

May/June 1995
Volume 25, No. 3

Integrity

Editorial: A Time for Everything

Speak Up for the Church

Lorraine & Lyndsay Jacobs

Interview With an Oklahoma Rescuer

Pearls, Prayer, and a Prohibition

Ken Hensley

Tongue-in-Cheek Hermeneutics

Jan Huffaker

Book Reviews:

Rocking the Roles

Reviewed by Roger D. Palmer

***Women Caught in the Conflict: The Culture War
Between Traditionalism and Feminism***

Reviewed by J. Bruce Kilmer

Readers' Response

Readers' Response

Thanks for running my recent letter regarding my book, *Christians, You Were Baptized in Water and the Spirit*. It got some results! Thanks again and may God bless you.

Leon Gibson
Santa Ana, California

Yesterday I read your article, "All Things to all People," in the January/February issue of *Integrity*. In these times when so many conservative/evangelical Christians are being so dogmatic and exclusive on many issues, I thought your article gave some welcome fresh air, inspired by none other than the Apostle Paul.

Roy Bowen Ward
Oxford, Ohio

Back issues of *Integrity* are available from:

Amos Ponder
1269 Pickwick Place
Flint, MI 48507

INTEGRITY, a journal published bimonthly by an independent nonprofit corporation, is intended to be a ministry of reconciliation which utilizes the varied talents of a large community of believers. These believers, united in faith but divergent in opinions, seek to accurately reveal God to both the church and the world so that all may become one as He is one. Accordingly, it should not be assumed that the views expressed by individual authors necessarily represent the opinions of either the editors or the Board as a whole.

Integrity

4051 S. Lincoln Rd.
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858

**ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED**

Nonprofit Organization

U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

Ann Arbor, MI 48106
Permit No. 189

EditorsDiane G.H. Kilmer
J. Bruce Kilmer**Layout Editor**

Noreen Bryant

Board of DirectorsKathleen Blakely
Bruce Bryant
Noreen Bryant
Brant Lee Doty
Elton D. Higgs
Laquita M. Higgs
Kay Kendall
Diane G.H. Kilmer
J. Bruce Kilmer
Curtis Lloyd
Curtis D. McClane
Henrietta C. Palmer
William Palmer
Amos Ponder
Keith Price
Karl W. Randall
Jan Van Horn
John Van Horn**Editorial Advisors**Hoy Ledbetter
Joseph F. Jones**Subscriptions**are by written request. There is no subscription charge, but we depend on your contributions, which are tax-deductible. Please send c/o: Jan Van Horn
4860 Livernois
Troy, MI 48098**Editorial Address:**4051 S. Lincoln Rd.
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858*A Time for Everything*

In Ecclesiastes 3, Solomon declares that "There is a time for everything . . . a time to be silent and a time to speak." The authors of this *Integrity* issue emphatically agree with Solomon! Lorraine and Lyndsay Jacobs tell us that now is the time to speak positively about the church—the whole church. Gene Paregien, who wrote "Find the Good and Praise It" for our March/April 1994 issue, speaks out about silence and praise in his first-hand account as a rescuer at the Oklahoma bombing site. If an exegetical article on the women "must be silent" passage in 1 Timothy 2 would interest you, then you'll appreciate Ken Hensley's careful, thoughtful analysis which he entitles, "Pearls, Prayer, and a Prohibition." Jan Huffaker speaks with tongue-in-cheek humor as she makes an important point regarding faulty hermeneutics. As some of you requested in last fall's readers' survey, two reviews on books which address the roles of women and men are included. Plus, some of you readers take the opportunity to speak out in the "Readers' Response" section.

We hope you find something in this issue that challenges your current thinking and provides you further opportunity to grow in Christ. As Solomon put it, there is a "time to tear down and a time to build." May the Spirit of truth guide us into all truth. May we hear and obey!

Diane G.H. Kilmer
Co-editor**Speak Up for the Church!**

LORRAINE AND LYNDSAY JACOBS

Speak up for the Church! The whole Church! Speaking negatively about "parts" of the church other than "our own" is a luxury we can no longer afford—if we ever could.

The fact that an aggressively secular society is challenging the whole church is a strong reason why churches should develop the feeling that they belong together. Also, in our Campbell-Stone family of churches we can see that our division is an embarrassment for a unity movement. But these are not the key reasons for adopting a more inclusive attitude within the church.

The key reason is that we cannot preach the gospel of reconciliation—amongst people and with God—and practice competition and condemnation. We have little difficulty in agreeing that we should speak up for Jesus Christ. We are his and we are his witnesses. But it follows that the whole church is the Body of Christ today. To speak against any part of the church is simply to abuse Christ.

Constructive discussion, including the sharing of concerns, is part of the healthy development of the church as we "build up the body of Christ." This is caring for the body. But often we speak of other parts of the church as if they were no part of the body. We rejoice in others' failures; we are jealous of others' successes; we distance ourselves from those whose views we find too different. But we need to speak up for the church. The whole church!

With the re-make of the classic movie, *Miracle On 34th Street*, we are reminded of the transformation a Santa Claus with a new spirit brought to the world of depart-

ment stores. Santa did the unheard of by directing customers to other stores if Macy's did not have what they wanted—or if they could get a better deal elsewhere. Customers just loved this and a spirit of cooperation grew up among the stores. The miracle was that this cooperation benefitted everybody!

Department stores are not all the same. . . neither are congregations or families of congregations within the whole church. There is a rich diversity. Can we see the whole church serving the needs of the whole human family?

When we are talking about the beliefs and practices of "other" parts of the church, will we speak up for variety within the church? Even if we are convinced that others are definitely wrong rather than just different, will we speak graciously about brothers and sisters who are attempting with integrity to serve God? Will we lift up our God-given unity or speak up for uniformity—correctness, from our point of view?

Personally, we (Lorraine and Lyndsay) have not worshipped in a single "denominational" congregation for nearly 25 years. From the early 1970's we were part of a united congregation of members of Churches of Christ (Christian), Methodists, and Presbyterians. The four years prior to our moving to the USA we were in a community with no Church of Christ. We worshipped regularly in the four churches in the community—Baptist, Episcopal, Methodist-Presbyterian (united), and Roman Catholic. In Nashville we worship in congregations from all three streams of our movement here.

Our experience has helped us to own the “whole church”—its whole heritage, its whole breadth, its whole future. We certainly have preferences. There are things we feel should be changed in the church. But in every situation we have found a great group of Christian people dedicated to serving Christ.

There are many people on the road to truth—all sinners. We are all partners, living in Christ, on a journey of discovery as well as proclamation. Therefore, as Christians, we need to speak positively about the church. We need to own the church. To speak up for the church. The whole church.

It would make a World of Difference.

