

## REPORT ON A JOURNAL ARTICLE

### "WOMEN AND THE NATURE OF MINISTRY"

November 1, 2023

TITLE OF ARTICLE: "Women And The Nature Of Ministry"

AUTHOR: Walter L. Leifeld, Professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois

Publisher and Date of Publication: JETS (Journal of Evangelical Theological Society), March 1987, PPs 49-61

### FIRST IMPRESSIONS

Your Reviewer, who has received no formal theological or divinity training, and who is largely self-educated in the field of Biblical Hermeneutics but who has read and studied, extensively, in that field and who co-teaches a class in that field, finds himself a bit reluctant to be critical of any Article written by an eminently trained and experienced theologian, such as our author, Walter Liefeld. However, your Reviewer does come away from numerous readings of the Article discussed in this Report finding himself somewhat disappointed in that Article. This disappointment arises out of what your Reviewer perceives to be a great reluctance on the part of Mr. Liefeld to state a firm conclusion about the subject which he is addressing, that being whether restrictions should be placed on the service or types of service, if any, which women might be Biblically allowed to provide in the ministries of Evangelical Churches, and, in particular, whether women should be allowed to hold senior positions in these ministries and to preach publicly in such Churches. At the end of his Article Mr. Leifeld comes very close to stating a position to the effect that placing restrictions on women's holding senior positions in these ministries, including restrictions against their publicly preaching in such Churches, substantially interferes with the teaching and preaching of the Gospel in our current culture in which women hold very senior, highly responsible and authoritative leadership positions in every field of human endeavor, including positions of leadership in the fields of Law, the Judiciary, Politics, and the direction of some of the world's largest corporations. However, he does not quite state a position in these respects, which, your Reviewer frankly finds to be a disappointing omission on the part of this Author.

In fairness to our Author, Mr. Leifeld, your Reviewer would note that several factors very likely affected the outcome of his Article. First, he was likely restricted by the Article Length restrictions which are likely placed on Articles for JETS, or any periodical for that matter. These restrictions likely prevented the Author from totally fleshing out all of his arguments and from reaching a firm conclusion on the issues raised by him. If he had been writing a book, he would have been much more able to state his arguments, in totality, and to then state a firm conclusion dictated by those arguments. Secondly, the Article discussed here was published in 1987. A lot of work in the fields of Women In Ministry, and in the exegesis and application of the various Biblical Passages which are relevant or are arguably



relevant to those fields has been done since this Article was published, and numerous articles, and books and other writings dealing with those fields have been published since 1987. Mr. Leifeld did not have the benefit of this work or of these publications when he wrote this Article. Perhaps, had he had the benefit of these items his arguments and conclusions would have been more fully stated. Thirdly, Mr. Leifeld, like many evangelical theologians, expressed a reluctance to actually argue for or against any theological conclusion which might be highly controversial and which might generate substantial dissent. He states, at the outset of his Article that: "...the purpose of this paper is to open discussion and probe new avenues, not to argue against one side or the other....(as)....we need a more conciliatory approach to this intense issue". Your Reviewer completely understands, and is sympathetic with the need for any theologian to humbly recognize that his or her conclusions might well be wrong, even when he or she is fully persuaded that those conclusions are correct. However, as a lawyer, a person trained in and experienced in the practice of law, your Reviewer is of the belief that any exercise in a search for TRUTH, whether that be in the field of law or the field of theology or any other field is more likely to produce actual TRUTH, when it is carried out by knowledgeable and experienced advocates, who seek to vigorously advocate for the competing sides of the arguments for that TRUTH, provided that their respective arguments are based on sound facts, sound research and reasonable argumentation stated with respect and civility. The persons who are trying to determine the TRUTH of an issue, can then analyze and weigh the arguments on each side of the issue, and, thereby, hopefully come to a sound conclusion as to the actual TRUTH. So, while your Reviewer understands and sympathizes with Mr. Leifeld's reluctance to express a firm opinion on whether or not restrictions should be placed on the roles and tasks which women might perform in the ministry of Evangelical Churches, and with his position that he simply wants to initiate further discussion of this matter, one can wish that he had actually advocated for the position which seems to be rather clearly justified by the matters stated in his Article, that being that, at least as of the 1987 date of publication of his Article, the rather heated arguments asserted on each side of the issue as to whether or not the roles of women in "Ministry" must be Biblically restricted have not considered the actual "Theology of Ministry", and that, if this Theology is properly considered, and the Form of Ministry and the true Goals and Purposes of Ministry are properly considered "...the form of ministry adopted (by any church) must not alienate hearers from the message of the Gospel....(and that)...a ministry (of today) that excludes public participation of women is likely to be rejected by the people we are trying to win".

