

Restoration of the Image of God: Headship and Submission

**John W. Peters, Ph.D., M.Div.
Pennsylvania Conference
Theology of Ordination Study Committee
January 2014**

Table of Contents

1			
2			
3			Page
4	Section I	Introduction	3
5			
6	Section II	Creation Headship in Genesis 1-3	5
7	A.	Twenty-Six Points of Identification	7
8	B.	Mystery of Godliness Embraces Headship and Submission	27
9			
10	Section III	Headship and Submission in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14	29
11	A.	Headship Principle in 1 Corinthians 11	30
12	B.	1 Corinthians 14 and the Law	35
13	C.	Implications of 1 Corinthians 11 and 14	37
14			
15	Section IV	Headship and Submission in 1 Timothy 2-3	37
16	A.	Authority and Priority of Creation	38
17	B.	Context: Culture or Scriptural Evidence	39
18	C.	Elder Qualifications—a Male Headship	42
19	D.	The Mystery of Godliness	46
20	Section V	Authority and Order in the Universe	48
21	A.	Authority and Submission among Angels	48
22	B.	Authority and Submission at Creation	49
23			
24	Section VI	Headship and Submission in the Trinity	50
25	A.	God is the Head of Christ—Incarnation	50
26	B.	God is the Head of Christ—Eternity Past	51
27	C.	God is the Head of Christ—Eternity Future	55
28	D.	Submission of the Holy Spirit	57
29	E.	Mutual Submission and the Trinity	58
30	F.	Interchangeable Roles and the Trinity	59
31			
32	Section VII	Restoration of the Image of God	61
33			
34	Section VIII	Fallacious Objections to the Biblical Principle of Headship/Submission	62
35	A	Mutual Submission	62
36	B	Neither Male and Female—Galatians 3:28	64
37	C	Priesthood of All Believers—1 Peter 2:9, 10	68
38	D	The Case of Deborah	72
39	E	The Case of Huldah	73
40	F	The Case of Miriam and Others	74
41	G	Phoebe	75
42	H	Junia(s)	77
43	I	Priscilla	78
44			
45	Section IX	Summary	80
46			
47	Section X	Conclusion	82

Restoration of the Image of God: Headship and Submission

I. Introduction

1 The impetus for the ordination of women as elders/ministers in the Seventh-day
2 Adventist church has its origin deep within the feminist movement which in America picked up
3 steam with the leadership of Betty Friedan (*The Feminine Mystique*) and Gloria Steinem in the
4 1960s-1970s. The push for women’s ordination entered into Evangelical Christianity with full
5 force in 1973 with the formation of the Evangelical Women's Caucus (EWC). Key books were
6 published. Primary examples include Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be*
7 (1974); Paul Jewitt, *Man as Male and Female* (1975); Virginia R. Mollenkott, *Women, Men, and*
8 *the Bible* (1977); Virginia R. Mollenkott and Letha Scanzoni, *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?*
9 (1978).

10 Galatians 3:28 became “a canon within a canon” and became a rallying point for
11 evangelical Feminists. In contrast to evangelical feminists, mainstream feminist theologians
12 clearly identified the principle of headship and submission as being built into the Genesis 2
13 record, not Genesis 3.¹ But mainstream feminist theology firmly rejected the high view of
14 Scripture which evangelicals claim to hold. On the other hand, evangelicals are still trying to
15 reconcile feminism with the Bible through the reinterpretation of troublesome texts.

16 Adventist advocates for ordination of women (egalitarians) also have adopted a special
17 hermeneutic for troublesome and uncomfortable portions Scripture dealing with women in
18 ministry. They have identified this special hermeneutic as a “principle-based, contextual,
19 linguistic and historical-cultural” reading strategy² which is at the heart of their biblical
20 approach for certain texts.³ Mainstream feminist theologians long ago understood that such

¹ Mainstream feminist Rosemary Ruether states “Even in the original, unfallen creation, women would have been subordinate and under the domination of man.” *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*, Beacon Press (1983), 94. See also “. . . [M]ale-female hierarchy was not just a product of sin, it was a part of the natural order created by God” (Ibid., 97).

² Kyoshin Ahn, “NAD Theology of Ordination Study Committee Report” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, January, 2014, 22-31. http://www.adventistchurchconnect.com/site/1/docs/NAD_Ordination_Report_2013.pdf accessed 12-2-2013.

³ Adventist egalitarians have adopted a flexible hermeneutic called a “principled-based, contextual, linguistic, historical-critical” strategy for certain uncomfortable texts. For Adventist feminist, the text determines which hermeneutic to employ—a plain reading of Scripture or the “principled-based” method. This flexible hermeneutic appears to be distantly related to a form of literary criticism and variant of a hermeneutic called “deconstruction”

1 reinterpretative approaches would be fruitless. They therefore abandoned the principle of
2 normative authority for all 66 books of Scripture.⁴

3 The present paper employs the historical-grammatical method of interpreting Scripture,
4 which relies on “the plain meaning of Scripture,” accepting the Bible “just as it reads.”⁵ This
5 approach is endorsed by the “Methods of Bible Study” Document (MBSD),⁶ which has been
6 taken as the fundamental exposition of Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) hermeneutical method to
7 be followed in the study of the theology of ordination. The role of the Writings of Ellen G. White
8 in interpreting Scripture has been previously documented.⁷

9 The biblical principle of headship and submission is woven like a golden unifying thread
10 through the pages of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. This biblical principle is the
11 foundation for male headship in the home and in the church, and is the basis for the
12 appointment (ordination) of men as local elders or the conference-employed elders/ministers⁸
13 with governing and teaching authority in the church. With the exception of the roles of
14 elder/minister and local elder, women may be appointed to other ministry roles in the church.

fathered by German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, and fully developed by Jacques Derrida in his classic 1967 work, *Of Grammatology*. Deconstruction espouses multiple meanings to a text or passage with no true meaning possible, recontextualization of the text, and rejection of all authority and hierarchy. Literary criticism of *Deconstruction* gives the reader the authority over the text. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deconstruction> (11-25-2013), See also http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Heidegger#Derrida_and_deconstruction accessed 11-25-2013. See the Conclusion of this paper for a more complete discussion of Deconstruction.

⁴ Portions of this brief historical summary are found in Larry Kirkpatrick’s “Foundations of Women’s Ordination Part 6: Evangelical Feminism.” <http://ordinationtruth.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/kirl-fwo-pt6.pdf> accessed 12-1-2013.

⁵ Ellen G. White wrote: “Let the Bible explain its own statements. Accept it **just as it reads**, without twisting the words to suit human ideas.” *Loma Linda Messages*, 55. “All who exalt their own opinions above divine revelation, all who would change **the plain meaning of Scripture** to suit their own convenience, or for the sake of conforming to the world, are taking upon themselves a fearful responsibility.” GC 268. “When those who profess to believe present truth come to their senses, when they accept the Word of the living God **just as it reads** and do not try to wrest the Scriptures, then they will build their house upon the eternal Rock, even Christ Jesus.” 21 MR 346.

⁶ “Methods of Bible Study” Document [MBSD], a statement voted by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Executive Committee at the Annual Council in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 12 October 1986, available from <http://www.adventist.org/fileadmin/adventist.org/files/articles/official-statements/Statements-2010-english.pdf> pages 241ff, accessed 12-1-2013. The preamble to the MBSD makes very clear that the use of the historical-critical method of Bible study, which “de-emphasizes the divine element in the Bible as an inspired book (including its resultant unity)” and “minimizes the need for faith in God and obedience to His commandments,” is to be rejected.

⁷ P. Gerard Damsteegt, “Ellen G. White on Biblical Hermeneutics,” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, January 2013.

⁸ Elder/minister are synonymous and interchangeable terms for the conference-employed leadership role in the local church, district, or conference entities.

1 This paper will document the headship/submission principle in Genesis 1-3 with twenty-
2 six points of identification. This will be followed by an examination of the headship/submission
3 principle in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 and 1 Timothy 2-3, in which the apostle Paul uses the
4 priority of Adam’s creation as a rationale for the principle. We will then examine the concept of
5 authority and order in creation followed by a documentation of the principle of headship and
6 submission within the Trinity. We will conclude with a summary of popular objections to the
7 principle of headship and submission.

II. Creation Headship in Genesis 1-3

8 The fundamental assumption of those advocating the ordination of women in the role
9 of elder/minister is that the principle of headship and submission was not divinely ordained at
10 creation and was non-existent until after the Fall. The chapter entitled, “Headship, Submission,
11 Equality in Scripture” in *Women in Ministry*⁹ clearly states the premise. “Before the Fall there
12 was full equality with no headship-submission in the relationship between Adam and Eve (Gen
13 2:24). But after the Fall, according to Genesis 3:16, the husband was given a servant-headship
14 role to preserve the harmony of the home, while at the same time the model of equal
15 partnership was still set forth as the ideal. This post-Fall prescription of husband headship and
16 wife submission was limited to the husband-wife relationship . . . [and was] *never* broadened to
17 the covenant community in such a way as to prohibit women from taking positions of
18 leadership, including headship positions over men.”¹⁰

19 In other words, before the Fall—so the theory goes—there were no functional role
20 distinctions between the man and the woman except perhaps for the obvious functional role of
21 childbearing. After quoting Genesis 1:27 the author states that “[T]his basic passage gives no
22 hint of a divine creation order. Here man and woman are fully equal, with no subordination of
23 one to another.”¹¹ Irrespective of these assertions, the “hint” of male headship is, in fact,
24 found in Genesis 1:26-27. This “hint” will be amplified as we examine the principle of male
25 headship in Genesis 1-3 in parallel with an exposition of the same principle found in 1

⁹ Richard M. Davidson, “Headship, Submission, and Equality in Scripture,” *Women in Ministry*, ed. Nancy Vyhmeister (Berrien Springs, MI, 1998), 259.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 284, italics original.

¹¹ Richard Davidson, “The Bible Supports the Ordination/Commissioning of Women as Pastors and Local Church Elders” (*Spectrum*, 10 Apr 2010).

1 Corinthians 11 , and also within the entire context of 1 Timothy 2-3. It also will be seen that Genesis 3 is, in fact, a commentary on the reversal of the divine creation order of Genesis 2.

3 A point-by-point critique of the thesis on headship and submission in *Women in Ministry*
4 has been previously documented.¹² The same article in *Women in Ministry* contends that “no
5 inspired writer—not Moses, Jesus, Paul, or Ellen White—teaches the creation headship of man
6 over woman.” We will enumerate twenty-six identifying points of creation headship that can be
7 found in Genesis 1-3. But first, does Ellen White endorse and harmonize with the principle of
8 creation headship? The answer: Adam was to stand at the **head** of the earthly family;¹³ Adam
9 [was] the **monarch** of the world;¹⁴ Adam was the **vicegerent** of the Creator;¹⁵ The Sabbath was
10 committed to Adam, the **father and representative** of the whole human family;¹⁶ Adam was
11 **crowned king** in Eden; He made Adam the **rightful sovereign** over all the works of His hands;¹⁷
12 He made him **ruler** over the earth;¹⁸ Adam was **lord** in his beautiful domain.¹⁹

¹² Samuele Bacchiocchi, “Headship, Submission, and Equality in Scripture,” *Prove All Things*, ed. Mercedes H. Dyer (Berrien Springs, MI, 2000), 65.

¹³ “The relationship existing in the pure family of God in heaven was to exist in the family of God on earth. Under God, Adam was to stand at the head of the earthly family, to maintain the principles of the heavenly family. This would have brought peace and happiness.” RH, January 16, 1913 par. 4; 6T 236.1

¹⁴ “Having conquered Adam, the monarch of the world, he had gained the race as his subjects, and he should now possess Eden, and make that his head-quarters. And he would there establish his throne, and be monarch of the world.” RH, February 24, 1874 par. 19. Adam was appointed by God to be monarch of the world, under the supervision of the Creator. *BEcho* Aug. 28, 1899 (cf. ST Apr. 29, 1875).

¹⁵ “Satan's dominion was that wrested from Adam, but Adam was the vicegerent of the Creator. His was not an independent rule. The earth is God's, and He has committed all things to His Son. Adam was to reign subject to Christ. When Adam betrayed his sovereignty into Satan's hands, Christ still remained the rightful King.” DA 129.

¹⁶ “In Eden, God set up the memorial of His work of creation, in placing His blessing upon the seventh day. The Sabbath was committed to Adam, the father and representative of the whole human family.” PP 48.

¹⁷ “Adam was crowned king in Eden. To him was given dominion over every living thing that God had created. The Lord blessed Adam and Eve with intelligence such as He had not given to any other creature. He made Adam the rightful sovereign over all the works of His hands. Man, made in the divine image, could contemplate and appreciate the glorious works of God in nature.” *Redemption; or the Temptation of Christ*, p. 7; 1BC 1082.2

¹⁸ “When God made man He made him ruler over the earth and all living creatures.” PP 59.

¹⁹ “Adam and Eve were rich indeed. They possessed Eden. Adam was lord in his beautiful domain.” FE 38.

1 It may be noted that Ellen White states that "Adam and his companion were to bear rule
2 over the earth" (PP 50). But this does not contradict the thrust of all her other statements
3 concerning the relationship of Adam to his helper. It does not say, "Adam and his companion
4 were to bear *co-rule* over the earth," since it is not detailing the relationship of Adam to his
5 companion—but their relationship to the earth. Adam's "companion" was his "helper" (see PP
6 46). At his creation Adam was made "ruler over the earth and all living creatures. So long as
7 Adam remained loyal to Heaven, all nature was in subjection to him." (PP 59). With Eve as
8 Adam's "helper" (companion), they both were to "tend and keep" the Garden. But primary
9 responsibility was given to Adam. Eve was to bear rule over the earth with him. Eve may well
10 have functioned as "queen" of the Garden home—being second in authority to Adam, but this
11 does not mean she was a "co-ruler" in the sense of being appointed co-monarch, co-sovereign,
12 vice-gerent, etc.

13 A co-monarchy is not specified. Co-equal leadership roles and titles for Adam and Eve
14 are completely missing from the inspired writings. Adam and Eve are not identified as co-
15 sovereigns, co-equal vicegerents, co-rulers, or king and queen with equal roles, nor was Eve
16 identified as the representative of the whole human family. It is true that Eve was
17 ontologically²⁰ equal (equality of being or nature) with Adam; she was "to stand by his side as
18 an equal, to be loved and protected by him."²¹ However, Adam's role of protector further
19 substantiates the principle of creation headship. Thus, the principle of male leadership in the
20 Adamic family of God is unmistakably clear from Ellen G. White's writings.

21 **A. Twenty-six Points of Identification**

22 Male and female role differentiation is both obvious and implied in Genesis 1-3 in
23 several ways: by their differentiation in terms of gender, by the order and mode of their
24 creation, and by describing the primacy of man's responsibility.²² Not only is there a "hint" of a
25 creation order given in Genesis 1:27 which will be established in the conclusion of Section II on
26 Genesis, but there is also a repeated amplification of the principle of creation headship in

²⁰ Ontology/ontological refers to the nature of being. All future references to "ontological" will be designated by "being" (that is, ontological equality will be designated equality of being).

²¹ Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 46.

²² Paul S. Ratsara & Daniel K. Bediako, "Man and Woman in Genesis 1-3: Ontological Equality and Role Differentiation," *Theology of Ordination Study Committee*, July, 2013, 13.

1 Genesis 1-3 in terms of the man’s responsibility and accountability. The twenty-six identifying
2 points of creation headship in Genesis 2-3 are summarized below.

3 **Point 1: Adam was created first.** “God formed (*plassō*, LXX²³) man of dust of the
4 ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being” (Gen
5 2:7). If the priority of the creation of Adam was not important in the creation of male and
6 female, why were they not created simultaneously from the dust of the ground to prevent any
7 possible suggestion of role differences?²⁴ The prior creation of the man helps define the
8 relationship between Adam and the woman. The historical account in Genesis 2 is a sustained
9 interaction between God and Adam, prior to the creation of Eve, where God gives Adam
10 guidance and instruction concerning life in the Garden of Eden. The apostle Paul uses the
11 priority of creation, that “Adam was formed (*plassō*)²⁵ first, then Eve” (1 Tim 2:13) as one of the
12 principal justifications for the headship of man in the church and that a woman was not to
13 teach or have authority over a man. Evangelical feminists claim that Paul was refuting radical
14 feminists in first-century Ephesus who were presumably advocating priority of the creation of
15 Eve over Adam.²⁶ In fact there is no historical evidence that a feminist culture existed in first-
16 century Ephesus,²⁷ and this proposition, derived from methodology associated with literary
17 criticism and limited biblical authority, has been rejected by scholars embracing plenary
18 inspiration and the historical-grammatical hermeneutic of Scripture which allows the Bible to
19 interpret itself.²⁸

20 The importance of the priority of creation and role differentiation has been resisted by
21 suggesting that Genesis 2 incorporates a literary device, an *inclusio* derived from rhetorical
22 criticism,²⁹ in which the creation of man at the beginning and the creation of woman at the end
23 of the historical account correspond to each other in importance.³⁰ The *inclusio* device may well

²³ LXX, The Septuagint is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament.

²⁴ Ratsara & Bediako, 17.

²⁵ Paul is careful to use the identical Greek equivalent from the Septuagint for the Hebrew in Genesis 2:7.

²⁶ Davidson, quoted in *Spectrum*, 10 Apr 2010; see: <http://spectrummagazine.org/node/2305>.

²⁷ See “Three Reviews of *I Suffer Not a Woman* by Richard and Catherine Kroeger,” in Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, Appendix 6 (Wheaton, IL, 2012), 646-674 (specifically p. 654).

²⁸ William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 46; Nashville: Nelson, 2000), see pp. lxxi-lxxii; 130-143; 232-243 and citations therein.

²⁹ Ratsara & Bediako, 16 and references cited therein concerning rhetorical criticism and the *inclusio* argument.

³⁰ Davidson, *Women in Ministry*, 261.

1 convey the idea of equal value of the man and the woman, but it does not eliminate the
2 element of functional differentiation.³¹ If equality without role differentiation between man
3 and woman were of paramount importance, God could have created both man and woman
4 simultaneously from the dust of the earth and avoided the need of a subtle literary device to
5 demonstrate equality.

6 It has been argued that although Adam was the “head of the human family” (6T 236)
7 and “the father and representative of the whole human family” (PP 48), this headship was
8 based not on the priority of creation but on the principle of corporate solidarity. It is thus
9 claimed that Eve should be considered an equal partner with Adam where they both are
10 representative heads of the entire human race —Father (and Mother) of the human race.³² But
11 the Bible explicitly teaches that Adam is the representative of the human race. Adam’s actions
12 (not the actions of Adam and Eve) affected the whole human race. “As in Adam [not in Eve] all
13 die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive” (1 Cor 15:22).³³ Sin and death entered the world
14 through one person, not two (Rom 5:12). The fallen race is not redeemed by the last Adam and
15 Eve or the Second Adam and Second Eve; it is redeemed by the Last Adam (the Second Adam).
16 “‘The first man Adam became a living being’; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit. . . . The
17 first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven. . . . Just as we
18 have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven” (1
19 Cor 15:45-49). The human race was derived from the representative man, Adam.

20 The idea that Adam and Eve functioned as co-equal heads of the human race is also
21 contradicted by the fact that “Adam was the **monarch** of the world”³⁴ and God “made Adam

³¹ Ratsara & Bediako, 16-17. Ratsara and Bediako have demonstrated the shortcomings and shallowness of the *inclusio* argument and conclude their analysis with the following summary. “The interval between the creation of man and the creation of woman in Gen 2 is filled with chronologically meaningful events that need not be attributed merely to the inspired author’s interest in arranging a literary *inclusio*. We may as well question the historicity of the narrative if the arrangement of the text is attributed simply to the author’s interest in creating a literary *inclusio*” (cited in note 72).

³² Richard M. Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” Paper for the Theology of Ordination Study Committee, Baltimore, MD, July 22-24, 2013, 7. Davidson asserts the possibility based on solidarity that “Eve also was given a representative role in solidarity with the entire human race, as the ‘Mother of all living.’”

³³ All Scripture references are taken from the NKJV version of the Bible unless otherwise noted.

³⁴ White, *Confrontation*, 16.

1 the **rightful sovereign** over all the works of His hands.”³⁵ The terms, *sovereign* and *monarch*, in
2 this context exclude Eve and demand absolute singularity—Adam was the sole and singular
3 monarch and sovereign of the world under God. By definition, a monarch is a sole ruler, one
4 who rules alone. Prior to the Fall, the human family consisted only of Adam and Eve. Thus,
5 Adam’s functioning as “monarch of the world” and “head of the human family,” in point of fact,
6 makes him head of the woman.

7 Furthermore, “The home of our first parents was to be a pattern for other homes as
8 their children should go forth to occupy the earth” (PP 49). This means that even before the
9 Fall, Adam’s headship in his relationship with Eve would serve as model of male headship in
10 subsequent families.³⁶ Finally, when the redeemed are welcomed to the City of God, Christ
11 does not greet Adam and Eve as Father and Mother of the race; He greets Adam as the father
12 of the race. “As the ransomed ones are welcomed to the City of God, there rings out upon the
13 air an exultant cry of adoration. The two Adams are about to meet. The Son of God is standing
14 with outstretched arms to receive the father of our race.”³⁷

15 **Point 2: Adam given authority and responsibility.** “Then the LORD God took the man
16 and put him in the Garden of Eden to tend and keep it” (Gen 2:15). Prior to the creation of the
17 woman, God provided a garden home for Adam; He placed Adam in his garden home; God
18 provided a source of food for Adam (Gen 2:8-9). God then assigned Adam with primary
19 responsibility and leadership to manage and care for (“tend and keep”) the Garden. Adam is in
20 charge of the Garden. With the later creation of Eve, Adam was given a helper with whom to
21 share the responsibility to tend and keep the Garden. But all major scriptural directives
22 concerning care of the Garden and its prohibitions were communicated to Adam directly by
23 God prior to the creation of Eve, thereby conveying creation headship responsibility to Adam.

24 **Point 3: God speaks to Adam first and gives him leadership accountability.** “And the
25 LORD God commanded the man, saying, ‘Of every tree in the Garden you may freely eat; but of
26 the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you
27 shall surely die’” (Gen 2:16-17). Prior to the creation of the woman, God instructs Adam what

³⁵ Ibid., 11.

³⁶ Ratsara & Bediako, 26 (cited in note 96).

³⁷ White, *The Great Controversy*, 647.

1 to eat.³⁸ Then God commands Adam, prior to the creation of Eve, with the warning not to eat of
2 the forbidden tree. Adam was given leadership responsibility to transmit this warning as it
3 became necessary. Eve received this same warning indirectly from God through Adam and
4 angels.³⁹ With cunning intentions, the serpent spoke to Eve first (Gen 3:1), enticing her to take
5 responsibility for leading the family into sin, and inverting the order that was established at
6 creation. Because Adam listened to the voice of his wife rather than the face-to-face
7 communication from God, Adam was held accountable and responsible for the Fall of the
8 human race (Gen 3:17; Rom 5:12).

9 Upon the creation of Adam, God could have immediately created the woman from
10 Adam's rib, if He had *not* intended to instill within Adam a sense of servant-leadership
11 (headship) prior to her appearance. This appears to be a contributing reason for man's priority
12 of address, thereby conveying authority and responsibility to Adam. With no supporting
13 evidence other than *inclusio* arguments, egalitarians claim that first-hand instruction from God
14 regarding the forbidden tree conveyed no headship status to Adam.⁴⁰ But denying the
15 scriptural evidence for creation headship, supported by God's direct command to Adam
16 regarding the forbidden tree, does nothing to support the functional role of equality of men
17 and women in the home and the church, and illustrates the weakness of the evangelical
18 egalitarian position.

19 **Point 4: Adam is given a helper.** And God said, "It is not good that man should be
20 alone; I will make (lit. "for") him a helper comparable to him" (Gen 2:18). Since no animal was
21 suitable as Adam's companion, Eve was created to be man's 'ēzer k^eneḡdô ("helper like
22 opposite him"). Specifically, she was to be his equal (k^eneḡdô) with the same human nature of
23 the opposite gender. She was also to be his helper ('ēzer), implying male headship. Thus, 'ēzer
24 k^eneḡdô itself spells equality and functional differentiation.⁴¹ It should be noted that man is
25 never said to be an 'ēzer of his wife. By defining the woman as 'ēzer k^eneḡdô, the idea is

³⁸ Ratsara & Bediako, 15-16.

³⁹ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 53.

⁴⁰ Davidson, *Women in Ministry*, p. 261. Davidson sweeps this evidence aside with no supporting evidence, other than the unconvincing *inclusio* argument, by simply claiming that "the divine impartation of such knowledge to Adam before Eve was created does not thereby reveal the headship of Adam over his partner." For the "inclusio" argument, see Davidson, "Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations," 8.

⁴¹ Ratsara & Bediako, 18.

