

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Doctor of Theology Dissertation

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1985

An Investigation of Contemporary Feminist Arguments on Paul's Teaching on the Role of Women in the Church

Hershel House Wayne

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_househ@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/thd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

House, Hershel Wayne, "An Investigation of Contemporary Feminist Arguments on Paul's Teaching on the Role of Women in the Church" (1985). *Doctor of Theology Dissertation*. 66.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/thd/66>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Theology Dissertation by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

AN INVESTIGATION OF CONTEMPORARY FEMINIST ARGUMENTS
ON PAUL'S TEACHING ON THE ROLE OF WOMEN
IN THE CHURCH

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

by
H. Wayne House
July 1985

Approved by H. Arnie Muelleging
Advisor
Wayne E. Schmidt
Reader
[Signature]
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. FEMINIST APPROACHES TO PAUL'S TEACHING ON WOMEN	6
Perspectives on Paul and Women	7
Paul as an Enemy of Women	7
Paul as a Friend of Women	9
Paul as Theologian in Conflict	17
Paul's Use of the Old Testament	23
Summary	25
II. GALATIANS 3:28 AS A <u>CRUX INTERPRETUM</u>	26
The Origin of Galatians 3:26-28	27
The Importance of Galatians 3:28	32
Feminist Interpretation of Galatians 3:28	34
The Meaning and Significance of Galatians 3:28	37
Paul's Use of the Creation Narratives	38
Some Feminist Misconceptions	50
Paul's Meaning in Galatians 3:28	55
Summary	59
III. WOMEN AS PROPHETESSES--1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16	61
The Integrity of the Pericope	62
The Present Form of the Pauline Corpus	62
The Authenticity of 1 Corinthians	63
1 Corinthians 11:2-16 as a Non- Pauline Interpolation	67
Paul's Argument on the Role Relations of Man and Woman in Public Worship	76
The Setting of the Section	76
The Old Testament Basis for Paul's Teaching	80
The New Apostolic Instruction	88
The Covering of the Head	95
Meaning of 'Ανρρ and Γυνή	108
Paul's Theological Reasons for His Teaching	112

The Practice of the Churches	126
Summary	126
IV. THE SPEAKING OF WOMEN AND THE PROHIBITION OF THE LAW--1 CORINTHIANS 14:33B-35.	129
The Nature of Paul's Instruction	130
Identity of the "Law"	131
Arguments on the Silence of Women	134
Interpolation of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35	134
Argument for a Private Setting	138
The Meaning of λαλέω	140
Inspired Speaking	140
Disruptive Speaking	142
Feminist Group	145
Judging the Prophets	147
Paul's Meaning in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35	148
Summary	151
V. WOMEN AS TEACHERS	153
The Setting of the Pericope	153
Men Praying in the Assembly	154
The Demeanor of Women	157
The Prohibition against Women Preaching	
The Fall of Woman and Its Implications	165
The <u>Sitz im Leben</u> of Genesis 3:16	165
The Meaning of the Woman's Desire	166
The Headship of Man	167
An Exegesis of Genesis 3:16b	169
Paul's Solution for Women	171
Summary	173
CONCLUSION	174
Contemporary Feminists have a Low View of Scripture	174
Erroneous Teaching in the Scripture	174
Use of Scripture against Scripture	179
A Flawed Hermeneutic	181
Non-Finality of Biblical Revelation	181
Cultural Myopia	183
Fabricating Tensions in Paul's Interpretation of Scripture	189
BIBLIOGRAPHY	198

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Often theological views thought to be settled over the centuries come up for new review because of changes in society. The cautious scholar of Sacred Scripture does not want to be "tossed to and fro" by every new idea that comes on the horizon, to be unduly taken in by the Zeitgeist. But on the other hand, he does not want to be insensitive to the moving of God in the world, bringing about a convicting of sin over callousness to social injustice.

The role of women in the church is one such "settled" Biblical doctrine. Except for a few outbreaks such as in Montanism, Gnosticism, and among certain Christian groups given to ecstatic activities, generally the accepted doctrine has been that women were not to occupy positions of leadership in the church. This would include the office of pastor, teacher of men, or as an elder. In this day of social upheaval, however, such views are being questioned. The women's liberation movement has not only affected the world in general but has made significant inroads into the twentieth century church specifically. Usually the Christian is concerned about the teaching of the Bible in regard to the liberation of women and how this

freedom is consistent with the coming of Christ to deliver humans from both the guilt of sin and the expression of sin in societal relationships.

In seeking to understand the teaching of Scripture, especially the New Testament, the feminist immediately confronts a problem. Although many passages of the New Testament present a high view of women, the chief apostolic expositor of Divine revelation, the apostle Paul, appears to be on the side of the oppressor. The secular feminist is hardly bothered by this obstacle; but the Christian feminist, especially the evangelical, must somehow come to grips with this incongruous affront to egalitarian relationships in society, in the home, and in the church.

Need for the Study

Such a situation in the church warrants a fresh look at Paul's teaching on the role of women in the church. One might think that enough has been written on this subject in the last decade. But this is not the case. Many Christians who hold to feminist ideology have been raising interpretative questions as to the correct understanding of Paul's teaching on the feminine role. Some have gone to considerable effort to demonstrate that Paul is really liberated in this area but was held back by his rabbinic training, or that so-called chauvinistic passages ascribed to Paul are not really from him, or he was afraid of moving too fast into social action, or he wanted to lay the groundwork which

he knew would culminate in a true egalitarian relationship between men and women in the church. Others believe that Paul simply has been misunderstood over the centuries and that his writings are culturally conditioned. For one to understand Paul's teaching one must not see the apostle's teaching as binding beyond the specific church to which he wrote his letters. Still others, who disagree with the attempt by feminists to pit Paul against himself or to relativize Scripture, argue that women can use gifts of teaching and leadership but only under the direction of men. They argue that the real issue is usurpation, not the simple exercise of authority.

Purpose of the Study

As may be readily seen, mass confusion pervades this problem. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the various approaches interpreters have used to understand the apostle Paul's teaching on the role of women in the church and to offer alternative ways to view the Pauline texts. Not only will I interact with the feminists on their specific perspectives of the pertinent Pauline texts, but I will examine the hermeneutical presuppositions of these writers and also attempt to discern their perspective of Scripture and how that affects the exegetical fruit they produce.

Methodology of the Study

The procedure of the thesis will be, first, to give

a short presentation of how present feminists view the apostle Paul. The advantage of this first chapter will be that the assumptions of current feminist interpreters will be clearly understood at the outset so that the contrast between Paul's teaching on women and that of present day feminists may be sharply defined in the subsequent chapters on exegesis.

Subsequent chapters provide the heart of the thesis. They will present the various feminist exegetical explanations of the Pauline texts on the role of women. Pertinent sections in the letters to Galatia, Corinth, and Ephesus will be examined, not only to interact with feminist interpretation, but also to uncover their meaning and implications for today in regard to the role of women in the church. The thesis concerns itself only with four major Pauline texts--Galatians 3:26-28, 1 Corinthians 1:2-16, 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35, 1 Timothy 2:8-15--because these are the central statements of Paul that are at controversy in feminist literature. As well, the issue of ordination, while important and complementary to the question of women speaking and leading in the public meeting of the church, will not be covered. If Paul did not allow women to speak because it expressed authority, then a fortiori they could not be ordained to the pastoral office. The conclusion to the work will draw together the various arguments of the thesis with

special attention to the failures of the various feminist approaches to the teaching of Paul on the role of women in the church.

CHAPTER I

FEMINIST APPROACHES TO PAUL'S TEACHING ON WOMEN

Confusion reigns in recent attempts to classify Paul's views on the role of women in the church. To some Paul is a champion of human rights but to others he is an arch foe of equality. Many Christian theologians with feminist disposition see Paul's teaching as the only obstacle to a consistent New Testament egalitarian view of men and women. Christ is perceived as a great liberator of women. Although New Testament books rarely, if at all, speak of the role of women in the church, those letters traditionally ascribed to Paul have several major passages which cause trouble for the feminist view. The attempts to explain (or should one say explain away) these passages has brought about no little research and scholarly (and some not so scholarly) articles and books.

Interpreters who reject the traditional view of Paul's teaching on the role of women in the church have responded in three different manners. Some have seen him as an oppressor of women who offers no consolation or freedom for the modern woman. Others have viewed him as being a true liberator of women. Passages that contradict this perspective of the apostle are reinterpreted to allow another

explanation that reflects this optimistic view. Still others see in the apostle a person struggling with the conflict of a rabbinic background in a chauvinistic society with that new order brought in the redemption of Christ. Lastly, some who may not see themselves as feminists, still believe that the Scripture provides for women to function in non-traditional roles in the church if under the authority of men, possibly to be labeled a semi-feminist view.

So then, the purpose of this chapter is to present the various perspectives that feminists, especially those of the evangelical camp, have of Paul. This will set the stage for the remaining chapters that specifically interact with feminist interpretation of Pauline texts.

Perspectives on Paul and Women

Paul as an Enemy of Women

Many feminists have agreed with the evaluation of George Bernard Shaw when he called Paul the "eternal enemy of woman."¹ Paul is considered to have been a misogynist,

¹G. B. Shaw, "The Monstrous Imposition upon Jesus," reprinted in The Writings of St. Paul, ed. W. A. Meeks (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), p. 299, cited in Elaine H. Pagels, "Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 42 (September 1974):538; Pagels avers that Paul should not be seen as a chauvinist but neither should he be a focal point for the contemporary discussion. He, she says, conscious of the eschaton as he was, could not envision a time like ours. Rather than look to Paul, we should look to contemporary scholars and theologians such as Robin Scroggs. Pagels, p. 547.

or one who hated women, or at the very least one who accepted the inferiority of women.² The source of Paul's thinking, they say, is Paul's rabbinical background. Since Paul was socialized in a misogynist society, it is only natural for this view to have strongly affected him.³ This is the perspective of Peter Richardson when he says, "The goal in Paul's exegesis appears to be, without I hope being unduly harsh, greater conformity with the Jewish (or Palestinian) view of subordination of women (I Tim. 2:11ff.; I Cor. 11:7ff., especially vv. 10, 12)."⁴

According to this position, then, Paul was affected by the rabbinical attitude toward women reflected in a passage from Tosefta Berakoth:

One should not trust a woman's virtue or intelligence, since sin came about through her. They are all more or less given to witchcraft. Men who let themselves be led by women are ridiculed. Every pious Jew repeats the prayer of R. Judah: 'Blessed be He who has

²Juliet Mitchell dismisses Paul with contempt. Juliet Mitchell, Woman's Estate, 1971, p. 112, cited in Gervase E. Duffield, "Feminism and the Church," Why Not? Priesthood and the Ministry of the Church, eds. Michael Bruce and G. E. Duffield (Berkshire: The Marcham Manor Press, n.d.), p. 22.

³Virginia Mollenkott, "A Conversation with Virginia Mollenkott," The Other Side (May-June 1976):26. Later argument from Mollenkott reveals she accepts another side to Paul's nature.

⁴Peter Richardson, "Paul Today: Jews, Slaves, and Women," Crux, 8 (1970):37.

not made me a woman'."⁵

This is not a prominent position among Christian feminists and so is not the subject of my investigation in this thesis. The view, however, is found in conjunction with the perspective that Paul had internal tensions that at times expressed this rabbinic attitude toward women, which view is discussed later in this chapter.

Paul as a Friend of Women

Generally Christian feminists believe that Paul demonstrated a "liberationist" attitude toward women, as one who had high regard for women and valued them in their ministry for him and the Christian community as well for their intrinsic worth.

Eugenie Leonard, approvingly quoting Joseph Holzner, gives a positive assessment of Paul's view of women when he says, "St. Paul was the first person who saw the value of women as workers in the Church and used them extensively in the development of the missions."⁶ Paul is seen as one who had many women involved in his own ministry. He accepted men and women as equals. Proof for this is said to abound

⁵Tosefta Berakoth 8.18. In reality this prayer does not have a misogynist background. See Stephen B. Clark, Man and Woman in Christ (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980), pp. 145-46.

⁶Cited by Eugenie Andruss Leonard, "St. Paul on the Status of Women," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 12 (July 1950):317.

in the New Testament. Phoebe was a courier for the apostle (Romans 16:102); he sent equal greetings to both sexes (Romans 16); both were eligible for the office of servant (διδάκωνος) in the church (1 Tim. 3:11). From where did he receive this attitude? According to Leonard, it came from Paul's understanding of the teachings of Christ on equality.

Blaming scholars for the denigrative manner in which feminists have looked upon the apostle Paul, Robin Scroggs exclaims, "It is time, indeed past time, to say loudly and clearly that Paul is, so far from being a chauvinist, the only certain and consistent spokesman for the liberation and equality of women in the New Testament."⁸

Obviously those holding to this view must somehow explain the passages in Pauline literature that seem to indicate a non-equal role for women in the church. The predominant ways in which this is done is: 1) to deny the authenticity of the texts as Pauline; 2) to consider the

⁷Ibid., p. 320.

⁸Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 40 (September 1972):283. Elizabeth Clark and Herbert Richardson consider such an evaluation of Paul to be dubious and approvingly summarizes Pagels response to Scroggs, "Whatever theoretical ideas Paul may have had about women's equality, he did nothing, as far as we know, to change the social structures which have contributed to their subordination. Elizabeth Clark and Herbert Richardson, Women and Religion (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977), pp. 32-34, 279.

texts as intended by Paul to be temporary in nature, either because of the cultural dimension of the setting or due to local church problems; 3) or to find a struggle within the apostle in overcoming his chauvinistic background as he strove to express the Christian ideal.

Denying that Paul has "anti-feminist" material has been the approach of many feminist scholars. William Walker argues, in his interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, that "chauvinist" passages are non-Pauline:

This means, of course, that the passage (1 Cor 11:2-16) cannot be used as a source for determining Paul's attitude toward the proper status and role of women. If the authenticity of 1 Tim 2:8-15; Tit 2:3-5; Eph 5:22-33; Col 3:18-19; and 1 Cor 14:33-36 (or 34-35) is similarly rejected on critical grounds, as I am inclined to do, then the genuine Pauline corpus contains none of the passages which advocate male supremacy and female subordination in any form. On the contrary, the only direct Pauline statement on the subject is Gal 3:28, which insists on absolute equality in Christ.⁹

This approach is also that of Robin Scroggs. He believes that scholars should do more to cause the general public--he calls the establishment--to refrain from using "pseudo-Pauline" books. Scroggs sets forth his objective:

To separate the establishment Paul from the historical Apostle is reasonably simple. Ephesians, Colossians, and the Pastorals are thus immediately discarded

⁹William O. Walker, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views regarding Women," Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (March 1975):109; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor has taken Walker to task in his article, "The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?" Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (December 1976):615-21.

and, for our purposes, hopefully forgotten. Also to be discarded as a post-Pauline gloss is I Cor. 14:33b-36, which prohibits women from speaking in the Christian assemblies.¹⁰

In similar vein, Robert Jewett says that an impasse has developed in understanding Paul's liberating perspectives on sex ethics because of contradictory patriarchal materials ascribed to Paul. In order to remove this "ambivalence" he suggests that one needs only to study Paul's authentic letters in chronological order and eliminate the inauthentic works, which he considers to include 1 Corinthians 14:33b and 1 Corinthians 11:16.¹¹

According to this tactic one may delete problematic Pauline passages and have blissful harmony. Paul is then freed from his position of "the all-time chauvinist,"¹² and instead is "the one clear voice in the New Testament asserting the freedom and equality of women in the eschatological community," in the words of Scroggs.¹³

¹⁰Scroggs, 283-84; Such a forthright approach is recent but it has been discussed for several years. See Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), p. 75, C. K. Barrett, Corinthians, pp. 330-33, and J. Leiboldt, Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum (Gutersloh, Mohn, 1962), pp. 123-24. Scroggs, 284, f.n. 3.

¹¹Robert Jewett, "The Sexual Liberation of the Apostle Paul," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, Supplement (March 1979):B 55.

¹²Cf. H. Wayne House, "Paul, Women, and Contemporary Evangelical Feminism," Bibliotheca Sacra 136 (January-March 1979):42.

¹³Scroggs, 302.

A second method to obviate the problem of the supposed contradiction in Paul's writings is to stress the temporal and local nature of the teaching. One argument is cultural. Portions of Scripture like 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 concerning women are written to guard the reputation of the church in view of the Greek or Jewish society. F. J. van Beeck says that Paul's words to the Corinthian church were a response to the immorality of pagan religion in Corinth.¹⁴

Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty aver that the Jewish and Greek custom of wearing of veils accounts for Paul's instructions in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16:

A Jewish woman seen in public without her veil was considered to be flouting her marriage vows, and the Talmud commanded her husband to divorce her. . . . Paul did not want Christian women to act in such a manner that people would confuse them with either the pagan orgiastic cults where women loosed their hair in ecstatic frenzy, or the gnostics who degraded the body and marriage.¹⁵

¹⁴F. J. van Beeck, "Invalid or Merely Irregular?" Journal of Ecumenical Studies 11 (Summer 1974):n.p., cited in R. T. Beckwith, "Recent New Testament Study," Why Not? Priesthood & the Ministry of Women, eds. Michael Bruce and G. E. Duffield, (Berkshire: Marcham Books, n.d.), pp. 150-51.

¹⁵Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be (Waco, TX: Word Incorporated, 1974), p. 65. C. E. Cerling, Jr., apparently a feminist, recognizes the major problem of the cultural movement. He says, "Were it not for [the fact Paul bases his argument on the relationship of Christ and the church and the order of creation] the cultural argument would be much easier to establish . . . the cultural argument faces a major problem." C. E. Cerling, Jr., "Setting the Issues: Women's Liberation and Christian Theology," Journal of Psychology and Theology 4 (Fall 1976):314.

Virginia Mollenkott senses that although Paul required submission to custom, he desired more:

The apostle Paul knew that the sinful social order could not be changed overnight. But he apparently glimpsed two truths concerning human society: that eventually the principles of the gospel would bring about a more egalitarian society, and that ultimately God's plan for a redeemed social order was a egalitarian one.¹⁶

D. Cartlidge suggests a practical reason why Paul did not attempt to implement the insight he had in Christ concerning the equality of women. For the apostle to proclaim the certain fundamental structures of Hellenistic society, such as slavery or male domination, were abolished "in Christ" might have brought about nothing less than a social revolution.¹⁷

A second way in which this argument finds expression is that Paul was trying to solve a particular problem in the churches at Corinth and Ephesus. At Corinth, it is posited, some women were overreacting to the new freedom found in Christ. They considered themselves, says Veselin Kesich, "free from any practice that had existed prior to their baptism."¹⁸ The Corinthians were participating in

¹⁶Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, Women Men & the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1977), p. 93.

¹⁷D. R. Cartlidge, "I Corinthians 7 as a Foundation for a Christian Sex Ethic," pp. 4-5, cited in Elaine H. Pagels, "Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion," Journal of The American Academy of Religion (1974):544-547.

¹⁸Veselin Kesich, "St. Paul: Anti-Feminist or Liberator," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977):142.

the new order. As Nils Dahl comments, they were anticipating "the eschatological glory to such a high degree that almost nothing was left for the future. To use modern slogans: the Corinthians upheld an 'over-realized eschatology,' overstressing the 'already' and neglecting the 'not yet.'"¹⁹

Kesich concludes that because of this new infusion they probably fought all established customs, including covering their heads.²⁰

At Ephesus, the apostle is said to have been responding to women who were led astray into heretical teaching. Elisabeth Fiorenza suggests that they were members of a rival Christian group that allowed women to teach and exercise leadership.²¹

Aída Spencer considers Paul's reference to Eve an indication that women at Ephesus were being deceived as she was deceived. Certain women were submitting to unorthodox teachings and Paul wanted to break the sequence at Ephesus

¹⁹Nils A. Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth in I Cor. 1:10-4:21," in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, eds., Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox (Cambridge: University Press, 1967), p. 332.

²⁰Kesich, p. 142.

²¹Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, "Interpreting Patriarchal Traditions," The Liberating Word, A Guide to Non-Sexist Interpretation of the Bible, ed. Letty M. Russell (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 58.

that Eve encountered in the garden, from deception to destruction. She concludes,

The passage of the First Letter to Timothy 2:11-15 does not suggest opposition by Paul to the ordination of women. If anything, the development of Paul's work at Ephesus should culminate in the authoritative leadership of schooled orthodox women today. Paul never meant for women to remain at the beginning state of growth exemplified by women at Ephesus.²²

The last viewpoint to be mentioned is that described as semi-feminist. Those who adhere to this position believe that males in the church are to exercise authority over women, but assert that females may function in traditionally male roles if under male leadership. For example, four lady members of the Christian Brothers Research Fellowship in Britain admitted in publication that men rightly have headship in the church but within this structure women should be allowed to teach, lead in prayer and hold the office of deaconess.²³

Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, the seminary from which I received the Master of Divinity and Master of Theology, since my graduation in 1974, has adopted a similar

²²Aída Dina Besançon Spencer, "Eve at Ephesus," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 17 (Fall 1974):219-20.

²³Discussed in R. T. Beckwith, "Recent New Testament Study," Why Not? Priesthood & the Ministry of Women, p. 151. I tried to secure the issue--Christian Brothers Research Fellowship, September 1974, no. 26--but was unsuccessful.

position. Discussions with various faculty there, which is divided on this question, indicates that the decision to do this partly comes from the interpretation that prophecy in 1 Corinthians 11 refers to preaching and the belief that Paul is speaking only against usurpation in 1 Timothy 2:12.

Paul as Theologian in Conflict

An alternative to the above two categories is that Paul was some sort of theological schizophrenic. Christian feminists of this persuasion see a tension in the apostle Paul: he supposedly accepted women as equals but at times in his teaching he placed them in an inferior position. Mollenkott says bluntly, "There are flat contradictions between some of his theological arguments and his own doctrine and behavior."²⁴

The view espoused by Mollenkott stands in stark contrast to the traditional interpretation. Until this new wave of feminism, Christians argued primarily that equality in Christ does not culminate in the eradication of the social order or of different sexual roles. The hierarchical structure taken over from Jewish society is supplemented in Christian thought by the dimension of sexual equality before God. No tension is seen between the equality of the sexes and subordination of the female. Heinrich Schlier,

²⁴Mollenkott, "A Conversation," 22.

in his commentary on Galatians 3:28, speaks to the application of "neither male or female" to the social order:

. . . one is wary of drawing direct inferences for the order of Church office or for political society. Church office does not rest directly on baptism, but on commission, and political society is never identical with the body of Christ.²⁵

An important scholar who has stressed this tension in Paul is Krister Stendahl. In a work on hermeneutics and the role of women (a book heavily relied upon by such people as Jewett, Mollenkott, Hardesty and Scanzoni), he admits the presence of a difference between social order and coram Deo, but he sees a contradiction between the two. He views Galatians 3:28 as the most important breakthrough in the proper attitude toward women, the crux Scripturum. Galatians 3:28, unlike other disputed and non-disputed Pauline writings, is a theological statement:

directed against what we call the order of creation, and consequently it creates a tension with those biblical passages . . . by which this order of creation maintains its place in the fundamental view of the New Testament concerning the sub-ordination of women.²⁶

²⁵Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an Die Galater, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), p. 175, f.n. 4 "so hutet man sich, aus ihm direkte Folgerungen für die Ordnung des kirchlichen Amtes oder auch der politischen Gesellschaft zu ziehen. Das kirchliche Amt beruht ja nicht direkt auf der Taufe, sondern auf der Sendung, und die politische Gesellschaft ist niemals identisch mit dem Leibe Christi."

²⁶Krister Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women, translated by Emilie T. Sander (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 32.

He then poses an important question, "Does the New Testament contain elements, glimpses which point beyond and even 'against' the prevailing view and practice of the New Testament church?" To this he answers yes!²⁷ To demonstrate further the implications of this thinking to the three pairs--Jew/Gentile, slave/free, male/female--in Galatians 3:28, Stendahl concludes:

It is our contention that all three of these pairs have the same potential for implementation in the life and structure of the church, and that we cannot dispose of the third by confirming it to the realm coram Deo.²⁸

Thus Stendahl recognizes a tension between equality in Christ and the social ordering of the sexes, and so calls for social restructuring based on religious equality.

His is not a wilderness call but a chorus contributed to by many Christian writers today. Paul is viewed by this new breed as both an enslaver and deliverer of women. He gives the great emancipation theology, it is said, in Galatians, bringing to completion the attitudes and actions of Jesus toward women. But on the contrary, he is also credited with teaching that supports their inferiority throughout his epistles.

Paul as a Rabbi

Although Paul supposedly recognized the total equality of men and women in Galatians 3:28, says Paul Jewett,

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid.

he was slow in the implementation of his own insights. He spoke of women as being subordinate and unequal.²⁹ Why does Paul act in this way? Jewett and others believe it is due to his rabbinical training. Mollenkott makes mention of this:

For Bible believers the problem is that the apostle Paul seems to contradict his own teachings and behavior concerning women, apparently because of inner conflicts between the rabbinical training he had received and the liberating insights of the gospel.³⁰

She cites 1 Corinthians 14:34 as an example of this conflict. There Paul forbids women to speak in conformity to the Law, which Law she curiously interprets as not the Old Testament, but the social customs and rules of first century Judaism.³¹

Not only does Mollenkott accept this rabbinic spell upon the Christian Paul, but also Jewett, when discussing Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 11 says, "It appears from the evidence that Paul himself sensed that his view of the man/woman relationship, inherited from Judaism, was not altogether congruous with the gospel he preached." Jewett then concludes, "Here we have what may be the first expression of an uneasy conscience on the part of a Christian

²⁹Paul Jewett, Man as Male and Female (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), p. 145.

³⁰Virginia Mollenkott, Women, Men, and the Bible, p. 96.

³¹Ibid.

theologian who argues for the subordination of the female to the male by virtue of her derivation from the male."³² So then, Paul as a Christian purportedly had a continuing struggle between programmed rabbinic chauvinism and his new insight in Christ.

Paul as a Christian

How did the Christian Paul differ from the Rabbinic Paul? He accepted, says Paul Jewett, the fact that there is no distinction because of sex to those in Christ. He did not simply consider this a theory but acted it out remarkably well for a former rabbi. Paul did not fully implement this insight but it did begin to take effect on his own ministry and later affected the early church. Jewett illustrates this radical change of attitude on the part of Paul:

1. In rabbinic usage a woman was designated only as the wife of another man, whereas Paul in Romans greets women by name.
2. Priscilla's name is mentioned before her husband's.
3. Phoebe carried the letter of Romans, a woman that Paul called a sister.
4. As a rabbi he hardly would address a group of women without men present, yet he did this at Philippi without any hesitation (Acts 16:13).
5. He accepted the invitation of Lydia without the slightest scruple (Acts 16:15).³³

³²Jewett, p. 113.

³³Ibid., pp. 145-46.

Many feminists consider Galatians 3:28 as the charter of Christian equality and the key to the male/female problem:

Galatians 3:28, in our opinion, holds the key to bringing harmony and removing the dissonant clash that is bound to exist as long as one sex is looked upon as superior and the other as being inferior and the source of evil.³⁴

But what about the other passages on male and female relationships? They are not considered vital to the issue. Except for Galatians 3:28, all of the passages in the New Testament are concerned with practical issues of personal relationships or behavior in worship services.³⁵ Mollenkott says concerning these other passages:

All those passages are addressed to very specific cases. But Galatians 3 which says there is no male or female is in a fully theological context. So that context tells us that Galatians is normative while the others are cultural.³⁶

So then, Galatians 3:28 is a locus classicus for the question at hand. Jewett regards Paul's words on male and female in this passage to be the last word on the subject; Christ could say no more. Moreover, Jewett says, Paul bases this teaching on the first creation narrative

³⁴Scanzoni and Hardesty, p. 15.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 18-19.

³⁶Mollenkott, "A Conversation," p. 73.

of Genesis rather than the second,³⁷ an issue to which I will now turn.

Paul's Use of the Old Testament

Feminists have seen several difficulties with Paul's understanding of the Old Testament narratives: 1) Paul, in 1 Timothy 2, argues that women are not to exercise authority over men because man was created first. He is basing his idea on Genesis 2. However, Scanzoni and Hardesty are bewildered as to how the order of creation has anything to do with abilities in teaching. In addition, if it is that beings created first are to have precedence, then animals are the betters of humans according to Genesis 1.³⁸ 2) Also, they say, Paul draws the conclusion that woman is inferior because she was made from man and was created for man and so must demonstrate submission to man by a head covering (1 Corinthians 11:7 and following.)³⁹ Contrary to Paul, they say that male and female were created

³⁷Paul, says Jewett, never appeals to the first creation narrative in his teaching on feminine submission. In speaking of equality, though, Paul alludes to that narrative. So then, when he talks of submission it is solely within the context of the second creation narrative, whereas equality is in the first narrative. Jewett, p. 142.

³⁸Scanzoni and Hardesty, p. 28. Even Richard and Joyce Boldrey recognize the ludicrous nature of this argument, when they say: "No comparison should be attempted here, for Paul is concerned more with 'derivation' (e.g. v.8) than with temporal order per se." Richard and Joyce Boldrey, Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), p. 34, f.n.8.

³⁹Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 64 and following.

simultaneously.⁴⁰ Rather than woman being made to be man's assistant, the idea of "helpmeet" is altogether different, they would emphasize, in a manner similar to Helmut Thielicke's comment:

Then exactly what does 'an help meet for him' mean? Bible scholars offer such phrases as 'a mirror of himself, in which he recognizes himself,' one who will 'assist him in the work given him to do, carrying it on in the same spirit,' 'a vis-avis has the character of a Thou.' Woman was created in every way the equal of man, one to whom he could relate at every level of his being.⁴¹

How is a Christian interpreter who believes in the integrity of Scripture supposed to react to these supposed misinterpretations or misunderstandings of Paul? Mollenkott says:

We must open our eyes to these conflicts, demonstrating faith in the God who allowed them to appear in the New Testament. We must conquer our fear that honest attention to what we see in the Bible will undercut the doctrine of inspiration. We must allow the facts of Scripture to teach us in the way it is inspired, rather than forcing Scripture to conform to our own theories about it.⁴²

So then, the consensus of many feminists is that there is a tension within the apostle Paul, sometimes causing him to regress to rabbinical misogyny and at other times leading him to the higher view of women that the Lord Jesus possessed. It is said that one must accept this contradic-

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 28.

⁴¹Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, trans. John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964), p. 4.

⁴²Mollenkott, Women, Men & the Bible, p. 105.

tion in the writings and teaching of the apostle and develop a view of Scripture in line with this perspective.

Summary

Feminists have parted ways with interpreters who, adhering to the teaching of the historic church, believe that Paul did not allow women to function in positions of authority within the church. Historic exegesis on the Pauline texts has been set aside for alternate explanations that accord with contemporary perspectives on women. Within three basic perspectives on Paul there are primarily six interpretations that have been offered in contrast to the traditional view. Those who believe Paul was a "true" liberationist of women argue that the "chauvinistic" texts either are not Pauline or that they are culturally conditioned or concern specifically local problems that do not apply beyond the specific churches addressed in the New Testament. Others believe that Paul had both Christian insight and rabbinic prejudice when he wrote his books. Only Galatians 3:26 and following represents the "Christian" Paul. Still others believe that the Pauline passages on feminine roles as long as women are under male leadership. The remainder of the thesis will take up each of the feminist arguments in the context of Pauline writings on the functions of women in the church.

CHAPTER II

GALATIANS 3:28 AS A CRUX INTERPRETUM

Galatians 3:28 has been made a locus classicus by those advocating the leadership of women in the church today. Since this Scriptural text has such importance to feminists in their arguments for the leadership of women in teaching, preaching, and traditional male roles, it is incumbent upon us to consider carefully these arguments in the light of this Pauline passage.

