

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php



BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

MARCH-APRIL 1986

Vol. 9, No. 4

\$3.50

EDITOR

Vernon C. Grounds

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR

William Mangrum

ADVISORY EDITORS

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College

Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

Mark Lau Branson, Fellowship Bible Institute

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*

Fuller Theological Seminary

Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*

Claremont McKenna College

Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*

Northern Baptist Theological Seminary

Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*

Denver Seminary

Scot McKnight, *New Testament*

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary

Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*

UMC Board of Discipleship

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

Keith Bolton

Fuller Theological Seminary

Luis Cortes

Philadelphia Baptist Association

Thomas F. Stransky

Mt. Paul Novitiate

Sze-kar Wan

Harvard University

FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS

Bernard Adeney

New College, Berkeley

Donald Bloesch

University of Dubuque

Geoffrey W. Bromiley

Theological Seminary
Fuller Theological Seminary

Richard Bube

Stanford University

Harvie M. Conn

Westminster Theological Seminary

Charles Ellenbaum

College of DuPage

Vernard Eller

University of LaVerne

Elouise Renich Fraser

Eastern Baptist

David Gill

Theological Seminary
New College, Berkeley

Larry Hurtado

University of Manitoba

Susanne Johnson

Perkins School of Theology

Richard Mouw

Fuller Theological Seminary

Richard Lovelace

Gordon-Conwell

PHEME PERKINS

Theological Seminary
Boston College

Bernard Ramm

American Baptist

Gerald Sheppard

Seminary of the West
Union Theological Seminary

Charles R. Taber

Emmanuel School

Keith Yandell

of Religion
University of Wisconsin

Introducing This Issue

Vernon Grounds

2

Faith For Failure: A Meditation on Motivation For Ministry

Vernon Grounds

3

Whitefield and Wesley on Righteousness by Grace

Timothy L. Smith

5

Reflections on *The Scripture Principle*

Clark H. Pinnock

8

Get Rid of The Lust in Your Life

Paul A. Mickey

11

The Resurrection of Jesus as Hermeneutical Criterion (Part II):

A Case For Sexual Parity in Pastoral Ministry

Ray S. Anderson

15

A Response To Anderson (I)

Berkeley Mickelsen

20

A Response To Anderson (II)

Gerald T. Sheppard

21

A Response To Mickelsen and Sheppard

Ray S. Anderson

22

Book Reviews and Comments

(Itemized on Back Cover)

23

on the Mount: "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart."

Some argue, of course, that extramarital "love," for them, had nothing to do with lust. They say it was a romantic impulse, completely unplanned. I say, Hogwash! I've found that in almost every case there's a period of preparation and an increasing level of lustful fantasizing before an actual affair. So stop the process before it even gets started! Recognize those sexual fantasies for what they are: the first rituals in an increasingly powerful movement toward infidelities that could leave your marriage in shambles.

Of course, it's not always so easy to change the direction of your fantasies and to head off an impulse toward infidelity. Lust is a powerful force that is rooted deeply in our selfish, rebellious nature. Indeed, the basic difference between lust and love seems to be that the first is self-directed while the second is other-directed.

So I know it would be wonderful if I could tell you that the lust in your life will evaporate into thin air, never to haunt you again, if you just take a few simple steps to get rid of it. And sometimes, through a powerful personal experience with God, this may indeed happen.

But more often, the lust gets eliminated through what the Bible calls a process of sanctification—or being made holier and purer as you draw closer to God. In other words, what

we're talking about here doesn't usually involve quick-fix solutions. Old, pleasurable habits die hard. There may even be withdrawal pains.

But if you seek help from your spouse in opposing your fantasies—or from some other confidant if you feel it would be hurtful to discuss some matters with your spouse—your chances for success will be greatly enhanced. And if you can also bring God, through prayer, into the process of changing and uprooting those destructive lusts, that's even better. I can tell you from my own experience that with you, your spouse, and God working together, you'll virtually assure your chances of success in observing this seventh commandment.

TSF AND ESA JOINT-SEMINARS

TSF and Evangelicals for Social Action (of which Dr. Grounds is president) are planning seminars at theological and graduate schools across the country. These seminars will present the Biblical/theological bases for political involvement and address the difficulties in motivating Christians to become more aware and to participate more actively in community and national affairs. Effective working models will also be presented. For more information concerning these seminars, write to Dr. Grounds in care of the *Bulletin*.

