

About this book

- Are there still people-men and women-who believe in subordination?
- Have the traditional values of the past been replaced by modern sensible humanism?
- What possible grounds can persons in this age have to cling to conservatism in doctrine and practice?
- Is there any reasonable case or cause to oppose the admitting of women to the ordained ministry of the church?
- What is meant by a 'one-flesh' union?
- What are the true foundations for marriage and vocation?

In this small book Geoffrey Bingham attempts to answer some of these questions. He has researched the subject widely and deeply for many years, and is not a conservative traditional simply out of obscurantism. A prolific writer in the area of human relationships, he has come up with a book which may well confront humanists-Christian and otherwise.

About the writer. Geoffrey Bingham is the author of many theological titles. An Anglican clergyman, he has had experience in war, in a Japanese P. O. W. camp, as a journalist, as Principal successively to two, Bible Colleges, and now as Executive Director of New Creation Teaching Ministry. He and his family spent 10 years of missionary service in Pakistan. He exercises a teaching and pastoral. role not only in Australia but in countries overseas.

God, Man & Woman in Today's World

**THE MATTERS OF MAN, WOMAN,
MALE HEADSHIP, AND THE
MINISTRY OF WOMEN**

by Geoffrey C. Bingham

Male-Female; husband-wife; head-body; Christ-Church; the Man and the Woman; ontological; archetypal, ectypal; women's ministry; men's ministry; male leadership; woman deceived; ordination, superordination, subordination; a gentle and quiet spirit; wives subject and submissive; elders, deacons, deaconesses, pastors; ministry gifts, gifts to all; seduction of Eve and the Church; male domination; feminine rule; 'lording it'; servant-ministry; Fatherhood, Sonship, Family.

**GOD,
MAN & WOMAN IN
TODAY'S WORLD**

THE MATTERS OF MAN, WOMAN,
MALE HEADSHIP, AND THE
MINISTRY OF WOMEN

by Geoffrey C. Bingham

Published by

NEW CREATION PUBLICATIONS INC.
P.O. Box 403, Blackwood, South Australia, 5051
1986

First published by New Creation Publications Inc.,
Australia, 1986

© Geoffrey Bingham 1986

National Library of Australia card number and
ISBN 0 86408 053 0

This book is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the
purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as
permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be
reproduced by any process without written permission.
Inquiries should be addressed to the publisher.

Wholly set and printed at

New Creation Publications Inc.
Coromandel East, South Australia
www.newcreation.org.au

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
1. KNOWING MAN AND WOMAN	3
The Sources of Our Knowledge	3
The True Woman	3
The True Man	5
2. KNOWING CREATED MAN AND WOMAN	7
Using the Knowledge We Have	7
3. MAN AND WOMAN UNDER REDEMPTION	11
Knowing Redeemed Man and Woman	11
4. MAN AND WOMAN IN FAMILY AND CHURCH	15
The Relationship of Male and Female	15
There are Leaders and Rulers in the Church	21
'The Priesthood of All Believers'	22
5. THE CHURCH, THE MINISTRY, AND THE SACRAMENTS	23
The Matter of the Church, Ministry, and Sacraments	23
A Conclusion Regarding the Church, Ministry and Sacraments	25
6. HOW, THEN, SHALL WE VIEW ALL THESE MATTERS	26
'All Things are of God'	26
The Aim of This Book	27
EXCURSUSES	30
Excursus One: Fatherhood and All Relationships	30
Excursus Two: The Nature of the Pastor	30

FOREWORD

We are, for the most part, the people of our age. We live according to culture and custom, and if we do not we are seen as nonconformists. At the moment we are in a ferment of ideas. Humanism has permeated not only our society, but the church as a whole. Hence human thinking has greatly changed. In this small volume I hope to draw our attention to the fact that the truth we need to know must come to us only from the Word of God, and not be the word of man.

If we look at the matters of man, woman, sexuality, and the place that men and women can personally take in today's world, then humanism would appear to be right. Humanism states that human beings are equal. Authority ought to be minimal, if at all. The husband is not to be the head of the wife. Husband and wife are equal, and each has a right to his or her own vocation, and not only in secular life, but in the church men and women have equal rights, and no place should be denied to a woman which is carried out by a man. Elders, deacons and clergy may be women as well as men.

Looking at it this way it is useless to argue any other position from the Scriptures for today the humanist conclusion is foregone. The popular prevailing presupposition is that equality of personhood means equality of function and work, except, perhaps, for the few elements that pertain to biological masculinity and femininity. Any attempt to find an ontological system which can be drawn from Scripture is unacceptable. When the mind is made up-either way-then discussion and debate is pointless. Cultural mores and the prevailing philosophy of the day will win the battle.

With this view I can by no means agree. Christian history has shown us that ideas change, practices alter, heresies and strange practices often almost win the day. Then the truth becomes resurgent: the mores change. Heresies die for lack of a true head of steam. Truth again rules. The Scriptures show themselves to be the Word of God. I believe we should, as Christians, take the Scriptures for our guide, and whilst evaluating the insights that come to us

today through other avenues, live and walk by the rule of Scripture.

I am well aware that scholars can come-and do come-to opposite conclusions when dealing with the same passages of the Bible. I doubt whether such an impasse has to be. If there is an impasse then there is something we must have missed. That is, of course, if the Scriptures are the truth. I am well aware that the principles of interpretation which scholars use are various, hence their different conclusions. Even so I believe the old principle that 'Scripture reveals Scripture' is the most useful one. If 'consensus' is to have value it must be the consensus of Scripture itself, and not simply that of the scholars. In any case scholars rarely come to a consensus.

Again, let me say that I am aware that not one human on earth comes to any theme-let alone the emotive one we are now examining-without previous conditioning, presuppositions, prejudices and 'hidden agendas'. We all do. Perfect is the person who does not. Feminists and masculists will differ because they have such prejudices and 'hidden agendas'. Those in between these two extremes will be no less conditioned. Many factors may predispose us towards a certain view, especially those which have to do with our early childhood, and the traumas and wounds we receive in life. I cannot claim to be an exception to that state of mind which believes it knows 'the right' and 'the wrong' of a thing. However, I wish to say one thing: 'He who is justified by God's grace does not have to justify himself, or herself. The justified person is - if he realises it - free to admit wrong, free not to justify himself whether right or wrong. The rest of us are caught up in lifelong 'pushing our own barrow' and protecting ourselves. We do not wish to be wrong: we must be right. Happy - and unusual - is the one who 'loves the praises of God more than the praises of men'.

Finally, the theme we discuss in this small book is not a light one. We do not really have options. It is not a case of making a choice for the traditional view of men and women, their place in the family and the community, and their participation in the churches, or dropping it for the modern humanist and egalitarian view, even if it has been 'Christianized'. The important business is to discover the ontology of the Godhead, and God's created humanity. In the long run only that can obtain. Fashions may come and go, but what is reality, i.e. 'things as they really are' can finally stand, and stand forever. We who are Christians must cry, 'Let God be God!' This will also make us cry, 'Let Man be Man!' i.e. 'Let a man be a man, and a woman a woman!' and this in the face of all that claims to be liberal and true. It is not truly liberal if it does not let God be God, a man a man, and a woman a woman. Otherwise it may end up diminishing God, emasculating man and masculating (defeminising) woman.

1. KNOWING MAN AND WOMAN

THE SOURCES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE

The Scriptures provide us with various sources in regard to man and woman, i.e. the creation accounts, the accounts of resurrection and glorification, and the accounts of Christ the True Man, and his Bride the True Woman. Let us first look at the True Woman.

THE TRUE WOMAN

The Power and Dignity of True Femininity

Our best method is to look at the True Man and the True Woman. If we first look at the Woman we will see she is depicted as the Woman who brought forth the Christ-child (Rev. 12:4-6, 14-17), the Bride and the Wife of Christ (Eph. 5:23, 32, Rev.21:9) and 'the Mother of us all' (Gal. 4:26). Eve was called 'the mother of all living' (Gen. 3:20), and Sarah 'the mother of nations' (Gen. 17:16). This shows, in principle, the vastness and power of femininity. The True Woman is depicted under the figures or realities of the body of Christ, the Holy City. Here femininity is unparalleled even by the most famous and wonderful of women.

