for a married woman is not to be equated with prayer or prophecy as permitted in 1 Corinthians 11:5." [63] If one agrees with Massey's suggestion, then Paul would not be disallowing a woman leader from ever speaking or teaching, but

---

[62] Massey, 245–52. J. D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998): 592; Westfall, 203–3. Armin D. Baum, "Paul's Conflicting Statements on Female Public Speaking (1 Cor 11:5) and Silence (1 Cor 14:34-35)" *TynBul* 65.2 (2014) 247–74, suggests that the reason Paul gave two different standards for women speakers in 1 Corinthians (wear a head covering vs. be silent), is that he was addressing two different house churches, one which was more openminded and allowed women to speak and another which was more conservative. In such a case, he contends for one basic principle behind both answers, "female public speaking without male consent is unacceptable whereas female public speaking with male consent is unobjectionable."

[63] Massey, 252–5. Baum, 247–74, provides an extensive review of Roman and Greek 1st Century parallel literature, concluding "that whenever women spoke in public either their chastity or male leadership or both were violated. Therefore, for them public speaking was always out of the question…Other philosophers, politicians, and Jewish theologians left room for public female speaking because they were convinced that neither female chastity nor male leadership was infringed under all conditions."

instead would be requiring that women keep within the boundaries of acceptable societal cultural practice and expectations.

Conclusion

The issue of women speaking in a public service or holding leadership roles, as well as issues raised by other passages such as 1 Tim 2:11f, deserve further examination, but alas, that examination must wait for another time since the limits for the current article have been reached. What we have been able to establish is that in salvation all have become one in Christ, so that we all are "sons" of God. Further, God poured out his Spirit upon all believers, without exception and gave to all gifts, including the public manifestation of his Spirit by all. Where there are restrictions placed on publicly manifesting the Spirit, those restrictions are given to impose order and so as not to create cultural barriers to the Gospel for outsiders. The practical application for women in ministry should be the same as the reason Peter gave for the acceptance of the Gentiles, "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could stand in God's way?" (Acts 11:17).

As, Sheri Benvenuti notes, "In early Pentecostalism, authority was never the issue; rather, servanthood was always the focal point of one's ministry calling. Even the manner in which the church services were conducted suggested that early Pentecostals fully believed that the Holy Spirit himself held absolute authority, and the Spirit anointed whomever he chose to serve the body of believers…that is to say, for the Pentecostal, authority is not derived through position alone, as some may assert, but rather is found in the individual who serves the body of Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit. With this understanding, the gender of the individual in question becomes irrelevant, for no one ever debates which gender is qualified to serve."[64]

[64] Sheri R. Benvenuti, "Pentecostal Women in Ministry: Where Do We Go from Here?" *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* (http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj1/ben.html), 1–9.

Foursquare Pentecostal Heritage: How Does It Relate to Women in Ministry Leadership?

Marion Ingegneri, M.A.[1]

ABSTRACT:
This article explores potential connections which exist between women leading in significant roles of leadership and the Pentecostal foundations of the Foursquare Church. This case study concentrates on the story of women in ministry leadership (WIML) within the Foursquare Church as experienced among a cohort of eighteen Foursquare women leaders who spent eight months together in a learning community in 2014. Analysis of the findings suggest that a connection does indeed exist between Foursquare Pentecostal foundations and women in the Foursquare church serving in significant roles of ministry leadership.

Introduction

The Foursquare Church boasts a strong heritage where women actively engage in ministry, yet according to the 2012 Foursquare census, "6% of senior pastors in the Foursquare Church are women".[2] Foundationally, Foursquare is a Pentecostal movement established by an evangelistic woman, Aimee Semple McPherson[3]. The focus of this study is to identify whether there is a connection between the Pentecostal perspective, which finds its genesis in the apostolic and prophetic gifts; and the decisions by church leaders with this perspective to appoint women to significant roles of ministry leadership. Additionally, the study seeks to reveal whether Foursquare churches who are missionally engaged in the Pentecostal foundations of its movement, are more or less likely to release women into significant leadership roles of public ministry. Marion Ingegneri (hereafter the Project Researcher) begins the inquiry with the hypothesis that such a connection

---

[1] Marion Ingegneri (marion@gracenorth.com) is the founder and lead pastor of Grace North Church in Phoenix, Arizona.

[2] International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, *Annual Report: Ministers Census (*Los Angeles, CA: National Church Office, 2012).

[3] Jack Hayford and David Moore, *The Charismatic Century: The Enduring Impact of the Azusa Street Revival* (New York, NY: Warner Faith 2006), 132.

exists and uses a matching patterns analysis to discover if this hypothesis is false.[4]

Background

In the earliest days of Foursquare, women leaders were widely appointed in church leadership.[5] This phenomenon took place when women in general were a suppressed people group. Aimee Semple McPherson founded the Foursquare Church in 1923 in Los Angeles, California with an open embrace of Pentecostal doctrine, with specific emphasis on the apostolic and prophetic gifts.[6] Aimee Semple McPherson (1924) is known for her strong position on the Holy Spirit. In her own words she once said, "To seek to stop the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is like a man holding a broom in his hand endeavoring to hold back the tidal waves of the Atlantic Ocean".[7] As a leader of one of the largest churches in the U.S., McPherson's strong position on the Holy Spirit may provide specific insight into the subject matter of this research.[8] Did the conviction held by McPherson have an impact on the empowerment of women ministerial leaders in the earlier days of its founder? If so, what is the implication for the Foursquare Church today?