So, while your Reviewer is somewhat disappointed by Mr. Leifeld's Article, for the reasons set forth above, and while your Reviewer finds and thinks that most readers will find that the first parts of the Article, those dealing with the exegesis and hermeneutical analysis of 1 Tim. 2:12 (his selected text from among those which seem to speak for the placement of restrictions on the roles of women (and it does contain what is arguably the most blunt statement of a requirement for such restrictions, at least in the areas of "teaching" and "authority")) are interesting and somewhat helpful, but do not go very far in advancing the arguments for and against restricting women's roles, the final parts of his Article, the ones dealing with the Theology of Ministry, and in answering the question which he raises (which is "How Can We Make Our Patterns of Ministry More Biblical") initiate an area of hermeneutical and theological inquiry which has been somewhat ignored in dealing with the questions about the proper Biblical Roles of Women (actually Women and Men for that matter) in Ministry. In particular, he raises,



at least by inference, the question of whether any church, which restricts the roles of women, including the public role of preaching, is, in our current day culture, actually interfering with the ability of that church to preach/teach/convey the Gospel to the very persons it is trying to reach. Is a church actually turning off those it seeks to reach and save by saying that “we find that the Bible prevents a woman from having any position of authority or from publicly preaching or teaching”? Mr. Leifeld’s Article at least raises this topic. One wishes that he could have more fully explored it.

#### WHAT IS THE AUTHOR TRYING TO DO WITH WHAT HE IS SAYING?

Candidly, because of the limitations of space and his expressed desires to avoid argument, it is somewhat difficult to outline or break down just what our Author is trying to say. He starts out with asking what appears to be a culturally relevant (in our current day culture) questions: *“What renders preaching inappropriate for women, while books or tapes by women that offer opinions on Biblical interpretation are considered acceptable?.....Why can women ‘share but not preach’, even when the audience and content would be the same?”* Then, at the conclusion of his Article, he raises yet another question which appears to be highly culturally relevant in our culture of today: *“It would be difficult to maintain that a women in the pulpit is perceived in the same way today, when women are physicians, professors, corporation executives, and college administrators as it was in the first century....”*. He then tentatively concludes that *“the form of ministry adopted must not alienate the hearers from the message of the gospel....(and) that visitors to our churches may be scandalized by a perception that the church demeans women...”* if it excludes *“PUBLIC PARTICIPATION”* in the pulpit.

So, while our Author is expressly unwilling to argue for either side of the issue about women’s participation in ministry he certainly gets awfully close to stating that, taking today’s culture into account, and the differences between that culture’s perception of the roles of women as compared to the perception to those roles as it existed in the culture of the 1<sup>st</sup> century when Paul wrote his epistles, including 1 Timothy, we might well be doing great harm to the church’s ability to convey the message of the Gospel to congregations of today if we restrict the roles of women in ministry, and, in particular, if we bar women, who are qualified to so teach and preach by a Call from God and by appropriate spiritual gifting and training, from the “public role” of teaching and preaching from the pulpit, a role which would have been considered to be shameful in the 1<sup>st</sup> century.

In reaching the conclusion of our Author, as stated in the preceding paragraph, your Reviewer has probably overstated the Author’s position, but it does appear, strongly appear from the Author’s Article that he would, if pressed, reach that conclusion. In fact, the whole tenor of the Article is one which seeks to compel more investigation and study and civil dialog about whether or not the conclusion stated in the preceding paragraph is a correct one. By seeking to compel such investigation, study and dialog our Author makes a hugely valuable contribution to the sometimes heated debates over the Biblically proper roles for women in ministry, particularly in the “public roles” of teaching and preaching from the pulpit or in other public settings.



