



THE COVENANT QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

COMMENT 1

PAUL AND WOMEN 3
Klyne R. Snodgrass

PROPHESYING DAUGHTERS 21
Fredrik Franson
Tr. Sigurd F. Westberg
Intro. Glenn P. Anderson

EVANGELICAL ROOTS OF FEMINISM 41
Donald W. Dayton

BOOK REVIEWS 57

These words of Scripture, together with other associated passages, constitute some of the necessary framework for our contemporary discussion of women's roles and functions in the Church of Jesus Christ and in human society at large. How shall we understand and interpret these words for the work of the Church today? How can we cultivate a climate of mutual exchange about this highly significant issue that we move beyond the sheer heat of debate to the illuminating light of dialogue?

The three articles in this expanded issue of *The Covenant Quarterly* are offered as input to the current discussion.

Klyne Snodgrass, assistant professor of biblical literature at North Park Theological Seminary, submits the study, "Paul and Women." Two perennially important questions are discussed: May women teach (or preach) in the Church? What is the relationship between husband and wife?

The historical document, "Prophesying Daughters," by Fredrik Franson is presented here in English for the first time, having been written in the late nineteenth century originally in German, later being translated into Norwegian and Swedish. An historical note and comment is provided by Glenn P. Anderson, Dean and professor of church history at North Park Theological Seminary.

Donald W. Dayton, assistant professor of theology and director of Mellander Library at North Park Theological Seminary, contributes an historical study, "Evangelical Roots of Feminism." His book, *Discovering Our Evangelical Heritage*, was published earlier this year by Harper and Row.

PAUL AND WOMEN

Klyne R. Snodgrass, assistant professor of biblical literature, North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

Few issues in our day carry more potential for both energizing and frustrating the efforts of the Church than the debate over the Christian role of women. The issues are much broader than the role of women in the church or home, as important as that is. Even more basic and with more possible ramifications are the questions of hermeneutics, exegetical method, and authority. Are aspects of the biblical material purely cultural? If so, how does one do "cultural exegesis"? How does one decide what is normative for Christian thinking and practice? How one answers those questions will affect his or her understanding of the role of women. Conversely, the issue of women's liberation may drive one back to a fresh look at hermeneutical and exegetical method. In the end the question is "How does one interpret the Bible?"

Any discussion of the role of women must deal eventually with Paul's attitude toward women. While there are other biblical statements that to limit women in some way (such as Genesis 3:16 in some interpretations or 1 Peter 3:1-6), the issue would probably not have attracted nearly so much attention apart from a few statements in the Pauline literature. Two questions, which seem to be the focal points of the debate, arise from a discussion of Paul's treatment: 1) May women teach (or preach) in the church? 2) What is the relationship between husband and wife? A reassessment of the pertinent passages offers the possibility for a better understanding of Paul's intention.

I. May Women Teach (or Preach) in the Church?

The question has been phrased this way intentionally rather than the more frequent "Should women be ordained?" Before the latter question is answered, one should ask "Should men be ordained and on what grounds?" Ordination is not directly derived from biblical teaching. The only New Testament passages that even offer a precedent for ordination are Acts 13:3 (where hands are laid on Saul and Barnabas prior to the first missionary journey) and 1 Timothy 4:14 "Do not neglect the gift in you which was given to you through prophecy with the laying on of hands by the council of elders".¹ This is not to indicate a negative view of

ordination: quite the contrary. It is only to indicate that ordination as we know it is not directly drawn from a biblical injunction. Rather, ordination is the legitimate and necessary recognition and affirmation by the church that a person has been called to perform a special task.

Frequently in response to our question "May women teach (or preach) in the church?" an immediate negative answer is given. This answer is based on two passages which, at least on first sight, make it quite clear that women should not speak in church (1 Corinthians 14:34,35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15). The interpretation of these two passages, however, is beset with difficulties and they are not the only passages in Paul's writings that relate to the issue.

Even though the focus is on the Pauline material, one cannot ignore the impact of the rest of the New Testament, especially the teaching and practice of Jesus in which the negative attitude toward women in Judaism is completely reversed.² One has only to think of Jesus with the Samaritan woman in John 4, Jesus with Martha and Mary in Luke 10, or Jesus with the sinful woman in Luke 7:36f. That a rabbi had women disciples was unheard of in first-century Palestinian Judaism. The importance of women as witnesses to the resurrection and in the early chapters of Acts (e.g., 1:14) is glaring in contrast with the attitudes of contemporaries. Of special importance is the quotation of Joel 2:28 (3:1 in Hebrew) in Acts 2:17: ". . . I will pour from my Spirit on all flesh and your sons and your daughters will prophesy. . . ." Regardless of what else is said, one must grant that something radical with regard to women has taken place in the ministry of Jesus and the bestowal of the Spirit.