The Resurrection of Jesus as Hermeneutical Criterion (Part II): A Case for Sexual Parity in Pastoral Ministry

by Ray S. Anderson

Can we say that Jesus not only is the living Word who inspires the words and teaching of the New Testament and thus insures its trustworthiness, but that he is also a contemporary reader and interpreter of Scripture? We answered this question in the affirmative in the last issue, and argued the following thesis: *the resurrection of Jesus to be the living Lord of the church constitutes a continuing hermeneutical criterion for the church's understanding of itself as under the authority of Scripture.*

We saw that the resurrection of Jesus served as a criterion by which the early church determined questions of apostolic authority, the experience of salvation, and the "rule of faith." We also suggested that the risen Lord continues to serve as a criterion for interpreting the purpose of Scripture in the contemporary church. Where there is a tension within Scripture between the "now" and the "not yet," we argued that a proper interpretation of Scriptural authority as a rule of faith must take into account the presence and work of the risen Christ within his church. This is not an appeal to experience over and against the authority of Scripture. Rather, this is a recognition that Jesus himself continues to be the hermeneutical criterion by which the authority of Scripture is preserved in its application to a concrete and present situation.

The purpose of this article is to apply this thesis in one

specific area of concern for the contemporary church: the role of women in pastoral ministry.

In choosing the case of sexual parity in pastoral ministry for the purpose of working through an application of our thesis, I am well aware that this is one of the most complex and vital issues facing the church today. There are, of course, many facets of the issue, not least of which is the issue of a critical exegesis of the primary New Testament texts which deal with the role of women in society, marriage, and the church. There is no way to review the extensive exegetical and theological literature which has recently emerged concerning this question in the short space of this article.¹

What is clear is that while the New Testament speaks with an emphatic voice concerning a restriction upon the role of women in certain teaching and ministry situations, in other situations the emphasis is as clearly on the side of full participation and full parity. One only has to compare the insistent commands issued by the Apostle Paul that women be "silent in the churches" and "not be permitted to teach or to have authority over a man" (1 Cor. 14:34; 1 Tim. 2:11), with the rather matter-of-fact instruction that a woman who prophesies (in public worship) should keep her head covered (1 Cor. 11:4). Even more significant is the same Apostle's practice of identifying women as co-workers [*synergoi*] along with men (Phil. 4:2-3), and his commendation of Phoebe in the church at Rome as a "deaconess," which is a dubious translation in the RSV of the masculine noun *diakonos* (Rom. 16:1-2). Paul goes on to describe Phoebe as his "helper" (RSV), which again

Ray S. Anderson is Professor of Theology and Ministry at Fuller Theological Seminary.

is a weak translation of *prostatis*, which is a noun form of the verb used in 1 Tim. 3:5 which designates a leadership activity, or of "managing" one's household.² The Apostle's overt recognition of the role of women serving as co-workers alongside other apostles is worthy of note. There is a strong possibility, according to many scholars, that the Junias mentioned along with Andronicus as being "among the apostles" was actually a woman—Junia (Rom. 16:7).³ "Only an extraordinary Biblical assumption that a woman could not be an apostle keeps most commentators from reading Junias as Junia," says Don Williams. Williams goes on to cite the church father Chrysostom as saying, "And indeed to be Apostles at all is a great thing . . . Oh! How great is the devotion of this woman, that she should be even counted worthy of the appellation of Apostle!"⁴

The point is this: with recent scholarship demonstrating that the New Testament evidence is not unanimous as to a teaching which would forbid women to exercise pastoral leadership and ministry in the church, the issue cannot be settled on textual exegesis alone. When all the exegesis is done, a decision still must be made as to which set of texts demand priority or serve as a normative criterion for determining the role of women in the church.⁵

It is in cases like this that the resurrected Jesus as the living Lord of the church can serve as a hermeneutical criterion. For surely he knows what his will is for the church in the particular

Can there be parity between men and women in pastoral ministry? Only if the Lord himself intends that there shall be and only if he acts within his church to distribute the gift of pastoral ministry to women and men alike.

For some of us, at least, it has become imperative to recognize, and not deny, that the Lord is calling forth women within his church to receive and exercise the gift of pastoral ministry as a full share of Christ's own ministry. To deny this, for some of us, would be to deny that the Lord, through his Spirit, has so acted. To refuse to ordain women to pastoral ministry would be to refuse to recognize the freedom of the Lord as manifested through his work of calling, gifting, and blessing the ministry of women in the church today. It is Christ himself who is at work in this continuing ministry, as T. F. Torrance reminds us:

Not only did he pour out his Spirit upon the Apostles inspiring them for their special task, and not only did he pour out his Spirit in a decisive and once for all way, at Pentecost, constituting the people of God into the New Testament Church which is the Body of Christ, but within that Church and its Communion of the Spirit he continues to pour out special gifts for ministry, with the promise that as the Gospel is proclaimed in his Name he will work with the Church confirming their ministry of Christ to others as his own and making it the ministry of himself to mankind.⁶

In choosing the case of sexual parity in pastoral ministry for the purpose of working through an application of our thesis, I am well aware that this is one of the most complex and vital issues facing the church today.

situation of the contemporary church. And there are many of us who feel that he has already shown us what his will is by calling and anointing women for pastoral ministry in full parity with men.

