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Shall the Church Ordain Women as Pastors?
Thoughts toward an Integrated NT Perspective

Teresa Reeve
Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

How shall we as a global Seventh-day Adventist church, seeking to be faithful followers of Jesus Christ, read the New Testament in order to correctly understand God’s will concerning the ordination of women as pastors in the Seventh-day Adventist church? Care and humility is required of every individual approaching this question. The complexity and breadth of the issue, and of the related literature, make it challenging and time-consuming to fully evaluate all sides, to identify accurately the intended meaning of related Scriptural passages, and to put the results together into an unbiased whole.

The natural solution is to grasp and build on those points that intuitively make sense from one’s own point of view, and no one is exempt from personal and cultural bias on this issue. We are, every one of us, pulled in one direction by the so-called “progressive” trends of post-modern culture, and in the opposite direction by the soothing assurance of tradition and “the way it has always been” in Christian history and in the other cultures and institutions of which we are a part. Despite our best human efforts to the contrary, the direction each of us goes is influenced much more than we would like to admit by our own personal upbringing, temperament, and experience, and by the resulting construction of life and reality we carry with us. It would be foolish for a group of any persuasion to suggest that they are exempt from the pull of culture in these ways. For every Scriptural story of God’s people straying from Him by following the example of surrounding culture, there is another story of Jesus’ struggle with religious leaders who were so sure of their own (cultural) understanding of Scripture and God’s law that they rejected Him, God’s own Son, when He did not conform to their traditional expectations.

These realities have left us facing a deep divide concerning potential answers to our question. Yet we have reason for optimism, for we all agree that our hope rests alone in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit’s guiding, as we humbly seek to take Scripture and the whole of Scripture alone as our highest rule of faith and practice. On the basis of this shared understanding of Scripture, I pray that we will allow God’s Spirit to help us put aside our distrust and our frustrations with each other and work closely together, observing and seeking to build from where we do agree, and granting honestly and exploring thoroughly where difficulties arise on either side. I am confident that, if we do so, God will lead us as a community through the minefields of our human failings toward God’s answer to our common dilemma.

The task given me in this paper is to present to you the rationale for believing that the NT supports, in cultures where it would enhance rather than hinder or discredit the gospel, the ordination of appropriately gifted and qualified women for pastoral leadership in the church. Although the size of this paper does not allow me to deal with each critique of this position, I have taken them very seriously, and continue to wrestle with some of them. I look forward to your input and to our continued discussion to point out areas I have missed, correct me where I am wrong, and strengthen those points in need of improvement.

Naturally, the ideal would be to discover a “Thus saith the Lord” explicitly addressing the ordination of women as pastors for His church today. Because there is no such declaration, it is necessary both to consider carefully those passages that appear to relate most closely to this
specific issue, and to explore the larger picture of the NT (in the context of the Old Testament) in regards to the related concepts of ministry, authority, ordination, and women. Each of these tasks is essential and must be completed before trying to discern whether God would have us ordain women for ministry. This paper will begin by seeking a clear understanding of the larger concepts in the big picture, before moving on to listen faithfully to specific passages that have been suggested to have a particular bearing on the question.

What Does the NT Tell Us about Ministry, Authority and Ordination?

Ministry in the NT

The NT leaves no room for doubt regarding the nature of the church and its mission. As often stated, the church is not primarily a building or an administrative structure but people—a community of believers, repentant and redeemed, who call God ‘Savior and Lord.’ The stated task of this community is to participate together, under God, in His mission to reconcile humanity to Himself through Jesus Christ, a mission to be completed in the full restoration of His kingdom when He comes (Luke 12:8, 9; 2 Cor. 5:17-20). Every believer is to be a part of the church’s work of proclaiming this good news in word and deed, making disciples of those who believe by nurturing their relationship with and obedience to Him (Matt. 24:14; 28:18-20; 1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 14:6-12). Thus we see Jesus, after initially sending twelve (Luke 6:13; 9:1, 2), sending seventy more (Luke 10:1, 9); and the Holy Spirit, after being poured out on all believers with power for witness (Acts 1:8; Acts 2:38), leading believers to follow Jesus’ pattern in advancing God’s mission through loving service and praise of Him (e.g. Acts 4:31; 9:36; 11:19, 20; 18:24-26).

The epistles describe further the ways in which God empowers the entire church for ministry. Through the Holy Spirit every believer is provided with divinely endowed abilities known as spiritual gifts (charismata), which He has chosen for that individual to employ in sharing God’s good news with the world and in edifying and serving the believing community (Rom. 12:6-8; 1 Cor. 12:4-11, 28; Eph. 4:7, 11-13; 1 Pet. 4:10-11). Several overlapping lists of gifts are found in the epistles, suggesting that none of them are exhaustive. These gifts are not described in detail, but allow us to observe the breadth of the Spirit’s gifting. No gift is presented consistently as standing at the top of a “hierarchy of gifts.” No differentiation of honor or care is to be made between those holding the various gifts and ministries (1 Cor. 12:4-7; 1 Cor. 12:22-25). And in none of the lists are any of the gifts said to be restricted according to gender. The church is one body with many members, called from every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. In Christ we are a new creation; distinctions of race, culture, learning, and nationality, and differences between high and low, rich and poor, male and female, must not be divisive among us. We are all equal in Christ, who by one Spirit has bonded us into one fellowship with Him and with one another; we are to serve and be served without partiality or reservation. Through the revelation of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures we share the same faith and hope, and reach out in one witness to all. This unity has its source in the oneness of the triune God, who has adopted us as His children (Rom. 12:4, 5; 1 Cor. 12:12-14; Matt. 28:19, 20; Ps. 133:1; 2 Cor. 5:16, 17; Acts 17:26, 27; Gal. 3:27, 29; Col. 3:10-15; Eph. 4:14-16; 4:1-6; John 17:20-23).”

Because all nouns must have a gender in Greek, the use of the masculine ending is the normal usage for designating a mixed group. These masculine endings are used of all the gifts in these lists, and since none of us would restrict gifts such as faith or prophecy to men alone it would be inconsistent to insist that the endings related...
the giving of the gifts comes the responsibility to make use of them (Matt. 5:14-16; 1 Cor. 12:7; Eph. 4:11-12) in the most effective possible way (Matt. 25:14-30; 1 Cor. 9:19-23; 10:31-33) in order to win and disciple to Jesus Christ the people among whom believers live and work.

Many of the tasks we associate today with pastoring are included among these divinely-assigned spiritual gifts and ministry functions (1 Cor. 12:4-5). In addition to concretely oriented gifts such as healing, and intellectually-oriented ones like knowledge, the Holy Spirit also bestows a number of socially-oriented gifts relating to leadership, that is, to the ability to act in a manner that influences others. Romans 12:8 speaks of a gift of leading (proistēmi). This Greek word is used to express a variety of actions from caring for someone, to guiding, to ruling. (As with all language, it would be erroneous to simply select a preferred definition, rather a careful consideration of the context of each usage is essential to learn how this and the other words in this paper were actually meant to be understood.) In the NT proistēmi is used in a variety of ways, including to indicate: individuals who labor among the believers (1 Thess. 5:12); the ability to deal with a household in such a manner that the children are submissive (1 Tim. 3:4, 5, 12); the valued work of the elders (1 Tim. 5:17). Administrative abilities (kubernēsis), a gift mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:28, refers literally to the skill with which a pilot guides a ship. Some uses in Greek literature include managing a household and also of leadership in general. In the NT it is used only here, but in the Greek Bible used by the New Testament church (the LXX) it is used several times in Proverbs to mean counsel, or guidance, from (a plurality of) others, which Proverbs proclaims it wise to receive (1:5; 11:14; 24:6).

Also included in these gift lists and fundamental to the work of the Adventist pastor are what might be spoken of as ministries (e.g. 1 Cor. 12:4-5) such as apostle, evangelist, pastor and teacher. These ministry gifts are likewise assigned by the Holy Spirit and do not directly refer to roles formally appointed by the church (1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11), although they may lead to such a formal appointment. The divinely appointed ministry function of apostle (apostolos) refers to the leadership gifts should be so understood. In 1 Corinthians 12:1, Paul’s use of the masculine term “brethren” to encourage Christian men and women to “covet earnestly the best gifts” (12:31), should be understood in the context of passages like Deuteronomy 15:12—“If your brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman, is sold to you and serves you six years, then in the seventh year you shall let him [or her] go free” (cf. 1 Cor. 7:16, 24).


5 The LXX is the earliest Greek translation(s) of the OT. It was the Bible generally used by early Christians, most of whom were unable to speak or read Hebrew. Timothy Friberg, et al., "κυβερνήσις," in Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids Baker, 2000). J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, "κυβερνήσις," in Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), 207. A cognate noun, kubernētēs, is used in the LXX and NT to refer exclusively to the pilot of a ship (4 Macc. 7:1; Prov. 23:34; Ezek. 27:8, 27-28; Acts 27:11; Rev. 18:17).
literally to one who is “sent out” as a representative or emissary on behalf of another. It is most often associated with the Twelve appointed by Jesus to represent Him, but is also used more broadly in the NT to refer to individuals such as Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14:4, 14), James, the brother of Jesus (Gal. 1:19) and Andronicus and Junia (Rom. 16:7) who, while they were not eyewitnesses appointed by Jesus during His ministry, were also recognized as being chosen and gifted for a representative role. The spiritual gift of evangelist (euangelistēs; Eph. 4:11) is not mentioned elsewhere in the NT, but might be exemplified by the work of “Philip the evangelist” (Acts 21:8), who in Acts 8 communicated the gospel (euangelion) to people who had not yet had the opportunity to hear or accept it.

Included in the list of ministries, given by the Spirit to whom He wills, is the function generally translated as pastor (Eph. 4:11). The word in Greek (poimēn) literally means shepherd. This is the only reference to any human individual other than Jesus as being a pastor/poimēn, although both Paul and Peter call on elders to participate in shepherding God’s flock (Acts 20:28; 1Pet 5:2). The characteristics of the shepherd that Jesus identifies with are his intimate knowing of his sheep, his deep love and concern for them, and his commitment to guide and protect them—in fact this shepherd is even willing to lay down His life for His sheep (John 10:11-15; cf. Matt. 2:6; 9:36; 26:31; Rev. 7:17). Paul’s concern in calling the elders to act as shepherds in Acts 21 focuses on the task of protecting the flock from false teaching. Peter, on the other hand, already faced the need to warn the elders themselves against understanding their role of shepherding as one granting them a ruling and controlling authority. Instead Peter called for the use of an authority based on influence, stating, “Shepherd the flock of God which is among you, serving as overseers, not by compulsion but willingly, not for dishonest gain but eagerly; nor as being lords over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock” (1 Pet. 5:2, 3).

The role of teacher (didaskalos) is closely tied to that of pastor in the Greek of Ephesians 4:11. This is seen in the lack of an article (thus reading literally “the pastors and teachers”) where each of the other ministry functions in the list are distinguished from each other by its presence. Didaskalos is the normal word used in the NT for teacher, regularly employed, for example, with reference to Jesus (Matt. 8:19) and to Paul (2 Tim. 1:11). Timothy is instructed both to teach (didaskō) and to empower others to teach (1 Tim. 4:11, 13; 2 Tim. 2:2), and all the

---

6 Apostles are mentioned first in two of the lists. Paul’s reference to himself as an apostle “untimely born” (1 Cor. 15:8) suggests that he saw himself as the last of the apostles in this original sense. He never spoke of himself as having appointed apostles, and the use of the term faded away in the early church, possibly because of its special association with those directly appointed by Jesus Himself.

7 Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1981), 768-9. Apostle is also used of other types of appointed representatives, such as individuals sent out by individual churches (2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25); cf. Heb. 3:1.

8 In 2 Tim. 4:5, Timothy, in a series of imperatives, is instructed both to do the work of a euangelistēs and also to fulfill his diakonia (ministry, or service).

9 Similarly the English word “pastor” is derived from the Latin pastorem meaning “shepherd.”

10 Paul also uses the example of shepherding to argue for his, and others, right to be supported financially in their work of ministry (1Cor. 9:7).

Colossian believers are told to teach one another (Col 3:16). The authority of the teacher is under authority of the apostles, and the Scriptures, whose teachings they explain (Isa. 8:20).  

Again, neither these more leadership-oriented gifts, nor any of the other gifts, are ever spoken of with restrictions as to gender. Rather, the NT indicates that it is God who, according to His own sovereign choice, gives to every believer a divinely-defined and unique contribution to make and holds them and the church accountable for its wise use.

Formally Appointed Ministry Roles in the NT

In addition to each believer’s exercise of the gifts of the Spirit under the leading and authorization of God, the NT testifies that, to help the church remain true to God and carry out its mission effectively, some organization is necessary (Acts 6:1; 1 Cor. 14:40). This organization includes the formal appointment of individuals entrusted by the church to carry out particular ministry functions (Titus 1:5). The examples and instructions in the NT testify that such appointments were generally done on the basis of evidence of the Holy Spirit’s presence (providing the power and appropriate gifts for ministry) and of the spiritual maturity to use these gifts to represent God and the church appropriately. Such recognition by the church functions to “test the spirits” (1 John 4:1) and adds to one already authorized by God a more tangible, humanly-delegated authority, indicating the church’s trust and affirmation.

The Twelve Apostles

The appointment of twelve apostles early in Jesus ministry was for the stated purpose of being with Him and being sent out to preach (Mark 3:14). The authority given them is directly stated to be authority (exousia) to cast out demons and to heal diseases—in other words, it was an authority over “nonhuman enemies of God’s reign” (Matt. 10:1; Luke 9:1). This same purpose and authority was soon given also to seventy others (Luke 10:1, 9, 17), in a prefiguring of the shared authority that Jesus would call upon His church to practice. As the criteria for selecting the new twelfth apostle further evidences, the special authority the twelve apostles did carry in relation to people was related to the trust and training Jesus had invested in them for the proclamation of their experience as eyewitnesses of the Lord and His teachings (1:21-22; cf. Luke 24:46-4; Acts 1:2, 8; 2:42). As time passed, the authoritative witness of these original apostles was recorded in writings which came to be accepted as NT Scripture, and which have inherited their previous authority. Thus today it would be inappropriate for a pastor or anyone

---


13 As Ellen White notes, “It is not always men who are best adapted to the successful management of a church” (*Pastoral Ministry*, 36).

