

THE PRINCIPLES OF HEADSHIP/ SUBMISSION AND THE MINISTRY OF THE EARLY CHURCH

PATRICK ANANI ETOUGHE, PhD

Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Silang, Cavite, Philippines

*I see women in a prophetic role, questioning the patriarchal foundation
of institutional Christianity. To do that, you have to be in relation to the
institution. That's why I'm here.*

—Female Episcopal priest ¹

1. Introduction

WHENEVER theologians tend to obtain information about doctrine indirectly through “theological reading,” predictably, interpretations are likened to facts rather than facts with facts and divergence is the predictable result.² Since the feminist interpreters’ movement in modern time started to deny biblical teaching on women’, the instruction given by Paul concerning the headship submission have been at best blurred and now mostly rejected on the ground of the cultural misogyny of the patriarchal dominion.³ The headship submission in the NT

¹Quoted in Kelley A. Raab, *When Women Becomes Priests: The Catholic Women's Ordination Debate* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 219.

²Hugh Ross, *The Fingerprint of God: Recent Scientific Discoveries Reveal the Unmistakable Identity of the Creator* (Orange, CA: Promise Publishing, 1991), 6.

³For example Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997), 164 and among Adventist as early as 1973 works as Leona Running, “Study of the Role of Women in Israel, In the Background of the Contemporary Near East,” *Unpublished Manuscript* (1973); Michael D. Pearson, *Seventh-day Adventist Responses to Some Contemporary Ethical Problems* (Oxford: Wolfson College, 1986), 176-181; Sakae Kubo, “An Exegesis of 1 Tim 2:11-15, and its Implications,” *Unpublished Manuscript* (1976): 14; Mary J. Evans, *Woman in the Bible: An Overview of All the Crucial Passages on Women's Roles* (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1983), 65-66, 111-113, 117.

seems not anymore binding for God's people. Thus, the NT seems to encourage the modern understanding of submission and headship, and by doing so, the 21st century is read onto the NT context.¹

Behind this movement is the use of historical criticism at work, where the historical sense is rejected and human reason becomes the chief key to unlock what is right or wrong. Being in harmony with Spinoza, the egalitarians or liberationist reject any dogmatic tradition of exegesis and find their conclusion in what they consider the only proper foundation of religion; that is "human reason," stemming from the enlightenment.² Scriptures promoting full equality are accepted as truth and more pragmatic (Gen 1; Gal 3:28), whereas texts seen as stemming from patriarchy such as 1Cor 11:17-17; Eph 5:22-23; 1Tim 2:11-15) are disallowed since they are generally considered old forms of the chauvinism of Judaism and Christianity.³

This article is an exegetical and theological study on two disputed passages: 1Cor 11:1-17 and Eph 5:22-33. The article endeavors to understand how the early Church understood the concept of headship as related to ministry through the window

¹In the early 1980s, Catherine Kroeger proposed that κεφαλή means "source" and therefore did not contain any implications for authority or an authority structure. See Catherine Kroeger, "Head" in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* 3rd ed. Ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993), 375-377. the discussion in Wayne Grudem, "The Meaning of Kephale (Head): A Response to Recent Studies," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, eds. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991), 425-468.

²See Roy A. Harrisville and Walter Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 41-42. Also E. S. Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroads, 1983); and idem *Bread Not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1984). She seeks to eradicate what she calls the oppressive androcentric and patriarchal reading of the Bible.

³See for eg., E. S. Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 30.

given by Paul's writing to perceive the household code.¹ Four questions are in focus: Does the submission-headship principle is merely a borrowed idea from ancient philosophers or it stems from the continuity of the OT? Is Jesus Headship, over all, is preventing women to have a role of submission in the NT?² Does the principle of headship submission as used by Paul is different from the sanction given in Gen 3:15? Why and how men have to be the head of their wife in home and in the Church?

These passages are used because in each, both *hupotassô* and *kephalê* are used in association with husband-wives relationship. The first to be studied is Eph 5:21-6-9. The *Haustafel* or lists of ethical injunctions are not isolated in Paul's thought. The list for the same categories exist in Colossians: (1) husband-wives (5:22-33//3:18-19; cf. 1 Pet 3:6-7), (2) fathers-children (6:1-4//Col 3:20-21); masters-slaves (6:5-9//Col 3:22-4:1). The importance of the problem for church ministry is still valuable. Whether misogyny is the root of preventing women to held all the position as the world permit it or it stems from God's ideal that the women be maintained under some kind of subjection in ministry as punishment of Eve's sin. Gilbert Belezikian represents well the egalitarian view when he says, "Mutual subjection suggests horizontal lines of interaction among equals."³

Thus, the passage against the old view is taken to teach mutual submission among equal. A clear understanding of the

¹Since Martin Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, an die Epheser, an Philemon* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1913), 54, which was further developed by his student Carl Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln: Ein Stuöck urchristlicher Paraenese* (Hamburg: Heinrich Bauer, 1928), this portion of Eph 5:21-33 is known as household code (from German, *Haustafel*), drawing attention to example in Greco-Roman literatures, especially in the writing of Aristotle, Plutarch and Seneca. See John Muddiman, *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 250-251. Although the Graeco-Roman notion of household management has significant points of contact with the New Testament household codes, there are also important differences, see O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, 407.

²"There is a headship/submission principle in the apostolic Church. But it does not consist of male leaders being given this headship role and women submitting to the male headship." Richard M. Davidson, *Flame of Yawveh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 648.

³Gilbert Belezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1990), 154.

relationship of headship-submission of women in the Early Church has been distorted, because of the emphasis made on isolated and a-contextual examples.

2. Context of Eph 5:21-6:9

Eph 5:21-6:9 is introduced unusually, since the verb in v. 22 is supposed to be supplied from the last participle in v. 21c.¹ Scholars, and consequently Bible translators, are divided on how this verse fits into the whole context. Contextually, the vv. 22-6:9 belong to the section of worship (5:18-21) and should be seen as another manifestation of the Spirit-filled believers. As singing and thanksgiving are to be expressed corporately, members also must willingly submit to one another. This fullness of the Spirit leads to mutual subordination and unity, not to any individual pride and disunity (cf. 1Cor 14:26-33; Phil 2:1-5). At the same time, 5:21 is a transitional verse from which the author proceeds to illustrate how that submission is to be observed in specific domestic relationships (5:22-6:9).