If we examine these we will be struck by the enormous power and dignity of femininity. In great anguish the Woman of Revelation 12 brings forth Messiah into the world, he who is to rule the nations. The Woman is, of course, Israel, or, as we say, 'the people of God'. She is so important that the Dragon (Satan) pursues her to destroy her, or make her impotent, but he does not succeed. This same Woman gives birth to the true children, the people of faith, the church. Then she is the church, the body of Christ which combines with Messiah to defeat all evil.

As the Bride of Christ she is subject to Christ, her Head. She sets out to make herself beautiful and ready for the bridal day (Rev. 19:7, 8, 21:2). She has 'the glory of God' (Rev. 21:11). As the New Jerusalem, the Holy City, she is the ultimate People of God and into the City come the nations, and the kings of the nations bring their glory into it. The throne of God is there, the Temple in it is now God and the Lamb, the river of life flows from the throne of God, and the tree of life produces twelve kinds of fruit, whilst its leaves 'were for the healing of the nations'.

The Many Ministries of the Bride

The Temple and the New Jerusalem are one in the O.T. Prophecies speak of the nations going up to Mt. Zion (the temple) to worship, and to know and obey the law of God. In the N.T. the church is the true Temple. Into it come the nations to worship God, for there is no worship outside that Temple which is true worship, i.e. 'in Spirit and in truth'. In history the church has the fulness of Messiah (Eph. 1:22-23), and by it aids him in his work of, (a) proclamation of the Gospel (Matt. 28:19-20), and, (b) his work of defeating the evil powers and bringing them to judgement (I Cor. 15:24-28, Rev. 11: 15, II Cor. 10:3-4).

Two Dynamic Women Contrasted

We will not understand the peerless and pure femininity of the Bride, and her effective work, unless we see her contrast, namely Babylon, 'the mother of harlots'. She is the gaudy whore, showy, ostentatious, riding on the beast, and seated on 'many waters' i.e. on 'the peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues'. She seduces the kings of the earth with her delicacies. She fornicates with the kings of the earth, i.e. receives idolatrous worship, and is in union with them (Rev. 17:2, 18:3). She is incredibly cruel, for 'in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all who have been slain on earth'.

When we contrast the Bride, the Wife of Christ with this cruel, sensuous and political woman, we further see what true femininity is, as also the nature of false femininity. We marvel at the nature of the Bride, the Wife of Messiah, the true 'Mother of us all', the New Jerusalem, the Holy City. Only by looking at her can we see what woman truly is. We are greatly impressed and moved by 'the power of femininity'. Here is no simpering, prettified, coy, sexy and girlish femininity, but a strong and functional dynamic working itself out in rich usefulness in the history of mankind. This is the true femininity, a femininity which is not masculated, not domineering, bitter, angry and ambitious, but one which fits the true role of 'helpmeet' to the Messiah of God, her beloved

Husband.

THE TRUE MAN

When we look at the True Man we see one who is the Messiah, the Son of God, the Warrior King of the ages, the great Redeemer and the great Judge, the Victor King. His masculinity is shown in, and by, the acts he carries out. This one who was foretold in the O.T. was to be the one to whom would be 'the obedience of the nations' (Gen. 49:10). He was the seed of woman who was to crush the serpent at its head (Gen. 3:15). He was also to be the great prophet (Deut. 18:18-22) whose words must be heard and obeyed under penalty of death. He was to be 'the Son of God' (Psalm 2, 89:26f.), the prophetic 'Son of Man' (Dan 7:13ff.), the Suffering Servant (Isaiah chs. 40-66), of whom it was said prophetically,

For to us a child is born, to as a son is given,
and the government will be upon his shoulder,
and his name will be called
Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God,
Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.'

In the N.T. we see the fulfilment of the prophecies, his strong affirmation by the Father at his baptism, the transfiguration, and the hours before his death. He went against the powers of darkness without fear, and in the power of the Spirit, in the cause of the Kingdom, released men and women from Satan, healed wounded and sinful people, and, going to the Cross, gave himself up to sin, death, and the powers of darkness, and overcame them all in his suffering and resurrection.

In his ascension to the Father he was given the place of reigning at the right hand of God, and from that point onwards has continued to sustain and lead his people, interceding for them against the powers of darkness, and assuring them of a place in his eternal Kingdom when every enemy has been vanquished.

As the Husband of his Bride, the church, he has not only cleansed her "by the washing of water and the word", but he has kept her pure from 'any spot or wrinkle, or stain' for the great day of the Marriage Feast. He has aided her to make her wedding garment out of 'the righteous deeds of the saints'. He has made sure that nothing can separate her 'from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus'. In the end he will have put down all rule and power and authority, and have won the Kingdom to give to the Father, 'that God may be all in all'.

We could go on endlessly about the things of Christ, but no one can

deny that they are the things of true masculinity. They represent the pattern for us to emulate, the true way of being a man, a son, a bridegroom and a brother.

THE TRUE MAN, AND THE TRUE WOMAN, TOGETHER

We cannot think of man as man, without thinking of woman. We cannot think of woman as woman, without thinking of man, and of both together. If a man who is a husband can think of himself apart from his wife, or she apart from him, then they do not yet know the secret of 'one flesh'. We cannot think of the Woman apart from the Man, the Wife apart from the Husband. Each delineates the other's femininity and masculinity. Together they portray true Humanity. She is fully feminine in the light of him being truly masculine. The two combine as the one. This is the true 'one-flesh' union. Now we know, on the human level, what it is to be a man or a woman. There is no great mystery.

2. KNOWING CREATED MAN AND WOMAN

USING THE KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE

It does not take much intelligence to see true masculinity and femininity in the Woman and the Man, and male-female union in the Two. Two words which are helpful in this matter are 'archetype' and 'ectype'. The archetype is the original prototype from which come the copies or ectypes. We can say, then, that Christ is the archetypal Man, and the Bride the archetypal Woman. For us to be men and women, we need to emulate (i.e. copy) these archetypes.

We might think such emulation too difficult if in fact at creation God had not already made us true ectypes of the Man and the Woman. Having seen the archetypes we can now come to our second source of knowledge of man and woman, i.e. creation.

The Creation Accounts of Man and Woman

Human beings are not always aware that they dislike going back to the creation to see their pure humanity as men and women. This is probably why so many like the doctrine (theory) of evolution, for it takes away responsibility to be what creation portrays us as having been. No matter: we never like to see what we were, anyway, when we have fallen from that height of dignity and truth.

In the N.T. when the subject of men and women or marriage and divorce is brought up Christ, and Paul, refer back to the creation whilst Peter, undoubtedly, has it in mind. Far from being influenced by the mores of their day (even the Jewish mores) they saw how things should be from the creational norm. It is here, now, that we can try to introduce the idea of ontology, i.e. the study of the metaphysics of being. Roughly speaking ontology is 'things as they really are', i.e. have always been, and certainly have been so since God's act of creation. For example, God has always been

'Father'. In that way He is the archetypal Father, and so we can deduce what our fatherhood (also ontological as an ectype on the human level) ought to be.

Whilst this kind of reasoning might sound strange it is introduced because today humans think that everything is so plastic (including humans themselves) that they can (if not now, then ultimately) shape everything as they will. However, nothing can change that which is ontological. We may go perversely against what is, and may even apparently pervert it, but we cannot essentially change it. The creation accounts regarding the forming of man and woman tell us what humans are - as men, and as women.