The situation is not unlike that which confronted Peter. On the one hand he had the Old Testament teaching that God's gracious election was restricted to the Jews and that the Gentiles were excluded. On the other hand, he had the teaching of the Lord himself that pointed toward offering Cornelius and his household full parity in the gospel. The issue was decided for him when the Spirit fell upon the assembled people while he was yet speaking. "Can anyone forbid water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?" he exclaimed (Acts 10:47).

Can the church today recognize and affirm female members as having the same calling and gift of pastoral ministry as male members, without being disobedient to the Lord's teaching in Scripture? Or perhaps we should formulate the question as a paraphrase of Peter's rhetorical remark: "Can anyone forbid ordination for those women who give evidence of being called forth and gifted for pastoral ministry in the church?"

If Christ is at work through his Holy Spirit setting apart women for pastoral ministry with the evident blessing of God in their ministries, then there will be full sexual parity in pastoral ministry.

By pastoral ministry we mean all that a person assumes when receiving the gift and calling of ordained ministry within the church, by whatever form of polity it is recognized. By parity we mean a full share in pastoral ministry. This, of course, entails equality; but parity implies a full share in that which is distributed by Christ, while equality tends to focus first of all on rights, power, and privilege.

In taking this position we are not unmindful of the objections which are raised.⁷ There is the objection based on precedent. Jesus himself was male, and all of his disciples were male. We have already seen how this objection loses its power based on the resurrection of Jesus as a hermeneutical criterion. The criterion of maleness, as the criterion of Jewishness and the criterion of circumcision, came to an end with the crucifixion of the Jewish, circumcised male named Jesus of Nazareth. No longer can the non-Jewish, the uncircumcised, and the female members of the believing community of faith be systematically discriminated against. We are not surprised to discover that the early New Testament church carried forward these criteria as part of its tradition. The new wine was put into old wineskins with predictable tensions and torments (Matt. 9:17). What is surprising is to discover that even here there are evidences of an incipient recognition of the hermeneutical criterion of the resurrection with regard to the role and status of women in the church.⁸ We have made reference above to the recognition the Apostle Paul gave to women as co-workers with the apostles, and not merely followers.

There is the objection that argues from church history. From the early church "fathers" through the medieval period, and even forward through the Reformation into modern church history, has the church ever officially recognized and affirmed the full parity of women in the pastoral office? As a rule, the answer is no, even allowing for some exceptions. It should be noted, however, that Dean Alford records the interesting fact that "women sat unveiled in the assemblies in a separate place, by the presbyters, and were ordained by the laying on of hands until the Church Council of Laodicea forbade it in 363 A.D.—three hundred years after Paul had written the Epistle to the Corinthians."⁹

But here too we have seen that historical precedent cannot be a determinative criterion for validating the present and future work of Christ. For he, as the living Lord, is the one who is the criterion himself. We have argued that the resurrection of Jesus and his already-present eschatological power in the church is the criterion for interpreting the command of the Lord. If this is true, does not the new work of Christ in the church today really suggest that Christ is continuing to give gifts to his church and prepare it for his own coming?

Ought we not at least have a sense of fear and trembling about such a possibility instead of appearing to be "dead certain" when we may really be "dead wrong"?

to the side of Paul's specific pastoral injunctions as the criterion, then one will conclude that the Galatians text does not in fact have a bearing upon the role of women in ministry, only to their full equality as children of Abraham. On the other hand, if one leans to the side of the Galatians text as a "Magna Charta" of women's liberation, then the teaching of Paul in the specific situation cannot be a criterion as a command of God. Willard Swartley says, "In Paul's writings we find texts which give different signals. Some appear to prescribe specific roles for men and women; others appear to grant freedom from these roles."¹²

I realize that not all will agree that there appear to be

While the New Testament speaks with an emphatic voice concerning a restriction upon the role of women in certain teaching and ministry situations, in other situations the emphasis is clearly on the side of full participation and full parity.