14 This is Ellen White’s heartfelt concern in calling for “Gospel Order” as can be seen for example in the chapter entitled “Gospel Order” in *Early Writings*, 97-104.

15 These functional roles are today often spoken of as offices. However the use of this term should not be confused with the status- and power-conscious implications that became associated with this term over the course of history.

16 Aída Besançon Spencer. "Jesus' Treatment of Women in the Gospels," in *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2005), 135. In a larger view, it might be recognized that the reason Jesus’ disciples had to exercise authority over demons was that the demons, led by Satan, had themselves sought to usurp undue authority and therefore it was necessary that all authority be taken from them.
else to attempt to take upon themselves the kind of authority held by the original apostles of
Jesus, for it is the Scriptures alone that now hold this eyewitness kind of authority.

Deacons

Other than the appointment of the apostles, Jesus did not give specific instructions
regarding formal roles of ministry in the church. However in the NT church, following His return
to heaven, two roles are explicitly identified as formally recognized by the church: the deacon
and the elder. Very early, the apostles requested the selection of seven individuals to take over
the “daily ministry (diakonia)” (Acts 6:1), of “serving (diakoneō) tables” (6:2). Thereby they
planned to concentrate more fully on the purpose Jesus had set out for them, described here, in
terms similar to their original commission, as “prayer and the ministry (diakonia) of the word”
(6:4; cf. 2:42). The basic concept behind the term diakonia and its cognates is the idea of service,
or ministry, rendered to another. For example, Paul uses diakonos to refer to various
individuals in the church, including its leaders such as himself and even Jesus. Interestingly,
where the NT speaks of leaders, English translators have often made the decision to use the word
“minister” [Rom. 15:8; 1 Cor. 3:5; 2 Cor. 6:4; Eph. 3:7; 6:21], whereas with individuals they do
not consider to be leadership positions they have chosen the term “servant.” Jesus used the term
in such sayings as, “whoever desires to become great among you, let him be your servant
(diakonos)” [Matt. 20:26].

Little else is said of the ministry of the seven, who eventually became known as deacons,
other than this initial assignment in Acts 6. This passage suggests that they were given authority
to resolve the issues involved in the daily distribution of food and other resources to those in
need, and to be in charge of the continued organization and implementation of this task. While
the initial task given the Seven dealt with the distribution of food, they were not barred from
authority to preach and teach, for it is reported that Stephen and Philip were active in these areas
immediately afterward (6:9-53; 8:5-13; cf. 21:8).

Two criteria were listed at that time for the selection of the seven: 1) they were to be of
“good reputation” (Acts 6:3), a primary concern later fleshed out in the qualifications for deacon
listed by Paul in 1 Timothy 3:8-13; and 2) they were to exhibit evidence of the Holy Spirit’s
presence in their lives, explicitly including the gift of wisdom (6:7; cf. 1 Cor. 12:8). The term

17 The term “NT church” is used here to refer to the church portrayed in the NT. This is the best term I have
found for this specific focus, since the broader term “early church” is regularly used to refer to both NT times and
the several subsequent centuries.

18 cf. Luke 10:40 and also 1 Cor. 12:5 which is probably the earliest use of diakonia in the NT.

19 This is in contrast to doulos, the other main word group used of a servant in the NT. doulos speaks not
simply of one who performs a service (whether servant or slave or other individual), but refers specifically to “a
relationship of dependence and subordination.” See Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, "Exegetical Dictionary of

20 Although these seven were not in Acts called “deacons (diakonos)”—a title which appears only in the
Pauline epistles (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:8-13)—this title was at some point assigned to them. This is the designation
given them by Ellen White (e.g., Acts of the Apostles, 89).

21 The report of Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 evidences the authority with which he spoke.

22 Indeed, Ellen White spoke of this process in Acts 6 as “the model for the organization of the church in
every other place.” What she is seeking to emphasize in this reference is that the apostles in their “general oversight
of the church” were not to lord it over God’s heritage” and that the deacons, chosen on the basis of reputation and
Spirit-gifting, would “have a uniting influence upon the entire flock” (Acts of the Apostles, 91).


diakonos is used for the first time in the more formal sense by Paul who extended greetings to 
“the overseers and deacons” in Philippi (Phil. 1:1), and described certain qualities one should 
exhibit before being appointed to the role of deacon (1 Tim. 3:8-13). Paul’s inclusion, in this list, 
of qualities especially addressed to women suggests the presence, even at this early date, of 
female deacons (3:11). The biblical mandate for female deacons is recognized by the Adventist 
church, which has been ordaining deacons of both genders since the early days.23

Elders

The other formally identified ministry role to which individuals were said to be appointed 
in the NT is that of elder (presbyters), also known as overseer (episkopos, sometimes translated 
in English as bishop; Acts 14:23; 20:17, 28; Phi 1:1). The role of elder finds its precedent in the 
elders of the OT and early Judaism (e.g. Gen. 50:7; Exod. 3:16). These were older individuals 
among the tribe and village who were respected for their experience, moral character and 
wisdom, and to whom the community looked for leadership.24 In the instances we know of they 
were generally male, although the work of Deborah, as judge, would incorporate the duties of 
an elder.25 Old Testament elders worked together as a group to give counsel and provide 
judgments regarding the day-to-day business of village or town in regard to both religious and 
civil matters.26 The process for selecting elders is not clearly known, in fact the role was likely 
held at times on the basis of a tacit recognition of stature and leadership in the community rather 
than being a formally elected office.27

The implementation of a role for elders in the NT church contrasts sharply with the 
church’s avoidance of implementing other OT positions such as ruler, with its encroachment 
upon the singular authority of God (1 Sam. 8:4-19), and priests, whose work was fulfilled in 
Christ (Heb. 7:11-19; 10:8-9). As in the OT, the NT role of elder was without exception a 
function held by a group of individuals within a local community of believers, never by a single 
individual.

23 Daughters of God, (Hagerstown: Review, 2005), 249.


25 Richard M. Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” (Theology of Ordination Study Committee, 2013), 60. It is feasible that other unnamed women also held this role at times. The Adventist church today officially recognizes that the office of elder is open to both men and women based on an understanding that the masculine gendered language of “one woman man” identifies a moral qualification that is also fulfilled by “a one-man woman.” Thus the current General Conference policy on ordination of women in the Seventh-day Adventist Minister's Handbook states: “By action of the Annual Council of 1975, reaffirmed at the 1984 Annual Council, both men and women are eligible to serve as elders and receive ordination to this position of service in the church.”


27 Philo Mig. 201; Sob. 7; Abr. 270, 274; R. Alastair Campbell, The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity (ed. Riches; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 20-66.
There is no clear description of the ordination of elders in the NT, however Acts 14:23 describes elders being appointed, and the qualifications given by Paul to Timothy and Titus for the choosing of elders further evidence that this had become a formally selected role. In addition to qualifications similar to that of the deacon, Paul adds that the elder should be able to teach (1 Tim 3:2; cf. 5:17), a gift that would be important to the elders’ task of shepherding and protecting the flock (Acts 20:2-31; 1 Pet. 5:1-4 and James 5:14). Other work associated with NT elders includes dealing with contributions for those in need (Acts 11:28-30) and leading, with others, in the process of decision-making (Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 21:18-25). As we have seen in our exploration of the spiritual gifts, each of these tasks are related to gifts that God has given to both men and women according to His sovereign choice. As noted above, even as early as the writing of 1 Peter, elders had to be reminded, as Jesus had so often counseled, that they were not to try to lord it over (katakurieuo) the community (1 Pet. 5:1-3). (In fact, within two or three decades powerful overseer-bishops, such as Ignatius of Antioch, set themselves over the other elders and began to rule the church like monarchs, insisting that all should obey their will.)

Some have suggested that Paul’s counsel regarding widows in 1 Peter 5:1-16 points to a developing formal role played by older widows in the church who no longer had the heavy burden of household management for husband and family (5:5, 10). This possibility is at least worth considering, since verse 2 uses the term presbyteros (with the appropriate feminine ending) which is often used to refer to formally appointed elders. Further, verse 9 speaks of women being “selected” (katalego; often translated as “enrolled”). Unfortunately Paul doesn’t describe what they are being selected, or enrolled for, leaving translators and commentators alike to educated guesswork. Many commentators believe that this was a sort of early church “welfare list,” but it seems odd that these widows should be expected to measure up to a list of

28 It is possible that χαιροτονεω in Acts 14:23 (“when they had appointed [χαιροτονεω] elders in every church”) may refer to a laying on of hands, but the current usage rather indicated choosing or electing by the raising of hands. Timothy Friberg, et al., "χαιροτονεω," in Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids Baker, 2000).

29 Ellen White comments on this challenge: “I saw that in the apostles’ day the church was in danger of being deceived and imposed upon by false teachers. Therefore the brethren chose men who had given good evidence that they were capable of ruling well their own house and preserving order in their own families, and who could enlighten those who were in darkness. Inquiry was made of God concerning these, and then, according to the mind of the church and the Holy Ghost, they were set apart by the laying on of hands. Having received their commission from God and having the approbation of the church, they went forth baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and administering the ordinances of the Lord’s house, often waiting upon the saints by presenting them the emblems of the broken body and spilt blood of the crucified Saviour, to keep fresh in the memory of God’s beloved children His sufferings and death” (Early Writings, 100).

30 The role of the elder was never mixed with that of the apostle in the NT. (See for example Acts 15:2).

31 (See the paper, Trajectories of Women’s Ordination in History, written by John Reeve for this conference.)

32 In fact, the early church did not dismiss this possibility, but rather went through a significant struggle on the topic. There is historical evidence that there were actually women elders for centuries after the writing of Paul’s letters. It was not until the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364) that the order of women elders was officially abolished. See John W. Reeve, "Trajectories of Women's Ordination in History,” (Theology of Ordination Study Committee, 2013).
qualifications similar to the qualifications earlier given for the deacon and elder.\textsuperscript{33} There is

certainly a concern for monetary aid that is not present in the part of the letter addressing elders
in general, although that may be a special consideration because of the dependent nature of
women’s lives in ancient times which often left widowed women without resources for survival.
That the section on the service of widows ends by returning to the topic of elders (\textit{presbuteros})
in general, with further discussion of monetary compensation, suggests the possibility that Paul
is the reference to female \textit{presbuteros} in 5:2 is not just a generic reference to older women.\textsuperscript{34}
Unfortunately the available evidence is too uncertain to be certain on this issue.

Qualifications for Formal Appointment by the Church

The qualification lists of 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1:1-11, noted above, describe several
aspects of character, behavior, and reputation which all believers are expected to develop, but
which are prerequisite to the office of deacon and elder. These qualifications may be understood
as gender neutral for several reasons. First, the opening words of Paul’s list of qualifications in
the Greek of 1 Tim. 3:1 actually begins with the statement, “\textit{if anyone (tis, which can be}
masculine or feminine) aspires (\textit{to be an}) overseer (\textit{episkopos}),” not “\textit{If a man (\textit{anēr}) aspires. . .}”
as some translations supply. The same is the case in Titus 1:6, which begins, in Greek, “\textit{If}
anyone (\textit{tis, not \textit{anēr}) is above reproach . . .}”

Second, it must be remembered that in Hebrew and Greek—as in many languages and
societies today—gendered (usually male) word forms are used anytime one wishes to refer to
both men and women together.\textsuperscript{35} Although an issue has often arisen with regard to the criterion
that the elder or deacon be “the husband of one wife,” such qualifications framed in the
masculine gender do not need to exclude women from serving in these ministries and offices any
more than does the use of the masculine gender in the Ten Commandments and other OT laws.
For example, in Exodus 20:17 the Israelites are told “Thou shalt not covet your neighbor’s wife”
with no mention of the coveting of a husband. Yet no one would argue that this commandment
allows a woman to covet her neighbor’s husband. Since ancient Greek had no word for “spouse,”
the use of “husband” in 1 Timothy 3:2 and Titus 1:6 may simply represent both genders by using
the word most expected in that cultural context.

Third, the qualification in literal Greek is “a one-woman man,” placing the idea of marital
faithfulness to one’s wife first, which is the emphatic position in Greek thinking. In a list where
all of the remaining qualifications focus on character and reputation it would seem much more
logical to believe that Paul’s concern was with sexual purity rather than gender, especially within
a prevalent pagan cultural context of male sexual freedom and temple prostitution.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} These qualifications are: 1) advanced age (a logical qualification for an “elder,” although the age of sixty
is older than one might expect); 2) having been literally “a one-man woman”; 3) being of good reputation; and
having in the past demonstrated hospitality, washed the saints feet (given humble service?), assisted those in
distress, and devoted herself to every good work.

\textsuperscript{34} Ellen White applies this biblical principle (expressed in masculine language) to both male and female
ministers. She writes: “Make no mistake in neglecting to correct the error of giving ministers less than they should
receive. . . The tithe should go to those [ministers] who labor in word and doctrine [5:17], be they men or women”
(\textit{Manuscript Releases}, 1:263).

\textsuperscript{35} Vern. S. Poythress, “Male Meaning in Generic Masculines in Koine Greek,” \textit{Westminster Theological
Journal}, 66 no 2 (Fall 2004), 325-336.

\textsuperscript{36}
Fourth, both the elder and the deacon are called to be literally, “a one-woman man” (1 Tim. 3:2, 12; Titus 1:5-6). Yet Adventists have recognized from the early years that women may serve in the role of deacon, as suggested in 1 Tim. 1:11.