1 conveyed that she will play a role within the overall responsibility given to the man.⁴² A
2 “helper” is one who assists the person having primary responsibility for the task at hand. The
3 suggestion that “never does the word refer to a subordinate helper”⁴³ is refuted by the
4 example where God would scatter all the troops, Zedekiah’s help (*‘ēzer*), from him (Eze 12:14),
5 if he tried escape from the siege of the invading Babylonian forces. As evangelical feminiusts
6 and some Adventist egalitarians have pointed out, “Elsewhere in Scripture, it is most often God
7 Himself who is called *‘ēzer* (‘helper’) (Exod 18:4; Deut 33:7, 26; Ps 33:20; 70:5; 115:9, 10, 11).”⁴⁴
8 But the role of helper can be carried out by someone in greater authority—for example, a
9 father helping his son with homework. Although the father takes on a subordinate role, the son
10 still has the primary responsibility for the task. Such was the case when God helped Moses,
11 David, and Jehoshaphat in conquering their enemies.

12 Likewise, such is the case when God helps needy redeemed sinners. God assumes a
13 subordinate role, but the sinner is held responsible for responding to God’s grace. In the
14 Garden Adam was given a helper equal to and comparable and opposite to himself. The
15 Hebrew text can be translated literally as, “I will make *for him* [Hebrew, *lô*] a helper
16 corresponding to him.” Thus the apostle Paul correctly conveys the “helper” role of Eve in 1
17 Corinthians 11 when he justifies the headship of Adam with the rationale, “nor was man
18 created for the woman, but the woman *for the man*” (v. 9).

19 **Point 5: Adam names the animals.** “Out of the ground the LORD God formed every
20 beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would
21 call them. And whatever Adam called each living creature, that was its name” (Gen 2:19). The
22 animals are “brought” to the one in authority. Only the man is given the responsibility to name
23 the animals (vv. 18-20), thereby echoing his role to have dominion over the world and to be
24 prime ruler over the animal creation (1:28).⁴⁵ It is universally recognized that the person doing
25 the “naming” of created things is always the person who has authority over those things. Adam
26 had sole and authoritative responsibility for naming the animals prior to the creation of Eve.

⁴² Ibid., 20.

⁴³ Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” 8.

⁴⁴ Davidson, *Spectrum*, 10 Apr 2010.

⁴⁵ Ratsara & Bediako, 25-26.

1 The woman, having no participation in the naming process, simply accepted the names
2 authorized by Adam, giving further evidence of his creation headship.

3 **Point 6: The woman is derived from man.** “Then the rib which the LORD God had taken
4 *from man* He made into a woman, and He brought her to the man” (Gen 2:22). The apostle
5 Paul refers to Genesis 2:22 in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16, where he presents justification for the
6 headship of man in the home and the church. He first asserts the headship of man in
7 1 Corinthians 11:3—“The head of every man is Christ, the head of the woman [wife] is man
8 [husband], and the head of Christ is God.” He then establishes its rationale in 1 Corinthians
9 11:8—“For man is not from the woman, but the woman *from man*.” Paul substantiates the
10 headship/submission principle by referring to the historical and biblical evidence that the
11 woman derived her existence from the man. The priority of the creation of Adam from whom
12 Eve derived her existence supports the creation headship of Adam.

13 It seems clear that “God wanted to convey *two theological truths* (not just one) in the
14 formation of the woman from the rib of Adam: Since the woman was taken out of the man, 1)
15 she is *fully and equally human* since she has come from his bones and his flesh, and 2) her very
16 human nature is constituted, not in parallel fashion to his where both would have been formed
17 from the same earth, but as *derived from his own nature*, so showing a God-chosen
18 dependence upon him for her origination.”⁴⁶

19 Adam’s protective role as head of the woman in relation to her origin (*from man*) is
20 conveyed in the following statement. “Eve was created from a rib taken from the side of Adam,
21 signifying that she was not to control him as the head, nor to be trampled under his feet as an
22 inferior, but to stand by his side as an equal, to be loved and protected by him.”⁴⁷ Some
23 Adventist egalitarians assert that Ellen White’s reference to *protection* has no connection with
24 headship responsibility, only physical strength.⁴⁸ It must be noted, however, that in the perfect
25 environment of the Garden the physical strength of Adam was not required to protect Eve;
26 Adam was to be her “protector” from the deception of the fallen angel. Only after the Fall did

⁴⁶ Bruce Ware, “Male and Female Complementarity and the Image of God,” in Wayne Grudem, ed., *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton, IL, 2002), 83.

⁴⁷ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 46.

⁴⁸ Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” 10.

1 physical strength and protection become a necessity. Just as the stronger of two allies protects
2 the weaker, or a father the child, the husband is to protect the wife. In a post-Fall setting,
3 White states that “The Lord has constituted the husband as head of the wife to be her
4 protector.”⁴⁹ According to White, the man’s function as head and protector of the wife applies
5 to both the pre-Fall and post-Fall condition. Adam was responsible for the protection and
6 welfare of the woman, who was derived from the man, signifying the servant-leadership
7 (headship) of the man.

8 **Point 7: God presents the woman to Adam.** “[A]nd He [God] brought her to the man”
9 (Gen 2:23). This apparently unremarkable statement is embedded with deep significance. The
10 woman is “brought” to one in authority. God does not present the man to the woman; He
11 presents the woman, as a gift, to the man in his previously established role as monarch of the
12 world. Of all the gifts given to Adam by God, Eve was “that one gift which in his eyes outvalued
13 every other.”⁵⁰ One who receives a gift has responsibility to cherish and protect it. So now
14 Adam has responsibility to care for the woman, and to protect and cherish her. The whole
15 scene is infused with Adamic headship as the woman recognizes the priority of Adam’s creation
16 and she listens to Adam explain her origin.

17 **Point 8: Adam speaks first upon creation of the woman.** “And Adam said: ‘This is now
18 bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out
19 of Man’” (Gen 2:23). These words imply the equality and close affection of love that was to
20 exist in the union of the man and the woman. But these words also convey a unique message.
21 The woman begins to gain an understanding of herself. Assuming his headship responsibility,
22 Adam initiates communication with the newly created Eve and informs her of her origin,
23 explaining the source (from him: “taken out of Man”) of her existence. These words spoken by
24 Adam communicate his leadership responsibility to Eve. The apostle Paul alludes to this text as
25 well as 2:22 (Point 6) in confirming the headship principle as found in 1 Corinthians 11:8 (“the
26 woman [is] from man”).

27 **Point 9: Adam names the woman.** “She shall be called [*qārā*] Woman, because she was
28 taken out of Man” (Gen 2:23). God brings the woman to Adam, and the first words she hears

⁴⁹ White, *The Adventist Home*, 215.

⁵⁰ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 56.

1 from Adam conclude with: “she shall be called Woman because she was taken out of man.” The
2 assertion that the foregoing quotation contains a pair of divine passives is unpersuasive.⁵¹
3 Adam informs her that she is part of him (“she is bone of my bone”) and was derived from him
4 (“she was taken out of man”). These first words the woman hears from Adam, including naming
5 her, instills within her the unmistakable sense of Adam’s leadership responsibility, and she finds
6 her own identity in relation to the man as his equal and helper by man’s definition.⁵² Adam
7 names his partner in order to distinguish the gender difference between himself (man: *’ish*) and
8 his partner (woman: *’ishshah*). As with Adam’s naming of the animals, the person doing the
9 “naming” of created things is always the person who has authority over those things.

10 To claim that the assigning of the name “woman” in 2:23 is only a generic
11 identification⁵³ contradicts the pattern of naming activities found throughout the first two
12 chapters of Genesis where same verb (*qārā’*, “to call”) is used in contexts of naming. For
13 example, God calls (*qārā’*) the light Day; calls (*qārā’*) the expanse Heaven; calls (*qārā’*) the dry
14 land Earth. Thus when Adam says, “She shall be called woman,” the term *Woman* is surely
15 taken as a name in 2:23, which coincides with the naming of mankind (Adam) in Genesis 5.⁵⁴
16 “He created them male and female and [God] blessed them and called (*qārā’*) their name Adam
17 (*’adam*; mankind)” (v.2). When God names male and female, “man” (“Adam”), in Genesis 5, a
18 male priority is indicated along with full male-female equality. The responsibility given to Adam
19 in naming indicates the leadership function and authority God gave to him, which Eve did not
20 have over her husband.⁵⁵

⁵¹ It has been asserted that Gen 2:23 contains a pair of “divine passives” indicating the designation of “woman” comes *from God*, not man (see Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” 11). But this creative proposition to deconstruct the text is tainted with eisegesis. More correctly stated, Gen 2:23 contains a pair of “Adamic passives.” It simply ignores the plain reading of Scripture: “Adam said . . . ‘She shall be called Woman.’” The responsibility given to Adam in naming indicates the leadership function and authority God gave to him, which Eve did not have over her husband.

⁵² Edwin Reynolds and Clinton Wahlen, “NAD Theology of Ordination Study Committee Report” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, January, 2014, 199.

⁵³ Davidson, *Women in Ministry*, 263.

⁵⁴ Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth* (Wheaton, IL, 2012), 31 (note 14).

⁵⁵ It is noted here that Adam does not give the personal name “Eve” to his wife until Genesis 3:20 (“the man *called* [Hebrew *qārā’*] his wife’s name Eve, because she was the mother of all living”). This is because in the creation story in Genesis 2 Adam is giving a broad category name to his wife, indicating the name that would be given to womanhood generally, and he is not giving specific personal names designating the character of the individual

1 **Point 10: Man to take the initiative in marriage.** “Therefore a man shall leave his father
2 and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh” (Gen 2:24). The man,
3 not the woman, exercises a leadership role and initiates the marital relationship, thereby
4 assuming responsibility for the welfare of his spouse. This command of Scripture for the man to
5 initiate marriage reaffirms the creation headship of the man in the home and in the church, for
6 the Garden of Eden constituted both the home and church for Adam and Eve.

7 Irrefutable confirmation of pre-Fall male headship is derived from the ideal pre-Fall
8 marriage: “. . . the two shall become one flesh.” The apostle Paul asserts that this mystery
9 (“two shall be one flesh”) “concerns Christ and His church” (Eph 5:32). But he has already
10 affirmed that “the husband is the head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church. . . [and]
11 just as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be subject to their own husbands in
12 everything” (vv. 23-24). The ideal marriage in Eden, where the man and the woman were one
13 flesh, was to be based upon the mystery of “oneness” between Christ and His church (the two
14 are to be one flesh). Since Christ is head of the church, as the husband is head of the wife, it is
15 apparent that Adam, in Eden, was ordained by God to be head of the woman/wife. Paul uses
16 Genesis 2 to ground and establish his teaching on headship both in the home (Eph 5) and in the
17 church (1 Cor 11 and 1 Tim 2-3).

18 The record of creation in Genesis 2 delineates at least ten definitive actions on the part
19 of God or Adam, all of which illustrate the *non-hierarchical* servant-leadership responsibility
20 that God intended for Adam with respect to his wife.

21 In Genesis 3, the servant-leadership of man in the Garden home was now divinely
22 mandated for our parents in their post-Fall condition. Just as the Garden home was to be a little
23 church, now the Christian home in a post-Fall world was to be a little church where a man was
24 appointed leadership responsibility. The church was to be an extension of the home. “The
25 home of every Christian should be a little church, a representation of the heavenly home, from
26 which others may learn what a family can become in this world through obedience to God's

person. This is analogous to Adam’s naming the animals with broad category names rather than personal names.
(See Grudem, *Biblical Foundations of Manhood and Womanhood*, 28.)

1 word.”⁵⁶ Genesis 3 continues as a commentary on the reversal of the divine creation order of
2 Genesis 2.

3 **Point 11: The woman leaves Adam’s protective sphere, initiating role reversal.** The
4 serpent said to the woman, “Has God said, ‘You shall not eat of every tree of the Garden?’”
5 (Gen 3:1). Eve wanders from her husband’s protective care and becomes deceived by the
6 serpent. Eve asserts independence from her husband and begins to assume a leadership-
7 headship role. “[S]he had fallen into temptation by *separating from her companion, contrary to*
8 *the divine direction*. . . . Eve had been perfectly happy by her husband's side in her Eden home;
9 but, like restless modern Eves, she was flattered with the hope of entering a higher sphere than
10 that which *God had assigned her*. In attempting to *rise above her original position*, she fell far
11 below it. A similar result will be reached by all who are unwilling to take up cheerfully their life
12 duties in accordance with God's plan.”⁵⁷ The immediate context of this statement indicates
13 that the “higher sphere” which Eve hoped to enter was “to rise above her original position” “by
14 her husband’s side.” The passage concludes with the warning that today the same process is
15 being repeated by modern Eves. Eve’s hope to be like God was *not* the “higher sphere” which
16 she sought to enter, nor is that the higher sphere that modern Eves hope to enter.⁵⁸ The
17 context suggests that modern Eves hope to enter a higher sphere by attempting to rise above
18 their original positions, by their husband’s side, in a manner congruent with the actions of the
19 first Eve. In addition to the evidence of Eve’s seeking a “higher sphere” instead of remaining in
20 “her original position” “by her husband’s side,” the text of Genesis 3 reveals at least fourteen
21 other indications of Adam’s leadership role.⁵⁹

22 **Point 12: Serpent and woman initiate dialogue, continuing role reversal.** “Has God
23 indeed said, ‘You shall not eat of every tree . . .?’ And the woman said to the serpent, ‘We may
24 eat the fruit of the trees of the Garden’” (Gen 3:1-2). The serpent speaks to the woman as if

⁵⁶ White, *Bible Echo*, February 16, 1903, par. 1.

⁵⁷ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 58-59, emphasis added.

⁵⁸ Davidson contends that the higher sphere to which Eve hoped to enter was to be like God. This assertion violates the context of the passage. See Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” 24.

⁵⁹ Contra Davidson who contends that there is no “indication of male leadership over the woman, and female submission to the man in the account of the Temptation and Fall” in Genesis 3:1-7. *Ibid.*, 23.

1 she were the head, reversing the headship principle.⁶⁰ Rather than first seeking her husband's
2 counsel upon encountering this mysterious phenomenon, Eve asserts her independence, and in
3 contradiction to the warning concerning the forbidden tree responds to the serpent's question.
4 Further advancing her leadership aspirations, and seeking a higher sphere, Eve initiates
5 communication and responds to the serpent's temptation.

6 **Point 13: The woman initiates transgression, continuing role reversal.** "And when the
7 woman saw that the tree was good for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree
8 desirable to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate" (Gen 3:6a). Embracing her perceived
9 leadership potential and disregarding the warning of angels⁶¹ regarding the forbidden tree, and
10 seeking to enter a higher sphere, Eve was deceived and fell into transgression. The apostle Paul
11 alludes to Eve's attempted role reversal and seeking of a higher sphere in 1 Timothy 2:14,
12 where he justifies the headship of man in the home and in the church by stating that "Adam
13 was not deceived, but the woman being deceived fell into transgression" (v. 14). "As the first
14 reason for male headship, Paul pointed to the creation order in which God created human
15 beings: 'For Adam was formed first, then Eve' (1 Tim 2:12). The second argument points to the
16 order of transgression: 'Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into
17 transgression' (1 Tim 2:14)."⁶² The reason for male headship: Adam was created first, and Eve
18 sinned first. Ingo Sorke, perceptively identifying the reversal of roles, states that "by conceding
19 to Satan, Eve substituted Adam's authority [headship] with Satan's, introducing sin and death
20 to the world (an 'unutterable woe')."⁶³ She began to assume headship over Adam and made
21 Satan her head. The serpent misled Eve, and she now proceeds to usurp Adam's headship
22 authority.⁶⁴

23 Since Eve sinned first, we might expect that the New Testament would tell us that we
24 inherit a sinful nature and die because of Eve's sin, or that we are counted guilty because of
25 Eve's sin. But this is not the case. In fact, it is just the opposite. We read in the New Testament,

⁶⁰ Wahlen and Reynolds, "NAD Theology of Ordination Study Committee Report (Minority Report)," 204.

⁶¹ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 53.

⁶² P. Gerard Damsteegt, "Headship, Gender, and Ordination in the Writings of Ellen G. White," Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013, 29.

⁶³ Ingo Sorke, "Adam, Where Are You?" Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013, 24.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26. Wherein Sorke (note 98) also cites Thomas Schreiner, who concludes that Eve's transgression "is indicative of what happens when male leadership is abrogated."

1 “For as *in Adam* all die, so also *in Christ* shall all be made alive” (1 Cor 15:22). The New
2 Testament does not say, “As *in Eve* all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.” It is
3 unmistakable, then, that Adam had a leadership role in representing the entire human race, a
4 leadership role that Eve did not have.⁶⁵

5 **Point 14: The woman initiates usurpation of Adam’s headship role.** “She also gave to
6 her husband with her” (Gen 3:6b). When she conveys the fruit to Adam, he—in distress and
7 astonishment—realizes the tragedy unfolding as Eve explains her experience at the forbidden
8 tree. He declares to his wife that “by the divine sentence she must die. In answer **she urged**
9 **him to eat**, repeating the words of the serpent that they should not surely die.”⁶⁶ Adam was
10 not deceived (1 Tim 2:14)—he sees that his headship has been reversed, and realizes his
11 headship hangs in the balance. “There was a terrible struggle in his mind. **He mourned** that he
12 had **permitted Eve** to wander from his side.”⁶⁷ “Adam reproached his companion for *her folly*
13 *in leaving his side* and permitting herself to be deceived by the serpent.”⁶⁸ Usurpation of
14 Adam’s headship role is nearly consummated.

15 Adam did not initiate taking the fruit from Eve. She preemptively *urges* Adam to
16 relinquish his headship responsibility and simultaneously to disobey God by offering him the
17 exhilarating experience of eating the fruit. The headship of Adam is illustrated in two ways in
18 this scene: 1) Eve attempts to usurp his headship by taking the initiative and urging Adam to
19 disobey; 2) Adam realizes his failure in exercising headship responsibility by permitting Eve to
20 wander from his side. He then contemplates the consequences. The headship of Adam remains
21 in the balance, awaiting his decision.

22 **Point 15: The usurpation of Adam’s headship and role reversal is consummated.**
23 “[A]nd he ate” (Gen 3:6c). By choosing to take the fruit from Eve and eating the fruit, Adam
24 relinquished his headship role. In effect Adam transferred his headship role to his wife, and the
25 role reversal between Adam and Eve was consummated. Through the woman Satan succeeded
26 in his purpose to overthrow the man, the monarch of the world. Through Adam, Satan

⁶⁵ Wayne Grudem, *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton, IL, 2002), 25-26.

⁶⁶ *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 56, emphasis added.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 57, emphasis added.

1 conquered the human race. “Having conquered Adam, the monarch of the world, he [Satan]
2 had gained the race as his subjects.”⁶⁹ “By one man sin entered the world . . .” (Rom 5:12).
3 What was it that led to the entrance of sin into the world? Ellen White’s writings indicate that it
4 was the reversal of the God-appointed roles for the couple.⁷⁰

5 **Point 16: The unequivocal evidence of role-reversal—nakedness.** “Then the eyes of
6 both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves
7 together and made themselves coverings” (Gen 3:7). This defining moment, Adam’s
8 transgression and resulting nakedness, marks the official Fall of the human race. It is
9 noteworthy that the woman did not become naked upon eating the fruit. Only after the
10 transgression of Adam, who had headship responsibility for the family, did they both become
11 naked. Generic transgression *per se* did not cause the resulting nakedness. Nakedness was the
12 result of Adam’s unique transgression of relinquishing his headship role that God had assigned
13 to him. In addition to disobeying a face-to-face command of God, Adam’s willing role reversal,
14 resulting in the visible sign of nakedness, is an additional and parallel reason he is held
15 responsible for the Fall of the human race. This *highly* underscores the fact that Adam was the
16 head and representative of the human race, and only his sin caused the Fall. The Scriptures are
17 clear in confirming the leadership/headship role of Adam. Sin and death entered the world
18 through the actions of Adam, even though Eve sinned first. “Therefore, just as through one
19 man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men because all
20 sinned” (Rom 5:12).

21 It is interesting to note that if Adam had resisted the temptation, God could have
22 supplied a new wife for him, and the race would have remained unfallen. “*He did not realize*
23 *that the same Infinite Power who had from the dust of the earth created him, a living, beautiful*

⁶⁹ White, “Redemption—No. 1,” *Review and Herald*, Feb 24, 1874.

⁷⁰ Damsteegt, 20. It was Eve who took on an independent leadership role. She left her husband’s side, not following the warning “*to beware of separating herself from her husband*” (PP 53). “*She had fallen into temptation by separating from her companion, contrary to the divine direction*” (PP 58). Having followed Satan’s advice, “*she became the agent of Satan in working the ruin of her husband*” (PP 56). “*It was by her solicitation that Adam sinned*” (PP 58). Satan “*had tempted the woman to distrust God’s love, to doubt His wisdom, and to transgress His law, and through her he had caused the overthrow of Adam*” (PP 57). Eve had not been content with her God-given role. “*She was flattered with the hope of entering a higher sphere than that which God had assigned her. In attempting to rise above her original position, she fell far below it*” (PP 59).

1 *form, and had in love given him a companion, could supply her place.”* The possibility of a new
2 wife for Adam shows that Eve's act alone was insufficient to curse the human race. This is
3 further evidence of the creation headship of Adam.

4 **Point 17: God calls and seeks and apprehends Adam first, then Eve.** “Then the LORD
5 God called to Adam and said to him, ‘Where are you?’” (Gen 3:9). Although Eve sinned first,
6 God did not call Eve asking why she ate of the tree of which she had been forbidden not to eat.
7 God had warned Adam about the forbidden tree prior to the creation of Eve, thus conferring
8 headship responsibility upon Adam. Therefore God calls Adam and holds him accountable for
9 not maintaining the integrity of his headship responsibility. The uniqueness of Adam’s
10 headship role can explain not only the nakedness issue but also why God calls and seeks and
11 apprehends Adam prior to Eve.

12 **Point 18: God interrogates Adam first and indicts Adam for the Fall, bypassing Eve.**
13 “Have you eaten of the tree of which I commanded you that you should not eat” (3:11)? God
14 indicts Adam by reminding him that He commanded the man, not the woman, regarding the
15 forbidden tree (the Hebrew has the singular “you”). Prior to woman’s creation, God expressly
16 forbade Adam from eating of the tree, thereby giving him headship responsibility. Responding
17 to Eve’s initiative and agreeing to take the fruit from his wife and eating thereof, Adam allowed
18 Eve to usurp his headship role. The reversal of headship roles led to Adam’s disobedience and
19 resulted in the Fall of the human race. Attempts to refute the obvious evidence of headship in
20 view of the priority of God’s interrogation of Adam strain credulity.⁷¹

21 **Point 19: Adam indicts himself.** “The woman You gave to be with me, she gave me of
22 the tree, and I ate” (3:12). First, Adam acknowledges his headship responsibility by virtue of

⁷¹ Davidson denies that the priority of Adam’s interrogation implies pre-Fall leadership over his wife, but acknowledges that it was natural for God to question him first because he was 1) created first, 2) the first to have received the command about the tree, and 3) personally warned of the consequences of disobeying the command. Although denying it, Davidson effectively acknowledges Adam’s leadership role by acknowledging the previous three facts. Davidson simply suggests that the man is not questioned “by God on behalf of his wife, but solely on his own behalf” and then, rather than embracing the obvious implications of the interrogation sequence, he employs a literary chiasmic argument to deny the divinely instituted leadership of Adam. But ignoring the clear evidences of headship with such reasoning is unconvincing. He concludes that those opposing the ordination of women as elders/ministers are “reading into the text what does not exist in the chapter.” By that same accusation, Davidson indicts himself by ignoring both the plain testimony of Scripture in Genesis 2-3 as well NT confirmation of headship in the OT text in 1 Timothy 2 and 1 Corinthians 11, 14 (see Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” 24-25).

1 the fact that God gave him the woman as a gift (“You gave me”) to be loved and protected by
2 him. “God Himself gave Adam a companion . . . as an equal, to be loved and protected by
3 him.”⁷² Again, it is noteworthy that God did not bring Adam to the woman and give him to her.
4 Nor did He bring the two simultaneously to each other. Second, Adam concedes that he yielded
5 to Eve’s assumed leadership role by accepting the fruit (“she gave me”). Third, he relinquished
6 his headship role when he ate (“and I ate”).

7 **Point 20: God interrogates Eve second even though she sinned first, being deceived.**

8 “And the LORD God said to the woman, ‘What is this you have done?’ And the woman said,
9 ‘The serpent deceived me, and I ate’” (Gen 3:13). Having previously indicted Adam for failure in
10 maintaining his headship responsibilities by yielding to his wife, God addresses the woman. The
11 woman, seeking to enter a higher sphere than her position by her husband’s side, was deceived
12 and fell into transgression, but Adam willingly transgressed the face-to-face command of God
13 regarding the forbidden tree, thereby relinquishing his headship role. The apostle Paul
14 confirms the Genesis 3 account of Eve’s deception in 1 Timothy 2:14, where he justifies Adam’s
15 headship role over the woman. “Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived fell
16 into transgression.”

17 **Point 21: Adam’s role reversal is corrected.** “To the woman He said . . . ‘Your desire
18 shall be for [against]⁷³ your husband, and he shall rule⁷⁴ over you’” (Gen 3:16). Although Adam
19 relinquished his headship responsibility upon the act of eating the fruit, with its consequential
20 nakedness, that same role reversal was corrected by the expressed declaration of God that
21 Adam was to rule over the woman by divine decree.⁷⁵ Prior to the Fall there existed a natural

⁷² White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 46.

