

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE ROLE  
RELATIONSHIP  
OF MALE AND FEMALE WITH SPECIAL  
REFERENCE TO THE TEACHING/RULING FUNCTIONS IN THE  
CHURCH

by George W. Knight, III\*

The very title of this paper inevitably raises the question whether there are indeed any roles at all that the New Testament recognizes or prescribes. Certainly the church has thought that it ascertained such roles in the New Testament. It spoke of the role relations of citizens and civil authorities, of the church member and those who ruled over them, of parents and children, even at times of servants and masters, and of husbands and wives. With the exception of servants and masters, which relation it has come to understand the New Testament was regulating as an existing situation but not presenting as based on God's order, the church understood the other relationships to be roles established by God for which basic guidelines were given by the Lord and the apostles. Included in these role relationships was that of the male and female in the marriage relationship. This role relationship is still recognized as normative among evangelicals.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, for the same considerations that pertain in the male-female relationships in marriage, the position of the historic Christian church has upheld a similar relationship between males and females in the ruling/teaching functions in the church. In particular, the passages of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, 1 Corinthians 14:33b (or 34) - 38, and the arguments of the passage, 1 Corinthians 11:1-16, have been understood as normative for this area.

But this understanding of the historic Christian church, even though it has stood as the position for centuries, has in recent years been challenged and in certain cases set aside as erroneous.

Vigorous discussions took place in Germany and the Scandinavian countries which led the majority of the Lutherans in particular to abandon the earlier position.<sup>2</sup> Similar studies took place in the U.S.A. and resulted in a predominance of American Lutherans following the

\*Associate Professor of New Testament, Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Harold Lindsell, *The World, the Flesh and the Devil* (Washington, D.C.: Canon Press, 1973), p. 132f.

<sup>2</sup>See the following works: Peter Brunner, *The Ministry and the Ministry of Women* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), Krister Stendahl, *The Bible and the Role of Women* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), and Fritz Zerbst, *The Office of Woman in the Church* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955).

Europeans.<sup>3</sup> On a broader level, most of the older American denominations have also altered their previous positions.<sup>4</sup> The World Council of Churches studies indicate that a great number of the member churches have taken this same position in principle.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the Reformed Ecumenical Synod at its last two meetings, (1968 Netherlands, 1972 Australia) reaffirmed as the teaching of Scripture the historic Christian understanding of the passages in question.<sup>6</sup> Also studies coming from the dominant conservative wing of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, have reaffirmed the normative character of the passages in 1 Timothy and 1 Corinthians.<sup>7</sup> So one might be tempted to generalize that the more liberal wing of the church has abandoned the historic Christian position and the more conservative wing has reaffirmed that position, and that this reflects their respective views of the Bible, its inspiration, inerrancy, and absolute authority.

However, a new element has been interjected into the discussion. The editor of *Christianity Today* has taken the position in his latest book that the position of Paul is an expression of the culture of his day and not normative for today.<sup>8</sup> This has been followed by a couple of editorials in *Christianity Today* seeking to implement such a decision.<sup>9</sup> Two women writing a book setting forth their understanding of the Biblical basis for women's liberation have taken an even more vigorous position which would not only see Paul's view of ruling and teaching as culturally relative, but also affirm an "equalitarian" marriage.<sup>10</sup> A majority of the invited participants of the Thanksgiving Workshop on Evangelical Social Concern voted to seek women's ordination in the teaching/ruling offices of the church, although there was a large dissent.<sup>11</sup> The Permanent Judicial Commission of one of the older denominations refused to ordain an evangelical because he said that his understanding of the Scriptures would prohibit him from ordaining a woman to the

<sup>3</sup>See the groundwork laid in the study book condensed by Raymond Tiemeyer, *The Ordination of Women* (Augsbury Publishing House, 1970).

<sup>4</sup>For example, the United Methodist, United Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ, etc. For a specific statement, see the *Book of Order of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.*, Chapter VIII, section 2, and Chapter IX, section 3.

<sup>5</sup>Cf., for one example, *What Is Ordination Coming To?* edited by Brigalia Bam (World Council of Churches, 1971).