For many serious Christians the foremost objection to the ordination of women is based upon an argument from certain scriptural texts. We have already cited some of these above. In 1 Timothy 2:8-15, Paul sets forth what he considers to be appropriate behavior for men who pray and for women who practice piety. In this context he addresses a specific charge: "I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent" (v. 12).

Earlier, in 1 Corinthians 14:34-36, he said much the same to the Corinthian church, adding that not only is it a shame for women to speak in church, but they are to be subordinate (presumably to their husbands). In chapter 11 of this same letter, again in the context of public prayer, he states that the head of a woman is her husband, the head of a man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God (vv. 3-5).

Only a casual survey of recent literature dealing with these texts would be necessary to convince a reader that no amount of exegetical cunning can rescue Paul in these cases from the appearance that he taught in certain circumstances that women should not have full parity in ministry with men.¹⁰ What is not as clear is what Paul's teaching and practice is universally, without regard to the capacity of the particular situation to bear responsibly the full measure of Christ's gift of freedom. It is well known that in the Corinthian society of Paul's day, women were suspected of being immoral when not abiding by the local customs regarding manner of dress and behavior. For this reason, Paul seems to have accommodated his pastoral teaching to this cultural factor in addressing some problems in the Corinthian church. While Paul clearly held that women were equal to men, and had the freedom to minister along with the apostles, he nevertheless urged the Christian women in Corinth to abide by the local custom concerning the style of their hair. The freedom of women in Christ apparently did not give them license to act in such a way that they would be viewed as "immoral" (cf. 1 Cor. 11:4-16).¹¹

Yet when it comes to the churches of Macedonia and the church at Rome, Paul is not only silent concerning the need for women to be silent but actually encourages and recognizes the role of prominent women, such as Lydia, Euodia, Syntyche, and Phoebe. Beyond this argument from these "descriptive" texts, there is the normative text in Galatians 3:28 where Paul explicitly states that "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

Here again, if we approach the texts without regard to the historical situation, we create a textual "stand-off." If one leans

unresolved differences between certain scriptural texts relating to the role of women in the church. Some will argue that these are only "apparent" differences, and that Scripture speaks with "one voice" in all matters because that is the nature of Scripture as the Word of God. It is true that Scripture testifies to its own intrinsic *unity*. But if this unity becomes a "principle of harmonization" of texts, this imposes a criterion of consistency on the exegetical and hermeneutical task which serves more as an *a priori* principle than a theological insight. After all, the phenomena of Scripture in its own cultural, historical, and literary context constitute the primary source for our doctrine of Scripture, not the reverse. One aspect of the phenomena of Scripture, surely, is the freedom of the Word of God in its specific and concrete variety of expression and application to communicate authoritatively and infallibly the truth of God to us.

For this reason, we do not feel that the freedom of an author of Scripture, say, the Apostle Paul, to express the command of God in ways which are quite different in specific situations contradicts the essential unity and consistency of the Word of God itself. What does contradict the Word of God, in my judgment, is to force it into a logical straitjacket of conformity to a principle of consistency. In this case, the criterion has shifted from the Word of God itself to a hermeneutical principle which controls the exegetical task. In our case, we argue that it is the resurrected Lord himself who is the criterion of continuity and consistency in the freedom of his own self-witness to the truth of God.

If one takes Paul's various statements on the role and status of women in the church in a way which abstracts them from the historical context in which they are uttered, a kind of "textual standoff" will occur, as we have said above. This can then compel the interpreter to attempt a kind of Hegelian synthesis through an exegetical exercise by which thesis and antithesis are resolved through a "higher principle." But this approach tends to dissolve particular texts of their full weight for the sake of a theological principle which becomes the criterion.

This can work two ways. One could take the position that Paul's christological statement in Galatians 3:28 concerning the status of male and female in Christ has a theological priority over his occasional teaching in 1 Timothy 2, where he forbids women to exercise the role of teaching or having authority over men. The theological principle of "equality in Christ" thus becomes the criterion by which one text is played off against another for the sake of resolving the apparent con-

tradition. This approach obviously makes the apostolic teaching to Timothy of dubious quality with regard to its being the Word of God for the church. In the end, one will wonder whether or not Timothy should have followed Paul's instructions if he applied the theological principle of equality as Paul himself taught in his letter to the Galatian church.