⁷³ Strong evidence has been set forth that *tēšûqâ* (desire) with the preposition *’el* should be translated as “desire against” rather than “desire for” (with a different preposition *’al*) as in Song of Solomon 7:10. Thus the Fall did not bring about headship in marriage. The Fall brought about a *distortion* of previous roles, not the introduction of new roles. The distortion was that Eve would now rebel against her husband’s authority, and Adam could misuse that authority to rule forcefully and even harshly over Eve. See Ratsara & Bediako, pp. 38-43 and also Grudem, *Biblical Foundations of Manhood and Womanhood*, 32-35.

⁷⁴ The Hebrew *māšal* (to rule) does not convey negative connotations of the word dominate. The word *māšal* has several nuances within the semantic range of “rule” —for example, to “rule” over siblings (Gen 37:8), slaves (Exod 21:8), nations (Deut 15:6), to “take charge” over someone’s possessions (Gen 24:2; Ps 105:21), to control (Gen 4:7; Ps 19:14), or to exercise self-control (Prov 16:32). See Ratsara & Bediako, 42.

⁷⁵ Ratsara & Bediako (pp. 39-42) present convincing evidence that the woman’s “desire” (*tēšûqâ*) denotes mastery or control over the man. The woman exercised authority over the man and influenced him to disobey. The divine pronouncement is predicated on the man’s having yielded to the leadership of the woman. But God divinely

1 and harmonious headship/submission relationship of the man and the woman. Now after the
2 Fall, the woman was placed in subjection to her husband by divine decree. The *harmonious*
3 headship/submission relationship of the man and the woman could only be restored through
4 divine decree and reception of the gospel by both husband and wife.

5 Evangelical feminists find evidence for the appearance of headship and submission only
6 after the Fall. Adventists in favor of the ordination of women elders/ministers cite, for
7 example, the passage in *Patriarchs and Prophets* where it is stated that “God had made [Eve]
8 the equal of Adam. . . in *harmony* with each other.” But after the Fall “their union could be
9 maintained and *harmony* preserved only by submission on the part of the one or the other. Eve
10 had been first in transgression; . . . and she was placed in subjection to her husband.”⁷⁶
11 However, evidence for Adam’s pre-fall headship responsibility is indicated by at least four facts:
12 first, Adam “mourned that he had *permitted* Eve to wander from his side;”⁷⁷ second, Satan by-
13 passed Adam and caused his overthrow through the woman;⁷⁸ third, angels had warned Eve
14 not to separate from her husband, for she would be in less danger from temptation,⁷⁹ and
15 fourth, Eve sought to enter a “higher sphere” by “separating from her companion” instead of
16 remaining in “her original position” “by her husband’s side.”⁸⁰ In the context of the full
17 statement that “harmony [could be] preserved only by submission” and that Eve was “placed in
18 subjection to her husband,” the author distinguishes between pre-fall harmony and the
19 necessary means for preserving harmony in a post-Fall condition. Pre-fall harmony was natural

mandates and restores the headship of the man. The woman’s desire for mastery is reversed by the authority bestowed on the man to “rule.”

⁷⁶ *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 58-59. “Eve was told of the sorrow and pain that must henceforth be her portion. And the Lord said, ‘Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.’ In the creation God had made her the equal of Adam. Had they remained obedient to God--in harmony with His great law of love--they would ever have been in harmony with each other; but sin had brought discord, and now their union could be maintained and harmony preserved only by submission on the part of the one or the other. Eve had been the first in transgression; and she had fallen into temptation by separating from her companion, contrary to the divine direction. It was by her solicitation that Adam sinned, and she was now placed in subjection to her husband. Had the principles joined in the law of God been cherished by the fallen race, this sentence, though growing out of the results of sin, would have proved a blessing to them; but man’s abuse of the supremacy thus given him has too often rendered the lot of woman very bitter and made her life a burden.”

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 57: “Satan exulted in his success. He had tempted the woman to distrust God’s love, to doubt His wisdom, and to transgress His law, and through her he had caused the overthrow of Adam.”

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 58-59.

1 with the principle of headship/submission as part of the natural creation order, as documented
2 in the previous points 1-21. But upon Adam's relinquishing of his headship role to Eve,
3 harmony in a post-Fall condition now could be preserved only by divinely mandated
4 headship/submission (unnatural in the initial, inherent post-fall condition) on the part of the
5 one or the other. Therefore God said, "Thy desire shall be for [against] thy husband, and he
6 shall rule over you."

7 The servant-leadership of man in the Garden home was now divinely mandated for our
8 parents in their post-Fall condition. Just as the Garden home was to be a little church, now in
9 the post-Fall world, the Christian home was to be a little church where a man was appointed
10 leadership responsibility. Even before the Fall, Adam's headship in his relationship with Eve
11 would serve as model of male headship in subsequent families.

12 The home of our first parents was to be a pattern for other homes as their children should
13 go forth to occupy the earth.⁸¹

14
15 The home of every Christian should be a little church, a representation of the heavenly
16 home, from which others may learn what a family can become in this world through
17 obedience to God's word.⁸²

18
19 **Point 22: God holds Adam accountable for relinquishing headship responsibility.** "Then
20 to Adam He said, 'Because you have heeded the voice of your wife and have eaten from the
21 tree of which I commanded you, saying, "You shall not eat of it": Cursed is the ground for your
22 sake'" (Gen 3:17). God holds Adam accountable not for explicit disobedience of His command,
23 but explicitly for listening to the voice of his wife in this matter. God reminds Adam that He
24 commanded the man, not the woman, regarding the forbidden tree. Adam relinquished his
25 headship responsibility by listening to the voice of his wife instead of God, yielding to his
26 emotions, and disregarding the face-to-face command of God prior to Eve's creation. God's
27 indictment of Adam for relinquishing his headship position is the primary reason Paul assigns
28 the responsibility of the Fall of the human race to Adam (Rom 5:12, 15, 17). Adam's headship is
29 confirmed by 1) priority of creation, 2) priority of the Forbidden Tree test, 3) priority of

⁸¹ Ibid., 49.

⁸² White, *Bible Echo*, February 16, 1903.

1 nakedness, 4) priority of apprehension, 5) priority of indictment and interrogation, and 6)
2 priority of accountability—heeding the voice of his wife.

3 **Point 23: Death sentence pronounced on Adam, not Eve.** “. . . till you return to the
4 ground, for out of it you were taken; for dust you are, and to dust you shall return” (Gen 3:19).
5 Although the woman sinned first, the death sentence is pronounced on Adam (the pronoun
6 “you” is singular here) for failure to exercise his headship responsibilities with the woman. The
7 relinquishing of Adam’s headship role brought sin into the world and death through sin that
8 affected every human being (Rom 5:12). The headship of Adam over the human race is
9 amplified by Paul, who attributes the entrance of death to Adam’s sin.

10 **Point 24: Adam reassumes his headship responsibility.** “And Adam called his wife’s
11 name Eve, because she was the mother of all living” (Gen 3:20). The assigning of names in
12 Scripture signifies authority over the one named, as noted previously. By naming Eve, Adam
13 reassumes his headship role, now divinely imposed, as God decreed in Genesis 3:16. This
14 declaration also seems to be related to fulfilling of the divine command to “be fruitful and
15 multiply” in Genesis 1. It also serves as an affirmation that life and salvation would come
16 through the woman’s giving birth to the promised Seed (as God promised in 3:15 and as Paul
17 seems to confirm in 1 Tim 2:15).

18 **Point 25: Adam is driven out of the Garden—the woman follows.** “The LORD God sent
19 him out of the Garden of Eden. . . . He drove out the man, and placed cherubim at the east of
20 the Garden of Eden. . .” (Gen 3:23-24). Adam’s headship responsibility is reaffirmed, when God
21 drives the man out of the Garden, leaving the woman to follow. When “the man is driven out
22 of the Garden, it is understood that where the man leads, the woman follows. The man will
23 continue to be the head of the human family. It is he who is given primary responsibility for the
24 life of the family and society. (Gen 2).”⁸³ Thus, Genesis 2-3 forms a perfect *inclusio* with perfect
25 symmetry; Genesis 2 begins with the creation of Adam (placed in the Garden), followed by the
26 woman placed in the Garden, and Genesis 3 ends with the expulsion of the Adam, followed by
27 the woman, from the Garden of Eden.

⁸³ Ratsara & Bediako, 45.

1 **Point 26: The Image of God.** God said, “Let Us make man in our image. . . . So God
2 created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He
3 created them” (Gen 1:26-27). It is important to observe that the order in Genesis 1:27 of male
4 and then female prepares for the creation order of the man and then the woman in Genesis 2.
5 Genesis 1:27 is expanded upon in Genesis 2. Both those in favor and those against ordination
6 of women agree on the equality of being of male and female; they agree that the creation of
7 male and female as the image of God indicates the equal value of women with men as being
8 fully human, with equal dignity, worth, and importance.⁸⁴ The plurality of the Divinity,
9 expressed in the declaration, “Let *Us* make man in our image [male and female],” suggests that
10 some unique difference associated with male and female, beyond gender, is imaged in the
11 Godhead, “Us.” Although evangelical feminists and egalitarian Adventist acknowledge that
12 humans are created in God’s image in terms of resemblance, relationship, and representation
13 or function, they deny that this implies any functional role relationships among the members of
14 the Trinity. They assert that the emphasis is on the “fellowship of equals;” and “if there is any
15 submission implied, it is a *mutual submission* of Equals.”⁸⁵ In contrast to this limited view, it is
16 evident that the declaration by one member of the Trinity, “Let *Us* make man in our image,”
17 suggests that the one speaking is giving *permission* to the other members to commence the
18 creation of mankind. The one in authority gives the command, “Let Us.” Ellen White confirms
19 conclusion when she states that “*They had wrought together in the creation of the earth and*
20 *every living thing upon it. And now **God said to His Son**, ‘Let us make man in our image.’”⁸⁶
21 Thus, in addition to equality of being in the Trinity, we also see evidence for
22 authority/submission roles with the Godhead. Consequently, if male and female are made in*

⁸⁴ For a representative complementarian view of the image of God see Bruce Ware, “Male and Female Complementarity and the Image of God,” *Biblical Foundations of Manhood and Womanhood*, ed. Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL, 2002), pp. 71-86. For a representative egalitarian view, see: Richard Davidson, “Biblical Anthropology and the Old Testament” (Third International Bible Conference, Jerusalem, Israel, June 16, 2012), 2-17.

⁸⁵ Davidson, “Should Women Be Ordained as Pastors? Old Testament Considerations,” 3. Davidson limits the relationship in the Trinity, quoting J. Moskala, only to a “plural of fellowship or community within the Godhead,” suggesting a process of deliberation among the members. He concludes that the text gives “no indication of hierarchy in the Godhead.” The assertion of those such as Davidson regarding mutual submission in the Trinity “is an egalitarian invention created to justify the egalitarian idea of mutual submission in marriage.” See Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 429-433 for a discussion on mutual submission in the Trinity.

⁸⁶ White, *Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 1, 25-25.

1 the image of God, we can be certain they would reflect the authority and submission roles
2 operative within the Godhead.⁸⁷ Confirming evidence for the principle of headship and
3 submission within the Trinity will be presented in Section VI.

4 **B. The Mystery of Godliness Embraces Headship and Submission**

5 The biblical principle of headship and submission has been demonstrated with the initial
6 evidence from Genesis 2-3. But evidence is piled upon evidence with the headship of the 12
7 Patriarchs, the male headship of the Levitical priesthood, Jesus' appointment of 12 male
8 Apostles, and the replacement of Judas by a male apostle. The evidence continues in 1
9 Corinthians 11:3-16 where Paul uses the creation order (Adam first, Eve second) as the
10 rationale for the headship principle and for behavior in the church. Paul then uses the same
11 rationale (creation order) for the headship principle as the basis for the appointment of men as
12 elders who have teaching and governing authority in the church in 1 Timothy 2-3.

13 Paul gives these instructions to Timothy so the saints might know how to conduct
14 themselves in the household of God, the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim 3:15). What is
15 truth? Jesus came to bear witness to the truth (John 18:37). Jesus came to reveal who God is—
16 to reveal the Father, His character of self-sacrificing love, which was demonstrated with the
17 incarnation (the gift of His Son) and supremely at the cross. With the incarnation we see the
18 principle of headship and submission clearly portrayed. Paul concludes his instruction on
19 conduct in the church in verse 16 with the enigmatic phrase: "Without controversy great is the
20 mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh. . . ." The "mystery of godliness" captures
21 the biblical principle of headship and submission, and this mystery which is inherent in the
22 Trinity is to be manifested in conduct and order within the church. The *truth* of self-sacrificing
23 love is the mystery of godliness, and this truth is opposed by the *lie* of self-exaltation—the
24 mystery of iniquity. The truth—the mystery of godliness which embraces the principle of
25 headship and submission—is to be manifested within and by the church.

26 The nature of the Godhead, the image of God, was to be reproduced in the creation of
27 mankind—Adam and Eve. In some unique and fundamental way, the male/female relationship

⁸⁷ For a more extensive discussion on the pattern of authority that gives order to the universe see: Jerry Moon, "Ellen White, Ordination, and Authority," paper presented to the Theology of Ordination Study Committee, Baltimore, MD, July 22-24, 2013.

1 was a reflection of the image of God. Of all the created beings, only man was created to reflect
2 the complete image of God. “*Human beings were a new and a distinct order. They were made*
3 *‘in the image of God.’*”⁸⁸ The complete reflection of the image of God included not just the
4 outward resemblance and moral character of God but also the headship/submission roles that
5 have always existed among the three persons of the heavenly trio of the Godhead. Equality of
6 being and the principle of headship/submission are inherent within the nature of the Trinity,
7 and this nature of the Trinity, the image of God, was reproduced in the creation of mankind,
8 male and female. This point is at heart of the controversy: the nature of the Trinity⁸⁹ is to be
9 reflected in the nature of mankind (male and female). Thus, the assertion⁹⁰ is misleading that
10 the passage in Genesis 1:27 gives “no hint of a divine creation order.” In fact this passage, in
11 combination with verse 26, shouts creation headship. “Let *Us* make man in our image . . . male
12 and female He created them.” The overarching purpose of the gospel is to restore the image of
13 God in mankind, namely the church, the pillar and ground of truth.

14 The evidence for creation headship in Genesis 2-3 is voluminous and overwhelming to
15 the honest student who allows Scripture to interpret itself, using the same hermeneutic that
16 the Reformers and our Adventist pioneers employed. It should be noted also that changing
17 cultural influences played no part in the establishment of male headship in Eden, since it was
18 the perfect culture established by God.

19 The case for male headship throughout the history of Israel is evident to any student of
20 the OT and need not be documented here. In the NT the same headship principle was carried
21 into the ministry of Christ, the Cornerstone of the church. Jesus Christ was incarnated in the
22 form of a male. He is the Head of the church. The twelve disciples chosen by Jesus were all
23 men (Mark 3:13-19). To the Rabbinical community Jesus was known as radical, and He surely
24 could have rocked the boat further by appointing women as apostles. After the ascension of
25 Christ the disciples gathered together to appoint one of two candidates to replace Judas—but
26 both were men (Acts 1:12-23). And not surprisingly, the seven deacons chosen in Acts 6 were

⁸⁸ Ellen G. White, *Review and Herald*, February 11, 1902.

⁸⁹ For an extended discussion of the principle of Headship, Submission and Equality in the Trinity, including pros and cons, see Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 45-48; 405-441 and references cited therein.

⁹⁰ Davidson, *Spectrum*, April 10, 2010.

1 all men. Male headship and leadership is unmistakably evident in the four gospel accounts of
2 the ministry of Christ. We turn next to the principle of headship and submission in
3 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 followed by 1 Timothy 2-3 where the apostle Paul affirms the creation
4 headship principle of Genesis 2-3.

5

6 **III. Headship and Submission in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14**⁹¹

7 The earliest place in Paul's letters where he addresses the subject of headship and
8 submission and its implications for the church is 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 where he lays the
9 groundwork rather thoroughly. This passage forms the theological basis for his later instruction
10 on the same subject. Written approximately twenty years into his ministry, his teaching
11 remained consistent in this matter until the end of his ministry, as seen in 1 Timothy 2-3 and
12 Titus 1-2, written perhaps nine years later. Thus, 1 Corinthians 11 was grounded in solid biblical
13 theology, not merely on the local cultural context in Corinth.

14 **Local vs. Universal Application.** The text of 1 Corinthians gives us very little insight into
15 what was happening in Corinth at that time. Only extra-biblical sources would provide that
16 information. But Scripture is supposed to be self-interpreting, internally coherent without
17 recourse to extra-biblical sources.⁹² There is no evidence that the text in 1 Corinthians 11 was
18 culturally conditioned and applied only to a local situation.⁹³ The text is self-interpreting, and as
19 such it sets forth universal principles. The instructions in 1 Corinthians 11 are based on biblical
20 and theological reasons given in 1 Corinthians 11:7-9. Each of the reasons given in vv. 7-16 has a
21 universal basis, not a local basis. The first ones (vv. 7-9) appeal to the order and purpose of the
22 creation of man and woman. The appeal to the angels (v. 10) is based on the order of heavenly
23 beings. The appeal to the nature of things (v. 14) is universal but ultimately appeals back to the

⁹¹ This section is adapted in part from Edwin Reynolds, "Biblical Hermeneutics and Headship in First Corinthians," Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013.

⁹² "Although many biblical passages had local significance, nonetheless they contain timeless principles applicable to every age and culture." "Methods of Bible Study" [MBSD], a statement voted by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Executive Committee at the Annual Council in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 12 October 1986, available from <http://www.adventist.org/beliefs/other-documents/other-doc4.html> accessed 22 May 2013.

⁹³ For example, there is no allusion in the text to Corinth's cosmopolitan populace, its commerce, its immorality, and its Temple of Aphrodite up on the Acrocorinth.

1 design in creation: “for her hair is given to her for a covering” (v. 15). The last appeal, in case of
2 contention, is to the universal practice of the churches (v. 16).

3 **Immediate Context of Submission.** Principles found in the immediate literary context of
4 1 Corinthians 11 include submitting to the will of God and submitting one’s own rights for the
5 good of the community (chapters 8-10). Submitting to all levels of God-ordained authority is
6 then introduced (11:3). As Paul prepares to approach the subject of the Lord’s Supper in 1
7 Corinthians 11, he urges the Corinthians to “Give no offense . . . to the church of God” by
8 following Paul in pointing to the model of Christ’s submission. This is the most immediate
9 context of the headship passage in 1 Corinthians 11.

10

11 **A. Headship Principle in 1 Corinthians 11**

12 Paul then informs his readers that there is something they must understand. There are
13 categories of nonreciprocal relationships in which some individuals are designated as “head”
14 while others are not in a reciprocal relationship with them. In each pair, only one is the head.
15 The other submits to the head. Even in the Trinity, biblically, the Father is the Head, and Christ
16 submits to His headship. The Father may honor Christ and give Him all power and authority, but
17 1 Corinthians 15:27 clearly states, “But when it says, ‘all things are put in subjection,’ it is plain
18 that He is excepted who put all things in subjection under Him.” There is no reciprocity in
19 headship relations, even within the Godhead. Mutual submission is outside of the headship
20 relation. Within the headship relation, there is no reciprocity, although Christ’s attitude as Head
21 of the church was one of self-sacrificing love, and the same is supposed to be true of the
22 husband’s relation to his wife. That is not the same as reciprocity, where the husband would
23 submit to the wife as head or where Christ would submit to the church as head, even where the
24 Father would submit to the Son as Head.

25 It is possible to be the head in a relationship to one party but not another. In the three
26 nonreciprocal relationships defined in the text, God (the Father) is the only one who is under no
27 one else’s headship, and the woman is the only one who has no explicit headship over another.
28 “The head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is
29 God” (NIV). This headship principle in 1 Corinthians 11:3 is the ground for all that follows in the
30 passage.

1 **Metaphorically, *Kephalē* Means Authority Over One in Subordination.** The Greek word
2 for head, *kephalē*, both in the NT and the OT (LXX), can mean either a literal anatomical head
3 (on a body) or a metaphorical head (ruler, leader, authority figure). The claimed meaning of
4 *kephalē* as “source” in 1 Corinthians 11 has been shown to be without foundation.⁹⁴ Paul uses
5 the *body* as a metaphor in 1 Corinthians 12 for the relation of Christ to His church (cf. Col 1:18;
6 Eph 5:23). Just as the head directs the body, so Christ directs His church. The head is not the
7 source of the body, but it is the part that sends directions to the bodily parts. Reynolds cites
8 Ranzolin that whether *kephalē* means “ruler” or “source,” “it’s hard to escape the notion that
9 *kephalē* conveys the sense of subordination.”⁹⁵ In the NT the meaning of *kephalē* as “head,”
10 (not “source”) is unmistakable as in Ephesians 5:23-24 where the church is subject to its Head,
11 “Christ is head [authority] of the church” and “the church is subject to Christ”; likewise in the
12 same passage “the husband is head [authority] of the wife” and “so let wives be [subject] to
13 their own husbands.” The meaning of *kephalē* as “head” or “authority” (not source) is also
14 evident in Ephesians 1:22 where Christ is “the head (*kephalē*) over (*huper*) all things.”⁹⁶ The
15 authoritative head of the church is confirmed by White. “*The great Head of the church*
16 *superintends His work through the instrumentality of men ordained by God to act as His*
17 *representatives.*”⁹⁷

18 Those in favor of the ordination of women as elder/minister repeatedly cite, with
19 authoritative emphasis, the culmination of over thirty years of effort by Philip B. Payne in
20 support of this issue.⁹⁸ Payne devotes 100 of 500 pages dealing with 1 Cor 11:3-16 and argues
21 that *kephalē* in v. 3 means “source,” giving a number of reasons to support such a translation.

⁹⁴ Those in favor of the ordination of women as elders/ministers have argued for interpreting *kephalē* as “source.” This meaning seems possible in Eph 4:15-16 and Col 2:19; however, this simply does not work in 1 Cor 11:3 or Eph 5:23. Rather, it results in both logical and theological problems. James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 166, shows then that “there is no way to construct a satisfactory set of parallels” in 1 Cor 11:3. Is man the source of woman (or husband, of wife) or is God the source of Christ in the same sense that Christ is the source of man? The obvious answer is No.

⁹⁵ Reynolds, 20 (see note 40).

⁹⁶ For a comprehensive summary of *kephalē* as “head,” see: Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “*Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3,” *Int* 47 (1993): 52-59; Wayne Grudem, “The Meaning of κεφαλή (“Head”): An Evaluation of New Evidence, Real and Alleged,” *JETS* 44/1 (2001): 25-65, who on 61-64 cites many others reaching this conclusion. See also Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 201-211, 544-599.

⁹⁷ White, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 360.

⁹⁸ Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2009).

1 For example, he says the Greek translation of the OT (LXX) only uses the word “head” as leader
2 6 out of 171 times. In fact the LXX uses the word “head” (*kephalē*) in the context of authority or
3 ruling at least 16 times.⁹⁹ Thus his credibility immediately comes into question. Payne’s
4 discussion of the word “head” does not advance the discussion. Second, there may be a few
5 examples where *kephalē* means “source,” but Payne actually gives very few examples (which
6 are themselves debatable) to substantiate his thesis. By way of comparison, Grudem has
7 carefully sifted the evidence in three major articles, showing that the meaning “authority over”
8 for *kephalē* is well attested.¹⁰⁰ Payne alleges that the term cannot mean “authority over” in
9 1 Corinthians 11:3 since not all acknowledge Christ’s authority. But this misses the point. Christ
10 is the authority over all men even if they do not recognize it. Payne goes on to say that 1
11 Corinthians 11:3 points to Christ as the source of Adam, but the text says that Christ is the
12 “head of every man.” There is nothing about Adam in particular in this verse. Paul speaks
13 universally here.

14 Finally, Payne suggests that, in 1 Corinthians 15:28, “God” refers to “the Godhead”
15 rather than to the Father. This is rather strange and fits awkwardly with the idea that Christ
16 submits to God. Is the verse saying that Christ submits to himself insofar as he is God? Such an
17 interpretation seems quite improbable. Payne’s discussion of *kephalē* is unpersuasive and
18 should be rejected.¹⁰¹

19 In summary, no textual evidence from ancient Greek literature has been produced
20 where a person is called the *kephalē* of another person or group and that person is not the one
21 in authority over that other person or group. Over fifty examples of *kephalē* meaning “ruler,

⁹⁹ Duet 28:13; 28:44; Jud 10:18; 11:8; 11:9; 11:11; 2 Sam 22:44; 1 Kings 8:1; Ps 18:43; Is 7:8 (x2); Is 7:9 (x2); Is 9:14-16; Jer 31:7; Lam 1:5.

¹⁰⁰ Review of Philip Payne’s book by Thomas R. Schreiner, “Philip Payne on Familiar Ground,” <http://cbmw.org/uncategorized/philip-payne-on-familiar-ground/> accessed 11-25-2013, in note 2 cites Wayne Grudem, “Does *Kephalē* (‘Head’) Mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority Over’ in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples,” *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59; idem, “The Meaning of *Kephalē* (‘Head’): A Response to Recent studies,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway, 1991), 425–68, 534–41; idem, “The Meaning of *Kephalē* (‘Head’): An Examination of New Evidence, Real and Alleged,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44 (2001): 25-65. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “*Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3,” *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 52–59; idem, “Another Look at *Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3,” *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 503-11.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, “Philip Payne on Familiar Ground.” The foregoing discussion has been extracted largely from this review article.