<sup>6</sup>*Acts and Reports of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod, Amsterdam, 1968*, p. 35, and *Acts and Reports of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod, Australia, 1972*, pp. 58 and 59. This last *Acts* presents two extensive reports presenting the study of Scripture which brought the Synod to that position, see pp. 52-58.

<sup>7</sup>See the first and last named books in note 2 and also David Scaer, "What Did Saint Paul Want?", *His*, May, 1973, pp. 11 ff.

<sup>8</sup>Harold Lindsell, *The World, the Flesh and the Devil*, pp. 148-150.

<sup>9</sup>*Christianity Today*, Vol. XVII, No. 24, Sept. 13, 1974, p. 51 [1351], and Vol. XVIII, No. 25, Sept. 27, 1974, p. 37f. [1423f].

<sup>10</sup>Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, *All We're Meant To Be, A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1974).

<sup>11</sup>See the reports in the following journals: *Christianity Today*, Vol. XIX, No. 6, Dec. 20, 1974, p. 28 [312]f.; a Religious News Service report in *Christian News*, Vol. 7, No. 50, Dec. 16, 1974, p. 1f.

teaching/ruling office.<sup>12</sup> The divergence of opinion reflected, the intrinsic importance of the question and the existence of several passages that purport to deal with the subject inexorably draw us to ask again: What do the Scriptures say?!

The Scripture itself provides us with the framework within which any and all differences or role relationships must be seen and considered in the momentous words of Galatians 3:28:

There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for you all are one man in Christ Jesus.

Here the apostle, recognizing the differences between Jew and Greek (cf. 1 Cor. 9:19-21) and male and female, affirms that these are brought into the one new being in Christ Jesus so that they are all one. With this word, he removes any ethnic, national, racial, social or sexual characteristic as determinative of one's spiritual standing in Jesus Christ. Faith in Christ and nothing else brings one into spiritual unity with Christ and into equality (cf. 1 Cor. 12) with all who are Christ's.

This theological underpinning is the fact that all human beings are made in God's image (cf. Acts 17:26) and that that image is restored and recreated in the image of Christ (Col. 3:10, 11; Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18). Thus what is said in Gal. 3:28 is reiterated in Col. 3:10, 11, in relation to image renewal in Christ. We may therefore say that Paul faithfully reflects the Old Testament teaching of Gen. 1:27 that image quality is equally present in man as male and female. Thus by both creation and now also by the redemption that renews that created image quality, the unity and equality of male and female are most fundamentally affirmed. So also the apostle Peter affirms this co-equality and unity when he speaks of male and female, husband and wife, as "joint-heirs (*sunklēronomoi*) of the grace of life" (1 Peter 3:7). The noteworthy factor in Peter's treatment for our question is that he affirms this spiritual equality in the midst of a passage which speaks of a distinct role relationship of wives and husbands, i.e., of wives that they must be in subjection to their own husbands (3:1) and of husbands that they must give honor unto the woman as unto the weaker vessel (*asthenesterō skeuei*, 3:7). The "weaker vessel" terminology would seem to be Peter's way of stating the femininity of the woman in relation to the masculinity of the man in terms of a comparison with no derogation intended.<sup>13</sup> By doing so the apostle Peter has at once joined the equality and the difference as the two factors which must guide role relationships. As we shall see later in Paul's treatment, both equality (image-bearers) and difference (masculinity-femininity) are seen to be equally the result of God's creative activity and order, and, therefore, both are germane to the question under consideration. He who can reflect Gen. 1:27 in terms of spiritual equality in Gal. 3:28 (and Col. 3:10, 11) can also reflect Gen. 2:18-25 in speaking of wives being in subjection to their own husbands as

<sup>12</sup>*The Presbyterian Journal*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 33, Dec. 18, 1974, p. 5.

<sup>13</sup>See G. Stahlin, *T.D.N.T.*, Vol. I, p. 491.

the head of the wife (Eph. 5:22-33, see especially verses 22, 23 and 31). Both facets of creation come to their rightful expression. Spiritual equality may not be negated by sexual differences because we are made and renewed as images of God (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:10, 11). Nor does our spiritual equality as joint-heirs of life remove our maleness and femaleness and the role relationships which that created difference brings to the relation of man and woman as instanced in marriage (1 Peter 3:1-7, Eph. 5:22-33). If we have found both these factors in evidence in this role, we will not find it strange to see that in the midst of a genuine spiritual equality in the life of the church, the apostle Paul will appeal to the same created difference and the relation it implies as a factor in determining the relationship between the sexes in the teaching/ruling roles in the church.