So how does our author go about reaching his tentative, actually inferred but not outright stated conclusions about the proper roles for women, as stated in the preceding paragraphs. He submits that all questions about whether or not the Bible requires that the roles of women in ministry should or should not be restricted must be addressed by responding to four questions, the first three of which deal with the often disputed exegetical and hermeneutical questions about the proper interpretation of and application in various cultural settings of those “principles” which are found (or are arguably, even if disputably found) in the Biblical passages which seem to either require such restriction and those which, to the contrary, seem to abolish such restriction. In particular, our Author addresses these questions to 1 Tim. 2:11-12, the passages which are argued as providing the clearest statement that a woman should not be allowed to “teach or to have authority over men”. By way of a reminder, these passages read as follows (using the NIV):

**“A woman should learn in quietness and full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent.”**

To state that this passage, taken in the context of the entirety of 1 Tim. is confusing is to make a masterful understatement. The Author seeks to address his 4 questions to these passages. Again, as noted above, the first three questions are ones which have been addressed by numerous commentators over many years, and those are the ones dealing with the interpretation and application of these passages, taking into account the original Greek Words used by Paul in 1 Tim. 2:12, which have been interpreted in numerous Biblical translations, including the NIV which is used in this Review, for “to teach” and “authority”, those Greek words being: for to teach, *didaskein*, and for authority, *authentein*. In somewhat simplified form, the Author’s first three questions (remember, there are 4 questions, and we will deal with the most important question, question 4, below) and his responses to those first three questions, are as follows:

QUESTION 1: *If an argument is asserted that one or more Biblical texts, such as 1 Tim. 2:12 prevents full participation in all aspects of ministry, have all exegetical issues been defined to the full satisfaction of all of those on both sides of the issue such that the nature of the prohibition is established beyond all reasonable doubt, using all exegetical and hermeneutical principles? (The Author states that this is a question of “definition” for the Greek Words that are used.)*

BRIEF ANSWER: *No!*

BRIEF OUTLINE OF AUTHOR’S REASONING: Tim. 2:12 and all analysis of same, fail to make it in any way clear whether Paul, using the Greek Word *didaskein* (meaning “to teach”) and the very unclear or obscure Greek Word that is nowhere else used in Scripture, *authentein* (which has been roughly interpreted as “authority”, although this meaning is very uncertain) intends: 1) that women should be barred from any form of teaching, or 2) whether the two Greek terms are grouped together, meaning that women should not be permitted to teach and have any authority over a man, or 3) what type of “teaching” or “authority” are barred for women. So, in the Author’s view the definitions of the Greek Words used in 1 Tim.2:12, as they are interpreted into the English language, are far from clear. Furthermore, “teaching” and the roles of “teacher” in any respect, were, in the first Century Jewish and



Greco Roman world roles that were considered to be inappropriate roles for women, a situation which the Author characterizes as being “not a permanent situation” since “it would be precarious to equate the status of teachers in the early Church with that of teachers today”. (Reviewer’s Note: While your Reviewer certainly agrees with this conclusion, it appears that the Author has jumped from a language interpretation and definition analysis to a cultural analysis, without discussion.) The Author further finds that the obscure Greek term, *authentēin*, which he states appears nowhere else in Scripture, can best be described, in the sense of NT times, as meaning that one has arrogated to oneself or seized by one’s own actions, some role of authority. Therefore, in the Author’s view, the restrictions which Paul placed on women was not so much on what the women did, but how they did it, and how they purported to acquire the authority to do so.

QUESTION 2: *Has it been demonstrated that any text which arguably restricts any of the roles of ministry from women are timeless and universal, even in circumstances which are substantially different than those to which the text is directed? (The Author characterizes this as being a question of “application”, although your Reviewer might characterize it as being a question of “cultural analysis”).*

BRIEF ANSWER: *No!*

BRIEF OUTLINE OF AUTHOR’S REASONING: Here the Author relies on some then significant articles, two of which are cited in a footnote, which have, in the Author’s view, “seriously challenged the assumption that Paul intended the passage (presumably 1 Tim. 2:12) to apply beyond the specific circumstances of women, either locally at Ephesus or, more generally, at a certain state in their spiritual development and doctrinal stability, and demonstration of Christian Character”. The Author argues that, therefore, “the questions raised have been sufficient in number and weight to require caution before making sweeping prohibitions today on the basis of that text”. The Author does not dispute the need to apply “the principles taught in the passage”, but rather emphasizes “...the importance of determining the appropriate time and place for the application of the specific elements (presumably “principles”) cited in the text”. (Reviewer’s Note: Your Reviewer does not disagree with the Author’s conclusion here, which seems to be a conclusion based on a hermeneutical exercise of “principilizing” and “application” in which one seeks to find a “timeless truth or principle or revelation” in a text, which (1) is reflected in the text, and (2) is timeless and not tied to a specific situation, and (3) is timeless and not culturally bound, and (4) corresponds with the teachings of the rest of Scripture, and in which one then seeks to find those applications to specific, current day situations, in which such truth, principle or revelation can be applied. The Reviewer’s issue is not with the conclusion, but is with the way in which the Author seems to jump to the conclusion without any description of the analysis he used in doing so. Perhaps the articles of other Scholars which are cited in the footnotes for his Question 2 provide this analysis.)