Fifth, the counsel in 1 Tim 5:9 regarding qualifications for widows to be “enrolled” requires that she must correspondingly be “a one-man woman.” It would seem rather unnecessary to insist that a widow needs to be a female, which suggests that for the widows, as for the elders, the point is marital purity. In brief, Paul uses gendered (male and female) language here, as in a number of other specific situations we have considered, in order to communicate principles that are relevant for men and women in leadership ministries.37

Male-ness, Female-ness and Formal Roles

As has often been noted, Jesus chose twelve males as apostles, and in the selection of both the Seven and of the new twelfth apostle appointed in Acts 1, the Greek word anēr is used to identify the possible candidates (Acts 1:21-22; 6:3).38 Unlike anthrōpos, which is often used in the plural to speak of human beings of either gender, anēr basically refers to males. The use of anēr in referring to apostles and deacons, together with the fact that Jesus’ original twelve apostles were all males, has been thought by some to be based in an OT precedent of male-only priesthood and spiritual leadership which they consider universally valid. The theory of the ongoing validity of the male-only priesthood will be discussed below. It is however appropriate to point out here several factors that should give pause to the assumption that women should on this basis be universally barred from leadership positions in the church.

The most elementary principles of interpretation recognize that one must treat stories differently than direct instruction. The initial appointments of the apostles, as well as the deacons, are in story form describing specific situations at the very beginning of the church’s organization, and cannot be assumed, without further evidence, to be prescriptive in all their details for the whole church for all time.39 Indeed Jesus and the church in Jerusalem appointed only Jews, yet no one argues that certain roles of leadership in the church should be given only to Jews.

Rather than a universal mandate legislating male-only leadership, the NT suggests that the main point in Jesus’ choice of twelve males to be apostles, and in the insistence on a

---

37 Even much later, in Ellen White’s time, she used male-gendered language to speak of functions that in other writings she more carefully assigns to both sexes. For example, she remarks, “Those who profess to be the ministers of Jesus should be men of experience and deep piety, and then at all times and in all places they can shed a holy influence” (Early Writings, 102); but also, “The tithe should go to those [ministers] who labor in word and doctrine, be they men or women” (Manuscript Releases, 1:263); “The experience thus gained [in the canvasing work] will be of the greatest value to those who are fitting themselves for the ministry. It is the accompaniment of the Holy Spirit of God that prepares workers, both men and women, to become pastors to the flock of God.” (Testimonies for the Church, 6:322). These, along with the context of the 1905 quote about Acts 6, suggest that White often made a point about the character of ministers using language appropriate to her day and age although she recognized the place of both men and women in ministry.

38 In seeking a twelfth, Peter states, “Therefore, of these men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us” (Acts 1:21, NKJV). Seeking the seven, the apostles ask, “Therefore, brethren, seek out from among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business” (Acts 6:3, NKJV).

39 If the exclusion of women from leadership was in fact an essential cornerstone of Gospel order and the organization of God’s government, it is odd that we have no record of Jesus instructing His apostles directly on this point.
replacement for the twelfth after Jesus’ return to heaven, was to represent symbolically the
twelve tribes headed by twelve (male) patriarchs, to whom Jesus had now come in fulfillment of
God’s promises that He would send a redeemer-messiah (e.g. Matt. 19:28; Acts 26:6-7; cf. James
1:1; Rev 7:4-8). The representation of the patriarchs/tribes by the twelve male apostles is also
evidenced in the book of Revelation, which portrays the names of the twelve patriarchs on the
gates of the New Jerusalem and the twelve apostles on its foundations (Rev. 21:12-14.) This
symbolism is an important part of the NT message that God’s OT promises to Israel did not fail
but were fulfilled for a remnant of the Jews, together with the in-gathering of believing Gentiles,
to become God’s NT people of God. (Acts 3:22-26; Rom. 9-11).

In fact anēr, the term used in 1:21-22 and 6:3 for man, is not as exclusively male as is
sometimes suggested. For example, it is used in Scripture in a representative way to make a
lesson or point about both genders, as is evidenced in Matthew 7:24 where Jesus says, "Everyone
then who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise anēr who built his house
on the rock." The reality is that male leadership in public places remained the overriding
expectation as it had for millennia, even though at this time the rare woman was able to
independently hold or gain wealth and even take a position of influence. To prominently appoint
women to places of leadership for which a man was prepared would at that time have brought
discredit to the Gospel and turned souls away from God’s invitation. Even as God was patient
with Israel for many years in their divorce practices (Matt. 19:8), and with the church in the
practice of slavery, time was needed for development in their understanding of women’s roles.

The Pastor

The NT does not speak of pastor as a role or office formally appointed by the church.
The only use of the term pastor in the English translations of the NT is the usage we have
already investigated in Ephesians 4:11 which refers not to a church appointed role but to a gift,
distributed by Christ through the Holy Spirit, endowing selected individuals to act in the ministry
role of a shepherd (poimēn) (4:7, 11). Even in the early church following the NT, pastoring was
not a separate office of its own, but a ministry carried out by the elder or bishop. As far as we
know it was not until the Reformation, in correcting the abuses of doctrine and power brought in
by the system of bishops and priests, that the term “pastor” became the title of a role formally
identified and appointed by the church.

Some have pointed to Acts 13:1-3 as the first pastoral ordination and thus evidence of a
formally-appointed NT role of pastor. It is certainly appropriate to see the work Paul and

---

White states, “As in the Old Testament the twelve patriarchs stand as representatives of Israel, so the twelve apostles
were to stand as representatives of the gospel church” (Desire of Ages, 291).

Complementarity without Hierarchy (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2005), 136.

42 Note also instances such as Acts 2:14 where Peter addresses the crowd as “anēr” despite the reality that
there would no doubt also have been women on the streets of Jerusalem that day. Martin Hanna has researched this
and other examples in a forthcoming paper, currently titled, “Men and Women in Church Order: A Study of Paul’s
Use of Representative Statements.”

43 Acts of the Apostles identifies this experience as an ordination to ministry, stating, “God had abundantly
blessed the labors of Paul and Barnabas during the year they remained with the believers in Antioch. But neither of
them had as yet been formally ordained to the gospel ministry. They had now reached a point in their Christian
experience when God was about to entrust them with the carrying forward of a difficult missionary enterprise, in the
Barnabas were being sent out to do as a being a ministry that overlapped with what we would see today as “pastoral” activities, and to find in their work inspiration and example for pastors and other gospel workers. Valid lessons from the story which may be applied to the work of the pastor today include the importance of the church following God’s leading, in publicly setting apart spiritually mature and gifted individuals for the carrying out of certain tasks and leadership roles. The pastoral role in the Adventist church today also brings together, in varying ways, roles of evangelism, nurture, and leadership held also by Paul and Barnabas.

The selection and ministry of Paul and Barnabas, however, differs in several respects from that of today’s pastor. Their selection, like Paul’s call, was directed audibly by God (in the Spirit), giving to their ministry an unusually strong divine imperative. In addition, the title given them in Acts, following this laying on of hands, was apostle, not pastor (14:14). For Barnabas, this seems to have been an apostleship similar to that of other later NT apostles. However Paul, to whom Christ Himself had appeared and given his call (9:1-20), understood his apostleship as equivalent to that of the twelve, speaking of himself as the “last-born” of the apostles (1 Cor. 15:7) and explaining that his gospel, too, had been given him directly by Christ (Acts 13:1; Gal. 1:11-12). Further, Paul and Barnabas carried out an itinerant ministry more akin to the specialized role of missionary or evangelist today than that of the average pastor, never settling long in one place but always moving on to new unreached areas to continue the work of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, as God had directed (Acts 9:15; 22:21; 26:17), but also of “last-born” apostle and prophet.

That we cannot locate within the NT the movement from pastoral ministry as a spiritual gift to pastoral ministry as an officially appointed role is not a weakness or problem, for God’s Spirit-leading of the church did not end with the book of Revelation or the 28th chapter of Acts. Rather the NT testifies that God both provided the principles and seeds of structure for the growth of the church, and at the same time left room for the growth and change that the church would face in the future with the Spirit as her guide. Thus Jesus gave, in place of a blueprint for church structure, an intensive mentorship of twelve who would initially lead in the sharing of the gospel and pointers toward the participation of the whole church in ministry (Matt. 18:15-20; Luke 10:1-3) guided by the central principles of meek and humble service. Following Pentecost, the church began the work of further organization when it responded to the burgeoning challenges involved in serving the physical needs of the church by appointing the Seven, who came to be called deacons. The unremarked emergence of the office of elder in the NT can be seen as a further development of this principle of organic growth under the guidance of the Spirit and Scripture that God built into His design for the church. To formally recognize, at various times and places under His leading and within Scripture’s guidelines, additional roles and ministries needed to enhance gospel order through efficient organization and effective ministry, is fully within the NT pattern.44

The office of pastor today carries within its title the reminder of the nurturing gift of shepherding, of caring for and protecting, the people of God. At the same time, it also makes use of many other abilities and gifts of the Spirit—as anyone knows who has recently seen or

 prosecution of which they would need every advantage that could be obtained through the agency of the church” (p. 160).

44 Ellen White states, “Later in the history of the early church, when in various parts of the world many groups of believers had been formed into churches, the organization of the church was further perfected, so that order and harmonious action might be maintained.” (Acts of the Apostles, 91). John Reeve has shown, in his paper for this committee, the results when church organization is not in harmony with the witness of His will in Scripture.
experienced the work of a pastor. These gifts vary to some degree from pastor to pastor but the church generally expects gifting in areas such as evangelist, leadership, and administration.

Roles of leadership are essential for the health and progress of the church.

Several general principles of ministry found in the NT must guide the church in thinking about the role of the pastor today, principles which, tragically, have been too often forgotten by the church in history. Fundamental is the principle that the selection of an individual for a formally-appointed pastoral role is to be based on evidence of a godly character and of selection by the Spirit, through appropriate gifting for the work of ministry. In the NT special respect and consideration is appropriately given to those who labor and lead, yet underlying all pastoral effort is Christ’s teaching that all ministry is to be about humble service to others, rather than about taking power over another to rule and control. Indeed, the pastoral role, with its church-defined expectations of nurture and leadership, is one among a number of valuable ministry roles God has gifted individuals for the purpose of serving the church and reaching the world for Christ.

There is nothing in the description of the role of the pastor above that women are unable to carry out with distinction. In fact it might be argued that many women are ideally suited for the nurturing task of shepherding, and that their more collaborative manner of expressing their giftedness in the other areas of pastorally related ministry effectively complements the more masculine styles of leadership. As we have seen, gifts of leadership, administration, pastoring and so on are given to all as the Spirit wills. The Spirit-led ministry of women today has demonstrated clearly that past questioning of a woman’s ability to carry out these roles to the glory of God is based in disastrously false assumptions. The next section of this paper will turn to the concern that the role of pastor entails some kind of authority that is inappropriate for a woman to exercise. First, though, it will be of value to remind ourselves of the relation of ordination to pastoral ministry in the church.

Ordination

This committee has recently been engaged in the task of exploring what we mean when we talk about “ordaining” someone to ministry in the church. While there inevitably remains some disagreement on the dividing lines between biblical mandate and current practice, as well as on finer points of wording, we have come to agreement regarding a central core of what we as Adventists understand ordination to mean. In our study we have recognized that the word “ordination” is found in no standard English translation of the NT, and that there is no single Greek basis for the English term, “ordain.” Rather, in English versions, the term “ordain” has been used to express a variety of ideas related to choosing and selecting things, actions, or people. In keeping with the idea of ordination as a choosing, and with the NT precedent of formally appointing people for selected ministries, we have defined ordination “as the action of the church in publicly recognizing those whom the Lord has called and equipped for local and global church ministry.” In addition we have noted that, “In the act of ordination the church

As part of this respect and consideration those who devote their lives to full time to ministry are to be supported economically by the community of believers (Matt. 10:9-10; 1 Cor. 9:3-14; 1 Tim. 5:17-18).
confers representative authority upon individuals for the specific work of ministry to which they
are appointed (Acts 6:1-3; 13:1-3; 1 Tim 5:17; Titus 2:15).46

When we look at the NT we find that just as Jesus specifically named and appointed
twelve apostles for the work of preaching the good news He had shared with them, so also the
Holy Spirit led the church to publicly and formally endorse qualified individuals to accomplish
the tasks involved in certain appointed roles of ministry, entrusting them to act on behalf of God
and of the church. To this public enactment we have given the title ordination. We understand
that in reality the church’s ordination is a recognition of a prior selection and gifting by God.

While in the act of ordination the NT church engaged in prayer on behalf of the
individual and of the ministry in which they will engage, the NT makes no suggestion that in the
act of ordination itself any special quality is bestowed. Neither does the NT suggest that
ordination grants an individual the right to act as a ruler over other human beings. Ordination
simply indicates to the individuals themselves, and to the people whom they serve, that these
individuals will go about their work having the full confidence and support of the church.47 Their
authority is a representative authority, that is, the authority to represent the Lord and the church
in the tasks of communicating the gospel and doing the work assigned by the Lord through the
church body.

How does this understanding of ordination impact our question of whether or not to
ordain women to pastoral ministry? Since ordination is simply a formal recognition of God’s
gifting of a person for a particular ministry and of their trustworthiness as a church
representative, the implications of ordination itself should present no impediment to ordaining
women as pastors. Yet some question whether the authority implied in the church’s endorsement
of the individual being ordained would make it inappropriate to ordain a woman as a pastor. This
is the issue we turn to next, first by investigating the meaning of authority and its use as the NT
presents it, and later by examining the passages that some hold to bar women from any exercise
of authority over men.