When we focus on the question of the possible role relationships in the teaching/ruling functions in the church, it is appropriate to ask if that question is dealt with explicitly and, if so, to concentrate our attention on such didactic passages. This is basic to the proper handling of the Scriptures and the resolution of any question, and it will prevent us from drawing erroneous conclusions by deductions from passages which do not treat the subject. In this case we have three passages: 1 Timothy 2:11-15 most clearly gives the apostle Paul's verdict and provides his reasons. 1 Corinthians 11:1-16 has explained the significance of one of those reasons. 1 Corinthians 14:33b (or 34)-38 presents the apostle's command and reasons in more general terms.

The setting for 1 Tim. 2:11-15 is that of a letter in which Paul is writing to Timothy to instruct him about the life of the church. Paul says explicitly in 1 Tim. 3:14 and 15 that he writes to Timothy: "that you may know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Although the limits of this reference may extend to the whole letter, it would certainly seem to encompass at least chapters 2 and 3 where our passage is found. In chapter 2 Paul first writes about prayer with particular reference to the responsibility of men. Then he turns to women and speaks of the need for modesty in dress and for a repudiation of ostentatiousness and for a concentration on the adornment of good works (2:9-10).

After a general statement which requests women to learn in quietness and all subjection (*pasē hupotagḗn*, the same keynote as found in the wife/husband relationship, Eph. 5, 1 Peter 3), he then makes that aspect of subjection more explicit by a definite negative: "But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness" (verse 12). That which is prohibited is teaching (*didaskhein*) and having dominion (*authentein*).<sup>14</sup> The prohibition is not absolute or unqualified, but it is specifically that she as a woman must not engage in such activities in relation to a man (*andros*). The prohibition is not that a woman may not teach anyone (cf. Titus 2:3, 4) but that she must not

<sup>14</sup>Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 120: "have authority ... over someone." The word is a N. T. *hapax*; see Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, p. 91.

teach and have authority over a man in the life of the church.

It has been suggested that what is prohibited is to be restricted to a wife and a husband.<sup>15</sup> It is true that these two Greek words used here (*anēr* and *gunē*) can also designate husband and wife more specifically, as well as man and woman more generally.<sup>16</sup> However, there is no evidence in the larger context that the terms are meant to be restricted in the passage, or that they become more restricted in the verses under consideration. Contrariwise, the terms would seem to be meant more generally in verses 8, 9 and 10 and, therefore, also in verses 11ff. Thus the prohibition of the apostle has to do with maleness and femaleness, not just with the married estate or relationship.

The reasons given for such a vigorous prohibition ("I permit not," *epitrepō*) are immediately given in verses 13 and 14: "For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled has fallen into transgression." The first reason is that the order of creation of man and woman (Adam and Eve) is expressive and determinative of God's order of relationship and authority. The one formed first is to have dominion, the one formed after and from him is to be in subjection. Paul develops this argument and its implications in 1 Cor. 11, and we shall turn to that passage shortly. The second argument is that related to the fall and the fact that Eve (woman) was beguiled. Paul does not expand and develop this argument and we must be content with the brevity of his statement. One may only conjecture that the apostle is citing this foundational incident as indicating that when the roles established by God in his creative activity and order were reversed by Eve, it manifestly had a disastrous effect. It is of note that no cultural reason is given or even alluded to in this passage, but rather the most basic foundational reasons which are always germane to men and women are given, namely, God's creation order and the fall. Nothing more basic and binding could be cited. Paul thus follows the example of Jesus Christ in dealing with the basic question of the relation of men and women; he cites the Father's basic creative action (cf. Mt. 19:3ff).

The reason given in 1 Timothy 2:13, 14 is developed in 1 Cor. 11:1-16. In 1 Cor. 11 Paul deals with the apparent freedom that the Corinthian women felt they had to abandon something which expressed in the Corinthian situation and the apostolic age the order which God has ordained and expresses in nature.<sup>17</sup> Paul argues that the freedom in Christ does not allow us to overturn this order and the particular expression of it in Corinth and the apostolic age. But he is careful to insist at the end of his argument that God himself in nature by means of

<sup>15</sup>Cf. for this possibility, C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 55.