QUESTION 3: *If there is evidence elsewhere in Scripture that women did actually perform the ministries which are said to be prohibited for women by the verses in question, has there been a satisfactory resolution of the apparent conflict between these Biblical Texts? (the Author states that this is a question of “resolution”).*



BRIEF ANSWER: *No!*

BRIEF OUTLINE OF AUTHOR'S REASONING: An obvious example of the tension or conflict between relevant Biblical texts can be found in the tension between 1 Tim. 2 and Pricilla's teaching of Apollos, who was a "learned man, with a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures", but who was instructed in the ways of the Lord by Pricilla and her husband, Aquila. (Acts 18:24-25) The Author asks questions which he does not believe to have been resolved, as follows: 1) did the fact that Pricilla taught with her husband, Aquila, somehow have an impact?, and 2) did the fact that the "teaching" took place in a home, informally, rather than formally church affect matters?. The Author's conclusion is that a response to these questions requires resort to the issues of the "theology of ministry", a theology which he discusses in Question 4.

#### QUESTION 4

In your Reviewer's (my) opinion, those parts of the Author's Article which deal with Questions 1 through 3 are interesting but do not explore any new ground, and are, frankly, rather weak in their expressed analysis. Question 4, and the Author's Responses to that Question, are a different matter. Here the Author reaches the essence of his Article, a clarification of the assertion made by him at the outset of his Article, which is that the arguments for and against women's participation in the various roles of ministry, and particularly in the public roles of preaching and teaching and speaking in public, do not address a crucial aspect which must be discussed, that being "THE THEOLOGY OF MINISTRY". In his view a proper consideration of the "theology of ministry", as it reflects on the roles of women, requires the use of what he calls "Reverse Contextualization", a terminology which your Reviewer thinks that he understands, but which is a terminology that is really not thoroughly explained by the Author. In the Author's view, such Reverse Contextualization would suggest that, in reviewing the roles of women (and very probably men) in ministry, and in reviewing the ways in which a Church conducts ministry, our concerns should not be with "How do we apply Scripture in our patterns of ministry?", but rather should be with "How Can We Make Our Patterns Of Ministry More Biblical?". Your Reviewer assumes that such "Reverse Contextualization" approach requires that we take our current patterns of ministry, and then, rather than looking forward from the past to the current, we look from our current patterns backward to Scripture to see whether "...the contemporary ministry at issue has been proven to be identical to that prohibited by the text (i.e. any Biblical text which, arguably, restricts the roles of women). In the Author's view this "looking backward" or "Reverse Contextualization" approach requires that a Question, with four parts, be addressed, that being Question 4 as follows:

QUESTION 4: *If women are being prohibited from the exercise of some specific ministry today on the basis of some Biblical text, has it been established that our contemporary practice of that ministry (i.e. without women) is truly identical to that prohibited by that text, and is OUR CONTEMPORARY PRACTICE OF THAT MINISTRY (I.E. WITHOUT WOMEN) TRULY BIBLICAL as regards (a) its nature, (b) the qualifications required for its exercise, (c) its scope, and (d) its form?*

AUTHOR'S ANSWERS: It is not possible to state, briefly, the Author's responses to these issues of (a) the nature of ministry, (b) the qualifications required for its exercise, (c) its scope, and (b) its form.