**Ministry and Authority**

In Jesus’ apocalyptic discourse, although He spoke much of the future, His deepest
concern was that His followers watch and be ready for His coming. Near the end of this
discourse, Mark records a parable about a master who went on a journey “giving to His servants
authority (exousia), to each their work” and commanding the doorkeeper to watch (Mark 13:34).
The main point in this parable is that all are called to “be watchful therefore, for you do not know
when the Master of the house will come” (v. 35). As they awaited the master’s coming, the
servants held authority to do the work he had left for them. The phrase, “to each their work,”
appears to be expository, that is, it explains the nature of the authority given to the servants as
being for the purpose of doing their individual work. In their watchfulness, the master’s servants
were given not only specific tasks to do but also authority to carry them out. The authority given

46 “Consensus Statement on a Seventh-day Adventist Theology of Ordination,” voted July 23, 2013 by the
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Theology of Ordination Study Committee.
47 See also Acts of the Apostles, pp. 161-164.
believers here and in the NT as a whole is not about authority over others to control or rule them, but authority to accomplish a task.  

The related parables in Matthew and Luke speak also of a servant who is said specifically to have been “put in charge of” (kathistēmi epi) the master’s servants. Even for the one in charge, the authority given is specifically described, not as authority to control or take power over, but rather authority to give the other servants their food at the proper time, that is, to accomplish the given task of serving and caring for their needs. Jesus repeatedly insisted that any authority exercised within the community of believers in the pursuit of the church’s mission was not to involve “ruling” or “lording it over” others (kurieuō) but rather serving them (e.g. Mark 9:33-36; Luke 22:25-27). Indeed, Christ’s followers are instructed to eschew any sort of role or title, such as rabbi, leader, or father, which would draw one into assuming such autonomous authority (Matt. 23:8-12). This reflects a theology of ministry and authority that is based on service, self-sacrifice and humility, not on higher rank and power over others.  

Such a ministry was modeled by Christ Himself, who “took the form (schema, function and not just the outward appearance) of a bond-servant (doulos)” (Phil. 2:7). This understanding of authority is evident in the frequent use of diakonos and its word-family to describe the ministry of Paul and others as that of servants (diakonos) and slaves (doulos) of the gospel and of Christ (Colossians 1:7, 4:7, 12; Ephesians 6:21). The NT writers envisioned ministry as service (diakonia) and applied the term to the service of all believers, both those who exercise leadership roles as well as those who fulfill other ministerial roles in the church (Acts 6:1, 4; Romans 16:1; Philippians 2: 5–7; Colossians 1:7; 1 Peter 4:10). In this way, the character of authority exercised by Christian believers is fundamentally different from that seen in the world at large (1 Peter 5:1–4).  

It would be of value here to pause for a moment and consider what exousia, the main NT word for authority, means in a general sense before delving further into the way the NT understands the concept. A common and mistakenly narrow understanding of authority defines it simply as the right to rule others and to expect obedience. Yet we also speak of priests having the authority, for example, to enter a restricted area such as the Holy Place of the temple; or individuals speaking with authority regarding their particular field of expertise. These examples do not have to do with ruling others but with the acknowledged right to act or speak in a particular way. The NT evidences just such a broad understanding of its key authority term, exousia, in the use of this word in John 1:12 where it is promised that, “as many as received Him, to them He gave the exousia to become children of God.” Here we do not find an authority to rule over others, but a right given by God to become what He created us to be.  

A more complete definition of authority (exousia), that makes room for the various ways it is used in the NT, is the ascribed or acknowledged right to act and/or to influence the behavior of others. It involves the right to make choices, to carry out actions, to influence in various ways what other people think or do.  

Authority is often distinguished from power, which is the ability to actually carry out the intended action. In the NT the concepts of exousia and dunamis (power) often overlap, especially where it is the God of all power who is the One granting authority (exousia).  

48 Ellen White warned against “kingly power” and authority and opposed even groups taking this kind of power. (General Conference Bulletin, April 3, 1901, par. 34; Selections from the Testimonies for the Church For the Study of Those Attending the General Conference in Oakland, Ca., March 27, 1903, 54.3; 55.2; Bible Training School, May 1, 1903, par. 5: Testimonies for the Church Containing Letters to Physicians and Ministers Instruction to Seventh-Day Adventists [SpTB02] 45.1 [1904]).  

49 Authority is often distinguished from power, which is the ability to actually carry out the intended action. In the NT the concepts of exousia and dunamis (power) often overlap, especially where it is the God of all power who is the One granting authority (exousia).  
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whether by other human beings or by God Himself. In reality, every ministry or gift granted by
God and recognized by people entails some degree of authority. For example, one with the gift of
administering (1 Cor. 12:28) exercises authority in the management of the church’s affairs. This
authority is subject to the policies agreed upon by the body as a whole. At the same time, an
individual with the gift of giving (Rom. 12:8) exercises authority over the distribution and use of
the resources placed in their hands. The authority of the giver is expected to be bounded by the
principles in Scripture and the wisdom of fellow believers. Again, one with the gift of
exhortation (paraklēsis) exercises authority to build others up, as they are willing to accept it
(Rom. 12:8; cf. 2 Cor. 10:8-9; 13:10-11).

Thus whether one is acting in a traditional leadership role or not, every exercise of the
gifts of the Spirit involves a use of authority constrained by the needs and the input of the
community of believers under the guidance of Scripture and the Holy Spirit. Some authority may
be the authority of expertise related to knowledge or skill in a particular area, some may be the
authority of influence based in a wise and godly character, and others may carry a formally
granted authority to represent the church. Never, however, does the NT grant believers a carte
blanche authority over people to enforce their own will. Although the prophetic gift carries
particular authority when speaking the messages of God, there is no indication that this gift was
to be separated out as alone bearing God’s authority (and thus uniquely allowing women to
speak with authority). Rather, as we have indicated, all gifts carry authority from God. Peter
states,

“As each one has received a gift, minister to (diakoneō) one another as good stewards of
the manifold grace of God: whoever speaks, do it as speaking the utterances of God; whoever
serves (diakoneō) do it as from the strength which God supplies; so that in all things God may be
glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom belongs the glory and dominion forever and ever.
Amen” (1Pe 4:10-11).

Christ alone is identified in the NT as head of the church (Eph. 1:22-23; 4:14-16; 5:23;
Col 1:18; 2:19). Under Christ, authority in the Christian church is always subject to the body
of believers as a whole. Jesus, the head, explicitly gave to the church as a whole, not simply to
any individual leader or office, the authority to arbitrate and to discipline, to bind and to loose
(Matt. 18:15-20; cf. 16:19).

Neither in the Gospels and Acts nor in the Epistles is any individual human given
ultimate authority over another, for a fundamental principle of God’s government and of
Christian behavior is respect for free will (e.g. Josh. 24:15; Phil. 8, 9, 17). When Paul wrote to
churches, he never addressed his letters to a single individual or leadership group within the
church. His exhortations, and even the difficult issues that needed to be cared for, were always
addressed to the whole church, with individuals made mention of only in brief greetings at the
end of the letter. Even in Phil. 1:1, the only verse where leadership groups are mentioned as
addressees, these overseers/elders and deacons (addressed only in the plural) are added as an
inclusion in a letter addressed to the church as a whole. Peter, though he was the one first
identified as receiving authority to bind and to loose (compare Matt. 16:19; 18:18), worked in
concert with the Twelve and brought his ideas to the body of believers for consideration (Acts
1:21-26; 6:2, 5; 15:6-13, 19). Likewise James, a key leader in the Jerusalem church after Peter’s

50 In a later section of the paper we will discuss 1 Cor 11:3-4 and Eph 5:23-24 and the headship principles
regarding man and woman found there.

51 See, James D. G. Dunn, The Theology of Paul the Apostle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 593-596.
departure (12:17), did not make a significant decision without participation from others (Acts 15:4, 13, 19, 22; 21:18, 23).

Paul certainly provides the biggest challenge to the idea that no individual in the church has ultimate authority over others. There are passages in his epistles where he does not hold back from using the language of authority in an undeniably bold way. For example, in Philoemer, verse 21, Paul states, “Having confidence in your obedience (hupakoē), I write to you,” and in 2 Thessalonians 3:4, “we have confidence in the Lord concerning you, both that you do and will do the things we command (parangellō).”

Several factors may be considered in seeking to understand such statements in light of the teachings of Jesus and the rest of the NT.

First, even the strong-minded Paul recognized the superior authority, not only of Jesus Christ but also of his family in Christ, the church as a whole. He submitted his understanding of the gospel to those of repute in Jerusalem (Gal 2:2). He accepted the authority of the church in Antioch, and later of the apostles and elders in Jerusalem together with the church regarding the issue of circumcision (Acts 15:2, 4, 22, 23). He also followed the instructions of James and the elders to sacrifice in the temple upon his return to Jerusalem (Acts 21:18-26). He made no attempt to exercise control over everyone who preached the word of God, but accepted and applauded the work of Apollos and others (1 Cor. 3:5; 1:10-13; 3:4-7; 16:12; Phil. 1:15-18).

Second, Paul’s authority was grounded, not in his own status or position humanly speaking, but in his identity as an apostle who, like the twelve, had been personally and audibly called by Jesus Himself to proclaim the gospel they had experienced (1 Cor. 15:7-9). For the twelve this authority of expertise involved their experience as eyewitnesses, but Paul made clear that he too had received his message as a prophet from Jesus himself (1 Cor. 7:10; 2 Cor. 12:7; Gal. 1:11-12; cf. Acts 13:1; 2 Pet. 1:20-21; 3:15-16). Paul’s calls to obedience are then not based in his own authority but are calls to obedience of Christ’s own instruction, given to him as a prophet of God. For this reason, together with his constant use of Old Testament Scripture, he could accurately say, “we are taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ” (2 Cor. 10:5; cf. 1 Thess. 2:13). Paul’s instruction, together with that of the apostolic eyewitnesses, has since been recorded in Scripture, which is where this authority now resides. (Where new prophetic claims are made today, they are to be tested by the body of believers on the basis of Scripture. Isa. 8:20; 1 Cor. 2:15; 1 John 4:1; cf. 1 Cor. 14:29-32).

52 See, ibid.

53 The chronology of these events, and Paul’s long-term handling of the Jerusalem council’s decision, is beyond the purview of this paper. I would suggest, however, that the events took place in the order given above and that Paul’s teachings in Rom. 14:1-15:13 and 1 Cor. 8 were not actually in opposition to the decision of the council.

54 Indeed, like Jesus (Luke 9:49-50), Paul rejoiced that even in the preaching of those with less than pure motives “in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed” (Phil. 1:12-18).

55 Paul began almost every letter by identifying himself as one called to be an apostle (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor. 1:1), or as an apostle by the will of God (e.g. 2 Cor. 1:1; Eph. 1:1). This claim is defended at various times by pointing out that, like the twelve (2 Cor. 11:5), he: 1) saw Jesus and was thus a witness to his resurrection (1 Cor. 9:1; 15:7-9); 2) received his call and his gospel directly from Him (Gal.1:11-2:9); 3) performed signs and wonders through Him (1 Cor. 2:4-5; 12:11-12); and 4) won others to His name (1 Cor. 9:2). George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 566-567. Paul, for example, rebukes Peter (Gal. 2:11) and takes the liberty to interpret the Acts 15 decision (Rom. 14:13-23; 1 Cor. 8). Even in the letter to the Roman church, whom he had not established nor even visited, Paul speaks with authority. Ellen White states that, “Paul regarded the occasion of his formal ordination as marking the beginning of a new and important epoch in his lifework. It was from this time that he afterward dated the beginning of his apostleship in the Christian church” (Acts of the Apostles, 164).
Third, Paul was usually gentle in this authority preferring to suggest and urge as he did with Philemon, stating: “Therefore, though I might be very bold in Christ to command you what is fitting, yet for love’s sake I rather appeal to you” (Philem. 1:8, 9), and to the Corinthians: "I am not speaking this as a command, but as proving through the earnestness of others the sincerity of your love also." (2 Cor. 8:8). In 1 Thessalonians 2:7, 8, he portrayed himself as a gentle mother.

Fourth, a closer investigation of the use and meaning of the various authority words used by Paul reveal a more nuanced view than is apparent from just a cursory reading. For example, an examination of Paul’s use of the words obedience (hupakouō) and obedient (hupakoē), reveals that Paul is in reality calling people to an obedience not to himself personally, but to the principles of the gospel and of the Lord Jesus Christ. In Romans 6:17 he states, “But thanks be to God that though you were slaves of sin, you became obedient (hupakouō) from the heart to that form of teaching (didachē) to which you were committed,” and in 2 Corinthians 10:5 “We are destroying speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and we are taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ” (see also Rom. 1:5; 2 Thess. 1:7, 8; cf. 1 Pet. 1:22).

Much of the language used by Paul that is understood as “authority language,” is also used in the NT to refer to actions to be carried out by all believers. For example, he tells Titus, “These things speak and exhort and reprove (elenkō) with all authority” (2:15) and counsels that overseers are to “give instruction in sound doctrine and also to rebuke (elenkō) those who contradict it.” Yet he also tells the Ephesian believers, “Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them (elenkō)” (5:11), just as Jesus told his disciples “If your brother sins [against you], go and show him his fault (elenkō) in private” (Matt. 18:15). Likewise while Paul says of himself in Colossians 1:28 “Him we proclaim, warning (noutheteō) everyone and teaching everyone with all wisdom, that we may present everyone mature in Christ,” he also tells the believers in 3:16, “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing (noutheteō) one another.”

Perhaps the most challenging authority terminology used by Paul is the word parangellō along with its cognate noun parangelia. The lexical meaning of parangellō is “to make an announcement about someth. that must be done, give orders, command, instruct, direct.” This is a broad range of meaning that necessitates thinking carefully about the author’s intention in each usage, based on the context of the passage and the NT as a whole. The word group is used in the NT of the instructions of God and Christ, and of official leaders in the world outside the church. Paul also occasionally uses it in instruction given to his addressees.