Arthur Patzia, says, "Eph 5:21 has been taken as an independent sentence, because it serves as a heading for the specific relationships that follow. Some translations, namely, GNB and RSV, use it this way. However, the NIV, however, lets it stand with the previous section. In either case, the position of the verses is as important as its teaching—a teaching in which believers are exhorted to submit themselves to one another out of reverence for Christ. Christ is the standard by which this mutual submission is done."² Patzia suggests that four views exist among the scholars: (1) the social code; (2) stemming from the ethical instructions that preceded it; (3) the code related structurally to the preceding instructions on worship (5:18-20); (4) the arrangement in Ephesians on the basis of Colossians, which, according to a number of commentators, the

¹This verbless command has no conjunction, hence NA27, RSV, NRSV taking as imperative starts the paragraph at v. 21.

²Arthur G. Patzia, *New International Biblical Commentary: Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990), 263.

author was using as a model.¹ He suggests a fifth view, which sees v. 21 has a bridge between vv. 1-20 and 22-6:9. It is the view adopted in this article on this ethical exhortation."²

Chap 5 is logically tied to the forgiveness offered by Christ in 4:32. And Paul develops what is a life of love in the light of Christ (5:1-2), which result in a high pure life (vv. 3-6) being heirs of God's kingdom. From v. 7, Paul makes another inference to stay in the light through the help of the Spirit to please only the Lord until v. 15; vv. 15-16 is a call for redeeming the time, and it is unconnected from v. 17. Paul gives the reason and the inference *dia touto*, "therefore"; for this reason believer need to know how to redeem the time (v. 16) and understand what is the will of God. And he adds more advices about wine (v. 18a) as contrasting with a life of the Spirit (v. 18b-20); and v 21 being also in participle, it connects with the preceding section of a life of the Spirit (*lalountes, adontes kai psallontes* v.19, *eucharistountes*, v. 20, *hupotassomenoi*, v. 21). The next participle comes later in v. 26b. However, from vv. 22 to 6:9, it concerns how to mutually submit as in the following framework: (b) one being under the authority, (b) and the authority itself. Henceforth, Paul places Eph 5 in the *imitatio dei* in the life of each-member as Christ would himself do to us (v. 1).

This brings a holy life with actions of Grace, since the dangers are great (vv. 5-6). Avoid to do that is to follow the enemy who will be destroyed (v. 7) because of the deeds stemming from darkness where Christ came to enlight His people for a wisely walk with him (vv.15-16). Paul appeals to the Church (vv. 7, 17) to be thus full of the Spirit so that four aspects of Christian life would be enlightened: (1) psalmody, (2) singing to the Lord, (3) thanksgiving, and (4) submitting to each other.

The life in Spirit is organized along with five active participles (*lalountes, adontes kai psallontes, eucharistountes*), and one passive, *hupotassomenoi*. It is this last passive participles that brings the whole explanation of where and who, to whom, and above all how this has to happen.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

Hendriksen William and Simon J. Kistemaker also suggest, "The simplest¹ construction would be to regard all these five present participles—speaking, singing, making melody, giving thanks, and subjecting (yourselves)—as governed by 'be filled with the Spirit' (5:18). So construed, all of them have the force of present imperatives."² Because it indicates how this mutual submission has to be done. The *Hupotassomenoi allêlois en phobô Christou* has not only parameters, but it is broader in scope since it closes the appeal to the Church as a whole. Christ is the parameter of women's self and total submission to their husbands (vv. 22-24),³ and visibly, the task of the man drain Paul energy, since it seems, that in Christ, it is more easy to submit than to love (vv. 25-32). Then, the intent of Paul is summarized in v. 33 where he concludes that a woman has to fear her husband as she does to the Lord. Paul discusses the submission in the mysterious relationship between Christ and His Church. Here the submission does not have a middle sense, which is with a component of compulsion, "have to submit," but rather a voluntary submission and total obedience to the Christ as to Christ. Thus, only her relationship to Christ would help her to subject herself.

Although it seems also that Paul emphasizes on women (vv. 22, 23, 24, 25, 28bis, 31, 33bis), the relationship woman-husband (vv.22-33), children-parents (vv. 6-4), slave-master (vv.5-9), are structurally the focus. Paul uses *ὡς* as a comparative particle, marking the manner in which the submission has to be done. *ὡς* means "as," "like," but it can also be used of a cause (v. 22) [14 times in the chapter Eph. 5:1, 8, 15bis, 22-24, 28, 33; 6:5bis, 7, 20]. Christ is the measure of every instruction Paul gives in Eph 5. In view of the

¹Ibid.

²Hendriksen William and Simon J. Kistemaker *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of Ephesians*, New Testament Commentary 7 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1953-2001), 243..

³The verb 'submit' does not appear in the best Greek text, so that the verse is dependent for its sense on the participle of v. 21. This is the reading of P46 B Clement Origen and several Greek mss. according to Jerome (ex., Aleph, A, D06). Other textual traditions supply some form of *hupotassein* ('submit') before or after *tois idiois andrasin* ('their husbands'), such as *hupotassesthe* ('be subject') or *ὑποτασσέσθωσαν* ('let them be subject'). Most editors argue for the omission of the verb because it is the shorter reading and it is likely that later scribes included the verb for the sake of clarity. For a detailed discussion see B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 608-9.

fact it is self-submission, which is encouraged by Paul, twice it is asked to the wife to be submissive to her husband (vv. 24) because he is the head of the woman.

2.1. The Meaning of *Hupotassô* and *Allêlois*

Hupotassomenoi expresses a state of submissiveness among members of different rank or genre (Rom 8:7); it means be submissive (10:3) as one who is to be placed in state of inferiority before any authority imparted by God (13:1,5; Titus 3:1). The reason for doing such is *en phobô Christou*, "in the fear of Christ," which is one of the expressions Paul uses for general admonition (cf. 2Cor 7:1). It was understood to be part of the law (1 Cor 14:34). Thus, *hupotassô* means becomes subject of a higher authority than himself (1Cor 16:16; 13:1,4). The pattern exists in the Church as also among the member of the divinity (1Cor 15:27-28; 11:3). There are hierarchies, Christ over His Church (Eph 1:22). This was not an isolated teaching of Paul, since in Col 3:18-22, the four categories are again addressed in the same fashion (cf. Titus 2:5,9). Obviously, men are seen as the authority above women, and this affects their ministry. For example, they ought to participate actively in worship by having a sign of their authority over the head (1Cor 11:11).¹

Also, the book of Acts provides hints of the original meaning of this word, *allos pros allon*, "one to the other(s)" (Acts 2:12:). So for H. Krämer it refers to the English each other (cf. German *einander*).² Wayne Grudem proposes a partitive sense, for example, he gives instances where the term might mean some to others, that is some have to submit to others (see Matt 24:10; Luke 2:15; 12:1; 24:32).³

¹Peter Thomas O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, The Pillar New Testament commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 412-13, understands Paul's instruction in the household code as stemming directly from the admonition of 5:21, which he says, "itself is a significant outworking of the exhortation to be filled by the Spirit" (p. 378). F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), BibleWorks, v.9. [§147[3]]. Here the nominative case with the article (αὗ γυναῖκες), rather than the vocative, is used in address. It is 'wives' who are in view, not women generally.