1 authority over” have been found and compiled, but no examples of “source without
2 authority.”¹⁰²

3 **Headship in the Trinity—Basis for Headship of Man.** The passage itself (11:3) suggests a
4 Christological and theological framework for the headship of man in relation to woman. Thus,
5 the headship of Christ and the headship of God the Father form the pattern for the headship of
6 the husband-wife (in the home) and man-woman (in the church). One objection to headship
7 has been that the principle of submission is a negative concept, a consequence of sin. This verse
8 invalidates that objection, since Christ is shown to be in submission to the headship of God and
9 every man is in submission to the headship of Christ, and these are not negative relationships.

10 There is no essential conflict between equality of being and submission, for God and
11 Christ are equal in being or nature, yet Christ submits to His Father. The submission is
12 functional, providing for different role relationships; it does not express or imply any inequality
13 of being. And this submission to the headship authority is not a consequence of sin (evidence
14 will be presented—that functional differentiation in the Trinity existed already in heaven before
15 sin).

16 **Application of Headship Principle in the Church.** The application of the headship
17 principle in the church is connected with the first two elements in 11:3. Christ is the head of
18 man, and man is the head of the woman. Men must pray with their head uncovered; women
19 must pray with their head covered (11:4). The context is public worship in the church. Men and
20 women may pray or prophesy in the church, but only under conditions appropriate to each
21 gender following the headship principle. The same conditions are not appropriate to each. The
22 literal head now represents the spiritual head. To cover or not to cover signifies honor or
23 dishonor depending on whose the head is. In the case of man, his head—representing Christ—
24 should be uncovered, or He is dishonored. In the case of the woman, her head—representing
25 the man—should be covered. Whatever form the covering takes, it represented a means of
26 showing honor or respect for the head or authority. (It is well to note that “authority” is explicit
27 in the text here, a point that many overlook—Headship, *kephalē*, explicitly represents authority,

¹⁰² Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, Appendix 3, 544-551.

1 not source.) The covering may change, but the principle is eternal, which is honored in heaven
2 (v. 3) and by angels (v. 10).

3 **Theological Rationale for Man’s Uncovered Head.** Man ought not to cover his head,
4 since man is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of man (v. 7). The basis for
5 this admonition is solely biblical and theological, lacking any reference to the cultural situation
6 in Corinth. The man and the woman were created for distinctly different purposes. Man—as a
7 gendered human being, not as a husband—was created for the glory of God. The woman,
8 although created in the image of God like the man, was created subsequently for the glory of
9 man. Man existed and accomplished tasks for God before he began to experience a need for a
10 helper. Woman was made a helper for the man to supply an inward need of the man, according
11 to the Genesis record (Gen 2:18).

12 **Headship of Man and Priority of Creation.** Paul now bolsters his rationale for head
13 coverings by appealing to the creation story: “For man was not made from the woman, but the
14 woman from man. Neither was man created for the woman, but woman for the man” (1 Cor
15 11:8-9). Paul has already declared that man is head of the woman (v. 3). He now gives the
16 biblical/theological reason for the headship of man and consequently the reason why a woman
17 should have a symbol of authority (the covering) on her head—she was created for (the glory
18 of) man, and she was created from man. It is important to note Paul’s instruction that a man
19 *ought not* to cover his head (v. 7) and a woman *ought* to cover head (v. 10) is based on the
20 identical rationale—man is the glory of God and the woman is the glory of man (v. 7); the
21 woman was derived from man and the woman was created for man (vv. 8-9). The headship of
22 man is based on the priority of the creation of the man, and the woman was created for him—
23 to be man’s equal, but opposite (gender), helper. The symbol of the head as authority
24 represents the man who is her spiritual head by virtue of priority and purpose in creation. Man
25 and woman were created for different purposes, the man for God and the woman for man.

26 **Equality of Being and Functional Differentiation.** Paul’s rationale for male headship is
27 based exclusively on the Genesis 2 creation record. The issue in Genesis 2 is not equality of
28 being, because male and female were both created in the image of God. The issue in Genesis 2
29 relates to the purpose and function in creation for the two genders. Man had priority in

1 creation, and his purpose was for the “glory of God.” The woman’s purpose was for “the glory
2 of man.”¹⁰³ Paul is quite clear that man’s headship was established already in Genesis 2, prior
3 to the entrance of sin. The biblical text of Genesis 1-2, which has been debated as to the
4 matter of when headship was established—whether before or after the Fall—needs to be
5 interpreted carefully in the light of this NT interpretation of the creation record that makes
6 plain that headship derives from before the Fall, already in Gen 1-2, based on the order and
7 purpose of the genders in creation.

8 **Interdependence of Genders and Nature Speaks of the Created Order.** The text (vv. 12-
9 13) does not pertain only to married individuals; it pertains to male-female relationships,
10 especially in the context of the church. For example, in 1 Cor 11: 12 the text would make no
11 sense if it were to be translated, “For just as the wife [came] from the husband, so also the
12 husband [came/comes] from the wife.” The text does make clear that the gender classes are
13 interdependent (vv. 11-12), but their relationship is properly defined by creation, from which
14 derives the headship principle.

15 Paul appeals to reason in demonstrating the universal nature of the headship (v. 13). Paul then
16 reaffirms God’s created order with the universal practice that always existed in nature (vv. 14-
17 15) of women having long hair and men having relatively short hair, for God gave the woman
18 long hair for a covering with the creation of the woman in Eden (v. 15). Upon the practical
19 application of the universal headship principle with covering or uncovering the head, all the
20 churches are united (v. 16).

21

22 **B. 1 Corinthians 14—Women Submissive in the Church as the Law Says**

23 Following a discussion of spiritual gifts and the greatest gift (love) in 1 Corinthians 12-13,
24 Paul describes the misuse and abuse of the gifts where love has been disregarded (1 Cor 14).
25 Proper conduct in the church includes being willing to submit one’s personal desires and
26 interests to the higher goal of maintaining church order for edification of the church. “All things

¹⁰³ Reynolds (p. 30, see note 66) states: “This does not imply that woman did not have a direct, unmediated relationship to God, in whose image she was created. But it does suggest that her purpose and role in creation was intentionally different from that of the man, even prior to the entrance of sin. There is nothing about functional difference that implies inferiority of being. There is no injustice in functional differences created by God, for there is no injustice with God (2 Chr 19:7; Zeph 3:5; Rom 9:14). The issue of injustice merely detracts from the real issues that need to be addressed.”

1 should be done decently and in order” (14:40), “for God is not a God of confusion but of peace”
2 (v. 33a). Apparently some women were interrupting with questions about what was being
3 prophesied¹⁰⁴ and Paul instructed the women: “As in all the churches of the saints, the women
4 should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in
5 submission, as the Law also says” (vv. 33b-34). No variance was permitted; it was a universal
6 practice—“as in all the churches of the saints.” The rationale is given: the Law says that women
7 should be in submission. Although many scholars consider Gen 3:16, where the Law (Torah)
8 says the man was to rule over the women, to be the allusion in v. 34, others believe the Law
9 refers to the record of Genesis 1-2, upon which Paul based the argument of 1 Corinthians 11:3-
10 9, which appeals to creation order.¹⁰⁵ Whether it refers to the pre-Fall order or to prescriptive
11 post-Fall submission, Paul seems to understand it as something ordained by God in the earliest
12 part of Scripture, from the very beginning of time. Submission, shown by not speaking out of
13 order, was not limited to women (see 14:29-31). But the role of women is especially appealed
14 to here in harmony with the spirit of the Law, which expects women to manifest a submissive
15 spirit, especially in the presence of men in the context of worship, where, according to chap.
16 11, men have a spiritual headship. Paul is very decisive on this issue; he is not being arbitrary; it
17 is a commandment of the Lord (v. 37). Those who disagree should not be recognized (v. 38).

18 Finally, it must be noted, Philip Payne argues along similar lines as Gordon Fee¹⁰⁶ that 1
19 Corinthians 14:34-35 is a non-canonical interpolation, and hence carries no apostolic authority,
20 and in fact does not belong in the Bible even though no Greek manuscripts of the NT lack these
21 verses. Payne claims that he recently discovered scribal marks of 14:34, called “distigmai,” in
22 Codex Vaticanus indicating the text (14:34-35) is an interpolation.¹⁰⁷ However, his
23 interpretation of scribal marks has been shown to be factually unstable and easily refutable.¹⁰⁸
24 Payne essentially employs a form of literary criticism and a variant of a hermeneutic called

¹⁰⁴ See Reynolds, 38.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 36-37 and citations therein. Reynolds presents evidence for both Gen 3:16 and also Gen 1-2.

¹⁰⁶ Gordon Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987).

¹⁰⁷ Payne, 232-246.

¹⁰⁸ See Thomas R. Schreiner, “Philip Payne on Familiar Ground,” <http://cbmw.org/uncategorized/philip-payne-on-familiar-ground/> accessed 11-25-2013; also Jim Hamilton, <http://jimhamilton.info/2011/04/19/review-of-philip-b-paynes-man-and-woman-one-in-christ/> accessed 12-3-2013.

1 “deconstruction,” derived from the writings of Martin Heidegger and Jacques Derrida, wherein
2 the text is deconstructed to uncertain multiple meanings or the meaning the interpreter
3 desires.¹⁰⁹
4

5 **C. Implications of 1 Corinthians 11 and 14**

6 There is a clear principle of headship taught in 1 Corinthians 11:3 that was established
7 by God based on the pattern set within the Trinity by the headship of the Father in relationship
8 to Christ, which is an eternal headship grounded in differences in function rather than in
9 essence, which will be documented in Section VI. Paul is abundantly clear that not all
10 relationships are reciprocal, nor are all are egalitarian. The relationship between Christ and man
11 is not egalitarian, for example, and while there may be an equality of being between God and
12 Christ and between man and woman, there are differing functional statuses, with God being
13 the head of Christ and man being the head of the woman. Headship is a metaphor for
14 designated authority. The proper response to designated authority is submission, honor, and
15 respect for that authority. Those who do not honor the authority that God has established do
16 not honor God (Rom 13:1-2). All authority that derives from God must be respected. Now we
17 turn to the one passage in the NT that focuses extensively on the spiritual authority of men and
18 women in the church as it relates to the appointment of officers.
19

20 **IV. Headship and Submission in 1 Timothy 2-3**

21 More than any other passage dealing with men and women in the church, 1 Timothy
22 2:11-15 has caused the polarization among those for and against the ordination of women as
23 elder/minister. *“Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. And I do not permit a woman
24 to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. For Adam was formed first, then
25 Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.
26 Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with
27 self-control.”* Based on this passage, historically the Christian church has believed that certain
28 restrictions are placed on women in the church. However, with the rise of the evangelical
29 feminist movement in the 1960s and 70s, new interpretations have been imposed on this

¹⁰⁹ See above, note 3.

1 passage. Extended expositions on both ends of the spectrum have been documented by
2 others.¹¹⁰

3 **A. Authority and Priority of Creation**

4 Paul's argument for the teaching authority of men and the submission of women to that
5 authority in the church is based on the priority of the creation of Adam in Genesis 2 to which
6 he refers in 1 Timothy 2:13—"For Adam was formed (*plassō*, echoing in Gen 2, LXX) first, then
7 Eve." Priority of creation/birth is also cited by Ellen White for Abel being subject to Cain.¹¹¹
8 Those desiring female leadership in the church must deny the creation headship principle in
9 Genesis 1-3, or their arguments for interchangeable leadership in the church fall apart. Since
10 the creation headship principle has been firmly established in this paper, it is apparent that
11 Paul's justification, based on the priority of creation as explained in 1 Timothy 2:13, for the
12 teaching authority of men and submission of women in the church is indeed valid. Paul's
13 second argument for the teaching authority of men and the submission of women is based on
14 Eve's being deceived.

15 The serpent deceived Eve by approaching her as if she were the head, reversing the
16 headship principle. Moreover, Eve's attempt to usurp Adam's headship role and to enter a
17 higher sphere than that assigned to her led to her deception by the serpent. Adam then
18 knowingly yielded to her attempt to usurp his leadership position. Thus, we have Paul's second
19 justification for Adam's headship, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell
20 into transgression" (v. 14). Gerhard Hasel supports this understanding: "Eve's deception is the
21 result of her asserting a role independent of and above Adam."¹¹² Paul concludes by

¹¹⁰ For those advocating the male headship perspective, see *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, ed. A. J. Kostenberger, T. R. Schreiner, H. S. Baldwin (Grand Rapids, MI, 1995); *Prove All Things*, ed. Mercedes H. Dyer (Berrien Springs, MI, 2000); Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth* (Wheaton, IL, 2012); *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, ed., John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL, 1998), 237-250. For those advocating the female leadership perspective, see Stanley J. Grenz, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1995); Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, *Women Caught in the Conflict: The Culture War Between Traditionalism and Feminism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1994); Virginia Mollenkott, *Women, Men, and the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1977); *Women in Ministry*, ed. Nancy Vyhmeister (Berrien Springs, MI, 1998); Richard M. Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA, 2007).

¹¹¹ Ellen G. White, *Bible Echo*, Apr 8, 1912. "Abel would not only love his brother, but, as the younger would also be subject to him."

¹¹² Gerhard Hasel, "Biblical Authority, Hermeneutics, and the Role of Women," Commission on the Role of Women (March, 1988), 42.

1 encouraging women to remain in their dignified role and in their highest and most exalted
2 sphere of activity, bearing and nurturing children (v. 15). This sphere of activity would
3 complement their role of being submissive to male spiritual leadership in the church and home
4 (vv. 11-12).

6 **B. Context: Culture or Scriptural Evidence**

7 It is important to establish the context of 1 Timothy 2-3. Why did Paul give the
8 instructions in 1 Timothy 2 regarding the teaching authority between men and women and the
9 appointment of elders and deacons in chapter 3? Paul answers: "I write so that you may know
10 how you ought to conduct yourself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God"
11 (3:15). The theme of God's household runs throughout 1 Timothy and is used as the basis for
12 inferences about Christian behavior.¹¹³ A thorough discussion of the church as the extended
13 family appears in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.¹¹⁴

14 Evangelical feminists attempt to ignore the plain reading of Scripture and claim that Paul
15 was refuting radical feminists in first-century Ephesus¹¹⁵ who were teaching the priority of the
16 creation of Eve over Adam. For example, in 1 Timothy 2:13-14 Paul is "correcting a false
17 syncretistic theology in Ephesus which claimed that the woman was created first and man fell
18 first, and therefore women are superior to men."¹¹⁶ This view was popularized by Richard and
19 Catherine Kroeger¹¹⁷ and has been adopted by Adventist feminists.¹¹⁸

¹¹³ Vern Sheridan Poythress, "The Church as Family: Why Male Leadership in the Family Requires Male Leadership in the Church," *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL, 1998), 237-250.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ John Stott warns that "the danger of declaring any passage of Scripture to have only local (not universal), and only transient (not perpetual) validity is that it opens the door to a wholesale rejection of apostolic teaching, since virtually the whole of the New Testament was addressed to specific situations." *The Message of 1 Timothy & Titus* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996), 77.

¹¹⁶ Davidson, quoted in *Spectrum*, 10 Apr 2010; see: <http://spectrummagazine.org/node/2305> accessed 11-25-2013.

¹¹⁷ Richard C. Kroeger and Catherine C. Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1992). See also see Gordon P. Hugenberger, "Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis? A Survey of Approaches to 1 Tim 2:8-15," *JETS* 35 [1992]: 341-360; and Sharon Gritz, *Paul, Woman Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of The Religious and Cultural Milieu of The First Century* [Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991].

¹¹⁸ For example, Nancy Vyhmeister, "Proper Church Behavior in 1 Timothy 2:8-15," *Women in Ministry*, ed. Nancy Vyhmeister (Berrien Springs, MI, 1998), 335-354; and Carl P. Cosaert, "Paul, Women, and the Ephesian Church: An Examination of 1 Timothy 2:8-15," *Theology of Ordination Study Committee*, July, 2013.

1 The only biblical evidence for false teachers in Ephesus relates to men not women:
2 1) Hymenaeus and Alexander in 1 Timothy 1:19-20; 2) Hymenaeus and Philetus in 2 Timothy
3 1:17-18; and 3) Paul’s warnings to the elders in Ephesus that “from among your own selves will
4 arise *men* speaking twisted things” in Acts 20:30.¹¹⁹ If the church in Ephesus had been infected
5 with false doctrine brought in by radical feminists in Ephesus, Paul certainly would have
6 addressed the issue in his epistle to “saints in Ephesus” (v. 1).¹²⁰ But the Epistle is silent on the
7 issue. In fact there is no historical evidence that a feminist culture existed in first-century
8 Ephesus¹²¹ as the Kroegers’ assert (their assertion is merely an assumption¹²²), and their claim
9 of a proto-Gnostic heresy that Eve was created first has no persuasive historical basis.¹²³

10 Schreiner counters the Kroegers’ argument that Ephesus faced ‘proto-gnostic’ forces
11 with the fact that such proposals “consistently appeal to later sources to establish the
12 contours of the heresy.” Köstenberger and Schreiner refute an Ephesian feminism that
13 Paul is seeking to counter. In their assessment, “Ephesus never adopted an egalitarian
14 democratic ideology that would necessitate feminism, or minimally, the inclusion of
15 women in public offices.” Historians are greeted by a “blaring silence regarding
16 feminism from curious explorers like Strabo and Pliny the Elder in their comments on
17 Ephesus. They give no hint whatsoever that women dominated this city.” In short, “at
18 the time of Paul, the political climate was Roman—not feminist.” Even the existence
19 of an Ephesian feminism remains nebulous as far as Paul’s counsel is concerned;
20 cultural context remains a speculative construct based on which quote is selected,
21 what extra-biblical author is quoted.¹²⁴
22

¹¹⁹ Sorke, 13.

¹²⁰ The words “in Ephesus” of verse 1 are not found in some of the earliest witnesses (P46, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus). However, the critical editions of the NT include the words (albeit in brackets), indicating that they are original.

¹²¹ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, Appendix 6 (Wheaton, IL, 2012), pp. 279-328. For three devastating reviews of the Kroegers’ work, see Wayne Grudem, “Three Reviews of *I Suffer Not a Woman* by Richard and Catherine Kroeger,” *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, Appendix 6 (Wheaton, IL, 2012), 646-674 (See p. 654).

¹²² S. M. Baugh, “Apostle Among the Amazons,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994), 153-171.

¹²³ “The Kroegers’ reconstruction is riddled with methodological errors. They nod in the direction saying that the heresy is ‘proto-gnostic,’ but consistently appeal to later sources to establish the contours of the heresy. The lack of historical rigor . . . is nothing less than astonishing. They have clearly not grasped how one should apply the historical method in discerning the nature of false teaching in the Pauline letters.” Thomas Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship,” *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, ed. A. J. Köstenberger, T. R. Schreiner, and H. S. Baldwin (Grand Rapids, MI, 1995), pp. 109-110. See also William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 46; Nashville: Nelson, 2000), see pp. lxxix-lxxxi; 130-143; 232-243, and citations therein.

¹²⁴ Extended quote from Sorke, (see pp. 22-23 and citations therein).

1 William Mounce has assembled an extensive summary of the nature¹²⁵ of the Ephesian
2 heresy and the source¹²⁶ of the Ephesian heresy with emphasis on 1 Timothy 4:1-6 with respect
3 to the source of the heresy.

4 Finally, it is significant that “the apostle does not command Timothy in the form of a
5 second person imperative prohibition (i.e., ‘you should not permit women’). Paul is *not* telling
6 Timothy what to do in his particular situation; rather, he communicates what *he* thinks is
7 universally appropriate for men and women in the church. This shifts the command from a
8 local Ephesian situation (Timothy’s context) to a universally applicable mandate for all churches
9 across time and place.¹²⁷ His counsel to Timothy is the apostle’s understanding of God’s
10 prerogative as subsequently expressed in 1 Timothy 2:13-14.”¹²⁸ “Our task . . . is to interpret
11 texts according to the intention of the author, and thus we must be careful that an
12 interpretation is not rejected merely because it offends our sense of justice.”¹²⁹

13 **Men and Women or Husbands and Wives?** The instruction in 1 Timothy 2 applies to
14 men and women in a universal sense and is not limited to husbands and wives as evangelical
15 feminists would contend.¹³⁰ For example, when Paul exhorts that “men pray everywhere” and
16 “in like manner . . . women adorn themselves,” a local Ephesus situation is not intended, and it
17 is unlikely that Paul could mean that only “*husbands* should pray, lifting holy hands” or that
18 only “*wives* should adorn themselves in modest apparel” (v. 8-9). Should not single women
19 dress modestly also? Paul does not say “I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority
20 over *her own* husband” (as he could have done). He simply says, “I do not permit a woman to

¹²⁵ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary) pp. lxix-lxxvi.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 232-243.

¹²⁷ Contra Payne, 320, who does not consider this aspect.

¹²⁸ Sorke, 17.

¹²⁹ Thomas Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship,” 114, in Köstenberger, 85-120.

¹³⁰ Davidson, *Women in Ministry*, 278-280. Davidson argues strenuously that the teaching authority issue in 1 Tim 2:11-12 is limited to husband and wives, not to men and women in general in the church. The Greek word *gynē* can be translated either woman or wife, and the Greek word *anēr* can be translated either man or husband. He notes that whenever *anēr* and *gynē* are used together in close proximity, they should be translated husband and wife. But he fails to note that when this is the case, the subject under discussion is marriage, and there are decisive clues that require the meaning related to marriage. For example, “Likewise, wives, be subject to your **own** [*idios*] husbands” (1 Peter 3:1). There are also other passages in the NT where the terminology of “men” and “women” uses the plural of the Greek terms *anēr* and *gynē* with the clear connotation of “men and women” (*andres kai gynaiques*) as in Acts 5:14; 8:3, among others.

1 teach or exercise authority over a man.” Paul’s original readers likely would have understood
2 the directions in 1 Timothy 2 as applying to all men and women in the church.¹³¹ The entire
3 context of 1 Timothy 1-5 appears to be concerned with conduct in the church as a whole, not
4 with the issue of husbands and wives in marriage.¹³²

5 However, if we allow that the passage is limited to husbands and wives in the church,
6 then married women would be excluded from exercising teaching authority over their
7 husbands in the church. This would also preclude appointment of married women as elders in
8 the church, since teaching is one of the qualifications of elders (1 Tim 3:2) and the elder must
9 also be able to rule his own house well (v. 4), a role reserved for men. The idea of gender
10 distinction in family government is plainly present in several other New Testament passages.
11 (See Col 3:18, Eph 5:22-24, 1 Peter 3:1, 5-6). If we interpret 1 Tim 2:12 that only married
12 women are excluded from teaching men, could a single woman fill that teaching/leadership
13 role? That would compound the problem. To put her in the elder’s position would not only
14 violate 1 Tim 3:2, but it would also forbid her to marry (since any future marriage would
15 disqualify her to teach men), and that would be contrary to nature and Scripture (Gen 2:24;
16 1 Cor 7:2; 1 Tim 4:3).¹³³

17

18 **C. Elder Qualifications and Male Headship**

19 Immediately following Paul’s instruction that a woman is not to teach or to have
20 authority over a man, he begins his instruction for the qualifications of elders with the
21 somewhat familiar phrase or formula: “This is a faithful saying.”¹³⁴ The “saying” itself can come
22 either before or after the introductory formula, depending on the subjective criterion of what
23 appears to be a doctrinal statement based on church tradition.¹³⁵ Paul uses this formula five
24 times (1 Tim 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11; Titus 3:8). In all five examples, the phrase thematically
25 links, by key words or ideas, what follows the formula with what precedes the formula, “This is
26 a faithful saying.” William Mounce cites Oberlinner who concludes that the formula, “This is a

¹³¹ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 297-299.

¹³² See Sorke, 16-18 for evidence of universality (male and husband) in the context of Gen 2.

¹³³ Eugene Prewitt, <http://advindicate.com/?p=1842>

¹³⁴ For the significance of the “faithful sayings” see Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 46; Nashville: Nelson, 2000), pp. 48-49 and citations therein.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

1 faithful saying,” is the vehicle by which Paul introduces “sayings” as supporting evidence for the
2 argument that he is setting forth either before or after the formula.¹³⁶

3 For example, in 1 Timothy 1:15, the theme of *mercy and grace of Christ* precedes and
4 follows the formula, “This is a faithful saying.” In 1 Timothy 4:9, the theme of *exercising to and*
5 *laboring in godliness* precedes and follows the formula. In 2 Timothy 2:11, ideas of *endurance*
6 *and salvation* precede and follow the phrase, “This is a faithful saying.” In Titus 3:8, the theme
7 of *justification and its fruit* is expanded and explained prior to the formula, and the theme is
8 reconfirmed following the formula with the concise words, “these things I want to affirm
9 constantly” in 3:8. It is apparent that in 1 Timothy 2:12, the theme of *teaching within the*
10 *context of the male leadership/headship role*” precedes and follows the formula, “This is a
11 faithful saying” in 3:1. Here, Paul is linking the qualification for elder (man of one wife/able to
12 teach) in 1 Timothy 3 with the substance of 1 Timothy 2, especially 2:12, (not permitting a
13 woman to teach or have authority over a man). This linkage is a key that lends confirmation
14 that to qualify to be an elder, the candidate, at a minimum, must be a man.