The approach for this chapter will be to look first at the origin of the text. Second, I will present the views of the feminists as to the importance and interpretation of Galatians 3:26-28. Third, I will carefully analyze Galatians by two steps: (1) study Paul's use of the first creation narratives, especially Genesis 1:26-28. This will involve an exegesis of Genesis 1:26-28 to determine if feminists have properly related this passage to Galatians 3:26, and (2) examine the meaning and implications of Galatians 3:26-28 in its historical and grammatical context. In this latter stage arguments by Krister Stendahl will be given special consideration. Also I will investigate the relation of the order of creation to the order of redemption (new

order) found in Galatians 3:26-28, taking special note of the feminist contentions on the abrogation of the old order. Lastly, the socio-political impact intended by Paul, if any, in the text, will be explored and a harmonization of this text with other Pauline passages on women's roles in the church will be offered.

The Origin of Galatians 3:26-28

Form critical studies by Wayne Meeks,¹ Robin Scroggs,² Heinrich Schlier,³ and Jurgen Becker⁴ suggest that Galatians 3:26 and following may have been cited from a baptismal formula by the apostle Paul. Two other Pauline passages, 1 Corinthians 12:12 and following and Colossians 3:9-11 contain a similar sequence of thought: baptism into one body, uniting pairs of opposites, and stress on unity in Christ. Note the similarities of the texts:

Galatians 3:26-28: Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἐνὶ δοῦλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ, οὐκ ἐνὶ ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

¹Wayne Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," Harvard Review 13 (1973-74):180-183.

²Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 40 (1972):291-293.

³Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 174-175.

⁴Jurgen Becker, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), p. 45.

Colossians 3:10-11: καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, ὅπου οὐκ ἔστι Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἰουδαίους, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.

1 Corinthians 12:13: καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

These three may be reflective of early baptismal formulas that Paul uses to develop his unity theme in the respective texts.

Jewett believes that the pairs slave/free and male/female are superfluous for the argument of Galatians, giving additional credence to the citation hypothesis.⁵ Becker expresses further indications: the shift to first person plural in verse 26, the unexpected use of "sons of God," and the baptismal terminology of verse 27, the return to his discourse in verse 29, leaving verses 26-28 as a self-contained unit.⁶ He also suggests that the γὰρ of verse 26 is added for transition and διὰ τῆς πίστεως is a typical Pauline insertion. This then leaves the following four strophes of a baptismal liturgy:⁷

1. In Christ you are all sons of God
2. a. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ
b. Have put on Christ;

⁵Robert Jewett, "The Sexual Liberation of the Apostle Paul," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, Supplement (March 1979):B 55.

⁶Becker, p. 45.

⁷Ibid., p. 46.

3. a. There is neither Greek nor Jew
 b. There is neither slave nor free
 c. There is neither male nor female,
4. For you are all one in Christ Jesus.

The source of the supposed liturgy is uncertain. Scroggs and Becker see it as Hellenistic Christianity.⁸ Meeks says the formula achieved its fullest expression in the androgynous myths of Gnosticism.⁹ The phrase "sons of God" may provide the impetus for the later gnostic goal of "making the female male."¹⁰

The evidence for Paul borrowing a baptismal liturgy is not conclusive. Though similar at points, 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Colossians 3:9-11 hardly represent a fixed form from which the apostle borrowed. The unified theological thought of Paul would explain the similarities of expression.

The view of Robert Jewett, that the superfluity of slave/free and male/female indicates a formula, assumes that the apostle had no need to heighten the acceptance that exists in Christ as contrasted with the lack of acceptance of and antagonism between these common pairs in the Roman world. This contrast would be impetus enough for their inclusion. Also, if one wishes to posit these pairs in

⁸Scroggs, p. 292, Becker, p. 45.

⁹Meeks, pp. 188-197.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 195.

early liturgy he must explain the reason for their inclusion in a confession.

Certainly, the use of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ as transition may be explained other than as an interpolation by the apostle. This causal conjunction is very proper to continue the logical flow from verse 25. Since faith has come, believers are no longer under the law (inheritance does not depend on the law, verse 18). Why? Because believers are sons (inheritors) of God through faith by baptism (verses 26-27).

Contrary to Becker, sons is really not unexpected at all in this context. First, the use of the masculine for the Christians is very common in the book (1:11; 3:15; 4:12; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18). More significant, however, in explaining its inclusion is that it is the proper term--for men and women--for the idea of heirship. The use of female in verse 28 excludes a hardline patriarchy, or a gnostic androgyny. The term has simply come to carry the force of heir (compare 4:7 and 4:31).

If one is to accept Galatians 3:26-28 as a baptismal liturgy, he must explain the lack of the confession of Jesus as Lord which was probably a definite part of baptismal confession.¹¹

¹¹Vernon H. Neufeld, The Earliest Christian Confessions (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963), p. 62.

A major problem with Paul merely citing a baptismal liturgy is his use of ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ rather than ἄρσεν οὐδὲ θῆλυ, the pattern found in the other parts. This is most probably a direct quote from the Septuagint rather than a confessional formulation.

If indeed, Paul is borrowing from an early Christian formula, it is more likely that he is adapting rather than citing, but there is another possible source posited by Madeleine Boucher. She proposes that Paul may be giving a conscious reply to a Jewish saying in which a man gave thanks to God for not making him a Gentile, a slave, or a woman, or it may be a quotation of a similar phrase in oral Jewish material but was written down considerably later.¹² The difficulty of Boucher's suggestion is the total uncertainty concerning the circulation of these Talmudic materials in oral form in the first century.

Whether Paul is quoting or adapting an earlier baptismal formula in no way affects the meaning or impact of his use of it in Galatians 3:28. He is clearly reflecting a matrix of relationships well recognized in the ancient world as being at opposite poles in the social context, one that for Paul in no way hinders union around the new man, Jesus.

¹²Madeleine Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels to I Cor. 11, 11-12 and Gal. 3, 28, the New Testament on the Role of Women," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 31 (January 1969): 53-54. For an example in Greek literature see Ben Witherington III, "Rite and Rights for Women," New Testament Studies 27 (1981):594.

The Importance of Galatians 3:28

Feminists consider Galatians 3:28 to be one of the most important passages in the New Testament regarding the equality of all persons in Christ. Paul Jewett calls it the Magna Carta of Humanity.¹³ Moreover, Jewett regards Paul's words on male and female in Galatians 3:28 to be the last word on the subject; Christ could say no more.¹⁴ The statement of Galatians 3:28, according to Robert, is "the beacon of equality for the current discussion" ¹⁵

Even non-feminist, Duane Dunham says, "Perhaps the capstone of all that Paul says on the subject of women is to be found in this text."¹⁶

Paul's teaching is the tour de force apparently to feminists Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, who write (in what appears to be a statement of a canon within the canon), "Of all the passages concerning women in the New Testament, only Galatians 3:28 is in a doctrinal setting, the remainder

¹³Paul K. Jewett, Man as Male and Female (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), p. 142.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Robert Jewett, "The Sexual Liberation of the Apostle Paul," (typescript of unpublished paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature, New Orleans, November, 1978), p. 13.

¹⁶Duane A. Dunham, "Ephesians 5 and Galatians 3," (typescript of unpublished paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976), p. 8.

are all concerned with practical matters."¹⁷ However, Dunham rightly retorts,

The fact is, that Galatians is not completely doctrinal and I Corinthians and I Timothy completely practical. Anyone who knows the style of the apostle Paul . . . will remember that he characteristically sets forth his doctrine, then brings the practical implications out of that. Further, his reason for writing the letter to the Galatians was a practical, and a theological one.¹⁸

All feminine scholars do not share the euphoric understanding of Galatians 3:28 that the feminists above espoused. Boucher describes the significance of Galatians 3:28 in less optimistic terms:

What Gal 3,28 is saying is that person 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. The only practical change demanded by Paul--and this is the thrust of Gal 3,28--was the admission of Gentiles, law-free, into the Church. He was saying: if the admittedly inferior slave and woman had a place in the Church (as in the Synagogue) why not also the Gentile? This might be described more accurately as a baptismal-ecclesiological statement than as a theological statement directed against the order of creation. In any case, Gal 3,28, as much as the first two texts, seems to assume a dichotomy between the social order and life coram Deo.¹⁹

Although not agreeing with the negativism that Boucher sees in Paul's position about slaves and woman, I

¹⁷Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be (Waco, TX: Word Incorporated, 1974), p. 71.

¹⁸Dunham, p. 8.

¹⁹Madeleine Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels," pp. 50-60.

agree that Paul is not speaking to social issues or ramifications in his statement of oneness in Christ. Instead, as subsequent exegesis will demonstrate, Paul is intending to teach that there are no areas of discrimination in reference to heirship in the Abrahamic covenant, to those who have faith in Christ. He seeks to explicate that point by reference to the unity of believers around baptism.

Feminist Interpretation of Galatians 3:28

What is the meaning and application of Galatians 3:28 to those who argue for interchangeability of roles for male and female in the church? Scroggs believes the passage demonstrates the obliteration of role distinctions between male and female:

To enter the Christian community thus meant to join a society in which male-female roles and valuations based on such roles had been discarded. The community was powerless to alter role valuations in the outside culture, but within the church, behavior and inter-relationships were to be based on this affirmation of equality.²⁰

The faculty of Christ Seminary (Seminex), in a study document on the ordination of women, have stated that the passage is not to be restricted simply to the spiritual or heavenly sphere but is to be applied in a concrete and physical way now. To do otherwise, they say, is to pervert the gospel. They make it clear to what application they

²⁰Robin Scroggs, "Women in the NT," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), p. 966.

refer when later they state that the implications of Galatians 3:28 and the gospel itself is the ordination of women, supposedly the logical and theological conclusion of Galatians 3:28 and the gospel.²¹

Krister Stendahl, a leading exponent of egalitarianism, in an hermeneutical study of Galatians 3:28, believes that the passage provides the key ecclesiastical freedom:

It is our contention that all three pairs have the same potential for implementation in the life and structure of the church, and that we cannot dispose of the third by confining it to the realm coram deo. Just as Jews and Greeks remained what they were, so man and woman remain what they are; but in Christ, by baptism and hence in the church--not only in faith--something has happened which transcends the Law itself and thereby even the order of creation. For this order rests upon the Scriptures, and can only be incidentally corroborated by 'nature,' as is clear in I Corinthians 11:14. If one counters that this would lead to a conflict with the order of creation, and hence must be wrong, we may say that it does indeed lead to such a conflict, and that is precisely what it should do and intends to do. The question is whether all three are not intended to be realized in the life of the church.²²

Stendahl has argued from Galatians that both position in Christ and function in society are matters of implementation in Galatians 3:28. He has two assumptions in his interpretation of Galatians 3:28: 1) Paul is reversing the order of creation, establishing the new redemptive order; 2) The Jew/Gentile, slave/free, male/female

²¹Christ Seminary statement, 135.

²²Krister Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women, trans. Emilie T. Sander (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 34-35.

categories are functional in addition to being positional.

Regarding the first assumption he has argued that Paul, in Galatians 3:28, has brought a destruction of the dichotomy between social order and coram Deo. He directs the theological statement of this passage against the former order of creation, in which, he says, woman is given a subordinate function in society and church. He believes that Paul in his passage in Galatians goes beyond the prevailing view and practice of the New Testament Church.²³

Concerning the second assumption, Stendahl further argues that all three of the pairs in Galatians 3:28 are to be equally implemented in the life and structure of the church. This Biblical text is the key to this implementation of social equality for women today. Even as the idea found in this passage was instrumental in the release of slaves in the last century, so few today, he says, "would confine the implications of 'neither slave nor free' to an attitude of the heart, apart from social structure and legislation."²⁴ One, then, cannot dispose of the third pair (male and female) by confining it to the realm coram Deo: "Just as Jews and Greeks remained what they

²³Stendahl, p. 33.

²⁴Ibid., p. 34.

were, so man and woman remain what they are; but in Christ, by baptism and hence in the church--not only in faith--something has happened which transcends the Law itself and thereby even the order of creation.²⁵

Subsequent analysis will demonstrate that Stendahl has brought to the text social implications of male and female roles that were not envisioned by the apostle when he wrote Galatians 3:26-28. Rather than advocating equality in society or church for the pairs of verse 28, the apostle argues for unity of the pairs around the new man, Jesus. Though Judaism might establish barriers by demands of tradition or the law, the new order in Christ holds forth admittance sonship (an heir) by faith and baptism.

The Meaning and Significance
of Galatians 3:26-28

A primary contention of many feminists is that the apostle subscribed to the second creation account (Genesis 2) for the submission of women, while on the other hand, the teaching on equality is that quoted by the apostle from Genesis 1. The former passage is used by the apostle to prove man's priority in creation whereas the latter Paul quoted to show that there was no priority, with male and female being created simultaneously.²⁶ Apparently even

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Virginia Mollenkott, "A Conversation with Virginia Mollenkott," The Other Side 12 (May-June 1976):27; Faculty

Paul did not recognize the implications of this liberating statement. Virginia Mollenkott perceives Paul as one in a theological pilgrimage, only gradually coming to a realization of what impact the gospel has on society.²⁷ His slowness was due to the rabbinical interpretation he had been taught from Genesis 2. So then, allegedly, he developed his Christian insights from the first creation narrative, but maintained chauvinistic rabbinic practices and teaching from the second creation narrative.²⁸ In order to determine whether this new feminist postulate is an accurate portrayal of Paul's mind, we turn to a consideration of Paul's use of the creation narratives.

Paul's Use of the Creation Narratives

Paul develops his teaching on the authority roles for women from the creation-fall narratives of Genesis 1-3. These teachings are recorded in Galatians 3:26-28, 1 Corinthians 11:7-12, and 1 Timothy 2:11-15, and 1 Corinthians 14:34 if one considers the "law" to be a reference to Genesis 3:16b.

Galatians 3:28 has the phrase, there is οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ. This appears to be a direct quotation from the

of Christ Seminary, "For the Ordination of Women," Currents in Theology and Mission 6 (June 1979)132-143.

²⁷P. Jewett, p. 142.

²⁸Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 27-28.

Septuagint rather than put in the disjunctive form of the other pairs in the listing, that is, ἄρσεν οὐδὲ θῆλυ. This quote from Genesis 1:27 is used to emphasize the ontological nature of male and female as both being in the image of God. Paul could use this passage best, then, to emphasize the unity of male and female around the new creation in Christ.

First Corinthians 11:7-12 reflects the second creation narrative of Genesis 2. Paul makes reference to the man being the image and glory of God, whereas the woman is the glory of man (verse 7). This seems to be Paul's way of expressing the fact that woman was created mediately from Adam. Paul deduces this because the creation account of Genesis 2 has the woman taken from the rib (side) of the man (verse 8). Moreover, the text says that woman was created for man, rather than vice-versa (verse 9). Based on the second creation narrative, Paul is able to conclude that because woman is derived from man and made for man (to be a helper) she is not to be in authority over man.

First Timothy 2:12 provides a variation of the idea of derivation found in 1 Corinthians 11:7-9 but also adds a new dimension from Genesis 3. Paul avers in verse 13 that Adam was created first, then Eve. This is an argument of priority from Genesis, although derivation is not excluded from the picture. The two ideas are interconnected. Feminists have sarcastically criticized Paul's argument

here by suggesting that animals, or even the dust, are superordinate to males because they were prior in time. Paul, however, is not concerned with mere temporal priority but a priority of origination.

The new dimension found in 1 Timothy 2:13 is of the sin of woman. A reason why Paul forbids women teaching (males) is that the woman was deceived into sinning. Unlike the man apparently who knew better, Eve ignorantly walked into transgression. For Paul, this disqualifies a woman from functioning in a position in which she might be led into error and in turn, lead others into error.

The last passage is 1 Corinthians 14:34. If the "law" in verse 34 is a reference to Genesis 3:16, and if the latter passage is prescriptive rather than descriptive, Paul would be declaring that the Old Testament did not allow a woman to rule over a man. As we shall see later, teaching and ruling were tantamount to the same thing in Paul's mind.

It is interesting that in none of these major texts on women and their roles in the church does Paul ever refer to custom or local circumstances as the reason for his commands. All of his rulings relate to the teaching found in the first three chapters of Genesis; his reasons are entirely theological. So then, it is imperative that we look at these Old Testament texts to discover if Paul was correctly understanding the passages or whether

feminists are correct in discounting Paul's use and understanding of them. We will examine Genesis 1 for this discussion on Galatians 3:26-28, Genesis 2 for 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15, and Genesis 3 for 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 and 1 Timothy 2:14-15.

Interpretation of Genesis 1:26-28

The first text on the creation of man is Genesis 1:26-28. Following is an interpretative translation of the passage that highlights the emphases of the cola:

- 26 Then God said,
 "Let us make man in our image, according
 to our likeness;
 and let them rule over the fish of the sea
 and over the birds of the sky
 and over the cattle,
 and over all the earth,
 and over every creeping thing that creeps on
 the earth."
- 27 And God created man in his own image,
 in the image of God He created him;
 male and female He created them
- 28 And God blessed them;
 And God said to them;
 "Be fruitful and multiply,
 and fill the earth, and subdue it;
 and rule over the fish of the sea
 and over the sky,
 and over every living thing that
 moves on the earth."²⁹

This splendid description of the creation, in majestic poetry, serves as the climax of God's creation in Genesis

²⁹The structure of these verses was suggested to me by Ronald B. Allen, "Male and Female: the View from Genesis" (typescript of unpublished paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976), p. 3.

1. Man is the crown of God's creative activity! These verses are to be understood as having a pyramidal structure,³⁰ focusing on verse 27 with the creation of man as male and female.³¹

Two basic emphases are evident in verses 26-28: (1) Man is presented as created in the image of God, and (2) man is master over all of God's other created beings on the earth.

The apex of the passage, verse 27, is poetry. Note the verse in Hebrew:

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ
 בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ
 זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם

The verse is a stylistically synonymous parallelism with בָּרָא occurring in each colon for emphasis.³² Umberto Cassuto

³⁰While verses 26 and 28 are closer to elevated prose than poetry, the balancing thought of verse 27 puts it into the class of pure poetry. Cassuto says, in reference to verse 27, "At this point the text assumes a more exalted tone and becomes poetic." Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part I, From Adam to Noah, translated by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961), p. 57. John Skinner comments, "The repetition [of v. 27] imparts a rhythmic movement to the language, which may be a faint echo of an old hymn on the glory of man, like Ps. 8." John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910), p. 33.

³¹Allen, p. 4.

³²The metrical form of this verse consists of three lines with four beats each. Cf. Cuthbert A. Simpson, "The Book of Genesis," "Exegesis," The Interpreters Bible, 12 Vols. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), 1:484.

gives the sense of the poetry in verse 27:

The poetic structure of the sentence, its stately diction and its particular emotional quality attest the special importance that the Torah attributes to the making of man--the noblest of the creatures.³³

The first colon of verse 27 emphasizes that man is the creation of God. The second colon stresses that man is created in the Divine image. The third colon portrays man, who is in God's image, as created male and female. Each of the previously underlined phrases is stressed in the text by its occurrence at the first of each colon, namely 27a וַיִּבְרָא; 27b בְּצֶלֶם; 27c וַיִּבְרָא.

The first colon succinctly identifies the heart of one's understanding of man: he is God's creation. Man is not viewed in the Hebrew mind as the result of chance forces at play in the cosmos, but a deliberative and purposive act of the Creator (cf Psalm 8, a commentary on creation), as averred by Eichrodt:

As regards the relation in which this life proper to the creature, established once for all at the creation, stands to God, the creation-concept in its Old Testament form already offers certain conclusions. On the one hand, by the concept of the creature, which is inseparable from the idea of creation, it presupposes the permanent dependence of the world on God, with no room for a detachment of the created thing from him who created it; and on the other it shows that a necessary consequence of the act of creation is an historical process which finds its forward motive power in the permanent life-relationship of the creature with the Creator. Similarly the self-attestation of the Creator

³³Cassuto, p. 56.

in his work by means of the teleology visible in the structure of the cosmos points to abiding values which the creaturely life strives to actualize, and which exclude the possibility that the world-process should be governed by capricious forces.³⁴

Colon two emphasizes the Divine image. The imago Dei, however, in this creation text, does not appear to be that which is usually seen in works of systematic, or even biblical, theology.³⁵ The image seems to relate to the

³⁴Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament Vol. 2, trans. by J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), p. 151. "In welchem Verhältnis dieses von der Schöpfung einmalig gesetzte Eigenleben der Kreatur zu Gott steht, darüber gibt der Schöpfungsgedanke in seiner alttestamentlichen Aufprägung bereits gewisse Aufschlüsse, sofern er einerseits durch den von ihm untrennbaren Begriff der Kreatur die dauernde Abhängigkeit der Welt von Gott voraussetzt, die eine Losreissung des Geschaffenen von seinem Schöpfer nicht zulässt andererseits als notwendige Folge der Schöpfungstat ein geschichtliches Geschehen erkennen lässt, das in der dauernden Lebensverbindung der Kreatur mit dem Schöpfer seine vorwärtstreibende Kraft besitzt. Und ebenso deutet die Selbstbezeugung des Schöpfers in seinem Werk durch die in der Struktur des Kosmos sichtbare Teleologie auf bleibende Werte hin, auf deren Verwirklichung das geschöpfliche Leben zustrebt und durch die eine Herrschaft launischer Mächte über das Weltgeschehen ausgeschlossen wird." Walther Eichrodt, Theologie des alten Testaments, Teil II, Gott und Welt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), p. 100.

³⁵See the various discussions on the imago Dei: Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, Part 1, From Adam to Noah, p. 56. H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Genesis (Columbus, OH: The Wartburg Press, 1942), pp. 89-92; Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, translated by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958), pp. 166-172; Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 122-128; Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 145-147, 208; Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. 1, translated by

ability to dominate the creation over which God placed man. Mankind is to dominate all of God's other creation and to produce children. Included in this capacity, one would probably include the intellect, emotion and will. Scanzoni and Hardesty may also be correct in adding self-awareness and self-transcendence.³⁶ Man (generically) bears indelibly the character of the Divine being, and because of this he can fulfill the work assigned to him. Thus, the task of domination that man has over all other creatures is not only because of the "content" of the Divine image but in "consequence" of it.³⁷ Horace Hummel concurs in his study when he asserts that the biblical text appears to be interested more in the image's result rather than its content.³⁸

D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 144-46.

³⁶Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 23-24.

³⁷Derek Kidner, Genesis, The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (London: The Tyndale Press, 1967), p. 52.

³⁸He comments: "To theoretically-minded Westerners it tends to be disconcerting that (as is common in Biblical idiom) the text's interest is almost totally in the image's result, not its content, in its function, not in its nature." Horace D. Hummel, "The Image of God," Concordia Journal (May 1984):86. See the preceding study for analysis of the Old and New Testament evidence on image of God, as well as the development from the Scripture in the theological and historical literature. Cf. also Susan Foh, Women & the Word of God (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1979), pp. 52-69, and S. R. Driver, The Book of Genesis, Westminster Commentaries

The responsibility that God has given to male and female extends to various facets of life, according to Scanzoni and Hardesty:

Both sexes were created with the biological and psychological capability for parenthood and both were given . . . the 'cultural mandate.' Agriculture, animal husbandry, education, industry, commerce, and arts-- every human being is equally responsible under God for all aspects of life on this earth.³⁹

Thus, mankind, as embodied in the male and female of verses 26-28, has the privilege and responsibility of ruling over God's creation. This is uniquely theirs. Kidner significantly states:

In both the opening chapters of Genesis man is portrayed as in nature and over it, continuous with it and discontinuous. He shares the sixth day with other creatures⁴⁰ But the stress falls on his distinctness

The third division is of supreme importance to the thesis at hand. Man is set forth as male and female, a point often overlooked by the commentators. The specific Hebrew words, יְנִקְבָּה וְיִזְכָּר, are sexual in meaning, referring to the sexual organs according to Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs.⁴¹ Some rabbis speculated

(London: Methuen & Co., 1913), pp. 14-15, for a look at the biblical evidence on man made in the image of God.

³⁹Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 24-25.

⁴⁰Kidner, p. 50. Emphasis his.

⁴¹Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (hereafter BDB) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 271 for יִזְכָּר and p. 666 for יְנִקְבָּה.

that man was an hermaphrodite, or bi-sexual, but some like R. Samuel B. Nahman, understood a more unusual contortion: "When the Lord created Adam He created him double-faced, then He split him and made him of two backs, one back on this side and one back on the other side."⁴² This rabbinic "myth" is negated by the text itself: "male and female he created them."

Others, from a different vantage point, sought to amend the text, or in some way to alleviate the idea of man as male and female. Schwally, according to Cassuto, proposed to change verse 27c to read "him" (יְהוָה) instead of "them" (דָּבָר).

Cassuto retorts:

- But the suggestion is unacceptable for three reasons:
- (1) it would make the second and third parts of the verse have identical endings, which is not possible;
 - (2) the emendation is based on a hypothetical interpretation, which, in turn, assumes the amendment;

⁴²Bereshith, 8:1, p. 54; Cf. also The Babylonian Talmud, Berakoth, 31, edited by Isidore Epstein (London: The Soncino Press, 1948), 61a, pp. 381-383; The Gospel of the Egyptians possibly viewed the coming of the kingdom with the obliteration of sexual distinction, or maybe an androgynous being. David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: The University of London, the Athlone Press, 1956), p. 80. This view also appears in Philo, and (some think) in Paul, Galatians 3:28. Ibid., pp. 80, 442. Tribble says, "Until the differentiation of female and male (2:21-23) 'adham is basically androgynous: one creature incorporating two sexes." Phyllis Tribble, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 41 (May 1973):30-48. This, however, is saying far more than the text requires.

- (3) the plural is found again later . . . Male and female He created THEM, and he blessed THEM Man when THEY were created.⁴³

Another effort, according to tradition but not reflected by the present Septuagint text, was an altering of the text by translators of the Septuagint to prevent a misunderstanding on the part of King Ptolemy. The clause "Male and female (neḱebah) created He them, was changed to Male with his apertures (neḱubaw) created He them."⁴⁴

These explanations are inadequate. The question turns on whether God is referring to Adam or to generic man. E. A. Speiser says, in his discussion of 2:22, that in Hebrew the definite (articular) form אָדָם is "man" while the indefinite (unarticular) is "Adam" "since a personal name cannot take the definite article."⁴⁵ If this is correct, then verse 26 is addressed to the male Adam, the Hebrew being אָדָם . Fritz Maass, however, speaks of אָדָם , with or without the article, as being inconsistent with

⁴³Cassuto, pp. 56-58. Italics and capitalization his. See also Paul Jewett, Man as Male and Female, p. 25.

⁴⁴Bereshith, 8:11, p. 61. This change may have been made to explain "them," or, since man was created in God's image, to avoid the implications of God being male and female. Ibid.,

⁴⁵E. A. Speiser, Genesis, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1964), p. 18. Though Speiser is in substantial agreement with Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, they specify this to be true only from Genesis 5:1 onwards. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited by E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910), paragraph 125-126, p. 402.

"man" or "Adam."⁴⁶ An additional reason that אָדָם in 1:26-28 should be considered as a generic term is that it serves as the antecedent of אֵיךָ, a pronoun referring to both male and female in the context.

The Midrash Rabbah introduces a misconception of the imago Dei, by attempting to delimit the terminus technicus as pertaining only to the male. R. Leazar says for R. Jose that the plural "you subdue" (כַּנְשֵׂה) (verse 28) should actually be written as the singular "you subdue" (יִכְנֹשֶׂה) because "man is commanded concerning procreation, but not woman."⁴⁷

This seems to be no more than a rabbinic prejudice. Such attempts at denying female participation in the divine image is unacceptable according to the evidence. The text clearly designates male and female as the recipients of the mandate and presents both as being in the image of God: male and female created He them.

It is the clear intent of the author of the text to teach that male and female are equal, both bearing the

⁴⁶Fritz Maass, "אָדָם", Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, 4 Vols., edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, translated by John T. Willis (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974), 1:75.

⁴⁷Midrash Rabbah, Bereshith, Vol. 1, edited by Harry Freedman and Maurice Simon (London: The Soncino Press, 1939), 8:12, p. 63. Hereafter reference to this series will be written according to the following example: Bereshith, 8:12, p. 63.

Divine image and having the responsibility that the image entails. In the words of Eichrodt, "Because man and woman emerge at the same time from the hand of the Creator, and are created in the same way after God's image, the difference between the sexes is no longer relevant to their position before God."⁴⁸

One may see from the preceding study of the Genesis 1:26-28 text that Paul properly used this passage for his teaching in Galatians 3:26-28. Only from this creation narrative could he emphasize the unity of the male and female as both created in the image of God and yet maintain the distinction of the sexes that the text retains in verse 27. Although the evidence from a study of Genesis 1:26-28 would appear to vindicate Paul's use of the text, certain feminists pose some problems in the exegesis I have presented above. I will now turn my attention to these issues.

Some Feminist Misconceptions

Feminists are correct when they claim that theologians, in general, have not often brought out some of the theological implications of Genesis 1:26-28, namely, recognition of male and female as equal with both given the

⁴⁸Eichrodt, p. 126. "Indem Mann und Weib gleichzeitig aus der Hand des Schöpfers her vorgehen und in gleicher Weise nach Gottes Bild geschaffen werden, spielt der Geschlechtsunterschied für die Stellung vor Gott keine Rolle mehr." Eichrodt, (German ed.) p. 81.

responsibility over God's creation. Recent feminist interpreters, however, have made an equally grave error by making statements that go beyond the evidence in the text.

Scanzoni and Hardesty say that Genesis 1 teaches the simultaneous creation of male and female, in contradiction (they say) to the favorite Pauline proof-text, Genesis 2.⁴⁹ In similar vein, Elizabeth Stanton asserts that Genesis 1: 26-28 "dignifies woman as an important factor in the creation, equal in power and glory with man," whereas Genesis 2 "makes her a mere afterthought."⁵⁰ Tribble also adopts the view that Genesis 1:27 portrays male and female as created in one act. In common with many feminists, Tribble accepts a documentary view that the texts of Genesis 1 and 2 represent two stages of thinking on creation and are in contradiction to one another. Genesis 1 was written by a later Hebrew theologian who had more enlightened views on male and female, whereas Genesis 2 reflects an earlier chauvinist perspective on women.⁵¹ Tribble here avers that the Yahwist in chapter 2, in contrast to the indefiniteness of the Priests in chapter 1, presents woman as the culmina-

⁴⁹Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 27-28.

⁵⁰Elizabeth Cady Stanton, The Woman's Bible, Part 1 (New York: European Publishing Company, 1895), p. 20, cited by Tribble, "Depatriarchalizing," p. 35.

⁵¹For a presentation of such views see Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 25-27, and M. E. Thrall, The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood (London: SCM Press, 1958), pp. 21, 28-30, who gives a more rational feminist view.

tion, the height of God's creation.⁵²

The view that Genesis 1:27 refers to a simultaneous creation of male and female goes beyond the language of the passage. The statement, in reality, is a broad, indefinite assertion without a time or action framework. That framework is supplied in Genesis 2, where the male is created first and the woman is created in God's image (not the man's) via the male.⁵³ This is the understanding of Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:7-9 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The purpose of the preceding infelicitous suggestion by Scanzoni, and

⁵²Trible, "Depatriarchalizing," p. 36. In another article she argues that woman is the dominant and most important figure in Genesis 2-3: "In Gen. 2 the man remains silent while Yahweh plans his existence. He speaks only in response to the birth of woman. Then he recedes again in the narrative while woman emerges as the strong figure. In conversation with the serpent, she quotes God and adds her interpretation ('neither shall you touch it') to the divine prohibition (Gen. 3:2). She contemplates the forbidden fruit physically, aesthetically, and theologically (vs. 6). This primal woman is intelligent, independent, and decisive, fully aware as theologian when she takes the fruit and eats. But her husband does not struggle with the prohibition. Not a decision maker, he follows his wife without question." Tribble, "Woman in the OT," The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), p. 965; Cf also Tribble, "Eve and Adam: Genesis 2-3 Reread," Andover Newton Quarterly, 13 (1973):251-258.