Lorraine and Lyndsay Jacobs are native New Zealanders and the parents of two grown children. In 1992 they were appointed General Secretaries, on a job sharing basis, for the World Convention of Churches of Christ, a global fellowship for members of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Christian Church/Churches of Christ (Independent), and the Church of Christ (a cappella) from more than 120 countries. The World Convention office is located in Nashville, Tennessee. This article was reprinted by permission from the WCCC Christian Friends publication.

Interview With an Oklahoma Rescuer

A calm Oklahoma morning was shattered on April 19th. The bombing at the Murrah building in downtown Oklahoma City sent shock waves around the world.

Stanley “Gene” Paregien, a member of the Britton Road Church of Christ in Oklahoma City, was activated by the Department of Defense to document and assist in the rescue efforts downtown. In his full-time job, Gene works in marketing at the interactive museum Enterprise Square, USA in Oklahoma City. One weekend a month and two weeks in the summer, he is a technical sergeant in public affairs for the 507th Air Refueling Wing at Tinker Air Force Base.

“Standing at the debris, I couldn’t believe what I was seeing. It took my breath away. Television didn’t do the disaster justice. What little was left of the building towered above me. Phones and computers

dangled by wires where desks and floors and people used to be.

“It was like walking through your worst nightmare. You wanted to hear someone call out for help, but we never heard any voices except the low murmur of workers in the background. The only other sound I heard was the wind whistling through the massive holes in the structure and bits and pieces of debris falling all over,” Paregien said.

On Saturday, April 22nd, Paregien arrived at the site and found things had gotten worse.

“The temperature had dropped to 39 degrees and the rain was pouring. The Oklahoma wind whipped around and made it feel like it was freezing out there. My teeth were chattering, but the work continued. We assisted the Red Cross delivering food and supplies to workers all around the

site. We were on our way into the building when they temporarily stopped the search because of rain weakening the structure,” said Paregien.

A Time To Mourn

Time passed quickly at the command center. On Sunday morning, April 23rd, the sun came back out and the national day of mourning was recognized at the bomb site by one minute of silence. All the workers stopped what they were doing. The giant cranes shut down. The FBI, ATF, FEMA, military and rescue personnel all gathered together. Everyone stood still looking at the damaged building and the flags flying quietly in the breeze.

“It was a very sad moment for all of us. Working there seemed so unreal. How could this occur in our beautiful state? It was a tragic moment in American history that I hope is never repeated,” added Paregien.

Later in the day, while they were still working, Billy Graham pulled up to Paregien in a golf cart and shook his hand and said, “Hello, my friend.”

At the command center Paregien was interviewed “live” on television and radio and he was interviewed by the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times.

“The media was in a frenzy to get the scoop on each other. Every time you would walk by on your way to or from ground zero, they would rush up and stick microphones in your face; I just tried to answer their questions as politely and informatively as I could,” he said.

Paregien commented that he was proud of all the workers who gave of their blood, sweat, and tears to make the best of a terrible situation. Several workers got cuts

on the rescue site and had to get tetanus shots on the spot.

“Everywhere you walked within two blocks, you stepped on shards of glass, pieces of broken concrete, and metal bits from the building. Decontamination stations were set up to clean off rescuers because of the threat of disease.

A Time To Mend

“If you step back and examine how this happened, you realize that this can happen anywhere in America. You know that these grieving families could just as easily have been your family. I was scheduled to go downtown that day for a convention. My daughter’s school was getting ready to load their buses to go downtown for a field trip when the bomb went off. My wife and I went to the building to get our son’s social security number a year ago; some people were innocently doing the same thing on April 19th,” Paregien said.

Paregien said he has been much more emotional than normal since the bombing.

“I didn’t cry at first. I was just in shock like everyone else. But in the last 10 days I have probably cried more than I have in 10 years. I find myself crying while watching Disney movies and Rescue 911 with my kids. It has made me further appreciate God’s gifts in my life and the lives of my family and friends. It made many people stop and think about their lives and whether they were ready to die; that aspect of the tragedy is good,” said Paregien.

Paregien said he didn’t sleep well for several nights after working at the scene. His mind played tricks on him. He wondered if he had really seen what he thought he saw downtown. He woke up one night in

a cold sweat after dreaming that he was stuck under the concrete and couldn't breathe.

"Working at the scene was sickening. You are standing less than a foot from where possible survivors are pinned under tons of concrete, but the frustrating thing is you can't do anything about it.

"When considering Philippians 4:8 and 4:9, there were many aspects of this disaster that were good and worthy of praise. The quick response by emergency personnel helped save many lives. Everyday citizens came from all directions. Churches helped families who needed supplies and food. Many church members worked in shelters and relief centers. The purity was found in the children who were taken away

too soon. We don't understand it, but we know God is in control.

"It brought out two feelings in me. One was of great sadness for the victims, all the children, the parents, the brothers and sisters who were killed or injured. The other feeling was of great pride. I saw so many Oklahomans pitching in to donate food, supplies, money and blood. I met workers from all across the country. I'm proud to be a Christian, an Oklahoman, and an American. I would urge folks to continue this great work by watching out for each other and volunteering in everyday non-emergency situations. Together, showing our best Christian testimony in times of struggle, we can all make our world more united and caring than ever before," Paregien added.

Gene Paregien holds a public relations degree from Oklahoma Christian University of Science and Arts in Oklahoma City.

Prayer, Pearls, and a Prohibition: 1 Timothy 2:8-14

KEN HENSLEY

⁸ *I desire, then, that in every place the men should pray, lifting up holy hands without anger or argument; ⁹also that the women should dress themselves modestly and decently in suitable clothing, not with their hair braided, or with gold, pearls, or expensive clothes, ¹⁰but with good works, as is proper for women who profess reverence for God. ¹¹Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. ¹²I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent. ¹³For Adam was formed first, then Eve; ¹⁴and Adam was not*

deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. 1 Timothy 2:8-14

The question of hermeneutics is perhaps best illustrated, and tested, in 1 Timothy 2:8-14. Ranging from lifting holy hands in prayer to the women's role in the church to the story of Adam and Eve, this passage offers ample material to test one's hermeneutic and exegetical methods. Interpretation of this passage requires sound exegesis and must involve conventional

wisdom, while keeping in check the intense emotions related to its contents. Commenting on this passage, authors Walter Liefeld and Ruth Tucker state: "The passage has tended to attract some careless and subjective interpretations."¹ I will attempt in this article to avoid both tendencies.

Brief Introduction To 1 Timothy

The apostle Paul is generally accepted as the author of the Pastorals, including this first letter to Timothy. The serious debate over Pauline authorship began in the nineteenth century.²

Part of the controversy centered around the author's use of words not found elsewhere in the New Testament, which in the case of 1 Timothy 2:12 is very important.³ In his commentary on the Pastorals, A. T. Hanson argues against Pauline authorship: "If they are Pauline, they represent a dismal conclusion to Paul's writings; if they are post-Pauline, they are an admirable and indispensable illustration of the state of the Church at the end of the first century. In fact, it is pretty plain by now that they are not Pauline."⁴ However, this article is written on the premise shared by many others: that 1 Timothy is part of Paul's correspondence with a young minister establishing a church.