²H. Kramer, "ἄλλος," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976): 163.

³Wayne Grudem, "The Myth of Mutual Submission as an Interpretation

Therefore in the context of submission of a superior to an inferior, *allêlois* is partitive and broader than to the simple "one another."

Although many editions of the Greek NT, would consider *hupotassomenoi* as imperatival, such is doubtful, as the other four participles, it is *anarthrous*.¹ What is requested to the women, is however, self-submission rather than authoritarianism, for the verb *hupotassomenoi* is passive with a middle sense, that is, with a component of voluntary submission through the help of God's Spirit; one can also read a note of compulsion, thus, "wives, you have to subject yourselves to your own husband" (although the verb to submit is implied in v. 22). This is just a consequence of a life full of the spirit (v. 18b). To the others categories, Paul uses each time the imperative. One conclusion is clear, from that is that the woman is of equal status with the husband in the couple, but because of the Lord, she has to be subject in everything to her husband. But, she has first to be full of God's Spirit to be able to achieve this.

2.2. Principle of Headship and Submission

Paul addresses the *Hupotassomenoi allêlois en phobô Christou* to six categories of persons, for there is no direct link between the vv 20, 21 20 22. Therefore, the mutual submission is broader. Paul expands it to each category. This mutual submission is a mutual duty to render as the likeness of Jesus and His Church, so as to perpetuate the mystery of the bound relationship:

- 22- (*hai gunaikes*) **Wives**, be subject to your husbands as is proper [in the Lord];
- 25 (*hoi andres*) **Husbands**, love your wives (cf. v. 33).
Children, obey your parents;
Fathers, do not annoy your children.
Slaves, obey your [human] masters;
Masters, treat your slaves justly.²

of Ephesians 5:21," *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood*, ed. Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2002), 229.

¹Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 651.

²See Best, "Haustafel," and the exegesis of the individual verses for this basic form. Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark International, 1998), 521.

While women submission's ideal is a full submission (v. 24b, ἐν παντί), but within the parameters of the *imitato dei* or Jesus in His connection to the Church. This is the genitive of the reciprocal relationship. Mutual submission to Christ is only possible if in that context mutual obedience is possible between master-slaves and fathers-children; since this does not make any sense, Paul specifies clearly what it means by mutual submission. In brief, this reflection of what Paul calls "mystery" is only possible when the men first love their wives as Christ loves the Church (v. 33). That is why, Paul concludes by the fact that, if the woman sees the cares of her husband, she would fear him in the sense of reverence as she does to God (v. 33; Col 3:22). This is made clear for both members: *hoti anêr estin kephalê tês gunaikos hês kai ho Christos kephalê tês ekklêsias*, "because the husband is the head of the woman, as also Christ is the head of the Church . . .," *hekastos tên heautou gunaika houtôs agapatô hês heauton, hê de gunê hina phobêtai ton andra*, "each one himself should love his wife in this manner, in order that the woman fears his husband." (vv. 23,33). This submission can be illustrated again in this double chiasm:



As the husband parallels Christ, the wife exemplifies God's Church. Men's prerogatives are corresponding to Christ model of relationship with His church. Thus, to say that a man is also submissive to his wife goes without saying that Christ also has to be submissive to his Church. It goes without saying that talking of mutual submission is far reached to say also that the Christ has to submit his Church. However, structurally, the woman plays the role of the Church's submission to Christ while the husband represent Christ headship. This is clear from the fact that as the husband has to care for his wife as Christ does to his church, the women has to submit has the Church.

As in Col 3:18–4:1, Eph 5:22–6:9 *allêlois* emphasizes the reciprocal obligations a man has to renders to his wife, and slaves are to be treated as well since all are accountable to God, for "there is one who is Lord of both slave and master, and each is accountable to him (6:9)."¹ Ministries, which do not follow the

¹O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, 406-07.

leadership of the home, will result only to chaos. It has pleased God that organizational ministry be gendered, but whenever men and women minister together, God has given precedence to the men over his wife (cf. 1Tim 2:13).¹ The submission of the weaker comes first with the desire to be filled with the Spirit. To follow the pattern of this world where women because of social reasons, at home are heads, demonstrates a lack of acquaintance with a Spirit-indwelt. Ephesian's' exhortation is one sided demand for obedience; however, in certain degree wives have also mutual authority, for example in sexual life (1Cor. 7:4).²

Biblical subordination does not imply inferiority, however. It is only when it is taken from the modern model that people feel that it is out of favor. Wives and husbands are in this chapter in the same level concerning their relation to God, as Christ is submissive to the authority of His father (1Cor 15:28). This is undoubtedly a functional subordination without implying inferiority of being, or of less honor and glory. But has Scott reminds us, equality of worth is not identity of role³ God's abundant honor is set for the less honorable members according to Paul (1Cor 12:21-24). The extent of which woman have to submit is full, of course, as much as it is as the husband leadership is as of Christ. The very action for submitting to one another, for the wife, applies in her submission to her own husband, so in that role she is submitting directly to the Lord. Her first and foremost ministry is to give wholeheartedly to this task unto the Lord. Only the husband in v. 23 is acting into the likeness of the role with Christ, "for the husband is head of the wife as Christ is head of the Church." However, his headship is coined by a loving and giving self-life as Christ does for His Church (24-28).

2.3. 1Cor 11:1-17

In 1Cor 11:1-17 Paul places women submission at the core of creative motif of Genesis. The very ordering act of God is theologically significant for male headship and leadership in worship and ministry. In v. 7, Paul admonishes men not to cover their head, for they are the glory of God, whereas women is of the man; This is

¹Hendriksen and Kistemaker, *New Testament Commentary*, 7: 248.

²*Black's New Testament Commentary*, 257.