Therefore, your Reviewer will attempt to briefly state the Author's responses to each of these subparts of Question 4 (i.e. subparts (a) through (d)) as the Author finds that each such subpart reflects on the Theology of Ministry, and on the question of whether or not a specific text (e.g. 1 Tim. 2:12 ,With the Author assuming that such text DID ACTUALLY RESTRICT WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION), using a looking backward approach from our contemporary practices (presumably without women's participation) to that prohibiting text (i.e. a reverse contextualization approach) indicates that our Current Practices are actually Biblical. That is to say, if we bar women from some specific ministry role is our current pattern of ministry actually Biblical when we consider subparts (a) through (d) of Question 4? The Author's analysis as to these subparts is as follows:

(a) THE NATURE OF MINISTRY: Ministry as Servanthood/No "Clergy" in First Century/No Office of Minister or Clergy in First Century/No "Authority" as such, Was Vested In Some "Office" in the First Century:

Jesus made it powerfully clear that ministry was "servanthood", not the exercise of authority. (See Mark10:42-45). "The idea that ministry is a power base giving an incumbent authority..." is a mistaken idea. This mistaken idea has been "one of the main reasons why many Christians feel uneasy about allowing women in ministry (as) they think this would give them power or authority that they think the Bible denies to them". Furthermore, there is a mistaken idea that the word "ministry" somehow means more than service, but rather is something restricted to those occupying some "office" or "class:, that being the "class of clergy". There were no "offices" in the First Century Church, and there was no specific class of "clergy" as such in the first Century Church. No term for "office" or "clergy" appears in the NT. Furthermore, when the NT does speak of authority (as it does in numerous instances cited by the Author at page 55 of his Article, as, for example, in the Great Commission, which appears to give authority to the apostles and to Christians today, men and women, to make disciples of all the nations) there seems to be no basis to restrict these exercises of "authority" to men. There is no reasonable way to, under the NT, determine what, if any, aspects of "authority" cannot be exercised by women. Additionally, there is no biblical passage which "...equates pastoral or teaching ministry with the exercise of authority." Most of the Biblical passages (i.e. those cited by the Author at page 55 of his Article) that do refer to authority have nothing to do with teaching or pastoral ministry. Additionally:

-There are three types of "authority", those being: *de jure authority*, or the legal authority vested by law or bylaws or some other legal instrument in certain persons, such as the board of elders or the bishop, or the congregation in the case of the Baptists, *de facto authority*, authority which becomes factually invested in someone by reason of their personal strong influence, strong personality, personal skills, etc., and *de senso authority*, an authority which observers can reasonably assume to be held by a person (even if not so held) by reason of his or her being placed in some capacity, or being allowed to perform in certain capacities (Note: Lawyers would refer to this third type of authority as being "apparent authority", a type of authority which others can properly assume that a person or entity has given to another by placing that other in a position where he or she fully appears to have such authority, with such apparent authority being such as can cause the party placing the other in such position to be bound, legally, by such other's actions or agreements).



-The assumption some can make is that a pastor speaking from the pulpit is, through *de senso* authority vested with all of the *de jure authorities* of his or her church.

-This faulty assumption can lead to discomfort among Christians in allowing a woman to preach because of the *de jure authority* which, *de senso*, has apparently been granted to her.

-What we have done is to allow ministry to become confused with authority as opposed to servanthood, sanctified the idea of "office", whereas none existed in the first century, and assumed that anyone who preaches or teaches, possesses some *de jure* authority.

-The assumption that there is a "ministerial office" obscures the fact that it is widely recognized that "ministry" is not "monolithic", a function vested in some ordained "clergy". There is no "office of ministry", as such, from which women are by sex excluded.

In summary, the assumption that "ministry" involves something other than that clearly defined by Jesus, that being "service", is wholly misplaced, as are the assumptions that the exercise of public aspects of ministry, such as preaching and teaching, are evidences of the exercise of some *de jure* authority. There is no evidence from the NT or otherwise, that teaching requires or involves the exercise of authority.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS FOR MINISTRY/There Was No Office of Ministry and No Ordained Clergy In The First Century/and There is Nothing In the NT to Indicate That Only Men Can Receive God's Call To Ministry, Or That The Spiritual Gifts Required For Ministry Are Restricted to Men.:

The special rite of ordination is commonly used to demarcate those who do and do not occupy the office of "minister". However, the rite of ordination rests on extremely slender evidence in the NT. The passages which, arguably, provide such evidence (those primarily being passages about the "laying on of hands"), when properly considered, provide no evidence for ordination. Unfortunately, the increasing restriction of certain spiritual ministries to those who have been officially ordained results, not just in the exclusion of women from those ministries but also in the exclusion of lay persons from those ministries, as all lay persons are wrongly perceived as being untutored and incapable. Additionally, if "God's Call" is a qualification for ministry, then why are women who have received that "Call" excluded from ministry? If another qualification for ministry is the divine bestowal of spiritual gifts, then there is absolutely no differentiation between women and men in the bestowal of such gifts. In summary, there actually being no NT evidence for ordination or for its being a requirement for ministry and men and women seeming to be equally open to God's Call to Ministry and to the divine bestowal of spiritual gifts, then both men and women would be equally qualified for ministry, in these respects.

