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(Mark Chase 20210224)

**1A) Introduction**

I was brought up in a denomination and a home that would have agreed with SBF’s current practices – which as Alan noted I will call the “current” perspective. I too agreed that it seemed to be the intent of the plain words on the page, and like all of you, I am firmly committed to the authority of Scripture. However, I have come to a different understanding of the words of Scripture. I owe almost everything I will say to others because I don’t know Greek or have any formal Bible training. The study that the Leadership Team is doing has been both challenging and exciting, and we value and very much appreciate your continuing prayers. There isn’t a completely unanimous interpretation really for either perspective, so I’ll present a view that attempts to be coherent while solidly supported by Scripture and related evidence. I hope you will find what we will share to be worthy of your thought and prayer and even further study.

There are six words that are especially important for this presentation because the two perspectives see them quite differently: Adam, and the words typically translated helper, rib, head, authority and man. Those who support change believe that if we restore these words to what they understand to be their original meaning, the meaning that the writer and the first audience would have understood, we may be able to free women from a subordinate role. And it is not just about words. Those who support change are convinced from Scripture that God’s redemptive intention, from creation, through the new creation as modelled and taught by Christ, by the gifting of the Holy Spirit, by the principles and examples of the New Testament and by His revelation of what we can expect in the new heaven and earth, is for full equality of men and women. By equality they are not suggesting that there are no differences, but that there should be no hierarchy, no difference in status, no restrictions on leadership functions or roles.

**1B) Genesis Before and After the Fall**

As Alan said, Genesis 1 teaches that God created “adam” (the first problematic word) which actually means mankind – both men and women, in His image and likeness, blessed them and gave them together a mandate to procreate and to exercise stewardship.

Genesis 2 matters because Paul appeals to it in two letters at the centre of the debate. One perspective claims that Genesis 2 establishes the primacy of men over women as God’s intent, which was then distorted by the Fall, whereas those who support change claim that both Genesis 1 and 2 give women equal standing and that the Fall and the curse introduced hierarchy.

Many advocates of the current perspective point to woman being created as a “helper” (the second problematic word) i.e., a subordinate. Those favouring change point out that the word “ezer” is used 19 times in the OT other than for Eve, three times for help given in life-threatening situations and 16 times of God Himself! Hardly subordinate! Even some who support the current arrangement agree that the word “helper” cannot settle the question.

The current perspective suggests that the creation of Eve from Adam’s rib (the third problematic word) depicts woman as subordinate. The change perspective points out that the Hebrew word translated “rib” typically refers to a “part” or “side”. The word is used 41 times in the OT and is only translated “rib” here. Maybe we should imagine God separating Siamese twins instead.

The current perspective says that the man names the female “woman” before the Fall, which demonstrates his precedence. Quite the contrary, those who support change point out that:

* Genesis 2:23 not only introduces the word woman, but also the word man. In every verse before that it was adam – mankind. God chose for the two to appear at the same time.
* “The word ‘ishshah’ [woman] is not a derivative of ‘ish’ [man]. It is simply a word play.” The words are made for each other. They are balanced. They complete each other.
* The actual naming of “Eve” only came after the Fall.

Those who support change say men and women were of equal status until the Fall introduced illegitimate hierarchy. They say “[Eve’s] sin turned the woman to seek dominance over the man, and the man’s sin turned the man to seek dominance over the woman.”

**2) Women Throughout the Bible**

There are a few important examples in the Old Testament of female leaders, including Miriam - a prophet (Exodus 15:20-21), Deborah – a prophet and judge, definitely a position of authority (Judges 4-5) and Huldah – a prophet called on for an important message at a time when there were significant male prophets available (2 Kings 22:14-20, 2 Chronicles 34:19-28).

Both groups agree that Jesus was radically countercultural regarding women, although they see it a bit differently. Those supporting change point to several passages they consider significant.

* In John 4:27-42 Jesus spoke with the Samaritan women – astonishing in itself - and in effect made her the first evangelist.
* In Luke 10:38-42 The story of Mary of Bethany learning at Jesus feet is remarkable. Mary entered the territory of men and their position as disciples of the rabbi. Then in response to Martha’s objection, Jesus commended Mary for her choice as better than choosing to play the traditional female role.
* The most important evidence is that women were the first witnesses to the resurrection. This proved God’s “full confidence in the role to women to tell others the most important message God has for people to know”.