³'Equality of worth is not identity of role', J. H. Yoder, cited by Stott, 218.

because man is not at first from the woman, but the contrary (v. 8), and the very reason of the creation of Eve was because of satisfying the need of man (v. 9). Then Paul concludes the positive moral duty by *dia touto opheilei hê gunê exousian echein epi tês kephalês dia tous angelous*, "For this reason, a woman ought to have an *exousian* over her head because of the angels" (v. 10). This word has been understood variously, for example, it is taken to mean exercising power, probably a veil (Gingrich), a symbol of feminine dignity in presence of the angels¹ or as, Everling suggests the power exercised by woman through the veil to restrain demons. Werner Foester sees only one alternative, that, "the veil is a sign of woman's subordination to man, i.e., that man is the *kephalê de gunaikos*. For this there are rabbinic parallels which treat the veil as a sign of the married woman."² In this case, *dia tous angelous* refers to the angels as guardian angels or watchers over the natural order in worship.

The term *exousia* is used materially for the veil."² Although the Vulgate renders it as *potestatem*,³ which can be glossed as "power, rule, force; strength, ability; chance, or opportunity," many ancient versions and patristic witnesses such as to Iranaeus, the Latin Tertulian, Jerome and Augustine presumed the meaning of veil, for they read the word *kalumma* instead of *exousia*, which is clearly a substitution made in order to clarify the meaning, but it is doubtful that this is in fact Paul's intended meaning. There is no extent variation from the early manuscript as to this replacement. There is no doubt that Paul wrote effectively *exousia*.⁴ The Aramaic NT Peshitta explains the term with *shultana*, which means to have authority. Kittel believed once that is of the same consonant with

¹ H. J. Cadbury, "A Qumran Parallel to Paul," *Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958): 1-2.

² H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Munich: Beck, 1926-63), 3: 423-440; The point of the par. from b. Shabb., 156b adduced by Foerster, *op. cit.*, is that the covering of the head (by the man) denotes subjection to God, whereas the opposite implies rebellion and the rule of evil impulse. According to *Acts of Thomas*, 56, γυμνοκέφαλοι are shameless women.

³ Werner Foester, "*exousia*," *TDNT*, 2:574.

⁴ Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 496.

shalath, "to conceal" and *shalath*, "to rule" or "to have power," hence confused with "veil."¹

Nowadays, two views prevail: (1) *exousia* as sign or symbol of authority (NRSV, NAB, JB, ESV, NEB, REB) that is a veil taken as a symbol of authority above her, and (2) symbol or sign of subjection (French Bible of Jerusalem, Goodspeed; SEG and TOB have, "marque de l'autorité"). According to Fitzmyer, *exousia* is found 29 times in the NT with the meaning to "have the right to control or do something."² However, in conjunction with the verb *echein*, "to have," *exousia* appears 47 times in the NT with the meaning of (1) having something under subjection or control over it (cf. Matt 8:9; Luke 7:8; 19:17), (2) having power to do something (Matt 9:6; Mark 2:10; 3:15; Luke 5:24; 12:5; John 10:18; John 19:10; Acts 9:14); (3) doing things authoritatively (Matt 7:29; Mark 1:22).

The force of *dia touto opheilei hê gunê exousian echein epi tês kephalês dia tous angelous*, "therefore, the woman ought to have power/authority over her head because of the angels," should fit no. 1, for two reasons, first here the head is not metaphorical as in 11:3, because she is not head of anyone, and second Christ is head of the man, the man is the head of the woman, and God is the head of Christ never the reverse. Hence, the woman would have authority over her head in symbol that she is herself under another authority (eg., Jesus to God, the centurion to the higher official, Pilate to the emperor, John 19:10-11). For example Paul says, in 1 Cor 7:37, one can have power over his own will or the right to do things, such as to eat and take along a wife in missionary work (9:4).

A. Robertson and A. Plummer concur similarly when they suggest that in covering her head, she actively exercises control over it, "so as not to expose it to indignity." "If she unveils it, everyone has control over it and can gaze at her so as to put her out of countenance."³ The head covering is a sign of the power received from the Lord (v. 11) and of the dignity she has to worship and

¹Roger L. Omanson and Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual Commentary for the Needs of Translators* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), 1 Co 11:10.

²See Foester, "exousia," TDNT, 2:574 and A. Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971; repr. Missoula: Scholars, 1974); but now rejected by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible Commentary (AYBC) 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 416.

³Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 417.

praise God in the presence of the angels, as the Greek prepositional phrase that follows in this verse suggests.¹

The reason Paul gives is *dia tous angelous*, "because of the angels," maybe in this context is a call of *Imitatores* (11:1). The seraphim in presence of the Holy one covers themselves in subordinate stand before Him or maybe they were witnesses of the order of the creation as Paul puts it (vv. 8-15). Although, since Tertullian believes that angels in 1 Cor 11:10 refers to the "sons of God" as fallen angels,² angels might also be seen as spiritual authorities during Christians worship. This is still puts forward by modern commentators who at times understand *exousia* as "veil" in the sense of a "magic power or charm" to frighten away such beings, or a sign of modesty to conceal the woman's seductive charms from the angels.³

2.4. The Principle of Headship/Submission Applied to Headship Ministries

The advice goes like this: wives, children, and the servants concerning how they should obey in the family in relation with the husbands, parents, and masters, the text is not limited only to oriental families.⁴ Since the local Church can only be led if one is able to actively have a protective and caring leadership to his own house (1 Tim 3:5). Paul sees also the Church as an household, "but in case I am delayed, I write so that you may know how one ought to conduct himself in the household of God, which is the church

¹A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, International Critical Commentary (1914; reprint New York, NY: Scribner's Sons, 1975), 232; similarly D. R. Hall, "Problem of Authority," *Expository Times* 102 (1990-1991): 41-42; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, AYBC, 417.

²Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 417.

³Since Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* 7.2 (CCLat Corpus Christianorum, series latina 2.1216); Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* 7.2 (CCLat 2.1216); *Adv. Marcionem* 5.8.2 (CCLat Corpus Christianorum, series latina 1.685. As for Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on the Epistles, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna: 1866), 81:3122, he believed that the veil signifies power and the angels are bishops.