From 1 Timothy 1:3 we learn that Paul left Timothy in Ephesus for the purpose of building and strengthening the church there. The Ephesian church was being threatened by dangerous false teachings and Paul was concerned with correcting any abuses. The city of Ephesus lent itself very easily to false teachings. In fact, 1 Timothy 2:8-14 is written against a backdrop of false teachings and must be understood in light of them. Manfred Brauch is even more

emphatic about the importance of understanding 2:11-12 in light of the false teaching when he writes, "Paul's restrictive word in 1 Timothy 2:11-12 must be understood within a context when false teaching is at issue."⁵

What False Teaching?

To gain a better understanding of what false teaching Timothy faced, one should read not only Paul's first letter to Timothy but also his second. Beginning with 1 Timothy and working forward, the following details about false teaching can be seen:

- 1 Timothy 1:3-4: false teachers devoted to myths and endless genealogies;
- 1 Timothy 1:6-7: they want to be teachers but are not well-enough informed;
- 1 Timothy 1:19: some have rejected Paul's instructions and prophecies;
- 1 Timothy 4:1-3: they forbid marriage, teach abstinence from certain foods, and are liars;
- 1 Timothy 4:7: Paul warns against godless myths and old wives' tales; (On this passage Catherine and Richard Kroeger write, "Translators usually manage to give the impression that the tales were harmless, but the writer of the Pastorals viewed them as a serious threat."⁶)
- 1 Timothy 5:13-15: younger widows are susceptible as well;
- 1 Timothy 6:3-5: they have an unhealthy interest in controversies and are given to greed;
- 1 Timothy 6:20-21: told to not participate in godless chatter and false knowledge;

- 2 Timothy 2:14-18: they quarrel about words, indulge in godless chatter, and say the resurrection has already taken place;
- 2 Timothy 2:23-24: avoid foolish arguments and do not quarrel;
- 2 Timothy 3:1-9: they will sway over women who are always learning but never comprehending the truth;
- 2 Timothy 4:3-5: they will teach what others want to hear.

This extended listing of the false teaching gives us a better picture of why Paul was writing and what Timothy was up against. Not everyone agrees that understanding the false teaching of Ephesus will help in understanding 1 Timothy 2:8-14. Indeed, the author of *Women and the Word of God* sees “no mention of false teaching, no word of correction in 1 Timothy 2:9-15.”⁷ In her opinion, for the false teaching to have any bearing on interpreting 1 Timothy 2:9-15, it must be explicitly mentioned within the passage itself. Such a view fails to take into account the overall theme and concern of the author which undoubtedly will influence the parts within the whole.

Prayer And Proper Adornment

Verse eight, which reads, “I want men everywhere to lift up holy hands in prayer, without anger or disputing,” picks up the thought which began the chapter: praying for “everyone—for kings and all those in authority.” Paul seems always concerned that Christians be about those things which promote “God’s work, which is by faith” (1 Tim. 1:4). The word for desire, or want, (*boulomai*) often suggests “not only desire but also a desire that directs one’s energies and shapes his decisions.”⁸

Two things are important to notice about 2:8, the posture of prayer and things to avoid. Posture in and of itself is an indicator of attitude. Recent books on worship have focused on the usefulness of posture for developing a mood or atmosphere. Peter Gillquist writes, “To tie it all together—we simply can’t be spiritual without being physical. For man was never created to be either just a soul or just a body. We are not one or the other, but both.”⁹ When Paul writes these instructions, he is building on a rich Hebrew history (Neh. 8:6, Ps. 28:2, 134:2; 141:2) of using the physical body in worship to God.

The posture is amplified in two ways. First, we are to “lift” holy hands in prayer. This posture underlies our basic dependence upon God. In a chapter entitled, “The Body of the Believer in Worship,” Allen and Borror write: “One holds out his hands to receive a gift of God’s grace. . . We do not come with our hands closed, expressive of secret desires or hostile intentions, indicative of the opposite thing that we are saying. We come rather with our hands open, our desires made known, and our expectancy demonstrated by our reverent position.”¹⁰ Lifted hands reach beyond oneself and individual ability, and are an acknowledgment of one’s need before God.

The second way Paul amplifies his request for them to pray is by focusing on the inner attitude of the one praying. His injunction to pray “without anger or disputing” fits within the context of combating the false teaching he addresses within this letter (i.e., 1:5, 2:2, 3:3, 6:4-5). The word for disputing (*dialogismos*) can mean either an argument or a doubt.¹¹ It is

unlikely that Paul is referring here to doubt, given the context and his concerns for the church. Much of the Christian life is an exercise of the heart, a combination of method and motive. Thus, to lift holy hands in prayer one must avoid anger or disputing, things which are characteristic not of God’s people but the false teachers.

A final word should be mentioned about the location of these men who are instructed to pray. Possible meanings include the house churches in which Christians met or it could be broadened out to encompass the universal church. Douglass Moo holds to the house church view while others, such as Craig Keener, are willing to admit both possibilities.¹²

Proper Adornment

The beginning of this section (2:9-10), which deals with dress for Christian women, has been suggested as a continuation of thought from verse eight. Alvera Mickelson offers an alternate translation for verse nine: “Likewise, I want women to pray in modest apparel. . .”¹³ While most agree that it probably refers to the worship assembly, Mickelson even takes it a step further. We will direct our comments, however, primarily towards the appearance issue.

Paul generally uses an evangelistic perspective when he instructs Christians on how they should behave (Col. 4:5-6; Gal. 6:9-10; 1 Cor. 9:19-23). He felt very strongly about not letting anything hinder the spread of God’s message, such as when he wrote to the Corinthians about women praying and prophesying with their heads covered (1 Cor. 11). These instructions to the women in Timothy’s church seem to

have evolved from a similar concern about their appearance hindering their Christian witness.

The situation in Ephesus made these instructions necessary. Catherine Kroeger, who has done extensive research on the ancient circumstances of the New Testament, indicates that “ostentation in dress was frequently considered a sign of promiscuity in the ancient world.”¹⁴ The city was famous for its temple to Diana (Latin for Artemis) and for the priestesses who attended to it. These priestesses were, in fact, prostitutes. Kroeger also thinks that 2:9-10 might be “a warning to women who sometimes disrobed during worship. . . furthermore, it was sometimes an act of piety and blessing for a pagan woman to raise her skirt to the waist.”¹⁵

While complete reconstruction of the situation is impossible, it is safe to say that there must have been sufficient abuse to warrant these words from Paul. Among evangelicals there has been a tendency to ignore the particulars in favor of the principle. Scholer writes in *Women, Authority, and the Bible*, “In view of this unity of 2:9-12 and the conclusion in 2:15, there is no exegetical, historical, or hermeneutical basis to regard 2:9-10 as normatively different from 2:11-12.”¹⁶ This underscores the tension that is often characteristic of trying to interpret the prohibitions in 2:11-12 while dealing with the inconsistent application of 2:9-10. The principle Paul is enlisting in 2:9-10 again returns to the theme of inner character, as he appeals to their sense of appropriate service. The Christian’s beauty comes from the inside, not the type of clothing or jewelry one might wear.

