

Authority & Submission in God's Image

By Jason Hunt

One of the most volatile issues within the church today is the debate over men's and women's roles in church leadership. Traditionally, two main camps have formed with regard to the issue: *egalitarians* and *complimentarians*.¹ Egalitarians deny any ultimate role differentiation in order to support equality between men and women, which opens up the door for women to serve in positions of authority in the church. Complimentarians stress the equality of men and women (ontological value), but a difference with respect to their created roles. When it comes to the crucial matter of authoritative leadership in the church, it is the question of *shared* versus *male* leadership.² Which view best supports the biblical data? The debate has spawned numerous exegetical issues, supposed historical contexts, and grammatical gymnastics, with both sides claiming victory.³ However, an important theological aspect of the issue has been largely ignored or overshadowed by the particulars. At a more foundational level, how does the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity shed light on the debate? Is there biblical warrant for such a connection to be made? I will argue that there is biblical evidence for ontological equality *with* role differentiation, concerning men and women. More importantly, this properly images the Triune God, who exhibits *both* of these truths within his own being.

¹ However, there is some variation within each of these two camps, particularly among egalitarians (Robert Lethem, "The Man-Woman Debate: Theological Comment," *WTJ* 52 (1990) 66). In addition, Blomberg claims to endorse a middle-ground approach. However, after he sifts through the biblical evidence, he ends up sounding not much different than a complementarian who is calling for a greater awareness among traditional complementarians of the many legitimate ministries that are biblically open to women, and to avoid the common abuses of the complementarian approach (James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg, eds., *Two Views on Women in Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001) 329-372).

² Stanley J. Grenz, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1995) 15.

³ The important passages include: 1 Cor 11:2-16; 14:29-35; 15:28; 1 Tim 2:9-15; Gal 3:28; Eph 5:22-23; Col 3:18-19; 1 Pet 3:1-7; Gen 1-3.

One of the key passages that fuels debate over women's roles in the church is 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. After commending the Corinthians for their remembrance of him and his teaching (v.2), Paul goes on to mention things in which they are not consistent with his teaching (v.4-16). The function of verse 3 is crucial in that it forms the theological principle that the verses which follow explicate.⁴ This theological principle revolves around the concept of headship. "Head" (*kefalē*) can mean either the idea of "authority" or "source" or "origin".⁵ Grudem has done extensive work on the use of this particular word in Jewish and Hellenistic literature and has found surprisingly little support for its use as "source".⁶ On the other hand, there have been clear examples seen in Greek literature to support the idea of "authority".⁷ More importantly, however, is Paul's use of this word in the context of 1 Corinthians 11. In verses 3, 7-9, and 10, the idea of "authority" is clear. Paul's use of this word elsewhere (Eph 1:22; 5:22-23; Col 2:10) shows the same idea of authority.⁸

So, if the idea of "authority" is in view in verse 3, what is this theological principle saying? It is saying that "the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God (ESV)." This verse sets up an authority

⁴ Thomas R. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 130.

⁵ It is often argued by egalitarians that "source" is meant here in light of verse 8. See: Belleville's discussion of *kefalē*. (Beck and Blomberg, *Two Views*, 137-139).

⁶ The two instances (Herodotus 4.91 and *Orphic Fragments* 21a) where a case could be made for this particular use are not entirely clear. A case could be made for alternate renderings. In fact, 2,336 examples from Greek literature were examined and no convincing example of "source" was found. In addition, the meaning of "source" is not found in the *LXX* (Wayne Grudem, "The Meaning of *Kephalē* ("Head"): A Response to Recent Studies," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 425-426).

⁷ Forty-nine clear examples were found among the above mentioned 2,336 uses (Grudem, "The Meaning of *Kephalē*," 426).