<sup>16</sup>See Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, under these two words.

<sup>17</sup>Paul's use of the word *physis* in verse 14 and in effect the argument from nature in verse 15 is in accord with his use of the word elsewhere. The word is found eleven times in the N.T., nine of which are in Paul's writings (Rom. 1:26, 2:14, 27, 11:21, 24, 1 Cor. 11:14, Gal. 2:15, 4:8, Eph. 2:3). The usage in Romans 1 and 2 most closely parallels the meaning here. In Romans nature is God's natural order and to be against nature is to be against God's order (1:26). In Rom. 2:14, doing the things of the law by nature is to show the work of God who has written the work of the law in their hearts.

long hair has provided the covering needed. So he ends: "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering" (1 Cor. 11:15). We thus have two things intertwined in this passage, the expression of the principle at stake in a particular practice and the natural provision that God has made which expresses at all times the principle of God's order between male and female.

Paul begins his argument about the role relationships of men and women in terms of headship (*kephalē*)<sup>18</sup> by placing it in the hierarchy of headships: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (verse 3). By doing so he has established the propriety of headship by appealing to that of Christ to man and God to Christ, and at the same time has shown that such headship is not derogatory to one's person, being or essence. He sandwiches the disputed relation within those not disputed to set it in a proper framework.

It needs to be noted that Paul not only speaks of Christ as the head and authority of every man, but also that the head of Christ is God. Although Paul does not develop the thought of this subjection of Christ to the headship of God as he does in Phil. 2, yet its significance is still there by its very presence. The headship of God in relation to the incarnate Christ in no way detracts from or is detrimental to His person as incarnate deity. His image quality and reality as the form of God is not at all denied, nor must it be affirmed so vigorously that the headship of God must be denied to maintain it. No, rather the headship of God in reference to Christ can be readily seen and affirmed with no threat to Christ's identity. This chain of subordination with its implications is apparently given to help with the objection which some would bring to the headship of man in reference to woman.

The apostle brings his argument to a focus by contrasting glory (*doxa*), or reflection<sup>19</sup> which the man and the woman each display. Of the man he says that he is the "glory of God," but of woman he says that she is the "glory of man," (verse 7). As verses 8 and following seem to indicate, this evaluation is based on the more immediate creation of man by God and the creation of woman from and out of a man. Thus, the man will reflect the one who directly created him and thus, also, the woman will inevitably reflect and be the glory of the one from whom she was created, namely man.<sup>20</sup> The argument is now advanced in verses 8, 9

<sup>18</sup>See Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer, p. 431: "in the case of living beings, to denote superior rank.... The divine influence on the world results in the series: God the k. of Christ, Christ the k. of the man, man the k. of the woman." Cf. also H. Schlier, *T.D.N.T.*, Vol. III, pp. 673-681, especially p. 679f.

<sup>19</sup>See Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 203.

<sup>20</sup>Cf. H. Schlier, *T.D.N.T.*, Vol. III, p. 679: "The same point emerges from v. 8f., where the being of woman as *doxa* ... is explained by the fact that the origin and *raison d'être* of woman are to be found in man. Hence, man is the image and reflection of God to the degree that in his created being he points directly to God as Creator. Woman is the reflection of man to the degree that in her created being she points to man.... In this relation of man and woman we are dealing with the very foundations of their creaturehood."

and 10 on the grounds of the order of creation of man and woman and the significance of this order for the headship of man in reference to woman. "For the man is not of (*ek*) the woman; but the woman of (*ex*) the man" (vs. 8). The significance of this order, also referred to in 1 Tim. 2:13, is now stated in verse 9: "for neither was the man created for (*dia*) the woman; but the woman for (*dia*)<sup>21</sup> the man." Here the order of creation explicitly communicated in Genesis 2:18-25 and spoken of in terms of the woman being a help answering to man (verse 18) is given as the divinely determined order of role relationship. To put it in a composite of words from Genesis and 1 Corinthians, man was not created to help and be the helper for woman, but woman was created to help and be the helper for man. This order is not based on the fall and the curse and the words of Gen. 3:16, but on the order of God's creation (contra Stendahl).<sup>22</sup> Paul concludes this section by saying that this order ought to be evidenced "because of the angels" (vs. 10), apparently referring to the supernatural beings who desire to see God's order preserved and God's glory displayed.<sup>23</sup>