MAN AND WOMAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD

The First Creation Account (Gen.1:26-31)

Genesis 1:26ff. shows us that Man was made in the image together, i.e. the two - man and woman - as one, thus forming together the image of God. (*Note: I am going to use the word 'Man' to denote 'man and woman', and the word 'man' to denote the male person, and 'woman' to denote the female person: 'Man' then will be generic for 'mankind', 'man' specific for a man, and 'woman' specific for a woman. It is a pity to lose the term 'Man' for it shows the utter oneness of man and woman). It is a pity to sacrifice the Hebrew concept of Man, in favour of a modern concept of independent sexes, through gender consciousness, which betrays the modern mind with its sexist view. Artless unconsciousness is surely a sign of maturity.*

What does the image of God mean? Surely it means 'everything that God is, man is like that, and anything that God is, man is none of that'. It may also mean that Man is God's regent in the human scene, i.e. he represents God's reign over creation. The image in some way has to do with government, hence Man has dominion over the creatures. We need not here worry ourselves too much about this, but what we must note is that 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him [Him, Man?], male and female he created them'. In Gen. 5:2 it adds, 'he blessed them and called them man [Man].'

It is important that Man is understood as a 'male-female entity'. If we look at the Man and the Woman, we can see this easily. In one sense the image of God is 'male-female', and in any case Man is male-female, and not otherwise. There are not two humanities, one male and one female, but one humanity which is male-female.

Equally important for understanding is the fact that Man is created for vocation. Man cannot be understood apart from vocation. The male-female entity is primarily for vocation, hence, 'He blessed them and said, "Be fruitful, and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing" '.

The Second Creation Account (Gen. 2:7-24)

In this account the man is formed of the dust of the earth, breathed into by God and being created is to tend and keep (guard?) the garden, and to name the animals. The naming of the animals is important as it is indicative of leadership, for it is stating the identity of each creature. Later the man names his wife, first Ishshah, (2:23) i.e. 'woman' that is 'out of man', and then 'Eve' i.e. 'living' because 'she was [to be] the mother of all living' (3:20). The woman was created by a special act of God, out of something (someone) already in existence. She was created to be a helpmeet ('tailored to fit him') because it was 'not good for man to be alone'. 'Good' here (Heb. *tob*) means 'functionally good, i.e. appropriate', cf. Gen. 1:31, Eccles. 3:11.

In this account the woman is made from the side of the man, and issuing from him (not he from her) he says of her, 'She is flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones'. The two become 'one flesh'. This is the male-female entity par *excellence*. Again this male-female 'one flesh' entity must relate to vocation.

THE EFFECTS OF THE FALL OF MAN AND WOMAN

The Fall of Man and Woman (Gen. 3:1-24)

This happened when the woman listened to the voice of the serpent, and was deceived into thinking she and the man could be gods, or 'as God'. They were already *like* God, but if they could become 'gods' they would be independent of God and of each other. The woman was deceived, (I Tim. 2:14) but the man knew what he was doing. They lost perfect union with God, feeling their nakedness, seeking to cover themselves before God. Their union was broken. They were two independent and separated 'gods'.

The man was punished because 'you listened to the voice of your wife', i.e. instead of the voice of God forbidding eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The word of woman has been accounted as more significant than the word of God. The woman was to have pain in child-bearing and be ruled by her husband because she had accounted the word of the serpent as more significant than the word of God. She would desire him - her husband - which could mean 'want him' (in spite of the pain of childbirth) or 'wish to rule over him' (cf. Gen. 4:7 where sin 'desires' to rule over Cain). The man was now to live by sweat and toil. Both were now 'dead', i.e. dead relationally to God and to one another. They were now 'gods' - 'the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil' (Gen. 3:22) - and so independent units, going against their ontological (true) beings. Their nature by creation would never let them rest until they were one, and their new (so-called) independent godhead would drive them apart, each

wishing to rule the other. Singleness of godhead is 'to be alone' (Gen. 2:18), which is not 'good', i.e. *tob*. 'Good', or *tob*, indicates true functionality, true human ontological being.

Fallen man and woman now had a different relationship than before. The man had not ruled the woman. Now he would. Some say this was not a command but a prediction. In fact male headship (see below) under the Fall became domination and not simply warm and intimate leadership in a one-flesh partnership, aimed at fulfilling God's will. The Hebrew word 'rule' is, in the Greek, the harsh word for 'lording it'. Jesus said the Gentiles like to 'lord it' over one another.

3. MAN AND WOMAN UNDER REDEMPTION

KNOWING REDEEMED MAN AND WOMAN

Until Christ's coming and his act of redemption man and woman had lived under the curse, if indeed it can be called 'the curse'. We must take into account that there were always two streams within humanity, one which was composed of men and women, who, though sinners, were people of faith (see Heb. 11), and another composed of 'the children of the devil' (see I John 3: 10-11, John 8:44), i.e. those who did not have faith in God. The Son of God came 'to destroy the works of the devil' (I John 3:8-9). He did this on the Cross and in his Resurrection. As a result of that men and women were regenerated, i.e. became 'new creatures' II Cor. 5:17, cf. Gal. 6:15).

Reconciliation With God is Reconciliation With All

To be reconciled with God through the death of the Cross, means we are reconciled to all men, whether they receive it or not. Christ, the Son of God revealed his Father. This revelation brings us to sonship, so that we cry 'Abba! Father!' (Gal. 4:4-6). This means we are brethren, one family. John says, 'We know we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren' (I John 3:14). He says, 'We love because he first loved us' (I John 4:19).

Reconciliation is not just individualistic. On the day of Pentecost the new people of God - the church - was born. This new community was one of love, sharing its resources, having a daily distribution to meet the needs of widows, orphans, the poor and other needy ones. Love was the keynote. This church was the new and greatest miracle of history. The unity was the true unity - the ontological unity of God described by Paul in Ephesians 4:1-6 - which worked out in the internal relationships of the body, the church

Thus the true relationship of Christ as head and the church as bride manifested itself down into the whole body. Masculinity and femininity united in a 'one-flesh' unity. The masculine side was headship in its true being, as also in being subject to its Lord. Femininity was its true self because issuing from the head. Thus it was submissive to the leadership of its Lord, Christ. This leadership, as we shall see, found its practical action in the presbyterate, or eldership.

The New Unity of the Body

In one passage explicitly (Gal. 3:28), and two others implicitly (I Cor. 12:13, Col. 3:9-11), Paul shows that nothing - such as being male or female, Jew or Gentile, slave or free - prevents a person receiving salvation, or having entrance into Christ's body, the church. The question of non-Jews not having salvation was a live issue. Jesus himself had said, 'Salvation is of the Jews' (John 4:22), meaning that there was no salvation outside Israel until the new thing happened which he was at that moment predicting. Paul in many places talks about 'the Jew first and then the Greek (Gentile)', but also insists that the Gentile now has the offer of salvation through Christ. In the O.T. the male Jew was accepted in the kingdom only through circumcision. The woman was not circumcised because she was under the cover of a male who was her 'head', whether father, husband, brother, or other relative. Slaves were without privilege, and often despised, but their status did not prevent them receiving salvation, and becoming part of the church.

In I Corinthians 12:4-31 Paul shows the utter unity of all members. He simply uses the natural (ontological) order of the human body to demonstrate that by nature of the case all members are interdependent. Each member is indispensable to the other. Hence the new innate unity of the people of God. No member is without honour, and without identity.

The statement of Galatians 3:28 that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female is sometimes used to say that there are no distinctions in the body, and that the church is therefore egalitarian. This is scarcely likely, for Paul is not egalitarian in the 'sense that it is often claimed the church should be. Paul knew nothing of democratization, however much we know it today. The use of the word 'equal' (isos) in Matthew 20:12, Luke 20:36, John 5:18 (cf. John 10:30-33), Philippians 2:6, and II Corinthians 8:13-14, can mean 'as one', 'like' or 'equal in measurement'. Whilst there is a general sense in which all mankind is equal before God, yet this question, as such, is not raised in the N.T. so much as respecting and honouring every human being is strongly insisted upon. Literal equality of persons does not exist for they are not 'the same' each is unique, discrete, and different. The unity of Christ's body is in the diversity of its members and its gifts. The principle of complementarity in differentiation preserves the uniqueness and discreteness

of each person but constitutes and maintains the unity. Paul still insists that the wife is subject to the husband, children to parents, women to men in worship, and even slaves to masters, although Paul does not necessarily make the last to be ontological, but rather provisional.