⁸ The Pauline texts sometimes used to argue for "source" (Col 1:18; 2:19; Eph 4:15) actually carry both ideas (source and authority) in context (Schreiner, "Head Coverings," 128). See also: Herman N. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. John Richard de Witt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 382.

structure in which God (the Father and Son) is the pattern for man (male and female). Kistemaker has rightly pointed out that if one presses the idea of “source” here, the parallel set up in verse 3 breaks down, for God the Father cannot be the “source” of Christ in the sense of a point in time.⁹ Interestingly, Paul, though he appeals to pre-fall creation as the basis for his teaching about man’s authority and women’s submission in church leadership (1 Cor 11:8-12; 14:34; 1 Tim 2:13-15), here he appeals to something even more foundational—God himself!

In what sense does God the Father have authority over Christ? Orthodox Christianity affirms that there is only one God existing fully in three Persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Each Person is equally and eternally God, therefore possessing ontological equality.¹⁰ Hence, what distinguishes the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit from each other is not their one and undivided essence, but their particular *roles* and *relationships* each has with the other Divine Persons.¹¹ Indeed there is an eternal order in the ontological Trinity—First, the Father (unbegotten), second, the Son (eternally begotten from the Father), and third, the Holy Spirit (proceeding eternally from the Father and the Son).¹² Regardless of differences, both East and West agree that there is an economic order in the Trinity.¹³ Thus, while there is *ontological* equality (John 1:18; 5:18; 10:30), there is also *economic* authority or role differentiation (1 Cor 15:28; John

⁹ Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NTC; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993) 366.

¹⁰ See: Nicene Creed (John H. Leith, ed., *Creeds of the Church* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1982) 30-31) and WSC Q6. As Ware points out, this is not merely an equality of kind, but identity (Bruce A. Ware, “Equal in Essence, Distinct in Roles: Eternal Functional Authority and Submission among the Equal Divine Persons of the Godhead,” 58th Annual Meetings, ETS, Washington D.C., November 16, 2006: 1-16. Online: <http://www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/WareETS2006.pdf>) 1)

¹¹ Ware, “Equal in Essence,” 1. See also: the Constantinopolitan Creed (Leith, *Creeds*, 33) and WCF 2.3.

¹² Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 2:88-89. See also: John T. McNeil and Ford Lewis Battles, eds. and trans., *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960) 1.13.18; Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973) 1:462.

¹³ Robert Lethem, “The Man-Woman Debate,” 68.

3:16-17; 6:39; Luke 22:42). Though each are fully God, the Father sends the Son¹⁴ into the world and both Father and Son send the Spirit, so in turn the Spirit's work in us leads us to the Son, through whom we have access to the Father. This order consists chiefly in terms of authority and obedience, seen most clearly in the Incarnation (John 5:19-43; 17:1ff; Heb 5:8; 10:5-10).¹⁵

Man was created in God's image, both male and female. Each is an equal bearer of this image (Gen 1:26-27).¹⁶ The thrust of Genesis 1:26-28 is that there is male-female equality in terms of being God's image bearers. Some egalitarians have suggested that men and women are only image bearers in the sense that only *together* do they image God.¹⁷ However, this raises questions of whether *individually* a man or woman could be considered a personal being.¹⁸ In addition, the biblical evidence later in Genesis (5:1, 3) shows that Adam and his son, Seth, both as *individuals*, are image-bearers.¹⁹ Yet, in Genesis 2, we see role differentiation with respect to man and woman. We see this in the fact that Eve was created in order to be a "helper" for Adam (2:18, 20), taken out of man (2:23). In addition, Adam's role differentiation is seen in the fact that he is *not* Eve's "helper"²⁰, his naming Eve (2:23), and his subsequent responsibility for sin²¹ as head of

¹⁴ Augustine highlights the fact that the eternal Word was *sent in order* to become flesh (St. Augustine, *The Trinity* (NPNF2) 4.27).

¹⁵ Lethem, "The Man-Woman Debate," 69.

¹⁶ Incidentally, this is one misconception of some egalitarians who claim that complementarians deny this (Greg Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985) 22).