When one comes to the Pauline literature, one finds the same radical approach stated in Galatians 3:28: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is not male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." We will return to this passage later, but again, regardless of what else one says, one must grant that something radical with regard to women has taken place in Christ.

Before dealing with the Pauline passages, it will be beneficial to look at Paul's practice. One gets the distinct impression from the biblical material that the success of Paul's mission was largely aided by women. The book of Acts stresses the response and assistance of women, particularly in Macedonia (Lydia in 16:14, 15,40; the chief women of Thessalonica in 17:4;³ the chief women of Berea in 17:12; and Damaris in 17:34). Paul sends greetings to Claudia, among others, in 2 Timothy 4:21 and to

Nympha and the church in her house in Colossians 4:15,⁴ and Apphia is included as one of the addressees of the letter to Philemon. Philippians 4:2 is of special importance in that it designates Euodia and Syntyche as those who struggled (or fought) alongside Paul in the Gospel and who apparently were doing whatever Clement and the rest of his fellow workers were doing. Probably the most significant passage in this regard is Romans 16, that long chapter of greetings which is all too often ignored. Ten women are singled out for mention: Phoebe, Prisca, Mary, Junia (?), Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Persis, the mother of Rufus (and Paul, metaphorically speaking), Julia, and the sister of Nereus (verses 1-15). Junia, Phoebe and Prisca will require further comment, but one should note that it is said of Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, and Persis that each labored in the Lord, an expression Paul uses of his own efforts (cf. Romans 16:6 and Galatians 4:11).

The mention of Junia in 16:7 presents a problem since the name could be either masculine, Junias, or feminine, Junia. If masculine, the name would be a rare, shortened form of Junianus. For that reason many have preferred the more common feminine name. Ancient commentators, including Chrysostom,⁵ understood Andronicus and Junia to be husband and wife. The statement that these two were outstanding among the apostles has been taken by some to mean they were well known to the apostles,⁶ but this is unnatural and unlikely. It is quite possible, then, that a woman was greeted and was considered to be an apostle (which is not surprising if that term means "one who has seen the risen Lord"); but uncertainty surrounds the passage.

With Phoebe, however, there is no uncertainty (16:1,2). Phoebe was probably the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans.⁷ Paul commends her to the church in Rome (cf. the letters of commendation in 2 Corinthians 3:1f.) and refers to her as a deaconess of the church in Cenchreae. The word that he uses, δῆακονος, does double duty in that it can be both masculine and feminine (see Romans 13:4 where δῆακονος is used in reference to ἐξουσία). Δῆακονος occurs thirty times in the New Testament, and the basic idea is "servant" (Matthew 22:13, 23:11, John 2:5). Paul uses it of Christ (Romans 15:8, "minister of circumcision," and Galatians 2:17), of himself and other apostles (1 Corinthians 3:5, 2 Corinthians 3:6, Ephesians 3:7, Colossians 1:23), of Epaphras (Colossians 1:7), Tychicus (Ephesians 6:21, Colossians 4:7), and Timothy (1 Timothy 4:6, 1 Thessalonians 3:2). Nothing less can be understood of Phoebe than is understood of Paul's other lieutenants.⁸ The word is also used of a "church office" in Philippians 1:1 and 1 Timothy 3:8 and 12. Part of our problem, however, is that we understand such terms

as institutions rather than roles. Paul does not refer to any of these persons as deacons in order to view them as holding an office, but to indicate the role of a servant they have performed.

Paul also asks that Phoebe be received "in the Lord worthy of the saints" and that the Roman Christians help her in whatever she has a need. The last clause of verse 2, which provides the basis for his request, has sometimes been misunderstood. It has recently been suggested that a better translation would be "She was designated as a ruler over many by me."⁹ The argument is based on the fact that προστάτις (literally, "one who stands before") can mean "ruler" or "leader." The word can and frequently does mean a protector, patron, or guardian, however, and that is the meaning demanded by the context. In addition, the "better" translation is impossible. καὶ γὰρ αὐτῇ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ cannot mean "She was designated as a ruler over many by me." Such a translation ignores the second καὶ which specifies that whatever Phoebe was to the many she was also to Paul. The sense of the passage is that the Roman Christians should help Phoebe because she had been a helper or patron of many others and especially of Paul himself. She was not designated a ruler, but she was an important person because of the role she performed in "standing before" many (as a patron or protector).