Paul’s strongly worded instructions to Timothy and Titus to speak with authority (e.g. 1 Timothy 4:11 “These things direct [parangellō] and teach”) may be understood as related to these same factors. The moderation with which Timothy’s authority is to be used can be seen in

---


57 Unfortunately, it is beyond the limitations of this paper to deal with all the words Paul uses in relation to authority.

58 The words “and we are ready to punish all disobedience, whenever your obedience is complete” which follow immediately after 2 Cor. 10:5 should also be noted. Note the plural “we” that is used here, which connects to a larger group than Paul alone and is in keeping with Christ’s instructions in Matt. 18:12-20.

59 BDAG, [what page?]
1 Timothy 5:1-2, “Do not sharply rebuke (epiplēssō) an older man, but rather appeal to him as a father, to the younger men as brothers, the older women as mothers, and the younger women as sisters, in all purity” (NASB). It should also be considered that whatever other role these two played in the church, the NT makes clear that they acted as assistants of Paul (Acts 16:1-3; 2 Cor. 8:16, 17; 2 Thess. 1:1) and thus were his representatives communicating his apostolic and prophetic message to the churches he had founded. This is illustrated by Paul’s use of the 1st person singular pronoun in telling Timothy, “I do not allow . . .” (1 Tim. 2:12). Timothy’s speaking on behalf of Paul might best be compared today with leaders who speak the instructions of Scripture.

In 1 Corinthians 16:15-16, Paul calls on believers to submit (hypotassō) to those who have devoted themselves to work and toil (double emphasis) among them. This is the single NT instruction calling for believers to submit (hypotassō) to leaders in the church. The basis on which Paul called for such submission is not the standard worldly qualifications for receiving authority, such as power or impressive resumes, but rather devotion to serving God and His people (diakonia). Certainly this would not apply to those who work hard sowing seeds of dissension or untruth, but rather to those who come as servants and who have been recognized and accepted as fellow-workers in the same cause. Another passage, Hebrews 13:17 states, “Obey (peithō) your leaders (hēgeomai) and submit (hupeikō) to them, for they are keeping watch over your souls, as those who will have to give an account” (NASB). Again studying the verse closely is necessary, for this is not a reference to a single ultimate “leader” but to a plurality. In this verse peithō is not the normal word for obedience (hupakouō), rather its meaning in this present passive is more specifically “to be won over as the result of persuasion.”

At the same time, it must be recognized that Paul and the rest of the NT here and elsewhere evidence a place for NT-defined authority and leadership in the church. This authority, rather than being about a unilateral hierarchical “authority over people,” is a shared and reasoned authority; it is about “authority to serve” in the areas of God’s gifting and leading.

In light of the tota scriptura principle of comparing scripture with scripture, it is appropriate to understand that the stronger uses of authority language were governed by the factors outlined above within the particular situations in which they were applied. In an overall reading, the authority of NT leaders, rather than being about a carte blanche authority over

---

60 Ellen White spoke of Timothy as a beloved son of Paul, whom he carefully trained as a gospel minister and teacher. Citing Paul’s counsel to him “Preach the word, be ready in season and out of season (2 Tim. 4:2, NKJV), she shows how Paul points Timothy to Scripture for the source of his authority: “Fearing that Timothy’s mild, yielding disposition might lead him to shun an essential part of his work, Paul exhorted him to be faithful in reproving sin and even to rebuke with sharpness those who were guilty of gross evils. Yet he was to do this “with all long-suffering and doctrine.” He was to reveal the patience and love of Christ, explaining and enforcing his reproofs by the truths of the word” (Acts of the Apostles, 503).


62 BDAG [which page?]; Note that the Greek word for submit is also a different word than the regular hupotassō, and suggests the idea to yield, or give way to.

63 Is it possible that the NT leaves room for some space in leadership style
people, focuses on authority to accomplish a task together under the overall authority of the church as a whole, based in Scripture and governed by the head who is Christ.  

In the first century strongly authoritarian behavior was the norm and was in fact socially insisted upon in many situations. The guidelines of shared servant leadership described by Christ and evidenced in the NT turn this traditional understanding of authority upside-down and reinstitute God’s picture of authority and of how it is appropriately practiced. This NT understanding does not negate authority but provides directions for a biblically appropriate understanding of authority and authoritative action. It is unfortunate that while the church still struggles at times to recognize and implement this biblical view of leadership, wiser minds in the world are now seeing its value and attempting to put it into practice.

In NT times as today, there were cultural differences in the exercise of authority that are biblically acceptable and many that are not. Biblical principles for exercising authority present a challenge to every human culture in one way or another. Some common perversions of biblically defined authority that have crept into today’s church in various places around the world include: dictatorial leadership styles; the creation of status and power hierarchies; failure to exercise legitimate authority due to political pressure; competition for position and honor; refusal to acknowledge and support legitimate biblical authority; and granting or withholding authority on the basis of ethnicity, disability, and social class. Is it possible that the practice of barring women from ordination to pastoral ministry, on the basis of Scripture, is also a cultural distinction that distorts Scriptural teaching on authority? While every culture contains elements that are both good and evil, all too often cultural views and perspectives, rather than biblical principles, have been allowed to define who can be ordained and how ordained persons should exercise their authority.

To summarize, ultimate authority within the church was never delegated to human beings. Any authority exercised within the church is exercised under the authority of the body of believers for the purpose of accomplishing the tasks given them by God. In the Adventist church, although important servant authority is vested in the pastor, he or she is not the highest authority for he or she is supervised by the authority of the conference committee, and so on, with the General Conference in session holding the highest authority under Christ.

The Place of Women in the Life and Teaching of the 1st Century Church

In the opening days of the NT church an event occurred that was indicative of the increasing place women were to take in the ministry of the first century church and in the end of days. After Jesus’ return to heaven, his apostles, “with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus” were “continually devoting themselves to prayer” (1:13-14). Upon the arrival of the Spirit, tongues of fire “rested upon each one of them,” men and women alike (2:1-3). Peter’s speech explaining the event to the skeptical crowd makes clear that this was not a spontaneous event, nor was the inclusion of women a happenstance. Rather this had been part of the plan of God from long ago. Peter’s speech began with a quote from the prophet Joel:

---


“And it shall come to pass in the last days, says God, That I will pour out of My Spirit on all flesh; Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, Your young men shall see visions, Your old men shall dream dreams. And on My menservants and on My maidservants I will pour out My Spirit in those days; And they shall prophesy. And I will show wonders in heaven above and signs in the earth beneath: Blood and fire and vapor of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, Before the coming of the great and awesome day of the LORD.” (Acts 2:17-20 NKJV, quoted from Joel 2:28-29).

In Acts 2:17 it is stated that the Spirit would be poured out on “all flesh,” and in verse 18 this is further clarified as referring to all of God’s servants, both male and female. Davidson has pointed out the close connections between this prophecy of Joel and the earlier coming of the Spirit upon the seventy elders of Israel at the time they were chosen for leadership roles. These elders, as a result of the coming of the Spirit, had all prophesied (Num. 11), just as in Acts 2 a similarly miraculous sign came when all spoke in tongues. Only this time the sign came to both men and women.

In Peter’s use of Joel’s prophecy to explain what was happening in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, the puzzling point is that no one is said to be prophesying, rather they were speaking in tongues—a very different gift. How could Joel’s prophecy about prophesying be fulfilled by a group of people speaking in tongues? The answer must be that, rather than prophecy being viewed as the only effect of the coming of the Spirit pointed to in this passage, it should be seen as a particularly apt example (hearkening back to Num. 11) of how the Holy Spirit would accomplish His purpose of empowering the church for to share God’s message (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8). The application of this prophecy of Joel to explain speaking in tongues also evidences that Peter did not see the prophetic gift as the main point of Joel’s prophecy, but rather used the passage to point out two things: 1) that the odd disturbance that day was taking place as a result of the coming of the Holy Spirit prophesied by Joel; and 2) that the full (and shocking) participation of women among those evidencing the sign of tongues was not inappropriate or scandalous, as observers would certainly have been tempted to think, but simply the fulfillment of God’s plan.

66 Luke 24:44-45 suggests that it may have been Jesus Himself who pointed out this passage to Peter and the other disciples before His departure


68 In fact very few prophecies, dreams, and visions are described anywhere in Acts.

69 David Peterson, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 142.. For information on the Greco-Roman attitudes of the time, see, John W. Reeve, "Trajectories of Women's Ordination in History," (Theology of Ordination Study Committee, 2013), 7-11. Prophecy is particularly apt as a paradigmatic example, because it is centered on communicating the messages of God, just as the church was to communicate the gospel of Jesus Christ.

70 In depicting the opening of the church’s ministry with a speech, and opening the speech with a quotation from OT prophecy, Luke also creates a parallel between Peter’s speech in Acts 2 and the speech of Jesus in Nazareth that opens the Lukan account of Jesus’ ministry (Luke 4:16-30). Such parallels are an important part of the literary artistry of Luke and Acts, functioning to demonstrate how the community of believers, through the leading and empowering of the Spirit, followed the pattern set out by Jesus. When one looks closely at the OT quotations at the beginning of the opening speeches of Jesus and Peter, further parallels become evident between Peter’s quotation from Joe, and Jesus’ quotation from Isaiah,
Individual Women in the NT

Women in the Gospels
The Gospels portray a respect for women and a level of inclusion remarkable from a first century viewpoint, despite appearing very moderate and limited today. Although it would be erroneous to assume that all women were kept completely out of sight in the Palestinian Judaism of the intertestamental period (since we find evidence of some limited participation by women in the synagogue and of heroes like Judith in Jewish literature of the time) cultural convention was still strong in believing women, for example, to be weaker in judgment and belonging in the private sphere of the household. Yet Jesus, for example, uses the female image of a mother hen in charge of her brood to portray Himself in the way He wished to care for His people, Israel (Matt. 23:37; Luke 13:34). In the narrative of the Gospels, the Samaritan “woman at the well” was likely the first “evangelist” of the Messiah’s coming (John 4:28-30, 39), as Mary was the first commissioned to tell the good news of his resurrection (John 20:17; cf. Matt. 28:10). Luke, sometimes called the gospel of the “underdog,” deliberately uses a series of paired stories, one featuring a man and the other a woman, to showcase the value given to the faith and ministry of women in the plan of God. This is first seen in the stories of Zacharias and of Mary which open the Gospel, and of Simeon and Anna in the temple, but is also repeated in later parts of the book. Luke also notes that it was not only males disciples who accompanied Jesus and learned

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He has anointed me to preach good news to the poor, he has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord” (Luke 4:18-19, quoting Isa. 61:1-2; 58:6).

It is immediately evident that the quotes of both Jesus and Peter refer to the coming of the Holy Spirit to enable the proclamation of God’s message, and that both end with a reference (though differently applied and further developed in Acts) to the day of the Lord. The content of the messages might also yield valuable parables.


Ellen White noted, “It was Mary that first preached a risen Jesus. In fulfillment of the divine plan, the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost. If this work was not beneath the dignity of the world’s Redeemer, the Creator of worlds, should it be considered too humiliating for sinful mortals? If Christ taught, and if he wrestled in earnest prayer to his Father in behalf of those he came to save, we should engage in the same work... If there were twenty women where now there is one, who would make this holy mission their cherished work, we should see many more converted to the truth. The refining, softening influence of Christian women is needed in the great work of preaching the truth” (RH January 2, 1879).

Here both Zacharias and Mary are visited by Gabriel who tells each not to fear and promises each a son. Yet the responses differ markedly for while Zacharias is rebuked for his lack of faith (Luke 1:18), Mary’s question receives no rebuke but instead a strong reassurance (1:34-37). It can also be seen in the two prophets, Simeon and Anna, who greet Jesus in the temple (2:25-39). In addition, the only son of the widow of Nain is raised from the dead (7:11-17), and so is the only daughter of Jairus (8:40-56). The parable of the mustard seed, which features a man planting his garden, is followed by the parable of the yeast, which portrays a woman baking bread (13:18-21).
from Him during His ministry, as would have been normal for a rabbi of that time. He was also accompanied by women disciples, which would have been considered extraordinary and even shameful (Luke 8:1-3; cf. 24:1, 6, 8). In response to being healed by Jesus, each of these women had chosen to provide for Jesus (diakōneō) out of their own resources, an action that would have gained them honor in that society as benefactors had they not disgraced themselves by stepping outside of the expected roles for women by also traveling with Him. The ending of the Gospels are particularly striking in their portrayal of women, for it is women who are portrayed as being present with Jesus at the crucifixion (Matt. 27:55-56) when nearly all the male disciples had fled (Matt. 26:56; Mark 14:50-52; cf. Luke 22:54), and women visited His tomb (Mark 16:1; cf. John 20:1) while the male apostles were cowering in an upper room with the door barred (John 20:19).

Priscilla and the Women of Acts

In the several mentions of Priscilla (Prisca) in the NT record, she is recorded as demonstrating traditionally female gifts such as hospitality (Acts 18:2-3) as well as more public roles such as teacher (Acts 18:26) and co-worker with Paul (Rom. 16:3) that are not generally expected of a woman in ancient society. Priscilla is never named alone, but always with her husband Aquila (Acts 18:2). It is worth considering that, while the wife’s name is seldom mentioned in ancient accounts and where it is mentioned is placed second, Priscilla’s name is most often placed first when the two are mentioned. In introducing them, Acts introduces Aquila first as would be expected, but in the other two mentions Priscilla’s name comes first. This is particularly interesting in the latter case, because the activity they were engaged in was teaching a man. The man whom Priscilla and Aquila taught was not simply an inexperienced new believer, but Apollos, the brilliant and eloquent preacher who was already “mighty in the Scriptures.” Apollos is said to have already known much about Christ, but was in need of some correction and additional learning which Priscilla was took part in providing (Acts 18:24-28).