¹⁷ Aida Bensaçon Spencer endorses this view (Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr., "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship: Genesis 1-3," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 98).

¹⁸ Considering the theological parallel already seen in 1 Cor 11:3, the logical conclusion of Spencer's view is that Christ is not fully God as a distinct Person, making the Triune God's very Deity a *sum* of its parts.

¹⁹ Ortlund, "Male-Female Equality," 98-99. Other examples include: Gen 9:6; 1 Cor 11:7; Jas 3:9; and Col 3:10.

²⁰ Spencer asserts that the word translated here as "helper" (עֲזָרָה) should be translated as

"leader" or "superior to", relying on the speculative relationship between the preposition (עַל),

the human race (Gen 3:9, 16-17; Rom 5:12-21). Frame concludes a discussion of men and women in the image of God by saying that both equally image God, even with regard to their roles involving authority and submission.²² He has also pointed out that this created order images the Divine order of God himself—the Father as head and the Son as one who willingly submits to the Father’s will.²³

How is this connected to the debate over women’s roles in the church? The theological principle of 1 Cor 11:3 (seen later in 15:28) and the basis for Paul’s instructions involving authority in public worship as being directly related to creation (11:8-15; also: 1 Tim 2:13-15) are both connected to this very issue.²⁴ At the heart of the issue, lies a Triune God with ontological equality and economic role differentiation, not an issue of cultural context or the result of the fall.²⁵ This same God has created man and woman both in his image (ontological equality) and for specific roles (economic differentiation). Men image God in their headship and women image God in their submission to this headship. The fact that both roles are seen within the Trinity should eliminate any notion that one is superior or more valuable than the other.

which literally means “in front of”, and the supposed noun which the preposition can be “converted” into (dygIn"), which means “leader” (Aida Bensaçon Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985) 24-26). However faulty this reasoning is, it clearly breaks down when considering a verse like Ps 119:168, where the psalmist says to God, “all my ways are before (dg<n<) you”. No one would conclude that the psalmist is saying that his ways are “superior to” God! (Ortlund, “Male-Female Equality,” 103).

²¹ For a detailed discussion of the sinful aspects of the role-reversal (not role creation!) seen in the fall, see: Ortlund, “Male-Female Equality,” 106-111.

²² John M. Frame, “Men and Women in the Image of God,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 231-232.

²³ John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of God* (New Jersey: P&R Publishing, 2002) 386.

²⁴ 1 Cor 11:7-10 seems to be Paul’s interpretation of Gen 2:18. In addition, though some have argued that “nature” (fu, sin) refers to Greek custom, Paul’s use elsewhere (Rom 1:26; 2:14; Eph 2:3) seems to point to “nature” as God ordained it.

²⁵ Schreiner, “Head Coverings,” 128.

A number of objections and counter arguments have been raised against the above conclusions. I will attempt to consider and respond to some of the main objections offered by egalitarians. First, Stanley Grenz suggests that Gal 3:28 (the “Magna Carta of Humanity”) is more fundamentally universal than other passages that speak to the issue of women’s roles (1 Cor 11:2-16; 14:34-36; 1 Tim 2:1-15). According to Grenz, these other passages speak to specific situations with less universal intent.²⁶ He states that all are now equal in Christ with our differences intact, yet these differences are no longer a basis for functional differences in the church.²⁷

The context of Gal 3:28 concerns what is true of those *in Christ* and that this union with Christ transcends all distinctions in terms of equal status as sons of God (not transcending created or natural distinctions).²⁸ However, each distinction listed is not transcended in the same way. Hence, the Old Covenant distinction between Jew and Gentile was transcended when Christ fulfilled its promise. The distinction between slave and free “had no such place in God’s saving plan”, or in creation, “but was a result of human exploitation.”²⁹ However, the male-female distinction is rooted in the pre-fall

²⁶ For problems with this view, see: D.A. Carson, “Silent in the Churches: On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 140-153; Thomas R. Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas J. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 105-154. It should also be noted that Grenz and others claim a “hermeneutical priority” of Gal 3:28 (Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 106-107). However, this is problematic due to a faulty exegesis of Galatians 3.