The last person to attract our attention is Prisca, who is better known to us as Priscilla, the form of the name used by Luke. She is always mentioned in connection with Aquila, her husband, but interestingly, of the six times this couple is mentioned, Prisca is mentioned first in four of them which may indicate that she was the more important of the two in spreading the Gospel. In Romans 16:3 both Prisca and Aquila are referred to as fellow workers in Christ Jesus unto whom all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks. In Acts 18:26 Aquila and Priscilla both took Apollos aside and explained the way of God to him more accurately. One does not get the impression that Priscilla was sitting by quietly while the instruction was taking place.

In the work of the Gospel, then, it is clear that women were of great assistance to Paul and that they were described with the same terms used for male helpers in the mission. It may be too much to conclude that the women were doing the same things as the men, but there is certainly nothing that would indicate otherwise. One begins to get the impression that people were involved in the communication of the Gospel and that they served in a variety of servant roles. One has to look very hard to find the institutionalized offices emphasized today. Our problem may stem from the fact that we have institutionalized the attitude and

role of service and the task of evangelism into offices.

With this look at Paul's practice in spreading the Gospel, we may turn our attention to the two passages prohibiting women's speaking in worship. As soon as one begins studying 1 Corinthians 14:33-36 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15—unless he has been using these passages as isolated proof texts—one realizes that there is not merely a conflict between Paul's practice and these verses, but also that there is an apparent flat contradiction between 1 Timothy 2:8-15/1 Corinthians 14:33-36 and 1 Corinthians 11:5, where it is clear that women are praying and prophesying in the Christian worship service (cf. Acts 21:9). The attempts to avoid the contradiction only illustrate the statement made at the beginning of this paper that the real issue is "How does one understand the Bible?" As we will see, some have argued that Paul did not make the statements requiring silence, some have argued that Paul was inconsistent, and some have argued that one or the other of the passages is "foundational," and thereby is more important than the others. All too frequently the passages that do not agree with one's position are passed over without adequate consideration.

First we will turn our attention to 1 Corinthians 14:33-36. For convenience the text of the ASV (1901) is included as a typical translation.

33 . . . for God is not a God of confusion but of peace.
[new paragraph] As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home: for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church. What? was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it unto you alone?

The first issue that arises is the proper reading of the text. The majority of texts (including P⁴⁶, N, A, B, 33, and 1739) include verses 34,35 in the traditional location, but a few texts (D, G, 88*, and some of the Old Latin) transpose these verses so that they follow 14:40. Such a transposition would affect the interpretation somewhat, but almost certainly the traditional location is correct and the transposition is an early recognition of the difficulty of sequence.¹⁰

With this mention of the textual variants, a look at the various attempts to reconcile the apparent contradiction between 1 Corinthians 11:5 and 14:33-36 will be helpful. A number of com-

mentators argue that 11:5 reflects what Paul believed while the verses in chapter 14 derive from a later editor. G. Zuntz would, therefore, omit 14:33b-35 and join 33a and 36.¹¹ H. Conzelmann would omit verses 33b-36 and would join 33a and 37.¹² The ones who argue that these verses are an interpolation do not do so because of the textual variant, but because of the logic of the sequence of the text. Such an approach is rather drastic and should be taken only as a last resort. The main problem with interpolation theories is that the editor is always dumber than the author or the critic. One cannot explain why an editor would put these verses here instead of elsewhere and how he could forget 11:5. The passage can be interpreted more easily than this.

Several other attempts to relieve the apparent contradiction have as little in their favor. Scanzoni and Hardesty argue that the two chapters in 1 Corinthians reflect two parts of the Christian worship service. The first half of the service was open to all (especially catechumens), but the second half, which included the service of the Lord's Supper, was open only to those who had been baptized. Chapter 11 then would deal with the second half of the service and women were allowed to prophesy; chapter 14, however, deals with the first half of the service where non-Christians were present (note 14:16,23,24). Paul asks that women not interrupt the service with questions.¹³ That Paul was concerned with the order of the service is clear, but there is no evidence (despite the claim) that the first-century church had a split service as the church did a few centuries later. Somewhat similar is the suggestion from F.W. Grosheide that women were allowed to prophesy but not when the congregation met officially. The prohibition against women's speaking in the "official" service is absolute.¹⁴ Again, however, there is no evidence of a different kind of service in chapter 14 from that in chapter 11 or that Paul only grudgingly permits women to prophesy in 11:5. One other approach that is somewhat forced is that of Robertson and Plummer. They suggest that women in Corinth had been claiming equality. Paul prohibited their teaching or speaking in the services. Married women could ask their husbands at home, and unmarried women could get a question answered through the married!¹⁵

Is it possible to come to an understanding of this text which is not forced and which relieves the tension between 11:5 and 14:33-36? While recognizing that 14:33-36 involves several difficult questions, I suggest that a careful analysis of the text with an especial awareness of the context will at least offer the possibility of a meaningful exegesis that is not forced.