⁵³Tribble thinks that the mention of male first and woman last in Genesis 2 is a literary device called inclusio. She quotes Muilenburg and Dahood. She continues, "The creation of man first and of woman last constitutes a ring composition whereby the two creatures are parallel." Tribble, "Depatriarchalizing," p. 36. It is just as likely that the biblical writer presents the sequence in the manner in which he understood it to have occurred. This is the way both Old and New Testament writers understood the event.

others, appears to be an effort to tone down the teaching of Genesis 2 and of Paul's later interpretations, where man's prior creation to woman is used by the apostle as a theological basis for male leadership in the church. Feminists have sought to bring uncertainty to Paul's legitimate citation of the second creation account in Genesis 2 by arguing, as we saw above, that the accounts are in disagreement. Supposedly, Genesis 1 presents an acceptable Christian view since it speaks of male and female in the image of God, which idea, it is argued, Paul sets forth in Galatians 3:28. On the other hand, Paul purportedly uses Genesis 2, an inferior text, for his chauvinist ideas, from which he illogically argues that priority in creation brings with it priority in leadership.⁵⁴ Rather than this purportedly priestly section being a contradiction of the earlier Yahwist,⁵⁵ it is simply a shortened version with a different emphasis; Genesis 2 is more focused on the relationship of man and woman.

The second major assumption by some contemporary feminists is that Genesis 1 argues for an egalitarian marriage. That joint image-bearing does not extend to an authorita-

⁵⁴Scanzoni and Hardesty, p. 25.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 25. See the discussion on the supposed doublets of Genesis 1 and 2 by Kenneth A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament (Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1966), pp. 116-118; also Umberto Cassuto, The Documentary Hypothesis, trans. by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961), pp. 69-78.

tively structureless marriage is argued by John Davis:

The first feminist argument, inferring egalitarianism in marriage from Genesis 1:26-28, is something of an argument from silence because the passage has nothing direct to say about the specifics of the marriage relationship relative to the question of authority, either egalitarian or hierarchical. . . . Furthermore, the joint exercise of dominion and joint image-bearing of this passage does not establish egalitarianism with respect to every aspect of the relationship. Such a conclusion would be based on the fallacious premise that equality in some respects entails equality in all respects. Within the family relationship both parents and children bear the image, and older children can exercise a measure of dominion over the creation, but this does not establish a symmetrical authority relationship between parents and children.⁵⁶

If one desires to know the teaching in these creation narratives on marriage and authority structure, he must turn to Genesis 2-3, which will be discussed in the chapters on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, 14:33b-36 and 1 Timothy 2:8-11.

So then, in reality there is no discrepancy between Genesis 1 and 2, either in the Old Testament or in the apostle's use of these Old Testament passages. Genesis 1 really does not say anything about a simultaneous creation of male and female--it simply speaks broadly of their creation without respect to time or sequence--and Genesis 2 gives the particulars about the creation of male and female. Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 and 1 Timothy 2, draws the conclusion that priority of creation grants priority in leader-

⁵⁶John J. Davis, "Some Reflections on Galatians 3:28, Sexual Roles, and Biblical Hermeneutics," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 19 (1976):204-205. Emphasis his.

ship, whereas in speaking of man and woman as spiritual beings in the Abrahamic covenant he refers to Genesis 1. Paul Jewett says that Paul never appeals to the first creation narrative in his teaching on feminine submission as proof of the importance of Genesis for egalitarianism,⁵⁷ but why should Paul? The passage says nothing to the issue of submission, or non-submission; it does not speak to the question of interpersonal relations or social questions. Whether one agrees with the apostle's exegesis is another point, but what is clear is that there is no tension required in the apostle's use of the creation narratives in his writings on the position and function of men and women.

Paul's Meaning in Galatians 3:28

The proper way to come to understand the meaning of Galatians 3:28 is to examine the intention of Galatians 3:26-28. The immediate context of Galatians 3:28 is clearly concerning the nature of justification and what conditions are necessary for one to be included in the Abrahamic covenant. Paul insisted that it is an issue of faith (verse 22) rather than works.⁵⁸ Sin is the great equalizer: all are prisoners of sin. Faith is also an

⁵⁷p. Jewett, p. 142.

⁵⁸John J. Davis, "Some Reflections on Galatians 2:28," 202-203.

equalizer: all--Jew/Gentile, slave/free, male/female--are by faith included in the Abrahamic covenant and heirs to the promise.

Paul's use of "sons of God" for all the pairs is instructive. The phrase apparently extends beyond any physical dimension for both women and men are included in the term. The use of female in verse 28 excludes a hard-line patriarchy, or a gnostic androgyny.⁵⁹ This general use of son should not be surprising since the masculine for the Christian is common in the book (1:11; 3:15; 4:12; 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18). Apparently to Paul, the term "son" simply implies heir (Compare 4:7 and 4:31).

There can be little question, then, that Paul is saying that no kind⁶⁰ of person is excluded from the position of being a child of Abraham who has faith in Jesus Christ. The further question that arises relates to the issue posed by Scroggs and the faculty of Christ Seminary above, namely, does this equality in heirship demand equality in role or function in the church. The apostle's emphasis is on unity in the one man⁶¹, not social equality between the pairs.

⁵⁹R. Jewett, p. 14.

⁶⁰Notice the lack of the article with each pair in verse 28, probably indicating character or quality.

⁶¹Witherington makes an interesting observation that Paul's use of εἶς, rather than neuter ἓν, one for Christ is a "reaffirmation of Paul's view of male headship." Ben Witherington III, "Rite and Rights for Women--Galatians 3. 28," New Testament Studies 27 (1981):603, f.n. 22.

The interpretation of Stendahl, and others, who interpret Galatians 3:28 as a passage advocating interchangeability of roles between males and females in the church,⁶² is totally foreign to the genre statement (to use E. D. Hirsch's term),⁶³ or intention of the apostle Paul. The statement Paul is making in Galatians 3:26 has reference to the position one has--note the terms: sons of God, Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise--through faith in Christ evidenced by baptism. These particular traits demonstrate the type meaning intended by Paul. The emphasis that Stendahl argues from this passage is disparate from the apostle's meaning. It is disparate because he draws implications of function in society and church from a context concerned with position as an heir, by faith, in the promises of Abraham. In reality, even the other pairs are in the same category, and whatever

⁶²P. Jewett, Mollenkott, Scanzoni and Hardesty--some of the major contemporary evangelical feminists--appear to borrow their hermeneutical procedure from Stendahl and the New Hermeneutic. For an interaction with Stendahl's selectivity in using Galatians as his model over against other Pauline texts, see Hans C. Cavallin, "Demythologising the Liberal Illusion," Why Not? Priesthood & the Ministry of Women, eds. Michael Bruce & G. E. Duffield (Berkshire: The Marcham Manor Press, n.d.), p. 88.

⁶³The hermeneutical procedure and terminology of this section on Galatians 3:26-28 is based upon the view expounded by Hirsch in his two books: E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Validity in Interpretation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 24-126, 209-224; Aims of Interpretation (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 1-13.

teaching on freedom from slavery or roles for Gentiles in the church may not be derived from this verse but must be substantiated from passages that specifically concern the issues of functions for these groups. If Stendahl had wanted to set forth implications based on the apostle's meaning, he should have done so only in line with the intention of Paul. A different⁶⁴ meaning from Paul, so as to distinguish clearly a disparate⁶⁵ one, will be given as follows: Whether one is a child or adult, rich or poor, black or white, there is equal access to the provisions of the Abrahamic Covenant. The genre expressed by these classes is still the same type meaning, namely, position. The factors of age, wealth, or color are immaterial to the inheritance since the position is based on faith, not other physical or social considerations. The disparate meaning Stendahl posits is that since male and female are both equally sons of God they should have interchangeable roles. This is non sequitur reasoning. The question of roles for any group is not a part of the implications with which Paul was concerned--position before God, coram Deo. The subject matter of 3:1-4:7 further demonstrates the

⁶⁴"Different" refers to implications that are not stated by an author but are in keeping with the author's intention.

⁶⁵"Disparate" refers to implications that are foreign to and outside of the author's intention.

accuracy of this statement in that it contrasts faith by the promise with that of works (externals) by the Law.

The above teaching on equality of all people of faith in their inclusion in Abraham's covenant and heirs to the grace of God is further taught by Paul in Romans 2:11 where he says there is no human preference with God and in Romans 10:13 where it is indicated that everyone who calls on the Lord's name will be saved. However, the question of egalitarianism in function is not Paul's teaching as indicated in the other passages on the subject of women in the church in Paul's other letters.

Summary

Paul's teaching on the unity of male and female around the person of the one man Christ is a pivotal doctrine for the church. The focus, however, for unity around Christ for all people has been of secondary importance for those feminists who desire to use the Scripture in Galatians 3:28 for egalitarianism of men and women in society and in the church. But their view on this text does not accord with the evidence.

Paul probably adapted an early Christian hymn which he integrated into his letter to the Galatians urging them to ignore those who believe there was another means to be an heir with Christ in the Abrahamic Covenant other than by faith. Little did the apostle know that some in our

day would use this majestic statement of unity in Christ as the pinnacle text for their movement. As a matter of fact, many feminists see this as the only Pauline text that truly expresses the "Christian Paul." In this text they see implications far beyond the language. Feminists believe that unity equals equality and that since there is neither male and female, the roles of the two are interchangeable in the home and church. They recoil from such phrases as equal coram Deo insisting that the order of creation has been abrogated by the order of redemption that has come in Christ.

Paul does quote from Genesis 1:27 that there is neither male and female, and he most assuredly believes male and female equally to be image bearers. But this does not mean, to Paul, that distinctive roles established in creation (Genesis 2) are done away with. Rather, Paul considered the sharing of the divine image to be that spark lost in the Fall that is renewed in Christ Jesus. Surely the order of creation is passing away and we are sharing in the eschaton, but both are in force and in different ways. Stretching Galatians 3:26-28 to teach otherwise violates the Scripture and demeans God's work in creation and redemption.

CHAPTER III

WOMEN AS PROPHETESSES--1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16

Paul, in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 has an interesting, though perplexing, discussion of women praying and prophesying. The circumstances under which this activity was done have been enigmatic to interpreters. Several problems arise when one seeks to examine the pericope: (1) Is the present text the original form written by the apostle, or are there later interpolations?; (2) Is the section Pauline?; (3) What role does apostolic tradition play in the formulation of the teaching of the passage?; (4) What is the significance of κεφαλή to Paul's argument?; (5) What role does creation play in the development of Paul's theology in the section and what part is only social custom?; (6) Has Paul properly understood the second creation narrative of Genesis 2 and derived proper principles from it for order in the church?; (7) What is the general practice of the Christian church in the first century and how does it affect the Corinthian situation? Several practices will not be explored in detail in this section since they are not essential to questions of the thesis. The basic teaching of the text may be ascertained apart from answering all the questions on veils versus putting up of the

hair, or good versus bad angels. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the above stated problems in order to ascertain the proper function of women as prophetesses in the Corinthian church, and to determine how the redemptive work of Christ affected the originally established creation order.

The Integrity of the Pericope

The Present Form of the Pauline Corpus

The traditional stance that 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is an original Pauline pericope has been rejected by several scholars recently. Either segments of this portion of Scripture are considered to be later glosses or the whole section has been under the influence of a later hand. This in turn finds expression in two ways. Either the pericope, in whole or in part, was written by the apostle but later improperly assigned to its present position or the portion was written by a later author, possibly from the same group who produced the alleged pseudo-Pauline corpus (who, it is said, were anti-feminists), and then awkwardly added 1 Corinthians 11:1 and 11:17.

That the writings of Paul have been subjected to later revisions has been an accepted idea by New Testament scholars for several years. Knox has said that the present form of the Pauline text came into existence only after a generation or so after Paul's death with the final editor

attempting to clarify the apostle's meaning, as he understood it, by means of interpolations, glosses, or omissions.¹

The Authenticity of 1 Corinthians²

In reference to the Corinthian material, generally, scholars have basically agreed that it is a composition formed out of several Pauline letters to that church.³ This is done without any manuscript support but this lacking provides no obstacle to many exegetes as seen in the statement of C. K. Barrett:

The evidence of the MSS can tell us nothing about the state of the Pauline (or, for that matter, of any other) literature before its publication. That what we call 1 Corinthians was published in the form in which we now know it is certain; but this does not prove that the form we know was not put together out of a number of pieces.⁴

¹John Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1950), p. 18.

²The primary purpose of this portion of the chapter concerns the integrity of 11:2-16 and the question of prophetesses but briefly the larger issue of isogagics will be presented for critical context.

³See Gunther Bornkamm (Paul [New York/Evanston: Harper and Row, 1971], pp. 244-46). Though he accepts the unity of 1 Corinthians, he believes that 2 Corinthians is composed of portions of five separate letters; Walter Schmithals (Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians [Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1971], pp. 87-101) argues that 1 and 2 Corinthians are composed of six different letters.

⁴C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Harper New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 14.

Until 1876 the unity of 1 Corinthians was universally acknowledged. In that same year, however, Hagge⁵ brought forth the suggestion that chapters 1-6, 9 (verses 1-18) and 15 should be taken with 2 Corinthians 10-13. Although his particular divisions did not find acceptance, it forged the way for later discussions on this issue.

In 1894 Carl Clemen⁶ proposed an elaborate hypothesis, dividing 1 and 2 Corinthians into five letters. Although his analysis did not stand the test--even he abandoned it⁷--his choice of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 as the nucleus of the earliest Corinthian letter served as the basis of subsequent discussion.

The first view that found wide acceptance was from Johannes Weiss.⁸ His analysis, as well as that of his successors,⁹ with occasional alterations, placed 2 Corinth-

⁵Hagge, "Die beiden überlieferten Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Korinth," Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, II (1876), pp. 481-531, cited from John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., The Origin of I Corinthians (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), p. 43.

⁶Carl Clemen, Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1894), pp. 66-67, cited from Hurd, p. 43-44.

⁷Carl Clemen, Paulus: sein Leben und Werke (2 Bde.; Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1904), I., p. 85, cited from Hurd, p. 44.

⁸Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1925), pp. xl-xliii, cited from Hurd, p. 44.

⁹Alfred Loisy, Les Livres du Nouveau Testament

ians 6:14-7:1 and 1 Corinthians 10:1-22 (23), 1 Corinthians 6:12-20, 1 Corinthians 11:2-34, and 1 Corinthians 9:24-27 together as a first correspondence of Paul to Corinth with the rest of 1 Corinthians as a second letter, except for 1 Corinthians 5:1-6:11 and 1 Corinthians 1-4, which passages were considered to be later correspondence.¹⁰

Rather than giving a detailed evaluation of the theories,¹¹ which is outside the scope of this work, a few observations will be made. First, it is obvious that Paul wrote a letter which precedes canonical 1 Corinthians. That this letter is at least in part 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is plausible since 6:13 may be interpreted as an uneven connection with what follows and may easily fit with 7:2 if the intervening section is deleted. However, it is as likely that the section is a digression, for which the apostle is well known.¹² It may, as well, be understood

(Paris: Émile Nourry, 1922), pp. 39-47; Walter Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 12-18, 22, n. 2; Erich Dinkler, "Korintherbriefe in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft (6 Bde.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-62), IV, 18; et al, cited from Hurd, p. 44.

¹⁰Hurd, pp. 44-46.

¹¹For a convenient presentation on the Corinthian correspondence, see H. Wayne House, Chronological and Background Charts of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), p. 135.

¹²Cf. the examples in Romans by Nils Dahl (Studies

as a proper flow from the preceding passage, which leads to the second point. It is agreed that the subject matters of various sections are interspersed and not progressive (for example, the strict view towards pagan sacrifices in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22 and the liberal attitude toward weak brothers in chapter eight and 10:23-11:1, or the discussion of eating in chapter 10 and 11:17 interrupted by 11:2-16). The popular source analysis does not allow for an author's spontaneous thought pattern, which is certainly allowable in a letter. Thirdly, the reason for the seeming incongruity may be simply that the critic does not understand the author's thoughts. Fourthly, the reasonable view of Ramsay that the Corinthian letters were probably not composed at single sittings commends consideration:

In 1 Corinthians he found evidence of an interval in the following positions--after chapters iv, vi, viii, x and xii. He claimed that chapters i-iv come to a distinct climax and are in the same emotional tone throughout. Paul mentions Timothy's mission and his own intention soon to visit Corinth, but the next section is pervaded with what Ramsay called a 'felling of horror', opening with a statement of astonishment--'It is actually reported that' After the severer tones of chapters v and vi, the apostle returns to calmer discussions in chapter vii and viii, and Ramsay suggested that some intervals, probably quite short, separated the writing of these different sections.¹³

in Paul (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1977), p. 83.
whose integrity is unquestioned, but for chapter 16.

¹³Cited from Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971), p. 441.

Such an argument is impossible to prove or disprove, but it is at least as likely as the other suggested source reconstructions presented previously. Fifthly, there is no manuscript evidence or historical tradition which suggests any other form of the text of the Corinthian correspondence than what is seen in the present documents.¹⁴ A later reconstruction of Pauline fragments into what we know as 1 and 2 Corinthians is highly speculative and can only be seen, at the most, as an imaginative hypothesis.

1 Corinthians 11:2-16 as a
non-Pauline Interpolation

Even though there is no manuscript evidence for a fragmented Corinthian letter, or proof that the church received the letters under discussion in anything but the present form, and though there are alternate ways to view the problem, the integrity of the text is still highly suspect to many and they place the burden of proof (inappropriately) on those who hold to its integrity. William Walker has recently argued that 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is a non-Pauline interpolation, which reflects an anti-feminist group, and excluding this text leaves Paul as a great liberator of women (namely, Galatians 3:28).¹⁵ He puts

¹⁴Ralph Martin, New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 181-183.

¹⁵See Walker's feminist bent, supra, 68-76.

forth three reasons for the text to be viewed as an interpolation and then posits the position that verses 2-16 are composed from three diverse pericopae. Lastly, he argues that several lines of evidence exist that show the passage to be non-Pauline.¹⁶ The first and last of his considerations are the primary foci of this section.

Walker sets forth three arguments to demonstrate that verses 3-16 are an interpolation (verse 2 is seen as a transitional statement added by a redactor). His first argument is that since the word ἐπαινῶ occurs in verse 17 with an earlier example of it in verse 2 and since there is an intervening section which, if excluded, would bring a smooth connection with verse 1, the section in question is obviously a sign of an editor at work.¹⁷ This judgment will not stand the test of careful scrutiny since the repetition of ἐπαινῶ is very natural in the context. Paul finds place for commendation because of the attempt of the Corinthians to follow his explicit instructions but then finds it necessary to rebuke them because of an extreme abuse of Christian liberty in a new problem area.

¹⁶William D. Walker, Jr., "I Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women," Journal of Biblical Literature, 94 (March 1976):94-110.

¹⁷He derives this "rule" from W. A. Meeks, ed. The Writings of St. Paul, p. 41. The mention of 1 Cor. 12:31b-13:13 as an example of this procedure is superficial and may be explained more satisfactorily. Walker, p. 98.

Walker secondly avers that the textual variations in verse 17 indicate the text has in some way been tampered with, as different editors and copyists have attempted to improve what apparently had been a rough transition to verse 17 from the preceding. He cites the various readings of the different manuscripts on this verse:

ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΛΩΝ ΟΥΚ ΕΠΑΙΝΩ ΟΤΙ	8G and majority of MSS
ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΛΩ ΟΥΚ ΕΠΑΙΝΟΝ ΟΤΙ	AC* Latin and Syriac vers
ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΛΩΝ ΟΥΚ ΕΠΑΙΝΟΝ ΟΤΙ	B
ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΛΛΩ ΟΥΚ ΕΠΑΙΝΩ ΟΤΙ	D* and a minuscule

Though textual variants may be signs of a redactional activity, the problems here are not major, basically revolving around παραγγέλλω and ἐπαίνω, a problem which remains even if the supposed interpolation is removed.¹⁸

He posits what he considers to be his most compelling reason for viewing verses 2-16 as an interpolation, namely, it breaks the context of the letter at this point. He says that chapters 8-11 generally concern matters of "eating" and "drinking." The discussion of role relationships of men and women in the church certainly does not fit at this point, he insists, and if it belongs it should be

¹⁸Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The Non-Pauline Character of I Corinthians 11:2-16?" Journal of Biblical Literature, 95 (December 1976):616.

somewhere in chapters 12-14. This third argument of Walker is equally without force. The allusion to eating and drinking in chapter 10 is within a context of a social gathering whereas that of chapter 11 is within the church. In chapter 10 Paul had been concerned with participation in pagan liturgies (verses 14-22) and participation in pagan banquets (10:23-11:1). Moving from the social affairs, he then presents a discussion on dress in worship (11:2-16), where praying and prophesying occurred, to that of the Lord's Supper in verses 17-34. The unity of the respective sections is that of association--social gatherings and church gatherings--not the action of eating.

Walker, having divided up verses 3-16 into three pericopae entitled A, B, and C, proceeds to show that these three do not have adequate attestation as being Pauline. He adduces various arguments against each pericope, which is now examined.

He gives three supposedly strong reasons for A (verses 3, 8-9, 11-12) being non-Pauline. First, these verses are unique in the view of man and woman in the authentic writings of Paul. If the Pastorals, Ephesians, and Colossians are pseudo-Pauline and 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36 (or 34-35) is a non-Pauline gloss, no other passage (excluding pericopae B and C) have a view of male super-

iority and female subordination. Since Galatians 3:28, undoubtedly genuine, teaches equality and since Paul was very positive to women in his ministry, this certainly gives credence, he thinks, to the inauthenticity of the pericope. Secondly, since A has a similar tone and vocabulary with the pseudo-Pauline passages Colossians 3:18-19 and Ephesians 3:22-33, the same interests responsible for the pseudo-Pauline works may have been present in these pericopae. Thirdly, the most compelling argument against A being Pauline is the use of κεφαλή, in Walker's judgment. Apart from 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, this word is found only twice in authentic Pauline writings (Romans 12:20; 1 Corinthians 12:21); both places it carries the literal meaning of head of a body. In the pseudo-Pauline writings, it is found often (Colossians 1:18; 2:10, 19; Ephesians 1:22; 4:15; 5:23) and is metaphorical.¹⁹

Section B (verses 4-7, 10, 13, 16) is also considered non-Pauline for three reasons. The first is the same as the first one of section A: its view of man and woman. Secondly, nowhere in the authentic writings does Paul have such concern for incidental matters such as head coverings or length of hair. Thirdly, the use of

¹⁹Walker, 104-05.

δόξα is different from its use in the authentic material, which is basically in the eschatological sense.²⁰

The inauthenticity of pericope C (verses 14-15) is bulwarked by three considerations. First, the use of nature in verse 14 is nowhere found in Paul's authentic books but is like that found in Greek philosophy and Stoicism. Secondly, it is highly improbable that Paul would have stated that long hair is degrading for a man, especially in view of Acts 18:18 and the high regard for long hair on males in Old Testament and Jewish thought. Thirdly, there is again the improbability that he would be concerned with trivial issues such as the length of a person's hair.²¹

The force of these arguments may be more clearly seen by the following graph:

Vocabulary different from Authentic Works

- A Similar tone and words with Colossians 3:18-19 and Ephesians 5:22-33. κεφαλή used in metaphorical sense (Cf. Colossians 1:18; 2:10, 19; Ephesians 1:22; 4:15; 5:23) is different from the literal sense as used by Paul (Romans 12:20; 1 Corinthians 12:21).
- B δόξα is used in a non-eschatological sense rather than the eschatological way found in Paul's works.
- C φύσις in verse 14 is like Greek philosophy and Stoicism rather than like Pauline usage.

²⁰Ibid., 105-07.

²¹Ibid., 107-108.

Different View of Man and Woman than Authentic Works

- A Paul is positive toward women in Galaians 3:28, unlike this section
- B Paul is positive toward women
- C

Different View on Long Hair than Paul Would Have Had

- A
- B
- C Paul would not have spoken against long hair on men in view of Acts 18:18, the Old Testament, and Judaism

Incidental Interests Different from Paul's Habit

- A
- B Paul is not concerned with such issues as head coverings or length of hair
- C Paul is not concerned with such issues as length of hair

Rather than interact with A, B, and C successively they will be discussed in an overlapping manner according to the reasons for their rejection.

A and B are rejected because they present a view of the role of man and woman different from the so-called authentic writings. This is really not a fair dealing with the apostle's texts. Any author's works may be found to be in harmony with one's assumptions by excising teaching that one finds objectionable. This is not a difficult task in exegesis. The real task of exegesis is to harmonize an author's texts. Walker's understanding of Paul's view of women is artificially contrived by suppressing

negative evidence and presenting that which he desires.²² In reality, Paul's words in Galatians 3:28 and the ministry of women with Paul in no way provide a different view of the role of women than is seen in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.²³

A, B, and C are posited as non-Pauline because they differ in terminology and "tone" from the authentic Pauline books. Section A has vocabulary which is similar to Colossians 3:18-19 and Ephesians 5:22-23, both supposedly pseudo-Pauline, and contains the metaphorical use of κεφαλή. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor says that this is a "classical example of 'evidence which fits' as opposed to 'evidence which proves.'"²⁴ It is as likely that the so-called pseudo-Pauline letters owe their Pauline "tone" and terminology to the fact that they were influenced by the authentic letters, such as 1 Corinthians. As well, if one accepts Ephesians,²⁵ and Colossians,²⁶ and even the Pas-

²²H. Wayne House, "Paul, Women, and Contemporary Evangelical Feminism," Bibliotheca Sacra, 136 (January-March 1979):41-42.

²³Ibid., 48-50.

²⁴Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?,": 619.

²⁵Cf. Markus Barth, Ephesians 1-3, 4-6 (New York: Doubleday, 1974); A. Van Roon, The Authenticity of Ephesians (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974).

²⁶Cf. William Henriksen, Exposition of Colossians and Philemon (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964), pp. 29-37.

Pastorals²⁷ as authentic Pauline works, then the argument goes in the reverse, arguing for the authenticity of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.

Similarly, B is not accepted because it supposedly uses $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ in a non-Pauline manner, which is eschatological. Walker cites Romans 3:23 as an example of Pauline usage. However, the reason for the difference between these two passages (1 Corinthians 11 and Romans 3) is evident in the fact that the former relates to position in Christ (11:11) and the latter to that position apart from Christ.²⁸

Passage C is rejected because "nature" is purportedly used differently than Paul uses it. Rather than $\phi\acute{o}\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ being un-Pauline, in reality it fits well into Paul's discussion of creation in chapter 11, as well as in Romans 1.

The objection to B and C on the grounds that Paul is unconcerned with "incidentals" is weak indeed. Who is to say what was not important to the apostle in respect to a given period of time or in view of a church problem that he saw as a hindrance to the furtherance of the Christian movement? Certainly not some scholar today, who is not in the midst of the complexities with which Paul dealt!

Lastly, Walker's rejection of the authenticity of C

²⁷Cf. Guthrie, pp. 198-236.

²⁸Murphy-O'Connor, 619-20.

because Paul would not have had a strong view against long hair on men is also presumption. Who can speak for Paul? There is good evidence that there was an aversion in general against men having long hair in Judaism²⁹ and Paul could have been sharing this perspective, but the reason he gives is that "nature" agrees with the concept (verse 14).

In conclusion to this presentation on the integrity on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, a further point must be made. If Walker and others were correct in their assessment of this section the problem would not be alleviated since the thrust of the canonical books received in the present form by the church as authoritative, and the basis of its faith, present the theological view of this section.

Paul's Argument on the Role Relations
of Man and Woman in Public Worship

The Setting of the Section

The apostle begins this pericope after he has just culminated a large section about the improper way the Corinthians had taken advantage of their freedom in Christ. Possibly picking up their phrase, "All things are lawful,"³⁰ he reminds them that all things, however, are

²⁹A. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple, trans. Neil Tomkinson and Jean Gray (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1965), p. 167.

³⁰John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., The Origin of I Corinthians, p. 43. Bultmann says concerning the phrase that it was "evidently a slogan of the Gnosticizing Christians in

not necessary nor do they edify (10:23). Having delivered to them gentle rebukes (1:10-11; 3:1; 4:7-13, 18; 5:1-3; 6:1-6; 7:1-5; 8:9-12; 10:1-14), he begins a section with praise (ἐπαινω) for their remembrance of him and their adherence to the traditions he had delivered (παρέδωκα) to them (11:2). He then proceeds to correct a problem on the abuse of freedom in Christ by some women in the Corinthian church.

Two questions arise in approaching the pericope: What is the Sitz im Leben?, and what are the traditions and why was the statement on traditions included in the text?

The majority of commentators and authors with whom I am acquainted see verses 2-16 in the context of public worship. However, a few have demurred from this view. Ralph Alexander, after he states that verses 17-34 certainly concern church worship, asserts, "On the contrary, verses 2-16 appear to be an outgrowth of the previous discussion on Christian freedom and not related to the aspect of church worship."³¹

Corinth." Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1, trans. by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 341.

³¹Ralph H. Alexander, "An Exegetical Presentation on I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Timothy 2:8-15" (typescript of unpublished paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976), p. 4; Against this view is A. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple, pp. 155-57.

This view cannot be maintained successfully for at least four reasons: (1) Though verses 2-16 assuredly are an outgrowth of Paul's theme on abusing freedom in Christ, this is most likely also true of verses 17-34, as well as much of the other portions of 1 Corinthians; (2) The use of ἐπαινῶ in verse 2 and ἐπαινῶ . . . οὐκ in verse 17 tie together these two pericopae structurally. They serve as a unit even as chapter 10 does;³² (3) The question of praying and prophesying is more naturally seen within a public worship setting. Were it a small, private gathering, would the admonition be needed? Or then again, is there a difference between a small gathering of Christians and the gathering of the whole church for the practice of Paul's principles?; (4) The instruction is related directly to the need to conform to the practices of the other Christian congregations, so certainly an issue of public worship.

What were the traditions (παράδοσεις) the Corinthians had received and what were their significance? They seem to refer to the apostolic κηρύγμα or εὐαγγέλιον (for example, 1 Corinthians 15:1; Galatians 1:9; 1 Thessalonians 2:13).³³

³²See the earlier argument on this point on pp. 76-77 of this chapter.

³³Examples of Paul's dependence on early tradition may be seen in an excellent and concise presentation by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Pauline Theology, a Brief Sketch (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967), pp. 11-13.

The value of apostolic tradition, in contrast to that of the rabbis, which was condemned by Christ (Matthew 15:6; 23:8-10), may be seen in the statement by George Ladd:

While the oral gospel tradition is in some ways similar to Jewish and oral tradition, in one all-important respect it is quite different. To receive the gospel tradition does not mean merely to accept the truthfulness of a report about certain historical facts, nor does it mean simply to receive instruction and intellectual enlightenment. To receive the tradition means to receive (parelabete) Christ Jesus as Lord (Col. 2:6). In the voice of the tradition, the voice of God himself is heard; and through this word, God himself is present and active in the church (I Thess. 2:13). Thus the Christian tradition is not mere instruction passed on like Jewish oral tradition from one teacher to another. The tradition handed on in the form of preaching (eueggelisamen, I Cor. 15:1) and the reception of the message involve a response of faith (episteusate, I Cor. 15:2).³⁴

Having praised them on their positive response to apostolic tradition thus far³⁵ he proceeds to introduce further instruction that he apparently had not given to them. Before pursuing the content of the new tradition,

³⁴George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974), p. 389.