²⁷ Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 101-106. Here, Grenz takes a slightly different stance than many egalitarians, who try to make the case that male-female role distinctions are a product of the fall and now remedied in Christ (See Belleville’s view: Beck and Blomberg, *Two Views*, 148)

²⁸ Ridderbos, *Paul*, 307. Paul’s concern here is not role relations within the body of Christ, but rather with the common initiation into it (Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 176).

²⁹ Edmund P. Clowney, *The Church* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1995) 222.

created order, therefore not subject to change in Christ prior to the *parousia*.³⁰ As we have seen, this created male-female distinction carries with it an economic role differentiation rooted in the Trinity. Another way in which this distinction is upheld is in the family. Scripture is clear on issues of authority and submission to be maintained in *Christian* households (Eph 5:21-33; Col 3:18-19). Interestingly, as many scholars have pointed out, the household structure of authority is to be a pattern for the household of God, the Church (1 Tim 3:2-5, 14-15; 5:1-2, 4-5, 16; 1 Thess 2:11-12).³¹ Paul's exhortations concerning the family and the Church *assume* the truth communicated in Gal 3:28, showing not a removal of role distinction, but rather upholding the original intent of those roles.

A second objection revolves around the supposed idea of "mutual submission" of Eph 5:21-33. Belleville contends for the idea of mutual submission without authoritative headship in view almost solely on grammatical grounds, which actually subvert the larger context of Paul's argument. In Belleville's opinion, submission is two-directional.³² However, if one applies this reasoning to Paul's analogy of the marriage relationship and Christ's relationship to the Church, the logical conclusion becomes heretical: the Church submits to Christ and *Christ submits* to the Church! Indeed, all are to submit to one other out of reverence for Christ (5:21) (i.e. in setting the tone of humility that is inherent in

³⁰ Schreiner has suggested that the egalitarian view of Gal 3:28 is actually a form of over-realized eschatology (Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15," 138).

³¹ See: George W. Knight, "Husbands and Wives as Analogues of Christ and the Church," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 165-178; Vern Sheridan Poythress, "The Church as Family: Why Male Leadership in the Family Requires Male Leadership in the Church," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1991) 233-247; Clowney, *The Church*, 223-231.

³² She only connects verse 21 with v.18-20, ignoring its connection with what follows (5:22-6:9) (Beck and Blomberg, *Two Views*, 132-133).

being filled with the Spirit; 5:18)³³, but this clearly does not erase distinctions of authority and submission in the household (5:22-6:9). If this was the case, could not one suggest that parents should submit to their children (6:1-4) in such a way that excludes any notion of authority?³⁴ Any notion of “mutual submission” that denies any distinction in authority is simply unbiblical.

Grenz, countering the idea that the Son submits to the Father’s headship in the Trinity, has suggested that there is a *mutual* submission within the Trinity.³⁵ In fact, he states that the Son’s submission to the Father’s headship was only in the economy of redemption, with no necessary eternal subordination ontologically.³⁶ He goes on to claim that the Holy Spirit gifts believers in a way that calls people (male or female) to serve in positions of leadership and submission in the church.³⁷

A few things need to be said in response to this line of reasoning. First, there cannot be a mutual submission within the Trinity which transcends authority (1 Cor 11:3). Second, this submission to the Father’s authority cannot be written off as merely an economic endeavor with no relationship to ontological existence. T. F. Torrance has rightly pointed out that Trinitarian ontology is the very ground of God’s economy of self-

³³ It should be noted that the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22-26) is for all Christians. Ephesians 5:21 is merely setting the tone for the following instructions concerning the distinctions within the household (George W. Knight, “Husbands and Wives,” 166-168).