Lest Paul's argument for the role relationship be misunderstood, he quickly adds in verses 11 and 12, as Peter did in 1 Peter 3:7, the equality and natural interdependence of man and woman. These verses indicate that what is to be gathered from the order referred to in verses 8 and 9 is not man's glory but the fact that "all things are of God" (vs. 12). So the mutual dependence in the Lord is added to give balance and prevent false glorying or misunderstanding. But it is not added to negate the previous argument. Here again the role relationship, and mutual dependence can be correlated without one destroying the other.

Some have said that it is not man and woman that are here spoken of but only husband and wife.<sup>24</sup> Again this understanding is hardly likely. This is most clearly indicated by the fact that the relationship in view between the man and woman in verses 11 and 12 is not that of husband and wife, but of parent and child, which would seem to imply that the words have been used in the more general sense of man and woman, not husband and wife throughout the passage.

We turn now to 1 Corinthians 14:33b (or 34) - 38. This passage is set in the midst of a chapter in which the apostle authoritatively regulates the use of spiritual gifts according to the norm of that which edifies (vs. 26), and according to the rule which is summarized at the end of the chapter: "But let all things be done decently and in order" (vs. 40). He prohibits the tongue speaker from speaking (*lalei*) in the church unless

<sup>21</sup>*dia* with the accusative with the meaning here of "because of," "on account of" or "for the sake of." See Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer, *Lexicon*, p. 180 and A. Oepke, *T.D.N.T.*, Vol. II, p. 69 and the standard Greek grammars.

<sup>22</sup>Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>23</sup>See F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London: Oliphants, 1971), p. 106 and the reference cited there. See also J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. 11:10," *New Testament Studies*, Vol. IV, 1957-58, pp. 48ff.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. for example, the translation given in *R.S.V.* of 1 Cor. 11:3. Note that the *N.E.B.* returned to the more general usage, man and woman, as does the *N.I.V.*

there is one to interpret (vs. 27) and demands that he keep silence (*sigatō*, vs. 28), and then only two, or at the most three, may speak in turn. Likewise, the prophets are to speak (*laleitōsan*) in turn and if another is given a revelation the first is to keep silence (*sigatō*, vss. 29 and 30). It is this section dealing with speaking and silence that provides the setting for Paul to speak about the same matters in regard to women, with the same two key words (*laleō* and *sigatō*). And just as God's order, who is not a God of confusion, but of peace (vs. 33), must prevail for tongue speakers and prophets, so it must prevail for women.

The speaking prohibited to women in verse 34 and the silence demanded is to be interpreted by two factors. First, the speaking (*laleō*) must be interpreted in the light of the immediate context and previous usage to be that of public communication (cf. verses 27 and 29). Second, the correlation of speaking and silence found here is paralleled in 1 Tim. 2:11-14, where what is prohibited is teaching with particular reference to men. It is such an understanding that seems most appropriate for 1 Cor. 14. Therefore, women are prohibited from speaking in church because it would be a violation of God's order in terms of her role in reference to men. The only qualification is that the speaking in view here in 1 Cor. 14 is restricted and applied even further in verse 35 to asking questions during the service. Verse 34 thus is the broad prohibition of public teaching in the church and verse 35 applies that prohibition to even asking questions in the Corinthian situation.

Now, we need to note the reasons presented for this prohibition. The appeal is to the need for subjection (vs. 34, *hupotassethōsan*) which would be violated by speaking. This subjection is taught by the law (vs. 34, *ho vomos*). It is most likely that Paul by this reference to "the law" has in mind God's law and the same passage in that law as that which he cited in 1 Tim. 2:11ff. and 1 Cor. 11:1ff., namely the creation order spoken of in Gen. 2. To violate that subjection as taught in God's law is that which makes it shameful<sup>25</sup> (vs. 35) for a woman to speak in the church. The apostle stifles any rebuttal or different practice by asking in vs. 36: "What? was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it unto you alone?" With these pointed and crisp questions Paul shows that they must not suppose that they originated God's word and order, or that they alone have some new word from God contrary to the understanding and practice of the apostle and all the other churches.