To fully understand the information presented and its relevance to Foursquare Churches in the United States, early interviews with apostolic leaders in the Foursquare movement resulted in the establishment of meaningful descriptions for significant roles of ministry leadership, and a tangible description for what constitutes a Foursquare Church that is missionally engaged in the Pentecostal foundations of its movement. The six areas of significant leadership which were identified and utilized in this study include: decision-making authority within the local church; preaching to both men and women in public gatherings; addressing the congregation with authority regarding vision and prophetic direction; possessing a ministry credential; authority and empowerment given by the senior leader over both

---

[4] Yin, *Case Study Research Design and Methods,* n.p.; Johnny Saldaña, *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research: Understanding Qualitative Research* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2011), Kindle.

[5] Leah Payne, *Gender and Pentecostal Revivalism: Making a Female Ministry in the Early Twentieth Century* (US: Palgrave McMillan, 2015), 213.

[6] Karen A. Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church: An Exploration of Opportunities and Hindrances in Leadership" (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2013), 9.

[7] Tremper, "Credentialed Women In the Foursquare Church", 9.

[8] Aimee Semple McPherson, "The Triumph of the Spirit and the Word," *The Bridal Call*, (December-January, 1924): 9-10, 30-31, accessed January, 2015, www.pentecostalarchives.org.

genders; and financial authority in areas of specific responsibility. This study also relied upon discovering if Foursquare churches, in which the participants in this study attend or by which they have been influenced, embrace their apostolic and prophetic Pentecostal foundations. For the sake of this research, criterion to define churches embracing their Pentecostal foundations include two categories. The first identifies activities that might occur in primary public services. The second includes activities that might occur in the life and ministry of the church outside of public services.

To grasp the breadth of the question, "Foursquare Pentecostal Heritage: How does it relate to women in ministry leadership?" one's understanding depends upon meaningful descriptions of significant roles of ministry leadership and a person's interaction in a Foursquare Church with a proven Pentecostal foundation. However, understanding foundational concepts within the topic of this research may be complexified by history, styles, preferences, doctrines, abuses, systemic issues, and a diversity of perspectives; resulting in a clouding of the true cornerstones one is attempting to uncover. It is the intent of this research to bring clarity and connection where it exists, and to recommend action steps that may help Foursquare reach their stated missional goal to empower women into significant roles of ministry leadership.

Reimagine Foursquare

In 2013, Foursquare President, Glenn Burris, initiated the Reimagine Foursquare project in an effort to discover how the movement could reach maximum missional effectiveness. In response, multiple task force groups were created, as stated within Foursquare's Reimagine section of their website. The Project Researcher enjoyed participation within the Reclaim Spiritual Vitality Task Force, which boasted great diversity and healthy conversation around the subject. The Pentecostal roots of Foursquare were discussed specifically and at length and deemed an important part of the movement's future success.

In 2015 Alan Hirsch spoke at Life Pacific College at a gathering of students and Foursquare pastors, on the apostolic, prophetic and evangelistic gifts. He referred to the same as "the lost gifts".[9] Foursquare leaders endorsed Hirsch, indicating a desire to identify, empower and release these lost gifts. In 2010, Tammy Dunahoo was

[9] Alan Hirsch *The Forgotten Ways: Reactivating the Missional Church* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press), 2006.

appointed as the first female general supervisor in the history of Foursquare.[10] This speaks directly to the doctrinal position of the Foursquare Church to release women into ministry leadership as supported by the Global Distinctives found on the official Foursquare website.[11] Dunahoo's appointment, the Project Researcher's appointment as the first female vice-chair of the Foursquare board of directors, and the appointment of three female district supervisors in the past decade, reiterate that at the highest levels within Foursquare, women are welcome to the table of conversation.[12]

Israel Experience and 2014 WIML Cohort

In March 2014, the Project Researcher led 38 women in a leadership experience to Israel as part of this research study, with the following stated goal: "experiential networking tour for women leaders embracing His Presence, exposing and breaking strongholds, and engaging ministry purposes".[13] This journey seeded conversations that birthed questions influencing the initial design of the research project.[14]

The second distinctive of this research project involved a group of eighteen women Foursquare leaders from across the nation engaged in an eight-month learning cohort. Ten out of the eighteen women also participated in the Israel experience. Seventeen of the eighteen women engaged in a survey for this study. All eighteen women leaders completed eight-months of intensive learning, coaching, and connecting, which culminated in a three-day summit in December, 2014. Five of the leaders from the 2014 WIML cohort engaged in a focus group for this study. The stated goal, as noted below, provides contextual understanding for the purpose of the cohort.

To coach and connect with key women leaders, in a relational learning

---

[10] "Tammy Dunahoo Named General Supervisor," Foursquare News, last modified June 23, 2010, accessed January 2015, http://www.foursquare.org/news/article/tammy_dunahoo_named_general_supervisor.

[11] "Handbook of the Operation of Foursquare Churches," Resources, last modified June 2013, accessed January 2015, http://foursquare-org.s3.amazonaws.com/assets/operations_handbook_english.pdf.

[12] International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. *Annual Report: Ministers Census.* (Los Angeles, CA: National Church Office of US Foursquare Churches, 2012).

[13] WIML Israel Tour Brochure, 2014.

[14] Israel Experience Video (http://vimeo.com/107301872); comprehensive WIML Israel Documentary (https://vimeo.com/125937763).

environment, for the purpose of future sponsoring within the movement, multiplication of women leaders, development of core competencies, and to create a cultural commitment to the holistic advancement of women in ministry leadership.[15]

Literature Review

Within the literature reviewed three common theories emerged, which help explain the general disproportion found in the ratio of men to women serving in ministry leadership within the Foursquare Church: rhetoric without action, complex pathway, and a male dominant paradigm. These theories were identified when compared and contrasted within multiple sources.[16] Research works performed within dissertations by Dr. Leah Payne (2015) and Dr. Karen Tremper (2013) provide specific facts and information on the topic of Foursquare women in ministry leadership. However, a demand remains for further research on the topic.[17] Of the resources reviewed, Eagly and Carli speak to leadership in general.[18] The remaining pieces of literature review women in ministry leadership within the greater church but do specify the Foursquare movement.[19]

---

[15] WIML Cohort Pilot Program Invitation, 2014.