15 In the face of obvious gender distinctions in 1 Timothy 2-3, evangelical feminists claim
16 that the qualifications for elder in 1 Timothy 3 are gender neutral.¹³⁷ Gender neutrality is
17 completely foreign to the context of the passage in 1 Timothy 2-3. The passage exhibits a
18 consistent contrast between the conduct of men and women in the worship setting of the
19 church in chapters 2-3 of 1 Timothy. The male/female distinctions in 1 Timothy 2 parallels the
20 male/female distinction in 1 Timothy 3 where the office of overseer is limited to the male. The
21 development of how we ought to conduct ourselves in the household of God is highly gender
22 specific in 1 Timothy 2-3 where we see a repetitive alternation of genders.¹³⁸

23	1 Tim 2:8	men
24	1 Tim 2:9-15	women (who in contrast to man can bear children—v. 15)
25	1 Tim 3:1-10	men (elders and deacons)
26	1 Tim 3:11	women
27	1 Tim 3:12-13	men (deacons)
28		

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Teresa Reeve, “Shall the Church Ordain Women as Pastors: Thoughts Toward an Integrated New Testament Perspective,” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013, 8-9. In a remarkable effort to deconstruct the plain reading of the text in 1 Tim 3:1-7, Teresa Reeve asserts that all the qualifications for elder are gender neutral.

¹³⁸ Sorke, 32.

1 In addition, when Paul uses the phrase, “This is a faithful saying,” it is apparent he is
2 linking the qualifications for elder in 1 Timothy 3:1-2 (man of one wife, able to teach) with the
3 substance of 1 Timothy 2, especially 2:12, (not permitting a woman to teach or have authority
4 over a man). Moreover, gender neutrality is contrary to the qualification that an
5 overseer/elder must be able to rule one’s own house well, a role reserved for men. The idea of
6 male gender distinction in family government is plainly present in several other New Testament
7 passages, as previously noted. Finally, Ellen White is explicit when discussing the qualifications
8 for elders—they must be men.

9 In the work of setting things in order in all the churches, and ordaining suitable *men* to act
10 as officers, the apostles held to the high standards of leadership outlined in the Old
11 Testament Scriptures.¹³⁹

12 There is a decided work to be done in our churches. Those chosen as elders of the churches
13 are to be *men* of experience, who have a knowledge of the truth and are sound in the
14 faith.¹⁴⁰

15
16 The qualifications of an elder are plainly stated by the apostle Paul: "If any be blameless,
17 the husband of one wife" . . . If a *man* does not show wisdom in the management of the
18 church in his own house, how can he show wisdom in the management of the larger church
19 outside?¹⁴¹

20
21 Those who are thus appointed as overseers of the flock should be *men* of good repute;
22 men who give evidence that they have not only a knowledge of the Scriptures, but an
23 experience in faith, in patience, that in meekness they may instruct those who oppose the
24 truth.¹⁴²

25
26 **Qualifications and Headship.** Just as the camp of Israel was organized with officers and
27 elders to function effectively, in a similar manner Paul instructed both Timothy and Titus to
28 appoint as elders in the church men who met certain qualifications (1 Tim 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9).
29 First and foremost an elder/overseer (these two terms are used interchangeably in Titus 1:5, 7)
30 must be a man (*anēr*). This qualification is in harmony with the creation-headship principle. The
31 text does not offer the flexibility of reading this phrase generically, “the spouse of one spouse.”
32 The 59 occurrences of *anēr* (“man, husband”) in the writings of Paul consistently refer to male

¹³⁹ White, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 95, emphasis added.

¹⁴⁰ White, *Manuscript Releases*, Vol. 5, 449, emphasis added.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

¹⁴² White, *Gospel Workers*, 413, emphasis added.

1 subjects.¹⁴³ Generally speaking, such men would be married, demonstrating corresponding
2 faithfulness to their spouse; however, men in a polygamous relationship (even though unlikely
3 in Roman culture) or involved in unscriptural divorces and remarriage would be disqualified.¹⁴⁴
4 Paul is certainly appealing to the Edenic ideal of the unity of husband and wife as “one flesh.”
5 Therefore, the elder (as well the deacon, 1 Tim 3:12) must be a man of one wife and able to
6 rule his own house well. Here Paul sees the church as an extension of the family, just as he
7 does in 1 Timothy 3:15 (see also 5:1-2).

8 The elder must exhibit headship responsibilities in the home and the church with the
9 ability to teach, namely, teaching in a headship role, being able to refute false teachers (1 Tim
10 3:2, 4-5; Titus 1:9). Since women are prohibited from teaching and exercising authority over a
11 man in the church (1 Tim 2:12), this would exclude women from serving as elders in the church.
12 Scripture clearly reveals that women such as Priscilla (Acts 18:26) were permitted to teach
13 under a variety of circumstances. “What then is the true meaning of 1 Timothy 2:12, ‘I do not
14 permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man’? We see in the immediate context
15 (1 Tim 3:2) that a bishop/overseer must be ‘able to teach.’ There is evidently a kind of teaching
16 that women are not to do, but which elders must do. The teaching restricted to men must be
17 the teaching associated with leadership and full ecclesiastical authority.”¹⁴⁵

18 “In light of the positive connotation of teaching per se in Timothy’s direct context (1 Tim
19 4:11; 6:2; 2 Tim 2:2), Paul is prohibiting women from the authoritative teaching ministry of
20 elders in the church, along with exercising eldership authority over men (as evident in the
21 context of 1 Tim 3). Of course, the wider data of the NT includes women praying, prophesying,
22 caring for the church and generally spreading the good news. It would be a monumental
23 misunderstanding to conclude that women are excluded from ministry or public speaking. The
24 issue at stake is therefore not just the ordination of women per se, but the ordination of
25 women *to what position in ministry.*”¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ Sorke, 34.

¹⁴⁴ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 80.

¹⁴⁵ Moon, 30.

¹⁴⁶ Sorke, 20.

1 Were women refused the position of elder because of cultural norms? If this were the
2 case, Paul had opportunity to argue this way. But how did he found his argument? He founded
3 it on the order of creation (1 Tim 2:13), the origin of sin (v. 14), the teaching of nature regarding
4 gender (1 Cor 11:3-16), and the model of ancient holy persons (1 Peter 3:1-6). And never once
5 did Paul or Peter found it on the custom of the Jews or of the Romans or the varied peoples
6 among whom they established churches.

7 **D. The Mystery of Godliness**

8 The creation headship principle, documented and confirmed in Genesis 2-3 with the
9 previous twenty-six points of identification, is the basis for Paul's instruction for the conduct of
10 men and women in the church (1 Tim 2) and the appointment of officers (1 Tim 3). Thus, he
11 concludes, "I write so that you may know how you ought to conduct yourself in the house of
12 God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth. And without
13 controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the
14 Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in
15 glory" (vv. 15-16). The key that unlocks the principle undergirding Paul's instruction in 1
16 Timothy 2-3 is found in chapter 3 and verse 16.

17 Although thousands of pages have been published in articles and books on Paul's
18 instruction in 1 Timothy 2-3 on the relationship of men and women in the church, relatively few
19 have explained why Paul concludes in 1 Timothy 3:16 with a statement on the mystery of
20 godliness. More often than not, the text is simply ignored when dealing with the roles of men
21 and women in the church by those both for and those against the ordination of women as
22 elders/ministers. William Mounce has assembled a number of explanations from a variety of
23 expositors for the relationship of 3:16 with the instructions chaps. 2-3.¹⁴⁷

24 But the question persists, Why does Paul conclude his instruction specifically about the
25 roles of men and women in the church with a statement about the mystery of godliness? What
26 bearing does the mystery of godliness have on the conduct of men and women in the church
27 and the appointment of church officers? The answer: The principle of creation headship and

¹⁴⁷ Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary) 224-232. Mounce suggests several possibilities, one being: The "hymn of 1 Tim 3:16" "looks back to the instruction of chaps. 2-3 by giving the reason those rules must be followed, because the church must support and protect the gospel" which is condensed in 3:16 (see p. 224).

1 submission we documented in Gen 2-3 underlies Paul’s argumentation in 1 Timothy 2-3, and
2 this principle is a manifestation of the mystery of godliness.

3 **Pillar and Ground of Truth.** The church is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim 3:15).
4 The “truth” is to be found in God’s church. And God is the embodiment of truth (Deut 32:4).
5 The “truth” is who God is. And Jesus said, “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (John 14:6).
6 The truth that is to be found in God’s church and exhibited by the conduct of his people (the
7 church) is the nature and character of God. The truth of who God is may be summarized: “God
8 is love” (1 John 4:8). That same love (the truth) *was supremely demonstrated* in the gift of
9 God’s Son, Jesus Christ, to the world (the incarnation) and was epitomized at the cross of
10 Calvary where the Son “became obedient [to the Father] to the point of death, even the death
11 of the cross.” The incarnation of the Son and His death on the cross is a visible manifestation
12 of the principle of headship and submission between the Father and the Son. Thus, the
13 principle of headship and submission is *inherent* in the nature of divine love, the very character
14 and nature of God who changes not. This principle was not a new or temporary expression of
15 divine love springing up at the incarnation, but it has been existent from before the beginning
16 of creation.

17 **Mystery of Godliness and Headship/Submission.** Paul concludes his instruction in
18 1 Timothy 2-3 with the powerful declaration of “the mystery of godliness: God was manifested
19 in the flesh.” This mystery, His character of self-sacrificing love, is to be manifested in the
20 conduct and roles of men and women in the church, the pillar and ground of truth.

21 This is the mystery of godliness. That Christ should take human nature, and by a life of
22 humiliation elevate man in the scale of moral worth with God: that He should carry His
23 adopted nature to the throne of God, and there present His children to the Father, to have
24 conferred upon them an honor exceeding that conferred upon the angels—this is the
25 marvel of the heavenly universe, the mystery into which angels desire to look. This is love
26 that melts the sinner’s heart.¹⁴⁸

27
28 The incarnation was the initial step in the supreme revelation of who God is—self-
29 sacrificing love. He gave His Son to the world (John 3:16). The Son willingly became totally
30 dependent on the Father—total submission. That same love, manifested in the principle of

¹⁴⁸ White, *Heaven*, 75 (Ms 21, 1900, quoted in SD 22).

1 headship/submission of the Father and the Son, is to be manifested in the roles of men and
2 women in the church.

3 A brief summary of the evidence for the principle of authority and submission that gives
4 order to the universe will be examined next. This will be followed by a summary of evidence for
5 headship (authority) and submission inherent in the Trinity.

6

7

V. Authority and Order in the Universe

8 Authority originates with and is delegated from God (Rom 13:1). “The expression of
9 authority occurs through ordered relationships of leadership and willing cooperation (authority
10 and submission). As the centurion said to Jesus, ‘I also am a man *under authority*, having
11 soldiers *under me*’ (Mt 8:9). Heaven is structured on the basis of relationships of selfless loving
12 authority and voluntary submission.”¹⁴⁹ The order of the whole universe is essentially a fabric of
13 loving relationships, structured by authority and voluntary submission. This is evident not only
14 in the nature of the Godhead, but also in nature of created beings.

15

A. Authority and Submission among Angels

16 Angels are sent forth as ministering spirits to minister to those who will inherit salvation
17 (Heb 1:4). They are charged with authority to help human beings (Ps 91:11). Ellen White makes
18 five pertinent observations regarding authority relationships among angels. First, they are
19 organized in ranks of authority, some higher, some lower. Commenting on Revelation 7:1-3, she
20 observed that the “*highest angel had authority to command the four angels to keep in check*
21 *the four winds until this work was performed, and until he should give the summons to let*
22 *them loose*” (TM 444). “*The very highest angels in the heavenly courts are appointed to work*
23 *out the prayers which ascend to God . . .*” (4BC 1173.5).

24
25 Second, she describes the roles of the commanding angels. After Lucifer’s rebellion,
26 before the creation of the world, “The angels were marshaled in companies with a commanding
27 angel at their head” (1SG 17). The “commanding angels” were sometimes presented to her as
28 taller than the other angels (EW 68, 272). It is interesting to note that “Eve was not quite as tall

¹⁴⁹ Jerry Moon, “Ellen White, Ordination, and Authority,” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013, 3. This section on “Authority and Order in the Universe” is adapted primarily from Moon’s paper.

1 as Adam. Her head reached a little above his shoulders.”¹⁵⁰ Third, she saw that each angel was
2 given a specific assignment. “Each angel has his own mission and is at his post, ready to
3 cooperate with you . . .” (*Southern Review* Oct 24, 1899). Fourth, angelic assignments could not
4 be altered by personal choice. “*Each angel has his particular post of duty, which he is not*
5 *permitted to leave for any other place*” (4BC 1173.5). Fifth, she notes that the angels’
6 motivation for obedience is purely that of love. The angels’ love for God,¹⁵¹ their love for each
7 other,¹⁵² for their commanding angels, and for the humans they minister to,¹⁵³ are the
8 constraints that subdue powerful emotions¹⁵⁴ and keep the angels in willing, joyful, freely
9 chosen *submission* to the divine *authority*.

10 “Meanings of authority and submission are radically different from their meaning in this
11 world. In a sinful world society, authority is often an opportunity to indulge selfishness and
12 disregard for the rights of others—the very opposite of love.” In God’s kingdom “voluntary,
13 loving submission to loving authority often does not look like earthly authority/submission at
14 all. Rather it takes the form of gentle, thoughtful, unselfish leadership and eager
15 cooperation.”¹⁵⁵

16 17 **B. Authority and Submission at Creation**

18 Just as there is authority structure among the angels, so there was an authority
19 structure implicit in the original creation of the human race. In the NT we find inspired
20 commentary on Genesis 2. In two places, the apostle Paul makes explicit what is implicit in
21 Genesis 2. In 1 Timothy 2:13 he writes: “For Adam was formed first, then Eve.” In 1 Corinthians
22 11:8 he writes: “For man is not from the woman, but woman from the man. Nor was man
23 created for the woman, but the woman for man. For this reason the woman ought to have a

¹⁵⁰ White, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 1, 25.

¹⁵¹ “The angels love to bow before God; they love to be near Him.” SC 94.

¹⁵² “The same love that animates the angels, the same purity and holiness that reign in heaven, should, as far as possible, be reproduced upon earth.” FLB 65.

¹⁵³ “On account of disease, or surrounding discouragements, some drift into despair,” but “the thought that Jesus loves them, *pure angels love them*, and our gracious Heavenly Father loves, pities and wants to save them, should inspire them with faith and confidence in God.” RH, May 4, 1876 par. 66, emphasis added.

¹⁵⁴ See White, *Early Writings*, 150-151.

¹⁵⁵ Moon, 6.

1 symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.”¹⁵⁶ In these two NT passages, Paul
2 makes explicit what is implicit in in Genesis 2—the man was created first, and afterward the
3 woman; and this sequence signified a difference in their roles. There was no coercion, no
4 “ruling” on Adam’s part before the Fall, but he was the first created, the head of the woman,
5 and he held primacy of position and authority. The Scriptures affirm: the head of man is Christ,
6 the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God (see 1 Cor 11:3). The headship of
7 man is based on the headship in the Trinity.

8 9 **VI. Headship/Submission in the Trinity**

10
11 The submission of the Son from before the beginning of creation should not be
12 confused with the heresy of the doctrine of Subordinationism (non-equality of being).¹⁵⁷ Some
13 in history have attacked the doctrine of the deity of Christ, His essential equality with the
14 Father (the doctrine of Subordinationism which careless scholars have confused with the
15 orthodox view—Submission from the beginning of creation). But the orthodox formulations of
16 the doctrine of the Trinity have always included both the equality of essence of the persons of
17 the Trinity and differentiation of roles within their existence.¹⁵⁸ Submission of the Son from
18 before the beginning of creation is encapsulated by this phrase, “ontological equality [equality
19 of being] but economic submission,” or “equal in being but subordinate in role.”

20 **A. God is the Head of Christ—Incarnation**

21 “But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is
22 man, and the head of Christ is God” (1 Cor 11:3). The author of Hebrews alludes to the

¹⁵⁶ Since the principle of authority and submission exists among angels in heaven, angels would expect to see the principle reflected in beings on earth. Alternatively, since man was created in the image of God and angels recognize the headship principle among members of the Trinity, the angels expect to see the principle manifested in “male and female” created in the image of God.

¹⁵⁷ See “Subordinationism” in Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, eds., *Dictionary of Theology*, 2d ed. (New York: Crossroad, 1981); Millard Erickson, *Concise Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986); Frances Young, *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983); Joseph A. Komonchak, Mary Collins, Dermot A. Lane, eds., *The New Dictionary of Theology* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1987); see also Michael E. Bauman, “Milton, Subordinationism, and the Two-Stage Logos,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 48 (1986), 177-182.

¹⁵⁸ Peter Schemm, “Kevin Giles’s *The Trinity and Subordinationism: A Review Article*,” *JBMW* 7/2 (Fall 2002): 67-78; see also David Miller, <http://sbcvoices.com/the-eternal-subordination-of-the-son-is-the-historic-doctrine-of-the-church/> accessed 11-25-2013.

1 submission of the Son in the incarnation, coming to do the will of God, as he quotes the
2 prophecy in Psalm 40.

3 Therefore, when He came into the world, He said: “Sacrifice and offering You did not
4 desire, But a body You have prepared for Me. In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin You
5 had no pleasure. Then I said, ‘Behold, I have come—In the volume of the book it is written
6 of Me—To do Your will, O God.’” (Heb 10:5-7).

7
8 Following the incarnation, it is self-evident to even the casual reader of the Gospels that
9 Christ was subject to the Father’s authority. “I can of Myself do nothing. . . . I do not seek My
10 own will, but the will of the Father who sent Me” (John 5:30, 19); “I always do those things that
11 please Him” (8:29); God sends His Son into world (3:17). Christ was subject to the authority of
12 the Father and kept His commandments (15:10). The submission necessary to secure our
13 salvation is further illustrated by His struggle in the Garden leading to Calvary: “O My Father, if
14 it is possible, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as You *will*” (Mt 26:39);
15 “[He] became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross” (Phil 2:8). The
16 equality of being of the Son with the Father is apparent in John 1:1-3 as well as Philippians 2:5-
17 8, where we see the equality as well as the willing submission of the Son to the Father. The role
18 of directing, sending, and commanding the Son belongs to the Father only.¹⁵⁹ Evangelical
19 feminists limit the submission of the Son to the Father strictly to the incarnation in relation to
20 solving the sin problem—sometimes referred to as *economic subordination*.¹⁶⁰ However, the
21 evidence is clear that a relationship of authority and submission between the Father and Son
22 has existed in parallel with their equality of being from before the beginning of creation.

23 **B. God is the Head of Christ—Eternity Past**

24 The Father-Son relationship of headship/submission existed before the creation—the
25 Sovereign of the universe had a Co-worker. Describing equality of being and
26 headship/submission in the Trinity existing in eternity past, Ellen White says, “The Sovereign of

¹⁵⁹ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 46.

¹⁶⁰ Rebecca Groothuis writes concerning economic subordination: “If Christ’s subordination is not limited to a specific project or function but characterizes His eternal relationship with God, then Christ is not merely functionally subordinate; he is by nature subordinate. . . . It is by no means clear from Scripture that the members of the Godhead are related to one another in terms of an eternal structure of rule and submission. This is a debatable point of theology on which conservative scholars disagree.” Quoted by Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 406.

¹⁶⁰ Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, 226.

1 the universe was not alone in His work of beneficence. He had an associate--a co-worker who
2 could appreciate His purposes, and could share His joy in giving happiness to created beings. . . .
3 Christ, the Word, the only begotten of God, was one with the eternal Father--one in nature, in
4 character, in purpose--the only being that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of
5 God."¹⁶¹ The Sovereign of the universe—the One who has supreme rank, authority, and
6 power—had an associate, a co-worker. Although His Co-worker was invested with equal power
7 and authority, the Son of God willingly submitted to the Supreme Sovereign of the universe in
8 His role within the Godhead. Thus, we have inspired evidence for differentiation of roles in the
9 Godhead.

10 Although it might be assumed that the Son took on the “role of Son” at the incarnation
11 or at some point in eternity past, the inspired record suggests otherwise. The distinction in
12 names, “Father” and “Son,” has always existed, implying role differentiation. Christ has always
13 been the eternal, self-existent Son.

14 In His incarnation He gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God. . . . While the
15 Son of a human being, He became the Son of God in a new sense.¹⁶²

16
17 He was equal with God, infinite and omnipotent. . . . He is the eternal, self-existent
18 Son.¹⁶³

19
20 The Word existed as a divine being, even as the eternal Son of God, in union and
21 oneness with His Father. From everlasting He was the Mediator of the covenant.¹⁶⁴

22
23 The terms of this oneness between God and man in the great covenant of redemption
24 were arranged with Christ **from all eternity**. The covenant of grace was revealed to the
25 patriarchs. . . . Paul speaks of the gospel, the preaching of Jesus Christ, as "the
26 revelation of the mystery, which hath been kept in silence through **times eternal**, but
27 now is manifested . . ." (Romans 16:25, 26, R.V.).¹⁶⁵

28
29 Edwin Reynolds concludes his study on headship in 1 Corinthians 11 stating that “this
30 paper has shown that there is a clear principle of headship taught in 1 Cor 11:3 that was
31 established by God based on the pattern set within the Trinity by the headship of the Father in

¹⁶¹ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 34.

¹⁶² White, *Selected Messages*, Bk. 1, 226.

¹⁶³ White, *Evangelism*, 615.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ White, *God's Amazing Grace*, 129, emphasis added. See also *Signs of the Times*, August 24, 1891 par. 10.

1 relationship to Christ, which is an eternal headship grounded in differences in function rather
2 than in essence.”¹⁶⁶

3 It is virtually impossible to deny functional role differentiation in the Godhead, if Christ
4 assumed a *new* role of Mediator (between God and created beings) prior to creation. Based on
5 the inspired record, we must remember that “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and
6 forever”; Christ has existed in His office as the eternal Son, Mediator, and the Word by inherent
7 voluntary submission to the Father. “*The Word existed as a divine being, even as the eternal Son*
8 *of God, in union and oneness with His Father. From everlasting He was the Mediator of the*
9 *covenant.*”¹⁶⁷ Christ never has changed His position, or role, or office in relation to the Father.
10 The term "role" underscores the fact that it is a relationship willingly entered into by the Son
11 from before the beginning of creation with respect to the Father, and thus it is not permanent
12 in the sense of somehow being inherent in the Son's being.

13 There had been no change in the position or authority of Christ. Lucifer's envy and
14 misrepresentation and his claims to equality with Christ had made necessary a statement
15 of the true position of the Son of God; but this had been the same from the beginning.
16 Many of the angels were, however, blinded by Lucifer's deceptions.¹⁶⁸

17
18 Christ was appointed to the office of Mediator from the creation of God, **set up from**
19 **everlasting** to be our substitute and surety.¹⁶⁹

20
21 Further evidence of the Father-Son relationship of headship/submission in eternity past
22 follows. The Father created all things through His Son and for His Son's benefit (John 1:3; 1 Cor
23 8:6; Heb 1:2, 10; Eph 3:9; Col 1:16); nevertheless, the Father who sits on the throne is
24 ultimately credited with the creation (Rev 4:11), though He accomplishes it through His Son
25 (Heb 1:2). The Father-Son relationship of headship/submission has always existed. The Father
26 “chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world” and “predestined us to be conformed to
27 the image of His Son” (Eph 1:4; Rom 8:29). The Father did the “choosing” and the
28 “predestinating” *in Christ*. The Son never “chose” or “predestined” us in the Father. The
29 relationship of roles is fixed. The authority-obedience relationship of the Father and the Son in

¹⁶⁶ Reynolds, 44.

¹⁶⁷ Ellen White, *Evangelism*, 615.

¹⁶⁸ White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 38.

¹⁶⁹ White, *Selected Messages*, Bk. 1, 74 emphasis added.

1 the Trinity has existed throughout eternity and is mandatory if we are to account for the
2 Father's eternal purpose to elect and save His people through His beloved Son, in Christ.¹⁷⁰

3 Furthermore, being obedient to the Father, the Son condescended to become the
4 Commander of the angels, known also as the Angel (Messenger) of the LORD, and Michael the
5 Archangel, Commander of angels. (See Joshua 5:13-15; Ex 3:3-6, 13-14; Jude 9; 1 Thes 4:16;
6 John 5:28-29).

7 The authority-obedience relationship between the Father and the Son has always
8 existed, from before the beginning of creation, simultaneously with their equality of being. This
9 apparent paradox was misunderstood by Lucifer, requiring the Father to declare to the host of
10 heaven that He had invested His Son with authority, endowed Him with unlimited power, and
11 that the Son would carry out His will and His purposes, but would do nothing of Himself alone.
12 The one who invests authority in the other possesses supreme authority. The writings of Ellen
13 G. White confirm the headship/submission principle in the Godhead in eternity past.