⁴Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 418; H. Balz and G. Schneider eds., *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990-93), 1:15.

of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth" (v. 15). This fact alone indicates as W. Michaelis holds the view that in Pauline writings "following the fatherly will ... recognition of authority ... obedience" exhaust the meaning of "imitating," and that therefore no Greek or Hellenistic notions of "imitation" must be taken into consideration when explaining Eph 5:1.¹ "Indeed it is probable that OT, rabbinic, and Gospel texts which speak of discipleship (viz. of *akolouthēō*, "to follow") can to a large extent explain the Pauline statements calling for imitation of Christ, of the apostle, or of both."² Thus, women have their referral of discipleship. While it is clear that women had significant leadership roles in the early Christianity, the household codes restrict this activity, not because the outsiders will not take offense, but because ecclesial office was gendered within the Church community.³

For example, women could have been in various roles model. However, even Priscilla who would have been more knowledgeable than her husband, she works under his shadow, Phoebe and the woman's of the deacons referred in 1 Tim 3:11 were having a supporting ministry exclusively. Phoebe is presented as *prostatis*, "a woman in a supportive role," "patron," or "benefactor" of many (Rom 16:2).⁴ Even if the evidences seems to point to Junia being a female, that would mean that both the husband, Andronicus and her were *epismoi*, "outstanding" or well "known" (adj. plural) among the apostles, not her alone being an apostle as in many wants to believe.⁵ The women of Philippi, Euodia and Syntyche are said to be as co-laborers, working together in a common cause with the apostle Peter (Phil 4:2-3), hence not alone as in the case of men, and women prophetesses carried out a work of exhortation under

¹Against Roy E. Gingrich, *The Book of Ephesians* (Memphis, TN: Riverside Printing, 1997), 39-40.

²W. Michaelis, "*mimetai*," *TDNT*, 4:659-674.

³Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 4-6*, AYBC 34A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 588.

⁴Against David L. Bach, "The Household Code," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genre*, ed. David E. Aune (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1988), 35.

⁵See Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frederick W. Danker, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. "προστάτις."

a Spirit-filled situation. At Caesarea, the four daughters of the evangelist were prophetess (Acts 21:8-9; Eph 4:11). The important things to note is that with women working with men, a *sun* - word is always present (*sunêthlêsan*, Phil 4:3; *sunergous*, Rom 16:3, 9).

This fellow working is a role of support or of help, even when men are in focus (Rom 16:21; 2Cor 1:24; 8:23; Phil 2:25; 1Tim 3:2; 3John 1:8). Equality does not imply sameness, as people want us to believe. The NT portrays different role, without being discriminatory. Women are not supposed to do everything men do since they do not have the same function. Women are more empowered when they play their God's given role rather than seeking to be like men in all aspect.

Paul puts the fall of Eve at the center of his understanding of women ministries in the Early Church. Women should have a limited and gendered role (Titus 2:1-5), but subservient during the distinction of prophetic message in the Church (1Cor 14:29-34). The reasons he uses to silent women in the Church are mainly based on the sequential order of God's creation (2 Tim 2:13; 1Cor 11:8; cf. Gen 22:7) and also on the basis of Eve deceitfulness (1Tim 2:14; 2Cor 11:3). The question would be whether this deceitfulness is part of women's character that "not only excludes them from leadership in the church" but also at home.¹

The text of Gal 3:28, the most often misquoted and misused by egalitarians never, in Paul theology erased the distinction of sex or nationality or social limitations. If it was so, the relation slave-master would have been expunged between believers. Paul never quotes this verse in his advice to Philemon about his escaped slave Onesimus. In addition, the differences of nations have been usually emphasized by Paul (Rom 11:1; 2Cor 11:2). Charles C. Ryrie is right when he says, "The 'no difference' between male and female means no difference in spiritual *privilege*, not spiritual activity. It does not mean that women should do men's jobs in the church any more than it means that men should do women's jobs in the home."² Christ's baptism breaks any distinction between races, gender, societies, and old spiritual status because all have free access to the Father through the Holy Spirit (see Col 3:11; Eph 2:8). Paul affirms clearly this in relation to the use of spiritual gifts, "For by one

¹Davidson, *The Flame of Yahweh*, 649; Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005); Rena Pederson, *The Lost Apostle: Searching for the Truth About Junia* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 203-218.

²Charles C. Ryrie, *Biblical Answers to Contemporary Issues* (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1991), 33.

Spirit we were all baptized into one body--whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free-- and have all been made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor 12:13). In Paul thinking, there are no more members insignificant, since all have access to the Spirit and are parts of God's free choice (1 Cor 12:23-27).

2.5. Supportive Ministries

Women ministry in the NT was mostly supportive and women had mostly supportive roles, from the inception of Jesus ministry. Only one has to recall the several women accompanying Jesus on His missionary journeys and supported him financially (Luke 8:1-3); Paul worked, as he mentions, some women who cooperate with genuineness as comrade sharing for the cause of the Gospel (Eph 4:3), however, Paul does not have in mind them being fellow worker (*sunergos*), because this is reserved only for male comrades (1Cor 3:9; 2Cor 1:24; Phil 2:25; 1Th 3:2; Phlm 1, 24) or a couple as Ananias and Saphira (Ro 16:3). What Paul has in mind then, is that women who devote themselves to good works such as bearing children, hospitable, washing the feet of the saints and helping the Church with what they have. In such line, we classify Tabitha, Lydia, and Phoebe (Acts 9:36; 16:14; Rom 16:2).

The contribution of women in the early Church should be regarded in this line, and due to the paucity of written documents, first we are unable to tell whether what has survived provides a fair and balanced picture on their contribution¹. Paul, as Jesus, did not take account of the cultural realities to instruct the people. Concerning, the marriage Jesus goes back to God's ideal found in Genesis (cf. Mat 19:4; Gen 1:27; 5:2). As does Paul when he foresees the relationship father-daughter and husband-wife in the fashion of the OT framework (Num 30:3-9), the daughters-wives would pass in two authorities, their father (single) and husband, whereas, when they are widow or divorced, they pass unto God's direct authority (Num 30:9; Lev 21:7; Luke 2:37; Rom 7:2). Arguments have been much read from the 21st century back to the Bible. For, even, the famous *diakonos*, which might as well designate a woman, until 100 A.D. A deacon was at the origin related with food that is "a table attendant" as even shown by the context of Acts

¹Ibid., 38.

(Acts 6).¹ Every person who would systematically render helpful service would enter in this category. There is no evidence that Phoebe's responsibilities were cultic or even we have cultic attendants as in the pagan world, although she is a member of the church of Chencrea (Rom 16:1-2).

