

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

good teachers" (*kalodidaskalous*, 2:3). Whether their students include both sexes or not (2:4 might, though not necessarily, limit the students to "young women"), these Cretan women are permitted by Paul to teach. Undoubtedly then, he understands the silence demanded of women in 1 Timothy 2 as limited to the situation in Ephesus and in his own locale. Since the older women of Crete have already been "saved through childbearing" and have "remained in faith and love and holiness," they may teach. (Curiously, in writing to Titus [1:10-11] Paul even demands that trouble-making *men* be silenced.)

Having freshly interpreted Paul's intention in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and observed the corroborating evidence from Titus, we might compose a paraphrase of this passage as follows:

Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness (not with loud disputes as some Ephesian women do). For the time being I am not permitting any woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet woman will be saved from that which demands her silence and will someday be able to teach. This is possible because through childbearing woman counterbalances the created priority of man and produces the "seed" which bruises the serpent's head, namely Jesus Christ. But woman will be restored only when individual women continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty, thereby demonstrating the maturity of faith demanded of any Christian teacher.

Anyone who uses 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in order to prevent women from teaching in church misuses the text. Paul never intended his limitation of women as permanent. Indeed he hoped for and foresaw theologically the time when women would be saved from their churchly prohibitions. So today, if women fail to continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty — like men who fail similarly — they should not teach. Ones like these, whether female or male, need to learn in silence and to practice what they learn. But if women have learned, if they have persevered in the Christian faith, if the Holy Spirit has gifted them for teaching, let us not quench the ministry of the Spirit through women because we have previously misunderstood what it means for woman to be saved through childbearing.

A fuller understanding of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 should speak not only to the church at large, but especially to those women who currently engage in or are preparing for Christian ministry. Verses which have so often functioned as a burden or stumbling block to women seeking to serve Christ now can offer their intended promise and challenge. The promise for women is that they shall be saved from whatever theological restrictions have been placed upon their free exercise of the Spirit's gifts. The challenge for women is to "continue in faith and love and holiness" in spite of the frustration and disappointment which attempting to serve the Lord in a trenchantly sexist church so often brings.

These verses also imply a challenge for men. We, who have for centuries suppressed the ministries of women, must now repent of our ways. We must confront our brethren with the truth that "in the Lord" women will be saved into ecclesiastical wholeness. We must encourage our sisters as they seek to serve Christ in His frighteningly patriarchal church. For if we all, male and female, support the Spirit's empowerment of women for ministry, perhaps she shall be saved!

Occasionally TSF will cooperate with other publishers or organizations in order to (1) let our readers learn about opportunities and resources, and (2) obtain access to other mailing lists so *TSF Bulletin* can become more widely known. If you do *not* want your name and address included in these exchange arrangements, please let us know.

INTERSECTION

(The integration of theological studies with ethics, academic disciplines, and ecclesiastical institutions)

THE FINNEY FESTIVAL: PERSPECTIVES ON AMERICAN EVANGELICALISM

By Donald Dayton, Assistant Professor of Historical Theology at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Jeff Smith, student at Princeton Theological Seminary.

"The times, they are a'changing." This again became clear October 16–24, 1981 at the "Charles G. Finney Sesquicentennial Festival." It celebrated the 150th anniversary of the 1830–31 revivals that had great impact on Rochester, New York and represented a high point in the evangelistic ministry of Finney. The host seminary, Colgate Rochester-Bexley Hall-Crozier Divinity School, is located in the heart of the "burned-over district" (so called because the area was so often swept by "revival fires" early in the 19th century) but more recently has been known more as a center of liberal and social gospel commitments. There was then a certain irony in a "Finney Festival" convened in Rochester to celebrate the history and import of American evangelicalism.

The festival was a multi-faceted occasion, inaugurated with a full re-enactment of a Finney "revival meeting" in the Genesee County Museum (a reconstruction of a mid-19th century village of upstate New York). The climax was a series of "revival meetings" held in the churches in which Finney preached but with contemporary preachers and prophets: Jim Wallis of *Sojourners*, James Forbes of Union Seminary in New York, Peter Gomes of Harvard's chapel and Sister Joan Delaplaine of the Aquinas Institute of Theology. The scholarly core of the conference was, however, a series of papers on the history of American evangelicalism. Your reporters attended only this last component, held October 16–17.