One can also see this same tendency to synthesize contrasting texts in the attempt to harmonize Paul's teaching in Galatians 3 with 1 Timothy 2 by interpreting the Galatians 3:28 passage as referring only to the spiritual unity and equality between male and female in Christ, and not as an attempt to eliminate these distinctives as role functions in the church. This approach succeeds in resolving the apparent impasse in interpreting the Pauline texts regarding the role of women through an exegetical surgery whereby the spiritual benefits of being in Christ are excised from the role functions of serving Christ in the church. Gender identity coupled with physical sex differentiation becomes the criterion for ministry. Male and female continue to operate as criteria outside of the benefits of Christ. Nature determines the extent to which grace can go in bringing the benefits of Christ into the historical and temporal order. In this case, the synthesis has been at the expense of the full weight of the Galatians text as a christological basis for the order of the church's ministry.

the Judaizers sought to invoke circumcision as a criterion and a formal principle by which Gentile Christians were not given full parity in the church, Paul rebuked them vehemently (cf. Galatians 1-2).

Certainly it is true that the Bible is normative and infallible in that it is the Word of God. The Bible teaches many principles which are helpful and instructive for Christian faith and practice. The problem comes when any principle is made into a normative criterion and imposed as a rule or law which excludes the Spirit of Christ as the criterion which upholds the normative teaching of the Scriptures.

Can a Scripture text remain intact as an inspired word of God when a *principle abstracted* from that specific command no longer serves as a normative rule in the church? I believe that it can and does. The "law of circumcision" was replaced by the "law of the Spirit of Christ" as the absolute criterion. To insist that circumcision as a principle or law defines the status of human persons before God is to deny the work of Christ who broke down that barrier and gave full parity to Gentiles along with Jews (cf. Eph. 2:11-22). Yet, this does not destroy the validity and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures as the Word of God; for these Scriptures served as the revelation of God to the people of their time, and so to us, because they point to Christ, as Jesus himself testified (John

When we allow that the resurrection of Jesus is a hermeneutical criterion (not the only one, but the supreme one), Scripture can be interpreted fairly and the word of God which Scripture proclaims and is, can be experienced freely.

Let us assume, for the moment, that what Paul meant for his readers to understand in the above texts was exactly what he wrote, in the context of their own time and place. Rather than attempting to fuse the horizon of these texts with a contemporary horizon and so interpret them in a way which renders their meaning more congenial to our modern views of egalitarianism, suppose we let them stand as the command of the Lord to the churches to which they are addressed.¹³ What do we then have?

The church in Corinth has an apostolic command which is equivalent to the command of the Lord himself. Timothy has an apostolic command which is also tantamount to the word of the Lord. But what must be remembered is that the *command* of the risen Lord through the apostle, expressed in the form of a pastoral rule, does not automatically become a *criterion* which can be used independently of the authority of the Lord himself. That is to say, it is the Lord himself who is the head of the body. He is the criterion by which the church as the body of Christ defines its existence and seeks its true order. The command of the Lord comes as a specific command in the particular situation in which the church exists and is meant to teach the church how to exemplify Christ in its present state and how to grow up into Christ in all things (cf. Eph. 4:1-15). The "elementary doctrine of Christ" which the author of Hebrews suggests should be left behind for the sake of going on to maturity, is also a command of God in its own time (Heb. 6:1).

This same relationship between a specific rule and the command of God was made quite clear in our earlier examination of the way in which the resurrection of Jesus served as a hermeneutical criterion to interpret the teaching concerning the "everlasting" covenant sign of circumcision. The Old Testament law concerning circumcision was the command of God for Abraham, and remains the inspired Word of God, but not the criterion for determining salvation as relation to God. When

5:45-47).

In somewhat the same way, I am suggesting that those who feel it necessary to deny the very possibility (if not also the actuality) that Christ has distributed the gift of pastoral ministry to women as well as to men in his church, will be forced to make out of one group of texts an absolute criterion which excludes women from pastoral ministry. This will have the effect of forcing other texts which describe full parity for women to be concealed or suppressed. Even more serious, it will create a law which restricts Christ from exercising that freedom here and now. In a sense this fuses the horizon of the present church to the horizon of the early church and results in a hermeneutical criterion which gives primacy to the letter rather than the spirit, to law rather than grace, and to the past rather than to the future.

I think that I can understand why some would want to do this. For I too do not wish to sacrifice the authority of the inspired text to cultural relativism and "prevailing winds of doctrine." I suspect that those who feel it necessary to deny the possibility of Christ's contemporary gift of pastoral ministry to women do so because they see this as the only alternative to an approach to certain texts of Scripture which appears to relativize the text to contemporary cultural values or ideological convictions.