Such an activity of teaching and correction is one considered a typical and important function of today’s pastor. Considering the kind of authority involved here, we can see that it was the Scriptures which held the ultimate authority, and that Priscilla and Aquila acted in a role consistent with a humble servant leader not a personal authority to control others. It has been argued that Priscilla in doing this was subject to and under the supervision of Aquila, but the deliberate moving of her name to the front of the pair questions this argument. She is referred to along with Aquila in Romans 16:3 as a synergos, or co-worker, the same term Paul used of himself (1 Cor. 3:9) and others including Luke (Philem. 1:24) and Timothy (1 Thess. 3:2).  

The parable of the lost sheep, which focuses attention on the shepherd (15:3-7), is succeeded by the parable of the woman who lost a coin in her home (15:8-10).


76 It would be no less plausible to suggest that Aquila may have provided accompaniment and aid that made Priscilla’s work in the public sphere in contact with males less culturally objectionable.

77 Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles : a Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 335-339, 567. By inviting Paul to her home, apparently acting on her own authority, Lydia plays would have been seen as Paul’s benefactor, or patron, giving her some degree of “moral authority” in the eyes of that society.
Note that there is no suggestion here of any necessity to make a justification, or exception, for a female acting in the role of a teacher. Priscilla’s ministry is only one in a long line of females in ministry in Acts, including Dorcas’ ministry to the widows (10:36-39), Philip’s daughters who were prophets (21:8, 9), and Lydia’s acting on her own discretion to offer hospitality to Paul and his ministry team, and act as their benefactor (16:13-16, 40).

Phoebe

In Romans 16:1 Paul says of Phoebe, “I commend to you Phoebe our sister, who is a diakonos of the church in Cenchrea, that you may receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and assist her in whatever business she has need of you; for indeed she has been a prostatis of many and of myself also” (Rom. 16:1-2). Unfortunately many English versions of this passage tend to translate these Greek words based on their assumption that since it is about a woman she can’t possibly be a leader. However, it is significant that Paul has chosen the masculine form of diakonos, which would indicate that she is not being referred to simply as a woman who serves, but as filling a formal role with a standardized title. The most likely option in a Christian context is that she was a deacon. This fits with the statement that she was a diakonos of a particular church, and with inclusion of qualifications for women in the qualification list of 1 Timothy (3:11). Another possibility is that she was acting as an appointed agent of the church in Cenchrea. Phoebe’s leadership role is even more strongly attested by a further descriptor identifying her as a prostatis. The term prostatis is related to the spiritual gift of leading (proistēmi) which is among the spiritual gifts, although the noun form is not found elsewhere in the NT. In other Greek writings of the time, it is regularly used both in the Jewish and Greco-Roman world of various kinds of official leaders. The noun’s feminine usage can also be found in inscriptions praising wealthy women who acted as patrons, providing funding, and thus also holding some authority over a group. According to the custom of the time the patron provided financial assistance to a group and its members in return for public honor and the authority to expect services of the clients she assisted. Phoebe however, as a believer in Christ, acts on an equal level as a sister.

Junia and Others

In addition to Phoebe, eight other women are named in Romans 16, including Priscilla and a woman named Junia who, like Phoebe and Priscilla, appears to have had a leadership role. Of this individual, Paul says, “Greet Andronicus and Junia, my countrymen and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me” (Rom.

---


80 “The overall impression one gets from Romans 16 is that not only were a wide variety of women involved in the work of the church, but also that they were doing a wide variety of things including missionary work, carrying letters, serving in charitable tasks as deaconesses, providing aid or shelter for traveling apostles, etc. …we see here a picture of a vibrant, multi-faceted Church using the gifts and graces of both men and women to spread the gospel.” Ben Witherington, Women in the Earliest Churches, SNTSMS 59 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 116. On the topic of Junia particularly helpful are Eldon Epp, Junia: The First Woman Apostle (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005).and Nancy Vhymeister, "Junia the apostle,” 85, no. 7 (2013): 6-9.
The initial challenge that causes many to doubt the accuracy of understanding this verse as referring to a female apostle is that many modern versions translate the name as “Junias” (a male name) rather than “Junia” (always female) in Greek. However, that is not how the ancients understood it. Despite arguments to the contrary based on literary texts, Junia was a common women’s name in the 1st century appearing at least 250 times in inscriptions and other writing in Rome during that period, while the masculine Junias appears nowhere during this same period. Eldon J. Epp and others have demonstrated that, although the letters in the names would have been the same in the grammatical form used in this sentence, the distinguishing accents later added to the text never indicated the masculine form of the name. Further, 37 of 38 Greek editions of the NT printed between 1516 and 1920 used the name Junia, and only between 1927 and 1994 was it understood in Greek editions as the masculine name, Junias. This is even despite the fact that the tendencies of the culture and church of those times strongly discounted women in leadership. Some have used another tack, arguing, based on the Greek preposition en, that the verse must be translated “…noted by the apostles” rather than “notable among the apostles.” However, the evidence doesn’t corroborate that en must be used in this way, in fact Belleville has discovered an almost exact parallel from the same time period which only makes sense as “among.”

This is not to claim for Junia a similar ministry to that of the Twelve and Paul, but to say that Junia, like other individuals given this title the NT church such as James (Gal. 1:19) and Barnabas (Acts 15:2), acted in a position of leadership as a representative of Jesus Christ.

Elsewhere in the NT, we find Euodia and Syntyche also praised as “fellow workers” (sunergos) who have contended by Paul’s side in the cause of the gospel (Phil. 4:2, 3), using the same term, sunergos, used of the male leaders who assisted Paul. Women’s leadership in the Christian Church is possible also in 2 John where the “chosen lady” addressed in verse 1 may well be the patron and leader of a house church in the province of Asia (now in western Turkey).

Although when taken separately some of these instances of women’s leadership are not fully certain, when considering all of the various examples a definite pattern emerges. One wonders why terms such as apostle, coworker, deacon and leader are taken as leadership language when referring to men, but automatically discounted when applied to women.

Women in the House Churches

---

81 Some have suggested the Junia and Andronicus, having been in Christ” even before Paul, may be the Joanna and Chusa mentioned in Luke 8:3, but this must remain within the realm of conjecture.

82 Neither is there any evidence in the literature of the time for suggesting that the name Junias could be a shortened form of Junianos which was used at the time. Eldon Epp, Junia: The First Woman Apostle (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 26-28.

83 Even though the spelling of Junia and Junias would look the same in the form used in Rom. 16:7, the accents would be different. A few manuscripts use the female name “Julia” in place of “Junia.” Ibid., 45, 62-63.


85 Carolyn Osiek and Margaret Y. MacDonald, A Woman’s Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity (Fortress: Minneapolis, 2006), 228.
The women mentioned above represent some of the most outstanding and well-known women in the first century church. NT writers could not write about all the women involved in the earliest church or give details on their activities, any more than all the male leaders and their actions in the churches across the Mediterranean world were represented. A valuable avenue for understanding the experience of women and their place in ministry in the first century house churches is to explore what can be known of women’s work and authority within the home.\(^{86}\)

While the absolute power of the *pater familias* (male head of household) was still a Roman ideal, within her own household, the woman held a considerable amount of authority and autonomy over such things as provisioning, care and supervision of everyone in the household, the purchase and working of fields, and the sale of produce while the husband busied himself with civic and public affairs.\(^{87}\) Although for married women this was officially under the oversight of the husband, many men did not concern themselves with household affairs. While widows still tended to be dependent on families, an increasing number of these, in addition to some never married women, were able to be financially independent and fully govern their own affairs. A church meeting in a home such as that of John Mark’s mother (Acts 12:12) and Nympha (Col 4:15) and Priscilla, then, brought a public gathering from the usual male sphere outside the home into a place where women often exercised *de facto* and sometimes full autonomy and authority. Such a reality places the clear-cut assumptions about authority in the New Testament in need of further consideration.

Galatians 3:28

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male and female (arsen kai thēlu); for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:28)

Galatians 3:28 has been called everything from a text devoid of social implications to the "Magna Carta of humanity."\(^{88}\) This passage does not speak directly to the issue of women in ministry, yet it does communicate an important message not only about soteriology but also about ecclesiology and how the church organizes itself.\(^{89}\) A primary concern of the epistle is the question of who constitutes the people of God—who are the heirs who will be rescued from this evil age (1:4). In Galatians 1-2a, Paul demonstrates that it was God Himself who gave him the gospel to preach to the Gentiles. Paul also vividly describes a rebuke he gave to Peter for timidly renouncing table fellowship with the Gentiles. Chapters 2b-3 show that, since no one could fully meet the requirements of the law, both Jews and Gentiles are a part of God’s people by the same

---

86 This has been excellently initiated by Osiek and MacDonald in *A Woman’s Place: House Churches and Earliest Christianity*, especially pp. 144-163, on which this paragraph is based.

87 For example, Xenophon, a classical Greek writer still important in Roman times, spoke of the husband and wife acting as partners in the household with the husband bringing in resources and the wife having the authority to manage and disperse them (*Oeconomicus* 3.14-16). Her work in the household (as a result of the training of the teenage wife by the older husband) is compared to that of a queen bee, a military commander and a city councilor (7.36-43; 9.15).


means—through the death of Christ in whom all who believe become heirs of the promises to Abraham, dying to the curse of the law in order to live for God.

In Gal. 3:26-29, which is set apart from the surrounding material by the use of the first person “we” in place of the second person plural “you,” Paul spells out several realities that are true “now that faith has come” (3:25). He begins with a theological assertion, stating that his audience are all (both male and female) sons (huios) of God through faith. This is true on the basis of their baptism into Christ by which they have clothed themselves with Him. Paul then adds that in the new union which Christ has formed, distinctions of Jew vs. Gentile, as well as slave vs. free and male vs. female are no longer of import, because all are one in Him and are therefore Abraham’s descendants and heirs of the promise. While most of 3:26-29 focuses on the vertical relationship with God, the words “you are all one” in verse 28 point outwards toward the horizontal relationship with fellow believers. Relationships between fellow believers are not just a side point, rather the importance of Paul’s concern for this very issue is underlined in his choice to report his confrontation with Peter in 2:11-14 at the beginning of the main, theological, section of the epistle. In 2:11-14 Paul states the reason he had opposed Peter’s avoidance of equal inclusion of the Gentiles in church life. In doing so, Paul states, Peter had not been “straightforward about the truth of the gospel” (2:14). Thus Paul makes clear that his concern is not only about salvation but also about how that gift of salvation should affect relationships and inclusion in the various aspects of the Christian community. To have the theology of oneness in Christ is meaningless without accompanying changes in the way we involve others within the body. Such an error was judged by Paul to be worthy of rebuke.

Paul’s inclusion of slave and free and male and female, along with Jew and Greek, in this list appears rather surprising, since Paul has been speaking thus far only about Jew and Gentile. Their inclusion here suggests that Paul wishes to bring out a larger principle. The point cannot have been to abolish all differences between the pairs, for those between Jew and Greek and between slave and free are a result of human history, those between male and female were fundamental differences rooted in the physical bodies at creation. One common denominator among these three pairs, however, is that each pair is the basis of a set of fundamental social roles by which everything in ancient society was organized and structured. Although the verse generally does not raise eyebrows today, in the first century it would have been quite shocking, and could not have been written without deliberate thought. The social organization and day-to-day life of both Jew and Gentile were dependent on these very distinctions, determining for example what work you did, where you did and did not belong, who you spoke to, and how people responded to you. The traditional cultural expectations involved in these distinctions are the very reason Peter was so reluctant to join with the Gentiles in meals shared by believers.

Indeed Paul underlines the basis in creation of “male and female”, in contrast to the other two pairings that are a result of sin, by using in this one place only, the rare terms artēn (male) and thēlus (female) rather than the normal ἄνηρ (man) and γυνὴ (woman), The phrase artēn kai

91 Ibid., 8.
92 This is evidenced to be true across centuries in both the Greek and Jewish cultures by the similar statements attributed to the philosopher Socrates and the in the Jewish Mishnah expressing gratefulness for not having been born a “brute creature,” a barbarian (Socrates)/Gentile (Mishnah), or a woman. Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers 1.33 (LCL); Menahot 43b; gf179180.
thēlu is found elsewhere in the Greek Bible only in, or in reference to, the stories of creation and the flood (un-creation), based on Gen 1:27, “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female (arsen kai thēlu) He created them” (Gen. 1:27; cf. 5:2). In Paul’s theology, those who believe are now a part of a new creation, begun in Christ (Col. 1:15), the second Adam (Rom 5:12-17), and experienced by every believer (2 Cor. 5:17). Paul summarizes his argument with the Galatians by referring to this very concept, stating, “For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation” (Gal. 6:14-15).

Paul’s point in Galatians 3:26–29 cannot be reduced to only the vertical dimension of forensic justification by faith in Christ, as joyful as that message is. Such an argument is based in a dualistic understanding which separates soul from body and sees salvation as pertaining only to right standing before God in a legal sense rather than to the life of the whole person. Such an idea would have been foreign to Paul as a Jew, it is foreign to the NT as a whole, and is foreign to the best of Adventist theology today. As Paul demonstrated in his report of the conflict with Peter, he expects that the salvation Christ provides will make a profound difference in how we view and treat each other within the life of the church. Participation, thus, is no longer conditional on circumcision or ancestry (Romans 9:6-7), but on a personal response to God’s revelation in Christ and a spiritual circumcision of the heart (Deuteronomy 30:6; Romans 2:29; Colossians 2:11, 13).