Can Women Teach?

The position and status 2:11-12 takes in the Pauline corpus depends upon one's beginning point in interpretation. To define what is normative often involves deciding which will take precedence, the prohibitions or other scriptures which seem to indicate permissiveness. Scholars are divided over this issue of precedence. F. F. Bruce, for example, holds up Galatians 3:28 as Paul's basic belief in the arena of gender issues.¹⁷ William Barclay, another renowned scholar, also argues for the place of Galatians 3:28 in understanding 1 Timothy 2:11-12: "All things written in this chapter are mere temporary regulations to meet a given situation. If we want Paul's permanent view on this matter, we get it in Galatians 3:28."¹⁸ Susan Foh, for one, takes 1 Timothy (and a similar passage in 1 Corinthians 14) to be the lens through which to interpret other passages.¹⁹ It's our goal to understand 2:11-12 as it was written, to Timothy for instructing the church at Ephesus.

Learning in Quietness

While many may see verse eleven in a negative light, it instead sends a ray of hope to women of the first century. To begin with, they are not to be excluded from learning in the same way they were discriminated against in the synagogue. Paul uses an imperative verb here to emphasize the importance and necessity of Christian women learning. It carries the weight of a command and not a suggestion. This in and of itself was a revolutionary command. As Barclay puts it, "To instruct a woman in the law was to cast pearls before swine."²⁰ Paul may have in mind the women who were swayed by the false

teachers, "always learning but never able to acknowledge the truth" (2 Timothy 3:6-7). Christian women are to learn. In fact, they must learn the truth. The issue of learning in quietness is not a matter of remaining in silence but refers to the manner of learning. The New American Standard translates this phrase as "Let a woman quietly receive instruction. . ." In no way is Paul restricting the woman's right to ask questions, make points, or verbalize thoughts. However, when they do so they must do so in the proper manner, with proper respect. Full submission should not be seen as a subservient role the woman is to occupy. Submission is a way of life for every Christian, male and female. Ultimately, we are to submit ourselves to God (James 4:7) and, as brothers and sisters in Christ, to one another (Ephesians 5:21). This attitude of submission is also to characterize the Christian home (Ephesians 5:22-33).

I Do Not Permit . . .

Let's examine verse twelve from three different aspects: first, in regards to the tense of *epitrepo* (permit) and its possible implications. Next, I'll discuss the role of *didaskein* (teach). Finally, we'll take a look at the usage of *authentain* (authority) and draw some conclusions.

For Douglass Moo, the significance of *epitrepo* is one of six issues that must be decided at the exegetical level.²¹ How this verb, in the present tense, is translated dictates a few of the implications we can draw about Paul's injunction against women teaching. If, as Ruth Tucker writes, we can translate this phrase as "I am presently permitting no woman to teach,"²² that would seem to indicate a temporal

parameter to Paul's prohibition. Arguing along these lines, Kroeger and Kroeger cite work done by John Toews. He suggests that whenever *epitrepo* is used in the Septuagint, it always refers to a specific and limited situation as opposed to a timeless, universal one.²³ Paul certainly had other tenses at his disposal which would have made a universal intent even clearer.

Moo, however, is not quick to attribute too much significance to the present tense of *epitrepo*. "The fact is, however, that nothing definite can be concluded from this word."²⁴ He goes on to say if Paul's parameters are to be evaluated it must not be from the verb "permit," "but must be decided by the context in which it occurs."²⁵ While the tense of *epitrepo* may assist us in developing a position on 2:11-12, it is not enough by itself to carry the entire position.

Didaskein In Context

Much of the discussion over what women can and cannot do within the church has centered around the word translated "teach." To help us grasp what Paul might mean by his use of *didaskein* in 2:12, let us first look to other uses of the word and its various forms in this letter. Chapter one has this reference to teaching, "command certain men not to teach false doctrines any longer" (1:3). Later in the same chapter, 1:7, we are told the false teachers want to be teachers of the law. Paul refers to himself as a "teacher of the Gentiles" (2:7). Elders or overseers are to be able or capable teachers and not just teachers in general (3:2). "Such teachings" in 4:2 refer back to the things taught by demons (4:1). Good ministers follow good teaching (4:6). Timothy is told to teach "these things," the content of which precedes the verse (4:11).

What conclusions can we draw from the above sampling of uses? To begin with, can we assume that Paul is only talking about the act of teaching without any aspect of the content in mind? In other words, is he ruling out teaching altogether or only a certain type of teaching? In *I Suffer Not a Woman* the authors state: "If the context of 1 Timothy 2:12 is neutral and refers only to the activity of teaching rather than to its positive or negative content, then it is the only time that *didaskein* is so used in the Pastorals. . . We believe that the verb here forbids women to teach a wrong doctrine, just as 1 Timothy 1:3-4 and Titus 1:9-14 also forbid false teaching."²⁶ Paul does seem to generally qualify the type of teaching that is occurring, either with warnings, encouragements, or examples.

If Paul is prohibiting the act of teaching in general, how, then, is it to be applied? Gilbert Bilezikian raises a good point in reference to how we answer this question. He writes, "References to the churches' teaching ministry are found in Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12, and Ephesians 4, but in none of those passages is there any expression resembling an exclusion concerning women, although it is clear that women participated in the ministries."²⁷ How do we place the teaching of Priscilla within this verse? To say that 1 Timothy 2:12 is exclusively within the boundaries of the worship service seems to do a disservice to the totality of the Christian life. Yet, very few would be willing to impose this prohibition on women in public schools or colleges. Additionally, few have problems with women teaching in the Sunday School, provided it's children.

If it's not teaching in general that is prohibited then it must be the type or man-

ner of teaching or the content that is taught which are prohibited. This seems to fit best within the context, and it also brings us to the use of another important word, *authenthein*.

Use of *Authentein*

The third key to understanding 2:12 is in the phrase “have authority over a man.” The reason for the special importance of this phrase lies in the use of a rare word for authority, *authenthein*. Given the lack of supporting usage, *authenthein* has provoked much controversy as to how it should be translated. Efforts have been made to trace the historical usage of *authenthein* but have yet to provide a conclusive reconstruction of its meaning. In fact, scholars are divided over how to interpret this word dealing with authority.