It is the purpose of this article to suggest that these are not the only two alternatives. One does not have to (and ought not) make out of an inspired text of Scripture a universal and everlasting law of the church which deprives half the members of the church from full parity in the gift and calling of pastoral ministry. Nor does one have to (and ought not) use as a hermeneutical criterion the prevailing impulses and ideological currents for the sake of making Scripture meaningful or acceptable to the present age.

When we allow that the resurrection of Jesus is a hermeneutical criterion (not the only one, but the supreme one),

Scripture can be interpreted fairly and the Word of God which Scripture proclaims and is, can be experienced freely. It is the task of biblical exegesis to assist us in determining as closely as possible what the exact meaning of the text is with respect to the single intention of the author. Critical methods of textual study as well as basic principles of exegesis must be employed so the text can speak for itself and have its own "distance" from the interpreter. In teaching and preaching these texts, as we have referred to above, one can show that the texts say what they were intended to say by the author. However, if doctrines or principles are abstracted from these texts and applied to the church and the life of faith as the command of God for today, without regard to the work of God in the church today, the resurrection no longer serves as a hermeneutical criterion. This separates the word of God from the work of God, a practice against which the Apostle Paul warned in his letter to the Roman church (14:20).

In teaching and preaching the scriptural texts, there is also

and female as created in the image of God, there is no thought of suggesting that the Spirit of Jesus as manifest in the church will lead to re-interpretation of the clear scriptural teaching. The resurrection of Jesus as hermeneutical criterion is a criterion which must be used to judge critically all contemporary claims for a "new moral order" for human relations, as well as a criterion to interpret critically and responsibly the Scriptures as an infallible guide to glorifying God in Christ, through a life of Christian faith and love.

The issue of the role of women in pastoral ministry is not an issue which strikes at the heart of a biblically based moral and spiritual order. Nor does this issue violate a fundamental natural order of creation, as Stephen Clark suggests in his book *Man and Woman in Christ*. To argue, as Clark does, that the subordination of female to male is "created into the human race," is of such dubious exegetical worth that it can only be accounted for by a theological predisposition to subordinate grace to nature.¹⁵

Every reading of Scripture is already an interpretation of Scripture. And the inability to interpret Scripture as the Word of God which seeks to accomplish our salvation and freedom in Christ, is already a reading of Scripture which has failed.

a pastoral hermeneutic which must be joined with textual exegesis in order to be faithful to Christ as the living Word. This is what Willard Swartley seems to mean when he calls biblical interpretation a "co-creative event," and goes on to say:

The task is not merely applying a learning to a given situation. To be sure, it includes that but it involves much more; the interpretive event co-creates a new human being, a new history, and a culture.¹⁴

It must be made absolutely clear that what we are suggesting here as an argument for the freedom of the church to recognize and affirm full parity for women in pastoral ministry does not give permission to set aside the normative role of the Bible in favor of some contemporary criterion. This is true for several reasons. First, in Part One, we made it clear that all Scripture is subject to the hermeneutical criterion of the risen Lord. This binds the text of Scripture to the purpose of God's Word as a construct of truth and infallibility. Secondly, the Spirit of the risen Lord is not just another "contemporary" spirit, but is the Spirit of the incarnate Word, whose authority is vested in the apostolic witness and communicated through the inspired word as Holy Scripture.

Third, there is an eschatological tension between the "now" and the "not yet" within which Scripture stands as the Word of God written. In certain areas, of which the role of women in the pastoral ministry of the church is one, we can find the resurrection of Jesus as a critical and helpful hermeneutical criterion. Apart from that criterion, as we have noted above, there will be a tendency to impose upon Scripture a hermeneutical criterion which "wrestles" the exegetical task into submission to *a priori* principles. This eschatological tension does not allow the camel's nose under the tent, as some might fear, so that Scripture loses its binding authority upon the church. Certainly Swartley does not himself mean to open the door to any and all claims to freedom from the teaching of Scripture by his suggestion that interpretation is not only the application of what we learn from Scripture, but is a "co-creative" event.

For example, in areas of moral behavior, personal holiness in thought and life, and the intrinsic differentiation of male

Nor does the ordination of women, in recognition of the work of Christ in his church today, set up a new criterion of "human rights" as a principle which seeks to re-interpret Scripture in line with contemporary cultural and ideological passions.