14 Satan in Heaven, before his rebellion, was a high and exalted angel, next in honor to
15 God's dear Son. . . . A special light beamed in his countenance, and shone around him
16 brighter and more beautiful than around the other angels; yet Jesus, God's dear Son, had
17 the preeminence over all the angelic host. He was one with the Father before the angels
18 were created. Satan was envious of Christ, and gradually assumed command which
19 devolved on Christ alone. The great Creator assembled the heavenly host, that he might in
20 the presence of all the angels confer special honor upon his Son. The Son was seated on
21 the throne with the Father, and the heavenly throng of holy angels was gathered around
22 them. The Father then made known that it was ordained by himself that Christ, his Son,
23 should be **equal with himself**; so that wherever was the presence of his Son, it was as his
24 own presence. The word of the Son was to be obeyed as readily as the word of the Father.
25 **His Son he had invested with authority** to command the heavenly host. Especially was his
26 Son to work in union with himself in the anticipated creation of the earth and every living
27 thing that should exist upon the earth. His Son would carry out his will and his purposes,
28 but would do nothing of himself alone. . . . There was contention among the angels. Satan
29 and his sympathizers were striving to reform the government of God. They were
30 discontented and unhappy because they could not look into his unsearchable wisdom and
31 ascertain his purposes in exalting his Son Jesus, and **endowing him with such unlimited**
32 **power and command**. They rebelled against the authority of the Son."¹⁷¹

33

¹⁷⁰ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, cited on 407.

¹⁷¹ Ellen White, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 1, 17-22, emphasis added.

1 From eternity past the Father and the Son entered into a covenant with clasped hands,
2 that if the human race should be overcome by Satan's deceptions, the Son would become their
3 surety. And when Adam transgressed, the Son received permission from the Father to give His
4 own life as a ransom for the race. Ellen White confirms the submission of the Son to the
5 authority of the Father, who grants permission to His Son to carry out our redemption:

6 Christ was not alone in making His great sacrifice. It was the fulfillment of the
7 covenant made between Him and His Father before the foundation of the world was laid.
8 With clasped hands they had entered into the solemn pledge that Christ would become the
9 surety for the human race if they were overcome by Satan's sophistry.¹⁷²

10
11 Soon I saw Him approach the exceeding bright light which enshrouded the Father.
12 Said my accompanying angel, "He is in close converse with His Father." The anxiety of the
13 angels seemed to be intense while Jesus was communing with His Father. Three times He
14 was shut in by the glorious light about the Father, and the third time He came from the
15 Father we could see His person. His countenance was calm, free from all perplexity and
16 trouble, and shone with a loveliness which words cannot describe. He then made known to
17 the angelic choir that a way of escape had been made for lost man; that He had been
18 pleading with His Father, and had **obtained permission** to give His own life as a ransom for
19 the race.¹⁷³

20
21 One obtains permission only from another who has supreme authority. The role of the
22 submission of the Son to the Father was clearly understood by Lucifer and the angels to the
23 extent that the Son was perceived as being nearly equivalent to themselves. The full extent of
24 the equality of being and power of the Son to the Father had heretofore been misunderstood,
25 requiring a full declaration by the Father.

26 27 **C. God is the Head of Christ—Eternity Future**

28 After the ascension, Christ was exalted at the Father's right hand (Acts 2:33). To be
29 seated at the right hand of a king in the ancient world indicated that that one was second in
30 authority. Such was the aspiration of James and John in Matt 20:21-23. The Messianic promise
31 in Psalm 110, "Sit at My right hand until I make your enemies My footstool" (v. 1), points to the
32 authority of the Father. That Christ would be exalted to the right hand of God after His
33 ascension is found in numerous other passages (Acts 5:31; 7:55-56; Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1;

¹⁷² White, *Manuscript Releases*, Vol. 12, 408.

¹⁷³ White, *Early Writings*, 126, emphasis added.

1 Heb 1:13; 8:1; 10:12-13; 12:2; 1 Peter 3:22). The supreme authority always belongs to the
2 Father. “*The Son of God was next in authority to the great Lawgiver.*”¹⁷⁴ Thus we have
3 evidence that one can be subordinate in authority and still be equal in being, equal in
4 importance, and equal in personhood. If this is true of the Godhead, then the husband and
5 wife created in the image of God can be equal and different, too.¹⁷⁵

6 After His ascension Christ, functioning as our High Priest, intercedes in our behalf before
7 the Father, providing further evidence that the Father possesses supreme authority, since the
8 Son does not command the Father, but brings requests (Rom 8:34; Heb 7:25).

9 Throughout eternity the submission of the Son of God to the authority of the Father will
10 be manifested to the universe of unfallen beings. Forever to retain His human nature, uniquely
11 perpetuating the results of His incarnation, Christ will be one with His brethren, our Elder
12 Brother.

13 To assure us of His immutable counsel of peace, God gave His only-begotten Son to
14 become one of the human family, forever to retain His human nature. . . . God has adopted
15 human nature in the person of His Son, and has carried the same into the highest heaven. .
16 . . The I AM is the Daysman between God and humanity, laying His hand upon both. He
17 who is "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," is not ashamed to call us
18 brethren. Hebrews 7:26; 2:11. In Christ the family of earth and the family of heaven are
19 bound together. Christ glorified is our brother. Heaven is enshrined in humanity, and
20 humanity is enfolded in the bosom of Infinite Love.¹⁷⁶

21
22 The Son will forever be subject to the authority of the Father. Paul says that after the
23 last enemy, death, is destroyed, “the Son Himself will also be subject¹⁷⁷ to Him [the Father] who
24 put all things under Him [the Son], that God may be all in all” (1 Cor 15:28). Here we find
25 further confirmation of the eternal, willing submission of the Son to the authority of the Father
26 from eternity past to eternity future. In eternity past, prior to the foundation of the world, the
27 Son was subject to the Father; in the Creation the Son was subject to the Father; following the
28 incarnation the Son was subject to the Father; from His ascension, the Son has been subject to

¹⁷⁴ White, *The Spirit of Prophecy*, Vol. 2, 9.

¹⁷⁵ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 411.

¹⁷⁶ White, *The Desire of Ages*, 25-26.

¹⁷⁷ Greek, *hupotassō*: “to subject, to subordinate, put in subjection, be subject to, submit to.” See the standard Greek Lexicon BDAG (2nd Edition), *hupotassō*, 848.

1 the Father, sitting at His right hand; today, as He intercedes for us, the Son is subject to the
2 Father; and when death is destroyed, the Son will be eternally subject to the Father.

3 The confirming evidence that Christ will be subject to the Father throughout eternity is
4 the reality that the Son willingly condescended to encumber himself with a human nature,
5 never to be the same, having become our Elder Brother. The entire Treasury of Heaven was
6 given to the human race. Christ has become the Second Adam, the new head of the human
7 race. Nevertheless, the Son is not eternally inferior to the Father; He is equal to the Father in
8 His being or essence, for He is fully God. This means that along with equality in attributes and
9 deity and value and honor, there is also a subordination in role, and the Son is subject to the
10 Father in authority.¹⁷⁸ The principle of headship, submission, and equality, inherent in divine
11 love and the nature of the Trinity, was ordained of God to be inherent in the creation of
12 mankind, male and female, “made in Our image.”

13 **D. Submission of the Holy Spirit**

14 The principle of headship/submission is manifested also in the relation of the Holy Spirit
15 with the Son and the Father. The Son is subject to the Father and the Holy Spirit is subject to
16 the Son. The Father sends the Son into world, and the Son sends the Holy Spirit into world from
17 the Father (John 15:26). Just as the Son’s mission was to reveal and glorify the Father (14:9;
18 17:4), the Holy Spirit will reveal and glorify the Son; and He will declare and testify of Christ
19 (15:26; 16:14). The Holy Spirit listens to and is submissive to the authority of the Father and the
20 Son. He never “speaks on His own authority,” but speaks only that which “He hears” from the
21 Father or the Son (John 16:13). The Holy Spirit, being subject to the Father, makes intercession
22 for the saints according to the will of God (Rom 8:27). “The heavenly trio”—the Father, Son,
23 and Holy Spirit—are inherently equal in being, yet the Son is submissive to Father and the Holy
24 Spirit is submissive to the Father and the Son in their respective functional roles.

25 Since God never changes, “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever” (Heb
26 13:8; also Mal 3:6; James 1:17), the equality, headship, and submission, inherent in divine love
27 and the nature of the Trinity has always existed and will continue to exist in the ceaseless ages.
28 And likewise in the years of eternity, as they roll, these principled characteristics will be fully

¹⁷⁸ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 411, 414

1 reproduced in the nature of redeemed mankind. The restoration of the image of God will have
2 been completed in the church of the living God.

3

4 **E. Mutual Submission and the Trinity**

5 The egalitarian commitment to “mutual submission” in marriage is so strong that they
6 have devised a new doctrine of “mutual submission” in the Trinity. Among evangelical feminists
7 who support the case for mutual submission in the Trinity, Stanley Grenz says the following:

8 The argument from Christ’s example often overlooks the deeper dynamic of mutual
9 dependence within the Trinity. . . . The Father is dependent on the Son for his deity. In
10 sending his Son into the world, the Father entrusted his own reign—indeed his own
11 deity—to the Son (for example Lk. 10:22). Likewise the Father is dependent on the Son
12 for his title as the Father. As Irenaeus pointed out in the second century, without the
13 Son the Father is not the Father of the Son. Hence the subordination of the Son to the
14 Father must be balanced by *the subordination of the Father to the Son*.¹⁷⁹
15

16 The Scriptures never show the Father submitting to the authority of the Son. The
17 Scriptures “show the Father planning, initiating, directing, sending, and commanding, and they
18 show the Son responding, obeying the Father, and carrying out the Father’s plans. In order to
19 show ‘mutual submission’ in the Trinity or ‘the subordination of the Father to the Son’ in a way
20 that is parallel, Grenz would have to find some passages that show the Son commanding the
21 Father, or the Son sending the Father, or the Son directing the activities of the Father, or the
22 Father saying that He is obedient to the Son. . . .

23 “So how does Grenz argue for the ‘subordination of the Father to the Son’? He changes
24 the topic under discussion and confuses the categories. He says nothing about any submission
25 of the Father to the Son’s authority. He rather says, ‘without the Son the Father is not the
26 Father of the Son.’ But this does not address the topic at hand. It is a linguistic sleight-of-hand
27 argument that shifts the discussion to whether the Father would be the Father without the Son
28 (the answer is, of course not, but all that tells us is that if God were not a Trinity, He would not
29 be a Trinity, or if God were different, He would be different). This statement tells us nothing
30 about who the true God is or about the relationships that *actually* exist among the persons of

¹⁷⁹ Stanley J. Grenz, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, IL, 1995), 153-54. Statements affirming “mutual submission” in the Trinity by Bilezikian are found in “Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping,” *JETS* 40 (1997), 57-68.

1 the Trinity. And it says nothing to show that the Father submits to the authority of the Son—
2 which He never does.”¹⁸⁰

3 **F. Interchangeable Roles and the Trinity**

4 Evangelical feminist in favor of the ordination of women as elders/ministers reject the
5 biblical evidence that clearly supports the principle of headship and submission within the
6 Godhead from before the beginning of creation. They see clearly that if a relationship of
7 authority and obedience is grounded in the immanent, inner-Trinitarian relations of Father,
8 Son, and Holy Spirit, then this gives at least *prima facie* justification to the notion of creational
9 human relations in which authority and submission inhere.

10 The early church clearly embraced the full essential equality of the three Trinitarian
11 persons (because each of the three divine persons possesses fully and simultaneously the
12 identically same infinite divine nature), nonetheless the church has always affirmed likewise the
13 priority of the Father over the Son and Spirit. Since this priority cannot rightly be understood in
14 terms of essence or nature (lest one fall into Arian subordinationism), it must exist in terms of
15 relationship.

16 The egalitarian denial of any submission of the Son to the Father, from before the
17 beginning of creation, makes it impossible to answer the question why it was the “Son” and not
18 the “Father” or “Spirit” who was sent to become incarnate. It has been both stated and
19 assumed that any one of the three Persons could become incarnate.¹⁸¹ The egalitarian view
20 would permit “any one of the three Persons” to become incarnate. And yet we have scriptural
21 revelation that clearly says the Son came down out of heaven to do the will of His Father. This
22 sending is not *ad hoc*. In eternity, the Father commissioned the Son who then willingly laid
23 aside the glory He had with the Father to come and purchase our pardon and renewal. Ellen
24 White refers to the possibility of the Father stepping down from heaven and veiling His glory so
25 that humanity might look upon Him. But that humiliation would not replace the redemptive act
26 of Christ in the incarnation and His death at the cross. In other words, the roles of the Father
27 and Son are not interchangeable.

¹⁸⁰ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 429-31.

¹⁸¹ John Thompson, *Modern Trinitarian Perspectives* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 22.

1 Had God the Father come to our world and dwelt among us, veiling His glory and
2 humbling Himself, that humanity might look upon Him, the history that we have of the
3 life of Christ would not have been changed in unfolding its record of His own
4 condescending grace. In every act of Jesus, in every lesson of His instruction, we are to
5 see and hear and recognize God.¹⁸²
6

7 A running theme in the history of this doctrine is that the Son was commissioned by the
8 Father in *eternity past* to come as the incarnate Son. As Jesus declares on well over thirty
9 occasions in John's Gospel, He was *sent to the earth* by the Father to do the Father's will.
10 Scripture reveals that this sending, or commissioning, took place in *eternity past*, a
11 commissioning that then is fulfilled in time. Peter confirms the eternal commissioning of the
12 Son. "He [Christ] was chosen before the creation of the world, but was revealed in these last
13 times for your sake" (1 Pet 1:20, NIV). If we wonder how far back this commissioning of the Son
14 took place, this verse settles the question. Before the world was made, the Father chose
15 (literally, "foreknew") the Son to come as the Redeemer. The Son's coming in time to shed His
16 blood reflects not an *ad hoc* decision nor a toss of the Trinitarian coin but the eternal purpose
17 of the *Father* to send and offer His *Son*. Ephesians 1:3-5 and Revelation 13:8 confirm this
18 understanding. In Ephesians 1, Paul gives praise to God the *Father* for choosing His own *in*
19 *Christ* before the foundation of the world, and for predestining them to adoption as sons
20 *through Jesus Christ* to Himself.¹⁸³

21 The plan of salvation was designed to redeem the fallen race, to give them another
22 trial. Christ was appointed to the office of Mediator from the creation of God, **set up**
23 **from everlasting** to be our substitute and surety. Before the world was made, it was
24 arranged that the divinity of Christ should be enshrouded in humanity. "A body," said
25 Christ, "hast thou prepared me." But He did not come in human form until the fullness
26 of time had expired. Then He came to our world, a babe in Bethlehem (Review and
27 Herald, Apr. 5, 1906).¹⁸⁴
28

29 It is thus clear that the Father's commissioning of the Son is based in eternity past, and that the
30 Son's submission to the Father is rooted in their eternal relationship within the Godhead. The
31 authority-obedience relation of Father and Son in the immanent Trinity is mandatory if we are

¹⁸² White, *Manuscript Releases*, Vol. 21, 393.

¹⁸³ Ware, "Tampering with the Trinity: Does the Son Submit to the Father?" *Biblical Foundations of Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton, IL, 2002), 249-250.

¹⁸⁴ Ellen Whit, *Lift Him Up*, 74.

1 to account for God the Father’s eternal purpose to elect and save fallen man through His
2 beloved Son.

3 Because Christ was commissioned in eternity past to come, in time and history, to carry
4 out the will of His Father, when this work is completed, Christ will place Himself in the very
5 position He had with the Father previously. While possessing again the full glory of the Father
6 (John 17:5), He will put Himself in subjection to the Father (1 Cor 15:28). The relation of the
7 Father and Son in eternity past, in Christ’s historic and incarnate life, and in eternity future,
8 then, is the same. Christ is fully equal in essence with the Father, yet subordinate in role.
9 Scripture clearly upholds these truths.¹⁸⁵

10 Finally, all of this scriptural evidence provides a backdrop for 1 Corinthians 11:3 which
11 states that God is the head of Christ. While there have been many disagreements about the
12 meaning of the word “head,” its meaning of authority is not only based on the natural meaning
13 of the word *kephalē* but also the scriptural claim that God is the eternal origin of all things and
14 Christ is the eternal agent (1 Cor 8:6).¹⁸⁶ In summary, then, within the Trinity a relationship of
15 headship and submission roles between the Father and the Son has existed from before the
16 beginning of creation.

17

18 **VII. Restoration of the Image of God**

19 With the creation of mankind, God brought about a new and distinct order of living
20 beings, made in the image of God. *“All heaven took a deep and joyful interest in the creation of
21 the world and of man. Human beings were **a new and distinct order**. They were made ‘in the
22 **image of God,**’ and it was the Creator’s design that they should populate the earth.”¹⁸⁷ The
23 myriad of angels were not created in the image of God, nor were any other unfallen beings.
24 This distinct privilege was given to humanity. Speaking generically, Ellen White wrote, *“God
25 created man a superior being; **he alone is formed in the image of God,** and is capable of
26 **partaking of the divine nature, of cooperating with his Creator and executing His plans.**”¹⁸⁸**

¹⁸⁵ Ware, 250.

¹⁸⁶ Kovach and Schemm, Stephen D. Kovach and Peter R. Schemm, JR., “A Defense of the Doctrine of Eternal Subordination of the Son,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 42/3 (September 1999) 472.

¹⁸⁷ White, *Review and Herald*, February 11, 1902.

¹⁸⁸ *Idem*, *Review and Herald*, April 21, 1885, emphasis added.

1 Not only the moral image of God but the principle of headship/submission, inherent in
2 divine love, was instilled in the creation of man, male and female. But this image was nearly
3 obliterated with the inception of sin. The overarching purpose of the gospel is to restore the
4 image of God—including the principle of headship/submission—in mankind, namely in the
5 church, the pillar and ground of truth. *“The central theme of the Bible, the theme about which
6 every other in the whole book clusters, is the redemption plan, the restoration in the human soul
7 of the image of God.”*¹⁸⁹

8 9 **VIII. Fallacious Objections to the Biblical Principle of Headship/Submission**

10 11 **A. Mutual Submission**

12 Ephesians 5:21 says, “submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.” Those in
13 favor of the ordination of women as elders/ministers say that this verse teaches “mutual
14 submission,” meaning that just as wives have to submit their husbands, so husbands have to
15 submit to their wives. Doesn’t the text say that we have to submit “one to another”? And this
16 presumably means that there is no unique submission that a wife owes to her husband, and no
17 unique authority that a husband has over his wife.¹⁹⁰

18 The Bible clearly states that believers (male and female) are to be considerate of one
19 another’s needs, and they are to esteem others better than themselves (Phil 2:3-4). Peter
20 admonishes the saints “to be submissive to one another,” “clothed with humility” (1 Peter 5:5).
21 Thus, there is a sense in which the members of the body of Christ must be willing to receive
22 counsel from one another. “God’s people must be subject to one another, counsel and advise
23 with each other, and the lack of one must be supplied by the sufficiency of the other. There is a
24 lack of humility.”¹⁹¹ In this context there is a mutuality that Scripture does require: “husbands,
25 love your wives as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her”; “fathers, do not provoke

¹⁸⁹ White, *Education*, 125.

¹⁹⁰ Portions of the ensuing discussion are taken from Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth*, 188-200; Idem, “The Myth of ‘Mutual Submission,’” <http://www.rockvalleybiblechurch.org/ResourcesAndLinks/MythOfMutualSubmission.htm> accessed 11-26-2013. See also Stephen Bohr, “A Study of 1 Peter 2:9,10 and Gal 3:28,” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013, 32-35.

¹⁹¹ White, *Manuscript Releases*, Vol. 15, 336.

1 your children to wrath”; “masters, do good to your servants, giving up threatening”, etc. This is
2 where we find mutuality, not in a shared authority, but in consideration of one another.

3 However, in a strict sense, the context of Ephesians 5-6 makes clear what Paul means by
4 “submitting one to another.” Wives are to be subject to¹⁹² their husbands (5:22-24), children
5 are to be subject to their parents (6:1-3), and servants are to be subject to their masters (6:5-8).
6 Paul does not tell husbands to be subject to their wives, or parents to be subject to their
7 children (nullifying all parental authority), or masters to be subject to their servants. The idea
8 of mutual submission is absent in the overall context of Eph 5-6. Paul is defining a specific kind
9 of submission to an authority: wife to the authority of her husband; children to parents;
10 servants to masters. Moreover, wives are to submit to their husbands as the church is to submit
11 to Christ (5:24). Here mutual submission is clearly excluded where Christ would submit to the
12 church. Wives are repeatedly told to be subject to their husbands in the NT (Eph 5:22-24; Col
13 3:18; Titus 2:5; 1 Peter 3:1-6). In *not one* case is it stated that husbands are to be subject to
14 their wives; however, husbands are admonished to love their wives as Christ loved the
15 church—a sense of mutuality between husbands and wives. We may also note a unique
16 concept of mutuality in the marital relationship where the “wife does not have authority
17 [*exousiazō*] over her own body, but the husband does. And likewise the husband does not have
18 authority over his own body, the wife does” (1 Cor 7:3-4). However, within the context of
19 Ephesians 5-6 and the use of Greek word *hupotassō* (to submit) , no author saw mutual
20 submission as Paul’s motif until the evangelical feminist movement began to gain prominence
21 in the late 1960s and early ‘70s.

22 In the NT, the Greek word *hupotassō* (to submit), carries the basic meaning of
23 submission to an authority. Although some have claimed that the word can mean "be
24 thoughtful and considerate, act in love" (toward another), there is little evidence to show that
25 any first-century Greek speaker would have understood it that way, for the term always implies
26 a relationship of submission to an authority. Examples of how this word is used elsewhere in
27 the New Testament are illustrated below:

¹⁹² Some NT manuscripts lack the verb “submit to” (*hupotassō*) in Eph 5:22. But many more manuscripts contain the verb as many popular translations attest. Moreover, the verb exists in 5:21 and 5:24 which makes the context clear that 5:22 demands the idea of submission.

- 1 • Jesus is subject to the authority of his parents (Luke 2:51)
- 2 • demons are subject to the disciples (Luke 10:17: clearly the meaning "act in love, be considerate"
- 3 cannot fit here!)
- 4 • citizens are to be subject to government authorities (Rom 13:1, 5; Tit 3:1, 1 Pet 2:13)
- 5 • the universe is subject to Christ (1 Cor 15:27; Eph 1:22)
- 6 • unseen spiritual powers are subject to Christ (1 Pet 3:22)
- 7 • Christ is subject to God the Father (1 Cor 15:28)
- 8 • church members are to be subject to church leaders (1 Cor 16:15-16 [cf. 1 Clement 42:4]; 1 Pet.
- 9 5:5)
- 10 • wives are to be subject to their husbands (Col 3:18; Tit 2:5; 1 Pet 3:5; compare Eph 5:22, 24)
- 11 • the church is subject to Christ (Eph 5:24)
- 12 • servants are to be subject to their masters (Tit 2:9; 1 Pet 2:18)
- 13 • Christians are subject to God (Heb 12:9; Jas 4:7)

14 None of these relationships are ever reversed. Husbands are never told to be subject
15 (*hupotassō*) to wives, nor the government to citizens, nor masters to servants, nor the disciples
16 to demons. Clearly parents are never told to be subject to their children! In fact, the term
17 *hupotassō* is used outside the NT to describe the submission and obedience of soldiers in an
18 army to those of superior rank.¹⁹³ The Greek word, *hupotassō*, is never "mutual" in its force; it
19 is always one-directional in its reference to submission to an authority.

20 What then does "one another" mean in Ephesians 5:21? It means "some to others," not
21 "everyone to everyone." The meaning of *hupotassō*, which always indicates one-directional
22 submission to an authority, prevents the sense "everyone to everyone" in this verse. And the
23 following context (wives to husbands, children to parents, servants to masters) shows this
24 understanding to be true. Therefore, it is not "mutual submission," but submission to
25 appropriate authorities, which Paul is commanding in Ephesians 5:21.

26 **B. Neither Male and Female: Galatians 3:28**

27 Rebecca Groothuis is an evangelical feminist and is representative of those who claim
28 that Galatians 3:28 teaches that there is full gender equality in the kingdom of God with the
29 leadership role of elder/minister open to all. "Of all texts that support biblical equality,
30 Galatians 3:26-28 is probably the most important. . . [I]t is a broadly applicable statement of the

¹⁹³ See, for example, Josephus, *War* 2.566, 578; 5.309; compare the adverb in 1 Clement 37:2). The *Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon* even defines *hupotassō* [passive] to mean "be obedient" (p. 1897).

1 inclusive nature of the New Covenant, whereby all groups of people, regardless of their
2 previous religious status under the law, have now become one in Christ.”¹⁹⁴

3 “Many evangelical egalitarians [those in favor of women’s ordination] have attempted
4 to frame the women’s ordination issue along the lines of slavery. It is contended that the
5 submission of wives to their husbands in the home and women to male leadership in the
6 church is akin to slaves being subject to their masters. It is argued that as slaves have been
7 emancipated from their masters so women must be emancipated from being subject to the
8 husband in the home and to men in the church. But is the comparison valid?

9 “[T]he distinction between male and female was part of God’s original pre-fall plan at
10 creation while slavery was a human institution established by sinful man. If read carefully, the
11 Bible provides the principles that would eventually lead to the eradication of slavery. But there
12 is no evidence in Scripture that it is God’s plan to eradicate the functional differences between
13 male and female.