Recent leadership controversies challenge the fact that although women had an important role in the Early Church, they rarely exercised a leadership role apart from their home circle. The old landmarks are challenged so as to understand *presbutidas* (Titus 2:3) elder and not as elder woman; however, in this case, one should also understand *presbutês* as in v. 2 such. Women ministered to Jesus mostly to support him in his ministry (Mark 15:41; Luk 10:39) and listened to His teaching meanwhile, in this article, I support the idea that women ministry is supportive under the authority of the father, husband and God.

While, personal ministry depended much on spiritual gifts, however, to be an elder would depend first on familial criteria (1Tim 3 and Titus 2:6-8). Ministry was gendered, and when women ministered out of the home, generally it was under the Husband supervision. Generally, Eph 5 has been read as up to v. 21, and then from v. 22, the paraenesis has seemed to jump from subject to subject but now we have a more systematic section centering on the behavior of those living in Christian households.²

The apostolic Church clearly included women in the office of deacon. Women in couple were allowed to work in the active teaching in private setting. Such is the case of Priscilla with her husband Aquilla in house teaching (eg., Acts 18:26). Women were among prophets either in foretelling the future (Acts 21:9; cf. 11:27), or in proclaiming the will of God, of course with a sign of submission on their head, in the Church (cf. 1Cor 11:5-6). Women were laborers actively in spreading the Gospel with Paul without necessarily a missionary teaching office. The only official role they had in the NT as far as the data are concerned is only found in *diakonos*. And because Paul arguments to refrain women as teachers

¹See Walter L. Liefeld, "Women and Evangelism in the Early Church," *The Study of Evangelism: Exploring a Missional Practice of the Church*, ed. Paul W. Chilcote and Lacey C. Warner (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 93-100.

²They would first be caring for temporal service, although deacons were seen active in others capacity such as evangelistic effort (Acts 6:8; 8:5-13, 26-40). Like elders, deacons were not selected based on the spiritual gifts, rather on the basis of moral, social and spiritual qualifications (1 Tim 3:8-13).

in Christian assembly are stemming from theological reading of the creation-fall in Genesis 2-3, thus, it does not stem from a prejudice or has a temporary character for early Christians due to the position of women in classical antiquity.

Phoebe, being active in the function of *diakonos* of the Church of Cenchrea (see the participle *ousan*, v. 1), her ministry is qualified of *prostatis*, and this goes beyond her readiness to support her Church, but also to Paul. The term is not used in its Greek traditional sense of leadership function, but refers rather to her supportive role as benefactor to care for the poor and the stranger. In fact, the term *prostatis* originally referred to a woman "who looks after the legal protection of strangers and freedmen."³

2.6. Women and the Home

Greek had an impact in Israelite society. With their interchange between Israel and Greece, as put forward in the books of Maccabees, women's life underwent great innovation. However, the impact of Hellenistic culture was more felt and conspicuous in the upper class,⁴ however, there were always powerful conservative and traditional forces in the Jewish society to resist to this cultural invasion.

In the light of What Paul wrote in the pastoral letters, a picture emerges. Women were respected according to the relationship they have with their husband, and or their father if they were single. And above all their best witness was their ministry of good deeds. That would then attest godly persons. In general, women are to concentrate on bearing children (1Tim 2:15; 5:14), which is for Paul the highest attainment and ministry of a woman, then they must be known to manage well their household (1 Tim 5:14; Titus 2:5), being submissive to their husbands (1Tim 2:11; Titus 2:5); and when they are widows, they might continue to minister to young girls to do the same (1Tim 5:9-10); some in the cultic context may be as wife of

³Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark International, 1998), 519.

⁴O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK 4 (Göttingen: n.p., 1978); B. Reicke, *TDNT*, 4:703; G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (Edinburgh: T. &T. Clark; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 88f.; Gerhard Lohfink, "Weibliche Diakonie in Neuen Testament," In *Die Frau im Urchristentum*, ed. by G. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein and K. Müller (Freiburg: Herder, 1983), 320-338. BAGD, s.v. "*prostatis*."

deacons serve also (1Tim 3:11), but they did not have the authority to teach when their husband were present (1Tim 2:12).

Although this seems sexist and unreasonable, this was the practice, unless they prophesied and prayed, this would also be done with symbols of their submission to their husband (1Cor 11:10). Paul letters presents continuity with the OT, where ministry was not only compartmented, but gendered; this seems the “divinely mandated gender roles,”¹ which are not isolated to consider them as socially bound, but timeless principles to follow even today. In fact, it seems that since Gen 3:16, women’s redemption continues to have a strong link with childbearing (1Tim 2:15).

In the fallen world, the presence of sin necessitates the submission of one part for a possible harmony. Men’s abuse caused women’s rebellion, and thus the blessedness of submission is totally missed. At the analysis of the event surrounding Gen 3, it becomes clear that as man’s representative played a secondary role in the deception through the serpent, under woman’s representative, then Eve, women representative would have a secondary and supportive role from the OT as in Christian’s leadership. Man dominion is God’s given plan, because the consequences of primeval sin had and continue to have far reaching impacts (Gen 3:16; Eph 5:22; 1Cor 11:3; 1Cor 14:34; Col 3:18).

The sentence of woman is part of the sphere she brought into the world with her husband. Jesus came specifically to redeem His people for their sins by granting repentance and forgiveness to Israel (Matt 1:21; Acts 5:31; John 1:29; Acts 13:38). This is the meaning of *wehû’ yimshal-bâk*, “he shall rule over you” (Gen 3:14). It is not on desiderative nuance as NET Bible suggests, “but he will want to dominate,” as if the Lord announces merely human struggles, but simply a sentence stemming from His own will. In this context where the *yiqtol* is not in the first position, it has a future indicative sense.² Modern women’s contention seems to re-enacts Eve’s recklessness as when she went out of her sphere in the presence of her husband, then sinned.³ The apostle Paul’s teaching in 1Cor 11 is that the woman’s spiritual equality with man

¹ Ant. 12:154-236; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 127-142.

² Mark Allan Powell, *Introducing the New Testament: A historical, Literary, and Theological Survey* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2009), 408-409.

³ See for eg., Duane A. Garret and Jason S. DeRouchie, *A Modern Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2009), 39-40.

does not in any way do away with the male headship and female subordination established at the creation (cf. 1Cor 11:12-13).