[16] Dana L. Robert, *American Women In Mission: A Social History of Their Thought and Practice* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2004), accessed January, 2015, Atlas Library; Pamela Cooper-White, "Becoming a Clergy Mother: A Study of How Becoming a Mother Changes Ministry," *Congregations 30,* no. 3 (Summer 2004): 14-19, accessed January 15, 2015, www.atlas.com; Joel Robbins, "The Globalization of Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity," *Annual Review of Anthropology 33*, (October, 2004): 117-143, accessed January, 2015,; Alice Hendrickson Eagly and Linda Lorene Carli, *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth About How Women Become Leaders* (Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press, 2007); Gaye M. Bammert, "Narrating the Church: Protestant Women Pastors Challenge Nostalgic Desire," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 26, no. 2 (Fall 2010): 153-174, accessed January, 2015; Kati Niemela. "Female Clergy As Agents of Religious Change?" *Religions*, no 2. (August, 2011): 358-371, accessed January 2015. Andrew Miles, and Rae Jean Proeschold-Bell, "Are Rural Clergy Worse Off?: An Examination of Occupational Conditions and Pastoral Experiences In a Sample of United Methodist Clergy," *Sociology of Religion 73, no.* 1 (Spring, 2012), 23-45, accessed January, 2015, http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1093/socrel/srr025; Cooper-White, "Becoming a Clergy Mother," n.p.; Payne, *Gender and Pentecostal Revivalism*, n.p.

[17] Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," 261.

[18] Eagly and Carli, *Through the Labyrinth,* n.p.

[19] Robert, *American Women in Mission, n.p.*; Cooper-White, "Becoming a Clergy Mother," n.p.; Robbins, "Globalization," 117-143; Bammert, "Narrating the Church," 153-174; Niemela, "Female Clergy As Agents," 358-371.

Rhetoric Without Action

Rhetoric without action is understood as spoken promises or theory without application and orthodoxy without aligned orthopraxy. Rhetoric without action has several components: a lack of accountability in the appointment process, an absence of intentionality, and segregated networks; making it difficult to navigate as a leader.[20] This an important observation because when women leaders are fed false hope (because promises, theory, and theology are not marked with visible application of women serving in significant roles of ministry leadership), the ultimate loss was found in the implementation of missional purposes.

Literature reviewed revealed studies of Pentecostal churches that show a consistent reality of more women than men as active members.[21] In one source an entire chapter is dedicated to this topic titled, "*Where Are the Women Leaders?"*[22]

Complex Pathway

The pathway for women seeking opportunities in ministerial leadership within the Foursquare Church is significantly different, and more complex, than a man seeking the same opportunities.[23] The authors of *Through the Labyrinth* explain that the complexity of a woman's journey into leadership is like a labyrinth.[24] Similarly, such pathway complexities are found within the gender segregation of networks within Foursquare.[25]

Successful women clergy must navigate a journey that often includes multifaceted diversions not common to male clergy.[26] Interesting research adds to this dimension, should their experience change and they become mothers facing possible realities of the demands of motherhood, while attempting to balance the complexities of ministry and other obligations specific to motherhood.[27] Women

---

[20] Miles and Proeschold-Bell, "Are Rural Clergy Worse Off?" 23-45; Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," 251

[21] Robbins, "Globalization," 117-143.

[22] Eagly and Carli, *Through the Labyrinth,* n.p.

[23] Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," 5.

[24] Eagly and Carli, *Through the Labyrinth,* n.p.

[25] Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," 251-252.

[26] Niemela, "Female Clergy as Agents," 360.

[27] Cooper-White, "Becoming a Clergy Mother," n.p.

may face internal pain and struggle when they realize that they do not have endless time to offer to family, personal relationships, and their congregations.[28] The lack of available role models during the natural seasons of the childbearing years for women underscores the difficulty experienced in the complex pathway for women ministry leaders.[29]

Male Dominant Paradigm

A male dominant paradigm was discussed in extant literature as a noticeable problem in hindering women who serve in leadership.[30] While the male dominant prototype exists in cities, it was specifically observed in rural America where strongholds of tradition and a resistance to change underwrite undesirable attitudes toward female clergy.[31] Foursquare's Global City Initiative described on their website informs that a cultural change toward a city model is on the rise and thus may change the male dominant paradigm.

Gaps in Knowledge

Limited literature exists on the specific topic of women clergy and their leadership appointments, with even more limitations specifically relating to Foursquare. The gaps in knowledge and the void in literature particular to Foursquare present an important opportunity for researchers to place high value on personal interviews; recognizing the need to allow the developing situation to speak into the overall story.[32] This void in Foursquare literature highlights the importance of this research project as well as the existing research completed in the dissertations offered by Dr. K. Tremper and Dr. Leah Payne.[33]

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Cooper-White, "Becoming a Clergy Mother," n.p.; Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," n.p.

[30] Robert, *American Women In Mission, n.p*; Robbins, "Globalization," 117-143; Eagly and Carli, *Through the Labyrinth,* n.p.; Bammert, "Narrating the Church," 153-174; Miles and Proeschold-Bell, "Are Rural Clergy Worse Off?" 23-45; Tremper, "Credentialed Women In the Foursquare Church," n.p.

[31] Miles and Proeschold-Bell, "Are Rural Clergy Worse Off?" 2.

[32] William R. Torbert, et. al, *Action Inquiry: The Secret of Timely and Transforming Leadership* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004), 13.

[33] Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," n.p.; Payne, *Gender and Pentecostal Revivalism,* n.p.