³⁵Some scholars consider the "praise" to be a sarcastic remark by the apostle since much of the letter is given to correcting abuses. Cf. E. Evans, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, The Clarendon Bible (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), p. 117; and Hurd, pp. 182-84. However, consult the strong arguments against such a contention by James B. Hurley, "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of I Cor. 11:2-16 and I Cor. 14:33b-36," Westminster Theological Journal, 35 (1973):192.

however, one must ponder the significance of the inclusion of the statement on tradition at this juncture of Paul's presentation. Apparently in the area of authority roles, which he turns to, he cannot praise them. In order that they may properly submit in this area he has reminded them of the παραδόσεις to which they have already subscribed. Now he wants them to continue such an attitude and practice in order that there might be uniformity in all the churches (verse 16). The section, then, begins and ends with a call for them to be obedient to the Lord through the teaching of the apostle and the practice of the other churches, and he appears confident that they will comply.

The Old Testament Basis for Paul's Teaching

Before continuing with this new tradition that Paul presents to the Corinthians, we need to look at the Old Testament foundation from which Paul draws much of his theology for man to be in leadership over the woman. This concept is first advanced in Genesis 2.

Genesis 2 is more than simply a doublet of Genesis 1 written by an early Yahwist into which was cast the creation of man and woman.³⁶ Here the inspired writer draws a magnificent picture of man and the reason for his creation with very delicate tones.

³⁶Contra Cuthbert A. Simpson, "The Book of Genesis," The Interpreter's Bible, 12 vols. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), p. 492.

Genesis 2:7-17 gives a setting to the story of the following narrative, verses 18-25. This latter section is the key to Genesis 2. In contrast to the pronouncements of טוֹב of chapter 1 up to the creation of man (verses, 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25), Genesis 2:18 begins, "And Yahweh said, לֹא-טוֹב." ³⁷ The passage teaches that man is not in the most suitable or excellent condition alone. A helper that corresponds to עֲזָרָה is needed. Only when man and woman were completed does the evaluation "very good" occur. Tribble argues that woman was the culmination of God's creation, but the text calls for a different emphasis. Neither Adam nor Eve, as individuals, is to be seen as the culmination of the pericope. Only as one unit can there be fullness, for they, as the unified being (see Adam's poem in 2), represent in fullest expression the person of God.

God declared that He, because of the intrinsic inappropriateness of man being alone, would make a complement for him. Actually the "helpmeet" of the Authorized Version conveys the meaning of the Hebrew quite nicely, that is, a helper fitting or suitable, but unfortunately time has obscured the sense. The Hebrew reads עֲזָרָה עֲזָרָה, which may be translated, "a helper corresponding to him." "Helper" (עֲזָרָה) occurs twenty-one times in the Old Testa-

³⁷Cf. Bereshith, 17:2, p. 132: "IT IS NOT GOOD. It was taught: He who has no wife dwells without good, without help, without joy, without blessing, and without atonement."

ment,³⁸ and usually is used for God who is also man's helper. It has no implication of inferiority. The word עֲזָרָה means "a counterpart," or "opposite,"³⁹ and with a preposition and the accusative, as in Genesis 2:18, signifies "a help corresponding to him, i.e. equal and adequate to himself" ⁴⁰ Helmut Thielicke catches the implication of the expression when he says that woman has the character of a thou, one who in every way is the equal of man and to whom he could relate at every level of his being.⁴¹

The idea of helper referring to an equal being well suits the emphasis given in Genesis 1, as we saw in chapter two, where male and female are equally in the

³⁸Cf. Gerhard Lisowsky, Konkordanz zum hebräischen alten Testament (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958), p. 1043: Ex. 18:4; Deut. 33:7, 26, 29; Is. 30:5; Ezek. 12:14; Hos. 13:9; Ps. 33:30; 70:6 (MT); 115:9, 10, 11; 146:5; Dan. 11:34; Ps. 121:1, 2; 124:8; Gen. 2:18, 20; Ps. 20:3 (MT); 89:20 (MT). Fourteen of the references, those underlined (with possibly Ps. 20:3 and 121:1), refer to God. Only in Ezek. 12:14 does the term refer to an inferior.

³⁹William L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), p. 226.

⁴⁰BDB, p. 617. A comment in Bereshith, 17:3, p. 133 is interesting: "I WILL MAKE HIM A HELP ('EZER) AGAINST HIM (KENEGDO): if he is fortunate, she is a help, if not, she is against him."

⁴¹Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, trans. by John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964), p. 4.

image of God. But it would be an error to understand equality of the persons as implying that the male did not have authority over the women in role relationships, for this is the clear teaching of the apostle Paul in his discussion of male-female roles and is the implication of Genesis 2 when God creates Adam first and gives him the responsibility to name, even the one created his equal.

Since Yahweh desired for man to have a companion who would be his equal, a true expression of himself, He brought the animals He had created⁴² to Adam for him to name. (This parade of beings is for Adam's benefit, not God's, for He knew the outcome.) After all these animals were shown to be inadequate for man, Yahweh made the counterpart from the very substance of Adam, her bone from his, and her flesh from his.⁴³

Though there is no explicit statement in the text that indicates man is to have authority over the woman that is created, a subtle argument for this is seen in

⁴²נִצָּר is most likely a pluperfect. See the following works for a discussion on נִצָּר as a pluperfect: C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament, Pentateuch, Vol. 1, trans. by James Martin (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1942), p. 130; J. Wash Watts, A Survey of Syntax in the Hebrew Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 61-62.

⁴³Umberto Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, part 1, trans. Israel Abrahams, From Adam to Noah (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961), p. 134. Cf. Gen. 2:23: "This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh."

Adam naming the animals and finally the woman. In Hebrew society, the prerogative of naming is a sign of a superior (though here in Genesis it is not essence but position as seen from Genesis 1:26-28). J. A. Motyer says, "When a superior thus exercised his authority, the giving of the name signified the appointment of the person named to some specific position, function, or relationship."⁴⁴ Thus when Adam named the animals, he did so by discerning their natures.⁴⁵ When he came to woman, he immediately recognized that she was unlike the animals; she, instead, was one "corresponding to him." He then named her אִשָּׁה . Some argue this is a feminine form of אִישׁ .⁴⁶ But it is more likely a pun or homonym.⁴⁷ Cassuto speaks to the signifi-

⁴⁴J. A. Motyer, "Name," New Bible Dictionary, ed. J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), p. 862. Cf. Cassuto, Genesis, p. 130: "The Lord of the universe named the parts of the universe and its time--divisions (i5, 8, 10) and He left it to man to determine the names of those creatures over which He had given him dominion." Cassuto lists the following verses as examples of dominance seen in the ability to name: Num. 32:28; 2 Kings 23:34; 24:17; 2 Chron. 36:4. See Fritz Maass, "אִשָּׁה," Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, 4 vols., eds. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, Trans. John T. Willis (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), 1:84.

⁴⁵Derek Kidner, Genesis, The Tyndale Old Testament (London: The Tyndale Press, 1967), p. 65.

⁴⁶Bob Key and Daphne Key, Adam, Eve, and Equality (Leicester: Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship, 1976), p. 7.

⁴⁷E. A. Speiser, Genesis, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1964), p. 18, says אִשָּׁה and אִישׁ have no etymological relationship. Adam seems to make

cance of the naming:

She is worthy of being called by the same name as myself (Nahmanides), that is to say: I have given names to all living beings, but I have not succeeded in finding one among them fit to be called by a name resembling mine, thus indicating its kinship with me. She, at last, deserves to be given a name corresponding to my own.⁴⁸

Phyllis Tribble disagrees:

Neither the verb nor the noun name is in the poem. We find instead the verb qara, to call: 'she shall be called woman. Now in the Yahwist primeval history this verb does not function as a synonym or parallel or substitute for name. The typical formula for naming is the verb to call plus the explicit object name.⁴⁹

She suggests Genesis 4:17, 25, 26 uses the popular naming formula:

Cain built a city and called the name of the
city Enoch after the name of his son.(17)

And Adam knew his wife, and she bore a
son and called his name Seth.(25)

To Seth also a son was born and he
called his name Enoch.(26a)

a play on words to indicate that he and the woman are of one harmonious relationship, even as the sound for the name he gives the woman agrees with the sound of his name.

⁴⁸Cassuto, Genesis, p. 136.

⁴⁹Phyllis Tribble, "Eve and Adam: Genesis 2-3 Re-Read," Andover Newton Quarterly 13 (1973):254. Genesis 2:19-20 is also an example of the naming motif. Emphasis hers.

At that time men began to call upon the
name of the Lord. (26b)⁵⁰

Though שָׁמָּה occurs with the word "name" in various places in Genesis, the question is whether this is necessary in Genesis 2. The view of Tribble assumes the documentary theory (to which I do not subscribe) and her conclusions follow from that presupposition. If Moses is the writer of Genesis, then there is no real problem. Genesis 2 contains one of the first causes for naming and a pattern, if there is one, had not been established by the author when he wrote Genesis 2. Yahweh brought every animal to Adam "to see what he would call them: and whatever the man called the creature that was its name." The woman was also brought before the man, though she was different in essence from the animals, and the first thing Adam did was give her a name. The procedure seems to be the same. The author's emphasis is that Adam named the woman. That she later received the name Eve is of no consequence. To receive names commensurate with changing character or events is a common phenomenon in ancient society. Thus the first woman is called Eve because she is the recognized bearer of all subsequent human life (3:20). In addition, notice that Genesis 1 (so called P)

⁵⁰Tribble, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 41 (May 1973):38.

records the naming of the day and night (verse 5), the heaven (verse 8), and the earth (verse 10) similar to the phenomenon of Genesis 2:19 and 2:23 although Moses in Genesis 1 does not use the term "name." Consequently, Tribble's novel arguments on the use of the term "name" are not substantiated by the uses of the so-called P and J texts.

So, in this passage one sees that man is created prior to the woman and is given lordship over her even though the woman alongside him is equal to him as a person. He was before her and named her, but he named her as the one who was part of him and completed him:

This one! This time!

Bone--from my bones!

And flesh--from my flesh!

This one shall be called woman,

For from man this one was taken!⁵¹

The Creation Narratives of Genesis 1-2 reveal the creation of man as male and female. Genesis 1 focuses on

⁵¹I adopt this from Ronald B. Allen, "Male and Female: The View from Genesis," (typescript of unpublished paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976), p. 8. Cf. Cassuto, Genesis, p. 135 on this verse: "The sense is: This creature, this time [that is, at last], is in truth a helper corresponding to me! Thus the man exclaims in his enthusiasm and heart's joy." Brackets his. Brueggemann argues that this poem states solidarity and equality. Walter Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2, 23a)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 32 (1970):532-542.

the unity of the sexes in respect to their nature and mission: they are equally in the Divine image and have responsibility to procreate and rule the earth. The focus of the second chapter is different. There one discovers the order and manner in which this "man" of Genesis 1 came into being. The male was without one to complete him physically, emotionally, and intellectually. Yahweh paraded before him creatures he had made for man to name, thus exercising his dominion, but none was adequate. Taking from the flesh of the man, Yahweh constructed one who was his equal. Even though they were equal as persons, the man was given lordship over the woman, not as a tyrant but as leader. The narratives of Genesis 1-2 are presented without any sense of tension between the ideas of equality of essence but difference in function. From these two chapters Jesus and Paul emphasize the unity of male and female, and Paul presents the leadership of men over women in the New Creation--the Church, views totally consistent with the teaching of the Genesis texts. With this understanding on Genesis 1 from the last chapter and now from Genesis 2, we may better appreciate the manner in which Paul used these texts when he instructed the Corinthian church on the function of females in the worship of that church.

The New Apostolic Instruction

The new tradition he imparts to them probably is

not merely that the husband occupies a position of authority over the wife--this teaching was already evident in the Old Testament and in society--but that this position is inherent in the divine order: Christ is over every man; man is over woman; God is over Christ. The discussion is not a reference to the essence of the individual being mentioned, since God is said to be the head of Christ, but only to function. Frederik Grosheide relates this authority structure to the recreation order in Christ, not the original creation,⁵² but it seems that the latter is also true (11:8-9).

What is the purpose of the teaching in verse 3 to that of the overall passage? The mention of the various headships provided the theological impetus for the rest of the apostle's discussion. The key to proper role relationship of man and woman is to recognize that Christ has headship over man⁵³ even as man has headship over woman. He assumes no argument on the first or last portion of verse 3 so proceeds to demonstrate that the center portion of

⁵²Frederik Willem Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 249.

⁵³Murphy-O'Connor believes that Christ "designates not the Risen Lord but the community of believers (e.g. 1 Cor. 12:12)." Murphy-O'Connor, p. 617. The suggestion is intriguing: it would tightly unite verses 3 and 16 together. But Paul's discussion does not lend itself to this idea in verses 2-16. As well, his normal terms of identi-

his three-fold proposition is also true.

The reason for the order of the clauses, namely, man-Christ; woman-man; Christ-God, is difficult to ascertain. For Paul to discuss the order of authority one would expect him to list the clauses thus:

God is the head of Christ

Christ is the head of every man

Man is the head of the woman

This arrangement would have each authority first, with the one over whom each exercised authority listed last and in descending graduation.

The necessity of the preceding arrangement is only prima facie. The cola really are not logically related. There is no need to equate the παντὸς ἀνδρός of verse 3a with the ἀνὴρ of verse 3b: the first ἀνὴρ is more inclusive than the second. The former has no delimitation: it includes all men⁵⁴ (probably believers are in view). On the contrary, the ἀνὴρ of verse 3b relates specifically to man in respect to his relationship with woman. Even though there is no pyramid structure or logical progression of units, it would be an error not to see the overall proposition as an expression of hierarchical authority.

The pinnacle of verse 3 may be seen in the word

fication are ones like "in Christ" (e.g. 11:11) or body of Christ.

⁵⁴Grosheide, p. 249.

κεφαλή: the verse revolves around how God, Christ, and man are κεφαλή.⁵⁵ Its meaning in Pauline literature (especially in this pericope and Ephesians 5) has been a matter of much dispute. Grosheide says that head is used figuratively as "a governing, ruling organ."⁵⁶ This definition has been strongly contested by many New Testament scholars today,⁵⁷ as well as by feminists,⁵⁸ who insist the word means "source," not "boss." Although this has been posited by scholars such as Markus Barth,⁵⁹ Stephen Bedale,⁶⁰ among a host of others, research by Wayne Grudem of over two thousand instances of κεφαλή through all the major authors of the Classical and Hellenistic period reveals no clear instance of such a usage. The idea of source in κεφαλή seems to be absent in Classical and early first century A.D. literature.⁶¹ Only in the case where

⁵⁵This repetitive feature, known as "climax," is common in Greek, in which the key word of the preceding comment is used in the following. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 261, para. 493 (3).

⁵⁶Grosheide, p. 249.

⁵⁷Markus Barth, Ephesians 1-3, pp. 183-192.

⁵⁸Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1974), pp. 30-31.

⁵⁹Barth, pp. 183-192.

⁶⁰Stephen Bedale, "The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies 5 (Oct 1954):215.

⁶¹Wayne Grudem, "Does kephale ("head") Mean "Source"

κεφαλή occurs in the plural, might the position be sustained. Even in this instance the term means the source of something, or that which completes something,⁶² and so not of a personal nature.

The usage of Paul more reflects the Septuagint and the Hebrew Old Testament. The Septuagint used κεφαλή for the Hebrew שָׂרָא. The sense in the Septuagint, then, is that of a chief individual or ruler (compare, Jud. 11:11 and 2 Kings 22:44, LXX). In addition, other words for rulership are seen as synonyms of κεφαλή and also have behind them the Hebrew word שָׂרָא.⁶³

A study by Bedale sought to demonstrate that κεφαλή does mean source. Various authors have appealed to his work as one that demonstrates that κεφαλή carries the idea of source in extra-Biblical Greek. Upon an examination of this much quoted article, one finds that he does not even cite one example of ancient literature outside the Bible for his comment: "In normal Greek usage, classical or

or "Authority Over" in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," Appendix 1 in George W. Knight III, The Role Relationship of Men and Women (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), pp. 49-80.

⁶²H. G. Liddell and George Scott, An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1880), p. 430.

⁶³Cf. Deut. 20:9 προηγουμένους; 1 Chron. 24:31 ἀρχόντων; 1 Kings 8:1 δικάστας.

contemporary, κεφαλή does not signify 'head' in the sense of ruler, or chieftan, of a community."⁶⁴ To make such a claim but not adduce even one piece of evidence for it is questionable scholarship. A comparison of the word with ἀρχή, however, a synonym of κεφαλή, in the Septuagint reveals that it may clearly carry the idea of authority.⁶⁵ Anyone that wishes to argue, like Bedale, for a view that κεφαλή meant source in the ancient world, will need to come to grips with the comprehensive and penetrating study of Wayne Grudem.

That Paul reflects the use of the Septuagint may be demonstrated from an examination of his writings. If we grant the term κεφαλή does mean source, the idea of authority is not ruled out. A study of κεφαλή in the context of three Colossians passages (1:18; 2:10, 19) shows that the word probably refers to rule as well as source, with the former possibly being the effect of the latter. This is the sense of Paul's discussion on the creation narrative in 1 Corinthians 11. The authority of the male may be seen in his being the source of the female in creation (verses 8-11); this idea of superior rank is also argued in 1 Timothy 2:13 on the basis of temporal priority in creation.

⁶⁴Bedale, 121.

⁶⁵Cf. Heinrich Schlier, "Κεφαλή," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 10 vols. gen. ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965), 3:674-675.

Heinrich Schlier says, "Κεφαλή implies one who stands over another in the sense of being the ground of his being."⁶⁶ Finally, there is its use in Ephesians. Ephesians 1:22 states that Christ is the κεφαλή or authority over, or possibly source of, the church.⁶⁷ This is the sense expressed also by Walter Bauer's lexicon, with κεφαλή being used with living beings and denoting superior rank.⁶⁸

The apostle uses "head", as said before, as the central concept in his argument. Around it revolves the reason for the submissiveness of the woman who prophesies or prays. She is to recognize that the coming of the order of redemption does not release her from the order of creation when she expresses her charismatic function within the church.⁶⁹ Even as Christ has a head, God--so

⁶⁶Schlier, p. 679.

⁶⁷J. Paul Sampley, And The Two Shall Become One Flesh, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, no. 16, ed. Matthew Black (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1971), pp. 122-124.

⁶⁸Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 431.

⁶⁹Fritz Zerbst, The Office of Women in the Church, trans. Albert G. Merckens (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), p. 32: "This brings us close to what Paul evidently wants to express, namely, that for man, woman, and Christ there is something which has been ordained over them; something which either has been established in creation or which has its foundation in the work of redemption, but which in either case expresses the will of God. According to Kittel, 'kephale designates him whose very reason for being consists in being over another.'"

the woman, man.⁷⁰ She is to take that into account when she prophesies lest she dishonors man (her head and source of her being in creation) and her own dignity.

The Covering of the Head

After the apostle had set down the divine principle of hierarchy, he turns to the problem at hand: should women in the Corinthian congregation function in the prophetic role without some indication of their submission to the divine hierarchical structure? In order to understand Paul's answer, one must consider the nature of prophecy, the meaning of the prophetic role, the distinction between a man and a woman in that role, the meaning of covering in society and in the church, and to whom was the woman to be submissive.

Regular or Occasional Prophets/Prophetesses?

Were the ones who prophesy in verses 4-5 regular prophets within the community or those who prophesied occasionally under inspiration? According to H. B. Swete, only a small group of believers were "established to be prophets," who were a charismatic order given a recognized position in the Church. These persons were said to be ἐχεῖν προφητείαν (1 Corinthians 13:2), known as οἱ προφῆται

⁷⁰Morna Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of I Cor. 11:10," New Testament Studies 10 (July 1964):410.

(Ephesians 2:20; 3:5) and were distinguished from those who occasionally "prophesied" (Acts 19:6; 1 Corinthians 11:4).⁷¹ Jean Daniélou, on the other hand, considers the use of the term in 1 Corinthians 11 as referring to someone who fills an office within the Christian community.⁷² However, A. Isaksson strongly argues that there is no difference between προφήτης and προφητεύων, or the female counterparts:

Even in the O.T. a noun and a participle [he is referring to ἀνὴρ προφητεύων and γυνὴ προφητεύουσα in 1 Cor 11] are sometimes used instead of a noun alone to denote a prophet. Thus in the LXX we find in Jer. 36. 26 (=MT 29.26) an expression which is strongly reminiscent of Paul's own phrase. The passage says that Zephaniah the priest received the following message: Κύριος ἔδωκεν σε εἰς ἱερέα ἀντὶ Ἰωδαε τοῦ ἱερέως γενέσθαι ἐπιστάτην ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ κυρίου παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ προφητεύοντι καὶ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ μαινομένῳ. And in Ezek. 13.17 we read the following counsel concerning the false prophetesses: στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας τοῦ λαοῦ σου τὰς προφητεούσας ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν. In Acts 21.9 the daughters of Philip are described as prophetesses in the following phrase: τούτῳ δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες τέσσαρες παρθένοι προφητεύουσαι. It is clear that in Biblical usage an expression like πᾶς ἀνὴρ προφητεύων should be translated by 'every man who prophesies', i.e. every prophet.⁷³

If Isaksson is correct, then, those endowed with the charismatic prophetic gift (1 Corinthians 12:10, 29) are the New Testament counterparts of the Old Testament

⁷¹H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (London: Macmillan and Company, 1909), p. 377.

⁷²Jean Daniélou, The Ministry of Women in the Early Church (London: Faith Press, 1961), p. 9.

⁷³Isaksson, p. 157.

prophets. They would occupy the office of prophet, not merely functioning as a prophet at specific times under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit or maybe only prophesying at a given time but never again. Possibly further proof of the office would be the paralleling of the prophets with the apostles in Ephesians (4:11; see also 3:5; 1 Corinthians 12:28).

In the Old Testament only four women are mentioned as being prophetesses, namely, Miriam (Exodus 15:20), Deborah (Judges 4:4), Huldah (2 Kings 22:14) and Noadian (Nehemiah 6:14). The rabbis added four more, namely, Sarah, Hannah, Abigail, and Esther, though the rabbis do not list Noadian. The Septuagint has Noadian as a prophet, not prophetess.⁷⁴

With the coming of the New Age of the Spirit ushered in at Pentecost, there seems to be more opportunity for women to have the prophetic office (Acts 2:17-18).⁷⁵ At Corinth this seems to be the situation for there can be little question that women were prophesying there alongside

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 159.

⁷⁵Palma argues that the age of the Spirit fulfills what Moses had desired, that is, that all God's people might be prophets. He, then, believes that there is a clear distinction between the "office" of prophet and the "function" of prophet. Anthony Palma, "Tongues and Prophecy--A Comparative Study in Charismata" (STM thesis, Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, 1966), pp. 5-9.

the men.⁷⁶ However, of what did this consist, and what, if any, distinction was made between the men and women?

The Nature of Prophecy

Concerning the first question on the nature of prophecy, the text indicates two activities, namely praying and prophesying, and both are to be understood as an effect of the Spirit's operation (1 Corinthians 12:10, 11). The Greek text has the particle ἢ, which may separate concepts which are antithetical, or those which are closely related. Probably the latter use is the one seen here. Prayer and prophecy are said to be equally typical of the prophet's activity in the Old Testament (note Abraham, Genesis 20:7; Samuel, 1 Samuel 12:23; and Jeremiah, Jeremiah 27:18). There are also examples of this wedding of prayer and prophecy in the New Testament (Anna the prophetess, Luke 2:37). Though a prophetess could pray and give inspired utterance, she was restricted from the office of teaching in the congregation, as later exegesis of 1 Timothy 2 will show. Daniélou says:

One thing is certain, women are not allowed to teach in the Christian congregation. Perhaps this was something which had actually taken place, which

⁷⁶Noel Weeks, ("Of Silence and Head Covering," Westminster Theological Journal 35 [Fall 1972]:21-27) argues that the apostle is really against the women praying and prophesying. Paul, he says, sought to show them the impropriety of such action by reductio ad absurdum: if woman is going to function in a male role she should be shaved. But since this is absurd, it is clear she should not prophesy.

explains why S. Paul forbids it. Yet it seems to have been altogether and always excluded. It is expressly this preaching of the Word to the congregation that is indicated by λαλεῖν, a high-flown style of word which emphasizes the sacred and liturgical character of the preaching (Cf. Hebrews 13:7).

But the role of the prophet in the Church is not primarily that of giving instruction: this is the duty of the teacher. The prophetic role is essentially concerned with prayer. If we look again at the text from 1 Corinthians we notice that it speaks of 'every man or every woman who prays (προσευχόμενος) or prophesies.' Even if the giving of instruction is thus forbidden to women, it does not seem that they would be prevented from praying aloud in church.⁷⁷

There is a special class of persons that I labeled semi-feminists in chapter one which needs to be considered at this juncture. They believe that women can serve as a preacher or teacher (over men) in the public life of the church as long as they do not usurp authority over the men in the church. As I stated previously, they believe that this view is substantiated by the texts of 1 Corinthians 1:2-16 and 1 Timothy 2:6-15. One such expositor, Earl Radmacher, has contended that prophecy and preaching are synonymous:

It is safe to conclude that 'prophecy' and 'preaching' are really synonymous In most cases,

⁷⁷Daniélou, pp. 10-11. The Didache reveals that the prophet was linked with giving of thanks (Did. 10:7: "Let the prophets give thanks as they will"). It may be that the Old Testament office of prophet, which included teaching, exhortation, revelation, and prayer, has been divided in the New Age with, for example, teacher and prophet functioning in different spheres. Women may have been allowed the prophetic sphere of one who prays but not that of teacher, or giver of revelation.

prophesying simply represents the activity of receiving God's message and passing it on. Before the time the written revelation was complete, the prophet received his message directly from God. Once the writers had inscripturated God's message, however, the preacher as God's spokesman, took it from the printed page and heralded it far and wide.⁷⁸

This theological position on the equating of prophecy and preaching was a driving force for women to be encouraged to attend Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, where Radmacher is president. Such a perspective on the nature of prophecy, however, is unwarranted by the scriptures.

Oscar Cullmann rightly distinguishes between prophecy and preaching. Preaching and teaching, he says, are founded on an intelligible exposition of the Word of God, whereas prophecy is based on ἀποκαλύψεις. This is in agreement with the words of Harold Hoehner, when he says:

In the New Testament the verb form [προφητεύω] is used twenty-eight times and it always has (with the possible exception of John 11:51) the idea of revelation flowing from God. Paul uses it eleven times. He uses it nine times in 1 Corinthians 12-14 and two times in 1 Corinthians 14:43 [sic, 4 and 5]. The noun propheteia is used nineteen times in the New Testament. Paul uses it once in Romans 12:6 and five times in

⁷⁸Earl Radmacher, "The Pre-Eminence of Preaching," Western Communicator, (Fall 1982):2.

⁷⁹Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, trans. A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), p. 20, cited by Anthony David Palma, "Tongues and Prophecy--A Comparative Study in Charismata," pp. 56-57. See also Ernest Best, "Prophets and Preachers," Scottish Journal of Theology, 12 (June 1959):150 and R. B. Y. Scott, "Is Preaching Prophecy?" Canadian Journal of Theology, 1 (April 1955):16.

1 Corinthians 12-14. The consistent New Testament idea is that a prophecy is an actual message or oracle from God. The word is not used in the New Testament to refer to the interpretation of an oracle by a skilled interpreter. 'In short, prophecy in Paul cannot denote anything other than inspired speech. And prophecy as charisma is neither skill nor aptitude nor talent; the charisma is the actual speaking forth of words given by the Spirit in a particular situation and ceases when the words cease.'⁸⁰

The understanding of Cullmann and Hoehner given above is consistent with the context of Paul's discussion of prophetic utterance in 1 Corinthians 11-14. When one examines the inspired dimensions of the spiritual gifts of 1 Corinthians 12-14, there is no reason to consider the nature of prophecy in 1 Corinthians 11:4-5 to be different. To use this passage to argue that since women prophesied in Corinth, women are allowed to proclaim the gospel in public worship does not follow. The preaching of the church is reserved in Paul's writings for men because of its strategic and honored place in God's economy. Note the words of Grosheide: Prophecy "may offer divine instruction which is helpful hic et nunc, but it is put beneath the apostolic preaching, beneath the gospel, which must occupy the place of honor (compare I Cor. 12:28)."⁸¹

⁸⁰Harold Hoehner, "The Purpose of Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14:20-25," Walvoord: A Tribute (Chicago: Moody Press, 1982), pp. 56-57.

⁸¹F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 287. See a similar opinion by Gerhard Friedrich in subtopic "Evangelium und Prophetie" in his article "Propheten und Prophezeien im Neuen Test-

Distinction between Prophets and Prophetesses

Now to the second question posed above about the distinction between the prophets and prophetesses. Some women at Corinth were prophesying in public worship⁸² without symbolically acknowledging their submission to men in the congregation. The cause of this lack of respect for the authority of men probably was their overinterpretation of what took place in Christ in respect to the relationship of man and woman. The woman's reasoning may have been of an a fortiori type: Since in Greek worship women were allowed to worship with loose hair as an indicator of belonging to the god and not the husband when in worship, certainly in Christ matrimonial authority and the order of creation were circumvented.⁸³ The Corinthians tended not to move in partial measures: they desired to operate with a realized eschatological view of acting now

ament," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959), VI: 856-857.

⁸²The majority of commentators and authors with whom I am acquainted see verses 2-16 in the context of public worship. However, a few have demurred from this view. Alexander, after he states that verses 17-34 certainly concern church worship, asserts, "On the contrary, verses 2-16 appear to be an outgrowth of the previous discussion on Christian freedom and not related to the aspect of church worship." Ralph H. Alexander, "An Exegetical presentation on I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Timothy 2:8-15", p. 4. Against this view is A. Isaksson, pp. 155-157.

⁸³Isaksson, p. 182. He thinks that the conduct of the prophetesses was to them a conveyance of the image of the bride of Christ prepared for His coming.

as though the consummation of all things in Christ had already come, and the order of creation had been superseded.⁸⁴

Apparently the Corinthian women in question desired to express this equality with men in being prompted by the Spirit, by praying and prophesying in public worship with their heads uncovered, even as the men. In order to preserve the order established in verse 3, Paul teaches that men should not wear a covering while exercising the ministry of praying or when moved by the Spirit to utter divine truth to the congregation for their upbuilding. Apart from prayer or this prompting by the Spirit to prophesy, women are not to speak in the congregation at all (1 Corinthians 14:33b-35; 1 Timothy 2:8-15).⁸⁵ Women, then may function in a prophetic role or give expression to the Spirit but in order to preserve the social order given by the Creator, they must wear a sign of their subordination.⁸⁶

The Symbol of Submission

Just exactly what the symbol of submission Paul

⁸⁴Hurley, p. 211.

⁸⁵Whiteley thinks the prohibition in 1 Corinthians 14:34-36 is against women addressing the assembly. Cited from Ladd, p. 528.

⁸⁶Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," Bibliotheca Sacra 135 (January-March 1978): 52-53.

desired for the prophetesses is difficult to determine. The social customs on veils and head coverings are obscure because of the intermingling of cultures during the Hellenistic period. Also, many statements about these coverings precede or follow the time of Paul so they are not totally reliable for the period of the discussion at hand. Generally, the argument of scholars is divided between the practice urged by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 being the wearing of a veil or the putting up of long hair on the top of the head.

Waltke quotes Jeremias to the effect the Jewish women wore veils in the time of Jesus and quotes Conzelmann that it may be assumed that Greek women wore a head covering in public.⁸⁷ In view of this he thinks the apostle was exhorting the women not to go beyond the cultural practice and thus deny proper respect for their husbands' authority.⁸⁸

Hurley, on the other hand, believes that a veil was not the requirement, but instead the wearing of the women's long hair on the top of their head, with the hair given her instead of ἄντὶ a veil.⁸⁹ He gives several lines

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 50. Contra. Hurley, p. 194, who says, "grecian pottery provides abundant information concerning elegant hair styles and an absence of head coverings among the Greeks from a very early period."