Ruth Tucker writes, “In the King James, *authenthein* is rendered not ‘to have authority’ but ‘to usurp authority.’ This would seem more consistent with the Greek.”²⁸ Tucker, in an earlier book with Liefeld, wrote this about *authenthein*: “One thing does seem certain already: it had a meaning much stronger than the normal verb for exercising authority, *exousiazo*.”²⁹ That Paul did have a more common word for authority at his disposal and chose not to use it is important to bear in mind.

Catherine Kroeger, adjunct professor at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, has done extensive research into the history of *authenthein*. Based upon her study of its usage in antiquity, she identifies a range of meanings. They include to begin something or to be primarily responsible for a condition or action. Also within the range of meaning is the idea of ruling or dominating. The King James utilizes another

possible meaning in using usurping the power or rights of another. *Authentein* could also mean to claim ownership, sovereignty or authorship.³⁰ Kroeger tends to focus in on the meaning of setting oneself up as the originator of something. As this range of meaning shows, the translation of *authenthein* is very influential in understanding Paul’s injunction against women. We need to know exactly what kind of authority Paul is forbidding.

Not everyone agrees with Kroeger’s work in reference to *authenthein*. Keener in his book on this issue of what women can and cannot do writes of Kroeger: “Kroeger finds evidence that the term can mean ‘to proclaim oneself the author and originator of something,’ and suggests that Paul here combats the Gnostic-type myth that woman is man’s source. . . but in Paul’s period it is unlikely that his readers would have automatically understood the term so narrowly.”³¹ Keener exhibits the cautiousness that is needed when dealing with such a rare, but pivotal, word.

The possibility has been raised that *authenthein* may actually be qualifying *didaskhein*. This is because of the use of the connector *oude*. Kroeger and Kroeger cite the work of Philip Barton Payne who “points out that in the Pauline corpus *oude* is usually employed to bring together two closely related ideas. . . Payne argues, then, that the two expressions *didaskhein* and *authenthein*, linked as they are by *oude*, together convey the meaning of the decree. The *oude* indicates that *authenthein* explains what sort of, or what manner, of teaching is prohibited to women.”³² In other words, Paul may be referring by his usage of *authenthein* to the type of teaching (*didaskhein*) he is prohibiting. If *authenthein*

is qualifying *didaskhein* and does not stand on its own, then the thrust of 2:12 is completely changed from both teaching and exercising authority to simply the style or manner of teaching.

She Must Remain Silent

Paul closes this prohibition with the words, “she must be silent.” What does he mean by this? The word for silent, *hesuchios*, is also used in other forms within this same book. While it is translated here as silent, in 2:2 it refers to the type of lives we are to live: peaceful and quiet. In 2:2 Paul is teaching respect for leaders and those in authority, and this is shown through our prayers for them. The purpose of this exercise is the goal of living peaceful and quiet lives. This is achieved on a practical level by our living in godliness and holiness. The same word is used in both 2:11 and 2:12, even though the NIV chooses to translate it as “quietness” (2:11) and “silent” (2:12).

Obviously, Paul is not intending the women to be totally silent, for this would preclude singing (Colossians 3:16; Ephesians 5:19) and would seem to contradict his instructions on how a woman prays and prophesies properly (1 Cor. 11:3-16). His appeal for silence must mean, as we mentioned previously in this paper, a proper attitude towards learning. He is concerned with the inner attitude one possesses. This passage has a parallel in 1 Corinthians 14:33-34, though that passage is not as easily understood as it may appear on the surface.

What About Adam And Eve?

Verse thirteen and fourteen possess their own fair share of varied interpretations, as

well as the concluding verse fifteen. Though not all may agree on what role and function this reference to Adam and Eve may play in interpreting Paul’s prohibition, all do agree that it plays a significant role. This section will deal with answering three possible questions about these verses.

On first reading, it may appear that Paul is appealing to creation facts to sustain his prohibition against women teaching. This position is fairly common, especially among conservative evangelicals. Because it is seen as being grounded in creation it is often used to offer these verses as universal, timeless principles. As Susan Foh states, “In 1 Timothy 2:11-12, Paul does state a general principle. Because his commands are founded on unchanging historical facts that have specific theological significance (vv. 13-14), they are authoritative for all times and cultures.”³³ The question arises, is Paul basing his prohibitions on creation or simply using Adam and Eve for other illustrative purposes? Unfortunately, many have used these verses to find divine justification to the inferiority and duplicity of women. If being created first determines superiority, then animals would be superior to humans. Was that Paul’s intent? Is that what Paul meant by using the story of Adam and Eve? If Paul is using Eve’s deception as grounds for not allowing women to teach, why should men be allowed to teach, given Paul’s treatment of Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15:21? Eve may have been deceived, but Adam was disobedient (Romans 5:19). Should the creation order be grounds enough for the prohibition against teaching, given the fact that both the man and the woman were told “fill the earth and subdue it” (Genesis 1:28)? Previous to the Fall there

appears to be no indication of any type of hierarchy. A few words are in order to discuss how this view has led to abuses within the Christian community. Some have taught that the Fall teaches that women are more susceptible to temptation, and that is why Paul would not allow them to teach. Women are more gullible than men, they reason, because the serpent targeted the woman. It is clear from Genesis 3:6 that both Adam and Eve were present during Eve's discussion with the serpent. More so, it had been Adam who was instructed by God in regards to eating the fruit of this tree. Any blanket statements about gender dispositions must surely be taken into account as well.

Does Paul Mean Something Else?

Earle Ellis wrote a book entitled *Pauline Theology*. He takes a novel approach to 1 Timothy 2:11-14 in that he sees it as relating to the husband-wife relationship and not to men and women in general. He argues, "1 Timothy 2:9-3:1a, 1 Corinthians 14:34ff, and 1 Peter 3:1-7 all appear to be elaborations and/or applications of an underlying tradition, probably expositions of Genesis, on the obligations of the wife to her husband."³⁴ He sees in the use of Adam and Eve further grounds to reinforce this belief. "In particular, 1 Timothy 2:9-3:1a also reveals its household origins in the use of a husband and wife, Adam and Eve, to ground its teaching in scripture (2:13f). In turn, these considerations give further support to the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15 as a reference to childbirth, that is, a familial context."³⁵

The way Ellis interprets this passage would seem to indicate varying levels of involvement for women depending upon

their marital status. Single women would not be under the umbrella of this command since it is addressed to the husbands and wives. Those single women who enjoyed ministry prior to marriage would be expected to cease certain parts of it upon marriage. While this position may harmonize with other sections of scripture, it does not have the textual evidence to fully support its basic premise.

Another False Teaching?

Could Paul's reference to Adam and Eve refer to the false teaching? This view is often associated with those who see Paul's prohibition not as a general restriction but as a specific injunction against the false teaching happening at Ephesus. Paul's use of Adam and Eve is not intended to establish a hierarchy based on the creation order, but rather Paul uses the story of the creation and the fall for illustrative purposes.