Additionally, Robbins indicated Pentecostalism as a patriarchal society, but did not provide a reason why.[34] In seeming contrast, he also concluded that Pentecostal churches include more women in active ministry than men.[35] His conclusions did not indicate the roles women play in Pentecostal churches, but infer the roles are task oriented and not leadership oriented, adding to the complexity of the conversation. The specific question asked, "Is there a connection between the Pentecostal perspective, which finds its genesis in the apostolic and prophetic gifts, and the rise of women leaders to significant roles of leadership?" is outside of the purview available in extant literature.

Participants in the Research

Twenty-one people engaged the study directly and included a combination of leaders from the Israel experience, the WIML cohort and four apostolic leaders serving in national or regional roles in Foursquare. A panel of six national Foursquare leaders chose the sampling as a valid representation of the 489 female leadership potentials being studied in the movement and understood that not all women in the overall population represented were interested in the pursuit of significant roles of ministry leadership.

Respondents embodied diversity, held Foursquare ministry credentials, and included global, national, regional, and local leaders. The respondents provided insight into cultural diversity because of their distinct differences in current leadership function, backgrounds, and geographical locations. Eight private interviews and three focus groups from this diverse group of respondents provided very useful responses. The interviews clearly displayed a commitment to answer without bias and revealed that a healthy perspective existed in field leaders and in those serving in global, national or regional roles. The environment for honest examination was admirable.

Research Questions

The primary research question was to discover if a connection exists between the Pentecostal foundations, the orthodoxy of the Foursquare Church to release women in significant roles of ministry leadership, and the orthopraxy on this strongly held doctrine. Aimee Semple McPherson joined ministers in her era that focused on the

[34] Robbins, "Globalization," 132.

[35] Robbins, "Globalization," 132.

reinstatement of the Apostolic Age.[36] With the call from Foursquare leadership to reimagine the movement, and challenges from leaders like Hirsch to return to the mission of the apostolic ministry, a secondary question emerges.[37] Is a relevant gender conversation embedded in the challenge to create an apostolic and prophetic environment where women are more freely released into significant roles of ministry leadership? If so, is this part of a greater conversation? With this in mind, interviews commenced, which assisted with the development of engaging survey questions.[38] These questions were then further developed into the script utilized during face-to-face interviews.

At times in this study the primary question of the research project appeared to take a back seat to the intense focus that occurred in discovering how to describe a significant role of ministry for a woman in a Foursquare church, and to provide a tangible descriptive of a church engaged in Foursquare's Pentecostal heritage. At the point of clarity on these descriptions, the research returned to the discovery process of the subject question and produced significant findings for review.

Findings and Recommendations

The research findings indicate the probability that Foursquare churches which missionally engaged in the Pentecostal foundations of its movement are more likely to release women into significant leadership roles of public ministry. However, more research must be done to formulate causation, as the limited scope of this research project reveals only an apparent correlation. Could it be that the great equalizer, the Holy Spirit, might be challenging the Foursquare Church to a greater engagement and responsibility with the grace that is upon the movement in regard to releasing women in ministry leadership? What might be imagined if Foursquare follows this grace? How might eternity be impacted if the Foursquare Church embraced with greater intentionality their Pentecostal DNA?

Findings

The foundational question of this project is worthy of asking: Are Foursquare churches, that are missionally engaged in the Pentecostal foundations of its movement, more or less likely to release women into significant roles of leadership?

---

[36] Tremper, "Credentialed Women in the Foursquare Church," 48.

[37] Hirsch, *The Forgotten Ways*, n.p.

[38] Appendix B, Original Document.

The stories within this study each contribute a unique voice to the final composition. While interpreting the journey of each respondent, a collective story emerged. It is within this context that the findings of this research project are presented.

Finding #1: Hypotheses Might Be True.

A link may exist between a Foursquare Church embracing its Pentecostal foundations and the release of women into significant roles of leadership. Ten out of the eleven interview respondents indicate they believe a connection does exist between the embracing of Foursquare Pentecostal foundations and the release of women in ministry leadership.[39] The general survey reports 94% of the seventeen respondents believe a Foursquare church that embraces their Pentecostal heritage is more likely to release women into significant roles of ministry leadership.[40]

Finding #2: Official Definitions Describing Significant Roles of Ministry Leadership for Women That Align Orthodoxy with Orthopraxy Are Absent from the General Conversation.

While the majority of all respondents conclude that the inclusion of their voice at the table of conversation is the most important of all criterions established to describe significant roles of ministry leadership for women in the church, multiple concepts emerged. A concern for title without function arose in the conversation surrounding orthodoxy without aligned orthopraxy, as it pertains to women holding credentials within the Foursquare Church. Interactions with Foursquare field, regional, national, and global leaders reveal that standardizing the description is important. The following are the six criterion found within the data which qualify as descriptions for significant roles of leadership:

1. Appointed and active leader in the core/executive leadership team responsible for making key decisions about vision, direction, and finance in the overall area of the church.
2. Authority and empowerment given by the senior leader to lead both men and women.
3. Preaching to men and women in primary public gatherings generally intended to reach the adult community served by the church. (e.g., Sunday morning services.)

---

[39] Appendix D, Original Document.

[40] Appendix B, Original Document.

4. Addressing the congregation with authority on topics of importance to the life of the church such as vision and prophetic direction.
5. Possessing a ministry license and/or ordination.
6. Financial authority in areas of specific responsibility.

Further, a common thread in conversations include a desire to see orthopraxy align with orthodoxy. Though a general opinion exists that orthodoxy and orthopraxy do not align, all respondents contributed to the conversation from a healthy, diverse and positive perspective. All expressed a desire to frame the conversation around significant roles of leadership rather than settle on the assumption that since Foursquare is licensing and ordaining women, this must mean the goals for including women in significant roles of ministry leadership have been attained. Aligning with the literature review, a male dominant paradigm is the prevailing perspective. Without alignment measurables of orthodoxy and orthopraxy, even considering high numbers of credentialed females, the Foursquare Church could be viewed as male dominant in leadership.