Because the term 'equal' is more a modern term, with a special modern connotation, it is doubtful whether we can find Paul using or endorsing this concept. It is certainly a concept of present humanism, but is not necessarily Christian. Of one thing we can be certain, and that is that Paul never thought in terms of inequality. It may well be that 'equal' and 'unequal' are wholly irrelevant to Paul's proposition that 'We are all one in Christ Jesus'. He saw the unity of Christ as our unity, since in baptism we put on Christ. He saw the unity of the Spirit, and the unity of the family under the divine Fatherhood.

The 'New Creation' and 'the Old Curse'

Each person in Christ - because of redemption - is 'a new creation' (II Cor. 5:17). The church itself is 'the new humanity' (Eph. 2:15, 4:24, Col. 3:10), i.e. the 'new man' who is Christ, who is head of his body, which is his church, which is the 'new humanity'. Each member is of course 'a new man', by virtue of participating in 'the new man, Christ'. This new creation is living in the 'old age' (Gal. 1:4), so that there is a constant tension between the old system, and the new. Some claim that the curse has been lifted because Christ was made 'curse for us' (Gal. 3:13). By this they mean that man does not still rule over woman. The curse, however, is not yet lifted. This is shown in Romans 8:18-25 where the whole creation groans, waiting for its liberation 'from the bondage of corruption. This bondage to decay is still present, not only in all creation, but even in the believer, for Paul says that, 'The body is doomed to death because of sin, but the Spirit is life-giving because of justification' (Rom. 8: 10, my translation).

Another way of saying this is that man's rule over woman is not ontological but provisional. Her suffering pain in childbirth is not ontological but provisional. By 'provisional' we mean, that which is temporarily brought about by sin, but is not of 'the true order of things'. Christian women do not escape pain in childbirth, and Christians still know their bodies to be 'doomed to death'. So, likewise, the husband still rules over the wife.

What difference, then, does redemption make in the order of living, and of relationships? Simply this: the Christian man does not wish to lord it over his wife, because he no longer sees himself as a 'god'. The Christian woman does not desire to rule her husband because she is no longer a 'goddess'. The fallen loves of the man and the woman are restored by God's love. True agape (God's divine love given as a gift) now rules their lives. 'One-flesh union' now obtains. True vocation now constrains their marriage into positive

and fruitful living. Their deficient or wrong relationships back with their families, and with others, are now changed. Anger against authority, bitterness for bad experiences, and the desire to 'lord it' change to forgiveness and love for all. The love of Christ constrains the 'new creation' into different lines of action and living.

All of this is, of course, not automatically so. The 'old' contests the new'. Christian men and women are always tempted to go back into anger, to rebel, to divide, and to 'lord it' over others. Faith must always battle to believe and walk in the grace of liberation. It must always apply to grace to walk in God's true law. Only when 'the perfect is come' shall 'that which is in part' be done away with. Even so, the life of each personal 'new creation' in the corporate 'new creation', i.e. the church, is a radically different life, and one which can make continuing advance into maturity.

4. MAN AND WOMAN IN FAMILY AND CHURCH

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MALE AND FEMALE

Reconciliation Means Obedience to God's Order

Mankind lives not in the ultimate, but the penultimate age, the age before the age of perfection. Hence no one is utterly perfect. Sin broke the good order so that all man's relationships became awry. In redemption these relationships can be restored. The ontological order, i.e. 'things as they are essentially', can now be pursued. Only in the ultimate age, however, will the true order be followed. It will be the age of glorification and perfection.

The Creational Order of Man and Woman

A number of passages in the N.T. give us some information as to the creational order of man and woman. These - for the most part - are based on the creation accounts of the O.T. and not upon contemporary cultural mores or norms.

(1) Passages relating to Man and Woman in Marriage

PASSAGE 1, EPHESIANS 5:21-33

We have seen that the true creational order must be gleaned from the true order between The Man and The Woman. In Ephesians 5:21-33 Paul does two things, he shows, (i) the relationship of Christ the Bridegroom to his Bride, the Church, (ii) that this is the relationship the human husband and wife ought to have, here, on earth. We are not talking about impeccability or

perfection of relationships, but the principle of relationships. Whilst Paul appears to be issuing injunctions to Christian husbands and wives at Ephesus, he is, in fact, talking about Christ and the Church. He says, 'This mystery is a profound one, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church'.

In the language that we have been using, Paul is saying, 'Christ is the archetypal Husband, and the Church the archetypal Wife. Let all men be ectypal of Christ, and all wives be ectypal of the Church. Then their relationships will be truly ontological, and so authentic. 'In line with this then let us see what Ephesians 5:21-33 is saying, in principle. We will not seek here, to interpret it.

- (i) The true wife is subject to her husband, and respects him (vv. 22, 33).
- (ii) The true husband loves his wife, to the point of giving himself up for her. She is 'flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones', so that he loves her as his own flesh, and nourishes and cherishes her (vv. 25, 28,29, 31, 33).
- (iii) The man leaves his father and mother and is joined to his wife.
- (iv) The two have become as one flesh.

PASSAGE 2, 1 CORINTHIANS 11.2-16

- (i) Man (the husband) is the head of woman (the wife).
 - (ii) As the man is the glory and image of God - his Head - so the woman is the *glory* of her husband. (Note:- she is not the *image* of her husband).
 - (iii) Man (the husband) was not made from woman (the wife), but the woman from the man.
 - (iv) The man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.
 - (v) In the Lord the man and the woman are not independent (gods?), but as woman was made from man, so now man is born of woman.
 - (vi) Women pray and prophesy during the time of worship.
- Doubtless in *interpreting* these points, scholars will differ, but an objective viewing of them will at least help to comprehend the thrust of them.

PASSAGE 3, 1 PETER 3.1-7

- (i) Wives are to be submissive to their husbands, especially in order to win them (the husbands) by wifely obedience, so that they (the husbands) will come to obedience to the Word of God.
- (ii) Women should not seek to do this only by dressing beautifully, but by 'the imperishable jewel of a gentle and quiet spirit'.
- (iii) Sarah is a good paradigm (example, pattern) of this 'gentle and quiet

spirit', for she 'obeyed Abraham, calling him 'Lord!'

- (iv) Husbands are not to take their wives for granted but are to 'consider them showing them honour [respect] as the weaker [not 'weak'!] vessel'.
- (iv) Husband and wife are 'joint heirs of the grace of life', i.e they equally share the new life given by redemption and will inherit the legacy (i.e. inheritance) it will bring in eternity.

If we examine the above passages we can see their frame of reference is (i) the creation account, (ii) the Abrahamic covenantal system, even though in passage 2 there is a cultural reference to the wearing of the veil during worship. The passages immediately below do not directly refer to creation, but seem to insist that the injunctions concur with the law. The law, of course, has its own links with creation.

PASSAGE 4, 1 CORINTHIANS 14.31-35

- (i) Prophets must be subject to the (other) prophets, i.e. they cannot speak ex *cathedra*, i.e. with authority from themselves.
- (ii) The custom of the churches is that women should not speak in the assembly but be subordinate in accordance with the law.
- (iii) If women wish to know something they should not ask in the church, but of their husbands at home.

Note: Without seeking to interpret the above passage, may it be said that the two following points of explanation are possible, (i) women were not to be those to whose spirits the prophets were subject, i.e. they were not to assent or dissent to what (male) prophets prophesied (vs. 32), or (ii) women were not to ask **questions during teaching, but to** leave the teaching to the men, asking their husbands at home what they (the wives) wanted to know. Teaching in the early church was often in dialogue (cf. Acts 17:2, 19:8), either in debate or discussion. Some suggest women were on one side of the meeting, and men on the other, and **that it would have been indecorous** of women to shout questions, especially if they were not edifying ones.