The first major problem that must be assessed is that of the punctuation of verses 32,33. The main question is whether verse 33b ("as in all the churches of the saints") goes with verse 33a or verse 34. Should we read "For God is not a God of confusion but of peace as in all the churches of the saints"¹⁶ (which does not make a lot of sense) or "For God is not a God of confusion but of peace. [new paragraph] As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silent in the churches" (which is redundant with its repetition of "the churches").¹⁷ Neither punctuation is really satisfactory, but if the second is chosen the contradiction with 11:5 is made more blatant and the prohibition of women's speaking in the church will be considered absolute. Because of the contradiction and the repetition of "the churches" it seems to me that the second alternative is unlikely. The first alternative, although not attractive, is possible, but there is another possibility which should be given consideration. Westcott-Hort made good sense out of the text by placing parentheses around verses 32,33a; verse 33b then would connect with verse 31, and verse 34 would start a new paragraph. "As in all the churches of the saints" then would go with "For you are *all* able to prophesy one at a time in order that *all* may learn and *all* may be comforted [or exhorted]." (Incidentally, are the three occurrences of "all" in verse 31 to be limited to the men?) While the parentheses would be foreign to Paul, it seems that the understanding provided by this modern punctuation conveys the intention of the author. His concern is that the worship service at Corinth will be like the services at all churches, free from confusion.

Even if one accepts that verse 34 begins a new paragraph, one can still easily understand these verses as a prohibition of women's speaking in the service. A closer look at the context, however, points in a different direction. Throughout 1 Corinthians Paul dealt with immature, boasting Christians who were emphasizing their freedom in the Gospel (e.g., 1:10-31, 3:1f., 6:12, 10:23). He wrote to answer questions and to deal with abuses (e.g., 7:1f., 11:2f., 17f., 12:1f.). Chapters 11-14 are given over to dealing with abuses during the worship service. One should note that in the immediate context of the passage which concerns us women are not the only ones told to keep silent. The same word $\sigma\tau\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is used in verse 28 to silence the one who would speak in tongues when no interpreter is present and in verse 30 to silence a speaker when revelation comes to another. Similarly, women are not the only ones told to be in submission. The same word $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ is used in verse 32 to indicate that the spirits of prophets are in submission to (other) prophets.¹⁸ The context clearly deals with disruptions in the service. If verse 35 is the reason for the statement in verse 34, as seems likely, the problem was that the women were asking questions during the

service. It may be that an aisle separated the sexes during the service.¹⁹ If so, questions asked across the distance would have been particularly annoying. The issue, then, is not teaching or preaching, but disruption of the service.

In that case, the question is still how one should understand "It is not fitting for them to speak" in verse 34 and "It is a shame for a woman to speak in church" in verse 35. The answer depends on how one understands λαλεῖν, the infinitive "to speak" in both cases. The following alternatives have been suggested: 1) it is not fitting for them to speak out (and thereby disrupt the service); 2) it is not fitting for them to speak at all (because of deference to the cultural attitude toward women); 3) it is not fitting for them to speak at all (absolutely—for all time and for all circumstances); 4) it is not fitting for them to chatter. The third alternative is unlikely because of the conflict with Paul's practice and with Galatians 3:28 and 1 Corinthians 11:5. The fourth is unlikely as well. Although in classical Greek the meaning of λαλεῖν is usually "chatter," it is doubtful that this meaning is present in the New Testament at all. Λαλεῖν occurs twenty-four times in this chapter, before in the discussion of speaking in tongues and of prophesying. There are three factors which suggest that the first alternative ("speak out" and disrupt the service) is correct: 1) the context of disruption of the service (verses 31-33); 2) the implication that questions are interrupting the service in verse 35; 3) the implication of pride in verse 36. (Pride and the abuse of freedom are dealt with throughout the epistle.) Although the first alternative seems preferable, one cannot exclude the second.²⁰ One should note, however, that in the first alternative (disruption of the service) λαλεῖν does not relate to teaching or preaching, whereas in the second (deference to cultural attitude) it does. Before dealing with these alternatives more fully, though, it is necessary to include a discussion of 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

