

Grenz, Stanley J., and Denise Muir Kjesbo. *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995. 284 pp. \$15.99.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin, eds. *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996. 334 pp. \$21.99.

Two books with the same title could hardly differ more. Only part of the difference comes from the subtitles; much more comes from the presuppositions undergirding the two. As Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin rightly question in their introduction: "Who among us is truly open to the biblical message? Who can claim to be free of the trappings of culture and tradition?" (9).

Grenz and Muir Kjesbo represent the Christians for Biblical Equality (CBE) viewpoint which favors women's participation in ministry on an equal basis with men; they conclude that "church leadership is enhanced by the presence of both" men and women (230). Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin represent the Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW) which maintains that women are excluded from leadership roles in the church; they conclude that women should not function "as teaching pastors or teaching elders/overseers of the churches. This means that women should not proclaim the Word of God from the pulpit to the congregation of the saints" (210).

Grenz and Muir Kjesbo begin their book with a sketch of the current controversy between CBE and CBMW. In spite of their "egalitarian" stance, the authors make amicable reference to "complementarian" views before refuting them. Emphasis is placed on the whole of Pauline writings, as well as on references to women in ministry in Acts, rather than on the problem texts. This approach permits Grenz to treat Paul's advice to the church in Corinth and Ephesus as local and temporal, rather than universally binding. Grenz finds that man and woman were created equal (156-165). Rather than being a "morally binding injunction," male domination as described in Gen 3:16 was a result of the fall and is reversed by Christ's redemption (165-169).

The last two chapters deal with theological aspects of ministry. A minister is not a priest, for the church itself is a gifted priesthood (188). The church community sets apart "by a public act persons whom the Lord . . . has called to pastoral ministry" (196); these should include called women. Women in ministry do not represent Christ as male; they represent his humanness (206). Furthermore, their ministry is not so much the exercising of authority as servant leadership (210-229). Mutuality, rather than dominance, should distinguish church leaders, male or female (229). Copious notes, a bibliography, and an index close the book.

In chapter 1 of Köstenberger, Schneider, and Baldwin, Stephen Baugh presents Ephesus as a normal Mediterranean city, rather than an ancient center for women's rights. He also reminds us of the Roman moralists' injunctions for women, far more restrictive than those of Paul. By the end of the chapter, Baugh can already conclude that Paul's injunctions "are not temporary measures in a unique social setting" (49). In chapter 2, T. David Gordon describes the genre of the Pastoral Epistles as instructions for the postapostolic church, which are "germane to our setting, which is postapostolic as well" (63). Baldwin tackles that

notoriously difficult word, *authentēin*, and concludes that its meaning is related to the concept of authority (79). Chapter 4 contains Köstenberger's analysis of the sentence structure of 1 Tim 2:12, showing that the verbs *didaskein* and *authentēin* should be viewed in the same light—either positively or negatively (this undoubtedly in opposition to Katherine Kroeger's suggested syntax in *I Suffer Not a Woman*). Since, as he maintains, all NT references to "teaching" are positive (which one might question in light of 1 Tim 1:7 and 6:3, although the verb *didaskō* is not used), the same must be true here and "exercising authority" would not refer to negative authority or "usurping" authority (103).

Chapter 5 (105-154) contains Schreiner's interpretation of the passage "in dialogue with scholarship." While not claiming to "have given the definitive and final interpretation of this passage," Schreiner's conclusions are definite: "Women should not arrogate a teaching role for themselves when men and women are gathered in public meetings" (153). Indeed, "the creation of Adam before Eve signaled that men are to teach and exercise authority in the church" (153). Finally women should not teach or exercise authority over men because "they are more prone to introduce deception into the church since they are more nurturing and relational than men. . . . Women are less likely to perceive the need to take a stand on doctrinal non-negotiables since they prize harmonious relationships more than men do" (153). A note asserts that "this does not mean that women are inferior to men," but that they do have "different weaknesses" (n. 227).