⁸⁸Waltke, p. 50; cf. Fritz Zerbst, The Office of Woman in the Church, pp. 36-37.

⁸⁹Hurley, p. 215.

of evidence to support his position. First, Jewish men in the Old Testament and in the society contemporary with Paul wore head coverings against which Paul would have been speaking if 1 Corinthians 11:7 refers to an object of some type. Second, Paul seems to have worn such a covering since he spoke in the synagogues. Third, the practice of women wearing a shawl or some kind of covering is inconsistently practiced, leaving some other explanation to be provided.

Goodenough, in an examination of murals of the Dura synagogue, has shown an extensive blending of Greek and Jewish motifs.⁹¹ A garment often seen in the murals is the himation, a long rectangular mantle which was draped over the person with the ends over the arms. This is apparently the garment referred to by Jesus in Matthew 23:5 when he speaks of broad phylacteries and fringes.⁹² The garment, known as the tallith of the Talmud and modern Judaism, was placed on the head as a sign of reverence.

If the foregoing garment is that to which Paul makes reference in 1 Corinthians 11:4, he is saying that the Jewish custom dishonors God. More than this, he would be in opposition to the elaborate headgear worn by the

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 194-96.

⁹¹Cited from Hurley, p. 194.

⁹²Epiphanius, Panarion, cited from Hurley, p. 195.

priests at the command of God (Exodus 36:35-37).⁹³

I question whether Paul's argument against men covering their heads in 1 Corinthians is in reference to a tallith, or similar object, for then it is difficult to understand his ability to speak in the synagogues during his missionary endeavors. Additionally, this problem would have arisen in each city where Paul won Jewish men to Christ; it would hardly have arisen only after he departed Corinth.⁹⁴

The practice of women in the wearing of veils is not consistent. With friends or in private, women were not required to wear veils. This is true from Assyrian times through the Talmudic period (see Genesis 24:65). The lack of a veil within familiar surroundings may allow for the freedom expressed by the women at Corinth.⁹⁵

Hurley concludes that the covering of the head must refer to a different practice than the wearing of veils. Rather, it refers to the wearing up of the hair on top of the head.⁹⁶

Isaksson also believes the custom is in reference to the looseness of the hair rather than a veil:

In the next verse the Greek phrase ἀκατακάλυπτος τῆ κεφαλῆ corresponds to the Hebrew phrase שׂאֵל פֶּרֶשׁ

⁹³Hurley, p. 195.

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 195-196.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 196.

⁹⁶Ibid.

or מנולל שרר (=having loose hair hanging down). This can be seen from the fact that the LXX uses the same Greek phrase to render this Hebrew expression. Lev. 13.45; the M.T. ופרג ירהי ושרר, the LXX και η κεφαλή αυτού ἀκατάλυτος. Num. 5:18; the M.T. שרר שרר פרר, the LXX και ἀποκαλύψει τὴν κεφαλὴν τῆς γυναικός.⁹⁷

Whatever this custom may have been, a thing which may never be known for certain, several points are clear:

1) The symbol carried a great importance because "the people of Paul's day felt much more keenly than do people of our day that the outward demeanor of a person is an expression of inner life, specifically, of his religious convictions and moral attitude";⁹⁸ 2) the symbol carried the significance in the Christian assembly of conveying the recognition on the part of men and women alike of the submission of woman to man--wife to husband--inaugurated in the creation narratives. When they perform a charismatic activity usually reserved for men, they are to indicate they are still in submission; 3) only prophetesses are in view in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16: no mention is made of women having this requirement when in a passive role at the meeting; 4) the practice is not reflective of a merely local custom since Paul appeals to the practice of all the churches (verse 16);⁹⁹ 5) Paul bases his ex-

⁹⁷Isaksson, p. 166.

⁹⁸Zerbst, p. 40.

⁹⁹There is a debate on the proper translation of this verse. See for further information: James C. G. Greig, "Women's Hats-I Corinthians xi.1-16," Expository Times 69 (1957/58):157; F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians,

hortation on theology rather than personal opinion or cultural necessity, namely, a) women are the glory of men (verse 7); b) men have priority over women because of creation (verses 6-9); c) they are to maintain this authority¹⁰⁰ symbol because of the angels (verse 10); d) Paul's reasoning is substantiated by the evidence of nature (creation) (verse 14).¹⁰¹

Meaning of ἀνὴρ and γυνή

The last area that needs to be considered in the subject of the covering of the head is whether the authority to which the woman is to show submission by the covering of the head is her husband or all the men in the congregation. Does ἀνὴρ and γυνή refer to the husband-wife or man-woman, or both? Isaksson argues that the terms refer

New Century Bible (Greenwood, SC: The Attic Press, 1971), p. 108; Zerbst, p. 44; F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 261.

¹⁰⁰See the following on the meaning of ἐξουσία in verse 10: Morna Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of I Cor 11:10," pp. 410-416; E. E. Kellett, "A Note on 'Power on the Head,'" Expository Times 23 (1911/12):39. See on διὰ τοὺς ἄγγελος: J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Cor. 11:10," New Testament Studies 4 (1957-1958):48-58; W. Foerster, "Zu I Cor. 11:10," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 30 (1931):185-186.

¹⁰¹See the following on Paul's use of φύσις: Paul Jewett, Man as Male and Female (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), p. 84; Greig, p. 157; Noel Weeks, "Of Silence and Head Covering," pp. 21-22. If Weeks is correct in Paul's use of satire, it was so tongue-in-cheek that it probably escaped his original readers, so an impractical argument in total.

to husband and wife. In view of the fact that the wife is called the glory of the man (verse 7b), he cites a Jewish tomb in Rome with a similar description, namely, "ἡ δόξα Σωφρονίου Λουκίλλα εὐλογημένη." In similar terms he says, the wife is the husband's glory (ἰσχύς) in the Old Testament and rabbinical thought.¹⁰² In respect to verses 11-12 he believes that husband and wife are definitely meant. The πλήν should not be understood as an adversative but as a concluding statement. This idea would be expressed thus, "In any case the wife is not separate from her husband (that is, exempt from paying any regard to him) nor is the husband separate from his wife in the Lord."¹⁰³ Furthermore, Isaksson considers verse 12 as an indicator of both husband and wife being important in the process of conception and birth:

Just as woman is dependent on man for her birth, so man is similarly dependent on woman. Just as there is no question in the Church of annulling the relationship between man and wife in marriage, so there is no question of annulling differences in sex. All things come from God, it is true, but the order of marriage is to continue, for man and woman are dependent on each other for their existence.¹⁰⁴

Alexander gives seven reasons why ἀνὴρ and γυνή should be taken as man and woman: (1) Man and woman would be the normal uses of the Greek terms; (2) The word ἀνὴρ

¹⁰²Isaksson, p. 175.

¹⁰³Ibid.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

is the popular term used to translate אָדער in the Septuagint; (3) Verse 3 qualifies ἀνδρός with the adjective "every" which would tend to indicate all men are in view, not just husbands; (4) The anarthrous γυναικός emphasizes the nature of a woman in verse 3. If wife were intended, the article would be more appropriate to specify the wife of the man; (5) Since verses 4-5 use the word "all" when speaking of man and woman praying and prophesying, it would seem that men and women in general are indicated, not just husbands and wives. He adds "What would unmarrieds do when they pray and prophesy?"; (6) The creation is the basis for the regulations in verses 7-11. This would tend to stress men and women in general. Also, since verses 11-12 speak of the mutual interdependence of the man and woman--it would be illogical to consider the husband coming into being through the wife and vice versa--the sense of man and woman seems to be maintained; (7) Verses 13-16 argue from nature and so apparently concern man and woman.¹⁰⁵

Neither of the above positions is totally correct for probably there is some ambiguity in the passage, as James Walther says, "Throughout this passage it is difficult to decide whether ἀνὴρ should be translated "man" or "husband" and even more particularly whether γυνή

¹⁰⁵Alexander, pp. 5-6.

should be translated "woman" or "wife."¹⁰⁶

The text seems to lean toward a general sense of man and woman. If κεφαλή is understood as source rather than ruler, then the sense of ἀνὴρ would be man, in relation to the formation of Eve and Adam (Genesis 2:21-23). This echoes a similar tone to that of H. Conzelmann who says the terms are used in a cosmological sense. The question of marriage is not in view but the nature of man and woman as such.¹⁰⁷ Certainly man rather than husband is intended in verse 4, for prophesying was not restricted to husbands. The use of ἀνὴρ and γυνή in verses 7-10 refers back to creation (Genesis 1 and 2) and like verse 3 refers to their being ontologically rather than economically. The mention of the interdependence of man and woman in procreation suggests strongly that Alexander, rather than Isaksson, has the right idea here. The concept of husband, however, seems implied in verses 4-5 with the shaming of the respective heads, the ones mentioned in verse 3. There seems to be a double entendre or Stichwort intended, as Waltke has said:

But when Paul says that one's head is dishonored, it must be asked whether the word head is to be taken

¹⁰⁶William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, I Corinthians, The Anchor Bible, Vol. 32 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1976), p. 259.

¹⁰⁷M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: The Fortress Press, 1972), p. 184.

literally or metaphorically.' Does one dishonor his anatomical head or his social head? The answer is both. The word head in this context is an intentional double entendre and serves as the Stichwort, the crucial term about which the rest of the argument is constructed.¹⁰⁸

Another answer to this dilemma may be in the remark by Fritz Zerbst:

One may perhaps say, therefore, that every word concerning marriage is at the same time a word concerning the relationships between men and women in general, and vice versa, that every declaration concerning the relationship between the sexes in general is decisive also for marriage. This fact explains the characteristic indefiniteness of 1 Cor. 11, which in one place speaks of men and women in general and in another place of married people in particular.¹⁰⁹

Thus the apostle appears to speak in general terms that may apply to either married or unmarried persons. The essential aspects of males and females remain the same regardless, as do the commands and intentions of God for them. They are equally sexual beings to fulfill the creation mandate to procreate, relational and intelligent beings to dominate the earth with the man providing the leadership, and spiritual beings to worship their Creator.

Paul's Theological Reasons for His Teaching

The apostle says that the woman is morally bound ¹¹⁰ to follow his instruction on covering her head when

¹⁰⁸Bruce K. Waltke, "I Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," p. 51.

¹⁰⁹Zerbst, p. 34.

¹¹⁰Alexander, p. 8.

prophesying, whereas the man is morally obligated not to do so; Paul uses ὀφείλω, implying moral obligation.¹¹⁵ This moral "ought" is reasoned from two primary propositions and one secondary.

First of all, man is the image (εἰκών) and glory (δόξα) of God, while woman is the glory (δόξα) of man. Three main questions must be answered about this statement: (1) What nuance of meaning exists between the words δόξα and εἰκών?; (2) What is the source of Paul's thinking?; (3) Why is woman only mentioned as the glory of the man and not also the image of the man, or why is she not also the image and glory of God?

The word εἰκών essentially means to be "similar" or like.¹¹² To be in the image of someone is to be a representation of that one. On the other hand, δόξα signifies "brightness," "splendor," or "honor."¹¹³ Honor or glory appears to be a primary meaning in the New Testament, reflecting the Septuagint and the underlying Hebrew Old Testament. In this text, honor makes the most sense. Man is God's representation and brings honor to

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Otto Flender, "Image," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, 3 Vols. ed by Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), 2:286-288.

¹¹³Sverre Aalen, "Glory," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, pp. 202-203.

God by fulfilling the purpose intended for him in creation. Likewise, woman brings honor to the man by fulfilling her role of subordination and vice-regency with him. The term δόξα should not be seen as referring to ὁμοίωσιν in Genesis 1:26 since the apostle is not borrowing from that particular verse but from the dominion theme of chapter 1.

A second question to be asked is what is the source of Paul's view? Some have improperly assumed that he is quoting Genesis 1:26. As stated above, they consider δόξα as synonymous to ὁμοίωσις in the Septuagint. There is no warrant for such a supposition. Though Paul did not use the word ὁμοίωσιν here, he was aware of the word group (see Romans 1:23). Its absence signals a different explanation than his use of an alleged synonym. Since Genesis 1:26-28 unquestionably presents man as male and female with each having the image of God ontologically, he could hardly allude to Genesis 1:26 as support for his position stated in verse 7.

In reality, Genesis has not been cited. The discussion in Genesis 1, as it relates to man, is that of ontology, whereas Paul's discussion in 1 Corinthians 11 is primarily man within an economical situation. This proper distinction leads to the reason why man is said to be the image and glory of God, while woman is the glory of man.

James Hurley rightly observes that the passage in

1 Corinthians 11 is concerned with authority relations rather than ontological relations. In view of this, he concludes:

Man, in his authority relation to creation and to woman, images the dominion of God over creation (a central theme of Gen. 1) and the headship of Christ over his church. The woman has a corresponding but different role to play. The woman is not called to image God in the relation which she sustains to her husband; she is rather to show loving obedience (Eph. 5:22). It would be inappropriate to identify her as the image of God in her relation to her husband, although . . . she does rule over creation with him. We must conclude from the context that Paul is not appealing to Gen. 1:26 but to the dominion theme of Gen. 1 and indeed to the whole OT, and that the term "image" is used in a relational rather than an ontological fashion.¹¹⁴

One may see, then, that Paul's use of image as an economic term of man representing God's dominion, rather than a reference to the ontological sense of Genesis 1:26-28, explains why only man is referred to in verse 7 as being the image of God. Such a view of hierarchy is compatible with Paul's view of authority established in creation (compare verses 3, 8-9; 1 Timothy 2:11-13).¹¹⁵

Woman is to be viewed as being the glory of man. The degree to which the man properly exercises the position to which God has assigned him determines his ability to bring glory to God. In like manner, to the degree the woman functions within the liberties and responsibilities

¹¹⁴Hurley, p. 205.

¹¹⁵House, "Contemporary Evangelical Feminism," pp. 52-53.

assigned to her, she brings glory to man.

The need of woman to bring glory to man is attested in Proverbs 11:16, a passage similar to Paul's emphasis: "γυνὴ εὐχάριστος ἐγείρει ἀνδρὶ δόξαν, θρόνος δὲ ἀτιμίας γυνὴ μισοῦσα δίκαια." Annie Jaubert goes further in her assessment by arguing that a man dishonored by a non-glorifying wife is hindered in his worship of God:

Paul pursues a reasoning that he put in motion with the succession of kefalai and which concerns the hierarchy in the worship. If in the thought of Paul it is by Christ that the man renders glory to God (cf II Cor 1:20) and that he must do honor to Christ, one could think similarly that it is by the man that the woman renders glory in the worship and she ought to do honor to him. The woman is referred to the man because, says Paul, it is not the man who comes from the woman, but the woman who comes from the man; moreover the man was not created because of the woman, but the woman because of the man, an evident allusion to Gen 2. One must without doubt deduce from this that for the man to be able to render to God a proper worship, for him to be the glory of God, it is necessary that he be without shame and therefore that the woman do him honor.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶Annie Jaubert, "Le Voile des Femmes (I Cor. xi. 2-16)," New Testament Studies 18 (1971/72):423-424. "Paul poursuit un raisonnement qu'il a amorcé avec la succession des kefalai et qui concerne la hiérarchie dans le culte. Si dans la pensée de Paul c'est par le Christ que l'homme rend gloire à Dieu (cf. II Cor. i. 20) et qu'il doit faire honneur au Christ, on peut penser de même que c'est par l'homme que la femme rend gloire dans le culte et elle doit lui faire honneur. La femme est référée à l'homme parce que, dit Paul, 'ce n'est pas l'homme qui vient de la femme, mais la femme qui vient de l'homme; en effet l'homme n'a pas été créé à cause de la femme, mais la femme à cause de l'homme', allusion évidente à Gen. ii. On doit sans doute en déduire que pour que l'homme puisse rendre à Dieu un culte qui convienne, pour qu'il soit la gloire de Dieu, il faut qu'il soit sans honte et donc que la femme lui fasse honneur."

Paul's reasoning is based on a theology of creation rather than socio-cultural considerations. He first states that woman is from the substance of man and the need of man is the reason for which woman was created (verse 8). This clearly reflects the narrative of Genesis 2. Man's position of authority over woman resides in his priority and thus in his being economically the image of God. The woman is the glory of her husband when she stands in proper relation to him within her created role.

The emphasis of verses 2-9 has been the issue of authority, which the Corinthians apparently had cast aside. Paul found it necessary to correct this error by demonstrating the need for these Christians to maintain the order of creation even though they were equal in Christ (Galatians 2:26-28). As Jaubert says, "Paul argues from an order of the creation, but of a creation reassumed by Christ."¹¹⁷

Lest the role of women in the New Order be obscured, the apostle begins a transition in verse 10: "For this reason, and because of the angels, the woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head" (New International Version). This rendering most likely portrays the sense of the verse. It takes the $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ as a concatenation,

¹¹⁷Ibid., 419. "Paul argumente à partir d'un ordre de la création, mais d'une création réassumée par le Christ."; Contra. Krister Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 29-30.

referring both to verses 7-9 as well as the following statement.¹¹⁸

Women, because of the angels, are to have authority on their heads. Exactly who the angels are and what authority the women have is the next subject of investigation.

Several views have been proffered as to the identification of the angels in verse 10. Rather than present an exhaustive discussion of each one,¹¹⁹ the two most widely held views will be mentioned, with appropriate response, then the writers' positions will be given.

Several¹²⁰ support the view that διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους pertains to evil angels who would attack women whose heads were not covered. This position often is bolstered by a reference to Jewish speculation about the sons of God in Genesis 6:2. However, such speculation is foreign to the New Testament where believers are freed from the power of Satan and his angels. Only obedient angels are purviewed as being at the worship of the saints (Hebrews 12:22; Revelation 5:11). As well, Fitzmyer says,

Against this option we may point out that the weak-

¹¹⁸See the discussion in Blass, p. 151, para. 290.

¹¹⁹See the following articles for interesting but unconvincing alternatives: W. D. Morris, "I Corinthians xi.10," Expository Times 39 (1927/28:139; Kellett, p. 39; P. Rose, "Power on the Head," Expository Times 23 (1911/12):183-4.

¹²⁰Hurley, p. 34; Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," p. 54.

ness of woman is a notion that the interpreters have introduced. Paul speaks of woman's subordination to man; he says nothing of her weakness. Hence woman's need of an added protection introduces into the context argumentation.¹²¹

A more acceptable view is that the angels are good angels who observe the decorum and worship of the saints. Alexander says, "It seems that one must conclude that these are good angels who view Christian decorum and testimony (1 Corinthians 4:9; 1 Timothy 5:21; Ephesians 3:10)."¹²² James Moffatt¹²³ perceives Paul as reflecting on the mid-rash on Genesis 1:26-28 which made angels guardians of creation. Also, he mentions them as assisting at public worship. Fitzmyer¹²⁴ sees support for this latter function of angels in Psalm 137:1 (138:1), "έναντίον ἀγγέλλων ψαλῶ σοι" (Septuagint), and Revelation 8:3 where an angel assists prayers.¹²⁵ Furthermore, evidence from Qumran indicates the belief in angels as present at sacred gatherings. In column 7 of the War Scroll ceremonial cleanness was expected of those who were to go to war because of the accompaniment of angels (I QM vii. 4-6). Also the so-called Rule

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Alexander, p. 9.

¹²³James Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947), p. 152, cited from Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," p. 55.

¹²⁴Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," p. 55.

¹²⁵Ibid.

of the Congregation excludes those with physical uncleanness from the congregational meetings because of the presence of angels (I Q Sa ii. 3-11).¹²⁶

Fitzmyer also notes the requirement of ceremonial cleanness for the priests in the service of the Temple.¹²⁷ He concludes, "We are invited by the evidence from Qumran to understand that the unveiled head of a woman is like a bodily defect which should be excluded from such an assembly, 'because holy angels are present in their congregation.'"¹²⁸

The preceding position has much to commend, but one must assume Paul's agreement with certain Jewish interpretations of the Old Testament and the views of Qumran to accept it. A more natural interpretation is to view the phrase $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in light of the occurrences of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in 1 Corinthians. Paul uses the term four times, more than in any other letter and "in each issues are raised which tie the angels in with the central problems of Corinth."¹²⁹

¹²⁶Ibid., pp. 55-56.

¹²⁷Ibid., p. 56; A similar example is recounted by Jaubert concerning the sparing of On, son of Peleth, whose wife got him drunk, then took down her hair so that any coming to look for On, upon seeing her undone hair would turn aside. The display of her undone hair is related to the fact that the congregation was holy. Jaubert, p. 426.

¹²⁸Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," p. 57.

¹²⁹Hurley, p. 209.

A brief investigation follows concerning each of the mentions of angels in 1 Corinthians. In contrast to the Corinthians who considered themselves to have "arrived" as Christians (apparently an overrealized eschatology), Paul says believers are in a cosmic θέατρον (4:9) before angels. The present place is suffering, not exaltation and reigning. In 6:1-3 he chides them for going to court against other believers and reminds them that they were going to judge angels, a fact of which they were aware.¹³⁰ First Corinthians 13:1 speaks of the languages of angels. The Corinthians thought themselves as having become as the angels (Matthew 22:30). This may answer why some desired celibate lives. In 1 Corinthians 11:10, the apostle desires to win the women to obedience because of the high place they occupy. When they let down their hair, seeking an authority not given to them in creation, it was a sign of rebellion and disgrace. When they put their hair up, it served as a sign of her high position or authority above the angels.

Since the movement of Paul's argument up to verse 10 is the subordination of women, many have taken ἐξουσία as passive. The ἐξουσία then, would be a sign of her husband's authority. Morna Hooker is accurate when she responds that ἐξουσία is being given a very strange meaning,

¹³⁰Ibid., pp. 209-10.

since the headcovering is not understood as a symbol of authority but, quite the reverse, as a symbol of subjection.¹³¹ A major problem would be the passive use of a word used normally as an active, as Jaubert asserts, "Moreover the philological difficulty is enormous, since the expression echein exousian in Greek never has the passive sense (undergo a domination) but always the active sense: possess a power."¹³² In similar tone, notice the famous retort of Ramsay on this view, ". . . a preposterous idea which a Greek scholar would laugh at anywhere except in the New Testament, where (as they seem to think) Greek words may mean anything that commentators choose."¹³³

Another view articulated by some is that the ἐξουσία refers to a magical power the veiled woman had against the attacks of evil spirits.¹³⁴ Though this interpretation maintains the active sense of ἐξουσία, it has little else in its favor. That evil angels are the ἄγγελοι of the pas-

¹³¹Hooker, p. 413.

¹³²Jaubert, p. 428. "D'autre part la difficulté philologique est énorme, puisque jamais l'expression echein exousian in grec n'a le sens passif (subir une domination) mais toujours le sens actif: posséder un pouvoir."

¹³³Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," p. 51.

¹³⁴O. Everling, Die paulinische Angelologie und Damonologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1888), p. 37; R. Reitzenstein, Poimandres (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904), p. 230, n. 1, cited from Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology," p. 52.

sage has already been discounted in the pertinent discussion previously. Moreover, no evidence exists that shows a veil, or another type of covering, had such magical power in the minds of the people in the days of Paul.

Gerhard Kittel proposed that ἐξουσία was related to the Aramaic word sltwnyh, from slt, meaning "to have power, dominion over."¹³⁵ Substantiating this view is the ancient variant reading in 1 Corinthians 11:10, where instead of ἐξουσία there is κάλυμμα. Jerome's use of valamen gives additional strength. Though this view is ingenious, "Paul would surely not have made his argument depend upon a pun which was incomprehensible to his Greek readers."¹³⁶

The most probable meaning of ἐξουσία is that it is a sign of the woman's authority. She has a right to function prophetically in the New Age when she puts up her hair; this must not be seen as a unilateral right: she operates as a vice-regent with man in the world and in the Church:

. . . the woman's hair marks her as a woman, part of mankind and over the angels. It marks her as a woman who is obedient to God and to his ordering of creation rather than as a rebel against it. As a rebel, she would stand to be judged rather than as judge. That Paul's word is surprising in this context which has previously stressed subordination is no doubt to be interpreted as part of his design. It calls attention to his point that this sign which they interpreted as one of abject subjection is in fact one of great

¹³⁵Ibid.; Hooker, p. 413.

¹³⁶Hooker, p. 413.

authority. Her hair is indeed glory to her (v. 13).¹³⁷

That this is the best explanation is attested by several ideas: (1) It retains the full force of the active sense of ἐξουσία; (2) It fits the transitional movement of Paul at this juncture of his presentation in which he hopes to show the equality of man and woman in the midst of the discussion on subordination; (3) Paul is very carefully arguing so as to win over the women's obedience showing them their high place in the Old and New Creation.

The apostle in verse 10, as indicated earlier, sought to build a bridge between the subordination of the woman to the man, and to demonstrate the interdependence of the two. He uses the word πλήν which clearly signals a limitation to the previous argument.¹³⁸ Why Paul now changes direction has had different answers. According to Jewett, Paul realizes the strong subordination he has been teaching is incompatible with the gospel expounded in Galatians 3:28: "Here we have what may be the first expression of an uneasy conscience on the part of a Christian theologian who argues for the subordination of the female to the male."¹³⁹

¹³⁷Hurley, p. 212.

¹³⁸Blass, p. 234, para. 449.

¹³⁹Jewett, "Doctrine of Man," p. 99 cited from Scanzoni, p. 28; See also House, "Contemporary Evangelical Feminism," pp. 43-45.

A better solution is that the apostle desires to put in proper perspective the economic and ontological relationships of man. Alexander correctly says,

Paul wants the men to understand clearly that though the woman is to be subordinate, she is not inferior. They should not overpress the arguments of vv. 3-10 to the exclusion of women's equality. Both man and woman are mutually interdependent upon one another for the continuing process of procreation. After the initial creation, man now comes through the woman, though the source of the woman was the man. Most important of all is that they not become proud of their roles, but remember that all things find their ultimate source in God. There is not place for 'lording it' over the woman in this context.¹⁴⁰

So then, though in God's design woman is created for man, the woman and man are ontologically equal and interdependent through God's design in procreation.

As has been amply seen, Paul based his view of economic relationships between man and woman upon theological considerations. This is no less true in verses 13-14 regarding his argument from nature. He is not appealing to social custom¹⁴¹ but to creation, a theme that has permeated the section. (This use of $\phi\acute{o}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is in agreement with its usage in Romans 1:26; 2:14, 27). How this is so, he does not say; but he clearly expects his readers to understand and to concur with his judgment. That this verse and those that follow are a retreat by the apostle because he views his position as weak¹⁴² is indefensible. He has

¹⁴⁰Alexander, p. 9.

¹⁴¹Scanzoni, p. 67.

¹⁴²Jewett, Man as Male and Female, p. 113.

plainly established his thinking and assumes the evidence is clear enough in the created order for them to agree readily with him.

The Practice of the Churches

Paul's conclusion in verse 16 presupposes his pointed question in verse 13. In answer to his question, "Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?" One must answer a resounding certainly not!, that is, if one is to make any sense of Paul's whole discussion. To those who still remain contentious, intransigent, and unconvinced, the apostle appeals to the universal practice of the congregations of God. The church at Corinth must not raise its head above the accepted tradition of all of God's people elsewhere in rejecting the apostle's mandate. No other church has women who prophesy uncovered and neither should such occur in their assembly.

Summary

I have sought to demonstrate in this chapter that this Corinthian pericope is a genuine Pauline text, contrary to some feminists, intended by Paul to correct excesses in the Corinthian assembly. Although Walker and some others prefer for the pericope to be non-Pauline since it leaves him, in their eyes, as a chauvinist, no external or

serious internal data disqualifies it.

The women at Corinth, apparently due to an overrealized eschatology and the pitting of the new order in Christ over against the old creation order, were functioning prophetically without indicating a position of subordination to the men and husbands of the church. The apostle endeavored to teach them that the Creator's originally intended respective economic positions for male and female are not to be circumvented. Paul established this argument upon his understanding of Genesis 2. Many feminists believe that Paul has erred in his use of Genesis for the subordination of women, because they believe this is in conflict with Genesis 1. My analysis demonstrates that the two passages do not conflict, but rather are complementary. Thus, the apostle properly used the passages on the priority of man to woman, and her derivation from him, by using the second creation narrative.

To minimize the headship of man over woman, a popular interpretation of the Greek word for "head" is that it refers to man being the source of the woman but not an authority over her. We have seen that this attempt to alleviate the headship of man over woman has no basis whatever in Greek lexicography or in the context of the New Testament.

A woman who has prophetic inspiration may function in the same role as a male prophet in public worship. How-

ever, at the same time, she must wear a symbol of submission to the males in the congregation in the area of public worship, which symbol becomes her authority and without which she disgraces her own head and that of her husband. In the functions of the spiritual gifts woman is equal with man but in the order of creation she is subordinate. Feminists usually have considered this passage to be culture bound so that the covering of the head and the subordination it showed are no longer relevant for us today. Although it is doubtful that women must use the social expression of covering of the head, the social structure established at creation and commanded by Paul, that is the subordination of women in public worship, is still in force. Some have reinterpreted prophecy to mean preaching so that women can preach in church today as long as she does not "usurp" the place of men in the congregation. We have seen that the nature of prophecy is inspired and revelatory, and it is for this reason that women could prophesy: they were not exercising their own authority.

Lastly, we saw that Paul built his arguments on Scripture, and the practice he had established at other congregations, not upon culture or other considerations adduced by feminists.

CHAPTER IV

THE SPEAKING OF WOMEN AND THE PROHIBITION OF THE LAW--1 CORINTHIANS 14:33B-35

Paul begins 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 with a reference to the universal practice of the Christian Church regarding the proper function of women in the local meeting of Christians.¹ The church agrees on these points: Women are to

¹There is dispute on the paragraphing. B. F. Westcott and F. Hort (The New Testament in the Original Greek [New York, NY: American Book Co., 1881], p. 397) concur with the Textus Receptus (The New Testament According to the Received Text [London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1962], p. 256) in ending the sentence with $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$, whereas the United Bible Societies text (The Greek New Testament, Kurt Aland, et al, eds. [New York; London: United Bible Societies, 1966], p. 611) and the text edited by Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland (Novum Testamentum Graece [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979], p. 466) begin a new paragraph with $\omega\varsigma$. There is awkwardness in the repetition of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ but Jean Héring (The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians [London: The Epworth Press, 1962], p. 154), Hans Conzelmann (1 Corinthians, Hermeneia Series [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], p. 246), and F. F. Bruce (1 and 2 Corinthians, New Century Bible [Greenwood, SC: The Attic Press, 1971], p. 136) avoid this problem (rightly) by taking the first usage to be a reference to the people of God and the latter to the local meeting. The mention of universal practice of the churches makes considerably more sense in reference to verses 34-35 than it does to the peace of God in verse 33a. Contra. F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 341; William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, 1 Corinthians, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1976), pp. 311-312.

be silent (σιγάτωσαν) at church meetings, are not to speak (λαλεῖν), and are to submit themselves (ὑποταστέσθωσαν).

Nature of Paul's Instruction

Paul's two reasonings--the practice of the church and the Law--demonstrate he is not expressing personal opinion as in 1. Corinthians 7. Instead, he appeals to guides that should convince the Corinthians to follow his directions. The words ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἀγίων have a close logical arrangement² with verse 36, "or did the word of God come from you, or did it come to you only? F. Bruce comments,

Some regard must be had to church practice elsewhere (cf. 11.16; 14.33b), including places which were evangelized before Corinth. Besides, there may be an implication that, in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa. 2.3//Mic. 4.2, it is from Jerusalem (as in Rom. 15.19) that the word goes forth.³

The Corinthians are not to be prideful in their interpretation and application of Christian truth to suppose they may operate in conflict with the rest of the Christian world. Paul desires all Christians to conform to certain Christian practices (1 Cor. 11:16; 14:33b, 36; 1 Tim. 2:8). To think that the prohibitions that Paul gives only apply to the Corinthians and their improprieties is out of harmony

²F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, trans. A. Cusin (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1890), p. 309.