Those who would seek to use the resurrection of Jesus as a hermeneutical principle which gives permission to re-interpret Scripture in order to make it more congenial to "modern" or "contemporary" concerns will find no basis in what has been said above. Quite the opposite. The resurrected Jesus is *himself* the criterion—there is no new principle of interpretation presented here. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom, said the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. 3:17). But it is the "Spirit of the Lord," not the spirit of the age, which gives this freedom. Paul is quite emphatic about that. But he is equally emphatic that where the Spirit of the Lord Jesus is present and manifest in his works, one must recognize and confess the truth and authority of that Spirit. It is the Spirit of the resurrected Jesus, working in his church, who is the criterion. And failure to exercise this criterion could well lead to "quenching the Spirit," a word of caution addressed by Paul to the church at Thessalonica (1 Thess. 5:19).

We must remember that the living Christ is Lord of Scripture as well as Lord of the church. The resurrected Jesus is not a criterion of new revelation that replaces Scripture; rather, he is the hermeneutical criterion for interpreting Scripture in such a way that his present work of creating a new humanity fulfills the promise of Scripture. We believe that he now chooses to call both women and men into the task of co-creating the new humanity through pastoral ministry by the gift of his Holy Spirit.

Can the church be trusted to exercise the criterion of the resurrected, coming, and already-present Christ as a "hermeneutical community" of faith and practice, under the authority of Scripture?

If it cannot be trusted, what is to be trusted? For every reading of Scripture is already an interpretation of Scripture. And the inability to interpret Scripture as the Word of God which seeks to accomplish our salvation and freedom in Christ, is already a reading of Scripture which has failed.

Let the church become the community of the resurrected and coming one, and then we shall experience that which the prophet Joel spoke of, and that which Peter saw happening at Pentecost:

And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; yea, and on my menservants and my maidservants in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy. (Acts 2:17-18)

¹ A helpful bibliography of recent literature on the issue of the Bible and the role of women can be found in the book by Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1983), pp. 342-345.

² For a full discussion of these exegetical issues, see Scott Barchy, "Power, Submission, and Sexual Identity Among the Early Christians," in *Essays On New Testament Christianity*, C. Robert Wetzel, ed. (Standard Publishing, 1978). See also the discussion of these issues by David Scholer in "Women in Ministry," *Covenant Companion* 72/21 (Dec. 1, 1983), pp. 8-9; 72/22 (Dec. 15, 1983), pp. 14-15; 73/1 (Jan. 1, 1984), pp. 12-13; 73/2 (Feb. 1984), pp. 12-15.

³ See Bernadette Brooten, "Junia . . . Outstanding Among the Apostles," in *Women Priests*, L. and A. Swidler, eds. (Paulist Press, 1977), pp. 141-144. Also, Scott Barchy, "Power, Submission, and Sexual Identity Among the Early Christians," op. cit., pp. 66-67.

⁴ Don Williams, *The Apostle Paul and Women in the Church* (Van Nuys, CA: BIM Publishing Co., 1977), p. 45.

⁵ Scott Barchy, in his helpful essay cited above, suggests that there are at least three broad categories of texts which deal with the place and role of women in the New Testament communities. There are "normative" texts, which declare the way things are to be; there are "descriptive" texts which report the activity of women without making any comment for or against these activities; and there are "problematic" texts where a disorder had occurred or was occurring which needed correction. *Ibid.*, pp. 56ff.

⁶ T. F. Torrance, *Space, Time, and Resurrection* (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1976), p. 121.

⁷ For a discussion of the objections raised against women's ordination, along with a perceptive argument for ordination of women, see Paul K. Jewett, *The Ordination of Women* (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1982).

⁸ For a helpful discussion of the new role of women as portrayed in the New Testament, see Don Williams, *The Apostle Paul and Women in the Church*.

⁹ Cited by Jessie Penn-Lewis, *The Magna Charta of Woman* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc., 1975), pp. 45-46.

¹⁰ For an excellent discussion of the various exegetical approaches to these passages, see Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women*, pp. 150-191; 256-269.

¹¹ See Alan Padgett, "Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984), pp. 69-86. Padgett discusses the three traditional exegetical arguments which seek to account for the apparent contradiction between Paul's harsh restrictions upon women in 1 Cor. 11:4-7, as compared with his emphasis in vv. 10-12 on the equality of women with men. Setting aside these solutions to the problem, Padgett argues for a new interpretation of this section which reads Paul as stating the position which the Corinthians themselves held in vv. 4-7, and then correcting this position with his own in vv. 10-12.

¹² Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women*, *ibid.*, p. 164.