(c) THE SCOPE OF MINISTRY: Does the Scope of Teaching Always Include the Exercise of Authority in NT Times or Today?/Was/Is it Necessary to be Ordained in Order to Teach?/Teaching in the NT Church Was Not Limited To Certain Classes Nor Did it Imply Authority On the Part of the Teacher.



Ministry in the first century church was not monolithic in nature, nor is it now when we have the growth of multiple church staffs and team ministries. This opens up the ways in which women can function in a pastoral capacity, even assuming that they are barred from teaching. One must then ask whether the scope of the teaching ministry, of necessity, always include the exercise of authority. This question exists as to both the first century Church and today's Church. While Paul clearly had apostolic authority (i.e. to expand the reach of, and teach and protect the true Gospel), that authority does not automatically pass to teachers *pro forma*, unless one accepts the concept of apostolic succession, the authority of bishops and the Roman Catholic Pope and Magisterium. Teaching in the NT Church was not the exclusive authority of some defined classes, such as "clergy" or "ordained clergy", which did not then exist, nor did it imply some authority in the teacher. Paul's stress in the Pastorals (1 and 2 Timothy and Titus) was on the "norm of teaching", not on the teacher. Unfortunately, in the 12<sup>th</sup> century Church preaching became very "clericalized", being the sole function of ordained priests, a fact that even the Reformation was unable to shake, which, perhaps, leads to discomfort over the idea of a woman preaching. THIS PROCESS HAS LED TO THE MOVEMENT OF THE FOCUS OF AUTHORITY FROM THE WORD TO THE PREACHER, MEANING THAT THE LOCUS OF AUTHORITY HAS BECOME THE INTERPRETATION OF THE WORD GIVEN BY THE PREACHER/TEACHER, RATHER THAN ON THE WORD ITSELF, a highly unfortunate and completely erroneous concept. In the first Century Church the authority rested with the Gospel, the Word, not the teacher, and the concerns of Paul in the Pastorals and elsewhere were with the protection of the integrity of the Gospel, the Word, the true authority.

In Summary, the scope of the teaching ministry, in the first Century Church and today, did not and does not include the exercise of authority. This is an important conclusion because, from the Apostolic Period to the Reformation the celebration of the sacraments was considered to be exclusively within the realm of the ordained clergy, this being particularly true as to the celebration of the eucharist, a celebration from which women were excluded because of the anachronistic belief that their monthly periods rendered them "impure", a belief which led to the complete exclusion of women from the rite of ordination and from the ordained clergy, an exclusion which exists to this day in the Roman Catholic Church. However, the Author concludes that one would look to Scripture, in vain, to find any evidence that the celebration of the Lord's Supper belongs within the realm of a certain designated class (i.e. clergy, much less ordained clergy for which there is no NT evidence). Rather it belongs in the scope of ministerial functions to be performed by the entire kingdom of priests, which includes women.

(d) THE FORM OF MINISTRY: Teaching and Particularly Preaching Are Public Activities, and So its FORM is Perceived Differently In Different Circumstances.

One must look at the form of Christian Worship in the NT Church. There the earliest form of Church was along the lines of the extended household, with intermingled elements from other social configurations, such as the *collegium* and the synagogue. There were vast differences between the "mutual ministries" (i.e. ministries among the congregation and participants, which was the function of all) and the contemporary, top down, polar structure of preacher and audience of today. The implication of these differences in the forms of the early, first Century Church and today's Church, with respect to public perception of preaching/teaching are obvious. Preaching is a far more public function, today. We all acknowledge that ministry is inevitably to some degree a public and therefore cultural



matter. THEREFORE, "WHAT IS NEEDED IS TO DETERMINE FROM THE TEXT ARE THE PRINCIPLES BEING TAUGHT THAT ARE TO BE APPLIED APPROPRIATELY IN DIFFERENT CULTURES. SCRIPTURE IS NOT CULTURALLY RELATIVE, BUT IT IS CULTURALLY RELEVANT." (REVIEWER'S NOTE: Your Reviewer, me, wonders whether the Reader shares your Reviewer's opinion that it has taken the Author a whole lot of rather difficult, somewhat disjointed statements and conclusions to come to this conclusion which would seem to be one that could have been much more easily and understandably reached through a defined and explained hermeneutical exercise, which would give weight to determining the timeless principle to be found in any Biblical text and then to the application of that principle in the various circumstances and situations of today.)