³F. F. Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 136.

with Paul's appeal that they are to conform to the rest of the Christian church. As well, the idea that today one may frivolously go against the last two thousand years of Christian teaching on the subject of women, because of the current Zeitgeist may be tantamount to the same attitude found in the Corinthians.

So, these injunctions from the apostle are not merely a personal whim of his or of the church, neither are they based upon custom; instead Paul says they are in agreement with the Scriptures (καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει).

Identity of the "Law"

What exactly is the Law to which Paul refers? Several (C. K. Barrett, Heinrich Meyer, William Orr, and F. Godet)⁴ consider this a reference to Genesis 3:16. Bruce discounts this view: "This is unlikely, since in Mt and LXX Gen. 3:16 speaks of the woman's instinctive inclination or passionate desire (Hebrew t^esugah, Gk apostrophe) towards her husband, of which he takes advantage so as to dominate her."⁵ However, Bruce may have the wrong understanding of

⁴C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Harpers' New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 330; Orr and Walther, p. 312; Godet, p. 308; Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 1884), p. 333.

⁵F. F. Bruce, p. 136. Contra Susan Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire," Westminster Theological Journal 37 (Spring 1975):377-378.

the woman's desire in Genesis 3:16. The desire may not be that of passion but a desire for dominion over man.

Likewise, Stephan Clark disagrees with Genesis 3:16 as the basis of authority for 1 Corinthians 14:34, because it "would be the only place in the New Testament where the 'curses' of the Fall were appealed to as a basis for Christian conduct, direction, or teaching."⁶

Bruce offers his own view that the reference in 1 Corinthians 14:34 is to the creation narratives of Genesis 1 and 2.⁷

This position has the advantage of a previous use of Genesis 2 by Paul in 11:3-5. In this passage, however, the apostle gives specific information tying his argument to Genesis 2, whereas, 14:34 speaks in general terms about female subordination.

Probably Lenski's view is best because Paul is using the entire teaching of the Torah as the basis of his position on female subordination, with the creation narratives providing the divinely ordained starting point.⁸

⁶Stephan B. Clark, Man and Woman in Christ (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980), p. XXX.

⁷Bruce, p. 136.

⁸See R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937), p. 616. Schlatter sees the reference possibly to Miriam's punishment in her rejection of Moses' authority. Adolf Schlatter, Paulus der Bote Jesu (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934), p. 388.

Regardless of the way one views the Old Testament foundation on which Paul forms his argument, one point is clear and must be emphasized. Paul is not unconsciously parroting Jewish tradition. He perceives his teaching (οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ ὑποτασσέσθωσαν) as Christian teaching, though backed by the Law. In verse 37, he says that all the things he has written are a command of the Lord. Whether one should see this as a reference to all of chapter 14 or only to verses 33b-37⁹ is difficult to determine, but either way, the command includes the teaching on women.

Women¹⁰ are commanded to be silent. This silence is not intended to inhibit their learning of Christian truth since they may learn¹¹ from their husbands at home (verse 35). Rather they are not to be vocal in the assembly, to

⁹S. Clark (p. 188) says, "It seems unlikely that the Lord would instruct his disciples about order in assemblies containing prophecy and tongues-speaking."

¹⁰One probably should understand the women in the Scripture at hand as married women (though the teaching almost certainly applies to the unmarried as well) since verse 35 says for them to inquire of their own husbands (τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας) at home.

¹¹James B. Hurley, "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women: A Consideration of I Cor. 11:2-16 and I Cor. 14:33b-36," Westminster Theological Journal 35 (1973):pp. 217-218: "His aim in v. 35 is not to prevent learning but rather to prevent a wrong exercise of authority." Lest the Corinthians move to the extreme of believing learning is forbidden women or because they initiated the contention in their letter, Paul says they may learn from their husbands at home.

be otherwise would be unsubmitive. Since this passage prohibits women from speaking in the church, on the surface this apostolic dictum appears contrary to the teaching in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 where women are allowed to pray and prophesy.

Arguments on the Silence of Women

Several explanations have been offered to alleviate the apparent discrepancy between 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and 14:33b-35 and to define the nature of speaking in the latter passage.

Interpolation of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35

Many critics (Johannes Weiss, Hans Conzelmann, C. K. Barrett, Robert Jewett) alleviate the apparent contradiction between 1 Corinthians 11:5-7 and 14:33b-35 by dismissing the latter passage as an interpolation, either by the pseudonymous author of the Pastorals or by one influenced by the 1 Timothy 2 passage. Conzelmann presents the standard argument:

This self-contained section upsets the context: it interrupts the theme of prophecy and spoils the flow of thought. In content, it is in contradiction to 11:2ff, where the active participation of women in the church is presupposed. This contradiction remains even when chaps. 11 and 14 are assigned to different letters. Moreover, there are peculiarities of linguistic usage, and of thought. And finally, v 37 does not line up with v 36, but with v 33a. The section is accordingly to be regarded as an interpolation. Verse 36, which is hardly very clear, is meant to underline the 'ecumenical' validity of the interpolation. In this regulation we have a reflection of the bourgeois consolidation of the

church, roughly on the level of the Pastoral Epistles: it binds itself to the general custom.¹²

Weiss, in concert, says that the passive ἐπιτρέπεται "points back to an already valid regulation, such as we find in 1 Timothy 2:12.¹³ Similarly, Barrett presents what he considers to be the most likely situation with 1 Corinthians 14:33-35:

Paul did not write verses 34f. They were added later as a marginal note (there is little to be said for the view that they were Paul's own marginal addition), at a time when good order was thought more important than the freedom of the Spirit. There is much to be said for this view, especially since the language of these verses can be explained as based upon 1 Tim. ii.11f., but the textual evidence is not quite strong enough to make it compelling.¹⁴

Robert Jewett sees 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 as being only one part of considerable redactional work done by a later Pauline school on 1 Corinthians, reflecting their concerns at that time.¹⁵

¹²Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 246; cf. Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), p. 342.

¹³Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, p. 342.

¹⁴C. K. Barrett, p. 332; Robert Jewett sees 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 as being only one part of considerable redactional work done by a later Pauline school on 1 Corinthians, reflecting their concerns at that time. Robert Jewett, "The Redaction of 1 Corinthians and the Trajectory of the Pauline School," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Supplement 44 (December 1978):371.

¹⁵Robert Jewett, "The Redaction of 1 Corinthians," p. 571.

These arguments may be divided into four classes:

1. The misplacement of verses 44 and 45 after verse 40 in some manuscripts.
2. The verses are unnecessary in the context: verse 36 easily joins with verse 33b.
3. 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 conflict with Paul's teaching on women speaking in 1 Corinthians 11:5 and 13.
4. 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 is dependent upon 1 Timothy 2:11-12, or at least upon the concerns of a Pauline school reflecting the opposition of women speaking.

The first two arguments are interrelated. Because some considered them awkward probably gave rise to the textual problems of the text. First, the textual problem of the verses 34-35 will be evaluated, then the issue of awkwardness will be pursued.

When Barrett says "the textual evidence is not quite strong enough," he does a disservice to the evidence. First Corinthians 14:34-35 are only found after verse 40 in D, G, and several Latin manuscripts, and also in Ambrosiaster. These witnesses are not substantial in view of the verses' attestation in the rest of the ancient texts representing the Eastern and Alexandrian church centers, which in addition are in Greek; no manuscripts, that I could discover, omit them altogether. The reading and position is very ancient. Even Zuntz, who apparently rejects their authenticity, says that the Western position is "an unsuccessful attempt at removing the hitch," which "witnesses to the

early existence of the insertion."¹⁶ Actually this "hitch" gives the traditional reading greater credibility, as does also the fact that the Western family includes the verses even though they are transposed. Neil Lightfoot says,

Yet in textual criticism the easier reading is generally not the preferred one: and further, the external evidence (the vast majority of manuscripts) is against this transposition. There is no reason (contrary to Barrett and Scroggs) to think these verses are a later addition to the text. All the MSS have these verses. Such radical surgery on the text in order to obviate an exegetical difficulty is altogether unwarranted. It is far better to accept the text as it stands in the mass of MSS and to seek to understand it in its present location.¹⁷

That the verses are inappropriate to the context or flow of the passage is questionable. In reality the verses do not necessarily interrupt the movement of the passage. They speak further to the problem of proper order in the church meeting, as Jean Héring elucidates:

. . . the Apostle has just restated the principle of decorum, which must be observed in Church gatherings (14:33a). So it is quite natural that he should go a step farther and reduce to silence the women who, contrary to Jewish and Greek custom, wished to take part in discussions.¹⁸

Further argument on the meaning of the passage will

¹⁶Cited by Bruce, p. 135.

¹⁷Neil Lightfoot, "The Role of Women in Religious Services," Restoration Quarterly 19 (1976):131-132. See Hurley, p. 216 on this.

¹⁸Héring, p. 154.

demonstrate their contribution to the development of Paul's argument.

The last two criticisms may be eliminated by a proper understanding of the text: subsequent discussion of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 will show that there is only an apparent discrepancy with 11:5 and 13, and that the verses reflect the apostle's hand, not some later redactor(s).

Barrett's claim that the words arose in a time when good order was more important than freedom of the Spirit apparently refers to sometime later than Paul. However, the concern for this kind of order and unity is found throughout 14:26-40. One would have to discount the entire section. In reality, verses 35-36 fit quite well into the theme of the section.

Argument for a Private Setting

Another method of alleviating the supposed conflict is to view 14:33-34 in a church setting and 11:2-16 in a private setting. F. W. Grosheide has argued that the prophesying of women in 1 Corinthians 11 is outside the church meeting and 1 Corinthians 14 is within a church meeting.¹⁹ He says that although the praying and proph-

¹⁹Grosheide, pp. 341-342.

esying of 1 Corinthians 11 is undoubtedly public, there is no indication that they occur in the official services of the church, whereas 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 clearly is.

Gordon Clark is even stronger. He argues that since 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 does not say "in the church" and 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 explicitly does so, there is really no contradiction between the passages. One should not insert "in the church" in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16; a small informal gathering is in view. The enjoining to silence for women in the church excludes ordination. A woman could pray and prophesy on occasions other than a regular church service as was done by Agabus in Acts 21:9-11 (and maybe Acts 11:28). "What Agabus did hardly fits into a worship service; and exegesis cannot deny that Philip's daughters prophesied, like Agabus, when no church service was in progress."²⁰

Concurring also is Ralph Alexander, who argues against public worship in 1 Corinthians 11 from a contextual consideration, "On the contrary, verses 2-16 appear to be an outgrowth of the previous discussion on Christian freedom and not related to the aspect of church worship."²¹

²⁰Gordon Clark, "The Ordination of Women," The Trinity Review, 17 (January/February 1981):3-4.

²¹Ralph Alexander, "An Exegetical presentation on I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Timothy 2:8-15," a paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November 1976, p. 4.

The view of Grosheide, Clark, and Alexander has considerable difficulty. Though verses 2-16 assuredly are an outgrowth of Paul's theme on abusing freedom in Christ as Alexander has maintained, this is most likely also true of verses 17-34, as well as much of the other portions of 1 Corinthians. Moreover, the use of ἐπαινῶ in verse 2 and οὐκ ἐπαινῶ in verse 17 tie together these two pericopae structurally. They serve as a unit even as chapter 10 does. Contrary to Grosheide, the question of praying and prophesying is more naturally seen within a public worship setting. As well, the instruction is related directly to the need to conform to the practices of the other Christian congregations, so certainly an issue of public worship.

The Meaning of λαλέω

The meaning of λαλέω has served as a point of contention in the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35. The prohibited speaking is viewed by exegetes as inspired speaking (prophecy or tongues), disruptive talk (gossiping or asking questions during worship), attempting to take the male role in church on the part of feminists, judging the prophets, and all non-inspired public speaking, the position to which I hold.

Inspired Speaking

Some would view the public speaking to be inspired speaking. Joseph Dillow says that women are not permitted

to exercise the gift of tongues in church and continues that a majority of tongues speakers today are women in violation of the passage.²² Frederick Bruner says that verses 33b-38 concern specifically the "glosso-lalic" participation of women in the congregational meetings. This is in contrast to the more intelligible contributions of 1 Corinthians 11:5.²³

It is true that verses 34-36 follow a lengthy presentation on speaking in tongues, but it is incorrect to assume the λαλεῖν must be restricted to that phenomenon. The more immediate context is self-control and judging prophets. However, the meaning of the prohibition must be broader since it stems from the teaching of the Law regarding women. Paul allowed inspired utterance if done under prescribed guidelines (11:2-16), so surely he would do so here if under the guidelines for tongues prescribed in this passage.²⁴ The Law required women not to occupy authority over men, which inspired utterance was not,²⁵ so

²²Joseph Dillow, Speaking in Tongues: Seven Crucial Questions (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975), p. 170. Orr also considers this probable. Orr and Walther, p. 313.

²³Frederick Dale Bruner, A Theology of the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, Publisher, 1970), p. 301.

²⁴H. Wayne House, "Tongues and the Mystery Religions of Corinth," Bibliotheca Sacra 140 (April-June 1983):134-50.

²⁵Héring, p. 154; Hurley, (p. 217) says, "It is clear from chapter 11 that Paul did not understand charismatic

the prohibition must curb a non-inspired usurpation by women.

Disruptive Speaking

Boyce Blackwelder views the speaking as disruptive questioning of husbands by their wives. He adduces several arguments for this. First, Paul uses λαλέω rather than λέγω the former meaning merely to utter sounds. Second, Paul uses the present infinitive λαλεῖν, signifying continuous action. They are not permitted to continue "la-la-ing." Third, the antithetical prohibition not to ask husbands in church carries with it the permission to ask at home. Lastly, the situation in the church calls forth the injunction.

Why such an exhortation? Because the women were disturbing the church service by asking questions of their husbands during the preaching. In those days education, as always among heathen peoples, was the privilege of the men. As an audience listened with rapt attention to the wonderful gospel, the men with their learning had little difficulty grasping the message. Not so with the women. Hence their questions produced an undertone of noise which was confusing to an audience. No wonder Paul corrected them. So we see that the Apostle is not dealing with the subject of women preaching, but with discipline. He is simply correcting disorder.²⁶

Lenski concurs with this interpretation and contin-

prayer or prophecy from women as violations of this order, as these involve no direct authority on the part of the speaker."

²⁶Boyce W. Blackwelder, Light from the Greek New Testament (Anderson, IN: The Warner Press, 1958), p. 56.

ues: "The fact that the asking of questions in the open assembly is practically equivalent to speaking publicly before the congregation . . . Paul supports the order that women should ask at home."²⁷

The perspective that λαλεῖν is chatter or asking questions has the strength of a probable historical view of the setting of church meetings. It is likely that women and men were separated in worship in a similar manner to the synagogue.²⁸ The view, however, does not accord with the apostle's development from the Law and so probably is too narrow an interpretation of the prohibition. Paul's rule does not seem to be directed at particular disruptions in the Corinthian assembly. Women are to be silent, he says, because they are women, not because they are disorderly. Such practice of speaking is contrary to the practice of the churches (14:33b) and is contrary to the Law of God which commands female subordination. Stephan Clark makes this clear:

Paul instructs the women to be silent because they are women, not because they are disorderly. First, the passage offers no hint that the women are causing any

²⁷Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, p. 618. Cf. also Hering, p. 154; Meyer, p. 334.

²⁸N. J. Hommes, "Let Women Be Silent in Church," Calvin Theological Journal 4 (April 1969):7-16; Hurley, pp. 217-218.

disorder other than the disorder that occurs simply from the fact that they are 'speaking' and they are women. Secondly, Paul says that the rule he is applying is the same rule followed by all the churches of the saints and is not a directive given to straighten out a particular difficulty found among the Corinthians. Third, Paul says clearly that it is shameful for a woman to speak in a disorderly way. Her 'speaking' is the shameful action. Finally, if disorder were the issue, men as well as women should have been instructed to keep silent and to be subordinate to the order of the assembly.²⁹

So what should not be overlooked is that the speaking is not forbidden because of outside factors; rather, they are not to speak in order to be subordinate, as the Law says. If they violate this teaching of the Law, it annuls the Law which commands subordination;³⁰ and this is a reason for shame (αἰσχρὸν, verse 35). All of Paul's teaching here is consistent with the teaching of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, where women are commanded not to exercise authority over men.

Moreover, the mention of λαλεῖν as a reference to disruptive chatter does not agree with the meaning of the term in the New Testament. Λαλεῖν is used of chatter in Classical times but was synonymous with λέγω in the period of the New Testament.³¹

²⁹S. Clark, pp. 185-186.

³⁰See Fritz Zerbst, The Office of Woman in the Church, trans. Albert G. Merckens (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), pp. 48-49 for a discussion on "shameful."

³¹Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New

On the surface, one might think the meaning of λαλεῖν is determined by the direction to ask husbands at home, in view of the logical converse not to ask them in church. However, other factors need to be considered. Bruce says, "It is doubtful, however, whether such expressions as they are not permitted to speak and it is shameful for a woman to speak in church can be understood to mean no more than this."³² Verse 35 is probably not included to define λαλεῖν exactly, but to counter a possible objection.³³ Godet comments on this:

The particle εἰ δέ, and moreover if, which begins ver. 35, introduces, not a simple explanation, but a gradation: 'And even if they would learn something, they ought to abstain from asking in the congregation; they should reserve their questions to be submitted to their husbands in private.' The form εἰ δέ, and if, is therefore founded on the fact that questioning was the case of least gravity, the one which seemed most naturally to admit of exception. But this very exception Paul rejects; for he knows how easily, under pretext of putting questions, women could elude the prohibition which forbade their public speaking.³⁴

Feminist Group

Related to the previous suggestion is that the speaking is aimed at a specific group of women within the Corinthian church who, because of their liberated status in Christ, now sought to exert authority over their husbands

Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 464.

³²Bruce, pp. 135-36. ³³Hurley, pp. 217-218.

³⁴Godet, pp. 312-313.

in the meetings of the church by contradicting them.

The intent of the command, then, is to interdict situations in which wives publicly contradict what their husbands say or think or embarrass them by an interchange of conversation. They may thus be rejecting the authority of their husbands (which was firmly fixed in the sociology of their religion) and thereby be no longer subordinate.³⁵

Barrett seeks to present the setting to which Paul addresses his alleged anti-feminist remarks:

Paul had been informed of feminist pressure (possibly of feminine chatter) which was contributing seriously to the disorder of the Christian assembly in Corinth, and took energetic measures to stamp it out. He cannot have disapproved on principle of contributions made by women to Christian worship and discussion or he would not have allowed xi.5 to stand in his epistle, but in the interests of peace and good order he could command the women to be silent, precisely as he could give orders for a male prophet to be silent if his continued speech was likely to prove unedifying (verse 30). Sevenster (Seneca, p. 198) may be right in saying that 'Paul is probably alluding in the first place to a passion for discussion which could give rise to heated argument between a wife and husband.'³⁶

The suggestion that Paul was specifically dealing with a feminist group at Corinth is a tenable postulation. But that his admonitions are thus localized does not follow. He presents the need for the Corinthians to conform to the other churches in this practice (14:34b).³⁷ The prohibition against speaking (ἐπιτρέπεται and ὑποτασσέσ-

³⁵Godet, p. 313.

³⁶Barrett, p. 332.

³⁷Grosheide, p. 342; contra John Calvin, (The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, Calvin's Commentaries [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960], pp. 306-307) who says that the prohibition should probably not be enforced in well-organized churches.

θωσαν) reveals an established practice.³⁸ His mention of the Law discloses the theological dimension of his command; his teaching is not merely to curb a current sociological crisis.

Judging the Prophets

A variation of the "asking questions" position is posited by Seeberg. He takes λαλεῖν as "critical discussion of passages from the prophets. . . . Questions asked for the purpose of achieving deeper comprehension and of obtaining additional elucidation and confirmation of things heard."³⁹

This approach is also proffered by James Hurley. He says that since Paul commanded the prophets to evaluate their messages to make sure no false doctrine was present, and women were enlisted among the prophets, then a problem of subordination to men arose.

It is clear from chapter 11 that Paul did not understand charismatic prayer or prophecy from women as violations of this order, as these involve no direct authority on the part of the speaker. It would, however, be a violation were women to sit in judgment over men. If we envisage a question period after the prophecies in which the congregation explored and evaluated

³⁸Weiss: "The passive points back to an already valid regulation, such as we find in 1 Tim 2:12." Cited by Conzelmann, p. 246; Walther says, "The linear jussive suggests that this is the expected condition rather than that Paul is proposing any radical regulation." Orr and Walther, p. 312.

³⁹R. Seeberg, Über das Reden der Frauen in den apostolischen Gemeinden, cited by Zerbst, p. 46.

the messages of the prophets, we have a setting adequate to explain Paul's injunction.⁴⁰

The view of R. Seeberg and Hurley has much to commend it. Certainly the context allows for the speaking to be evaluating prophetic utterances. Seemingly after the prophets spoke, other prophets would judge the utterance. If this position is correct, then women were disallowed this opportunity for this would put them over the male prophets. Lightfoot says,

This interpretation . . . deserves consideration. But it is doubtful if this provides the solution to the problem. In 1 Corinthians 12, Paul differentiates the gift of prophecy and the gift of distinguishing spirits, although, of course, it might be possible for one person to have both gifts. Still, Paul seems to be forbidding the speaking of women in general in the assembly: they are not even to ask questions in the give-and-take dialogue that was characteristic of first-century preaching.⁴¹

Paul's Meaning in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35

Each of the foregoing interpretations has merit, but all of them are too narrow for Paul's use of λαλεῖν in the context for 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36. Both Grosheide⁴² and Bruce⁴³ say that λαλεῖν almost certainly means more than simply speaking during a service. Yet these interpretations put the emphasis on prohibition of disorder in the Corinthian assembly such as loud talking, tongue-speaking, asking questions of or arguing with husbands,

⁴⁰Hurley, p. 217.

⁴¹Lightfoot, p. 134.

⁴²Grosheide, p. 342.

⁴³Bruce, p. 135-136.

and judging prophets. Paul, rather, puts the emphasis upon God's intention for women in general, namely, subordination to men. The term appears to be a general prohibition including any of the alternatives which have been offered.

Lest the Corinthians move to the extreme of believing that learning is forbidden women, or because they initiated the contention in their letter, Paul says they may learn from their husbands at home.⁴⁴

This is not to imply that only married women fit the prohibition. As P. W. Schmiedel poses, "Should Paul always have been so mindful of the scrupulosity of his expositors."⁴⁵ One should understand that the unmarried women have fathers or other women (Titus 2:3-5) to whom they may turn with their questions.⁴⁶

This instruction is intended by Paul for all churches

⁴⁴Hurley, pp. 217-18: "His aim in v. 35 is not to prevent learning but rather to prevent a wrong exercise of authority. It helps the modern reader to understand that men and women were separated in the synagogues. It is very likely that the pattern was followed by the new church at Corinth. The women were therefore unable to reach their husbands to talk with them during the service itself, to say nothing of the disturbance which this talking might have caused. Paul's instructions are thus geared to the situation which existed. They prevent a wrong use of authority but guard the instruction of the women, with which Paul was vitally concerned; likewise Zerbst, p. 48.

⁴⁵P. W. Schmiedel, Der Briefe an die Korinther, Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, cited by Zerbst, p. 48.

⁴⁶Conzelmann, p. 246; Lenski, p. 618.

and apparently is practiced by them; the Corinthians are commanded to get in line with the people of God. The trans-cultural nature of the apostolic teaching is that it is based upon the Old Testament's view of female subordination. For them to act in disharmony with God's revelation is shameful. Paul may also have had teaching of the Lord on this idea not preserved for us in the four gospels (verse 36).⁴⁷

Clearly, the speaking is one that causes women to have an unsubordinate role over men in the congregation. So probably Paul refers to public speaking. Such is the view of Godet:

Our study of chap. xiv. confirms the idea that the word λαλεῖν, to speak, in this chapter, cannot apply merely to simple questions, or vain gossiping, in which women might indulge with one another during worship. The term speaking in the church, especially in a chapter where it is applied throughout to the glossolaltes and prophets, can only designate a public speaking, which has for its end to teach and edify.⁴⁸

One might counter that this would be in contradiction to 1 Corinthians 11 where Paul allows women to pray and prophesy if their heads are covered. But in that passage the women are in a state of inspiration whereas in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36, they are not. Those who speak under inspiration are not expressing their own authority⁴⁹ and so not in violation of the Law. Paul, in denying pub-

⁴⁷S. Clark, p. 188.

⁴⁸Godet, p. 313.

⁴⁹Hurley, p. 217.

lic address to women, a fortiori denies also judging prophets and publicly disagreeing with their husbands. So then, any non-inspired public speaking would be in violation of Paul's prohibition in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36.

Summary

In 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 Paul comes forth with blunt force and prohibits women from speaking in church. This appears to be incongruous with the previous teaching that Paul gave in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 in which he allowed them to prophesy. Those interpreters who do not want to disturb the text of 11:2-16 offer several ways to deal with the immediate passage. Either the text is said to be bound to Jewish custom, the law interpreted as Jewish tradition, or due to the lack of education of women in Paul's day it is a warning to stop loudly asking questions of their husbands. Another approach is to deny the integrity of the texts.

The attempts by feminists to soften the blow Paul has given in 14:33b-35 is to no avail. No textual evidence exists that demonstrates the passage is a later gloss, although it is transposed to different places. The law is clearly the Old Testament law, and probably refers back to the creation and fall narratives of Genesis. The injunctions that Paul gives are built upon the Law of God and are the practice of the churches of Christ. The Corinthi-

ans are to conform.

None of the suggestions that narrow down the meaning of "speak" are satisfactory. The talk is not chatter, judging prophets, tongue speaking, asking questions of husbands. The emphasis is not on disorder but God's intentions for women generally. Since inspired utterance is allowed in 11:2-16 because the woman is not in her own authority, it is best to take 14:33b-35 as any non-inspired address in the church in which the woman expresses authority from herself.

CHAPTER V

WOMEN AS TEACHERS

The teaching of Paul in 1 Timothy 2:6-15 appears to have more in common with 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 than it has with 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 regarding the role of women in the church. Whereas 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 recognizes the prophetic function of women under the control of the spirit, 1 Timothy 2:8-15, alongside 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35, prohibits vocal expression or position of leadership over men in the congregation. These latter two passages have similar emphases. The overriding thrust of the letter to Timothy is proper behavior in the church meeting (3:15),¹ specifically praying and speaking in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The same is true of the Corinthian passage (14:33b-35). As in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35, the exhortation of the apostle is addressed to the Christian church in general, though written to a specific location, which point shall be argued momentarily.

The Setting of the Pericope

The setting of the Pauline injunctions in 1 Timothy

¹Stephan B. Clark, Men and Women in Christ (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980), p. 192.

2:8-15 appears to be public worship, a view held by most expositors.² This is bolstered by the phrase ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ probably referring to different church localities,³ or to the several house churches in Ephesus.⁴ C. K. Barrett says on ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ:

This is no mere literalism, for in Jewish usage 'place' meant 'meeting-place,' 'place of prayer,' and there is evidence (especially in I Cor. 1:2; I Thess. 1:8) that it became Christian usage too. The author means 'in every Christian meeting-place.'⁵

Men Praying in the Assembly

In view of his exhortation to pray in verses 1-7 (note οὖν), he instructs the men⁶ of the congregation to pray in an exemplary manner (χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ).

²Cf. Douglas Moo, "I Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance," Trinity Journal 1 (1980):62; Grant Osborne, "Hermeneutics and Women in the Church," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 20 (December 1977):346.

³Ralph Alexander, "An Exegetical Presentation on I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Timothy 2:8-15," a paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November 1976, p. 11; A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, vol. 4 (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930), p. 569; cf. Neil R. Lightfoot, The Role of Women: New Testament Perspectives (Memphis, TN: Student Association Press, 1978), p. 32.

⁴Moo, 62; C. Spicq, Les Épitres Pastorales, 4th ed. Paris: Gabalda, 1969), p. 372.

⁵C. K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 54.

⁶Ἄνθρωπος should not be taken as husbands but men. Certainly not just husbands are to pray in congregational worship. If he had meant husbands one would think he would have used ἰδίους τοὺς ἄνδρας (cf. Eph. 5:22). Alexander, p. 12.

From this he then turns to the women at Ephesus with specific commands on teaching and authority. J. W. Roberts has argued that women are excluded from the public prayer:

The men are to do the praying. Paul uses the specific word for the male--the man (husband) as opposed to the woman (wife). (The word is aner in Greek, not the generic word anthropos, which would have included both sexes.) This has the force of excluding the woman from leading the prayer in the assembly. That this is the correct understanding is plain from Paul's going on to apply the same limitation to the woman's teaching.⁷

Robert's position on the use of άνήρ appears substantial. However, Paul's use of άνήρ would not preclude the option of women praying in the assembly anymore than the use of άνήρ in 1 Corinthians 11:4 precluded the γυνή of 1 Corinthians 11:5 from praying, except that the latter was inspired prayer and prophecy and women were given explicit permission in that instance.

Dibelius and Conzelmann (contra Roberts) argue that the force of the argument is probably for women to be allowed to pray when they understand ώσαύτως with βούλομαι and προσεύχεσθαι. The "likewise," then, would make the statement to the women in verse 9 parallel to the statement to the men in verse 8. It would read "Likewise, also, I desire the women to pray."

⁷J. W. Roberts, Letters to Timothy (Austin: Sweet Publishing Company, 1961), p. 21.

⁸M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. 45.

The option affirmed by M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann is the very one rejected by Alexander who says, "The infinitive which expresses Paul's desire for the woman is κοσμεῖν, 'to adorn.' There is no reason to assume the infinitive προσεύχεσθαι, 'to pray,' in verse 9 (from v. 8) when an infinitive is given in verse 9."⁹ ὡσαύτως stands for βούλομαι and is used in a loose transitional sense linking together series of regulations."¹⁰

The second argument of Roberts, the limitation to a woman's teaching proving likewise her inability to pray, may also be correct. This is similar to that of 1 Corinthians 14:36 where women are forbidden to ask questions. If a woman cannot speak publicly, then logically she cannot pray in public, though admittedly, this argument is not as convincing as the former. The apostle's reference to teaching is very explicit and is fostered by Scripture, while the question of women praying, or not praying in Robert's case, is in the context of decorum, is somewhat vague, and has not been substantiated by Paul's presentation of theology.

⁹Alexander, p. 12.

¹⁰ Timothy 3:8, 11; 5:25; Titus 2:3, 6. See Newport J. D. Whyte, "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus," The Expositors Greek Testament, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1920), p. 108; Moo, p. 63.

The Demeanor of Women

Whether women are allowed to pray or not is unclear, but how they are to dress is unambiguous. This has a formal correspondence to the instructions for women in 1 Corinthians 11 though the emphasis may be different. In 1 Corinthians 11 the dress was to indicate submission while functioning in a role normally occupied by men, whereas, here the thrust is that a woman's true ornamentation is good works, not externals (though this may also be an act of submission).