The priesthood of all believers

Another paradigm of the church, which the NT takes very seriously, is the believers’ identity as a royal priesthood. This concept grows out of God’s declaration, given at Sinai before they begged not to hear any longer the fearsome voice of the Lord, that Israel was to be “a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,” declaration was (Exod. 19:6; cf. 20:19; Deut. 5:5, 25-31; cf. Deut. 18:15-16). Many years later, God had promised through Isaiah that in the future His people would indeed be looked upon as “priests of the Lord” and “ministers of our God” (61:6). Although due to human free will this prophecy was not fulfilled in just the way His people predicted, Jesus applied its opening verses to His own ministry, declaring, “Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing” (Luke 4:18-21; Isa. 61:1-2). Jesus’ reading of Isaiah 61:1, 2 as fulfilled in His own ministry suggests that verse 6, “you shall be named the priests of the LORD, They shall call you the servants of our God” (NKJV), might also be fulfilled in a special way as a consequence of His ministry. 1 Peter 2 indicates that this is indeed the case, for he declares that

93 These terms are used nowhere else in the NT except in a quote of the same passage by Jesus who pairs Gen. 1:27 and 2:24 in speaking against divorce by demonstrating that man and woman were created to be united (Matt. 19:4; Mark 10:6). This argument by Jesus for the oneness of male and female provides parameters to our understanding of Paul’s statement that there is no arsen kai thēlu. Cf. Gen 5:2, "He created them male and female (arsen kai thēlu), and blessed them and called them Mankind (Adam) in the day they were created." Linking them by “and” (kai), rather than the “nor” (oude) used between the other two pairs, may also underline the close connection between the two.

94 Jd317-319; ‘06ts158[missing]; Vyhmeister et al. near end of Women in Ministry article (?1st or 2nd ed.?). [missing] Paul’s theology of a new creation is grounded in the new exodus theology of Isaiah whose fulfillment begins in Jesus Christ (e.g. Isa 43:18-21). Gf177-9[missing]

95 Gf176-7[missing]
believers in Christ “are being built up like living stones as a spiritual house(hold), into a holy priesthood” (2:5) so that together as a reconstituted “holy nation” they made up “a royal priesthood” who would at last proclaim God’s praises (2:9). The ministry and gifts given to all believers attest that, more than was ever the case in the OT, each believer has a role to play in the priestly ministry of representing God before the world. John in Revelation 1:5-6, after reviewing Christ’s completed work on our behalf in “washing us from our sins by his blood,” states that God already “has made us (past tense) a kingdom, priests to His God and Father (Rev. 1:6). This pairing is so important to John that He returns to it in 5:10, depicting the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders praising Christ in song with the words, “You are worthy to take the scroll, and to open its seals; for You were slain, and have redeemed us to God by Your blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and have made us kings and priests to our God; And we shall reign on the earth” (NKJV). These passages together strongly attest that a fulfillment of God’s intention that His whole people function as a royal priesthood has taken place with the completion of Jesus’ earthly work.

It has been argued that women cannot hold higher leadership positions in the church because God, by designating that the Levitical priesthood be wholly made up of males, demonstrated a universal principle of male headship and spiritual authority in religious contexts. Such an imperative is never stated in Scripture, in fact Scripture gives strong reasons to believe that this is not so. Davidson has demonstrated some of the possible factors from the Old Testament perspective, including: 1) the priestly function of Adam and Eve in the garden; 2) the idolatrous temple practices of the pagans involving the priestly participation of women to which God established a male-only priesthood as a witness and boundary; 3) physiological differences between the man and the woman, including physical strength for performing the priestly functions as well as concerns of monthly ritual purity; 4) a woman’s family responsibilities as the mother of children; and 5) the reality that women actually did perform two of the three functions of priesthood and were absent only from the cultic (likely for one or more of the reasons above). (See Fig. 1 below for a graphic representation of this change.)

The NT gives more definite evidence that the male nature of the Levitical priesthood was not a model for all spiritual authority for all time. It does so both by demonstrating this priesthood as ending with Christ and by showing the church entering into a fulfillment of God’s plan for a royal priesthood. The whole book of Hebrews, and especially chapters 5-10, demonstrates as part of its central argument that the Levitical priesthood was fulfilled in Jesus Christ, a priest from the order of Melchizedek, and is no longer valid for Christians (e.g. Heb. 7:11-19; 10:8-9). The NT never speaks of any individual other than Jesus Christ in priestly language, (other than a reference by Paul in Phil. 2:17 to being poured out as drink offering, which is doubly odd since only Christ is truly symbolized by the Levitical offerings). Rather it is the community of believers, the royal priesthood, that are called upon to “offer up spiritual sacrifices” by praising God, by doing good, and by sharing what they have (1 Pet. 2:5; Phil. 4:18; Heb. 13:15-16).

96 The Greek word ὠἶκος (1 Pet. 2:5) can be translated as either “house” or “household” and appears to be a play on words here, providing for both a ‘house’ built from living stones, and a ‘household’ of priests.

Rom. 12:1-8 is of particular interest to our discussion of inclusive ministry. It opens with the exhortation, “I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service” (Rom. 12:1, NKJV), calling on believers to act in the role of both priest and sacrifice. Verses 1 and 2 contrast the call to present your bodies as a holy and acceptable sacrifice, with the alternative: being “conformed to the world.” Verses 3 through 5 spell out an important aspect of sacrificing oneself: instead of conforming to the world’s way of approaching things, believers are to show humble-minded respect for the function of each member in the body of Christ. Verses 6-8 climax this brief interpretation of the believer’s priestly sacrifice by encouraging each and every member to use to the utmost the gifts God has given:

So we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another. Having gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, let us use them: if prophecy, in proportion to our faith; if service, in our serving; the one who teaches, in his teaching; the one who exhorts, in his exhortation; the one who contributes, in generosity; the one who leads, with zeal; the one who does acts of mercy, with cheerfulness. (Rom. 12:5-8 NKJV)

Here is laid out a beautiful picture of the sacrifice, or “priestly work,” God has in mind for His “royal priesthood.” Through the transformation of one’s mind (12:2), while respecting the functions of the other members of Christ’s body, believers, both male and female, are to use faithfully, humbly, and actively the spiritual gifts they have received.

Figure 1 is a simple diagram of the priesthood patterns depicted in the OT and NT. The earthly Levitical priesthood, so important in the Old Testament as a prefiguring of Christ, is annulled when Jesus takes over the role of high priest and fulfills its symbolism in His sacrifice and in His work in the heavenly sanctuary. The royal priesthood, planned by God and remembered in the OT, comes into a new reality in the NT, taking the Levitical priesthood’s place as God’s representatives before the world.
Then What Do We Do with Paul’s Statements That Don’t Seem to Fit?

Any informed reader is aware that there are several passages in Paul that have traditionally been translated and interpreted as directly prohibiting women from leadership in pastoral ministry. Thus far we have sketched out a big picture of ministry and ordination in the first century church, finding no reason in the NT portrayal of these topics to insist that women should be excluded from either. This paper has also suggested that a correct understanding of authority and leadership, as the NT presents it, turns upside down for the church the whole traditional cultural idea of these things, replacing the idea of autocratic rule over other humans with that of shared servant leadership under Christ, with each person carrying the authority appropriate to their gifting and ministry. The NT model thus pushes toward a shared leadership model in which the pastoral leadership of women is appropriate and called for.  

If the above discussion is plausible, it is worthwhile to look again at the Pauline passages understood to oppose “spiritual authority” for women. This is particularly the case since, as Davidson has just demonstrated, there is no clear evidence in Genesis 1-2 for female subordination. For, as Jan Barna has observed, ultimately “the principle of male headship and female subordination” grounded in creation is the “primary theological foundation” used against the ordination of women. At the same time, we must also grant the question, how can the above be true in the face of Paul’s reference to creation order in 1 Timothy and 1 Corinthians? These passages present challenges for both sides in this discussion that go far beyond the time and space allotted to this paper. Instead of retreading all the paths that have been traced repeatedly, let us just consider a few points that are most pertinent to women’s ordination in each passage.

1 Corinthians 11:2-16

“But I wish you to know that of every man the head is Christ, and the head of a woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God” (1 Cor. 11:3, literal transl.)

In 1 Corinthians, Paul writes to a church that is divided and stumbling because believers have allowed themselves to become distracted from Jesus and His gospel. They have instead chased after their own fallen human desires for honor and power and for selfish and immoral pleasures, justifying their actions by claiming their own great wisdom and freedom in Christ. In the immediate context (ch. 8-10), Paul has been dealing with the issue of eating food offered to idols, which believers justified with the claim of superior knowledge, arguing that “all things are

---

98 It might even be argued, in an alternative sort of complementarianism, that the consensus style of leadership common to many women may even be especially suited to participation in this NT model of leadership.

99 Ján Barna, “Ordination of Women in Seventh-day Adventist Theology” (PhD diss., University of Bristol and Trinity College, 2009), 244. Richard M. Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” (Theology of Ordination Study Committee, 2013), 1-17. Davidson’s paper has ably demonstrated the case that Genesis 1-3 does not demonstrably support creation headship of man over women. Rather, Genesis 1 teaches that male and female are created in the image of God, blessed, and given dominion, with no assertion of any hierarchy between the sexes. Genesis 2 reinforces this picture, presenting woman as Adam’s counterpart and ezer (who comes to his aid), and the grand finale of the six-day creation sequence. Genesis 3:16 evidences that the leadership of the husband within the marriage relationship is among the curses after the fall and is not God’s ideal.
lawful” in Christ (10:23). He points out practices that would be idolatrous against God and ends
his counsel by urging that these believers consider not only their own freedom, but how their
choices will affect others, insisting, “whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the
glory of God. Give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the church of God” (10:28, 29).
1 Corinthians 11-14 continues to be concerned with how believers represent God in their
interactions, this time in reference to the church’s worship gatherings. Paul’s main purpose in 1
Corinthians 11:2-16 was to bring the spiritually arrogant and liberty-grasping Corinthians to
think about how the choices they were making regarding head coverings in their public
gatherings affected their relationships both with God and others. The exact nature of these head
coverings remains a matter of no small debate, but this is not our concern here, for the type of
head coverings themselves are generally recognized as details specific to the first century
world. For people of the Mediterranean world, in ancient times and even today, gaining honor
and avoiding shame was of pivotal value, entering as a factor into every social interaction and
decision. While Paul does not have the same dedication to personal honor, he ties into the
cultural concern regarding shame and honor to urge these men and women so concerned about
their own liberty, not to bring shame on God and His people by their choice of head coverings.101
1 Corinthians 11:3, the verse so often quoted with reference to the ordination debate, is
not a distinct theological treatise, but functions as part of Paul’s argument about head coverings.
Together with verses 4-6, it functions to demonstrate that a man (anēr) should not be concerned
only about his own liberty when he chooses the head covering to wear to a church gathering, but
also about the honor, or public reputation of Jesus Christ. And a woman (gynē) should not
consult only her own preferences, but should think about the honor of the man who was her
husband. Metaphorically, Paul insisted, it was not only their own anatomical heads that were
being shamed.102
Although headship is often understood as ruling power, this meaning is not normal in the
Greek language. In fact where the Septuagint translators, in earlier translating the Hebrew Old
Testament into Greek, ran across the Hebrew word rōsh (head) used of chiefs or rulers, they
almost always chose not to translate it with the Greek word head (kefalē), but rather substituted

100 The issue of head coverings may have related to hair styles or to what is worn on the head. All sides in
this discussion make the choice to describe some things as cultural, and this is one place where most agree. Paul’s
underlying and evident concern here is focused on the disgrace, or shame, the wrong head-covering brings in the
eyes of observers. In a different culture head-covering issues might be of no concern and some other item of
clothing or behavior would be considered potentially shaming.

101 The differentiation between male and female dress, important in both the Biblical (Deut. 22:5) and
Greco-Roman culture, seems to be a more universal principle that partially underlies the concern.

102 Paul generally uses the words anēr and gynē with their basic meanings man and woman (e.g. it is not
only husbands praying in 11:4; 11:8 would not be arguing that the wife comes out of the husband), but often when
the context uses these words more narrowly to indicate husband and wife (11:3b, possibly 11:11). 11:3 begins by
referring broadly to “every man,” then in the second pair narrows specifically to the relationship between a man and
woman, for Paul uses this analogy in human terms only of the relation between the husband and wife (Eph. 5:23).
There is no more indication that this counsel was to be extended to the male elder or pastor in the church than to any
other man in society.

103 Few Jews living in the diaspora at that time spoke Hebrew, and virtually none of the Gentile Christians
would have known Hebrew. For this reason, in order to communicate to a mixed group in writing to Corinth, if Paul
had meant to convey ruling headship, it seems unlikely that he would have chosen kefalē, but rather a word that
conveyed this meaning clearly in the Greek language.
words such as archē (ruler) and hēgeomai (leader) in order to make sense in Greek.\textsuperscript{104} Greek, both biblical and literary, uses head (kefalē) metaphorically in a number of ways closely related to the actual anatomical part including the idea of foremost or preeminent (Dan. 2:32; Ps. 118:22; Jer. 31:7) and in representing the whole person (Exod. 16:16; Num. 1:18; Jdg. 9:57; Ps. 3:3).\textsuperscript{105} Although the idea of head as source, is not prominent in the lexicons, outside of reference to the head of a river, Philo and several other Jewish authors around the time of the NT used kefalē metaphorically to refer to a source for feelings and ideas and of a human progenitor.\textsuperscript{106} More importantly, this meaning fits best in the context of the passage, where Paul comes back repeatedly to the question of whether man came from woman, or woman from man (1 Cor. 11:8-9, 11-12). In fact, in Eph. 4:15-16 Paul speaks of Christ as the head and source of growth for the body (the church), and in Colossians 1:18-20 as “head of the body, the church; and He is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that He Himself will come to have first place in everything.” The order of the pairings in verse 3 actually supports better the chronological idea of head in the sense of preeminence or source: Christ created man, man was the stuff of which woman was made, and lastly God sent Christ to earth as a human in the incarnation (1 Cor. 8:6; 11:8).\textsuperscript{107} This reading also relieves us of the logical necessity to push the Son into a subordinate relationship with the Father.