Although it is true that the word "woman" used in 1 Cor. 14 is particularly applied to wives in verse 35, it must still be asked whether Paul intends the prohibition to be restricted to married women and to exclude single women. Considering the parallel passages, 1 Cor. 11 and especially 1 Tim. 2, it would seem more likely that Paul does not intend to restrict the prohibition, but simply refers to the most commonplace relation that existed for women in the congregation to provide a concrete answer to the problem presumed in verse 35. This concrete example provided the guideline for other and different situations.

The conclusion of our survey of these three key passages is that the

<sup>25</sup>*aischpon*, the same word used in 1 Cor. 11:6.



apostle Paul laid down a universally normative regulation which prohibits women from teaching the church and from ruling and teaching men in the church. The reason that the prohibition is universal is because it is grounded in God's creation order and arrangement between men and women. It should be carefully noted that the passages considered are not illustrations but commands, and that the reasons or grounds given are not time-bound historically and culturally relative arguments that grow up out of or only apply to that day and age, but are rather the way God created man and woman and therefore the relationships God commanded that they should sustain to one another because of their maleness and femaleness.

This creation order and its correlatives of headship and subjection appear in each passage just as they provide the one and only foundation for the role relationships in marriage. To dismiss the role relationships in the church in regard to the teaching/ruling function as simply cultural would carry with it the dismissal of the analogous role relationship in marriage as also cultural. Lindsell is not that consistent;<sup>26</sup> Scanzoni and Hardesty are!<sup>27</sup> But likewise a preservation of the marriage role relationship based on the creation order demands a preservation of the role relationship in the teaching/ruling function in the church, which is based on that same creation order.

The fact that "there can be no male and female; for you all are one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28) does not deny the teaching of 1 Tim. 2 and 1 Cor. 14 just as it does not deny man's maleness and woman's femaleness, nor annul their relationship in the family (cf. Eph. 5:22ff.).

It has been left until now to comment on the reference to women praying and prophesying in 1 Cor. 11. Some have said that this contradicts Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. 14 (and 1 Tim. 2) and therefore shows the inconsistency of 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2.<sup>28</sup> Others have virtually argued that this passage should govern the interpretation of the others and thus give a very different understanding to 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2.<sup>29</sup> But clearly, 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2 are the didactic passages which self-consciously deal with the subject and 1 Cor. 11 only mentions an aspect incidentally. This consideration demands that the former two be considered the foundational passages and then that 1 Cor. 11 with its

<sup>26</sup>*The World, the Flesh and the Devil*, p. 132f.

<sup>27</sup>*All We're Meant To Be*. Compare the two chapters "Love, Honor and \_\_\_\_?" and "Living in Partnership" pp. 88-117, and the term, an "equalitarian marriage," p. 118 and elsewhere.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 35, and E. Schweizer, "The Service of Worship—An Exposition of I Corinthians 14" *Interpretation*, Vol. XIII, 1959, pp. 400ff., who says that the verses in question in 1 Cor. 14 are a later interpolation and that they are actually contradicted by 1 Cor. 11:5. Although there is a slight textual problem, it is not a matter of interpolation, but rather at which place in the chapter the verses 34 and 35 were originally found. Aland *et al* in their textual apparatus evaluate the very strong textual witnesses as evidencing the usually acknowledged position, i.e., as verses 34 and 35, as the best textual reading with a "B" level evaluation. For the basis of their judgment, see B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 565.

<sup>29</sup>For example, Irene M. Robbins, "St. Paul and the Ministry of Women," *Expository Times*, Vol. XLIV, No. 4, 1935, p. 196, cited by Charles C. Ryrie, *The Place of Women in the Church* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), pp. 75 and 92.

incidental reference be integrated with them and not vice-versa. It also is appropriate to presume that the great apostle Paul does not contradict himself within the same letter and only a few chapters apart.