The Prohibition against Women Teaching

Whether Paul's comments in 1 Timothy are to be taken as only applicable to a local problem at Ephesus or to the total Christian church is a question of considerable import to the current discussion on the role of women in the church. Some have argued recently that Paul is addressing a feminist problem at Ephesus where certain women either were teaching unorthodox views in the congregational meetings or at least were deceived by them. In view of this, Paul forbade women at Ephesus, temporarily, to participate vocally in the church meetings, either in teaching/preaching or discussion.¹¹

¹¹Philip Payne, "Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo's Article, '1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance,'" Trinity Journal 2 (1981):185-97; Aída Dina Besançon Spencer, "Eve at Ephesus," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 17 (Fall 1974):215-

Several lines of argument are used to substantiate this position. First, Paul's use of ἐπιτρέπω is to be interpreted as an opinion and as a temporary, localized injunction. Under different circumstances, women would be allowed to teach in the congregational meetings. It is argued that if Paul intended his instruction on this subject to be universal and permanent, he would not have used the first person singular present active indicative. Philip Payne voices this view:

Since in 1 Tim 2:12 Paul uses his typical verbal form for giving his own personal position (first person singular present active indicative) and since he neither claims that his position is from the Lord nor that the same restrictions on women should apply in all the churches, it would seem to be the most natural reading to understand ἐπιτρέπω in 1 Tim 2:12 as referring to the particular situation in Ephesus to which Paul was speaking without necessarily being applicable in all times and places.¹²

The contention is also advanced that had Paul meant a timeless rule, he would have included phrases like ὑπερ πάντων in 1 Timothy 2:1 and ἐν παντί τόπω in 1 Timothy 2:8.¹³

Secondly, teaching (διδάσκω) is perceived not to be restricted to any particular church office but to all believers in general. Priscilla is set forth as an example

22; Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, All We're Meant to Be (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1974), pp. 70-71.

¹²Payne, p. 171.

¹³Ibid.

of a woman functioning as a teacher.¹⁴

A third reason for the temporary nature of the prohibition is the meaning of αὐθεντεῖν. Payne argues that the term means "to dominate" or "to lord it over" men in the church. This is in contrast with the "quietness" advocated in 1 Timothy 2:11, 12 and in agreement with ὑποταγῆ in 2:11. Women are not denied authority over men; they are not to dominate men.¹⁵ N. J. Hommes concurs with this view saying αὐθεντεῖν means "to be bossy" and defines διδάσκω.¹⁶

Fourthly, Paul's use of γάρ should not be taken as a causal conjunction. Rather, it is explanatory:

If γάρ in 1 Tim 2:12 is explanatory, not illative, the actual reason Paul was prohibiting women in Ephesus from teaching is not that Eve was formed after Adam or that she was deceived by Satan, but that some women in Ephesus were (or were on the verge of becoming) engaged in false teaching.¹⁷

Lastly, Aída Spencer says that the existence of women at the Ephesian church who were either teaching error or were captivated by it leads to the conclusion of a temporary and localized injunction. Paul's purpose in 1 Timothy is to warn against unorthodox teachings toward which the Ephesian women were inclined.¹⁸ This may be seen par-

¹⁴Ibid., p. 174; Hommes argues that teaching should be understood as referring to dialogue, not monologue. N. J. Hommes, "Let Women Be Silent in Church," Calvin Theological Journal 4 (April 1969):7-16.

¹⁵Payne, p. 175.

¹⁶Hommes, pp. 18-20.

¹⁷Payne, pp. 175-177.

¹⁸Spencer, p. 216.

tially from Paul's use of γυναῖκες, weak women who were deceived and listened to the wrong persons. In view of this, some men were reacting to the false teaching from these women by not allowing women to teach at all.¹⁹ In view of this, Paul slowed down the move to the full equality he would have desired instead.²⁰

Unquestionably, ἐπιτρέπω may carry the connotation Payne gives to it of a temporary injunction, but does it? Paul's use of the first person present active indicative is not always accompanied with qualifying phrases when he gives something other than an opinion. Compare Romans 12:1 where he says, "I am beseeching you brethren, to offer your bodies as a living sacrifice. . . ." Paul does not use the first person to restrict action necessarily. He uses it to express personal appeal,²¹ certainly appropriate, if not demanded, in this personal letter to Timothy, as Stephan Clark states:

. . . he used the first person to back up the ruling with his own authority. 1 Tm 2:12, then, is analogous to 1 Cor 11:16 as a passage in which a rule universal to the Christian people is reaffirmed on the basis of the apostle's own personal authority. It is a personal reaffirmation, given by someone with the necessary personal authority to give such a reaffirmation, based upon universal teaching, and contained in a book probably intended to be something like a church order. All the evidence points to the conclusion that this passage has been preserved for us in the canon of

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., p. 219.

²¹Moo, p. 200.

of scripture as a basic ruling on the roles of men and women in community leadership.²²

Payne's contention that teaching was open to all believers in general betrays a misunderstanding of the nature of teaching in the first century church. Teaching in the first century concerned more than mere conveyance of information. (Possibly, this was part of what Priscilla and Aquila did to Apollos; the text gives little indication of the nature of their interaction.) Clark clarifies this distinction:

Modern 'teaching' does not involve the exercise of authority over people, except insofar as the teacher needs to maintain enough discipline to continue teaching. Modern 'teaching' is usually a process whereby an expert is hired to transmit a skill or information to students who are free to ignore that is taught.

By contrast, the early Christian understanding of teaching, built upon the Jewish understanding, saw teaching as an activity involving personal direction and an exercise of authority. The teacher did not just give his views. He laid out what he expected the student to accept.

Moreover, teaching occurred within a relationship in which the teacher had authority over the student. The focus of teaching in the New Testament was upon teaching a way of life. Students were expected to follow that way of life, and the teaching was passed on with authority. Teachers were either elders, heads of a community or of some grouping within the community, or masters who took in disciples who submitted themselves for formation. Teaching was not a function in which an expert came and performed a service which a client was free to receive or not receive as he wished. The teaching occurred within a relationship in which the students acknowledged the teacher's authority. Moreover, authority was primarily exercised within the early church not as much by individual direction, but by teaching given to a body, accompanied by the correction of individuals who were not following the accepted

²²S. Clark, p. 200.

teaching (cf. 1 Tim 4:11, 4:16-5:2; 2 Tim 4:1-4; Ti 2:15, 3:8-11). In other words, the scripture views teaching primarily as a governing function, a function performed by elders, masters, and others with positions of government. In this context, the connection between teaching, exercising authority, and being subordinate can be seen more clearly.²³

Theodore Jungkuntz also presents the correct perception on teaching in the New Testament. He comments that teaching is not the conveyance of a skill but is expression of authority:

It was a governing function which took place within a committed relationship of headship and submission and which was accompanied by the correction of individuals who were not following the accepted 'teaching.'²⁴

Consequently, the proclamation of doctrine and kerygma in the Christian congregation (and school, I would think) is reserved for men, to whom God has given authority to represent Him in spiritual matters dealing with leadership.

Paul emphasizes the importance of the prohibition on teaching by putting it in the emphatic position in verse 12. Some have understood διδασκεῖν as taking ἄνδρας along with αὐθεντεῖν,²⁵ but this is unnecessary, even if grammatically possible. Women simply are not allowed to teach, for that would give them authority over men in the congre-

²³S. Clark, pp. 196-197.

²⁴Theodore Jungkuntz, "The Question of the Ordination of Women," The Cresset, 42 (December 1978):18.

²⁵Moo, pp. 201-202.

gation. The explanation alleviates any problem with teaching non-males. Elsewhere Paul allows older women to teach younger women (Titus 2:3), presumably in private.

The contention that ἀυθεντεῖν means to dominate is a stronger argument than the previous two. The word is a hapax in the New Testament. Walter Bauer's lexicon allows "domineer" as a possible meaning (apparently the English translators understood herrschen to be the same as beherrschen, an uncertain conclusion), but "have authority" is given first. Even if one understands "dominate,"²⁶ it does not carry a negative meaning by necessity. George Knight, who has done a thorough study of all the occurrences of ἀυθεντεῖω in extant literature, confirms the meaning of "have authority" as the natural meaning.²⁷

Payne's claim for an explanatory γὰρ is difficult to understand. First, the usage is rare,²⁸ so good reason would need to exist in the context to prefer it over the

²⁶Carroll D. Osburn, 'AYΘENTEΩ (1 Timothy 2:12)," Restoration Quarterly 25 (First Quarter 1982):1-12. Osburn has taken too restrictive a meaning for the term in this writer's opinion.

²⁷George W. Knight III, "'AYΘENTEΩ in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12," New Testament Studies 30 (January 1984):143-157.

²⁸Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 151; H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: Macmillan, 1927), p. 243; Maximilian Zerwick, Biblical Greek (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Press, 1963)x, 473.

causal. Second, the move from the command or prohibition to the reason for the command or prohibition is common in Paul,²⁹ and naturally occurs with γὰρ. Third, Payne admits Paul is giving a reason for his prohibition. The force of the explanatory γὰρ is to explicate a previous statement, which verses 13 and 14 do not. It is better to understand γὰρ as introducing the reason why Paul has given his previous prohibition.

False teaching did exist at Ephesus, as Spencer says, though one has difficulty in ferreting it out as to kind and number.³⁰ If false teaching were the emphasis of his teaching in 2:8-15, certainly he would have also prohibited men from such teaching. The emphasis is not on women teaching false doctrines, but women teaching.

The reason, however, that Paul gives for not allowing women as teachers relates back to the Creation-Fall narratives of Genesis. Paul says that the prior creation of Adam and the deception of Eve in the Fall excludes women as teachers over men. We have already examined the prior creation of man, and woman's derivation from him in chapter three in the discussion on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. So, let us turn our attention to the account of the Fall found in Genesis 3.

²⁹For example, 1 Timothy 3:13; 4:5, 8, 16; 5:4, 11, 15.

³⁰Moo, pp. 215-221.

The Fall of Woman and Its Implications

The third major text in the early Genesis narratives that Paul uses for his teaching is Genesis 3. Eve was deceived by the serpent so that she disobeyed God by eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Because of this deception, she received a judgment. The words read in the Authorized Version: "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

The Sitz im Leben of Genesis 3:16

There are three effects of the fall often viewed in this verse: 1) Her pain in childbirth; 2) her sexual attraction to her husband; and 3) the woman will be ruled by the man.³¹ Probably one should understand otherwise. Upon close observation, one sees that the verse contains an introductory monocolon:

אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה אָמַר

To the woman He said,

followed by a synonymous bicolon:

הָרְבָה אֲרֻבָּה עֲצָבוֹנֶיךָ וְהָרְבָה

בְּעֵצָב תֵּלְדִי בָנִים

³¹John J. Davis, Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975), pp. 93-94; Gerhard von Rad, Genesis: A Commentary, translated by John H. Marks (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 90.

I will greatly multiply your pain in childbirth;
In pain you shall bring forth children.

and finally an antithetical bicolon:

וְאֵל-אִישׁוֹ תִּשְׁרָתָהּ

וְהָיָה יָמֶיהָ לְבָרָה

And your desire shall be for your husband,

But he shall rule over you.

So then, the first of the two effects of the fall in reference to woman is pain in childbirth (though if synecdoche is to be understood it may extend beyond even further to rearing children). Rather than the phrase עֲצֻבוֹתָ וְהַרְגָּתָהּ meaning "sorrow and conception" (Authorized Version), so that the curse includes sorrow in general for woman, but especially in the bearing of children, one should understand it as an example of hendiadys, "your pain in childbirth."

The Meaning of the Woman's Desire

The second portion (3:16b) of the curse relates to the new relationship between man and woman: the woman's desire and the man's rule. Some view the genesis of feminine sexual desire to be this curse. The תִּשְׁרָתָהּ (תִּשְׁרָתָהּ) or "desire" is viewed as that craving for the husband which is so strong she will endure the pains of childbearing to satisfy it.³² An example of this is found in Midrash

³²David R. Mace, Hebrew Marriage: a Sociological Study (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), p. 196.

Rabbah:

When a woman sits on a birth stool, she declares, 'I will henceforth never fulfill my marital duties,' whereupon the Holy One, blessed be He, says to her: 'Thou wilt return to thy desire for thy husband.'³³

Also aligned with this view of תַּשׁוּבָה referring to the sexual desire of the woman is that often the desire is considered in an abnormal or perverted way. H. C. Leupold uses such words as "morbid," "a perverted form," "a just penalty,"³⁴ and E. J. Young sees it as practically bordering on disease.³⁵

I consider such perceptions of 3:16b to be out of harmony with the word תַּשׁוּבָה in its context, and to be out of harmony with the sexual nature of man. Is one to think that Eve had no sexual desire for Adam before the curse, even in view of the mandate to procreate?

The Headship of Man

Another major error in the interpretation of this text is that woman was not under the authority of man until the curse. For example, man's rule over woman, according to Helmut Thielicke "is not an imperative order of creation, but rather the element of disorder that disturbs

³³Bereshith, 20:7, p. 166.

³⁴H. C. Leupold, Exposition of Genesis (Columbus, OH: The Wartburg Press, 1942), p. 94.

³⁵E. J. Young, Genesis 3 (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1966), p. 127, cited by Scanzoni and Hardesty, p. 35.

the original peace of creation.³⁶ This problem will be dealt with momentarily, but first the subject of cause for the woman's submission will be discussed.

Some have viewed the submission of woman as caused by her "desire" for man. She is instinctively dependent on him.³⁷ Or, she recognizes a need for his protection.³⁸ Thus man rules over woman simply because of her desire for him.

Others see the submission as being caused by the lordship of man. Helen Andelin interprets "he shall rule over you" as "the first commandment which God gave unto the woman."³⁹ In disagreement with the foregoing, Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty comment that "in Genesis 3:16 we have a statement, a prediction, a prophecy, of how man degenerated by sin, would take advantage of his headship as a husband to dominate, lord it over, his wife."⁴⁰ The obvious difficulty with this viewpoint concerns the lack

³⁶Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, trans. John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964), p. 8.

³⁷John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930), p. 82.

³⁸Clarence Vos, Woman in Old Testament Worship (Delft, N.V.: Vereingue Drukkerijen Judels and Brinkman, n.d.), p. 24.

³⁹Helen B. Andelin, Fascinating Womanhood (Santa Barbara, CA: Pacific Press, 1963), p. 89, cited by Scanzoni and Hardesty, p. 35.

⁴⁰Scanzoni and Hardesty, p. 35.

of interaction with the woman's desire and its relationship to the man's rule.

We will now interact with the previous interpretations from the major text on this issue, Genesis 3:16b.

An Exegesis of Genesis 3:16b

The major difficulty many face in developing a proper understanding of Genesis 3:16b is the awareness that this bicolon really develops one idea, not two; there is only one effect from the fall in 3:16. This is confused by the translation of the first ׀ in 3:16b as "yet" instead of "and." The second half of 3:16b does not come out of the first. The second ׀ should be interpreted as an adversative, translated "but." Thus the text has an antithetical parallelism:

And your desire shall be for your husband,
But he shall rule over you.

With this understood, a proper interpretation may be made. Susan Foh has suggested a parallelism between 3:16b and 4:7b, a suggestion that is most probably correct. An important word found in both passages is ׀שׁרקה. It is a rare word occurring only three times in the Old Testament. The etymology of the word is uncertain, the verbal root being probably ׀שׁר; the lexicon by Brown, Driver, and Briggs gives three homographs. The root of ׀שׁרקה in 3:16b and 4:7b apparently is related to the Arabic root šāqa

meaning "desire," or "affection." Probably the equivalent of שׁ is sin, not shin, with the Arabic cognate being probably sāqa, to "drive," or "impel."⁴¹

With the preceding in mind, an examination of 3:16b in comparison with 4:7b yields interesting results:

3:16b

וְאֵלֶיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
 וְאֵלֶיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
 And your desire shall be for
 your husband

וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל־בְּךָ
 וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל־בְּךָ
 But he shall rule over you.

4:7b

וְאֵלֶיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
 וְאֵלֶיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה
 . . . its [sin] desire is for you
 but you must master it.

Foh speaks in reference to 4:7b:

In Genesis 4:7 sin's desire is to enslave Cain--to possess or control him, but the Lord commands, urges Cain to overpower sin, to master it. An active struggle between Cain and sin is implied; the victor of the struggle is not determined by the words God speaks to Cain.⁴²

And in regard to 3:16b, she concludes:

The woman has the same sort of desire for her husband that sin has for Cain, a desire to possess or control him. This desire disputes the headship of the husband. As the Lord tells Cain what he should do, i.e., master or rule sin, the Lord also states what the husband should do, rule over his wife. The words of the Lord in Genesis 3:16b, as in the case of

⁴¹Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 1003; Foh, 377-378; Allen, p. 12.

⁴²Susan Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire?" Westminster Theological Journal 37 (Spring 1975):380-381.

the battle between sin and Cain, do not determine the victor of the conflict between husband and wife. These words mark the beginning of the battle of the sexes. As a result of the fall, man no longer rules easily; he must fight for his headship. Sin has corrupted both the willing submission of the wife and the loving headship of the husband to usurp his divinely appointed headship, and he must master her, if he can. So the rule of love founded in paradise is replaced by struggle, tyranny and domination.⁴³

Foh almost certainly has presented the better exegesis in her interpretation of the passage, over against the fanciful and uncontextual understandings in many commentaries and books on the question of women. It takes due consideration of the meaning of *קַדְשׁוֹ*, the poetic structure, the context of the narrative, and experience.

Chapter three describes the fall of man and the attending curse. Rather than the headship of woman beginning with the fall of Eve, we have already seen in chapter three that it was part of creation. The original unity God intended in creation, however, was destroyed in the fall so that woman would desire to usurp man's rule, and man, if he was to rule, would not do so easily. The participation of Eve in the transgression excludes her from church leadership.

Paul's Solution for Women

So then, women are not permitted either to teach where men are present or to take over jurisdiction intended

⁴³Ibid., pp. 381-382.

for the men in the church. This presentation of Paul is transparent. Women are to subordinate (ὑποταγῆ) themselves to what the men teach and are not to seek the place of men: (ἀύθεντεῖν) in the congregation.⁴⁴ The way in which a woman is to learn (versus teach) is in quietness (ἡσυχία). Alexander says,

This term [ἡσυχία] is employed elsewhere in the New Testament to stress an external quiet demeanor, as in Acts 22:2 when the Sanhedrin becomes quiet to hear Paul's address or in II Thessalonians 5:12 where busybodies are exhorted to work in a quiet fashion and to eat their own bread. The implication of the word is that women should learn quietly, not talking, but listening.⁴⁵

The idea of quietness is very similar to the teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35. Paul's proof for his instruction (γάρ) resides in the teaching of the Law, probably referring to Genesis 2 (some think 3:16). Likewise, the teaching of the passage at hand specifies the reasoning as based upon the fact that Adam was made first. Again, as seen before in 1 Corinthians 11:9, man's priority in creation is the basis of his authority. Furthermore, the woman sinned by being deceived (verse 14), unlike the man whose eyes were apparently wide open (though Phyllis Tribble has implied he may have been in a daze).⁴⁶ To Paul

⁴⁴Dibelius and Conzelmann, p. 47.

⁴⁵Alexander, p. 13.

⁴⁶Phyllis Tribble, "Eve and Adam: Genesis 2-3 Re-read," Andover Newton Quarterly 13 (1973):251.

this excludes a woman from teaching doctrine in the church, lest she fall, and lead men astray, like her mother, Eve.

Summary

Paul does not present the equality of men and women in Christ in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Instead women are seen in a subordinate role to men in the teaching function in the church. Some have argued that Paul's teaching should not be understood as an absolute prohibition of women teaching men in the church. Rather, they say, the apostle is concerned with certain women in the church who are involved in heresy and are teaching this at Ephesus. Nowhere is this idea found in 1 Timothy. Paul does not say that certain women are not to speak because of error they have, but that women are not allowed to speak. Paul does not base this on temporal concerns, but as in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14, upon theological principles. The reason he gives in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is because of the fall of woman in the garden and the order of creation that God established.

CONCLUSION

A CONCLUDING INTERACTION WITH THE CONTEMPORARY FEMINIST ARGUMENTS

The contemporary feminist perspective is unacceptable to the Christian scholar who adheres to the inerrancy and full trustworthiness of the Scripture. As well, the feminist develops a highly questionable hermeneutic that does not properly regard contextual and historical considerations, often finding it necessary to develop unnatural interpretations of the texts contrary to the historic teachings of the orthodox church through the centuries. To demonstrate the truthfulness of the aforementioned statements has been the task of this work.

Contemporary Feminists have a Low View of Scripture

Many of those scholars who advocate a feminist view of Scripture do so by finding erroneous teaching in the text and by pitting text against text.

Erroneous Teaching in the Scripture

Harold Lindsell, formerly editor of Christianity Today, which magazine has been favorable to the feminist movement, has penetrated the underlying difficulty of the

feminists' rejection of the full revelation of God in the Bible:

At stake here is not the matter of women's liberation. What is the issue for the evangelical is the fact that some of the most ardent advocates of egalitarianism in marriage over against hierarchy reach their conclusion by directly and deliberately denying that the Bible is the infallible rule of faith and practice. Once they do this, they have ceased to be evangelical: Scripture no longer is normative. . . . Anyone who wishes to make a case for egalitarianism in marriage is free to do so. But when he or she denigrates Scripture in the process, that's too high a price to pay. And if a case for egalitarianism in marriage cannot be made without doing violence to Scripture maybe the case isn't very strong to begin with.¹

In the same vein of thought as Lindsell, Clark Pinnock acknowledges that "moderate" evangelicals, those who do not accept total inerrancy, have tendencies of handling the Bible like liberals. He cites Dewey Beegle as one who distinguishes between primary and secondary revelation in Scripture. One must, then, in Beegle's view, determine the most authentic word of the Lord. Pinnock avers that this is what Paul Jewett does in Man as Male and Female in Paul's teaching about women. The apostle, being an heir to both rabbinic and Christian traditions, at times expressed a sub-Christian view, and so should not be considered accurate in such cases. Jewett believes that these kinds of Pauline passages cannot be

¹Harold Lindsell, "Current Religious Thought, Egalitarianism and Scriptural Infallibility," Christianity Today, March 26, 1976, p. 46.

be harmonized with Galatians 3:28. Pinnock continues that God then does not always speak in Scripture, and so the reader must determine when He does and when He does not. He then further remarks: "In principle this seems to be liberal, not firmly evangelical, theological methodology, and therefore a disturbing doctrinal development."²

As one representative of the group against which Lindsell and Pinnock speak, Virginia Mollenkott boldly declares that Paul has contradicted himself in his teaching on women.³ Interestingly, while she says he misinterpreted the Genesis 2 account of creation, she also avers that she hesitates to call Paul's position an error in Scripture. It is simply Paul thinking out loud trying to work through his conflicts.⁴ One wonders how broad a meaning the term "error" may have, or just exactly who in this discussion is contradictory. Why does Paul interpret Scripture the way he does? He does what is natural to him in his setting, according to Mollenkott:

So when Paul asks in I Corinthians 11 whether nature doesn't teach that women should have long hair and cover their heads when praying, he clearly is appealing to culture. The Bible itself is telling us how to read it; it's telling us that at times biblical writers fall

²Clark Pinnock, "Three Views of the Bible in Contemporary Theology," in Biblical Authority, ed. Jack Rogers (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1977), pp. 69-70.

³Virginia Mollenkott, "A Conversation with Virginia Mollenkott," The Other Side 12 (May-June 1976):25.

⁴Ibid., pp. 27-28.

back on what they have been socialized to think is natural.⁵

I believe it is warranted to say from her statement that her view of Scripture opens a Pandora's box in biblical interpretation. Whatever one disagrees with in Scripture simply may be relegated to socialization. Could not one consider the holy wars of Joshua cultural? Or was not Paul's perspective on homosexuality merely socialization? Interestingly, Mollenkott has been entirely consistent. In answering the interviewer's question on violence in the Scripture, she says that one must de-absolutize the biblical culture. Specifically in reference to the holy wars of Israel, one simply regards "and God said go down and smite them" as socialization. "God said" is simply an assumption of the author.⁶ In addition, she and Letha Scanzoni have written that much biblical interpretation today against some forms of "legitimate" homosexuality is because of homophobia in society, not the demands of Scripture.⁷

Christians who reject this line of reasoning and view of Scripture and socialization are relegated by Mollenkott to the position of those who need to come to a more scholarly view of scriptural study. They need to

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 30.

⁷Virginia Mollenkott and Letha Scanzoni, "Homosexuality: 2 Perspectives," Daughters of Sarah, (November/December 1977), pp. 6-7.

learn the difference between faith and fear.⁸ She says that many may fear if one admits Paul is contradictory, the authority of Scripture and doctrine of divine inspiration will be undercut. But she retorts: "Things have come to a bad pass when we have to avoid seeing certain facts of Scriptures (or avoid admitting that we see them) in order to preserve our preconceived notions about inspiration."⁹

Few could question that the way so-called evangelical feminists have handled Holy Writ goes much further than is acceptable in evangelical theology. If areas of disagreement may simply be eliminated by an appeal to socialization, then interpretation has no controls and the idea of limited revelation or degrees of inspiration can hardly be avoided. Certainly using this methodology, one could take Paul's teaching on original sin coming from man and discount it by appeal to modern anthropology; Paul may be viewed as borrowing from rabbinic theology for his doctrine. Cases of such misunderstanding by the ancient writers, in view of our "proper" contemporary knowledge could be multiplied.

⁸Mollenkott, "A Conversation," p. 75.

⁹Virginia Mollenkott, *Women, Men, and the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1977), p. 103 (italics hers).

Use of Scripture against Scripture

How may feminists justify the practice of citing one Scripture in contradiction to another Scripture? Paul Jewett, for example, says that he seeks to interpret Scripture as Christ did in Mark 10:3-5. There, Christ was asked if his view of divorce was in harmony with the Mosaic law. Jesus, Jewett says, in a sense, appealed Scripture against Scripture. While Jesus acknowledged the Mosaic law to allow for divorce, He recognized that it did not express the true intent of creation in regards to monogamous marriage. Jesus, in citing Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 commented that Deuteronomy 24:1 was because of their hard hearts. Jewett elaborates:

In other words, the commandment in Deuteronomy reflects the cultural, historical realities of life in ancient Israel, not the will of God as originally revealed in the creation. Such reasoning, we submit, is analogous--if we may play on the word--to that which we have followed in seeking to understand the Pauline statement of sexual hierarchy in the light of the creation ordinance of sexual partnership. To say that a man may write a bill of divorce and put away his wife, or to say that the woman by definition is subordinate to the man, is to come short of the revealed intent of the Creator; it is to break the analogy of faith.¹⁰

Severe fallacies are present in Jewett's discussion:

1) Jesus was not contradicting the passage in Deuteronomy 24 by his appeal to the creation narrative. He expressed God's original intentions over against God's concessions.

¹⁰Paul Jewett, Man as Male and Female (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 136-37.

God inspired the Deuteronomic legislation. It was not merely a socialization apart from God's direction. In reality, the case law gave women protection that would not necessarily have been so generous if it originated purely from a male dominated society. Jewett seems to recognize the tenuousness of his argument on this point when he uses the words, "Jesus, in a sense, appealed to Scripture." Jesus really did not contradict Scripture. To say that one may cite Scripture against Scripture based upon the practice of Christ is a non sequitur.

To assert that Paul must be interpreted against himself in the feminist issue is to assume that he misinterpreted the Old Testament in practically all of his writings on women except for Galatians 3:28. The reason why this latter passage becomes all important to feminists is that it is the only passage in epistolary material that is amiable with their desired teaching on women. However, it is not at all certain that the passage concerns the question of social equality of male and female or that there is really any tension between this passage and any other Pauline teaching on the subject. If one were going to be "free and loose" with the Scripture, as the feminists have done, one could argue that "male and female" is an interpolation made by a rare feminist scribe. Likewise, one could argue that Galatians 3:28 was written by a less

mature and experienced apostle. Sensing the radicalism of some first century Christian feminists, based upon his teaching in Galatians 3:28, he excluded such teaching from the remainder of his works. Note that Colossians 3:11, a later book, has a similar listing but omits the phrase "male and female." But such mishandling of the text is not appropriate or needed. As subsequent chapters on exegesis will show, Paul's teaching is not contradictory but entirely complementary.

One must make a decision as to whether God is author of Scripture. Though the human authors of Scripture must be given their full due, there is not any room for erroneous teaching by the New Testament writers within an evangelical doctrine of Scripture. Even Baalim, the Old Testament false prophet, could not speak but what God gave him.¹¹ May we expect less of the writers of the New Testament?

A Flawed Hermeneutic

Non-Finality of Biblical Revelation

One aspect of some feminist argumentation is the non-finality of biblical revelation. Krister Stendahl speaks clearly on this issue. The teaching of the New Testament must not be seen as the final word on a given

¹¹Ronald B. Allen, "The Baalim Oracles: A Pagan Diviner and the Word of God," (ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1973).

point of theology. A realistic interpreter (to use his phrase) can demonstrate how Jesus or Paul said certain things in such a way that they considered them to be "timeless truths" but he is aware that they were so considered because in these respects "Jesus and Paul shared the same exegetical and cultural presuppositions of their time."¹² So then, if something is viewed a certain way in the New Testament, does it mean that this is the way it is to be viewed today? The answer is no. Stendahl gives the reason why: "As a hermeneutical principle, it may lead to a denial of history as God's history. For it is highly doubtful that God wants us to play 'First-Century Semites.'"¹³ He cites for a case in point Matthew 10:6. Christ was sent only to the house of Israel, but it became incumbent upon Paul to convince the church that the situation had changed. Jesus' teaching in this area was not for all time.¹⁴ How does one determine new truth? It is not discovered by developing timeless truths from the events of the New Testament. Instead, "When new questions emerge, the guidance of the Spirit is counted on (Acts 15:28; I Cor. 7:40)."¹⁵

One recognizes readily that Stendahl does not rec-

¹²Krister Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 13.

¹³Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵Ibid.

ognize the finality of revelation in Christ. The church throughout history receives and formulates new revelation from the Spirit in order to meet current situations. This is similar to continual revelation in Romanism or Mormonism, but rather than being the Pope or Mormon elder, the ability has been broadened to include anyone willing to be an up-to-date interpreter. Controls on new truth are non-existent. Contrarily, the view of revelation and inspiration in the New Testament demands adherence to a certain body of truth verified and delivered by men chosen by God and requires obedience on the part of the church. What about such passages as Matthew 10:6? God in the Christ-event progressively revealed his purposes in establishing a redeemed community which culminated in the commission to the world (Matthew 28:19-20). There is no contradiction, only slow and partial unveiling. These are not human adjustments; they are divine unfoldings.

Cultural Myopia

A major fallacy of "biblical feminists" is to read contemporary ideas about equality into the biblical text. John Davis says that the current understanding of equality "derives more from the ideals of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century ('Liberty, Equality, Fraternity') than it does from Scripture."¹⁶

¹⁶ John J. Davis, "Some Reflections on Galatians 3:28, Sexual Roles, and Biblical Hermeneutics," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 19 (Summer 1976):202.

Stendahl considers the biblical text of Galatians 3:28 as the key to implementation of social equality for women today, even as the idea found in that passage was instrumental in the release of slaves in the last century. Few, he says, "would confine the implications of 'neither slave nor free' to an attitude of the heart, apart from social structure and legislation."¹⁷

Stendahl expresses himself more fully when in reference to the three pairs in Galatians 3:28 he explains:

It is our contention that all three of these pairs have the same potential for implementation in the life and structure of the church, and that we cannot dispose of the third by confining it to the realm coram deo. Just as Jews and Greeks remained what they were, so man and woman remain what they are; but in Christ, by baptism and hence in the church--not only in faith--something has happened which transcends the Law itself and thereby even the order of creation. For this order rests upon the Scriptures, and can only be incidentally corroborated by 'nature,' as is clear in I Corinthians 11:14. If one counters that this would lead to a conflict with the order of creation, and hence must be wrong, we may say that it does indeed to such a conflict, and that is precisely what it should do and intends to do. The question is whether all three are not intended to be realized in the life of the church.¹⁸

The proper understanding of New Testament Christianity is not to be seen, in Stendahl's thinking, necessarily as the authoratative and purposed standard for the church of all ages. To consider it so is to play "First Century" church and to negate history as God's history.