A few of Paul's concerns about the false teachers were the "opposing ideas of what is falsely called knowledge" (6:20), those who "wanted to be teachers of the law, but [they] do not know what they are talking about" (1:6-7), and people who were "always learning but never able to acknowledge the truth" (2 Timothy 3:7). Timothy was trying to maintain the integrity of the faith amidst a barrage of false teaching. And as we know, people "will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear" (2 Timothy 4:3). Timothy faced the monumental task of discipling reliable converts, converting others, and opposing the false teachers.

Adam and Eve may provide, as some suggest, a good model for the false teachers. Kroeger and Kroeger find in 2:13

traces of Gnosticism. They write, "We suggest that these verses are not intended as the rationale for prohibiting a gospel ministry for women, but rather they constitute a refutation of a widespread heresy. Specifically, we consider this to be directed against Gnostic or proto-Gnostic mythology glorifying Eve."³⁶ Also commenting on 2:13-14, Tucker states: "It was before Eve was created that Adam was instructed not to eat the fruit. She perhaps lacked instruction, for she may have heard of the restriction only through Adam. It would seem natural, then, that she could be more easily deceived. So it was with the women at Ephesus."³⁷

Are these valid suggestions? It does appear that Paul is using Adam and Eve in an illustrative role. If what Kroeger writes of the prevailing winds of Gnosticism is true, then 2:13 would fit right into Paul's argument. A complete reconstruction of the religious atmosphere at Ephesus, however, has not been done and may be impossible. This passage, 2:13, may fit with the false teachers targeting women (1 Timothy 5:11-15; 2 Timothy 3:6-9). In addition, given the false teachers' ambitions to be teachers without first grasping what to teach, 2:14 could be a statement directed to that situation. Paul may be restricting from teaching those who are not prepared or fully instructed.

Conclusions

I will draw my conclusions around the three main areas within this text: holy hands in prayer, women's dress, and whether or not women should be allowed to teach in the church. Based upon the textual and hermeneutical evidence, I will seek to draw applications to today's church situation.

Lifting Holy Hands

This entire section of scripture has been troublesome (especially 2:11-14) for our traditionally conservative Church of Christ fellowship. A common tendency among certain evangelicals is to avoid the extremes represented by the literal legalism of the fundamentalists and the emotional "free-for-all" of the charismatics. In regards to 2:8 we often stand in the middle: to avoid fundamentalism we do not require that hands must be lifted (even though it carries the weight of a command) and, to maintain a certain protocol separate from the charismatics, we usually do not lift them anyway.

Historically we have chosen to focus on what seems to be Paul's main concern, which is, one's attitude in prayer. Holy hands are achieved through a holy lifestyle, one set on pleasing God. Character is further brought into focus by his admonition against anger and disputing. Unquestionably it is true that Paul is concerned about their attitude and character in prayer. But can we so easily dismiss posture?

A certain mood in worship is recaptured when we involve our total self in worship to God. All too often our worship is primarily an intellectual exercise with prescribed doses of emotion. Not all of the senses may be engaged in encountering God. One often overlooked facet of posture is the manner in which it not only indicates attitude but also influences attitude. When one kneels in prayer it is a physical reminder that we are subject to God and not vice versa. In the same way, lifting holy hands to God is reminiscent of Peter reaching up to Jesus after taking a few steps of faith before sinking. We are extending our lives to God in a gesture of

servanthood, submission, and hope that he will hear and lift us up.

Women's Dress

This passage has raised questions, as has 2:8, about whether Paul is concerned about the particulars (braided hair, gold, pearls, clothes) or simply is trying to establish a principle of modesty to be defined in every given locale. Some have taken his words literally and their women have dressed accordingly. A few of these same people see nothing wrong in driving expensive cars or men wearing nice suits or fancy watches. Usually their conception of modesty tends to run a few years behind popular fashion. Most who require women to dress this way do not require men to lift hands in prayer.

Inconsistency aside, there is much we can learn from Paul's call to modesty. If posture is an indicator and influencer of attitude, then dress probably is, too. We are not conformers to this world (Romans 12) but have been called to live by a higher standard, God's. Our dress, both as men and women, needs to reflect the change which has occurred in lives as transformed people. More so, our dress should never lessen or hinder our ability to be spokespersons for God.

Women Teaching

Churches of Christ have by and large held to the view that this passage constitutes a timeless restriction, grounded in creation. Only a few times has serious scholarship been devoted to this issue within our movement. Very few out of more than 13,000 a cappella congregations would allow a woman to do as much

as say a prayer in public worship. Within most Independent congregations, women have a little more freedom than their a cappella sisters, but are still quite limited. Based upon the research done both for this article and for myself, I find a few inconsistencies in our traditional interpretation of this passage. First, if this was Paul's universal command (as he states in 1 Corinthians 14), why didn't Timothy already know it? The relationship between Timothy and Paul was especially close and they had ample time to discuss such matters while traveling together. With teaching being such a vital role in the life of the new church, it would appear logical to think that Paul would have been very careful to ground Timothy in principles about teaching. Indeed, Paul reminds Timothy that "you, however, know all about my teaching, my way of life, my purpose, faith. . ." (2 Timothy 3:10).

A second dichotomy exists in the line we draw between public and private teaching. Some go even further in their effort to distinguish between teaching in worship and teaching in areas such as Sunday School. Nowhere in New Testament scripture can I find such a distinction between the public and private lives of the church. Much has been said about the role of Priscilla in teaching Apollos (Acts 18). Too much significance has been attached to the fact that when Priscilla taught Apollos it was in her home (Acts 18:26). From Romans 16:3-5 we know that Priscilla and Aquila had a house church meeting in their home. It is likely, then, that they had one in Ephesus. When they invited Apollos to their home in Acts 18, it could have conceivably been a house church.

Romans 16:1-16 points out rather plainly that Paul did have female co-workers at times. Paul should not be accused of chauvinism based upon 1 Timothy 2:9-15 and other related texts. It simply is not the case. The record shows that Paul utilized the talents of both men and women to accomplish his missionary task. Euodia and Syntyche were said by Paul to have "contended at my side in the cause of the gospel" (Philippians 4:2-3). Women hosted house churches, worked hard for the Lord, and did many other things in conjunction with Paul's ministry.

Based upon this study, it appears that 1 Timothy 2:11-14 is addressed to a specific situation within the ministry context of Timothy in Ephesus. Before 2:11-14 Paul has already admonished Timothy to command "certain men not to teach false

doctrines any longer" (1:3). His prohibition against women teaching in 2:12 could be an extension of the desire stated here to quell false teaching. From the context of 1 Timothy in general, Paul is probably condemning the type of teaching which characterized the false teaching so prevalent, and that accounts for his use of *authentain*. Be it men or women, false teachers are to be silenced or they will wreck the faith of others.