PASSAGE 5, 1 TIMOTHY 2:8-15

- (i) True womanly adornment is not primarily outward attire, but the good deeds' they do.
- (ii) A woman should learn in silence, with submissiveness.
- (iii) Paul permits no woman to teach or have authority over men: she is to keep silent.
- (iv) Two things determine this demand, (a) Adam was formed first, and Eve after him, and, (b) Adam was not deceived, but Eve was.

(v) A woman will be saved through childbirth, if she continues 'in faith and love and holiness, with modesty'.

PASSAGE 6, TITUS 2:2-6

(i) Older men (not elders as such) should live sensible, mature lives. (ii) Older women (not elders) should also be sensible and mature. (iii) Older women through their lives (whether by example or direct teaching) will train young women to 'love their husbands and children' and be 'sensible, chaste, domestic, kind, and submissive to their husbands'. (iv) Younger men should be taught to control themselves.

Interpretation of the Above Passages

The interpretations of the passages are many and varied. One school insists that Paul and Peter were either greatly influenced by traditional Jewish thinking, which they say was always male and patriarchal, or by the current cultural mores. Others say the apostles were simply pointing out what is ontological in relation to creation and redemption, and that they were seeking to teach these principles in the context of the culture of their day.

What issues from these passages is that the apostles saw wives subject to their husbands, and women subject to the male leadership of the church. They saw the responsibility of husbands to love and care for their wives, being considerate with them, and that husband and wife being 'one flesh' and 'joint heirs', had what we call 'equality' of personhood, even if (sometimes) different operations within their functionality.

(2) Passages Relating to Men and Women in Ministry

Some of the passages above relate to the functions of men and women in the church, and we will need to refer to them. Because there are so many passages we will simply record the details, and as far as possible refrain from comments.

SCRIPTURES RELATING TO WOMEN'S MINISTRY

Men and women both have ministry. All members of the church are ordained to ministry, whether they are men or women. This can be seen from the following references - Mark 10:45, cf. 9:35, Romans 13:8-10, Ephesians 4:12, Galatians 5:13-16, 6:10 (etc.) - but even these references do not compass the general ministry of women. Often writers are eager to inform women that there is almost anything they can do except be eligible for the office of elders or the priesthood. To some women this seems like throwing a bone to distract the barking animal (feminity), or is unconscious but heavy

patronage and condescension. Even so, let us see something of the ministry of women, i.e. the ministry to which they were (and are) ordained.

In the O.T. woman was to participate with man in fulfilling the mandate God gave at creation (Gen. 1:28ff., cf. I Pet. 3:7). It would be a full-time work. Any vocation, of course, could be contained within the general vocation. Revelations from God came directly to many women, i.e. to Hagar (Gen. 16:7-8, 21:17), Rebekah (Gen. 25:23), and Manoah's wife (Judges 13:3). They also came to prophetesses Miriam (Exod.15:20f., Num. 12:1-2), Deborah (Judges 4:4), Huldah (II Kings 22:14-20), and the prophetess of Isaiah 8:3. Deborah was also a judge in Israel (Judges chs. 4-5). Athaliah is the sole example of a queen ruling over Israel (II Kings). The prayers of Rebekah (Gen. 25:22f.), Rachel (Gen. 30:6, 22), Leah (Gen. 30:17), and Hannah (I Sam. 1: 11, 2: 1-10) have helped to change the course of history.

In the N.T. Christ called all who obeyed his word his 'brother, and sister and mother' (Luke 8:21). Many women ministered to Christ (Luke 8:1-3, 10:38ff., John 12:1ff.). They were at his cross when many of the disciples were not, were at the taking of him down from the cross, were first at the tomb, first to announce his resurrection, were present at Pentecost and received the outpouring of the Spirit, were at prayer for Peter (Acts 12:12ff.) and others (cf. Acts 4:23ff.). We saw in I Corinthians 11:5 that women prayed and prophesied in the church. In Acts 21:9 the four unmarried daughters of Philip prophesied (not only once, but, it seems, continually), and this accorded with the statement of Joel, repeated and amplified by Peter (cf. Joel 2:28f., Acts 2:17ff.) that both 'sons and daughters', 'menservants and maidservants' would prophesy. In Romans 16:1-2 Phoebe is called 'a servant', or 'a *diakon*' (the word means 'servant', -cf. Mark 9:35, 10:45), which some believe belongs to the order of 'deacons', and she is also called a *prostatis*, which can be translated 'guardian' or 'protectress'.

Women laboured in the Gospel - whatever that means in different contexts - for Lydia opened both her heart and home to God's messengers (Acts 16:14f.). Women at Thessalonica and Berea also accepted the Gospel, searching the Scriptures, and doubtless were part of the witness of which Paul speaks in I Thessalonians 1:6-10. In Philippians 1:5 Paul speaks to the Philippians about their 'fellowship in the Gospel', and in 4:2-3 nominates at least two of these women, Euodia and Syntyche. Couples such as Priscilla and Aquila, and those mentioned singly such as Mary, Junia and Julia (there could have, and would have, been numerous others) all attest to women in ministry. We repeat: all Christian women, as also all Christian men, were assumed to be in ministry or 'servantship'.

Women received what are called 'the gifts of the Spirit', for they prophesied. Apart from what we may call 'ministry gifts' i.e. apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor and teacher, we have no need to doubt that all gifts at some time or another manifested the Spirit in both men and women. There

is some debate as to whether women were given these 'ministry gifts'. It is argued that in Romans 16:7 the Junia mentioned is one 'notable among the apostles'. Some scholars see two meanings for the word 'apostle', (a) for those of the apostolic college, i.e. 'the Twelve', and (b) for anyone who was a 'sent one' or 'messenger'. Junia could not be included among the former, but there is no reason why she (or, he) should not be included among the latter. We have evidence that women prophesied, although we would need to be certain whether this was the gift of prophecy (which all had) of the office of a prophet, which was given only to some. In one sense all Christians are sent (are apostles), and all can prophesy (cf. I Cor. 14: 1, Acts 2:17, 18).

We must draw the conclusion then that women carried out no less ministry than did men. It is better to say, 'Together all Christian men and women carried out a combined ministry under the Lordship of their Head, Christ'. There the matter of ordination to ministry should be left, provided the injunctions of Paul are kept in mind. All are ordained to ministry.

SCRIPTURES RELATING TO ELDERS AND DEACONS

If we keep in mind that women's personhood and ministry is not inferior to that of men, and if we also keep in mind that when it came to headship, i.e. 'source', 'origin', and 'government' in the home and the church that the headship was masculine, then what we are about to say will be intelligible. If it be said that this present writer is presupposing what has to be proved, then we must return to our study on headship and see the principles of 'headship' and 'body' relationships as they are with Christ and his bride, i.e. Christ and his church. He is without doubt masculine, so that headship is always masculine. In the case of the husband his headship too, relates to 'source', 'origin' and 'government'. In both cases the body cannot be the head, nor the head the body, but both head and body form the one unified entity.

Paul's and Peter's remarks in regard to headship confirm the fact that the husband is the head, and so the wife is the body. If it is true that the N.T. Epistles confirm that there are leaders or rulers in the church, then we would expect them - on the basis of headship - to be male. It would not be congruous for the female to head up the leadership. Paul's injunctions would thus not be able to obtain. As with Adam and Eve, so with Christ and his church. Thus the body can never be the head. It is ontologically incongruous for such an attempt to be made. Whilst the wife can certainly effect lordship over her husband, and the husband can become submitted to the wife, such a changing of the ontological order must bring suffering and wrong in its wake. In fact the order cannot be essentially changed, but it can be changed *de facto*. With such a perverse change, the children of such an unontological husband-wife family will be confused as to the true nature of Christ, for it is his headship which is called in question by the reversal of husband-wife

relations. The church which feminates the head, and masculates the body will end with an emasculated masculinity and a masculated femininity.