This is the stand of Ellen G. White, for while she was aware that women were growingly participating in public affairs, she advocated combination of talents in Gospel ministry between a wife and her husband working in teams (letter 231, 1899).¹ She believed that women have a work to perform for the Lord, which would not be belittled by men; however, this was only possible when the education of children was secured (see GW, 453). She defines women ministry as such,

A. M. Convington summarizes White understanding of woman's ministry as such,

A woman ministry – not an organized body of women preachers, but an organized service in which all good women might have part, She felt that a woman's holiest ministry is in the home, among her neighbors and friends as they come and go about her, and it was her aim that the great truths might be served with the dinner, fitted with dress pattern, bound in the same bundle with the common things about which women are wont to talk.²

In accord with Titus 2:3-5, Ellen White sees the works of women as carrying truth to families, when she says, "In many respects a woman can impart knowledge to her sisters that a man cannot."³ White without doubt, understood the role of women to be distinctive to her natural task, for it is where she can find "the most sacred, elevated office that she can fill."⁴ Her distinctive duties there may be summed up thus:

There is a work for women that is even more important and elevating than the duties of the king upon his throne. They may mold the minds of their children and shape their characters so that they may be useful in this world and that

¹Ellen G. White, *The Adventist Home* (Washington, DC: Ellen G. White Estate, 2011), 115.

²She also advocated women to run for political office on the platform of temperance, but not for other political causes. See Ellen G. White, "The Temperance in Battle Creek," *Review* (11 April 1882): 232; Idem., *Letter 118*, 1898.

³A. M. Covington, *They also Served* (Washington, D.C: Review and Herald, 1940), 177.

⁴Ellen G. White, *Evangelism* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1970), 493.

they may become sons and daughters of God. Their time should be considered too valuable to be passed in the ballroom or in needless labor. There is enough necessary and important labor in this world of need and suffering without wasting precious moments for ornamentation or display. Daughters of the heavenly King, members of the royal family, will feel a burden of responsibility to attain to a higher life, that they may be brought into close connection with heaven and work in unison with the Redeemer of the world . . . They will be in sympathy with Christ, and in their sphere, as they have ability and opportunity, will work to save perishing souls as Christ worked in His exalted sphere for the benefit of man." (3T 483-84.)

If we consider that "nature abhors a vacuum," when men are not doing their job, women would have the tendency to fill out the gap. If men were responding to God's call to lead His Church accordingly, women would not be out of place. The struggle we are testifying exists because male leadership is not assumed properly, or not at all. The pursuit of advantages and of men's interest does not allow a dynamic and spiritual leadership. If men knew Scripture and were eager to stand by it, this crisis would not exist and there would have enough leaders, male leaders in their proper role. This, in the opinion of the author is one the main solution to this crisis.¹

3. Priesthood of all believers

The implicit question that remains to be answered is whether the spiritual equality between Jew, Gentiles, men and women, slaves and masters in the body of Christ eradicated all social hierarchies and gender distinctions (cf. Gal 3:28; Eph 2:11-22)? This article answers that question with a resounding "No." It is misleading to use Gal 3:28 for debating women ordination. Galatians 3 discusses the access of the heritage promised to Abraham through Christ. The implications of such promises lead all the categories in the body of Christ to serve.

Therefore, implications of the priesthood of all believers in the New Testament Is that the Church is made up of both men and women, slaves and free, as chosen race. The priesthood in the NT is

¹Ellen G. White, *Messages to Young People* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1930), 326.

first an open access of both male and female to the father through the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is to say, that women are equally open to salvation as would be any other human. The priesthood of all believers is based on the indwelling of God's Spirit that women ought to submit in "all things" to the leadership of men (cf. Eph 5:15-24). Women service is indeed as important as male leadership, although it is mostly focusing on home building by essence.

The submission is an attitude of self-abandonment to the Lord first, in order to abandon her self-power to her own husband. Although women have to be home builders where their responsibility to bear children is "paramount to everything else," they shall not take it as excuse to do something in the work of God.¹

In the OT, the priesthood was a function and duty of priests anointed to minister to the Lord through the generation (cf. 29:9; 4:15; Num 3:10; 1Sam 2:36). The Levites were then chosen for the service of the tabernacles as priest (Num 16:9-10; Jos 18:7). Apart from their service of the tabernacle in ceremonial service, they would also have a spiritual duty to make atonements and expiations (Num 18:1,2,5,7).

It is in that role of the Aaronic priesthood, which was accomplished in offering of incense-intercessory before God on behalf of people, that the New Testament's priesthood re-enacts the OT's counterpart. When the temple was still in function, the priesthood was still limited to the formal priests (Luke 1:9; cf. Heb 7:5). Later by the death of Christ, a new order and renewed law brought a new priesthood (cf. Heb 7:11-14). It is the unchangeable "spiritual sacrifice" welcomed by the Lord. This duty is assumed only by those who are filled by God's Spirit (cf. 1Cor 2:13; 1Peter 2:5). This priesthood mostly fosters holiness or moral excellence virtue that makes known the redeemer (1 Pet 2:9). In other terms, NT's priesthood refers to *euangelizesthai*, "proclamation" of Christ as Savior and redeemer.

4. Theology of Submission in the NT

The common use of the verb *hupotagê* coupled with a form of adjective *pas* indicates how this theme holds an important place in early Church. The middle seems to denote enforced submission (cf. Luk 10:17,20), but elsewhere voluntary submission should be

¹See also Ryrie, *Biblical Answers*, 42.

understood. *Hupotagê* appears in hortatory request to submit to God or Church discipline (cf. James 4:7; Heb 12:9).

Like the subjection of children to their parents was exemplified by Jesus himself to Joseph and Mary (Luke 2:51), the divine order is also requested to every level of authority: wives to husband (Col 3:18; Eph 5:21-32; 1Pet 3:1; 1Tim 2:5) and to other level of social relationship.

God divinely appointed social authorities serving His purpose to reward and punish evil, hence Christian should submit to them (Rom 13:1-5; cf. Tit 3:1; 1Pet 2:13-14; Mark 12:17); so if divine ordination is acknowledged to earthly institution, then all people owe subjection to it.

Even when it is not a divine reality as slavery but as consequence of human sinful nature and that Christianity are no social reformers, slaves should subject to their master. Although it was recognized by God as a yoke (1Tim 6:1-2; Tit 2:9), for the sake of peace slaves should honor their masters (1 Peter 2:13,18; Phlm 16). Even younger were asked to submit to the elderly so as to avoid the sin of being proud (cf. 1 Pet 5:5). Demands for general humility witnessed to unbelievers. Hence, Christians have different level of submission not for their force, but for the sake and the force of the Lord.