Finding #3: Rival Theories Emerged in the Study.

The conclusion to proceed with the foundational research question did not come without rival theoretical propositions. One respondent suggested that the study of reformed theology practiced within Foursquare environments might be a better question, because under this theology, which is contrary to the foundational Pentecostal theology of Foursquare, the voices of female ministry leaders are silenced. Interviews suggested that when examined, Foursquare history embraced women in leadership, but the practice plummeted during the shepherding movement. Therefore, it was suggested the problem was less about Pentecostalism, and more about spiritual authority. Furthermore, multiple respondents expressed concern about complementarianism versus egalitarian views within the Foursquare Church as a potentially larger issue than whether or not Pentecostal foundations were embraced.

Finding #4: The Common, Defined Expression of the DNA of Apostolic and Prophetic Gifts Within Foursquare Churches is Important to the Conversation Surrounding Women in Ministry Leadership.

A Foursquare church embracing and living in their Pentecostal heritage is not easily defined in common terms. While present and founding day Foursquare Churches have the same general orthodoxy in Pentecostal theology regarding apostolic and prophetic gifts, the orthopraxy of both may be quite different. It became clear that a

tangible, practical perspective of a Foursquare church embracing and living in their Pentecostal heritage would include a normative of activities found in public services as well as a standard of activities found in the life and ministry of the church.

Pentecostal expressions in public services are viewed by some Foursquare pastors as contrary to their evangelical mission and therefore to assess a church's view on Pentecostal expression based on public services alone would be a mistake. Although relevance is vital to the process of reaching the culture of the 21st century, a question surfaced: How might Foursquare Churches engage in their Pentecostal foundations with genuine power offered by the Holy Spirit and do so in a manner that is relevant to the people they serve? The words of one respondent resonates with certain importance, "in not wanting to offend the culture, we find ourselves sometimes catering to it in the name of relevancy." The excitement in the voices as the stories began to emerge solidified the inclusion of discussion around Pentecostal expressions. Originating from dialogue with apostolic leaders within the movement, the following descriptions were used:

Public Services

- Messages and/or proclamations (other than the planned sermons) of divine inspiration and revelation are expressed from the public platform.
- Responsive and expressive worship where the congregation interacts both in song and physical response (such as kneeling, clapping, raising hands).
- Opportunity for people to respond to preached messages.
- Prayer for the sick is offered.

Life and Ministry of The Holy Spirit in the Church

- Members are discipled to live a Spirit-empowered life.
- Church gatherings promote encounters with the Holy Spirit
- Members and leaders pray with each other with regularity.
- Formalized intercessory prayer ministry is evident in the church.
- Teaching on the ministry of the Holy Spirit is regularly offered and easily found by the newest attenders of the church.

Interestingly, the discussions held at the WIML cohort summit revealed that although the majority of the women were comfortable in a prophetic and apostolic environment, about one quarter of the women present had never received a prophetic word or had anyone with prophetic insight pray over them. The lost apostolic and prophetic gifts spoken of by Hirsch became an important part of the conversation

surrounding the release of WIML.[41] The stories of the respondents, and in particular the primary participants, revealed a strong desire to speak about Pentecostalism in the Foursquare Church, and specifically in their own environments. The stewardship of the gifts of the Holy Spirit became a common conversation among all respondents. Using the measureable descriptions, it was discovered that all four of the primary participants ministered in an environment that embraced their Foursquare Pentecostal foundations.

Finding #5: Co-pastoring Emerged as a Dominant Factor in the Conversation of WIML Within the Foursquare Church.

Surprisingly, this common form of Foursquare leadership surfaced from within the data. Another description of women in significant roles of ministry leadership is missing from the dialogue; that of co-pastor. One respondent expressed distress over her own situation in which she holds the title of co-pastor but does not feel empowered in some key areas of the church. Another woman described a truly collaborative environment with her spouse and their lead team in which she considers her voice equal to her husband's voice. All four of the primary participants serve within a co-pastor environment but were not chosen on the basis of co-pastorship. Without definition, the role of co-pastor becomes another place where women in ministry leadership may become diminished, and marriages put at risk.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Pro-actively Engage Apostolic Voices Such as Alan Hirsch.

Foursquare leaders have a specific opportunity to pro-actively engage voices like Alan Hirsch on local levels through teaching and by encouraging the use of his Ephesians four assessment tool found in his book, *The Forgotten Ways: Reactivating the Missional Church.*[42] The application of this recommendation creates opportunity for apostolic and prophetic cultures in local, regional, and national environments; thus strengthening relationships among leaders and ultimately producing greater fruitfulness in the field.

---

[41] Hirsch, *The Forgotten Ways*, n.p.

[42] Hirsch, *The Forgotten Ways*, n.p.

Recommendation #2: Officially Define Significant Roles of Ministry Leadership.

A national definition for significant roles of ministry leadership help frame conversations and assist in the ability to gauge effectiveness in missional efforts to identify, empower, and release women of all age, gender, and ethnicity within the Foursquare Church. Definitions encourage movement forward with the ability to accurately report progress.

Recommendation #3: Create Stronger Licensing Requirements.

For the purpose of greater empowerment of WIML, Foursquare leaders might consider a standardized process requirement for all applicants of Foursquare credentials that addresses the topic of women in ministry leadership. Such a process might begin with the requirement that the expectation of the alignment of orthodoxy and orthopraxy within the subject of WIML be a part of the licensing interview.

Recommendation #4: Further Study on Pentecostal DNA As It Affects WIML.

Further study is needed on the topic of the Pentecostal DNA as expressed within the local Foursquare Church as it relates to WIML. Important to this aspect of research is the local church that intentionally does not exercise the gifts and ministry of The Holy Spirit in public gatherings because of their views on evangelism and their sincere desire to accommodate the seeker. These voices are an important part of the Foursquare family, as well as the overarching story and presentation of relevant and accurate data. Discovery from diverse perspectives may also reveal more in-depth data and expose fresh recommendations on how to apply it.