³⁴ Indeed, this raises serious questions regarding the Trinity. If there is a Father-Son relationship within the Trinity that suggests this type of “mutual submission”, why would God command an authority structure among parents and children (Exo 20:12; Eph 6:1-3; Col 3:20) and express displeasure over any overthrow of this structure (Rom 1:30; 2 Tim 3:2)?

³⁵ Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 153-155.

³⁶ Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 152. Interestingly, he contradicts himself later in his discussion (153).

³⁷ Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 153. Earlier, Grenz makes an interesting but unconvincing suggestion that we cannot compare the subordination of the Son to the Father (Person to Person) to that of women to men (group to group) apart from considering giftedness or abilities (114-115). In essence, he says it is like ‘comparing apples with oranges’. However, Paul does not seem to have a problem making this comparison (1 Cor 11:3ff).

revelation toward us.³⁸ There is an essential connection between the two, which cannot be separated.³⁹ In addition, they must not be confused.⁴⁰ Grenz seems to make this mistake in claiming that because the Father cannot be the Father without the Son and the Son cannot be the Son without the Father (ontology), this necessarily implies a mutual submission in the economy of redemption.⁴¹ Though closely connected, one cannot use the ontological Trinity to deny economic distinctions. As biblical revelation has it, the eternal relationship between the Father and the Son (which is revealed in the economy of redemption) is irreversible. Certainly, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are *distinct* Persons and cannot engage in role switching.⁴² With this in mind, Grenz's assertion about the gifting of the Spirit amounts to God transcending *Himself*—erasing the very role distinctions patterned after His own eternal economy (in which our salvation is rooted), in order to establish a new 'spiritual' economy of church leadership.

A third objection centers on something hinted at in Grenz's argument. In Grenz's mind, there is a temporal nature to the Son's submission to the Father that is distinct from the "mutual submission" of eternity. Bilezikian and Giles accuse complementarians (who base their argument on the Trinity) as expounding subordinationism in suggesting that the submission of the Son to the Father in the economy of redemption is actually eternal.⁴³

³⁸ Thomas F. Torrance, *The Christian Doctrine of God* (New York: T&T Clark, 1996) 99.

³⁹ Torrance, *Doctrine of God*, 7-8.

⁴⁰ This kind of collapsing of the economic Trinity into the ontological Trinity (following Rahner) tends to result in modalism, and can lead to supporting a form of pantheism or panetheism (Robert Letham, *The Holy Trinity* (New Jersey: P&R Publishing, 2004) 493).

⁴¹ Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 153-154.

⁴² Torrance, *Doctrine of God*, 137-145.

⁴³ Gilbert Bilezikian, "Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping: Subordination in the Trinity," *JETS* 40 (1997) 57-68; Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, 241; Kevin Giles, *The Trinity and Subordinationism* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002).

Instead, it is asserted that the Son's submission to the Father is merely *temporal* and fundamentally different than his eternal state in relation to the Father.⁴⁴

In response, it must be said, first of all, that what is being labeled here as subordinationism is actually the orthodox view of the Trinity as I have already indicated. An honest look at the church fathers will make this clear.⁴⁵ Secondly, some very serious implications arise if one denies the eternal submission of the Son to the Father and confines it solely to Christ's earthly ministry. If there is only a temporal economy with regard to the nature of the Son's relationship to the Father, then we have never met God as he really is in eternity.⁴⁶ The very significance of the Incarnation is that the eternal God is revealed, as he really is (in all his inter-Trinitarian relations), in Christ. Consequently, if God's self-revelation in history is merely a convention designed for man's salvation, then it is one in which we cannot truly know God.⁴⁷ The idea of temporal submission makes it difficult to escape the notion of modalism, in which the Incarnation of the "Son" becomes *ad hoc* in nature.⁴⁸ Ultimately, a modalistic god cannot sustain the Trinitarian relations essential for creation, revelation, and the salvation of man as it is revealed in scripture.