The only major challenge from those not wanting change is to point out that Jesus did not have women among the 12 Apostles. Those supporting change have a number of responses:

* Jesus purpose was to bring people to repentance and proclaim the coming of the kingdom of heaven. Nothing distracted Him from that priority – and if he had females among his closest disciples it would have been a major distraction for those He came to reach and would have required Jesus to repeatedly anticipate and address their reactions.
* There were also no Gentiles among the Apostles, but that has not been an issue.
* Jesus needed at least 10 male disciples to be recognized as a rabbi. He chose 12 to represent the 12 tribes and the replacement of Israel by a kingdom of the redeemed.

Beyond the women that Jesus honoured, those who support change point to the following roles that women played in NT church leadership:

* Phoebe – Benefactor (A very prestigious label, literally “a woman set over others”), probably a Deacon, and who, given Paul’s introduction, may well have carried and explained (i.e., taught) this letter - Romans 16:1-2
* Priscilla (along with Aquilla) -Teacher, Co-worker, House church leader –Acts 18:1-3, 18-26, Romans 16:3
* Euodia and Syntyche – Women who contended at Paul’s side in the cause of the gospel – Philippians 4:2-3
* Philip’s daughters - Prophets – Acts 21:9 (It should be remembered that Paul listed prophecy after apostleship and before teaching in his ranked list of greater gifts.)
* Possibly leaders as well as hosts of house churches – Lydia in Philippi – Acts 16:13-15,40, Chloe in Corinth – 1 Corinthians 1:11, Nympha in Laodicea – Colossians 4:15

**3) Qualifications for Leadership**

Those who support current arrangements claim that the requirements for elders and deacons in 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1 refer to men. They take “husband of one wife’ as further evidence.

It is worth noting that Paul would have had several reasons for giving leadership qualifications for the troubled churches in Ephesus and Crete (Titus). In view of the false teaching, they were desperately in need of good teachers. Those who were wealthy and elite had a virtual lock on leadership positions in the temples and in politics. Paul needed to make it clear that character was what matters. There is abundant evidence of abuse and greed in secular leadership and by the false teachers in the church. Paul corrected that.

Those who support change are able to demonstrate that none of the words used actually refer to males, and all could refer to men or women. Apparently “the Greek pronoun “tis” (the next problematic word) refers to either a male or a female”, so the historical translation “If a man desire the office …” is not accurate. And while, except in some of the oldest Greek texts, some of the pronouns used are masculine, apparently that is the default in Greek as it is in English.

A prominent supporter of the current arrangement acknowledges that the phrase translated “husband of one wife”, literally “one woman man” “is best understood to mean that a polygamist could not be an elder in a church”. Josephus confirmed that male polygamy was common.

There is no strong case that the requirements listed for deacons, or for that matter for elders, are internally restricted to men.

Beginning with Pentecost, when Peter quotes Joel clearly stating that God will “pour out [His] Spirit on both men and women, and they will prophesy”, those supporting change emphasize that “God’s spiritual gifting is gender-neutral”. Those wanting the current arrangement agree that both men and women receive gifting from the Spirit, but say that God then prescribes how these gifts are used in the church and that women are not eligible for the “offices”. Those supporting change respond that Paul and Peter taught believers to use their gifts, not to limit them, and that any attempt to differentiate and restrict “offices” is artificial and does not hold up to scrutiny.

**4) Principles of the New Creation**

My Bible refers to all of Galatians as the “Magna Carta of Christian Liberty”. Galatians 3:28 is the centrepiece, proclaiming “There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” Those supporting change consider this a very significant verse, articulating a critical principle of the new creation, and yes, presented much more strongly than the 1 Timothy 2 verse. To answer the response from those favouring current practice that it is primarily about salvation, they offer the following:

1. Jews did not see the categories slave/free, male/female having any significance for salvation – all were a part of Israel, and there never was any question in the church whether women could be saved. The suggestion that Galatians 3:28 is only about salvation doesn’t work.
2. It is evident that the words “neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free” certainly have huge societal implications – and so must “male and female”.
3. There was a well-known phrase repeated daily by Jewish men, especially Pharisees, expressing thanks that they were not made a Gentile, a woman or a slave. It is very likely that Paul wanted to deliberately negate that attitude with all of its baggage.
4. There are six similar passages from Paul, strongly indicating that these ideas were central to him. Furthermore, the phrase “in Christ” signals that this passage, like many others where he uses those words, is normative and has broad redemptive social implications.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that this whole letter was about broad doctrines. Paul was clear about the new status, in Christ, for Gentiles, slaves and women. He dedicated his life’s work to making that real for Gentiles, not only for salvation but for full equality in Christ.

**5A) 1 Corinthians 11:2-16**

We have discussed original creation earlier, but let’s consider the reference to headship in this passage.