Robert W. Yarbrough's chapter on hermeneutics (155-196) does not outline a hermeneutical method; rather, it roundly condemns "progressive" interpretations of the text as rooted in historical criticism and feminism. In the final chapter Harold O. J. Brown reaffirms the role differentiation at creation with the male as head (200-206). He also notes that "the intellectual culture of the first century" is as valid as the "political correctness of the late twentieth century to determine our interpretations of Scripture" (207). Furthermore, while we are called to be kings and priests, we must recognize that "not everyone can function in society as king" or even "in the church as priest" (208).

Appendix 1, "A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2" by Daniel Doriani, concludes that the church has "traditionally interpreted 1 Timothy 2:11-14 in a straightforward manner," meaning thereby that women should not "hold teaching offices or formally authoritative positions" (262). Appendix 2 lists selected usages of *authentēin* in ancient Greek literature and concludes that the word means simply "to exercise authority." A comparison with Leland Wilshire's listing ("1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited," *EQ* 65 [1993]:46-47), which favors the meaning to "instigate violence," shows how differing positions guide research. A 14-page bibliography, a Scripture index, and subject index close the book.

Both books are well-written and documented. Yet both seem to defend a position already taken. Grenz and Muir Kjesbo look at the big picture and conclude that women belong in ministry. Köstenberger, Schreiner, and Baldwin examine 1 Tim 2:9-15 and from the one passage conclude they should not.

One wonders what conclusion Köstenberger and others would have reached had they included v. 8, which obviously belongs to the passage, in their analysis: "I desire that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling." While sympathetic to their concern for truth, the integrity of

Scripture, and obedience to the Word, I fail to see in Scripture some of their basic presuppositions—headship from creation and prohibition of women's teaching ministry. Perhaps my view is overly tinted by 35 years of teaching young ministers—most of them males. On the other hand, I may simply have been acting as a "mother in Israel," not a seminary professor, and am thus exempt from the prohibition.

Andrews University

NANCY J. VYHMEISTER

Guthrie, George H. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. NovT Supplement, no. 73. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994. xix + 161. Cloth, \$90.00.

Despite the popularity of new approaches in biblical studies, the field of linguistics, and more specifically text linguistics, has been largely neglected by biblical scholars. This study may represent something of a turning point. Text linguistics, better known in the U.S. as discourse analysis, has been neglected by the guild of biblical scholars. Its application has been largely confined to the realm of Bible translators. As a result many have not had access to its benefits for exegesis. Only in the form of structuralism and semeiotics have text-linguistic approaches had much impact. Only outside of North America (e.g., in South Africa and Scandinavia) has text linguistics been applied to more traditional exegesis of the Bible. But now we are beginning to see a bridging of this gulf and the consequent entry of discourse analysis into the larger academy as an increasing number of works presenting the fruit of discourse analysis are appearing on the market. Guthrie represents an important step in this trend and an important contribution both to the study of Hebrews and the discipline of discourse analysis.

The Structure of Hebrews is the published version of Guthrie's Ph.D. dissertation completed in 1991 at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary under Bruce Corley. Lane, in his WBC commentary, gave fairly extensive discussion of the unpublished version of Guthrie's dissertation. It is good to see the work available to the wider public in its full form.

The work consists of two parts and seven chapters. The first section, consisting of two chapters, discusses and evaluates past proposals on the structure of Hebrews from the *kephalaia* system of divisions found in early Greek MS of the NT, down through the recent work of Linda Lloyd Neeley, Walter Übelacker, and Harold Attridge. He does not take note of the revised edition of F. F. Bruce's commentary nor the more recent commentaries of Paul Ellingworth and H. F. Weiss; presumably his manuscript was completed before he could get access to the latter two. The second section provides an application of text linguistics to the structure of Hebrews. After laying out his method, he attempts to isolate units through "cohesion shift analysis." He next tests his findings there by studying the use of the ancient rhetorical device of *inclusio*. Chapter six uses the text-linguistic study of lexical cohesion to determine the interrelationship of the various units identified. The final chapter discusses the resulting structure of Hebrews.

In his delineation of the structure Guthrie finds it necessary to maintain a distinction between the exposition and the exhortation, not subsuming the former to the latter as most do. Thus he traces the flow of thought in the expositional unit and then considers developments within the hortatory material. Only then does