2:28, Sexual Roles, and Biblical Hermeneutics," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 19 (Summer 1976):

¹⁷Stendahl, p. 34.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 34-35.

It is to "neutralize the power of the new and contribute to a permanent 'holding at minus x minutes' in the drama of the launching of the kingdom."¹⁹

Several inadequacies are found in Stendahl's argumentation. First is his desire to equate equality and social roles. Any inability, he seems to say, on the part of equals to function interchangeably in the structures of society, home, and church is simple artificial or theoretical equality, only in the heart, not in reality. Davis gives a proper response to this argument in his discussion of Genesis 1:26-28 and egalitarianism:

Furthermore, the joint exercise of dominion and joint image-bearing of this passage does not establish egalitarianism with respect to every aspect of the relationship. Such a conclusion would be based on the fallacious premise that equality in some respects entails equality in all respects. Within the family relationship both parents and children bear the image, and older children can exercise a measure of dominion over the creation, but this does not establish symmetrical authority relationships between parents and children.²⁰

If I may take the liberty of drawing out the implications of Stendahl to a logical conclusion, one must reject all forms of hierarchy among Christians since they are equal. There should be no hierarchy of rich or poor; possibly socialism or Communism is the way for us all to go. There is to be no authority levels of parents to children; certainly some of this is in the making in our

¹⁹Stendahl, p. 36.

²⁰Davis, pp. 204-205.

society. Ruling elders in the first century church must give way to a community of believers that is egalitarian. Certainly, we are not expected to follow first century patterns in the above mentioned areas anymore than those mentioned in Galatians 3:28. Unless we are to reject the teaching of the apostles about their own authority, the hierarchy in the church, and the home, we need to recognize that ontological equality and roles of authority are not to be equated or put in conflict.

A second difficulty is his desire to reject creation as a norm for proper relationships in church and home, and to elevate the idea of a new creation in Christ over it. The new creation in Christ does not void the creation order; it restores us from the effects of the fall and its distortion of creation. Paul certainly accepted the order of creation (both Genesis 1 and 2) as valid theological bases for equality of male and female as image bearers and the hierarchical structure of church and home.

Thirdly, the presentation of slavery and male/female relationships as directly analogous is non sequitur reasoning. Because slavery is not endorsed by the apostle, and that rather he planted seeds for its eventual disintegration in Christianity, does not mean that the apostle desired for authority of men in church and home to disappear. Slavery is not a creation norm while man/woman relations are. Davis correctly observes that customs that

are only permitted in the Scriptures "are not ipso facto authoritatively taught as creation norms:"

A distinction between creation norms and permissive rules can be drawn here. This implies that social principles which are grounded in the creation order and explicitly taught in the redemptive economy are normative for the Church in all ages and cultures. This means that marriages which are monogamous, heterosexual, permanent, and patriarchal are the norm for the Church, not merely a matter of cultural convention. Here it is necessary to again reject false analogies between slavery and hierarchical authority patterns in marriage. Marriage is clearly grounded in creation as a fundamental structure; slavery is not. Slavery represents a sinful distortion of creation structures and has no proper claim to abiding validity.²¹

Stendahl's fourth error is akin to that mentioned under the non-finality of revelation. He repeatedly asserts that we must not consider ourselves bound to think or perform that which the New Testament church did. God's truth is not static. We must interpret the truth of the Gospel, our oneness in Christ, for our society and time even as the early Christians did for theirs. Stendahl sees Paul as attempting, but only partially succeeding, in drawing out the implications of the gospel for his generation; Paul has given us the way to go. This latter interpretation is faulted in that he has eisegeted the apostle Paul. Having desired to have the New Testament give truth by which to speak to our current developments in society, he has forced it to speak our language. Certainly, the

²¹Ibid.

approach of Madeleine Boucher is more consistent from one of non-evangelical presuppositions:

Theologians are often led to fresh insights by the new factors operating in their own time, especially intellectual and social factors. Then, because they stand in the Judeo-Christian tradition, they turn to the Bible in search of texts with which to undergird these new insights. Yet, because they are seeking to answer contemporary questions, questions unknown to the biblical writers, they sometimes interpret the biblical texts in a way which is more true to contemporary thought than to the thought of the biblical writers.²²

Boucher then observes that the question on women today is an example of the afore stated error. Modern man is unable to accept an abstract equality not put into practical terms. Boucher continues:

Theological reconsiderations of the traditional policy of assigning women to an inferior position in the Church have been undertaken in response to these new factors. Like Professor Stendahl, the present writer fully agrees with these attempts. But the quest for support for such a position in the Bible may have resulted . . . in something other than a true and precise description of the biblical texts.²³

So then, if one desires social change that is not sanctioned by biblical writers, rather than molding the passages or causing the writers to appear to hold truths other than they envisioned them, one would be more in accord with integrity simply not to use the Bible.

In accord with this fourth difficulty of Stendahl's

²²Madeleine Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11,11-12 and Gal 3,28: The NT on the Role of Women," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 31 (1969):57-58.

²³Ibid., p. 58.

approach is the belief that modern thinking is superior, or more correct, than first-century views. This is much too simplistic and not easily demonstrable. One must have a canon to determine truth. If one does not have the authority of biblical norms, then he is in a sea of virtual uncertainty. Hardly can changing opinions of the 'man come of age' serve for such a canon. Where is the "death of God theology" or other such "modern" ideas of recent times? Davis gives us the proper direction for our consideration of this error:

One can not assume that twentieth-century social patterns are more correct than first-century ones simply by virtue of their modernity. The assumption that what is new is more likely to be true is itself a modern idea, largely produced by modern man's fascination with scientific and technological achievements. In matters of religion and revelation it is more often the opposite. Biblical history gives ample evidence of the decline and deterioration of pristine revelation among the people of God over time. There is no natural process of moral and spiritual progress. By tacitly equating modernity with social enlightenment, one is committing the fallacy of inferring moral from technological progress.²⁴

Fabricating Tensions in Paul's Interpretation of Scripture

The third major fallacy in evangelical feminists' interpretation concerns how it presents Paul as one who is divided in himself in his view of women, one who has not been faithful in bringing to proper completion the teachings of Christ, and one who has misinterpreted the second

²⁴Davis, 205.

creation narrative to propagate the inferiority of women. My contention is that there was no tension or contradiction in Paul, that he is in perfect harmony with the view of Jesus on the equality and role of women, and that he has correctly understood the presentation of man and woman in Genesis 1 and 2 and drawn proper implications from those narratives for the theology of role responsibilities in the church and in the home.

Paul against Christ

Did Paul fail to understand the view of Christ on the new relationship that men and women were to enjoy because of their union with Him? There can be little argument against the fact that Jesus had a high view of womanhood. Albrecht Oepke, in his article on "woman" in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, says:

We never hear from the lips of Jesus a derogatory word concerning woman as such. In holding out the prospect of sexless beings like that of the angels in the consummated kingdom of God (Mark 12:25. . .) He indirectly lifts from woman the curse of her sex and sets her at the side of man as equally the child of God.²⁵

In harmony with the previous quote is that of Paul Jewett in reference to the reactions of the rabbis to the actions of Jesus recorded in Luke 10:38-42:

²⁵Albrecht Oepke, "γυνή," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament A-F, vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), p. 785.

What Jesus did in this case must have been absolutely incomprehensible to them. They would never dread of entering a house occupied by two unmarried women, let alone discoursing with them, especially concerning spiritual things. Jesus is here showing an utter disregard for custom in order that he might do his kingdom work. And so he fellowshiped with these women who were his disciples even as he fellowshiped with men who were his disciples. He showed the same intimacy and esteem toward Mary and Martha as he showed toward men.²⁶

Is Paul to be seen as the betrayer of Christ in this area? He is seen as seeking greater conformity with the Jewish view of women rather than following Christ's new freedom. Peter Richardson elucidates this theme: "To that extent he has not pushed Jesus' new view of women any farther, but has rather retreated, in the face of local factors that threaten the stability of the struggling community of believers, to a more Judaic and rigidly Pharisaic view."²⁷ This great divide is stressed so by some that Mollenkott has stated that "Jesus doesn't seem to matter much to traditional evangelicals; Paul is the one who counts."²⁸

Was Christ's view on women really contradictory to Paul's? First, one must recognize that the attitude of Christ was not unique in the Mediterranean world. The Epicureans had a high regard for women in their school and

²⁶P. Jewett, Man as Male and Female, p. 99.

²⁷Peter Richardson, "Paul Today: Jews, Slaves, and Women," Crux 8 (1970):37.

²⁸Mollenkott, "A Conversation," p. 26.

the women were treated as equals. Even in Jewish society, the common label of Jewish misogyny must be tempered. Louis Epstein has demonstrated that women, before Talmudic times, were given access to worship in Judaism approaching that of men and that there is even some evidence they could read the Torah in mixed crowds.²⁹ Certainly many Rabbis had a high regard for women and taught them the Torah. The Gospels present Jesus treating women with respect and kindness. He expresses the same love toward them as to any of the men. They are considered equal coram Deo without question. However, the records show nothing at all about his considering women equal in regards to ministerial leadership or spiritual headship. There is no evidence that any woman was commissioned as one of the seventy or the Twelve. No amount of argument can change these facts. How does Paul compare to Christ? The Acts and the epistles of Paul reveal the tender heart he had toward women and appreciation for their help in the gospel ministry, but nowhere does he ordain them as overseers or apostolic representatives to the churches.

Paul against Paul

The attempt by feminists to find a tension within the apostle Paul is partly due to some improper assumptions.

²⁹Louis M. Epstein, Sex Laws and Customs in Jerusalem (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1967), p. 78.

First, there is the assumption that Paul borrowed his views on feminine subordination from rabbinic sources rather than the Old Testament Scriptures, or that when he did take from the latter, he accepted the rabbinical view. The idea that Paul is referring to rabbinic traditions when he uses "law" in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35, as we saw in chapter four, has little substantiation. Equally questionable is the view that when Paul refers to "by nature" in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, he refers to the customs of the day. Even Stendahl recognizes that Paul refers to the Genesis creation narratives as the contact point for the law in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-35. Moreover, Jewett admits that when using the term "natural" Paul is referring to that which is true based on the order of creation. Furthermore, rabbinic influence on the New Testament writers is very debatable since most of these rabbinic sources were written after the time of the New Testament.

Second, there is the attempt to see Paul admitting that he has some personal biases, that we need not accept, since even he recognized theological tensions in himself and in his teaching. Although he did differentiate between his own teaching and that which is based on oral tradition from the Lord while on earth, he did not consider the acceptance of his teachings as optional. Several times he said that his teaching was not to be rejected, that it is taught to, and is the practice of, all the churches, and

that to reject them is to prove one's ignorance (see 1 Corinthians 14:33b-38).

Third, many feminists insist that all the other passages on women are in practical contexts while Galatians 3:28 is the purely theological one. They are saying that Galatians 3:38 is a more important passage for this issue than others found in the Pauline corpus. Such bifurcation of the canon and dividing between practical and theological passages leave one without a reliable text and an uncertain methodology.

Fourth, the belief that Galatians 3:28 teaches the elimination of hierarchical structure since all are one in Christ totally misses Paul's point. Rather than Paul speaking of the eradication of social distinctions, he was presenting the subject of access to justification by faith and entry to Abraham's covenant. He did not seek to demonstrate social equality relationships among the classes he mentioned; instead, he wished to show that all, regardless of standing in society, may participate by faith in the inheritance of Abraham, to be sons of God. To draw social implications from Galatians is to go beyond the text.

Paul's Misunderstanding of the Old Testament

The last problem fabricated by some feminists is concerning the apostle's improper interpretation of the

creation narrative. Paul used these to develop the idea that woman is to be subordinate, as exegesis in 1 Corinthians 11, 14, and 1 Timothy 2 has shown. Many feminists think that God originally intended an egalitarian social relationship among men and women, as in Genesis 1:26-28, whereas the curse (Genesis 3:16) brought woman into enslavement. With the coming of Christ, it is thought, this curse upon the woman of subordination to her husband, or the disallowance of spiritual headship in the church, was done away.

According to this view, Genesis 1:27 is to be taken as teaching the simultaneous creation of male and female as totally equal persons functionally and ontologically. On the other hand, Genesis 2 presents woman as created after man. Paul correctly interpreted Genesis 1 in Galatians 3:28, in their opinion, but he draws improper conclusions of subordination of the female from Genesis 2.

Who has really misinterpreted Genesis 1-3, Paul or the modern feminist? I believe it is the feminist! First of all, Genesis 1:26-28 has nothing to say about social relationships of male and female. It speaks of ontological unity of male and female as both being image-bearers of God. From this information, Paul concludes that both male and female have an equal right to the grace of God. In addition, it does not say they were created simultaneously. Genesis 1:26-28 speaks only in indefinite tem-

poral terms, so not in contradiction to Genesis 2.

Second, Genesis 2 indicates that Yahweh created male and then female and that the woman was to be a helper to man, as one corresponding to him. Adam named her woman. Such an action was the prerogative in the ancient near East for one in authority. Genesis 2 provides a proper text for Paul to develop his view of male and female functions in the church.

Third, Genesis 3:16 does not introduce the hierarchical structure of male and female. The structure is found in the creation narrative of Genesis 2. The Genesis 3 passage reveals the distortion of the original pattern. Rather than man lovingly ruling and woman willingly submitting to that rule, the war between the sexes began. Man would seek dominance with woman vying for his position. This conflict, not the hierarchical structure, needs to be alleviated in Christ. Paul understood this; unfortunately the feminists do not.

I had as my goal in this thesis to develop the various perspectives in which modern feminists have dealt with the texts written by the apostle on the role of women in the church. The arguments used by these interpreters have largely posed more problems than they have solved. In general they have produced novel interpretations of the Scriptural teaching on male-female roles by rejecting the obvious teaching of the texts. Either the texts have been

considered culturally conditioned, explained away by relegating them to special local church problems only, rejected as authentically Pauline, or contorted to find in Paul a tension on this issue of which he was never aware. Dr. Peter Richardson once said, in disparaging terms, in a meeting I attended, that Paul did not take the implications of the gospel beyond Christ. Richardson is correct; Paul has gone no further than Jesus, and he should not have. Should the church today?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Authorized Daily Prayer Book, The. London: Valentine and Company, 1947.

Babylonian Talmud, The. Edited by Isidore Epstein. Bera-koth, no. 31. London: The Soncino Press, 1948.

Midrash Rabbah, vol. 1. London: The Soncino Press, 1939.

Didache. Translated by Robert Ernest Wallis. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 7.

Secondary Sources

Books

Aalen, Sverre. "Glory," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, vol. 2 G-Pre. Edited by Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Alford, Henry. Galatians-Philemon. The Greek Testament, no. 3. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.

Andelin, Helen B. Fascinating Womanhood. Santa Barbara, CA: Pacific Press, 1963.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

_____. The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963.

Barth, Markus. Ephesians 1-3. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1974.

_____. Ephesians 4-6. Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1974.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated

- by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Becker, Jurgen. Der Brief an die Galater. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- Beckwith, R. T. "Recent New Testament Study," Why Not? Priesthood and the Ministry of Women. Eds. Michael Bruce and G. E. Duffield. Berkshire: Marcham Books, n.d.
- Blackwelder, Boyce W. Light from the Greek New Testament. Anderson, IN: The Warner Press, 1958.
- Blaiklock, E. M. From Prison to Rome--Letters to the Philippians and Philemon. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1964.
- Blass, F., Debrunner, A., and Funk, Robert W. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Boak, E. R. A History of Rome to 565 A. D. 3rd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.
- Boldrey, Richard and Joyce. Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by William Wolf. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Bornkamm, E. Gunther. Paul. New York/Evanston: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Bruce, F. F. 1 and 2 Corinthians. New Century Bible. Greenwood, SC: The Attic Press, Inc., 1971.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, Publisher, 1970.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

- Calvin, John. The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Calvin's Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.
- Cambridge Ancient History, The. Edited by S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, M. P. Charlesworth. The Imperial Peace, no. 9. Cambridge: University Press, 1936.
- Carcopino, Jerome. Daily Life in Ancient Rome. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.
- Carrington, Philip. The Early Christian Church. The Second Century, no. 2. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957.
- Cassuto, Umberto. A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part 1, From Adam to Noah. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961.
- _____. The Documentary Hypothesis. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961.
- Cavallin, Hans C. "Demythologising the Liberal Illusion," Why Not? Priesthood & the Ministry of Women. Eds. Michael Bruce & G. E. Duffield. Berkshire: The Marchan Manor Press, n.d.
- Clark, Stephan B. Man and Woman in Christ. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980.
- Clark, Elizabeth and Herbert Richardson. Women and Religion. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1977.
- Clemen, Carl. Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1894.
- _____. Paulus: sein Leben und Werken. 2 Bde.; Giessen: J. Richer'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1904.
- Conzelmann, Hans. 1 Corinthians. Hermeneia Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Early Christian Worship. Translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1953.
- Dahl, Nils. "Paul and the Church at Corinth in I Cor.

- 1:10-4:21," in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr. Eds. Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- _____. Studies in Paul. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1977.
- Dana, H. E., and Mantey, Julius R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Daniélou, Jean. The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. Translated by Glyn Simon. Leighton Buzzard: The Faith Press, 1961.
- Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: The University of London, The Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davis, John J. Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975.
- Dibelius, M. and Conzelmann, H. The Pastoral Epistles, Hermeneia Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Dillow, Joseph. Speaking in Tongues: Seven Crucial Questions. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.
- Dinkler, Erich. "Korintherbriefe," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Religionswissenschaft. 6 Bde.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957-62.
- Donaldson, James. Women: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome, and Among the Early Christians. New York: Gordon Press, 1973.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Genesis. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co., 1913.
- Duffield, Gervase E. "Feminism and the Church," Why Not? Priesthood and the Ministry of Women. Eds. Michael Bruce and G. E. Duffield. Berkshire: The Marchan Manor Press, n.d.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. vol. 2. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

- . Theologie des alten Testament, Teil II, Gott und Weit. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Epstein, Louis M. Sex Laws and Customs in Jerusalem. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1967.
- Evans, E. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. The Clarendon Bible. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Everling, D. Die paulinische Angelologie und Damonologie. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1888.
- Ferguson, Everett. Early Christians Speak. Austin: Sweet Publishing Company, 1971.
- Flender, Otto. "Image," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 vols. Edited by Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1978.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler, "Interpreting Patriarchal Traditions," The Liberating Word, A Guide to Non-sexist Interpretation of the Bible. Ed. Letty M. Russel. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. Pauline Theology: A Brief Sketch. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Foh, Susan. Women & the Word of God. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1979.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "Propheten und Prophezeien im Neuen Testament," Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. vol VI. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959.
- Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Translated by A. Cusin. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1890.
- Goltz, G. Der Dienst der Frau in der christlichen Kirche. 2nd ed. Potsdam, 1914.
- Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Compnay, 1953.

- Grudem, Wayne. "Does kephale ('head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples." Appendix 1 in George W. Knight III, The Role Relationship of Men & Women. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.
- Gryson, Roger. The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. Translated by Jean Laporte and Mary Louise Hall. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1976.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971.
- Hägge, "Die beiden überlieferten Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Korinth," Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, II. 1876.
- Hendriksen, William. Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967.
- _____. Expositions of Colossians and Philemon. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964.
- Héring, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- Hirsch, Jr., E. D. The Aims of Interpretation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- _____. Validity in Interpretation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Hoehner, Harold. "The Purpose of Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14:20-25," Walvoord: A Tribute. Edited by Donald Campbell. Chicago: Moody Press, 1982.
- Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.
- Holzner, Joseph. Paul of Tarsus. St. Louis: Herder Book Co., 1945.
- House, H. Wayne. Chronological and Background Charts of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.
- Howe, E. Margaret. "Interpretations of Paul in the Acts of Paul and Thecla." Pauline Studies, Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday. Grand Rapids:

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.

Hurd, John Coolidge, Jr. The Origin of I Corinthians. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.

Isaksson, A. Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple. Translated by Neil Tomkinson and Jean Gray. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1965.

Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Trans. by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1958.

Jewett, Paul. Man as Male and Female. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, Publishers, 1975.

_____. The Ordination of Women. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.

Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, F. Commentary on the Old Testament. Translated by James Martin. Vol. 1: Pentateuch. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1942.

Kent, Homer. The Pastoral Epistles. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.

Key, Bob and Key, Daphne. Adam, Eve, and Equality. Leicester: Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship, 1976.

Kidner, Derek. Genesis. The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. London: The Tyndale Press, 1967.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1966.

Knight, George W. III. The Role Relationship of Men & Women. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.

Knox, John. Chapters in the Life of Paul. New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1950.

Kohler, Kaufmann. Jewish Theology. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1968.

Lacey, W. K. The Family in Classical Greece. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Ladd, George Eldon. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

- Leipoldt, J. Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum. Gutersloh: Mohn, 1962.
- Liétzmann, Hans. An die Korinther I/II. Tübingen: Mohr, 1949.
- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1937.
- Liddell, H. G. and Scott, George. An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1880.
- Lightfoot, Neil R. The Role of Women: New Testament Perspectives. Memphis, TN: Student Association Press, 1978.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. Konkordanz zum hebräischen alten Testament. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Loisy, Alfred. Les Livres du Nouveau Testament. Paris: Emile Nourry, 1922.
- Mace, David R. Hebrew Marriage: A Sociological Study. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.
- Maass, Fritz. "דָּבָר." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. 4 vols. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.
- Martin, Ralph. New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 1884.
- Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Romans. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947.
- Mollenkott, Virginia Ramey. Women, Men, and the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon, 1977.
- Motyer, J. A. "Name." New Bible Dictionary. Edited by J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.

- Moulton, James Hope and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930.
- Murray, John. The Epistle to the Romans. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.
- Nugent, Sister M. Rosamond. Portrait of the Consecrated Woman in Greek Christian Literature of the First Four Centuries. Patristic Studies, vol. 64. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1941.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "γυνή." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament A-Γ. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.
- Orr, William F. and Walther, James Arthur. 1 Corinthians. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1976.
- Pagels, Elaine. The Gnostic Gospels. New York: Random House, 1979.
- Parry, R. St. John. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1920.
- Parvey, Constance F. "The Theology and Leadership of Women in the New Testament." Religion and Sexism. Edited by Rosemary Radford Ruether. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.
- Pinnock, Clark. "Three Views of the Bible in Contemporary Theology" in Biblical Authority. Edited by Jack Rogers. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1977.
- Pomeroy, Sarah. Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves. New York: Schocken Books, 1975.
- Prohl, Russell C. Woman in the Church. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis: A Commentary. Trans. John A. Marks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.
- Reitzenstein, R. Poimandres. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904.

- Roberts, J. W. Letters to Timothy. Austin: Sweet Publishing Company, 1961.
- Robertson, A. T. Word Pictures in the New Testament. 4 vols. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1930.
- Roon, A. Van. The Authenticity of Ephesians. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- Ryrie, Charles C. The Place of Women in the Church. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.
- Sampley, J. Paul. And The Two Shall Become One Flesh. Edited by Matthew Black. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, vol. 16. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1971.
- Scanzoni, Letha and Hardesty, Nancy. All We're Meant to Be. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1974.
- Schlatter, Adolf. Paulus der Bote Jesu. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Schlier, Heinrich. Der Brief an Die Galater. Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962.
- Schmithals, Walter. Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians. Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1971.
- Scroggs, Robin. "Women in the NT." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Volume. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- Shaw, G. B. "The Monstrous Imposition upon Jesus." Reprinted in The Writings of St. Paul. Edited by W. A. Meeks. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.
- Simpson, Cuthbert A. The Book of Genesis. The Interpreters Bible, vol. 1. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952.
- Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1910.
- Speiser, E. A. Genesis. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1964.
- Spicq, C. Les Épitres Pastorales. 4th ed. Paris:

- Gabalda, 1969.
- Stagg, Frank and Stagg, Evelyn. Woman in the World of Jesus. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. The Woman's Bible, part 1. New York: European Publishing Company, 1895.
- Stendahl, Krister. The Bible and the Role of Women. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Swete, H. B. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Company, 1909.
- Thielicke, Helmut. The Ethics of Sex. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.
- Thrall, M. E. The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Trible, Phyllis. "Woman in the OT." The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Volume. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- Vriesen, C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Vos, Charles. Woman in Old Testament Worship. Delft, NV: Vereinigde Drukkerijen Judeis and Brinkman, n.d.
- Watts, J. Wash. A Survey of Syntax in the Hebrew Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Weiss, Johannes. Der erste Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Whyte, J. D. "The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistles to Titus." The Expositors Greek Testament. 4 vols. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1920.
- Zerbst, Fritz. The Office of Woman in the Church. Translated by Albert G. Merckens. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. Biblical Greek. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Press, 1963.

Zscharnack, L. Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrhunderten der christlichen Kirche. Göttingen, 1902.

Periodicals

- Bartlet, J. V. "Fragments of the Didascalia Apostolorum in Greek." The Journal of Theological Studies 18 (July 1917):307.
- Bedale, Stephen. "The Meaning of κεφαλῆ in the Pauline Epistles." Journal of Theological Studies 5 (October 1954):211-215.
- Beeck, F. J. van. "Invalid or Merely Irregular?" Journal of Ecumenical Studies 11 (Summer 1974).
- Best, Ernest. "Prophets and Preachers." Scottish Journal of Theology 12 (June 1959):129-150.
- Boucher, Madeleine. "Some Unexplored Parallels to I Cor. 11, 11-12 and Gal. 3, 28, the New Testament on the Role of Women." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 31 (January 1969):50-58.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2, 23a)." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 32 (1970): 532-542.
- Cerling, C. E. "Setting the Issues: Women's Liberation and Christian Theology." Journal of Psychology and Theology 4 (Fall 1976):314.
- Clark, Gordon. "The Ordination of Women." The Trinity Review, no. 17 (January/February 1981):3-4.
- Davis, John J. "Some Reflections on Galatians 3:28, Sexual Roles, and Biblical Hermeneutics." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 19 (Summer 1976): 201-208.
- Faculty of Christ Seminary. "For the Ordination of Women." Currents in Theology and Mission 6 (June 1979): 132-143.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Widows and the Church." Firm Foundation (December 1981):6.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Cor. 11:10." New Testament Studies 4 (1957-1958):48-58.

- Foh, Susan. "What is the Woman's Desire?" Westminster Theological Journal 37 (Spring 1975):376-383.
- Foerster, W. "Zu I Cor. 11:10." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 30 (1931):185-186.
- Greig, James C. G. "Women's Hats-I Corinthians xi.1-16." Expository Times. (1957/58):156-157.
- Hommel, N. J. "Let Women Be Silent in Church." Calvin Theological Journal 4 (April 1969):5-22.
- Hooker, Morna. "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of I Cor 11:10." New Testament Studies 10 (July 1964):410-416.
- House, H. Wayne. "Paul, Women, and Contemporary Evangelical Feminism." Bibliotheca Sacra 136 (Jan-Mar 1979):40-53.
- _____. "Tongues and the Mystery Religions of Corinth." Bibliotheca Sacra 140 (April-June 1983):134-150.
- Hurley, James B. "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women: A Consideration of I Cor. 11:2-16 and I Cor. 14:33b-36." Westminster Theological Journal 35 (1973):190-220.
- Hummel, Horace D. "The Image of God." Concordia Journal (May 1984):83-93.
- Jaubert, Annie. "Le Voile des Femmes (I Cor. xi. 2-16)." New Testament Studies 18 (1971-72):419-430.
- Jewett, Robert. "The Redaction of 1 Corinthians and the Trajectory of the Pauline School." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 44 (December 1978):571.
- Jungkuntz, Theodore. "The Question of the Ordination of Women." The Cresset 42 (December 1978):1-5.
- Kellett, E. E. "A Note on 'Power on the Head.'" Expository Times 23 (1911-12):39.
- Kesich, Veselin. "St. Paul: Anti-Feminist or Liberator?" St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 21 (1977):123-147.
- Knight, George W. III. "AYΘENTEΩ in Reference to Women in I Timothy 2:12." New Testament Studies 30 (January 1984):143-157.

- Lane, W. L. "I Tim. iv. 1-3. An Early Instance of Over-realized Eschatology?" New Testament Studies 11 (1964-65):164-167.
- Leonard, Eugenie. "St. Paul on the Status of Women." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 12 (July 1950):311-320.
- Lightfoot, Neil. "The Role of Women in Religious Services." Restoration Quarterly 19 (Third Quarter, 1976):129-136.
- Lindsell, Harold. "Current Religious Thought, Egalitarianism and Scriptural Infallibility." Christianity Today (March 26, 1976):45-46.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." Harvard Review 13 (1973-74):180-183.
- Mollenkott, Virginia. "A Conversation with Virginia Mollenkott." The Other Side 12 (May-June 1976):22-28,75.
- _____. "Homosexuality: 2 Perspectives." Daughters of Sarah (November/December 1977):6-7.
- Moo, Douglas. "I Timothy 2:11: Meaning and Significance." Trinity Journal 1 (1980):62-83.
- Morris, W. D. "I Corinthians 11:10." Expository Times 39 (1927/28):139.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Non-Pauline Character of I Corinthians 11:2-16?" Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (December 1976):615-621.
- Osborne, Grant. "Hermeneutics and Women in the Church." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 20 (December 1977):337-352.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (I Timothy 2:12)." Restoration Quarterly 25 (First Quarter 1982):1-12.
- Pagels, Elaine H. "Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 42 (September 1974):538-549.
- Payne, Philip. "Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo's Article, 'I Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance.'" Trinity Journal 2 (1981):185-197.

- Radmacher, Earl. "The Pre-Eminence of Preaching," Western Communicator (Fall 1982):2-3.
- Richardson, Peter. "Paul Today: Jews, Slaves, and Women." Crux 8 (1970):37.
- Rose, P. "Power on the Head." Expository Times 23 (1911/12):183-184.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "Is Preaching Prophecy?" Canadian Journal of Theology 1 (April 1955):11-18.
- Scroggs, Robin. "Paul and the Eschatological Woman." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 40 (1972):283-303.
- Spencer, Aida Dina Besançon. "Eve at Ephesus." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 17 (Fall 1974):215-222.
- Trible, Phyllis. "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 41 (May 1973):30-48.
- _____. "Eve and Adam: Genesis 2-3 Reread." Andover Newton Quarterly 13 (1973):251-258.
- van Beneden, P. "Ordo, Ueber den Ursprung einer kirchlichen Terminologie," in Vigiliae christianae 23 (1969):161-176.
- Walker, William D. "I Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women." Journal of Biblical Literature 94 (March 1975):94-110.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation." Bibliotheca Sacra 135 (Jan-Mar 1978):46-57.
- Weeks, Noel. "Of Silence and Head Covering." Westminster Theological Journal 35 (Fall 1972):21-27.
- Witherington, Ben III. "Rite and Rights for Women--Galatians 3.28." New Testament Studies 27 (1981):593-604.

Unpublished Works

- Alexander, Ralph H. "An Exegetical presentation on I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Timothy 2:8-15." A Paper pre-

sented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976, (Typewritten).

Allen, Ronald B. "Male and Female: the View from Genesis." A Paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976, (Typewritten).

. "The Baalim Oracles: A Pagan Diviner and the Word of God." THD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1973.

Dunham, Duane A. "Ephesians 5 and Galatians 3." A Paper presented at the Seminar on Women in the Ministry, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, November, 1976, (Typewritten).

Jewett, Robert. "The Sexual Liberation of the Apostle Paul." A Paper presented at the 1978 Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, New Orleans, November, 1978, (Typewritten).

Palma, Anthony. "Tongues and Prophecy--A Comparative Study in Charismata." STM thesis, Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, 1966.