At the same time when Paul uses the metaphor of Christ as “head” there is generally an aspect of leadership involved, as Greek also indicates in its metaphorical references to the anatomical head. Nowhere, however, does Paul use the metaphor of “head” to speak of ruling dominion over the body. Where, in Ephesians 1:20-23, Christ is said to have gained dominion over the principalities and powers, He is given “as head over all things to [for the benefit of] the church, which is His body” (NASB). Likewise in Colossians 2:6-19, where He is spoken of as divine head over all rule and authority (v. 9), with reference to those who are “in Him,” He is “the head, from whom the entire body . . . grows with a growth which is from God” (v. 19, NASB). This is true also of the use of headship in the husband-wife sense in Ephesians 5:21-33, where the husband is directed, not to rule the wife, but to nourish and cherish her as his own body. Submission (v. 22), also described as respect (v. 33) is the prerogative of the wife, and is to be understood in the context of the instruction in v. 21 that all are to submit to one another.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{104} In only about 6 places in the Septuagint is kefalē used of a ruler or leader, whereas rōsh is used many, many more times in this sense. While some have disputed this based on a cursory look at some lexicons, doing a simple word study examining each use of rōsh in the OT will make this abundantly clear. (Note also that even where rōsh is used in the Hebrew OT of leading or ruling, it is never used to refer to sovereignty over an individual.)

\textsuperscript{105}Exod. 16:16 reads literally, “one omer for each head;” Num. 1:18 reads literally “head by head,” often translated as, “individually.” Head may also possibly, but rarely, designate a whole group (Job 1:17). Henry George Liddell, et al., "κεφαλή," A Greek-English Lexicon:945. Thiselton (The First Epistle to the Corinthians : a commentary on the Greek text (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000), 812-822.) gives a good overview of the discussion on the meanings of kefalē. for representation of the whole body, person, or grouping.

\textsuperscript{106} Philo, Preliminary Studies 61; Rewards 125. Other Jewish writings of the time also evidence the use of kefalē, including the Apocalypse of Moses 19.3, and the Testament of Reuben 2.2. Although Philip Payne often overstates his case, he gives a good overview of the uses of kefalē as source in Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 124-129.


\textsuperscript{108} In fact, Eph. 5:22, “wives to your own husbands,” stands without a verb, indicating the close connection to verse 21 from which the verb “submit” (hupotassō) is assumed.
In verses 7-9, Paul goes on to work with several aspects of Genesis 1-2 as he seeks to
dissuade the offending Corinthians from shameful head covering. In verse 7 while Adam is
said to be the image of God, both Paul and his audience are aware that Eve is also in that image.
To speak of the woman then as also being a glory, places her in a special place of honor (if she
conforms to Paul’s concern) which should not be changed into a source of shame. In verses 8-9
the idea that woman comes from man is being used to demonstrate that man is the head of the
woman and therefore it is appropriate to avoid shaming him (even though one may be free in
Christ). The idea of headship as source, or being first, makes perfect sense with these verses,
while head as ruling power has no place in the analogy of verse 8 or elsewhere in this passage.

Verse 10, which is widely disputed, makes full sense when we recognize the main point
of the passage and set aside the insistence that headship is primary about ruling authority.
Literally this verse says, “Because of this a woman ought to have authority on/upon/over the
head.” Rather than needing to turn the simple meaning of the verse inside-out by adding multiple
words, one can recognize “because of this” as referring to the problems caused by improper head
coverings, and recognize that Paul continues to plead with women to take the initiative or
authority to make good decisions about what to put on her head. When seen this way there is
no longer a need to debate whether verses 11-12 is meant to offset the early verses, for Paul is
simply completing the idea of verse 3-10 focusing on source and respect, by recognizing that in
the end it goes both ways. Thus the passage all works together in a perfect sequence calling on
men and women to cease shaming themselves and the one who came before them and to instead
act to replace shame with honor, ending in verses 13-16 by calling on the offenders to think
logically about the issue and avoid what is naturally and communally recognized as
unacceptable.

Clearly the pairings listed in 11:3 are not referring to church organization at all, but to the
three representative relationships that point men and women—who seem to have been pushing
the boundaries of what was sexually appropriate—toward concern for how their choices reflected
upon those to whom they owed respect. Thus with the regard to the question of ordaining women
for ministry, the appropriate lessons would be that such women dress in an appropriate manner
that would reflect well on her relationship with her husband and her God, and that these
relationships in general be engaged with all respect and honor.

“In the end,” as Payne observes, “it is plain that Paul wants the woman to maintain the
tradition (whatever it is) and to do so primarily for reasons of ‘shame’ and ‘honor in a culture
where this is a primary sociological value.” Understanding 1 Corinthians 11 in this way would
remove the idea that the passage speaks against women being ordained to act in a pastoral role,
especially when we recognize the nature of authority in the New Testament and the various ways
in which authority is practiced by all who minister. Instead it would encourage women to act as
full human beings with a conscience and a will of their own and at the same time giving honor
and appreciation to her husband.

109 For several of the ideas in this paragraph I am indebted to Gordon D. Fee. "Praying and Prophesying in
the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," in Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy
(Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2005), 142-160.

110 The reference to the angels in verse 10 might, in this time when angels were eagerly studied and highly
revered, be referring back to the reference in 4:9 to the angels being deeply interested witnesses to the whole great
controversy, and how it is played out in the lives of women and men.

111 Philip B. Payne, Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters
(Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 148.
1 Corinthians 14:33b-35

As in all the churches of the saints, let your women keep silent in your churches, for it is not permitted for them to speak; but they should be submissive, as the law also says. And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church.

1 Corinthians 14:33b-35 is falls near the end of a chapter focusing on public worship. In this case the point of the passage is specifically about behavior in the worship service. The concern of the previous passage in verses 26-33a was to bring order to a service that was disrupted and chaotic, ending with the reasoning, “For God is not a God of confusion but of peace” (v. 33a).

The next words, “As in all the churches of the saints…” (v. 33b), would be a strange addition to a universal statement about God’s nature. They would, however, make perfect sense in introducing the brief counsel of vv. 34-35, which is where it is placed in the most current Greek and English versions. The brief counsel concerning women is thus prefaced by founding it not in universal principle but in a customary practice among the churches. The words, “for it is shameful,” in verse 35 affirm that the underlying rationale for this custom is based in cultural expectations, pointing, as in chapter 11, to the concern for shame and honor so important in the culture of the contemporary Greco-Roman society. At that time, a woman who spoke in public could still be considered dishonorable, and speaking to males who were not her husband suggested that she was flirtatious or worse.  

Several times in the chapter Paul has spoken to others about silence, giving a rationale, stating: “If anyone speaks in a tongue, ... if there is no interpreter, let him keep silent (sigaō)” (14:27-28); and, “Let ... prophets speak ... but if anything is revealed to another ... let the first keep silent (sigaō)” (14:29-30). In 34-35 we get suggestions that there are two related reasons also for the counsel to women, one related to what is shameful in the culture and the other suggesting that the specific problem with which he was particularly concerned had to do with speaking out in church to ask questions of those who were teaching. Since Paul has already, in 1 Cor. 11:5, made room for women praying and prophesying in public, his counsel in 14:34-35 seems to be directed specifically at the disruptive and disreputable behavior of questioning teachers, often male, in the course of a worship service.

The two positive commands, “keep silent” and “be submissive” (hypotassō) are given together as a specific prescription in a chaotic situation. If the statement in vv. 36 is also addressed to these women they were quite combative in their questioning. This would fit the picture of the self-proclaimed wise ones and the liberty graspers that arises in the earlier part of his letter. Indeed all believers are instructed, just a little later in 1 Corinthians (16:15-16), to submit (hypotassō) to individuals, including members of the household of Stephanas and others.


113 The term sigaō does not necessarily refer to absolute silence, but often to “keeping one’s peace” with reference to an issue or person (Exod. 14:14; Ps. 31:3; Luke 9:36).
(like Priscilla and Phoebe?) who have been working (synergeō) and toiling (kopiaō) with them, who devote themselves to service (diakonia). That peace and order is a primary concern of the entire chapter is evidenced by Paul’s return to this point at the end of the chapter with the statement, “Let all things be done decently and in order” (14:40).

With reference to the question of ordaining women pastors, the church which is comfortable today allowing women to speak in church has no reason to be concerned, based on this passage, that a female pastor’s public speech is any more inappropriate than that of a Sabbath School teacher or superintendent. Each makes use of authority, calling for an appropriate degree of submission, to make use of their gifting and accomplish the task entailed in the church office for which they have been chosen.

1 Tim 2:11-15

Carl Cosaert, in his paper for this committee, has ably explained Paul’s instruction in 1 Timothy 2:11-15. In summary, Cosaert demonstrates that 1 Timothy shows Paul to be dealing with a problem of false teaching not only within the church but among some of its leaders, who were evidencing prideful and arrogant behavior. These teachings were attractive to the women of the church, who in the context of the emerging opportunities for women in some corners of Ephesus, were enticed to be disruptive and assert themselves in inappropriate ways and even to advocate for false teachings they found attractive. Paul combats these problems by calling on both men and women to worship in a spirit of peacefulness and quietness (not silence) and instructing these women not to teach or to act in a domineering manner, explaining from Genesis that women are in no position to domineer men.

Again, to practice appropriate authority to carry out a task for which one is gifted or appointed fits fully within Paul’s guiding principles and avoids the kind of controlling authority over people in manipulative or authoritarian ways with which authenteō is concerned.

Conclusions

This paper suggests that the NT witness regarding church leadership and ordination provides no impediment to the ordination of suitably qualified women to serve in the role of pastor. The basis for selection of individuals for such roles in the NT, such as those of elder or deacon, was evidence of spiritual maturity and of the Holy Spirit’s presence and appropriate gifting in the individual. Today’s office of pastor, although not fleshed out in detail in the NT, must be understood to carry the same basic qualifications.

All ministries, whether gifted by God or appointed by humans, carry some type of authority and the pastoral ministry is no different. Yet in each case the authority is authority for a

---

114 Some translations say “be in subjection to such men,” but the word men is not present or necessitated in the Greek. These to whom believers are told to submit could thus include the women whom Paul identifies as among those working together with him (synergetos), including Priscilla (Rom. 16:3) and Euodia and Syntyche (Phil 4:2-3), and possibly others including Mary, Tryphaena, Tryphosis, and Persis (Rom. 16:12) whom Paul says labored (kopiaō) much for the Roman church. Timothy, in the same list (Rom. 16:21; cf. 1 Thess. 3:2), and Titus too are spoken of as synergos (2 Cor. 8:23).

task, not authority to domineer or control individuals. This authority is always exercised under Christ, and under the authority of the Scriptures and the body of believers which He has instituted. The pastors’ primary tasks of preaching the word and nurturing the body of Christ are enacted under these higher authorities, specifically, in the Adventist church today, including the administration of the conference committee which is governed by the policies enacted by the whole body of believers in General Conference session. The ordination of a pastor is thus not about placing an individual at the top of the power or status hierarchy, giving them ultimate authority over people, but about affirming the presence of the authority God has already given to do the tasks for which He has called and equipped that individual. The concerns of Paul, addressed to specific situations in the New Testament churches, present no impediment to women exercising such an authority.

The priority of seeing God’s universe as a place of order and organization is truthful and important. The question is, “According to what principles does God order His universe?” The sketch of ministry, authority, and gifting in this paper suggests that rather than ordering the universe by means of an arbitrary subordination of half of his human creation, the New Testament portrays an ordering guided by the Spirit through the endowment of spiritual gifts recognized by the church under His leading through the avenues of Scripture and experience of His workings.

While many cultures see the use of a pastoral-type of authority as problematic, other cultures have become comfortable and even come to prefer this sort of authority that works by means of cooperation, nurture, and agreed-upon guidelines. In such cultures women pastors with their special qualities of nurture and compassion would thrive, and should not be blocked from ministry. Such qualities, in fact, are central to the core pastoral task of shepherding. Is it not time to consider that in the role of pastoring there may be a place, in some parts of the world, for “mothers in Israel” who can use their qualities and gifts in a way that is complementary to the male pastors in our midst?

In Acts 15, the church listened carefully to the voices of those who had experienced the Holy Spirit’s leading. Many evidences were given of the Holy Spirit’s working in the lives of the individuals involved. James then appropriately turned the attention of the gathering to the Scriptures to ensure that they were understanding the will of God correctly in this matter. Significantly, Amos 9:11-12, which he quoted is not an explicit “Thus saith the Lord” calling for an end to circumcision after the coming of Christ, but the statement of a general principle regarding God’s intent for the Gentiles. On the basis of the intent of God expressed in this Scriptural passage, (no doubt also along with consideration of other similar passages of Scripture), the church took the huge step of not requiring circumcision, even though they laced an explicit Scriptural command to do so. Instead of insisting on such a declaration, they looked to what God was doing in human lives in their day, in the context of the history and teaching recorded in Scripture. This model is one that we would do well to consider more closely.

Near the end of His ministry Jesus spoke at length of His second coming and repeatedly called on His disciples to be ready when He comes. As He finished telling the parable of the ten virgins who awaited the bridegroom, a parable much loved by us as Adventists, He warned that one must “be on the alert, therefore, because you know neither the day nor the hour” (Matt. 25:13). Building on this warning He immediately moved into a second parable, stating, “For it is just like a man going on a journey who called His bondservants and handed over his belongings to them. And to one he gave five talents, and to another two, and to another one, then he went on his journey” (Matt. 25:14-15). As the well-known story goes the servants who used what the
master had given them were rewarded while the one who hid their talent was punished. In the context today of Jesus’ soon coming, do we dare to insist that a God-given talent or gift not be used to its full potential to complete the work of spreading the gospel to all the world? With many societies today welcoming the leadership of women and respecting the non-authoritarian participatory style of leadership taught in the NT, a style of authority often practiced quite naturally by women, shall we move out of God’s way as we “pray the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into His harvest” to finish His work (Matt. 9:38)?