The word translated “head”, which is “kephale” in Greek, is one of those problematic words. Those who support change are able to provide substantial evidence that the problem with using the word “head” is that we associate it with leadership or authority, for which the Septuagint and most Greek lexicons give “archon”, not “kephale”. They can justify an alternative as “source”, which fits to some extent but I agree seems a bit forced. Because of Paul’s evident concern with order and decorum and his sensitivity to contemporary moral convictions, some propose that the word be interpreted as - one who is “prominent” or “honoured”. It should also be remembered that in that day it was thought to be the heart, not the head, that was the “central governing place of the body” (to quote Aristotle), “the seat of control and the seat of intelligence”. Paul used the heart as his image when he had that connotation in mind. There is a better word somewhere, but it almost definitely should not be understood as leader or authority.

One scholar provides an extensive analysis of Roman law, literature and philosophy of this period to show the emergence of an assertive and often promiscuous “new Roman woman”. He argues convincingly that, as those involved would have recognized, “by deliberately removing her veil while playing a significant role of praying and prophesying … the Christian wife was knowingly flouting the Roman [law and standards]”. He also observes, “Just as it was improper for a wife to pray unveiled, so too it was … shameful for a woman to speak in the Christian meeting in the context of weighing up of prophecy, ‘even as the law says’.” He demonstrates that Roman standards of morality and modesty explain Paul’s references to what was proper, to head coverings, to shaving the head, to contentiousness, to judging for yourselves and to the law.

Even more important, those who favour change note that Paul’s insistence on no distinction “in Christ” uses those key words and is structured to emphasize that is what is really important. It does affect how we relate to each other!

**5B) Ephesians 5:21-33**

Note the comments above on the key word “kephale”.

Those who favour current arrangements explain that the submission of wives to the headship of husbands is the parallel of the church to the headship of Christ, and is definitive, and that these instructions are to restore God’s intended order, a point we have discussed earlier.

The grammatical syntax of the passage actually focuses on mutual submission in verse 21. It is not just the end of the previous section about six things we are enabled to do with the filling of the Holy Spirit, it is deliberately grammatically linked to the next section. One commentator points out that the word for “submit to one another” is technically “be subject to one another” and is a military term referring to accepting leadership from one higher in rank. The word “submit” from that verse is then borrowed and implied in the next verse for the wife.

The directions to men and women are different, but think back to Genesis 3. Paul seems to be trying to redeem the distortion of the Fall and return to the original intent of unity as “one flesh”. The instruction to wives is indeed to submit to their husbands as to the Lord. However, reflect on the nature of our submission to the Lord – which the passage describes when it calls us to consider what this mutual submission is supposed to look like for husbands. It goes way beyond even expecting each of us to treat our wife as our equal, rather we are to love her: as Christ loved the church, presenting her to himself as … radiant, without any blemish but holy and blameless, [loved] … as [our] own bodies, being united and becoming one flesh. Men, if you love your wives that way, it will teach you to love her more, to love Christ more, and to be more humble. Paul was actually counteracting hierarchy and subordination.

**6) 1 Timothy 2:9-15**

For some of you, this is the show stopper, the critical passage that has persuaded you that women should not teach or be Elders. I’ll summarize several reasons why those supporting change come to a different conclusion than those who do not. To be fair, the explosion of research means that we are in a better place to consider what the original audience would have understood than ever before. Let’s begin with context for the passage.

There are two main themes to pay close attention to. First, false teaching is Paul’s overriding concern throughout 1 Timothy. He says that at the start in the 3rd & 4th verse and again in the last 2 verses of the letter, and refers to false teaching or myths or the opposite, sound teaching, at least 12 more times. Paul also says in 1 Timothy 3:14 that appropriate conduct was another theme.

If we are to watch for false teaching, the religious environment in Ephesus is important. Because of the passage in Acts 19 about the riot in Ephesus due to Paul teaching against their goddess Diana/Artemis, and because of several references Paul makes to personal danger in Ephesus, we need to look into the conflict between Christianity and Artemis-worship. There is considerable evidence that Artemis was a huge influence. The Temple of Artemis was the foundation for Ephesian governance, culture, and commerce. Over 50 cities in the area put her image on their coins. Her cult has been found in most of the 2,000 towns and cities of the Roman Empire. She had numerous titles and attributes. There were processions in her honour almost every day as well as major festivals and celebrations. Artemis reigned supreme. In particular, Artemis worship and the nobility of the city were heavily interconnected and interdependent. Moreover, it has been suggested that to be an Ephesian meant to be a follower of Artemis.