The problems in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 are surprisingly similar to those in 1 Corinthians 14. Many ignore the conflict between this passage and 1 Corinthians 11:5 since they view the pastorals as written by a Pauline disciple who, as a representative of early catholicism, was more concerned about ecclesiastical structure and authority than Paul was (just as they viewed 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 as a non-Pauline interpolation). Again, many view this passage as an unequivocal prohibition of the active participation of women in worship. J.N.D. Kelly, for example, suggests that Paul made the comment in 1 Corinthians 11 grudgingly.²¹

Others again would argue that there is more to the passage than meets the eye or that it is entirely culturally conditioned.

From 2:1 the passage is concerned with prayer and especially with prayer for the authorities so that "we might live a quiet and tranquil life." Verses 4-7 are a digression, and verse 8 returns to the theme of prayer. Verse 8 is clear enough except for the last phrase, which may, however, be the key to the passage. Why is it necessary for the writer to encourage prayer "without wrath and argument"? There is Jewish precedent,²² but the phrase may point to problems in the region being addressed. It is unlikely that this is a general allusion to Matthew 5:23,24, since all three pastorals warn of disputations, false doctrine, fables, and those who lead astray. (In 1 Timothy see 1:3f., 18f., 6:3f., and 20, 21.)

The meaning of verse 9 is not nearly as clear as the English translations suggest. Does ὡσαύτως ("likewise") refer only to βούλομαι ("I desire") or to βούλομαι προσεύχασθαι ("I desire . . . to pray")? That is, did Paul desire the men to pray and the women to adorn themselves in modest apparel or did he desire likewise the women to pray in modest apparel [and] to adorn themselves with modesty and good judgment? In the latter case κοσμεῖν, "adorn," would be joined by asyndeton (i.e., without a connective) parallel to ἐπαίροντας, "lifting," in verse 8. Most commentators ignore the second possibility, but it is possible. It makes good sense in that it would be virtually synonymous with 1 Corinthians 11:5f. and is the view of A. Wiesinger (in the Olshausen series), Martin Dibelius, and C. K. Barrett.²³

Verses 11,12 are much more pointed in the statements that are made. The woman is instructed to learn in quietness in all submission. The word for "quietness" (ἡσυχία) is sometimes translated silence and has this meaning in Acts 22:2, but in 2 Thessalonians 3:12 "quietness" is obviously more appropriate. One should note that in verse 2 of the context that concerns us a cognate form (ἡσυχίος) is used to express the desire that all "may lead a quiet and tranquil life" (cf. 1 Peter 3:4). Verse 12, however, is frequently understood as saying that it is not fitting for a woman to teach or to have authority over (or domineer) a man. Again, however, the meaning is debated, and especially with the word translated "have authority over" (αὐθεντεῖν) since it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The meaning "interrupt" has been suggested by Dibelius²⁴ and makes sense in the context, but the basic idea seems to be the possession of absolute authority. The other factor that makes this passage difficult is that the context for what is said is uncertain. Some argue that since a shift is made from the plural to the singular "woman" (or wife), verses 11f. refer to the husband-wife relationship. Others would argue that the shift is inconsequential

and that what is said relates to the conduct of women in the church. The latter is more likely, especially in view of the words "to learn," "to teach," and "to have authority over." If so, this passage does place limits on the participation of women, but the same three alternatives for understanding the significance of the passage that were present for 1 Corinthians 14:34f. are in effect here: 1) The statements were made because of the special problems in the church concerned—in this case the concern is over divisions and false teachings; i. e., the statements are locally conditioned. 2) The statements are culturally conditioned because of the lack of education for women and the general negative attitude toward them. Such statements are not really surprising in a culture where respectable women rarely took part in public life and were not educated.²⁵ (There were exceptions, however.) 3) The statements are absolute and operative for all times and circumstances.

If one accepts the last, as we have already pointed out, he must deal with the conflict between these statements and 1 Corinthians 11:5f. and Galatians 3:28. If Paul means something different by "prophesy" than he does by "speak" and "teach," then we do not have enough information to explain the difference or to lay down rules for a service. It will not do to say Galatians 3:28 is "spiritual" because the other distinctions abolished there (Jew and Greek, slave and free) are treated as having social implications. Furthermore, one would have to abolish a good number of current practices, such as women missionaries teaching and preaching both on the field and while on furlough, women teaching Sunday school, women "sharing" in church, and possibly even women singing. The restriction of women merely from preaching from the pulpit is an artificial and thoroughly modern (in a negative sense) application of the passage.