What does the Biblical evidence show in response to the idea of temporal submission? First, the revealed names, "Father" and "Son", imply economic differentiation in terms of authority (Mal 1:6; John 3:17; 6:38; 1 Cor 15:27-28; Heb 1:1-3). We see the Father as having rightful authority over all things (Ps 2:3-9; John 6:37, 44;

⁴⁴ Bilezikian, "Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping," 60-65.

⁴⁵ See: Ware's discussion (Ware, "Equal in Essence, Distinct in Roles," 9-16).

⁴⁶ Torrance, *Doctrine of God*, 92.

⁴⁷ Letham, "The Man-Woman Debate," 68.

⁴⁸ It has been pointed out that egalitarians are particularly vulnerable to this criticism. Since, in their view, there is no ontological ground for the Son being the Son of the Father, there seems to be no reason why the Father should send the Son. It would seem that any of the three Persons could have become incarnate (Ware, "Equal in Essence, Distinct in Roles," 2-3).

1 Cor 15:28; Eph 1:9-11). We see the Son submitting to the Father in his incarnate mission (Matt 4:3-4; John 4:32-34; 5:19-43; 8:23, 28-29; 17:1ff; Heb 5:8; 10:5-10).⁴⁹

There are some passages that show the Son's pre-incarnate submission to the Father (Matt 11:27; Luke 7:8; John 3:16-17; 6:38; 8:42; 10:36; 1 Cor 11:3; 1 Pet 1:20-21), as well as those which indicate submission in eternity future (Ps 110:1; Rom 8:34; Heb 7:25; 1 Cor 15:24-28; Phil 2:11).⁵⁰ This brief scriptural survey shows clear support for the eternal submission of the Son.

Conclusion

Perhaps the root issue in the debate over women's roles in the church (as in any debate) involves the presuppositions used to filter through the evidence.⁵¹ At the root of most egalitarianism is the presupposition that *economic submission necessarily means ontological inequality*.⁵² This would explain the great lengths some have gone to rework the Trinity, often divorcing it from a proper Christology. However, this presupposition is biblically incorrect, according to what God has revealed about his own Trinitarian nature. The biblical discussion of women's roles in the church is rooted not only in pre-fall creation, but ultimately in the Trinity. Orthodox Christianity has always held and

⁴⁹ Someone might object by saying that these statements only apply to Christ's human nature and not an indication of his eternal state. However, this implies a Nestorian dualism, which again robs man of any true knowledge of God (Letham, "The Man-Woman Debate," 69).

⁵⁰ Ware, "Equal in Essence, Distinct in Roles," 2-9.

⁵¹ See: Brown's discussion (Harold O. J. Brown, "The New Testament Against Itself: 1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the 'Breakthrough' of Galatians 3:28," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas J. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 197-208).

⁵² Other egalitarian presuppositions have surfaced in the debate, such as: Paul was confused (Gal 3:28 vs. 1 Tim 2:9-15; 1 Cor 11:2-16 vs. 14:33-36), a low view of the scripture as God's inerrant word, and revisionist history, which pits the community of faith (egalitarian) against the institutional church (which necessarily decays in its authority structure and oppresses women).

defended ontological equality and role differentiation among the three Persons. This is good news for both men and women.⁵³ As P.T. Forsyth put it:

Subordination is not inferiority, and it is God-like. The principle is imbedded in the very cohesion of the eternal trinity and it is inseparable from the unity, fraternity, and true equality of men. It is not a mark of inferiority to be subordinate, to have an authority, to obey. It is divine.⁵⁴

⁵³ As opposed to the egalitarian reasoning, which actually undercuts the very value they intend to ‘create’ for women. If women are stripped of their distinct gender role, they can no longer be valued for being unique as women. Instead, they become “faceless” and their cry becomes, “value me by erasing me.”

⁵⁴ P. T. Forsyth, *God the Holy Father* (reprint, London: Independent Press, 1957) 42. If there is no authority and submission in God, then there is no legitimate authority and submission among men and women in the Church—leaving all of us to the whims of our culture and to our own sinful tendencies toward power struggles.