Second, there are several hints of what my Bible identifies as an early form of Gnosticism in both 1 and 2 Timothy, so it too deserves attention. “Gnosticism claimed an oral tradition that stretched as long or (really) longer than the NT texts, meaning that we could infer that some version or elements were part of the “swirl of ideas” before being written down.”

Third, as mentioned earlier, there is substantial evidence regarding the “new Roman woman”, a gender and sexual revolution taking place in many of the major cities of the Roman Empire. The “new” kind of woman dressed elaborately and often provocatively, was frequently promiscuous, avoided childbearing, was increasingly independent and was often headstrong and arrogant – even in public. Caesar Augustus legislated specifically against this behaviour, going so far as to specify a dress code for wives.

With all that background in mind, let’s look at the passage.

Paul’s listeners would have had no trouble recognizing his instructions in verses 9-10. The distinctive clothing, hairstyles, gold and pearls described the “new” Roman woman. It also described Artemis and the way wealthy young Ephesian women dressed at the major annual festival procession for the goddess, and it was celebrated in a contemporary popular story called *Ephesiaca* – which used many of the same words in its description that Paul chose to use in his.

Let’s jump to the final verse 15 which begins “But women will be saved through childbearing”. One scholar discusses the “new” Roman wives and asks whether this “[reflects] the aversion to having children by rich or progressive wives? The use of preventive measures often put them in physical danger, and sometimes led to death.” Furthermore, Artemis was extremely important for women in childbirth when they prayed for her to “Deliver me safely or kill me quickly!”. It would have made perfect sense for Paul to reassure young Ephesian women that they no longer needed fear childbirth or to appeal to Artemis or to fear her, but to trust in God.

Verses 11-12 are the centrepiece. As most advocates of the current practice do, Alan has already used this verse to interpret almost every other passage. That is an awful lot of weight on one verse. The verses urge women to learn “in quietness and full submission”, and most importantly, “I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man; she must be quiet.”

Paul made it clear in 1 Timothy 1:3 that the whole point of the letter is to “command certain people not to teach false doctrines.” When he then repeats a very similar command, “but I do not permit a woman to teach”, he would not need to reiterate that it is the false doctrines that he is talking about, especially given numerous references to false teaching all around the verse.

If we look at his wording in 1 Timothy 1:3-7 and 6:3-5 and 2 Timothy 2:14-17 Paul was not just correcting false teaching, he was correcting a style of teaching that was assertive, controversial and quarrelsome. In 1 Timothy 1 and 2 Timothy 2, Paul names three men that he dealt with himself who were doing that. The verses give the same prohibition to certain women.

We need to home in on the word Paul used to forbid the woman from acting authoritatively, “authentein” (the fourth problematic word). That word is used nowhere else in the New Testament. Paul used other more common terms elsewhere for the exercise of authority. Those supporting change observe “The obvious reason [for Paul not using a typical word] is that ‘authentein’ carried a nuance that was particularly suited to the Ephesian situation.”

First, those favouring change point out that there is a long history of Biblical translation “stemming from the oldest versions and running down to the 21st century” favouring the translation “to dominate” or “to gain the upper hand”. A recent extensive linguistic analysis concludes that whenever the word is used in relation to humans or animals, it is negative and refers to “the autonomous use or possession of unrestricted force”.

Second, “The new Roman woman was noted for snatching the podium for public addresses and teaching.” She was characterized as having “an aggressive, confrontational public presence”. Artemis was powerful, authoritative and independent, so the word not only applies to the “new Roman woman”, but fits perfectly with the persona of Artemis - the huntress and Amazon.

Third, a few years later a leading Gnostic writer from this area, Cerinthus, called his version of the “supreme power” i.e., God, “Authentia”. It is likely that Paul was prohibiting behaviour that was modelled on the supreme power in Ephesus, Artemis.

I hope these points have raised questions in your minds. We must not forget that Priscilla and her husband taught Apollos in Ephesus (Acts 18:24-26) and that Paul praised them. There is a very strong case that “Paul [was] prohibiting teaching that tries to get the upper hand and not teaching per se.” and that he was prohibiting domineering behaviour, not church governance. But what about Paul’s reference to Adam and Eve to back up his instructions?

Followers of Artemis would have justified their aggressive behaviour because they claimed that women were superior, because there was a well-known myth was that Artemis was born before her twin Apollo and even assisted with his delivery. Early Gnostic myths also claimed that Eve preceded Adam, and that Adam “was deluded and was liberated by the knowledge of his more enlightened spouse”. Paul had a clear reason to connect the instructions in verses 11-12 to this myth about Artemis possibly reinforced by early Gnostic myths, and given our themes, to remind these women that the first woman, Eve, was not born first but was deceived and “overstepped an established boundary” (i.e., sinned), which is what they were doing.