AUTHOR'S FINAL CONCLUSION: Finally we get to what your Reviewer finds to be a very helpful conclusion and to be a notable furthering of the arguments and discussions about the roles of women in ministry. This conclusion, which appears at page 61 of the Author's Article, will be quoted in detail because it is a conclusion that should result in further research, and discussion and in the substantial limiting of restrictions placed on the roles of women in ministry. The Author's conclusion is as follows:

"Paul's heavy use of the language of contemporary conventional morality, especially in 1 Corinthians that deal with public participation of women, suggests that he was intensely concerned with the way women's ministry was perceived by moralistic pagans and Jewish onlookers. **The message of these passages is, in my judgment, not so much the specific form that women's ministry is to take as it is the principle that the form adopted must not alienate the hearers from the message of the Gospel....In many parts of the Roman Empire in the first century a ministry that included the public participation of women, especially without appropriate head-covering or hairdo, would have been rejected. Today a ministry that excludes the public participation of women is likely to be rejected by the people we are trying to win. While we are worrying about a *de senso*, perceived, authority being ascribed to a woman in the pulpit, visitors to our churches may be scandalized by a perception that the church demeans women.** To adapt the form of our ministry with a view to reaching today's woman follows Paul's wise modification of his apostolic rights in order to identify with Jews or Gentiles he was trying to win."

#### REVIEWER'S FINAL NOTE

Your Reviewer acknowledges, with apologies to our Author, who is far more learned than your Reviewer, that the tone of this Review is probably unnecessarily harsh and critical. That said, your Reviewer concedes that he became increasingly frustrated with trying to wade through parts of this Article, which contained some interesting tidbits but were difficult to truly decipher in order to try to reach any definitive conclusion, in order to reach the Author's final conclusion (the one quoted above, at length), which provides a very valuable addition to the realm of the arguments over the proper roles of women in ministry. Your Reviewer apologizes for the length of this Review and for the rather verbose "brief summaries" (now that is a humorous statement) of the various Questions and Answers provided by the Author, but, since your Reviewer wanted to try to better understand just what the Author was saying he engaged in these "summaries" more for his benefit than for the benefit of the Reader.



All that is said in this Final Note notwithstanding, in your Reviewer's opinion the Author's Final Conclusion stated above is GOLDEN. Wading through this Article and trying to outline and summarize this Article have been like "Mining For Gold", and the Gold has been found in the Author's Final Conclusion, a Conclusion which can be used and expanded in order to seek elimination of restrictions on the roles of women in ministry, and particularly in the public roles of preaching and teaching.

#### FURTHER WORK

Time and the waning energy of an 81 year old man permitting, Your Reviewer wants to use the Author's Final Conclusion set forth above, and some of the other valuable nuggets of information found in this Article, together with other sources, including *Hearing Her Voice, Revised Edition (a Biblical Invitation to Teach)*, By John Dickson, Zondervan 2012, and *Why Can't Women Do That?, (Breaking Down The Reasons Why Churches Put Men In Charge)*, By Philip B Payne and Vince Huffaker, Vinati Press 2021 and some additional resources, in order to apply a thorough hermeneutical analysis (using the accepted Rules and Models of Hermeneutics) to the questions about the intentions, the *illocutions* and desired results, the *Perlocutions*, behind Paul's statements in 1 Corinthians, and 1 Tim. 2-12 and elsewhere, texts which are used to assert arguments that women's roles in ministry should be restricted. While your Reviewer readily concedes that Scripture Governs over all, and that, if God, through the passages of Scripture, has truly Revealed His Intentions that women's roles should be restricted, then such should be the case. However, from the preliminary point of view of your Reviewer it is believed that, in fact, such has not been God's Revelation, and that any restrictions placed on the roles of women in the ministry of today's churches are mistaken and damaging to the abilities of the Church to bring to Christ, Faith, and the Gospel those who it is called upon by God to save and minister to. So, hopefully, more on this later.

Your Reviewer thanks you for your patient endurance.

Dan Simon