THERE ARE LEADERS AND RULERS IN THE CHURCH

In the following passages we are directed to the fact of 'leaders' in the church, i.e. 'overseers' (*episcopoi*) and 'rulers' (*hegoumenoi*), i.e. 'those over you' (*proistamenous*), and these terms would appear to be interchangeable for the words 'elders' (*presbuteroi*) or 'bishops' (*episcopoi*), and, perhaps, 'pastors' (*poimenas*), i.e. 'shepherds', see Acts 14:23, 15:6 20:17, 28, Ephesians 4:11, 1 Thessalonians 5:12, 1 Timothy 3:1ff., 5:17f. Titus 1:5ff., Hebrews 13:7, 17, 1 Peter 5:1ff., cf. Revelation 4:4, and the many references in Revelation. There is also a sense in which younger men are under older men (1 Tim. 5: 1, and, perhaps, 1 Pet. 5:5), as also younger women are under older women (Titus 2:3f).

When we remember that Christ under the headship of his Father not only drew his origin from Him, but obeyed His commands, and that Christ the head of the husband constituted not only the man's source and origin, but that he also gives him commands, and as head of the church gives it commands, then there can be no doubt that the elders represent Christ's government of the church, i.e. are his headship in practical fact and action, and therefore have a most responsible leadership and rulership role, as well as the role of shepherding the flock, and feeding it. This seems to tie in with the fact that Christ chose men to be apostles, and lead the church. In this sense Peter calls himself an elder (1 Pet. 5:5).

One of the tasks of the elders and/or the bishops is to teach. 1 Timothy 3:2, 'an apt teacher'; 1 Timothy 6:17, 'who labour in preaching and teaching'; 1 Timothy 2:9, 'He must hold firm to the sure word as taught, so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also to confute those who contradict it'; Heb. 13:7, (assuming the leaders are elders), 'who spoke to you the word of God', whilst 1 Peter 5:2, 'Shepherd (*poimane*) the flock of God' must mean 'feed them', i.e. with the bread of life. If 'pastors and teachers' (Eph. 4:11) are the one, as many exegetes think, and they are the elders (as this present writer feels forced to conclude), then Paul's talk to the elders at Ephesus (Acts 20:17ff.) appears to make pastoring the flock (amongst other things) a matter of teaching.

If then we take ourselves back to 1 Timothy 2:8-12 where a woman is permitted to teach, it would appear that teaching is primarily a directing by the 'head' of the 'body' since teaching is not merely the right impartation of information, but the dynamic revelation of 'the whole counsel' of God and has as much to do with life and its practice, as with faith, since exhortation is part of the teaching ministry. It requires the head to impart to the 'body' that

which it needs. This is not to say that within the body (member to member) there is not any teaching, for there is, but it is not of the kind that the elders-overseers-leaders-shepherds-rulers give, particularly in the context of worship.

‘THE PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS’

This great Reformation saying is not found - as such - in the N.T. In the O.T. Israel was called ‘a kingdom of priests and a holy nation’ (Exod. 19:6) and the same term is given to the church in the N.T. (I Pet. 2:9-10, cf. Rev. 1:6, 5:10, 20:6). In Israel not all members were priests, though the nation was ‘priestly’. The people were represented by the priestly and Levitical order. In the church there are many presbyters (elders) but only one Priest (*arkierous*), i.e. Christ himself, ‘our great high priest’ (see Heb.2:17, 5: 1 ff., etc.). None of us is singly a ‘priest’ (*hieron*). The doctrine is not ‘the priesthood of every believer’, but ‘the priesthood of all believers’, i.e. a corporate priesthood. The question then of having male priests or female priests is a *non sequiter*.

Peter said, ‘. . . like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God *through* Jesus Christ’. In Hebrews 13:15-16 these sacrifices are ‘a sacrifice of praise to God, that is the fruit of lips’, and, ‘to do good and share what you have’. In I Peter 2:9-10 the function of the new priesthood is to ‘declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light’.

What we have to understand is that the church is prophetic, priestly, and royal, because it is the body of Christ, and he is Prophet, Priest, and King. The body shares the life of the Head, and since there is the only one ‘Mediator between God and men’ (I Tim 2:5), the only way in which a mediatorial work can be said to be effected is by Christ, i.e. by his whole body directed by him as its Head. Because he is prophet does not make us all prophets; because he is Priestly does not make us all priests; and because he is King does not make us all kings, but it does make us the prophetic, priestly, and royal people.

5. THE CHURCH, THE MINISTRY, AND THE SACRAMENTS

THE MATTER OF THE CHURCH, MINISTRY, AND SACRAMENTS

We know as a fact of history that the church in its universal nature was undivided until fragmentation came in the form of differences on two fronts, (i) doctrine, and, (ii) variant views of the church, its ministry and sacraments. Undoubtedly politics divided (and still divide) the church, and politics have undoubtedly used these two elements we have named. These two problems are still with us. Keen scholars and theologians have sought to set forth and vindicate their systems of doctrine and practice, and, their views of the church, ministry and the sacraments.

Because of the present debate regarding the place of men and women in the ministry of the church, many have become confused. As we have seen, ministry is for all, but headship is not ontologically women's function. We have also seen that there is, in fact, no priesthood, apart from Christ's, and certainly no sacerdotal priesthood in which men or women can participate. So in that sense the debate about women being ordained to the priesthood is a *non sequiter*. It does not follow from anything.

I am aware, of course, that Catholic traditions believe their order of bishops, priests and deacons is to be found in Scripture and that the doctrine of apostolic succession is also proven by both Scripture and tradition. Many would say the three-fold order is germinal in the Scriptures and became fully, naturally, and logically developed in the second century. I am also aware that Anglo-Catholics - a Catholic tradition developed in the Post-Reformation era - are convinced their position can also be supported by Scripture, historic practice, and tradition. I am simply saying that from the Scripture it would be a difficult matter to establish a *prima facie* case for the Catholic tradition. It cannot, therefore, reasonably reject the one-fold presbyterate, especially if a diaconate is linked with it. This paper is far too brief to allow us to enter into

these questions. We must concede the positions others take, without necessarily endorsing or rejecting them.

Whilst the more Catholic traditions speak of the priesthood that has sprung from 'the apostolic succession', i.e. the authority and administration of grace given to a priestly order through Christ's vicar Peter, through successive episcopal ministry, Reformed thought in rejecting this sacerdotal order, is nevertheless insistent upon the presbyterate, i.e. the order of ordained elders. Most Protestant churches believe there have been orders of leadership, whether that of bishops, priests and deacons, or a presbyterate, or a pastoral leadership with the support of a diaconate, and insist that the leadership has always been male, this being a mark of its validity, and insist that this is how it ought to continue. Some ground is given to the order of deacons in that many admit women to the diaconate because women can serve at a certain level, in certain functions, but always under the authority of male leadership which represents the headship of Christ. Some churches see the male diaconate of another order than that of the female diaconate.

We need also to remember that the churches' views of the ministry are linked with that of the meaning and administration of the sacraments. In fact an understanding of the church is primary to fully understanding both the ministry and sacraments. It is fair to say that many views of the church are taken from current ideas of organization in general, i.e. the church is one amongst many organizations. This, of course is not true. There is a great need today to study the nature of the church, its functional operations, and the goal God has set for His people. We need also to understand the relationship of the church to the Kingdom of God. Without such understanding participation in the sacraments may be without a biblical rationale.

To continue: some Protestant churches see the bishop' of the early church as synonymous with 'elder'. Of these some see the bishop as *primus inter pares*, i.e. 'first among equals' or the leader of the elders, i.e. 'chief elder' (cf. I Pet. 5:4). Some see the pastor (often called 'the minister' or 'the priest') of the church as the true elder, and whilst they may wish for a body of elders, often do not ordain such. In some churches which ordain elders, the elder is looked upon merely as an officer, though perhaps a higher officer than a deacon, who, in his turn, is considered to be more of a church organizer, one attending to 'the nuts and bolts' of administration.