This passage provides many challenges to the church's expression of faith today. It challenges our ability to stay faithful to the integrity of the Bible while at the same time building cultural bridges for our message to cross. The hermeneutical challenge will be met only by solid, stable exegesis which is motivated by our love for truth and a desire to see lost people saved.

Ken Hensley ministers to the Allied Gardens Church of Christ in San Diego, California.

Selected Bibliography

(Works Not Cited in Paper)

- Allen, Ronald and Beverly. *Liberated Traditionalism: Men and Women in Balance*. Portland: Multnomah, 1985.
- Bullough, Vern L. and Bonnie. *The Subordinate Sex: A History Of Attitudes Toward Women*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Evans, Mary J. *Women in the Bible*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983.
- Gundry, Patricia. *Woman Be Free*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977.
- Spencer, Aida Besencon. *Beyond the Curse: Women Called To Ministry*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985.

Notes

1. Tucker, Ruth A. and Walter L. Liefeld, *Daughters of the Church*. Grand Rapids: Academia Books, 1987. p. 462.
2. Hanson, A. T. *The Pastoral Epistles*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982. p. 2. Also cited: Spain, Carl. *The Letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus*. Austin: R. B. Sweet Company, 1970. p. 8.

3. Spain, *The Letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus*. p. 51.
4. Hanson, *The Pastoral Epistles*. p. 9.
5. Brauch, Manfred T. *Hard Sayings Of Paul*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1989. p. 256.
6. Kroeger, Richard Clark and Catherine Clark Kroeger. *I Suffer Not A Woman*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992. p. 64.
7. Foh, Susan T. *Women and the Word Of God*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1979. p. 123.
8. Spain, *The Letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus*. p. 45.
9. Gillquist, Peter E. *The Physical Side of Being Spiritual*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979. p. 152.
10. Allen, Ronald and Gordon Borrer. *Worship*. Portland: Multnomah, 1982. p. 123.
11. Barclay, William. *The Letters To Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975. p. 65.
12. Piper, John and Wayne Grudem eds. *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. Wheaton: Crossway, 1991. p. 182. Moo writes chapter nine, "What Does it Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?" Also cited: Keener, Craig S. Paul, *Women And Wives*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992. p. 102.
13. Clouse, Bonnidell and Robert G. Clouse eds. *Women In Ministry*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989. p. 200.
14. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not A Woman*. p. 75.
15. Ibid. p. 74-75.
16. Mickelsen, Alvera ed. *Woman, Authority And The Bible*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1986. p. 202.
17. Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982. p. 190.
18. Barclay, *The Letters to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*. p. 67.
19. Foh, *Women and the Word of God*. p. 124-125.
20. Barclay, *The Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon*, p.66.
21. Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.p. 184.
22. Tucker, Ruth A. *Women in the Maze*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992. p. 114.
23. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not A Woman*. p. 83.
24. Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood And Womanhood*.p. 185.
25. Ibid. p. 185.
26. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not A Woman*. p. 81.

27. Bilezikian, Gilbert. *Beyond Sex Roles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985. p. 175.
28. Tucker, *Women In The Maze*, p. 115.
29. Tucker and Liefeld, *Daughters of the Church*. p. 84.
30. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*. p 84.
31. Keener, *Paul, Women And Wives*. p. 108.
32. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not A Woman*. p. 83-84.
33. Foh, *Women and the Word of God*. p. 124-125.
34. Ellis, Earle. *Pauline Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989, p. 72.
35. Ibid. p. 74.
36. Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*. p. 117.
37. Tucker, *Women in the Maze*. p. 116.

Tongue-In-Cheek Hermeneutics

JAN HUFFAKER

Recently I discovered something that lets me off the hook of discipleship! All of my life I have been told by preachers that I needed to count the cost and follow Christ. To me it sounded pretty tough to do. And trying to do it has shown how tough it really is. Now I find I didn't need to worry about it at all. It's all right there in Luke 14:26-27. The Bible says:

If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, and even his own life also, (he) cannot be my disciple (masc.). Whoever (masc.) does not carry his own cross and follow me cannot be my disciple (masc.). (My own fairly literal translation from Greek, emphasis mine).

Obviously, the one who wants to be a true disciple of Jesus must have a living father and mother, brothers and sisters, and

be a mature, married man with children. He must not only hate these people, but hate his own life and carry his own cross.

Granted, we may be inclined to let him off easy if his parents are no longer living or did not produce some brothers and sisters for him. And we might even be inclined to give a little if his union hasn't produced children. Or maybe he hasn't quite gotten the wife yet (he's still hunting the bride price!). Or perhaps he's taken a vow of chastity that rules out marriage. But given the facts that only males can have wives and the gender of the noun "disciple," Jesus is making the position of disciple open to men only, even though he started the sentence with "anyone." Context shows that "anyone" really means "any male."

What a relief to see it right there in black and white. No more crosses and self-

denial and hating the family to follow Jesus. That's the men's job. The Greek tells me so. I read it myself. I can go my way rejoicing and leave the hard stuff to the men. Surely the women in the crowd that heard Jesus were glad it wasn't for them, too, don't you think? Maybe Joanna didn't need to be doing all this travel after all. . . away from her husband. . . and all that.

You may object that there were some women elsewhere in the Bible who are called disciples—by Luke, even. The ones Saul hauled off to prison, the ones he wanted to murder? Surely they were called disciples because their husbands were disciples and these women just happened to get caught in the net along with them. Guilt by association. Position by association—

like Isaiah's wife, the prophetess. We know from the mouth of Jesus himself that real disciples were men! And the little seamstress? Well, it was something different, not exactly on par with men, "disciples," I think it would be, if there were such a word. Sort of like "stewardess." And whatever it meant, if these were exceptions, they still prove the rule that disciples were meant to be men. After all, the times women are called disciples are few and far between.

Why is it that the same people who would deny women access to positions of leadership in the church (based on I Timothy 3) using arguments similar to mine would deny emphatically that I have correctly exegeted Luke 14?

Jan Huffaker serves as a missionary in Uganda. She teaches Old Testament Survey and Hermeneutics at Kiburara Baptist Bible College. She has studied at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and Denver and Fuller Seminaries. This article is reprinted by permission from *Mutuality*, the national newsletter of Christians for Biblical Equality.

Book Review

Rocking The Roles

By ROBERT LEWIS and WILLIAM HENDRICKS (Navpress, 242 pages)

Reviewed by ROGER D. PALMER

Simply put, this book is a refreshing look at the necessary roles in a marriage. The authors seek to answer the modern-day dilemma concerning traditional versus egalitarian, or "roleless, '90s-style" marriages.

A "role" is defined by the authors as the essential function that God has designed a man and a woman to fulfill in the marriage relationship. Roles address one's

responsibility, not one's rank. The authors refute the notion of a roleless marriage, saying that such marriages contradict the Bible. Gender was created for specific applications, say the authors. God created us "male and female" for specific purposes.