¹³ For a penetrating critique of the problem of "presenting" New Testament texts, see the essay by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, "The Presentation of New Testament Texts," in *No Rusty Swords*, English translation by E. H. Robertson (London: Collins, 1970, Fontana Library), pp. 302-320. Rather than bringing the text to the present situation in hopes of making it relevant, Bonhoeffer suggests that in presenting a text, one must bring the present situation to the text and remain there until one has heard Christ speak through the text. This changes the present to the future:

The Present is not where the present age announces its claim before Christ, but where the present age stands before the claims of Christ, for the concept of the present is determined not by a temporal definition but by the Word of Christ as the Word of God. The present is not a feeling of time, an interpretation of time, an atmosphere of time, but the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit alone. The Holy Spirit is the subject of the present, not we ourselves, so the Holy Spirit is also the subject of the presentation. *The most concrete element of the Christian message* and of textual exposition is not a human act of presentation but is always God himself, it is the Holy Spirit. . . . 'Presentation' therefore means attention to this *future*, to this that is *outside*—and it is a most fatal confusion of present and past to think that the present can be defined as that which *rests upon itself and carries its criterion within itself*. The criterion of the true present lies outside itself, it lies in the future, it lies in Scripture and in the word of Christ witnessed in it. Thus the *content* will consist in something outside, something 'over against,' something 'future' being heard as present—the strange Gospel, not the familiar one, will be the present Gospel. A scandalous 'point of contact'!

¹⁴ Swartley, op. cit., p. 225.

¹⁵ Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980. The sexual difference between men and women, says Clark, has been "created into the human race" (p. 440), and thus reflects human nature as God's creative purpose (p. 447). The benefits of Christ, thus, cannot alter this fundamental "nature" with its sexual differentiation and hierarchical structure. The merits of this theological assumption need to be debated before it can be allowed to become a hermeneutical criterion in the way that Clark wishes to use it.

A Response to Anderson (I)

by Berkeley Mickelsen

A two-part essay of this length warrants more space than that allotted for this response. The essay moves in the right direction, and I support Ray Anderson in his search for helpful hermeneutical criteria and in his biblically-based case for sexual parity in pastoral ministry.

Commendations

Stress on the resurrected person, Jesus Christ. For apologetic reasons, pastors at Easter often stress the resurrection event. Anderson rightly emphasizes the *person* to whom all authority in heaven and upon earth has been given (Matt. 28:18). In Part I, he shows what revolves around this resurrected Christ and why he is the supreme hermeneutical criterion.

Pointing out the danger of bad fusions of the two horizons. Anderson shows the need for normative teaching to evaluate what happened in the first horizon, what should or could happen in our horizon, and how we establish our interpretations. Adequate interpretations demand more than a mere fusion of two horizons. They involve depth understanding of both horizons.

The description of Christ as binding himself to Scripture. Anderson does not see the truths

about Christ as impersonal abstract propositions. When he speaks of a "propositional form of revelation," Anderson means fresh statements of truth that affect how we think and live. When we think of the Bible in terms of propositions, it can easily become a philosophical collection of abstract axioms. Anderson does not let this happen.

Recognition of texts that, on first impression, seem to give contrasting messages. In dealing with sexual parity in pastoral ministry, Anderson rightly observes that some texts seem to restrict certain activities for some kinds of women. Others speak about godly women and women in child bearing. Other texts point to full participation of women in various aspects of ministry.

Summary of main objections to Jesus' call of women to pastoral ministry. Anderson presents clearly and fairly the usual objections to women in pastoral ministry. He fairly critiques these objections.

Presentation of the historical situation behind New Testament passages involved in the debate. Anderson shows well the situation at Corinth, Macedonia, and Rome. He needs information on Ephesus, the background for I Timothy. We need to see the influence of the temple of Artemis with its worship of the fertility goddess, the first century Gnostic influences, and the constant emphasis through-

out I Timothy on false teaching.

Fear of true diversity is unnecessary. Diversity frightens some people so much that they accept almost any explanation to get rid of it. Anderson condemns this approach. We must not force Scripture into a straitjacket of conformity in order to serve our emotional or intellectual need for consistency. Anderson insists that we see teachings within their historical settings rather than as axioms unrelated to the people to whom they were first written. Anderson says that Paul wrote what he wanted particular readers to understand. Different churches needed different guidelines. Paul's medical suggestions to Timothy for treating his stomach problems are not to be universalized. Yet we know that not all of Paul's teachings are in that category.

Themes That Can Be Clarified and Developed

Anderson's criterion can be enlarged. He has undoubtedly pointed out a unique and overlooked criterion in the resurrected Jesus. Yet unless we are careful, his approach can leave us with a limited abstraction—the resurrected Jesus alone. Anderson does not intend to do this. However, the reader may need more explanation of *what is involved in this resurrected Jesus*. The New Testament gives us his teachings and its teachings about him. Some