I would suggest that alternatives one and two are both operative for 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15. There seem to be special problems in both situations. The problem in 1 Timothy is not as easily identifiable as that in 1 Corinthians 14, but it does seem clear that Christian women were in danger of bringing reproach on themselves, and this situation may have resulted from the newly found status of women in Christianity.²⁶ These statements should also be seen against the background of the usually negative view of women in the first century and in light of the fact that most women were uneducated. The main difficulty in saying that the verses are locally or culturally conditioned, however, is that one frequently just ignores such texts. Even where passages are so conditioned it is still necessary for us to "hear" them in their context and to learn from them.

In concluding this first question, then, in view of the cultural differences, biblical statements such as Galatians 3:28 and 1 Corinthians 11:15 and the biblical evidence showing women involved in the work of the Gospel, one limits the activity of women in ministry only with great difficulty. It will not do to deal with only a part of the biblical text. The passages on both sides of an issue must be considered, at least, even if one cannot account for all the details. I would no more argue for the silence of women in the church than I would argue for slavery on the grounds that Paul sends Philemon back, that in the *Haustafeln* (which is the "house rules") slaves are told to obey, or that in 1 Corinthians 7:20-24, a slave is told to remain in the state in which he was called. The statements in 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-12 were necessary for decorum to avoid confusion, arguments, and the violation of the sensitivities of others. The Christian attitudes of sobriety, quietness, selflessness, submission properly understood, and love are expected of all Christians regardless of sex. May a woman teach or preach? *If* she has knowledge, ability, Christian virtue, and has been called to that task, definitely she may, and I would place the same limitations on a man.

II. What Is the Relationship between Husband and Wife?

No attempt will be made here to deal with this question fully. Instead, attention will be focused only on the importance of the context of Ephesians 5 and on the model of the marriage relationship that is presented. The usual immediate response to our question is that the woman should submit. A reexamination of Ephesians 5 can set this directive in proper perspective.

The statement that women should submit appears three times in the New Testament, all three as part of the *Haustafeln* (Ephesians 5:22f., Colossians 3:18f., 1 Peter 3:1f.). The point that needs to be made could be made from any of the passages, but it is most obvious in Ephesians 5. It is frequently pointed out that people often ignore the following context with its injunctions for husbands, but the preceding context is even more important, especially in the Greek text. In 5:18-21 the readers are told to be filled with the Spirit, and this injunction is qualified by five participles: speaking, singing, praising, giving thanks, and being in submission to each other in fear of Christ. *It is only in the context of mutual submission (and mutual love) that further specification is given that the woman should be in submission to her husband.* In fact, the words "be in subjection" are not even in the text;²⁷ they are assumed from verse 21. Literally, verses 21,22 read: "Being in subjection to one another in fear of Christ. Wives to

their own husbands as to the Lord." In this context of mutual submission and with the direction to husbands to love their wives as Christ loves the Church, the statement to wives must be viewed differently from the way it usually is. As always in the New Testament, "authority" is defined by the role of the servant.

The second point that needs to be made is that two images of the husband-wife relationship are present in the New Testament. Both are clear in Ephesians 5. On the one hand an egalitarian relationship is made explicit. The quotation of Genesis 2:24 ("the two will be one flesh") in 5:31 points in this direction as does the wife's submission and the husband's giving himself for the wife. This egalitarian relationship is present in Genesis 1:26,27, in Galatians 3:28, and in 1 Corinthians 7:3f. (where each is to fulfill his or her duty to the other and each has authority over the other). The egalitarian relationship is easily diagrammed as a triangle with husband and wife as partners forming the base and Christ as Lord of the couple forming the top.

The other image of the husband-wife relationship in the New Testament that cannot be ignored is the hierarchical. In Ephesians 5:23 and 1 Corinthians 11:3 the husband is referred to as the head of the wife. Ephesians 5:33 states that the wife should fear her husband (certainly referring to a proper kind of fear that is part of the covenant concept in both testaments) cf. 1 Peter 3:6.