Lewis and Hendricks also point out the flaws of the traditional notions of marriage, as well. When they speak of

traditional marriages, they note that in the ostensibly perfect "Ozzie and Harriet" homes of the 1950s, fathers were conspicuously absent in the day-to-day running of a home. Also, a father's emotions and inner life were not shared with his wife and children. They continue by pointing out that women were neither esteemed nor challenged, for the most part. In fact, a woman's value and identity were measured solely with reference to her husband and children, and never in terms of her own individual talents.

Having said this, the authors then develop the notion of a "symbiotic" relationship in marriage. The husband's role is to be servant/leader, much in accordance with the biblical notion of headship. Many parallels to Christ are made, and the au-

thors give 25 practical ways in which husbands can be good servant/leaders. The wife is characterized as a "helper" (see Genesis). Further, her roles are those of "husband lover" and "child lover." The authors also attempt a major discussion of the "s" word (submission). It would have been helpful if the authors had also given a list of practical applications for women, similar to that given to men.

In summary, what the authors try to convey is that we need neither traditional nor roleless marriages. What we need today are biblical marriages, described and analyzed in *Rocking the Roles* as "symbiotic" marriages. This book should be helpful reading for all married Christians. It would serve as an excellent reference for group study.

Roger D. Palmer, of Topeka, Kansas, is a regular contributing writer to a relatively new publication called *Scruples*, a monthly publication devoted to encouraging Christians to be better Christian citizens (You may request a sample by writing: *Scruples*, P.O. Box 5858, Topeka, Kansas 66605-0858).

Book Review

Women Caught in the Conflict: The Culture War Between Traditionalism and Feminism

by REBECCA MERRILL GROOTHUIS (Baker Books, 1994, 249 pages, paperback)

Reviewed by J. BRUCE KILMER

No issue has been more volatile both in the church and in society in recent years than the role of women. As Groothuis says in the introduction to *Women Caught in the Conflict*, "It is not easy to come up with a reasonable viewpoint in an age when slogans and bandwagons have largely replaced the use of logic and common sense. It is even more difficult to communicate a viewpoint that cannot be reduced to a battle cry or a campaign motto." Having said that, she proceeds with one of the most logical and reasoned analyses of this issue that I

have read. She concludes that neither traditionalism nor radical feminism has a corner on the illogic, name calling, emotionalism, and prejudice that have characterized the debate over the role of women in society and in the church. She provides a biblically-based, logical analysis of the issue—an issue that can often leave women and men caught in conflict.

Because the practices in the Churches of Christ regarding women are so contrary to the way boys and girls are being raised today, I believe that the role of women in

the church is one of the most pressing issues that the Church of Christ will face in the coming century. This issue could divide us in the near future, if we do not prayerfully, carefully, and logically look at what the Bible actually teaches about the roles of women and men. This book can help.

Many pleas for the equality of women in today's evangelical churches are met with sardonic admonitions that Christians should be careful not to take up issues just because they are popular in today's culture. This admonition is worth remembering. But one of equal value is that society has sometimes been ahead of the church (or at least some segments of it) in recognizing truth (e.g., the slavery issue in the United States). Furthermore, there may be biblical reasons for advocating the equality of women which are different from those reasons driving society's interest in these issues.

Historical Analysis

However, while recognizing the above cautions, one of Groothuis' most valuable contributions to the debate over the women's role issue is her historical demonstration that the "traditional" view in the church limiting the role of women is based less on the Bible than upon Victorian society's view of women, which was "reincarnated" in the American society of the 1950s.

In the first part of the book, Groothuis shows how the church has mistaken for biblical its view limiting the role of women. In fact, this limiting view had been rejected by the church in the early 1800s, only to be revived in post-World War II America. This can be illustrated by the change which

has taken place in four institutions since the turn of the century: D. L. Moody's Bible Institute in Chicago, A. B. Simpson's Christian Missionary Alliance, Fredrik Franson's Free Church, and the Salvation Army. Of these institutions, all of which supported women preachers at the turn of the century, only the Salvation Army maintains its historical commitment to freedom for women in public ministry.

In 1945 women in the workplace were forced out of their jobs to make room for the returning GIs. Women were told their "place" was in the home—it was there that they could help fuel the post-war economy by purchasing refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and the like. This cultural emphasis affected the church and combined with a male-dominated "sub-movement" in evangelicalism to remove women from many of the places they had occupied in ministry.

Throughout this historical analysis, Groothuis is careful to remind us that even though the traditional viewpoint may be of recent origin, that does not make it wrong. Her goal is to help us question where and how we have come to our views on the role of men and women in culture and in the church.

Logical Analysis

After taking us through a historical treatment of women in the church, Groothuis explains the many varieties of feminist thought in history and currently. Many of these she rejects as unbiblical. However, she warns against a rejection of all feminist ideas just because some feminist ideas are extreme or wrong. She presents a strong and logical case for a biblical or evangelical feminism rooted in

a Christian world view which looks to the Bible—not "women's experience"—as its final authority.

She persuasively points out the problems with the popular evangelical notion that women and men are "equal" but have different roles, when the different roles always place only men in leadership, while women are forced to use their leadership gifts only outside of the church. This robs the church of many valuable contributions of women and quenches the Spirit of God.

Far from being a struggle to gain power and dominance, the goal of biblical feminism is that men and women in the church may be liberated from the preoccupation with power and authority that characterizes the traditionalist agenda, so that everyone may serve God freely and wholeheartedly without the anxiety that one might be stepping out of one's place in the "chain of command." Evangelical feminists believe that when male authority is billed as biblically mandated, this is not an inconsequential error. Such teaching entails the unavoidable implication of the male's unique relationship to God—that he is more representative of God and closer to God in the "chain of command"—and it is therefore harmful to both men and women spiritually, socially, and emotionally (page 110).

J. Bruce Kilmer, Co-Editor of *Integrity*, is an attorney who serves the Michigan Supreme Court as a regional state court administrator.

Groothuis shows us how both the church and society have come to where we are today, and she calls for the church at the end of the 20th century to have "cultural discernment." She demonstrates that "both traditionalism and feminism are creations of culture; they are systems of human behavior that have developed in interaction with the world views of certain members of a particular society at a particular time in history."

This discernment will need to recognize the emotional resistance of both women and men to an open discussion of this issue. Much of this resistance derives from the societal and cultural experiences of women and men.

Finally, logic, informed by the Scriptures, must be employed in arriving at conclusions of God's purposes for us in creating us in his image and creating us both male and female.

Whether one agrees with Groothuis' conclusions or not, this book is an excellent resource for churches wanting to study the issue from the premise that the Bible is inspired by God and is our final authority for faith and practice. The book contributes to removing the fear associated with studying this issue, while presenting a viewpoint that is definitely contrary to the practices in most Churches of Christ.

He who walks in integrity walks securely.

--Proverbs 10:9