There are several reasonable solutions that have been proposed. First, that the praying and prophesying in view and acknowledged is not done in the church and therefore there is not even an apparent contradiction with 1 Cor. 14.<sup>30</sup> Some would say that Paul also in 1 Tim. 2 places prayer in the church as the activity of men.<sup>31</sup>

Second, there are those who say that Paul only mentions the activity in 1 Cor. 11 as an activity he knows that is going on without condoning it.<sup>32</sup> He uses the existence of the practice to get to the particular issue in that chapter and he returns to it in chapter 14 where he forbids it, at least in the church.<sup>33</sup> The analogy for this argument is the activity of eating meat in an idol's temple. In 1 Cor. 8:10 it seems to be acknowledged as an appropriate action, although in 1 Cor. 10:20-22 that activity would appear to be forbidden.<sup>34</sup>

Third, the activity of praying and prophesying<sup>35</sup> is seen to be in a different category from authoritative speaking, teaching and ruling and is therefore not prohibited in 1 Cor. 14 (or 1 Tim. 2) but expressly allowed by the fact of its recognition in 1 Cor. 11.<sup>36</sup> As can be seen, these solutions all preserve the didactic element in 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2. The resolution of which of these or some other solution is the intent of the writer demands more time and attention than is now available, but does not impinge upon or put in doubt the clarity of the apostle's teaching already discussed.

The exclusion of women from the teaching and ruling office of the church in 1 Tim. 2:11-15 and 1 Cor. 14:33b-37 must not be construed as all the evidence of the New Testament on the role of women in the church, even though it is very specific. Time and space will only allow us to call attention to other passages which indicate that women are involved in diaconal tasks and also in appropriate teaching situations. A

<sup>30</sup>See, for example, Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, reprint 1953), p. 305.

<sup>31</sup>For example, Ryrie, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>32</sup>For example, A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *1 Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd ed., 1914), p. 324f. as a possibility.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. for example R. St. John Parry, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: University Press, 1926), p. 210f.

<sup>34</sup>For example, Hodge, *1 Corinthians*, p. 148.

<sup>35</sup>The author of this paper is persuaded by a study of prophecy in the New Testament, which is expressed by the terms *prophēteia*, *prophēteuō*, and *prophētiēs*, that the New Testament speaks of this activity as the result of God's Spirit acting in and through a person to produce that which is God's revelation and that it is regarded therefore as intrinsically different from and distinguished from what the New Testament means by teaching or preaching. Although this might impinge upon or effect the decision upon the above-mentioned solutions, it would remain true apart from that decision.

<sup>36</sup>J. B. Hurley, "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of 1 Cor. 11:2-16 and 1 Cor. 14:33b-36," *Westminster Theological Journal*, Vol. XXXV, No. 2, 1973, p. 203.

sampling of these activities may be seen in the following: older widows are enrolled by the church (1 Tim. 5:9-16), older women are called upon to teach and train younger women in reference to their responsibilities to their husbands and children (Titus 2:3, 4), women (or wives, *gunaikas*) are referred to in the midst of the description of deacons (1 Tim. 3:11), Phoebe is designated as “a servant (*diakonon*) of the church that is at Cenchreae” (Rom. 16:1), Paul referred to a situation in Corinth where women are praying or prophesying (1 Cor. 11:5), and Priscilla and Aquila that inseparable husband and wife team, in a discreet and private meeting, expounded unto Apollos “the way of God more accurately” (Acts 18:26).

Therefore in considering the ministry of men and women in the church, these three biblical truths must be held in correlation:

(1) Men and women are equal as image bearers: “There can be no male and female, for you are one in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:28) and, therefore, in their standing in and before Christ male and female are equal.

(2) Men and women manifest in their sexuality a difference created and ordered by God: Women by God’s creative order are to be in subjection to men in the home and church, and are therefore excluded from the ruling and teaching offices (Eph. 5:22; 1 Tim. 2:11-15; 1 Cor. 14:33b-37; cf. 1 Tim. 3:4, 5), which men are called on to fulfill.

(3) Women have a unique function to fulfill in the diaconal task of the church, along with men, and in teaching situations in relation to women and children (cf. for example, 1 Tim. 3:11, 5:9, 10 and following, Titus 2:3, 4; Rom. 16:1).