Recommendation #5: Discover How Best to Serve Co-pastor Leaders in Foursquare.

The establishment of definitions, roles and succession practices are arterial to the healthy advancement of the co-pastor concept. Foursquare leadership might consider the engagement of conversations with those serving in a co-pastor perspective. Such empowerment ultimately impacts the lives of the communities served by co-pastor couples and thus becomes a conversation with eternal consequences.

Recommendation #6: Engage the Foursquare Doctrine Committee.

Engaging the doctrine committee assists leaders in better understanding the contributing doctrinal factors, as well as the distractions, that stop WIML candidates from entering their higher vocation. Doctrinal alignment and clarification may also allow Foursquare leaders to produce diagnostic materials which both identify

potential candidates as well as resource women currently serving in leadership roles.

Conclusion

The research indicates a connection exists between those Foursquare Churches who embrace their Pentecostal heritage and the release of women into significant roles of ministry leadership. While this is so, the response is not merely a platform for women, but the empowerment of any messenger of the gospel, including females. It follows that the importance of this topic is not only about the forfeiture of effective and fruitful female leaders who serve in ministry leadership. The loss is much greater; it is the debilitated presentation of the most powerful message on earth, the message of God's love and power. Therefore, engaging the world with this message becomes the missional purpose for one seeking to understand this research.

Foursquare has a grace upon the movement to release women into significant roles of ministry leadership and a distinctive of a Pentecostal heritage. The need for a Spirit-empowered church and the perspective surrounding the resurfacing of the lost apostolic and prophetic gifts equals in importance. Navigating this grace and distinctive might be aided by embracing and encouraging further research on related topics while allowing the Holy Spirit, the Great Equalizer, to bring clarity and understanding and to draw full conclusions. It is hopeful that this research will encourage others to study from an academic platform, so credible solutions may emerge on the topic of women serving in ministry leadership as well as other matters relevant to the full embodiment of the members and ministers within the Foursquare movement.

BOOK REVIEW – Leah Payne, *Gender and Pentecostal Revivalism: Making a Female Ministry in the Early Twentieth Century*. Charis: Christianity and Renewal-Interdisciplinary Studies. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). xii + 223 pp., $70.00, hardback.

In an era when public religious leadership was seen as naturally male, how did Pentecostal revivalists Maria Woodworth-Etter (1844-1924) and Aimee Semple-McPherson (1890-1944) overcome not only their gender but also limited education, unclear ordination and the taints of divorce, single motherhood and public scandals to become authoritative revivalist pastors? What is it about the instincts, tastes and sensibilities of Pentecostalism, in particular, that allowed these talented, albeit scandalous women to find a place and achieve such success in the movement? And what did these women in particular contribute to the creation of an emerging distinctly Pentecostal identity?

In her award-winning study of gender dynamics at work in early twentieth-century Pentecostal revivalism, Leah Payne examines the ministry practices of Woodworth-Etter and McPherson to argue that they overcame the limitations of their gender "by co-opting versions of ideal womanhood in service of their ministerial identities, and by displaying these identities through classic Pentecostal revivalist methods" (2). Woodworth-Etter and McPherson, "utilized Pentecostal biblical narratives, manipulated their public images, capitalized on revivalist worship spaces, and adapted preaching styles to perform versions of themselves that were womanly (according to the standards of their day) and authoritative for their Pentecostal followers" (2).

Leah Payne is Assistant Professor of Christian Studies at George Fox University and Portland Seminary (of George Fox University). *Gender and Pentecostal Revivalism* is a version of her dissertation for her Ph.D in History and Critical Theories of Religion which she completed in 2013 at Vanderbilt University. She is also a member of the Foursquare Education Commission.

In her book Payne's goals are to: (1) show how gender-construction worked during this era and how it was changing; (2) illuminate how Pentecostalism was being formed as a movement distinct from its holiness roots; (3) show how authority was constructed and maintained in revivalism in general and in Pentecostalism in particular; and (4) take the work of Woodworth-Etter and McPherson seriously; that is, to resist the temptation to reduce them to a focus on their scandals.

While other studies of the period, and of these two evangelists in particular, have explored the question of access to ministry or the women's general appeal, Payne's study looks beyond the issues of access and appeal to examine the strategies these

female ministers used to establish themselves as authoritative revivalists in the eyes of their followers. Along the way Payne hopes to show, as well, how Pentecostalism shaped—and was shaped by—these two powerful female leaders. In light of their notoriously flexible approach to precise doctrine and their changeable affiliations, rather than analyze them from a theological or denominational point of view, building on the work of Judith Butler and Catherine Bell, Payne focuses on their practices as revivalists, particularly "their performance of ritualized acts" (15). She attempts to show that the key to these female revivalist's authority was their ability to create female ministry through performing male revivalist practices in improvised, non-conventional, and even resistant ways that made room for them and their influence in the male dominated institution of revivalist ministry. Citing the work of Daniel Boyarin and Joan Scott, Payne takes gender history to be "the study of how the practices and processes that create this two-sex system of power relations changes over time" (16).

Since the Enlightenment gender has been understood as part of a binary system wherein "males, manliness and masculinity were attached to any persons, places, things, and acts associated with the public world of science, rationality, and society. Femaleness, womanliness, and femininity referred to the private, sacred, and non-rational realm" (16). In the 1890s-1920s Americans added to this general Enlightenment scheme such culturally specific traits as aggression, initiation, dominance, virility, professional, strength, Christian (Protestant) and white as associated with maleness, while peace, passivity, reception, submission, fertility, domestic, weakness, Non-Christian (including Roman Catholic) and non-white were traits associated with femininity. Together these two categories provided a sense of "normative sexuality." In the Progressive Era during which Woodworth-Etter and McPherson conducted their ministries, shifts in gender construction were beginning to take place, albeit within the context of these long-established binaries.