Whether the question is of bishops, priests, and deacons, or pastors and elders - whatever the form - it is clear in many cases that 'new presbyter is old priest writ large' (Hooker), and that there are many other popes ('pappas') than the Bishop of Rome. Protestant pastor can be as much *prostasis* as any pope or bishop. Much of which goes to show that the leadership of the church is a long cry from contemporary humanism which sees no ontological differences in function between men and women, and which simply sees ability as the true qualification for any office. The larger ontological question

has been by-passed or dismissed as irrelevant. Not, of course, that many have diligently applied themselves to the ontology of the Man and the Woman, and so man and woman, by which they would see the functional nature of 'the head' and 'the body'.

The matter of calling or vocation, especially in regard to the leadership of the church is presently a problem. If ontologically the leadership is male, then the 'call' of women is a *non sequiter*. That women believe they are called to ministry must not be denied, for all are called to ministry. That they feel called to the leadership which has always been male raises other issues. How much has the primacy of clerical affected people? How much does leadership itself attract many of us to place of primacy? If power, i.e. authority and ability, is what we desire as sinful people, how much might we be conditioned by it? If the church is in no position to change the ontological order, then much will have to be rethought in regard to calling and vocation.

A CONCLUSION REGARDING THE CHURCH, MINISTRY AND SACRAMENTS

If the more Catholic churches concede to the present pressure to include women in the priesthood, then they do not merely give away their tradition on this score, but their whole structure. If the Protestant churches concede the claims of egalitarianism ('all are equal in all things' except certain biological elements), then they give away the whole ontology of 'headship' and 'body', of which we have been speaking. Whilst this short treatment of the subject does not enter into the wider world of secular government and vocation, yet its implications within contemporary society and its rapidly changing mores have to be considered. Indeed the whole matter of functional authority, God's ordination of 'head' and 'body', and the true ontological order if it embraces all the human race, cannot be ignored without great peril to the world, as well as to the church, to the community, as well as to Christian families. Ontology is not exclusively within the people of God.

6. HOW, THEN, SHALL WE VIEW ALL THESE MATTERS?

'ALL THINGS ARE OF GOD'

Paul, it seemed, often suffered anxiety regarding the churches he helped to found. Indeed this could form quite a subject for one caring to research it from his Letters. Without prejudice to women, it does seem there were females at Corinth who had been captivated by their gifts. Some scholars - undoubtedly male chauvinists - have conjectured that women were seeking liberation from those over them. We certainly have no proof of this idea. There were, nevertheless, those who would wean away the church from 'a sincere and pure devotion to Christ'. It seems that Paul recalled the scene of the Fall. In 11 Corinthians 11: 1- 15 he claims that he betrothed the church to Christ as a pure bride 'to her one husband'. Now he fears lest the church be led astray from its devotion to Christ.

Is he not making Christ the new Adam, and the church the new Eve? Is he not confronted with the old serpent in new garb seeking to get this new bride to listen to his - the serpent's - old ploy? Is Paul not afraid that history will repeat itself, and a bride (the church at Corinth, or anywhere) may listen to the voice that is other than her husband's and other than God's? What, then, was the essence of the old temptation? Surely that the human person would be free from the Lordship of God. He - or she - would find the way of man in himself (herself), and be free to make personal choices without reference to Him.

There is a principle we can adduce from the first fall which may help us to guard against a second fall. It is this: when the woman was tempted it was not only to be 'as God', but in fact 'as gods', i.e. the human race would be a collection of 'gods'. More apposite, Adam and Eve would have each been 'gods', i.e. autonomous units, independent of God, and *independent of each other*. Where individuals are independent of each other there can be no talk of 'headship' and 'body', i.e. leadership and submission. Nor can there be any

thought of both working together in God's vocation. Each will have separate vocations and no 'master-vocation'. Every other human being will be a threat. If husband and wife are not in a 'one-flesh' union, then children will be threatened by their individualistic parents, parents by their (now individualistic) children: and so on. This could well be the way Satan attempts to bring about a second fall, the fall of the very church itself, the Bride of the True Adam. This would be for him a huge victory, outweighing even the first fall. The 'mother of us all' could end up by being no mother, but just a female moving within the orbit of her own egocentric designs.

Paul calls these agents of the serpent (Satan) 'false apostles, deceitful workmen, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ'. What we have probably never contemplated is that the church, Christ's Bride, could be deceived and beguiled, so that a second 'fall' could take place, and Christ's purposes in and for his church be thwarted. We ought to be wary lest such a thing happen in our day, and, if possible, even the elect be deceived by the arch-deceiver. We are not saying that the issue of the ordination of women to church leadership is what was troubling the church at Corinth. The church of the day - as throughout all its history - was beset by heresies and false teachers, i.e. 'by the cunning of men, by their craftiness in deceitful wiles'. There were Judaisers at Galatia, gnostics and docetics at Colossae and Ephesus. There was the false prophetess Jezebel in Thyatira, and Nicolaitans at Pergamum.

Paul stands by his ontological understanding. When speaking of the husband and the wife in I Corinthians ch. 11, he says, 'And all things are of God'. He means in regard to creation, what he later means in regard to salvation, 'All this is from God' (II Cor. 5:18). In the O.T. the writers spoke about God's 'fixed order' (Ps. 148:5- 6, Jer. 31:35-36). Thus in Ephesians 5:21-33, when speaking of the order of marriage, leadership and submission of the wife, he says he is only giving helpful advice in regard to ectypal husbands and wives by referring to the archetypal marriage of Christ and his church. Current cultural mores and practice are irrelevant to him, and humanism has no place in his *schenta*.

THE AIM OF THIS BOOK

This little book is a condensation of some principles given in a larger volume now in preparation. The wider treatment gives more attention to points on which many scholars, feminists, masculists, humanists and others have been writing. Most of these folk just mentioned have gone through the subject quite thoroughly, and many of them painstakingly, though naturally enough, each from his, or her, own point of view. I have sought to treat the subject from within Scripture itself, believing as I do that the principles of

truth - as also much of their practice - can be found in these Scriptures.

Much is at stake in the current debate. Congregations can be divided, denominations can be split, union within Christendom, as envisaged by many, can be delayed: indeed a whole host of things. Paul made it clear that spiritual immaturity is being caught up in party spirit, in which one says, 'I am of this one! I am of that one! I am of this, and of that!' I have noticed that when it comes to knowing what is right and what is wrong we are again back in the Fall. We know what is right and wrong, and will not budge. We may appear most mature in some areas of life, but in being 'right' or 'wrong' we are so immature. So-called tolerant people become 'justice men and women' and get caught up in 'the great rage'.

I am one who wishes we would distinguish the ministry that is 'head-ministry' from that which is body-ministry', for the two should work functionally as one. This they will be unable to do if one usurps the function of the other. I realise in practical fact that within many families women are the 'heads', as in many churches women have taken on 'head-ministry'. This is generally due to many factors such as indolent husbands, previous family conditioning, separation, divorce, and other elements.

On mission fields, and in some Third World countries, there are more women pastors than men. Here no criticism of women is intended: if men will not hear God's voice and take up their responsibility, then women will. That does not invalidate masculine headship or feminine 'body-ship'. Nor does it validate the ministry these women are carrying out. Perhaps we are short on valid action, and long on invalid action, but we note that something gets done! Somewhere along the line men have not responded, and it may well be that the preaching of the Gospel has been deficient, weak, and so, ineffective. There could be many reasons. Nevertheless it must be said that if an headship were held by women in many or most situations, and if this state were a fait accompli, this would nevertheless not reverse the irreversible, i.e. God's ontology of His creation. Sooner or later certain consequences would inevitably ensue. It would be terrible to contemplate a world which is so unontological if God's grace were absent or inoperative.

It is the way we go about things which matters. If we breach the ontological order we may find the new form attractive, and presently beneficial. We will live, nevertheless, to regret it deeply. The breaching itself may be the very judgement of God upon the sloth of men, the ambition of women, the abdication of our true functional beings, and our participation in God's mandate.