14 “Some have sought to make the struggle for women’s ordination a matter comparable
15 to the civil rights struggle for racial equality in the decade of the 60’s. They argue that the
16 subjection of women to male headship in the home and in the church is a deprivation of their
17 equal rights with men and thus is tantamount to discrimination. But upon careful scrutiny this
18 comparison falls on its face. . . . But ordination to pastoral leadership is *not an inalienable right*
19 but rather a *calling* that is *not* given by God to all His creatures.”¹⁹⁵

20 The text of Galatians 3:28 does not say that the distinction between Jews and Greeks is
21 abolished, and the distinction between slaves and free is abolished, and the distinction
22 between male and female is abolished. To say that we are “one” means we are *united* based on
23 our redemption in Christ Jesus. There should be no factions or divisions among those who have
24 embraced Christ as Savior and Lord. The context of the passage in Galatians 3 is redemption,
25 justification in Christ, and baptism into Christ, not full gender equality without gender
26 distinctions in the home and the church. The members of the body of Christ do not all have the
27 same function, although we are one body. “For as we have many members in one body, but all

¹⁹⁴ Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995), 25-26.

¹⁹⁵ Bohr, 13

1 the members do not have the same function, so we, *being* many, are one body in Christ, and
2 individually members of one another (Rom 12:4-5; see also 1 Cor 12:4-31). “The context of
3 [Galatians 3:28] shows that Paul is dealing with eligibility for baptism, not ministry. . . . Paul is
4 not talking about roles of the sexes here [and] therefore this passage is quite irrelevant”¹⁹⁶ to
5 Paul’s teaching concerning functional roles of men and women in the church in 1 Corinthians 11
6 and 1 Timothy 2-3.

7 In quick succession Paul cements a vertical articulation of human-divine relationships.
8 The particular context and content of Gal 3:28 is salvation, not gender-specific service
9 (let alone its abrogation). In short, Gal 3:28 epitomizes relations between humans and
10 God (vertical), not human-to-human relations (horizontal). Every single verse
11 establishes this vertical dynamic:

- 12
- 13 Gal 3:26 “For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.”
- 14 Gal 3:27 “For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ.”
- 15 Gal 3:28 “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave or free, there is
16 neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”
- 17
- 18 Gal 3:29 “And if you are Christ’s, then you are Abraham’s seed, and heirs
19 according to the promise.”
- 20

21 After all, conversion does not change one’s ethnicity, status, or gender; the male
22 remains male, the slave was still a slave post-conversion. In view is the status of *any*
23 human before God, not before other humans. The message of Gal 3:28 is precisely
24 that human perceptions of cultural, economic, or gender advantage/disadvantage do
25 not correlate to ontological value and salvation status with God. This statement makes
26 even more sense if functional differentiations are maintained, not abrogated. Paul’s
27 point is clear: neither ethnicity, economics, nor gender grant one person privileged
28 soteriological status before God over another person. This text does not cancel
29 gender-specific ontology. Finally, NT scholarship schedules 1 Timothy *after* Galatians –
30 in other words, Gal 3:28 does not prevent Paul from defining certain ministry roles in
31 gender-specific terms.¹⁹⁷

32

33 What is perhaps most significant about the categories listed in Gal. 3:28 is that all the
34 distinctions beside those between male and female are man-made. Race, nationality, social
35 status, and economic station are all human constructs, products of the age of sin. The Bible
36 doesn’t say, Black and white created He them, nor does it say, Patrician, plutocrat, plebeian,

¹⁹⁶ Gordon Wenham, “The Ordination of Women: Why is it so Diverse?” *Churchman* 92 (1978), 312.

¹⁹⁷ Sorke, 53-54.

1 and peasant created He them. And certainly the Bible doesn't say, Slave and free created He
2 them. Here we see the best reason for rejecting the analogy between slavery and Biblical
3 gender-role distribution. Slavery came after the Fall. By contrast, the evidence we have seen
4 from Scripture is conclusive that gender-role distinctions began at creation. Put simply,
5 Galatians. 3:28 is about the universal availability of salvation opportunities. It does not deny
6 the universal Biblical affirmation of spiritual male headship.

7 If gender distinctions are abolished in Galatians 3:28, then marriage between two men
8 or two women becomes a new liberty in Christ, as some evangelical feminists are advocating.¹⁹⁸
9 But the Bible forbids this aberrant behavior (Lev 18:22; 20:13; Rom 1:26-27; 1 Co 6:9; 1 Tim
10 1:10). Although Galatians 3:28 endorses the abolition of social injustice (including slavery and
11 caste systems) and rivalry and pride among believers, nevertheless gender distinction between
12 male and female in marriage, in the home, and in the church have timeless application.¹⁹⁹ If we
13 take the entire New Testament as the inspired word of God in the New Covenant today, then
14 any claim that Galatians 3:28 should overrule other texts such as Ephesians 5 and 1 Timothy 2
15 would be a claim that the apostle Paul contradicts himself, and therefore that the Word of God
16 contradicts itself. We allow the Bible to interpret itself.²⁰⁰

17 "Some egalitarians have used the following quotation from the pen of Ellen White²⁰¹ to
18 bolster their case in favor of ordinations to pastoral leadership without regard to gender:

19 "No distinction on account of nationality, race, or caste, is recognized by God. He is the
20 Maker of all mankind. All men are of *one family* by creation, and all are one through

¹⁹⁸ *Spectrum Magazine* promotes "Seventh-Gay Adventists" film.

<http://spectrummagazine.org/blog/2013/11/24/seventh-gay-adventists-film-now-available-online> accessed 11-27-2013.

¹⁹⁹ See Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 183-187; Sorke, 48-53; Bohr, 13-47 for further insights on Gal 3:28.

²⁰⁰ The method of interpretation (hermeneutics) often seen in feminists expositions of Gal 3:28 derives from a form of literary criticism called "destruction" (see above, note 3). Ingo Sorke perceptively observes "Galatians 3:28 represents a hermeneutic, catalyzed by Krister Stendahl's 'progressive hermeneutic.' . . . With astounding transparency he concedes that 'the ideology or dogma which underlies both the movements of emancipation and the demand for the ordination of women is a secularized philosophy of equality with roots in the Enlightenment or in Hellas or in the cult of Baal—in any case alien to the Bible.' Stendahl's hermeneutical bedfellow F. F. Bruce does not hide his bias either when he establishes his exegetical criterion: 'Whatever in Paul's teaching promotes true freedom is of universal and permanent validity; whatever seems to impose restrictions on true freedom has regard to local and temporary conditions.' In the estimation of Allen, this defines a hermeneutic that has descended into unsustainable relativism: . . . 'Every domain of inquiry and every value is relative to a culture and even to subcultures.'" See Sorke, 48-49 and citations therein. On-line edition: <http://www.adventistarchives.org/adam,-where-are-you.pdf>, 51-52.

²⁰¹ Ellen White, *Christ Object Lessons*, 386.

1 redemption. Christ came to demolish every wall of partition, to throw open every
2 compartment of the temple, that every soul may have free access to God. His love is so
3 broad, so deep, so full, that it penetrates everywhere. It lifts out of Satan's circle the
4 poor souls who have been deluded by his deceptions. It places them within reach of the
5 throne of God, the throne encircled by the rainbow of promise. In Christ there is neither
6 Jew nor Greek, bond nor free. All are *brought nigh* by His precious blood. (Galatians
7 3:28; Ephesians 2:13)

8
9 “Are those who use this quotation in this manner respecting its legitimate context? First
10 of all, it is important to underline that although Ellen White is clearly alluding to Galatians 3:28
11 she did not include the phrase ‘male or female’ in this quotation. Not only did she stop short of
12 quoting the last phrase of the verse, but at the beginning of the quotation she refers only to a
13 distinction of nationality, race and caste. Gender is totally absent from the quotation!”²⁰²

14 “Galatians 3:28 argues that Christ’s death created an opportunity for humans to change
15 their status from slaves to sons, thus rendering them heirs and therefore receiving adoption
16 status regardless of ethnicity, status, or gender. The text cannot be used to annihilate all gender
17 distinctions or functional differentiations in church practice as profiled by the same author.
18 Social and ecclesiastical implications fall outside the context of Gal 3:28.”²⁰³

19 Galatians 3:28 articulates the vertical dimension of human-divine relationships; it does
20 not erase all gender roles or functional distinctions.

21 22 **C. Priesthood of All Believers: 1 Peter 2:9, 10**

23 Does the NT doctrine of the “priesthood of all believers mean that both men and
24 women are qualified to fill positions of leadership in the church as elders/ministers? Although
25 the exact expression, “priesthood of all believers” does not exist in Scripture or the Writings of
26 Ellen G. White, the concept of a “priesthood” of believers is quite apparent. “But you are a
27 chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, His own special people, *that* you may
28 proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light; who once
29 were not a people but are now the people of God, who had not obtained mercy but now have
30 obtained mercy” (1 Pet 2:2-10). God’s people are to be a “holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual

²⁰² Bohr, 43.

²⁰³ Sorke, 53.

1 sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ” (v. 5). The apostle Peter extracts the “royal
2 priesthood” concept from Exodus 19:6, where at Sinai God declares that Israel was to be “a
3 kingdom of priests and holy nation.” But it must be noted that Moses distinguishes between
4 the people of Israel as a “kingdom of priests” in Exodus 19:6 and the appointed ministerial
5 priests in 19:22, 24 (a precursor to the Levitical priesthood). The concept of a priesthood of all
6 believers already existed in the Old Testament period, and therefore it should be not
7 understood as a revolutionary concept introduced in the NT. So in what way is the NT “royal
8 priesthood” similar to the OT “kingdom of priests?”

9 Peter is echoing the covenant language of Exodus 19 in 1 Peter 2, indicating that “This
10 covenant is of *just as much force today* as it was when the Lord made it with ancient Israel.”²⁰⁴

11 White continues the linkage of Exodus 19 with the “royal priesthood” of the NT:

12 The Lord made a special covenant with his *ancient Israel* if they would prove faithful, “Now,
13 therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar
14 treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a
15 kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.” He addresses his commandment-keeping people in
16 *these last days*, “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a
17 peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of
18 darkness into his marvelous light.”²⁰⁵

19 So it is clear that the Scripture is calling both OT and NT Israel, both dispensations, to be
20 a royal priesthood. But is this an indication that both genders were being called by God to be
21 “priests” or spiritual leaders? The answer is “no” for both the OT royal priesthood and in the NT
22 royal priesthood. In the OT God appointed men from the tribe of Levi to the priesthood, and in
23 the NT God appoints men who rule their own house well (1 Tim 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9).

24 The people of Israel had God-given responsibilities as a kingdom of priests. Likewise,
25 what is our function as members of the royal priesthood? Jesus Christ as our heavenly High
26 Priest functions as our Mediator with God, the Father. “There is one God and one Mediator
27 between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus” (1 Tim 2:5). As part of the royal priesthood, we
28 too have a function as a “mediator.”

29 “Every member of Israel belonged to the covenant community and therefore was
30 responsible to mediate the gospel *to the world* in order to draw out those who were in

²⁰⁴ White, *God’s Amazing Grace*, 142, emphasis added.

²⁰⁵ Idem, PH011, 16, emphasis added.

1 darkness unto Christ's marvelous light. That is to say, every Israelite who became a member of
2 God's church at Mt. Sinai was called by God to be a missionary with the specific purpose of
3 preparing the world for the arrival of the Messiah. The fact that all Israel was called to mediate
4 Christ to the world did not mean that the office of the priesthood was unnecessary. This role of
5 Israel as God's mediator of the gospel to the nations was beautifully portrayed by the Gospel
6 Prophet Isaiah:

7 "It is too small a thing that You should be My Servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob,
8 and to restore the preserved ones of Israel; I will also give You as a light to the Gentiles, that
9 You should be My salvation to the ends of the earth.'" (Isaiah 49:6)²⁰⁶

10 God calls His royal priesthood today, without gender distinction, to "offer up spiritual
11 sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2:5). This, however, is not a
12 universal call to the office of elder/minister. "So what are the spiritual sacrifices that *all*
13 *Christians* must now offer without regard to gender? David, who was *not a priest*, offered such
14 sacrifices already in the Old Testament. In his penitential Psalm of repentance David prayed to
15 God: 'For You do not desire sacrifice, or else I would give it; You do not delight in burnt offering.
16 The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart—these, O God, You will
17 not despise' [Psalm 51:16-17]."²⁰⁷ In a similar manner the apostle Paul exhorts the people of
18 God, "by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to
19 God, which is your reasonable service. And do not be conformed to this world, but be
20 transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good and
21 acceptable and perfect will of God" (Romans 12:1-2). Christians are a royal priesthood chosen
22 with the specific purpose of declaring to the world the praises of Him who called them out of
23 darkness into His marvelous light (1 Peter 2:9).

24 From the beginning it has been God's plan that *through His church* shall be reflected to
25 *the world* His fullness and His sufficiency. The members of the church, those whom He
26 has called out of darkness into His marvelous light, are to show forth His glory.²⁰⁸

27

²⁰⁶ Bohr, 9.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 9-10. In other texts sacrifices are identified with praise (Psalm 116:17; Hebrews 13:15, 16), joy (Psalm 27:6), thanksgiving (Psalm 107:22; Hebrews 13:15, 16) and mercy (Hosea 6:6).

²⁰⁸ White, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 9, emphasis added.

1 In both the OT and NT dispensations, the entire people was called as a royal priesthood
2 was called to mediate God’s truth to the nations, but neither in the OT or the NT dispensation
3 does this qualify all to officiate as priests or elders/ministers/pastors without regard to gender
4 in the narrow sense of the word. Even of the men, only a relatively few served in this way.

5 One truth of Scripture (the priesthood of all believers) does not override or deny other
6 passages of Scripture specifying the appointment of elders/ministers (1 Timothy 2:12; 3:2; Titus
7 1:6 along with passages that establish a pattern of male leadership in the church). The Bible is
8 internally consistent, and its parts will not contradict each other. Thus, Psalm 119 confirms this
9 principle when it says, “The *sum* of your word is truth, and every one of your righteous rules
10 endures forever” (v. 160).

11 “The ‘priesthood of believers’ was Luther’s slogan asserting that every believer had the
12 right (authority) to read the Bible for themselves, every believer had received the illumination
13 of the Holy Spirit to interpret Scripture for themselves, and every believer had the standing
14 with God to approach Him directly in Jesus’ name. In the 16th century, all of these were
15 thought to be exclusive prerogatives of priests. So the slogan ‘priesthood of believers’ spoke a
16 powerful truth to the members of the medieval church, which had taught that only the priests
17 had direct access to God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and Scripture.

18 “In the 21st century, however, the social and political context is so different that the
19 term ‘priesthood of every believer’ acquires some actually unbiblical connotations. In the
20 context of modern democracies, ‘every member a minister’ has a subtle but pervasive
21 democratizing influence on the concept of church, which results in a great diminution of the
22 ‘specialness’ of the ordained ministry. . . .

23 “To reassert the special responsibilities of ordained ministers, and restore the biblical
24 difference between ordained men and unordained men and women would do much to restore
25 the rightful authority of the ministers.”²⁰⁹

26
27
28

²⁰⁹ Moon, 19-20.

1 D. The Case of Deborah

2 Does Deborah's role as a prophet and judge in Israel show that women can assume
3 leadership over men in the church? The period of the judges following the death of Joshua and
4 his contemporary elders was a time when the order established by Moses had degenerated and
5 disorder ensued, in which "everyone did what was right in his own eyes." Over a period of 200
6 years, apostasy was followed by repentance numerous times, and God called specific men to
7 judge Israel. Deborah was called of God to be a prophetess, but there is no scriptural evidence
8 that God called Deborah to be a judge. God specifically called willing and courageous men, such
9 as Gideon (Jud 6:12-14), to be judges when the people cried out for deliverance (see also 3:9,
10 15; 11:29; 13:24-25). At the time when Deborah was called to be a prophet (not a judge), there
11 was a dearth of willing and courageous men. God used Deborah's prophetic office to call a
12 reticent Barak to function in the capacity of military leader of Israel to fend off the advances of
13 Jabin, king of Canaan, and his commander, Sisera. The abnormal nature of the situation with no
14 men to function as judge is confirmed by Barak's timidity²¹⁰ and the rebuke implied in his
15 subsequent loss of glory, "there will be no glory for you" (Jud 4:9); Deborah expresses surprise
16 in her "Song" that no man had stepped forward to initiate Israel's rescue from the oppressor,
17 but that a *mother* had to prophetically call a military leader (5:7).

18 Without exception, all the men who were called to judge Israel were military leaders.
19 With the lack of a man called of God to be a judge and military leader in Israel, the people
20 sought the services of Deborah, the prophet, not as a military leader, but for counsel and
21 justice, and she judged under her palm tree (Jud 4:4-5). It was highly unusual for a woman to
22 serve as a civil magistrate, as White explains: "She [Deborah] was known as a prophetess, and
23 in the *absence of the usual magistrates*, the people had sought to her for counsel and
24 justice."²¹¹ The text does not say that Deborah ruled over or taught God's people. Teaching was
25 the responsibility of the priesthood (Lev 10:11; Mal 2:6-7).

²¹⁰ "Although *he had been designated* by the Lord Himself as the one chosen to deliver Israel, and had received the assurance that God would go with him and subdue their enemies, yet he was timid and distrustful." White, *Sons and Daughters of God*, 37, emphasis added.

²¹¹ White, *Sons and Daughters of God*, 37, emphasis added.

1 “When the text says that ‘Deborah . . . was *judging* Israel at that time’ (Jud 4:4), the
2 Hebrew verb *shāpat*, ‘to judge,’ in this context does not mean ‘to rule or govern,’ but rather has
3 the sense of ‘*decide controversy*,’ discriminate between persons in civil, political, domestic and
4 religious questions.”²¹² This is not a picture of Deborah ruling as queen in a leadership role, but
5 she is simply settling private disputes. Additionally, there is no evidence that she taught the
6 people in any assembled group. Furthermore, Deborah refused to lead the people in military
7 battle, but insisted that a man do this (Jud 4:6-7, 14). Schreiner points out that Deborah is the
8 only judge in the book of Judges who has no military function.²¹³ Her prophetic function was to
9 issue a command to Barak that God had called him to take up arms and lead the people into
10 battle. Her function as with many women of God was to encourage and exhort a man to take
11 the leadership role to which God has called him, as she did with Barak. “Deborah delivers the
12 ‘divine declaration or decision’ (4:6) regarding the people’s ‘call for help’ (4:3). The divine
13 response is indicated by her issuing the call to Barak to lead Israel into battle (4:6), designating
14 him as the next individual to lead Israel.”²¹⁴

15 It is Barak’s, not Deborah’s, leadership that is later cited by Samuel and again in the
16 book of Hebrews. Samuel tells the people, “And the Lord sent Jerubbaal and *Barak* . . . and
17 delivered you out of the hand of your enemies on every side” (1 Sam 12:11). And the author of
18 Hebrews says, “And what more shall I say? For time would fail me to tell of Gideon, *Barak*,
19 Samson . . . and the prophets” (Heb 11:32).

20

21 **E. The Case of Huldah**

22 The Book of the Law was discovered in the temple during the reign of Josiah following
23 his order to repair the temple. When Josiah learned of the discovery and that the Book of the
24 Law contained the covenant blessings and curses that would hinge upon Judah’s faith and
25 obedience, he tore his clothes in repentance for the history of apostasy in Israel. Josiah was
26 anxious to know what pending action God would take with Judah in view of the curses foretold
27 (2 Kings 22:8-13). At his request for some inspired counsel, one of God’s prophets, Huldah the

²¹² Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 133.

²¹³ Cited by Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 133.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 135; see also note 11 therein.

1 prophetess, was summoned with the inquiry from Josiah. She faithfully delivered the message
2 of fate to come upon Judah, “this what the Lord says,” (v. 15) which would occur after Josiah’s
3 reign. He and his contemporaries would be spared because of his faithful leadership of Judah
4 (22:16-20).

5 Huldah was never anointed and was never an elder or a priest.²¹⁵ She did not take the
6 reins of leadership in Judah; she did not take the throne; she did not take over the priesthood
7 to clean up the temple. She was merely a messenger of God to encourage Josiah to move
8 forward in faithful obedience. It was the king who led Judah to repentance, reformation, and
9 revival. Huldah gave the king the inspired message, and the king implemented the counsel
10 given to him.

11 “There is clear Biblical evidence that prophets served as inspired *advisors and*
12 *counselors* to rulers and yet the rulers had the governing authority to accept or reject the
13 counsel. That the *rulers had executive power* over the prophets is made clear by what the rulers
14 frequently did to prophets who delivered politically incorrect messages. Among others, Isaiah
15 was sawn asunder, Elijah had to flee, Jeremiah was committed to the dungeon (2 Chronicles
16 36:11-15), John the Baptist was beheaded, and Stephen was stoned.”²¹⁶

17

18 **F. The Case of Miriam and Others**

19 Miriam, the sister of Moses, was a prophetess who “was richly endowed with gifts of
20 poetry and music and ‘in the affections of the people and the honor heaven she stood second
21 only to Moses and Aaron.’”²¹⁷ She prophesied specifically to women of Israel: “And Miriam sang
22 to them [the women]” (see Exodus 15:20-21). In the OT women prophets always prophesied
23 privately or to women. And the prophecy was always a message from God to His people. It was
24 different from teaching God’s people and different than ruling God’s people, neither of which
25 women did with God’s blessing in the Old or New Testament.²¹⁸

²¹⁵ Laurel Damsteegt, “Women of the Old Testament: Women of Influence,” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, July, 2013, 20. See the entire article for full a discussion of influential women of the OT.

²¹⁶ Bohr, 73

²¹⁷ Ibid., 11 quotes PP 382.

²¹⁸ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 138.

1 The Old Testament frequently honors women who are faithful to God and portrays
2 them very favorably. Examples include: Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Sarah, Rebekah, Ruth,
3 Naomi, Abigail, Esther, and the godly wife of Proverbs 31. They are always seen as submissive
4 either to the leadership of their husbands (1 Pet. 3:5-6) or to some other person in authority.

5 Instances where women seized ruling authority over God’s people in the OT are always
6 viewed negatively. Queens such as Jezebel (1 Kings 16:31; 18:4, 13; 19:1-2; 21:5-25) and
7 Athaliah (2 Kings 11) led the people into evil when they gained power. Jezebel, strong-willed,
8 evil, manipulative, and unrepentant, becomes the ultimate symbol of treachery, idolatry, and
9 immorality in Revelation (2:20ff). Athaliah, Jezebel’s daughter, was worse, having become the
10 ruling monarch of Judah through murderous treachery (2 Chron 22:10-12; 23:12-15).
11 Discovering the somewhat secret coronation of Joash, Athaliah screamed, “Treason! Treason!”
12 but she herself was slain outside the temple. So ended the ruthless rule of the sole female
13 monarch recorded in Scripture.²¹⁹

14 “There were wise queens such as Esther, but she did she did not rule as a monarch,
15 since the authority rested with Ahasuerus the king, and she was not queen over Israel, but over
16 Persia. The Queen of Sheba (1Kings 10:1-13) is also viewed positively, but as a foreign queen
17 she did not rule over God’s people.”²²⁰

18 “Women were highly influential and important in the history of God’s people. Some had
19 godly influences on their children to the third and fourth generation. Some faithfully
20 transmitted the Word of God to those inquiring. Some were strong to do righteousness when
21 all the men around were cowardly. Some women were so evil the nation of Israel never really
22 recovered. The stories of these women are instructive examples of faith and unfaith. These
23 were women of influence, all. Not priests, not elders, but yes, they were women of influence
24 for good or evil.”²²¹

25

26 **G. Phoebe**

27 The apostle Paul highly commended her for her ministry to the congregations in Rome.
28 “I commend to you Phoebe our sister, who is a *servant* [*diakonon*] of the church in Cenchrea,

²¹⁹ Laurel Damsteegt, 20.

²²⁰ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 146.

²²¹ Laurel Damsteegt, 23.

1 that you may receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and assist her in
2 whatever business she has need of you; for indeed she has been a *helper* of many and of myself
3 also” (Romans 16:1, 2). Those in favor of the ordination of women as elder/minister assert that
4 Phoebe was *not* simply a self-sacrificing servant (*diakonon*) of the church, but she was
5 appointed to the office of deacon.

6 First, it must be recognized that the office of deacon in the NT does not include the
7 governing and teaching authority that is reserved for elders. The Greek word *diakonos* has two
8 basic meanings in the NT, *servant* and *deacon*. The vast majority of occurrences describe a
9 servant fulfilling his master’s wishes; only two occurrences clearly employ *diakonos* in the sense
10 of a defined office (1 Tim 3:8, 12). Was Paul honoring Phoebe as a deacon or as a servant to
11 the church? Within the context of Paul’s writings, Phoebe would naturally fall under the
12 category of servant.²²² From the standpoint of the principle of headship, it makes little
13 difference in the case of Phoebe. In neither case does this passage show that she had any
14 teaching or governing authority in the church. Teaching and governing authority is granted only
15 to the elder/minister (1 Tim 3:2, 5; 5:17; Titus 1:9; also Acts 20:17, 28).