Exhortation in the NT for submission calls to readiness to avoid to resist to evil (Matt 5:39) and to renounce one's own will for others; however, this aspect as his basis in Christ. He himself shall be subject unto God who put "all things under him, that God may all in all" (1Cor 15:28). As children were called in subjection at home, women were supposed to be fully submissive to their husband in the Church gatherings (1Tim 3:4; 1Tim 2:11).

However, in the history, the voice of women started to be heard. Feminism as many other -ism rises from the dust of men abuses.¹ Even so, is the Patriarchal mistake, which is the power relations in which "women's interests are subordinated to the interest of men."² This parody of biblical given order is at best inaccurate. Biblical headship rests not on social given, biological or even sexual difference. It is a great glory for women to submit to their husband because of the Lord. Women always played an important role in religious ministries by participating in couple

¹Ellen G. White, *Welfare Ministry* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1952), 158, 165.

²I recommend this colorful introduction by Cathia Jenainati and Judy Groves, *Introducing Feminism* (Cambridge: Totem Books, 2007).

in missionary works, prophesying, benevolence (e.g., Dorcas Acts 9:36; 1 Tim 2:10); however, these seemingly lowly positions they held were considered prominent in the sight of the Lord, for they were as important as were the work of a pastor-elder. Hence, serving as a woman is not a villainous slavery, it is true liberty. All, women, wives, servants or even apostles are in the service of God by obeying to the injunctions of submissiveness.

This paper takes a similar position of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1721-78), that in the marriage, women could only occupy a subordinate role as companions to their husbands when it comes to general leadership and ministries. However, as Jesus himself occupied a subordinate position without being unworthy of the divine existence, women deserve much care and interest. Feminism is right in what they claimed to their husbands, but wrongs by severing themselves to their husbands. Feminism as philosophy proves just that men failed to care and love their mate as Jesus Loves His Church. Women must have right and can partake of their own decisions and develop their giving gift. Biblical headship is based on one commitment to the Lord.

Biblical ministry is gendered at the risk to be considered as mannish in essence, although the strong maternal ministry is emphasized. Women can achieve much in social world, but must be careful to not be lost in the process, ministry in the NT should first stems from the domestic sphere; and care have to be taken that women do not sacrifice this on another altar.

Actually, women's ministry's view is against Simone de Beauvoir when she sees that women construct their sense of self in relation to something that is not their "self," except through Jesus Christ. Women, in working otherwise renounce to their godly spiritual identity.

In the second wave of feminism, there comes a development of feminist mystique, which rejects womanhood as defined against the male counterpart, but fulfilled only in sexual activity, women dominion and singleness. Biblical ministries do not undermine marriage or motherhood before anything else. If women wish to be spiritually normal, they would always look carefully at that aspect. The door of feminist mystique might entrap many as well today. Women since Gen 3 are mainly defined solely in relation to men as daughter, sister, wives, mothers and home main builders. Core of women's personhood is fulfilled through the fullness of God's Spirit and the loving and care of their male counterpart.

This paper argued for the importance of maintaining difference between men and women in ministry. And this need to emphasize a recognized fundamental difference will help appreciate women's multiple possibilities not subjectivities. The Bible still protects against the gynocriticism, since the world created with the absence of true motherhood is not desirable in term of education.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, authority over someone is not a bad thing *per se*, although authoritarianism is abusive, since God give and expects the first. The Early Church integrated without discontinuation the life and mode or relationship of the OT; they did not have a mere individualistic understanding whereby women would stand-alone. The contribution of women likewise was not detached phenomena, but a major part of the community life and ministry in the Church not apart from the family circle. Any understanding that is not taking into this context runs the risk to make a twist to the biblical text and its understanding. Women have to submit to their husband when they also submit to the Lord, for it will be not advocating a unilateral wife submission to husband's authority. Paul's advice, "submit to one another" is addressed to three categories within the body of Christ: that wives are to be subject to their own husbands (Eph. 5:22-23), children are to be subject to their parents (Eph. 6:1-3), and slaves (or bondservants) are to be subject to their masters (Eph. 6:5-8). There is not place in Eph 5 for mutual submission as modern eyes wants it, for the relation is never inverted for each category. This indicates a person submissive and another being in position of authority. Although the woman places willingly in this position as to the Lord; the children and the slaves are *de facto* in that position of submission.

However, the motive of submission is seen under the life of Spirit-filled person, which allows first the wife's relationship with the Lord—wives, submit to your own husband as to the Lord, so as their submissiveness is as if the husband was a test of Christ obedience. The Ephesian's submission is regulated by divine parameter of Christ's relationship to the Church, not by social or patriarchal rules. The one in authority as the one whom submission is requested must find the pattern in Christ.

The husband's authority and woman's complete submission are not regulated by human conducts of dictatorship, but by Christ

through his Spirit. Therefore, this paper understands that as God has put *kephalên huper panta tê ekklêsia*, "[Christ as] the head over all things to the Church" (1:22), as the same women have the privilege also to "submit to their own husband in all things" (*houtôs kai hai gunaikes tois andrasin en panti*, 5:24b). Both the husband and the wife realize in their relationship the mystery of Christ and His Church. The principle of headship submission reaffirms the curse given by God between Adam and Eve in Gen 3:15 and not to the original plan before the fall. And wives by accepting God's test demonstrate of the Spirit filled life.

If in worship, as Paul puts it, women are under the head of their husband, so as to allow woman to exercise the authority over her own head in the context of worship, it means that some kind of differences must exist even in the ministry of God. That's why, women stand, in the ministry apart from their circle of influence, under the shadow of their male heads. Woman's ministry must keep with this sense of subjection to her direct authority (father or husband). It induces the woman to be humble and preserve the order she brought through our mother of us all that is Eve. She must dwell in the church of God in self-obedience as a test of her own salvation.

The subordination of a woman to her husband is not forced or based on inferiority of being, since Christ would also be seen as inferior in divinity to the Father, but rather a self choice to stay in this situation in the mission of redeeming mankind. As the Father and Christ are interdepend, as well are the woman to her husband (cf. 1Cor 11:11-12). The ministry of women have to be define by their relationship to men. As Christ submit himself to the Father because of the redemption of mankind, women have to put themselves in subjection because of the original sin. Therefore, there is contradiction of being equal but having different functions.

Therefore, ministries limited to male headship are still truthful as they were in the time of Paul and the Church needs to remember that it is only by accepting theological liberalism, universalism that the endorsement of such practice as women holding male position and fighting for ordination is possible. And while gifts of the Spirit are the basis for ministry, male headship does not depend on spiritual gifts, rather on his abilities to direct his own home (cf. 1Tim 3).