Performance

After clearly and colorfully outlining the various (generally unsuccessful) strategies employed by early twentieth century women in ministry to overcome the barrier of the ideal minister as a "manly man" practicing a "muscular Christianity" and the biases and expectations associated with the era's conception of "ideal womanhood" (chapter 1), Payne moves on to explore how these two women evangelists overcame the biblical prescriptions used to deter women from ministry (chapter 2). While other female ministers and their supporters claimed these apparently restrictive biblical passages should be re-interpreted, like most of their fellow more conservative revivalists, neither Woodworth-Etter nor McPherson emphasized this strategy.

Instead, “they circumvented the problem of the Bible by using biblical arguments as an engine for identity creation” (17), constructing classic Pentecostal biblical narratives that incorporated aspects of popular womanhood into their identity as authoritative ministers. For Woodworth-Etter the overarching and central plot of her narrative was that of the warring, protective mother, modelled on the biblical figure of Deborah. For McPherson it was her (and the church’s) role as the bride of Christ. Here Payne deftly distinguishes the Pentecostal revivalist’s approaches from mainline Protestant and more strictly Fundamentalist ones.

Exploring the body as “an enduring instrument of representation” chapter 3 analyzes the women’s use of attire and personal presentation to demonstrate how Woodworth-Etter and especially McPherson overcame the ideal body image of the revivalist as a fit, conservatively groomed, suited white male by providing their followers with images corresponding to their respective narrative identities of mother and bride. The contrast between Woodworth-Etter’s plain presentation as the warring, somewhat matronly, holiness mother, and McPherson’s creative, dazzling, even attractive bride illustrates varied ways of constructing identities which could be authoritative, while at the same time maintaining connection with popular ideals of womanhood.

Chapter 4 analyzes how the two female revivalists utilized the sacred space of the meetings to construct and communicate simultaneously their power as ministers as well as their status as “womanly women.” Revival tabernacles of that time worked through various means to highlight the manliness and thus the powerful authority of the (male) minister. Lacking male bodies, the female revivalists had to find alternative visual cues to signal their authority.

In the case of Woodworth-Etter it is not surprising that after forty years on the road she finally built a plain and simple tabernacle in the Midwestern town of Indianapolis. McPherson however, a mere five years into her itinerant ministry, determined to go west and build a revival center in golden Los Angeles.

Originally slated to be named the Echo Park Revival Tabernacle, McPherson decided what Los Angeles needed was not a tabernacle but a temple. Payne observes that while tabernacles were rural, portable, and simple, temples are urban, set in a fixed place and meant to impress. And the extravagance of Angeles Temple did impress indeed, in a way which fit its theatrical surroundings as well as the flair of its leader.

It also harmonized with McPherson’s bride of Christ narrative identity, reflecting her relationship with her heavenly husband, Jesus. In contrast to the prevailing angularity and straight lines of more decidedly masculine intimations of so many church buildings of the time, McPherson’s engagement of the well-known

art deco architect A.F. Leicht to construct the Temple in the *Style Moderne* was "all rounded edges and soft lines . . . gracefully arched windows, a domed ceiling, a rounded auditorium, and a curved stage" (90). This inspiring, cogent, and detailed analysis of the Temple goes on at some length, illustrating in a clear way how McPherson constructed and performed an identity which could bridge into a male-gendered space, but at the same time bring her own, gender related contribution into the mix.

Chapter 5 examines how Woodworth-Etter and McPherson realized their authority over their followers during the revival services themselves. In contradistinction to male ministers who repeated preaching acts which typically took the aggressive, initiating (male) role, leaving to the congregation the more submissive and responsive (female) role, the two women revivalists adapted traditional revivalist preaching conventions to maintain their constructed womanly biblical identities while simultaneously performing in ways that elicited submission from the audience. Here, as in other places in the monograph, Payne is adept at showing in perceptive detail how the women's creative, non-conventional performances of the rituals affirmed some ministerial and gender norms, while subverting others.

McPherson in particular conducted services at Angeles Temple that represented a complete departure from the "manly ministry." Appearing within its beautiful, rounded confines, her beautiful appearance, often surrounded by lavish displays of flowers, provided the setting for a public ministry which translated masculine authority into a romantic story. Her famous illustrated sermons supported by large choirs and orchestras brought all of these features to bear. Although she employed large and bold gestures, these movements were tempered by her surroundings and clothing and countered by other, softer ones. Her voice could boom; but its typically cheerful, conversational cadence created a friendly feel, and it would often reduce to a soothing, inviting hush. In this context Payne describes McPherson's altar calls and healings as demonstrations of "ultra-femininity."

In addition to maleness, Payne contends that issues of race and class were also on display. Woodworth-Etter's modest means and openness to more freewheeling manifestations attracted more working class, African crowds, which may have limited her appeal with white middle class adherents. In contrast McPherson, on the one hand, had relatively progressive practices with respect to race. At the same time, she utilized the more upscale architecture and furnishings of the Temple, the separation of more enthusiastic Pentecostal practices from the main sanctuary in "the 500 room" and certain features of her preaching "to subtly distance herself from black audiences in her services" (119). As a result, Payne argues, McPherson

attracted more middle and upper-class followers and avoided the charges of "Black Voodoo" or "Indian Medicine" which were levelled against Woodworth-Etter. While questions of motive and causality are sometimes difficult to ascertain, in light of Pentecostalism's mixed record on issues of race this comparative analysis helpfully and appropriately invites reflection on the complex set of motives, signals and consequences at work in race relations.