It will not do to attempt to ignore either image of the relationship even though each image has been ignored by various approaches. Recently an attempt has been made to ignore the hierarchical by interpreting the word κεφαλή (head) as "beginning," or "source."²⁸ Rather than man's being the head of woman with respect to authority, the biblical statements merely say that woman is derived from man (as in Genesis 2). κεφαλή is seen as an equivalent of ἀρχή ("beginning"). There are certain passages that seem to suggest that κεφαλή does mean "beginning." Note Colossians 2:19, ". . . the head from which all the body . . . increases . . ." (with the parallel in Ephesians 4:15,16), and Isaiah 19:15, where head (κεφαλή) and tail are paralleled by beginning (ἀρχή) and end." κεφαλή is often used in close association or interchangeably with ἀρχή, and both words are used to translate the Hebrew word רִאשִׁית, which can mean either "first, top, beginning, or head." To say that κεφαλή means merely "beginning" or "source," however, does not do justice either to the word itself (which includes connotations of "first, supreme, or extreme") or to the context of Paul's discussions. While different nuances of κεφαλή may be emphasized in different contexts, one cannot

get away from the connotation of authority that this word carries with it.²⁹

In the Septuagint the metaphorical use of κεφαλή for a ruler is frequent. See Deuteronomy 28:13,43,44, Judges 10:18, 11:8-11, 2 Kings 22:44 (Septuagint location; it is 2 Samuel 22:44 in the Hebrew and English) paralleled by Psalm 17:43 (18:43 in the Hebrew and English), Isaiah 7:8,9, and 9:14.

More important is the fact that Paul's understanding of κεφαλή includes the idea of authority. In Ephesians 1:22 he speaks of all things being subjected under Christ's feet and of him as "head over all things for (or with respect to) the Church."³⁰ In Colossians 2:10 Christ is presented as head of every rule ἀρχή and authority, and 2:15 makes it clear that the reference is to defeated foes. One cannot retreat to the interchangeability with ἀρχή, for this word itself, as Colossians 2:10 and other verses show, has connotations of authority. The meaning "source" or "origin" is not sufficient for Paul's understanding of κεφαλή. In the context of the relation of husbands and wives in Ephesians 5, the connotation of authority is reinforced in verse 33 with the statement that the wife should "fear" (properly understood) her husband.

This is not to suggest that the husband is to lord it over the wife. The way that the husband-wife relationship operates is clear in Ephesians 5. In the context of mutual submission and mutual love the wife is to submit to a husband who loves her as himself and gives himself for her and the two are bound in one flesh. Greater responsibility is placed on the husband in the relationship, but never is any suggestion made that he should act authoritatively or that he has special privilege.

The question arises, however, as to why the hierarchical image is included, especially since so much emphasis falls on the egalitarian relationship. It may be that the hierarchical is merely a foil to show the radical nature of the Gospel or that Paul's statements derive in part from a conventional house code of his day or that the hierarchical is itself a cultural application. It seems to me, though, that real meaning is conveyed by the hierarchical image, especially since recourse is made to the creation account (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:8,9).

Paul's statement that the husband is head seems to be related to the reference in 1 Peter 3:7 to the woman as the weaker vessel (physically). Greater responsibility is given to the husband because of the physical vulnerability of the wife and the oppression this led to in the first century.

Although things have changed a great deal, we delude ourselves if we think that most women are not still more vulnerable than most men. The presence of sin in our society turns vulnerability into oppression. Besides turning incompleteness into completeness, the marriage relationship provides a context where both husband and wife are nurtured and cared for, with the greater responsibility given the husband because of the physical vulnerability of the wife.

I would suggest then that the truth is in the tension, that the hierarchical and egalitarian aspects are both present and necessarily so. The conventional understanding of headship must no doubt be redefined as the Gospel redefines it. There is no limiting of roles or suppression of the development of the wife. There is no abuse or enslavement by the husband. On the contrary, the husband gives himself so that the wife is *also* cared for and nurtured and the two become one flesh.

To speak more broadly than the husband-wife relationship, there is no room in the Christian faith for chauvinism, for put-down, for restriction of development, or for sexual discrimination. By the grace of God each person has the potential and freedom for maximum development. At the same time one must also say that there is no room for pride, rebellion, and the attempt to obliterate sexual distinction. One does not express Christian freedom with non-Christian attitudes, nor would it seem necessary to do so for one who had experienced the grace of God.