16 Some evangelical feminists interpret the word Greek word *prostatis*, “helper,” as
17 “leader or “ruler” (“she has been a helper [leader] of many and of myself”).²²³ Was Phoebe a
18 leader or ruler over Paul? Paul did not think that even the Jerusalem apostles ruled over him
19 (Gal 1:1, 11-12). Those who “seemed to be influential” in Jerusalem did not rule over Paul (2:6);
20 and he rebuked Peter publicly (2:11-14). Paul did not consider himself to be subject to any
21 human leader but to Jesus Christ alone. In addition, Paul employs a play on words in Romans
22 16:2 with the word “helper” (*prostatis*) and the verb “assist [help her],” both of which are
23 derived from the Greek root *histēmi*. Thus Paul says that the church should “help (*paristēmi*)
24 her in whatever she may require from you for she has been a “helper” (*prostatis*) of many and
25 of myself as well” (16:2).

26 In view of the fact that Phoebe was a helper to Paul, it seems more likely she functioned
27 as a self-sacrificing servant in behalf of Christ to Paul and others rather than in the office of
28 deacon. During His ministry, Jesus admonished *each and every one* of His followers to be a

²²² Sorke, 40.

²²³ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 220-221. See also citations therein.

1 *diakonos* or servant in the general sense of service or ministering, but this does not mean that
2 all have been called to be elders/overseers. Jesus said: “But he who is greatest among you shall
3 be your *servant* [*diakonos*]” (Matthew 23:11). “And He sat down, called the twelve, and said to
4 them, ‘If anyone desires to be first, he shall be last of all and *servant* [*diakonos*] of all” (Mark
5 9:35). “If anyone *serves* [*diakonē*] Me, let him follow Me; and where I am, there My *servant*
6 [*diakonos*] will be also. If anyone *serves* [*diakonē*] Me, him My Father will honor” (John 12:26).

7 Ellen White clearly explained that Phoebe had the spiritual gift of *hospitality* and was
8 foremost in providing lodging and food to those who visited the church of Cenchrea. In this
9 sense she ministered to the needs of the saints and encouraged the church today to do the
10 same: “Phoebe *entertained* the apostle, and she was in a marked manner an *entertainer* of
11 strangers who *needed care*. Her example should be followed by the churches of today.”²²⁴
12

13 **H. Junia(s)**

14 Those in favor of the ordination of women claim that if Junia was an apostle, a woman
15 can hold any other church office as well. The apostle Paul closes the book of Romans with
16 greetings to many of his co-laborers in the ministry, including Andronicus and Junia(s). “Salute
17 Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note [well-known]
18 among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me” (Rom 16:7). A number of questions
19 revolve around this text: first, concerning the name Junia(s), was this person a man or woman?
20 Second, the Greek syntax is debatable. Was this person “well-known *among* the apostles” or
21 “well-known *to* the apostles?” Finally, was this person an apostle, like the original twelve, or
22 was did this person function as a messenger (*apostolos*)?

23 Regarding the gender of this person, there is no uniformity among twenty common
24 translations of the text—some specify a man, Junias (NIV, NASB, RSV, ASV), while others specify
25 a woman, Junia (KJV, NKJV, NRSV, NLT, ESV), usually indicating the alternative in the margin.
26 Evidence from the early church (patristic) fathers and Latin is also non-uniform concerning the
27 gender question.²²⁵

²²⁴ White, *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 6, 343, emphasis added.

²²⁵ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 225-226 and citations therein.

1 What about the Greek syntax (grammatical sentence structure)? Was Junia well-known
2 *among* or *to* the apostles? In light of recent research in Greek syntax,²²⁶ the more suitable
3 translation seems to be, **“Greet Andronicus and Junia(s) . . . well-known to the apostles.”**
4 Therefore it does not make much difference if this is a man’s or a woman’s name, because it
5 does not say that Junia(s) was an apostle. This person was well-known *to* the apostles.

6 Finally, the word translated “apostles” could just as well mean “church messengers” in
7 this text as it does elsewhere in Paul’s writings. The Greek word *apostolos* can mean either
8 ‘apostle’ or ‘messenger’ in the NT. A number of examples of *apostolos* meaning messenger are
9 found in the NT (John 13:16; 2 Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25). Since Andronicus and Junia(s) are otherwise
10 unknown as apostles, even if someone wanted to translate “well known *among*,” the sense
11 “well known among the messengers” would be more appropriate.”²²⁷

12 Ellen White assumed that apostles were exclusively male: “The apostles and elders,
13 *men of influence and judgment*, framed and issued the decree, which was thereupon generally
14 accepted by the Christian churches.”²²⁸

15 “In conclusion there is not a single unambiguous instance in the NT where the word
16 ‘apostle’ is applied to a woman. The feminist claim that there was an apostle named Junia is
17 built upon on one uncertainty (gender of the name) on top of another uncertainty (the meaning
18 of ‘apostle’ [or ‘messenger’] in this verse) on top of an improbable meaning of a phrase (‘well-
19 known among’ rather than ‘well-known to’). This is a highly speculative and flimsy foundation
20 upon which to base any argument. It carries little weight against the clear teaching of the
21 exclusive male eldership and male apostleship in the rest of the New Testament.”²²⁹

22

23 **I. Priscilla**

24 “When Priscilla and Aquila [the sequence: “Aquila and Priscilla” follows the *Textus*
25 *Receptus* (KJV)] heard him, they took him aside and explained to him the way of God more
26 accurately” (18:26). Evangelical feminists uniformly cite evidence that Priscilla and Aquila both

²²⁶ M. H. Burer and D. B. Wallace, “Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Reexamination of Romans 16:7,” *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 76-91. Cited by Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 224-225.

²²⁷ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 227.

²²⁸ White. *The Acts of the Apostles*, 196, emphasis added.

²²⁹ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 227.

1 “explained” to Apollos “the way of God more accurately” (Acts 18:26), and therefore women
2 can exercise the teaching role of an elder and serve in the same capacity.

3 It should be noted that Priscilla and Aquila were not teaching Apollos in a public setting.
4 They “took him aside”²³⁰ *privately* to explain the way salvation more fully. The context indicates
5 that they waited to speak to Apollos until he finished speaking *publicly* in the synagogue
6 (18:26), so they could take him aside, out of public view. When he was instructed concerning
7 the gospel, Apollos was given written endorsement by the brethren to function as a *public*
8 teacher (v. 27). He then crossed into Achaia and “refuted the Jews *publicly*” (18:28). There is a
9 clear contrast between the public teaching of Apollos and the private teaching of Priscilla. In
10 situations where the whole church is assembled, Paul restricts the governing and teaching
11 activities to men (see 1Cor 14:33-36; 1 Tim 2:11-15; see qualifications for elders in 1 Tim 3 and
12 Titus 1). The example of Priscilla and Aquila in instructing Apollos privately does not contradict
13 this.

14 In a number of Greek manuscripts Priscilla’s name is put before Aquila’s name,
15 especially when they are in ministry situations. Those advocating ordination of women suggest
16 this indicates that Priscilla was the leader in their ministry team. There is much speculation
17 about what might be meant by the order of the names Priscilla and Aquila, but very little hard
18 evidence to go on. Various expositors have various suggestions regarding the order of the
19 names.²³¹ The claim that the order is always “Priscilla and Aquila” in the context of ministry is
20 not correct, since Paul “reverses the order of names in connection with ‘the church in their
21 house’ (1 Cor 16:19), which is surely a ministry connection: ‘Aquila and Prisca [Priscilla],
22 together with the church in their house, send you hearty greetings in the Lord.’”²³²

23 The example of Priscilla and Aquila provides excellent encouragement for women and
24 men to talk with each other about the meanings of Bible passages in private discussions and in
25 small group studies, as Christians everywhere have done for centuries.²³³

26

²³⁰ BDAG understands *proslambanō* in this verse to mean, “to take or lead off to oneself, *take aside*” (883).

²³¹ Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 180 and citations therein.

²³² *Ibid.*

²³³ *Ibid.*, 178; see also 75.

1 IX. Summary

2 As we follow the guidelines of the Methods of Bible Study Document (MBSD), allowing
3 Scripture to interpret itself, we discover that the principle of headship and submission
4 permeates the pages of Scripture. Genesis 1-3 reveals the development of the creation
5 headship principle. Twenty-six identifying points of creation headship in Genesis 2-3 have been
6 documented in this paper. The leadership role of Adam and the complementary submissive role
7 of Eve are highlighted by this partial summary of evidence from Genesis 2: Adam was created
8 first; Adam was given primary responsibility for the Garden; Adam was given primary
9 responsibility for avoiding the tree of knowledge of good and evil; Adam was given the task of
10 naming the animals (Gen 2:19-20); Eve was created out of Adam; Eve was created as a helper
11 for Adam; and Adam spoke first upon the creation of Eve and named Eve (Gen 2:23). In Genesis
12 3, Eve, seeks a higher sphere than her original position by her husband's side, attempts to usurp
13 Adam's headship, reversing the creation headship role. Adam relinquishes his headship role by
14 submissively yielding to his wife's initiative and grasping the fruit from her and eating of it.
15 Instantly they both became naked, and the reversal of the headship role of Adam was
16 consummated, resulting in the fall of mankind. Genesis 3 is a commentary on the reversal of
17 the divinely ordained male headship of Genesis 2, for in Genesis 3, God holds Adam responsible
18 for relinquishing his headship responsibilities—"Because you have heeded the voice of your
19 wife . . ." (v. 17). Restoration of male headship is imposed by God in the curse of 3:16. Just as
20 Adam was placed in the Garden first, followed by Eve, likewise, Adam is expelled from the
21 Garden first, followed by Eve. Male headship in Genesis 2-3 may be briefly summarized and
22 confirmed by Adam's priority associated with: 1) Creation and Establishment in the Garden, 2)
23 The Forbidden Tree Test, 3) Communication, 4) Naming, 5) Marriage 6) Nakedness, 7)
24 Apprehension 8) Indictment and Interrogation, 9) Accountability (heeding his wife), 10) Death
25 Sentence — Romans 5:12, and 11) Expulsion from Garden.

26 When God says, "Let Us make man in our image," it is clear that the One speaking is
27 giving permission to the others to unite for the commencement of the creation of mankind.
28 Headship in the Godhead is implied in Genesis 1:26 and "headship" is a metaphor for
29 designated authority. Man was made in the image of God, male and female. Male and female

1 created in the image of God reflects, at a minimum, the principle of headship and submission.
2 Paul concludes his instruction concerning male headship in the church in 1 Timothy 2-3, where
3 he says the “mystery of godliness” is to be manifested in the church, and “the mystery of
4 godliness: God manifested in the flesh” embraces the headship/submission principle inherent
5 in the Trinity.

6 The apostle Paul uses the creation headship principle of Genesis 2 to affirm male
7 headship in the home and the church (1 Cor 11:8-9; 1 Tim 2:13-14). In 1 Corinthians 11:3 he
8 establishes the principle of headship/submission and correlates headship in the Trinity with
9 male headship in the church (11:3-16). The headship of Christ and the headship of God the
10 Father form the pattern for the headship of the husband-wife (in the home) and man-woman
11 (in the church). Just as there is no reciprocity in headship relations in the Trinity, there is no
12 reciprocity for headship relations in the home and the church. Mutual submission with respect
13 to authority is outside of the headship relation. *Headship is a metaphor for designated*
14 *authority*. Paul provides preliminary justification for male headship with his declaration that
15 “man was for the glory of God” and “woman for the glory of man.” His concluding justification
16 is based on the Genesis 2 record—the priority of the creation of Adam (“from man,” 11:8), and
17 Eve was created “for man” (11:9). Man was created for God; woman was created for man.

18 In 1 Timothy 2-3, the priority of the creation of Adam is the basis for the teaching and
19 governing authority of certain men in the church and for men to serve as elders in the church.
20 Paul concludes his teaching on the proper conduct of men and women in the church with the
21 enigmatic statement that the mystery of godliness should be manifested in the church. What is
22 the mystery of godliness? *God was manifested in the flesh*. The incarnation of the Son of God
23 was not a temporary display of the principle of headship and submission in the Godhead but a
24 principle existing from before the beginning of creation. For Paul, creation headship and male
25 headship in the home and church are integrally related to the mystery of godliness, which
26 describes the very nature and character of the Godhead and the relationship among the
27 persons of the Trinity.

28 The order of the whole universe is essentially a fabric of loving relationships, structured
29 by authority and voluntary submission. This is evident not only in the nature of the Godhead,

1 but also in the nature of created beings. More could have been said in terms of how evil
2 originated through the attempt to thwart the structure of authority established by God. We
3 have demonstrated evidence for both order and headship and submission among the angels.
4 Moreover, the biblical evidence clearly supports the principle of headship and submission
5 within the Godhead from before the beginning of creation which includes not only Christ's
6 incarnate earthly redemptive act, but includes also eternity past before the foundation of the
7 world, and also eternity future where Christ will be subject to the Father (1 Cor 15:28).

8 Eternal equality of being and a functional relation of headship and submission exist
9 among the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Equality of being and functional role differentiation
10 constitute the image of God in which man was created—male and female.

11 Finally, objections to the biblical principle of headship and submission have been shown
12 to be without biblical foundation. Mutual submission is excluded since non-reciprocal
13 relationships are demanded by the headship principle. There is no headship reciprocity among
14 the Trinity. Galatians 3:28 does not qualify as a “canon within the canon” to support the
15 appointment of women in the office of elders/ministers with governing and teaching authority
16 in the church. The same argument applies to the “priesthood of all believers” (1 Peter 2:9, 10),
17 where the appointment of all believers includes ministering praise to God and good news to the
18 world, “offer[ing] up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God.” Although Deborah, Huldah, Miriam,
19 Phoebe, Junia(s), and Priscilla functioned as faithful servants of God, performing extremely
20 valuable service, none of them possessed any teaching or governing authority in the church.
21 Teaching and governing authority is granted only to the elder/minister (1 Tim 3:2, 5; 5:17; Titus
22 1:9; also Acts 20:17, 28).

23

24

X. Conclusion

25 The principle of headship and submission, equivalently called authority and submission,
26 is firmly rooted in Scripture and runs as unifying golden thread from Genesis to Revelation. The
27 headship of the 12 Patriarchs and 12 Apostles is self-evident in the Old and New Testaments
28 respectively, and the male headship principle is confirmed in Revelation 21 with the names of
29 the 12 Patriarchs on the gates and the names of the 12 Apostles on the foundations of New

1 Jerusalem. The biblical principle of headship and submission among angels and within the
2 Godhead is the foundational basis that undergirds the teaching of male headship in the home
3 and in the church and is the basis for the appointment (ordination) of men in *biblical headship*
4 *roles* as local elders or the conference-employed elders/ministers²³⁴ with governing and
5 teaching authority in the church. With the exception of the roles of elder/minister and local
6 elder, women may be appointed to other ministry roles in the church.

7

8 **A. Fatal Implications of Rejecting the Headship Principle**

9 Jesus states the paradox of equality of being and functional submission: “My Father and
10 I are one” (John 10:30) and “My Father is greater than I” (John 14: 28). In addition to equality
11 of being in the Trinity, we also see evidence for authority/submission roles with the Godhead.
12 Consequently, if male and female are made in the image of God, we can be certain they would
13 reflect the authority and submission roles operative within the Godhead. “*Human beings were*
14 ***a new and distinct order. They were made ‘in the image of God.’*”²³⁵ “*God created man a*
15 ***superior being; he alone is formed in the image of God.*”²³⁶ Inherent in the image of God is the
16 principle of headship and submission. And “God created man in His own image; in the image of
17 God He created him.”****

18 The fundamental assumption of those advocating the ordination of women in the role
19 of elder/minister is that the principle of headship and submission was not divinely ordained at
20 creation and was non-existent until after the Fall. This assumption has been shown to be
21 without biblical foundation. Therefore, moving forward with the ordination of women both as
22 local elders and as elders/ministers²³⁷ would be a rejection of the creation headship principle
23 which in turn would be equivalent to the rejection of the restoration of the image of God in
24 man.

25 Since the purpose of the plan of redemption is to restore the image of God in fallen
26 human beings, any rejection of the restoration of the image of God, which includes the creation
27 headship principle and its restoration in the home and the church, would be unthinkable. First,

²³⁴ See above, note 8.

²³⁵ White, *Review and Herald*, February 11, 1902, emphasis added.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, April 21, 1885, emphasis added.

²³⁷ See above, note 8.

1 it is tantamount to the rejection of the very nature of God, and second, it is a virtual
2 repudiation and rejection of the gospel itself, the purpose of which is to restore the image of
3 God in man. Continuing down this path will only lead to a misrepresentation of the character of
4 God to the world by the Seventh-day Adventist Church and the consequential hindering of the
5 ultimate purpose of the gospel and the delaying of the coming of Christ.

6 Moving forward with the ordination of women as elders/ministers and local elders
7 would constitute a reversal of divinely ordained roles of men and women in the home and the
8 church. This in turn would constitute a rejection of the mystery of godliness, the very nature of
9 God and the image of God. Since the purpose of the gospel is the restoration of the image of
10 God, all attempts at reversing the roles of men and women in the church would result in a
11 rejection of the gospel itself. The consequences are serious and demand a decision to return to
12 the Bible as our only authority and a decision at the 2015 General Conference Session not to
13 ordain women as pastors/elders and reversing the unauthorized decision of the 1975 Spring
14 Council to ordain women as local elders. That decision belongs solely to the General Conference
15 in session.

16 **B. Hermeneutics—the Pivotal Issue**

17 Hermeneutics (methods of interpreting the Bible) lie at the heart of the theology of
18 ordination issue. This paper has followed the historical-grammatical method of interpreting
19 Scripture which relies on “the plain meaning of Scripture,” accepting the Bible “just as it
20 reads.”²³⁸ This approach is endorsed by the “Methods of Bible Study” Document (MBSD),²³⁹
21 which has been taken as the fundamental exposition of Seventh-day Adventist hermeneutical
22 method to be used in the study of the theology of ordination.

²³⁸ “Let the Bible explain its own statements. Accept it **just as it reads**, without twisting the words to suit human ideas.” *Loma Linda Messages*, 55. “All who exalt their own opinions above divine revelation, all who would change **the plain meaning of Scripture** to suit their own convenience, or for the sake of conforming to the world, are taking upon themselves a fearful responsibility.” GC 268. “When those who profess to believe present truth come to their senses, when they accept the Word of the living God **just as it reads** and do not try to wrest the Scriptures, then they will build their house upon the eternal Rock, even Christ Jesus.” 21 MR 346. Emphasis added.

²³⁹ “Methods of Bible Study” [MBSD], a statement voted by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists Executive Committee at the Annual Council in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 12 October 1986, available from <http://www.adventist.org/fileadmin/adventist.org/files/articles/official-statements/Statements-2010-english.pdf> pages 241ff, accessed 12-1-2013. The preamble to the MBSD makes very clear that the use of the historical-critical method of Bible study, which “de-emphasizes the divine element in the Bible as an inspired book (including its resultant unity)” and “minimizes the need for faith in God and obedience to His commandments,” is to be rejected.

1 Adventist Bible scholars who favor the ordination of women have adopted a two-
2 pronged hermeneutical approach—the MBSD approach to many portions of Scripture, but for
3 troublesome or uncomfortable texts dealing with women in ministry they employ a special,
4 flexible hermeneutic they call a “principle-based, contextual, linguistic and historical-cultural”
5 reading strategy which is at the heart of their biblical approach for certain texts.²⁴⁰
6 “Fundamental to this approach is its recognition that the text is semantically independent of
7 the intention of its author. The text is primarily seen as a construct, insofar as meaning is taken
8 to reside in the encounter or interchange between text and reader. Meaning thus emerges as
9 an outcome of interplay between text and reader, both of which are culturally and historically
10 conditioned.”²⁴¹ The principle for Adventist egalitarians is found in the key message of
11 Galatians 3:28, “a canon within the canon,” which says that in Christ there is “neither male and
12 female.” “The key principle for them is restoration in Christ which needs to be taken into
13 account when handling the specific texts regarding church organization.”²⁴²

14 For Adventist favor the ordination of women, the text determines which hermeneutic to
15 employ—a plain reading of Scripture or the “principle-based” method. Adventist egalitarians,
16 who selectively choose when to employ the “principle-based hermeneutic,” see “biblical
17 inspiration as a mediated process in which God imparts information that is then ‘contaminated’
18 by the social, cultural, historical and language context of the human author. In its nature,
19 Scripture, while containing the divine message, also contains human baggage. For this reason, a
20 plain reading of Scripture could potentially be misleading.”²⁴³ This method of interpretation
21 could just as easily be employed to justify new interpretations regarding gender-orientation
22 issues, Sunday sacredness, and the immortality of the soul and should be soundly rejected by
23 the world church in General Conference Session.

²⁴⁰ Kyoshin Ahn, “NAD Theology of Ordination Study Committee Report” Theology of Ordination Study Committee, January, 2014, 22-31. http://www.adventistchurchconnect.com/site/1/docs/NAD_Ordination_Report_2013.pdf accessed 12-2 -2013.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 28.

²⁴² Jan Barna, “Ordination of Women and the Two Ways to Unity: Ecclesiastical and Biblical,” Adventist Society for Religious Studies, Baltimore, MD, 21 November 2013, 4. http://sdaordinationbook.com/book/ASRS_Paper_files/Jan%20Barna%20ASRS%202013%20Paper.pdf accessed 12-18-2013.

²⁴³ Ibid.

1 There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the flexible, “principle-based” hermeneutic is
2 distantly related to a modified form of literary criticism (a hermeneutic) called
3 “deconstruction”²⁴⁴ fathered by German philosopher Martin Heidegger²⁴⁵ and fully developed
4 by Jacques Derrida in his classic 1967 work, *Of Grammatology*. Deconstruction espouses
5 multiple meanings to a text or passage with no true meaning possible,²⁴⁶ recontextualization of
6 the text, and rejection of all authority and hierarchy. Literary criticism as found in
7 *Deconstruction* gives the reader the authority over the text. The Bible no longer has authority
8 over the interpreter; the interpreter has authority over the text. A.K.M. Adam’s, *What Is*
9 *Postmodern Biblical Criticism*, sets forth a concise summary of the hermeneutic of
10 Deconstruction.²⁴⁷

11 Heidegger’s and Derrida’s philosophy of “deconstruction” infiltrated the feminist
12 movement²⁴⁸ and has been adopted by feminist theologians.²⁴⁹ It is significant to note that the
13 hermeneutic of deconstruction for Bible interpretation has also been embraced and adopted by
14 leaders of the Emergent Church Movement,²⁵⁰ Brian McLaren and Leonard Sweet.

15 A quasi-feminist hermeneutic employing limited biblical authority is a radical departure
16 from the methods of interpretation employed by the Reformers and our Adventist pioneers.
17 Allowing culture, literary criticism, rhetorical criticism, or inter-textual criticism to supersede a

²⁴⁴ See above, note 3.

²⁴⁵ Heidegger’s affiliation with Nazism which he adamantly embraced even after WWII is an example of what can happen when culture drives theology. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Heidegger. accessed 12-23-2013; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Heidegger_and_Nazism. accessed 12-23-2013.

²⁴⁶ A definition of “deconstruction” is found in the American Heritage Dictionary: “A philosophical movement and theory of literary criticism that questions traditional assumptions about certainty, identity, and truth; asserts that words can only refer to other words; and attempts to demonstrate how statements about any text subvert their own meanings: ‘In deconstruction, the critic claims there is no meaning to be found in the actual text, but only in the various, often mutually irreconcilable, ‘virtual texts’ constructed by readers in their search for meaning’” (Rebecca Goldstein). <http://www.answers.com/topic/deconstruction#ixzz2mXGvsxSn>. accessed 12-4-2013.

²⁴⁷ A.K.M. Adam, *What Is Postmodern Biblical Criticism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

²⁴⁸ See <http://bibliotecavirtualut.suagm.edu/Glossa2/Journal/march2010/Winking%20at%20derrida.pdf>, and <http://www.answers.com/topic/deconstruction-and-feminism> and also <http://www.nla.gov.au/openpublish/index.php/ras/article/viewFile/2156/2550>. accessed 12-4-2013.

²⁴⁹ For “deconstruction” in the feminist theology see: http://books.google.com/books/about/Deconstruction_Feminist_Theology_and_the.html?id=nhfJHq_RHZkC. accessed 12-4-2013.

²⁵⁰ For “deconstruction” in the Emergent Church Movement see: http://www.holybibleprophecy.org/2013/07/02/emergent-deconstruction-train-tracks-auschwitz/?doing_wp_cron=1386186032.1362679004669189453125. accessed 12-4-2013.

1 plain reading of Scripture, and not permitting Scripture to interpret itself has led to our current
2 quandary. Our only safeguard is in returning to the principle of *sola scriptura*.

3 But God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the Bible only, as the
4 standard of all doctrines and the basis of all reforms. The opinions of learned men, the
5 deductions of science, the creeds or decisions of ecclesiastical councils, as numerous and
6 discordant as are the churches which they represent, the voice of the majority--not one nor
7 all of these should be regarded as evidence for or against any point of religious faith.
8 Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain "Thus saith the Lord"
9 in its support.²⁵¹

10

²⁵¹ White, *The Great Controversy*, 595.