Despite the fact that these two female ministers were extraordinarily successful in establishing authority for themselves, especially through attention to their respective criminal trials, chapter 6 importantly details the more severe scrutiny, often unfair treatment, and resistance they had to endure. An analysis of the trials and their coverage in the media shows that the focus of each trial was more on the techniques the women used to gain power over their followers than it was on the facts of the cases themselves. Attempts to characterize the women as a hypnotist (Woodworth-Etter) and a hyper-sexualized cult leader (McPherson) were aimed at de-legitimizing their authority as ministers by undermining their respective constructed identities. While scandal was not unusual in turn-of-the-century revivalism, the women seemed to be punished more severely than their male counterparts. In the end, despite their considerable success, the women were unable "to perform their identities as female ministers so well as to escape punishment for unconventional gender performances" (128).

In all of these analyses – the creation of narrative identities, the overcoming of apparent biblical prescriptions, the use of the body and appearance, creation of the worship space, and the performance of the services and the preaching – Payne's painting of the detailed particularity of each woman's situation and strategies is important and revealing. For it is in the detailed particularity of complex and highly nuanced psychological and social matrices where we discover the gender realities which must be transcended in order to see a fuller actualization of female leadership in the churches.

Legacy

On virtually every level Payne's monograph achieves its goals. Her depiction of the subtle strategies Woodworth-Etter and McPherson employed to establish themselves as authoritative female Pentecostal revivalists in the midst of a male dominated institution is interesting and convincing. Along these lines we can also say the revivalists do indeed seem to illustrate gender theorists' concept of performative acts done in improvised, unconventional, and even resistant ways.

With respect to any light her study of these two figures might shed on the sensibilities and characteristics of Pentecostalism, Payne correctly suggests these

two women's careers demonstrate the power of practice in Pentecostalism. Whatever other factors might have contributed to these women's ability to overcome gender biases, lack of formal education, and scandal, it seems due in large part to their ability to successfully *do* revival. Earlier in her study Payne cites attendance as "the most enduring measure of authority for any revivalist minister" (13). By this measure, both Woodworth-Etter and McPherson demanded at least some notice.

In addition, Payne argues that McPherson's and Woodworth Etter's stories "reveal an emerging hermeneutic that helped define Pentecostalism" (137). Combined with their evolving relationship with the world, these women's more experiential approach, which found its story more in biblical archetypes than in exegesis, helped shape a distinctly Pentecostal way: "Experience-oriented, but biblically centered. Biblically centered, but not fundamentalist. Interested in holiness codes, but not so much that it would get in the way of communicating through mass media" (138).

In a time when some commentators have observed signs of an "Evangelicalization" of Pentecostalism, the distinction Payne draws between the more Pentecostal hermeneutic embodied in Woodworth-Etter and McPherson and mainline Protestantism, more strictly Fundamentalist and holiness ones as well, is valid and important. Given that Pentecostal fathers are often remembered as the progenitors of these Pentecostal distinctives it is likewise important that Payne calls attention to these Pentecostal mothers' roles in helping shape these particular sensibilities and practices.

Payne's analysis of aspects of emerging Pentecostalism are solid as far as they go. But it is in her detailed, socially intelligent observations of these women's practices related to the negotiation of power where she shines. To see the extent to which these ingenious and indefatigable women had to go and the price they had to pay in order to be effective is sobering, to say the least. Yet Payne's skillful use of gender theory to open up some of the many dimensions of female ministerial experience in early twentieth-century Pentecostal revivalism can help us imagine and perhaps address similar kinds of hindrances and barriers to full enfranchisement of women leaders which still exist in our day.

With respect to gender questions, some historians have argued that since the gender transgressions performed by Woodworth-Etter and McPherson did not last beyond their own lives, they were not successful. Payne points out, however, this was not a stated goal of either woman, nor did their actions show this to be a guiding focus. Having gained authority over many followers and spread far and wide their brand of Pentecostalism, by their own stated goals they were quite successful. Nevertheless, years later the question of why the churches continue to struggle to see

more women operating in senior church leadership ministries remains.

Although much has been written on the subject of women gaining access to ordination, and their various experiences of gaining it, Payne rightly notes: "studies have repeatedly demonstrated that simply having access to ordination did not (and does not) guarantee female power from the pulpit" (9). Payne cites the research of Mark Chaves who observes that denominations which ordain women nevertheless, especially over time, typically do not see large numbers of women seeking it. In addition, there are usually few women leading influential churches or in upper level denominational leadership.[1] As Payne notes, this is the case for McPherson's and her own Foursquare church.

For some these statistical realities may serve as confirmation that nature has indeed equipped males and not females to carry the mantle of church ministry leadership. But for others, both in light of biblical revelation and experience in the Spirit, this analysis seems inadequate.

For these it is, of course, important to officially affirm the openness of Scripture to female leadership in ministry. But access does not necessarily create full enfranchisement. To penetrate into deeper dimensions of fulfillment the churches must move beyond policy to examine in detailed particularity the deeply ingrained psychological attitudes, social realities, and organizational dynamics which hinder the actualization of authoritative female ministerial leadership. Although it is focused on another time, because it searches out the particularity of the social, psychological and to some extent organizational realities encountered by these female ministers within both the spaces and limitations of Pentecostalism, for our journey in search of greater actualization, Payne's excellent and important study can be a great help.

Recipient of the 2016 Society of Pentecostal Studies *Pneuma* Book Award and a good number of laudatory peer reviews, *Gender and Pentecostal Revivalism* is a first-rate work of inter-disciplinary gender scholarship. At the same time, it is clear, smart writing and its relatively short length makes it eminently accessible. Although a bit expensive for non-specialists, it is a book which can well be accessed through a borrowed read.

Steve Overman, M.Div.[2]

---

[1] Mark Chaves, *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 1-13.

[2] Steve Overman (steve@faithcenter.net) is lead pastor of Eugene Faith Center in Eugene, Oregon.