ENDNOTES

1. The translations are sometimes misleading in this connection. For example, the King James Version used the word "ordain" thirty-five times, but this one English word represents twenty-three different Hebrew and Greek words, none of which is the equivalent of our understanding of "ordain." Several passages appear, on first reading, to be speaking of ordination, but a glance at the original text shows that ordination is not in mind and that a better translation would be "appoint." (See Mark 3:14, John 15:16, Acts 14:23, 1 Timothy 2:7, and Titus 1:5.)
2. Note the following opinions on women: The Letter of Aristeeus 250: [Women] easily change their minds as a result of specious argument. Josephus' *Against Apion* II.24 [Section 201]: Woman is in all things inferior to the man. Philo's *Questions on Genesis* 1.33: Woman is more accustomed to being deceived than man. Aboth 1.5: Talk not much with a woman [including one's own wife]. Cf. Ketuboth VII.6.

Women were not permitted as witnesses in a court of law (Josephus

Antiquities IV.8.15 [Section 219] nor were they counted as helping make up the quorum required for a synagogue.

On the whole subject of the social standing of women in Palestine, see Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 359-376.

One should note that certain women in the Old Testament were not viewed so negatively: Miriam in Exodus 15:20, Deborah in Judges 4 and 5, the wise woman in 2 Samuel 14, and Huldah in 2 Kings 22:14f.

3. That this is not merely a Lukan emphasis is clear from the opposition by women in 13:50.
4. Although the name may be masculine, and there is a textual variant that would read "his house."
5. Homily XXXI of his *Homilies on Romans*.
6. For example, see William G.T. Shedd, *A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1967 reprint of 1879 edition), p. 427.
7. Since she was from Cenchreae, one of the ports serving Corinth, from which Romans was written.
8. Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty (*All We're Meant to Be, Waco, Texas*: Word Books, 1974, p. 62) point out that twenty-one of the twenty-two times διάκονος is translated in the King James Version either "minister" or "deacon" is used. Only once is "servant" used—with Phoebe.
9. See Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 62 and 217, n. 4.
10. See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 565.
11. G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London: The British Academy, 1953), p. 17.
12. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 246.
13. Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 68,69. The relegation of the word νόμος (14:34) to "what is proper, what is assigned to someone," i.e., to social custom, is not at all convincing.
14. F.W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), pp. 341, 342.
15. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p. 325.

16. As the Textus Receptus, the KJV, the English Revised Version, and the Westcott-Hort text.
17. As the UBS text, the Nestle-Aland text, the ASV, RSV, and NEB.
18. Verse 32 provides the reasoning behind verse 30. No prophet would fail to submit to revelation being given by another.
19. At least at a later time women were kept separate from men in the Jewish synagogues. See Jeremias, p. 374; and Werner Förster, *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*, trans. Gordon E. Harris (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964), p. 127.
20. Especially if one could take ὁ νόμος as referring to social custom, but this is unlikely.
21. J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 68.
22. See Strack-Billerbeck, III, 645.
23. August Wiesinger, *Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, to Titus, and the First to Timothy*, trans. John Fulton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1857), pp. 385,386; Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, trans. by Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. 45, and C.K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 55.
24. Dibelius and Conzelmann, p. 47.
25. See for example on the Greeks, Aristophanes, *The Thesmophoriazusae*, 405-420 and 786-800, and the discussion in E. Guhl and W. Koner, *The Life of the Greeks and Romans*, trans. F. Hueffer (London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, 1889), p. 185. On the Jews see the discussion and rabbinic references in Jeremias, pp. 359f.
26. Note Titus 2:4,5 and 1 Timothy 5:13. Joachim Jeremias and Hermann Strathmann (*Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Der Brief an die Hebräer, Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963, p. 19) view the problem as a combination of a misused emancipation and a heretical asceticism. Katharine C. Bushnell (*God's Word to Women*, Oakland, California: privately printed for the author, 1923, sections 306-345) explained the words in 1 Timothy as necessitated by persecution, which is unlikely.

Verses 13-15 are difficult to explain on any interpretation. Obviously, the writer does not think women will be saved merely because they have children. Note the shift in verse 15 from the singular in the first half of the verse to the plural in the second half. See the options presented in Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 77-79.

27. They are, however, present in different forms in variant readings. See Metzger, pp. 608,609.
28. Scanzoni and Hardesty, pp. 30f. See also Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XL (1972), pp. 298,299; the suggestion seems to have originated with Stephen Bedale, "The Meaning of *kephale* in the Pauline Epistles," *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, V (1954), pp. 211-215.
29. Bedale, p. 215, who is one of most influential in arguing for the meaning "beginning" asserts that κεφαλῆ and ἀρχῆ both unquestionably carry the idea of authority.
30. See George Howard, "The Head-Body Metaphors of Ephesians," *New Testament Studies*, XX (1974), pp. 350-356.