Those who support change explain that this passage should be recognized as focused mainly on a particular situation in Ephesus of false teaching by women. Everyone in Ephesus, and indeed throughout the region and across most of the Roman Empire, would have recognized his references to Artemis and to the “new Roman woman”. We are the ones who have been at a disadvantage. Those who support change are not in any way diminishing the timeless value of this passage. They are saying that the timeless messages Paul intended are for women (he could also have said men) to guard against false teaching – as he emphasized that he was addressing, and to conduct themselves responsibly and honourably within the culture – which was also a theme, which would have included guarding against domineering behaviour and show-off abuses of wealth and instead showing their character by good works, self-control and faithfulness.

**7A) In Heaven, Esp. Marriage Supper/Bride of Christ**

Those supporting change say that the “climactic” point on this issue of the role of women must be at the wedding supper of the Lamb to the Bride of Christ (Ephesians 5:27, Revelation 19:7-9 and 21:9-10). “This will not be a demotion [of men] to a subordinate sex; it will be the supreme promotion for God’s people, women and men, to a union with Jesus Christ.” Why would Scripture repeatedly use a female image, the Bride, as the ultimate symbol of the church if a female could not lead or represent that church? They also point out that in Matthew 22:20, Jesus said that there would be no marriage in heaven, so any husband/wife status differential will also be gone. It seems that in the two possible locations where those who support the current arrangements insist on female subordination, it will no longer apply in heaven. In God’s redemptive plan, in heaven where His will is done, there is no hierarchy between men and women.

**7B) In Conclusion**

Those who support change are convinced from Scripture that God’s redemptive intention, from creation, through the new creation as modelled and taught by Christ, by the gifting of the Holy Spirit, by the principles and examples of the New Testament and by His revelation of what we can expect in the new heaven and earth, is for equal status of men and women without hierarchy.

**The following are not included in the verbal presentation, but are here for information.**

**1 Corinthians 14:26-40**

Those who favour the current arrangements interpret verses 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 as instructing women to be silent in churches, although several acknowledge that 1 Corinthians 11:5 does permit women to pray and prophecy. They therefore offer various other limitations on women – particularly teaching - whereas those supporting change suggest it probably points to addressing some sort of disruption, as per Paul’s concluding request for things to be “fitting and orderly”.

There are several interpretations and applications of verses 34-35 offered by those supporting change, including the possibility that the passage is a quotation (as elsewhere in the letter) or that it may have been inserted by a scribe. However, taking the verses at face value, a number of those supporting change favour the interpretation that women should not disrupt church meetings with rudimentary questions. “Throughout the first-century Mediterranean world, novices were expected to learn quietly, but more advanced students were expected to interrupt…with questions”. Relatively uneducated women in Corinth may have been overstepping their status. Notice that the passage goes on to tell women to ask questions of their husbands at home.

**1 Peter 3:1-8**

Those who support change point out that the instruction for wives to submit is targeted to Christian women married to non-believing husbands – which in itself would have been dangerous in a challenging world where Christians were experiencing persecution. Thayer’s Bible Dictionary on the military and non-military usage of the term translated “submission” says it is: “A Greek military term meaning ‘to arrange [troop divisions] in a military fashion under the command of a leader’. In non-military use, it was ‘a voluntary attitude of giving in, cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden’.

Peter gives several “instructions to certain groups of Christians to be submissive:

* Firstly, Peter tells all his readers to submit to every secular authority, or institution (2:13)
* Then he addresses slaves and tells them to be submissive to their masters (2:18)
* Then he says, ‘Husbands, in the same way be submissive to your own husbands’ (3:1)
* Then he says, ‘Husbands, in the same way live together with your wives…’ (3:7)
* In 1 Peter 5:5, Peter reintroduces the subject of submission and says, ‘In the same way, you who are younger, submit yourselves to your elders’
* This is followed by a phrase that in some Greek texts has a clear exhortation for mutual submission: ‘Yes, all of you be submissive to one another, and be clothed with humility’ (1 Peter 5:5 NKJV).”

The instruction to wives is one of a sequence of instructions to be submissive – “which includes being humble, deferential, cooperative, loyal and respectful – [as] a characteristic of Christ-like living.” While Peter does not use the word “submit” in verse 7, it is implied by the adverb “in the same way”. This would have been a radical instruction in the Greco-Roman context. Asking husbands to “honour” (time) their wives was also extraordinary and “unmistakably highlights the mutuality and equality of Christian husbands and wives”.
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