May bitterness, anger, the desire for revenge, the triumph of attaining what we have desired not be present in all that is happening. In honesty I cannot see how that can be in a world where anger is never found absent from any human creature - of whatever gender it may be. What we need so much today are those who are humble and contrite in heart, and tremble at my

word' (Isa. 66:2). May our human emotions, passions and desires not lead us against that Word, nor make us (imagined) lords over it. What advantage then will there be to feminists and masculists, those who 'lord it', and to those others who are too weak in their servility and fear to raise their voices, as indeed to all who do not 'tremble at His Word', walk in His ways, i.e. who do not tread the path of peace?

EXCURSUSES

EXCURSUS ONE

Fatherhood and All Relationships

It is simply not true, biblically, that God is ever other than masculine. He is only referred to by the masculine pronoun. This is not for lack of another and better word. He is masculine. We cannot even say, *'par excellence'*, for He is unique as God, as Spirit, and as masculine. In the Scriptures He is never called 'mother', 'wife', 'daughter', or 'sister', although at times He is compared with such. At the same time we must never use human masculinity as an analogy of God's masculinity, or God's masculinity as an analogy of man's masculinity. God - if He does not reveal Himself - is ineffable (undescrivable, unknowable). He says there is *nothing* we know to which He can be likened. Thus if we commence at human masculinity and human femininity and think of God in these terms, we will end up in tragic misunderstanding. In other words, God's masculinity can never be understood by human beings, unless He were to reveal it : which of course He has. Once revealed we would see it is other than human masculinity, whatever elements the human ectypal masculinity may *reflect* of the archetypal masculinity.

Because God is Creator He has no need (or place) for sexuality. Because we are procreators we need sexuality. We do not know what masculinity is which is not sexual, although we do know that masculinity is not contained within sexuality. Nevertheless, with our human thinking centred about sexuality, we do not know what Fatherhood and Sonship would be without sexuality. Masculinity, then, to some degree, is a hidden thing. If some become angry at masculinity then they need to stay their anger until they understand what it is by having a true revelation of God's masculinity. When God made man and woman in His own image, and made them male and female, it may well be that God has what we would call 'male and female elements'. Our problem would be to know what these elements really are. For example, is all human masculinity and femininity subsumed (existent within) God's masculinity? Is that why Christ said that in heaven there is no marrying

or giving in marriage? Is that why all will be called 'sons of God' in eternity, even though on earth one is 'male' and the other 'female'? Will being 'sons of God' bring us into a category of non-sexuality which is not necessarily neutral in regard to gender, and in which, even though gender might remain, all would be without sexuality as we know it?

On these things we may not be dogmatic, but we must not shy away from the thinking they open up to us. It is not as though God does not exhibit a masculinity (male gender) which is without sexuality. This is what He does. So then, the concept of His Fatherhood does not derive from human fatherhood, although human fatherhood must be the ectype of the archetypal Fatherhood. This may also explain the Christian's reluctance to see anything of a sexual nature in the union of the Bride and the Lamb. Sexual union, as such, bewilders all but the erotically mystical Christian thinker.

On an even wider issue, when Paul says (Eph. 4:6) that God's Fatherhood is 'above all, and through all, and in all', he is surely speaking of God being the Head of His family by being 'above all', just as 'through all' means He is the Integrator of His family, and 'in all' that He is the One who is intimately present to each of His family members.

When Paul says (Eph. 3:14-15), 'The Father from whom all familyhood in heaven and earth is derived', he is averring that all relationships stem from the Father. All have - so to speak - an archetypal masculine origin. The ectypes emerge from this. These factors by no means put femininity down, but give it an integral place in the wider reality of God's (non-sexual) masculinity. To see God's Fatherhood through the Son, via the Cross and Resurrection, is to lose all anger at all faulty human ectypes, be they masculine or feminine. It is to be caught up in His redeeming, loving Fatherhood. It is to be swept off our feet, constrained and gripped by love, and thus to be dynamically initiated into new, true relationships.

It is indeed to discover (or rediscover) what creation is all about, and how it is we can with joy, even glee, 'Let God be God, and Man be Man!'

EXCURSUS TWO

The Nature of the Pastor

The term 'pastor' (*poimen*) is used only once in its English form in most translations of the N.T., i.e. in Ephesians 4:11, 'pastor and teacher'. It means 'shepherd' and the word as 'shepherd' is used, or implied, a number of times- In Matthew's Gospel it is used three times in the pastoral sense. In

John's Gospel Jesus uses it of himself five times in the one discourse (John 10: 1-16), and once of the false pastors. In this passage he is referring back to Ezekiel 34 and kindred passages where the pastors are Israel's leaders - for good or for bad - and where God is the true Shepherd, and David His Messiah, the shepherd He will give to Israel. to make them into a true flock (e.g. Ezek. 37:15ff.). Jesus compares the false shepherds and the true shepherds, as indeed does Ezekiel. After the Resurrection he proves himself to be shepherd as he commands Peter to feed his sheep and his lambs. He is the good Shepherd, i.e. the archetypal Shepherd and the archetypal Pastor.

The word is also used in Hebrews 13:20 where Jesus is called 'the great shepherd of the sheep', as he, coming up out of death by God's power, leads his flock through the valley of the shadow of death into the pastures of eternal life. Again, the word is used in I Peter 5:4 where he is called 'the Chief Shepherd'. In I Peter 2:25 his true flock have returned to the Shepherd (*poimena*) and Bishop (*episkopon*) of their souls. In Revelation 7:17 it is the Lamb who is the Shepherd of the great multitude of the redeemed. He leads them 'to springs of living water'. The picture, then, in both the O.T. and N.T., of the Pastor, is a rich one. Who could be a pastor unless the gift were given to him?

When we go back into history seeking out the origin and use of the word 'shepherd', we discover in so many situations that kings are called shepherds. So are the elders. 'Great David's greater Son' will be an even greater Shepherd than his famous father. In other words, far from being a humble lad hidden away in the hills minding a flock of sheep, the true shepherd is a king, or the Great King Himself, i.e. God (cf. Ezek. 34:15). Christ, when he comes is the King-Shepherd, the Shepherd-King, and this shepherd - in accordance with Zechariah 13:7 - is smitten at the Cross where he is both Shepherd and Lamb (cf. Matt. 26:3 1). Thus the references to him in John 10, Hebrews 13:20, and I Peter 2:25, and 5:4 are all vindicated, and explicated.

Peter certainly links being an elder with being a pastor-shepherd (I Pet. 5:1-5). In Acts 20:28 Paul tells the elders of the church at Ephesus, 'Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers (*episkoupous*, i.e. 'bishops'), to care for the church of God'. He then speaks of wolves that will arise to devour the flock, thus reminding us of the Good Shepherd who gives his life for the sheep. So high a calling it is to be an elder-bishop-pastor-shepherd!

The main point in this excursus; is that the history of the word 'shepherd' ('pastor') shows the office and calling is to be that of a leader, and a significant leader, having responsibility of the flock, the people, the nation, and in the N.T., the people of God, the church. We know that in history many a maid or a woman may have kept watch over a flock, but the true shepherd of the flock has to be a strong vessel. In Israel the shepherds were

always kings. Only once was a queen ever a shepherd in that nation, and she was a murderess and no true shepherd (shepherdess) at heart. This leadership ministry is firstly that of the Father, God, and then that of the Son, Jesus the Messiah, and then it is given to the elders, to the pastor-teachers of the flock. Shepherding the flock is a 'head' ministry. Being the flock is a 'body' ministry. This appears to be the ontology of the matter. May we let responsibility be taken by those to whom it is given, under the Great Shepherd, the Chief Shepherd of the flock who loved his sheep so much that he gave himself up for them, at the instigation of the Father who is the Great Shepherd of His eternal flock.

He shall feed his flock like a shepherd,
he will gather the lambs in his arms,
he will carry them in his bosom,
and gently lead those who are with young.

Only he who is himself a lamb can know the ways of a flock, and the heart of a sheep, so that

the Lamb in the midst of the throne
will be their shepherd,
and he will guide them
to springs of living water,
and God will wipe away
every tear from their eyes.