The diversity and variety—even the ambiguity—of evangelicalism was the major motif. The foil of several papers was an interpretation of evangelicalism based too much on a Northeastern, Reformed, white, male, and post-fundamentalist viewpoint. Jon Butler of the University of Illinois, for example, used the Southern experience, where evangelical themes were bent to the support of slavery, to argue that evangelicalism was not always the carrier of the social reform and moral transformation of the Finney revivals. Al Raboteau of the University of California, however, probed the black evangelical experience to discover a revolutionary egalitarian impulse. Nathan Hatch of Notre Dame undermined more usual interpretations of millennialism by arguing that such themes did in fact on occasion combine with popular religion to produce a democratic and anti-elitist thrust. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg (University of Pennsylvania) and her student Nancy Hewitt (University of South Florida) used anthropological models to argue that revivalism contributed, at least at some points, to new power and roles for women. Henry Bowden found the mission of early Oberlin College to the Chippewa Indians more progressive and more identified with Native American interests than often assumed.

Two papers were devoted more directly to Finney and the Rochester revivals. Dean Garth Rosell of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary countered caricatures of revivalism as emotional excess by delineating the interplay of heart, mind and will in Finney's thought and practice. Paul Johnson of Yale University traced the impact of the Rochester revivals on the social structure of the city using statistical studies of shifts in sexual morality

and the rise of benevolent societies.

The two final papers turned to the more recent evangelical experience in the twentieth century. Joel Carpenter (Trinity College) returned to the diversity motif by showing the variety of the theological traditions represented in the neo-evangelical coalition. And ambiguity was again the final note in a paper by Grant Wacker (University of North Carolina) surveying the contemporary scene and the discovery by the secular media of an insufficiently noticed but potentially powerful religious force in American society.

Half-a-dozen prominent scholars in the areas under consideration provided formal responses to initiate discussion among some 150 participants and observers. Since publication of the papers as planned, *TSF Bulletin* readers should have the chance eventually for their own evaluation.

ANOTHER "CHICAGO STATEMENT": A RESPONSE TO THE NEW RIGHT

By Donald W. Dayton, Assistant Professor of Historical Theology, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The following "Chicago Statement" was issued October 10, 1981, after an all-day working session at the Chicago Temple (United Methodist Church). As has been widely reported in the press, the statement is intended as a response to the rise of the "New Religious Right" by a diverse and widely based group of Christians who wished to articulate openly an alternative stance—one concerned about some of the same problems but more aware of the complexity of the issues involved and more sensitive to the pluralism of American society.

Composition of the statement took place over an eight-month period in the wake of a consultation on the "New Religious Right" held at the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago under the sponsorship of a number of local churches and institutions representing several denominations. The major figure behind both the original consultation and the statement was Jack Lundin, pastor of the Community of Christ the Servant, an experimental Lutheran church. Lundin organized a continuation committee that in response to criticisms voiced at the consultation included greater representation of evangelicals and others outside the mainstream.

Probably a hundred persons were involved in the process at various points. Primary author of the original draft was Episcopalian Bob Webber of Wheaton College, author of the recent book, *The Moral Majority: Right or Wrong* (Crossways Books, 1981). Lutheran Joseph Sittler, recently retired from the University of Chicago Divinity School, made significant revisions, especially of a literary character. A core working group met several times for revision. Personnel changed from meeting to meeting, but the most consistently present included Linda Barnes and Hugh and Tommye Talley, members of the Community of Christ the Servant, Dean Gene Reeves of the Meadville/Lombard Theological School (Unitarian/Universalist), Prof. LeRoy Kennell of the Church of the Brethren's Bethany Theological Seminary (Kennell is a Mennonite), and myself (Donald Dayton, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wesleyan Church). The final revisions and promulgation took place October 10 at the Chicago Temple in a gathering of about fifty theologians and church leaders in the Chicago area.

As is apparent from the statement, the major strategy was an attempt to take the shibboleths of the "New Religious Right" and broaden the range of concerns and push them more in the direction of justice and concern for the disenfranchised. Thus to be "pro-life" is to be more than merely against abortion; it is to be concerned about nuclear arms proliferation, capital punishment, exploitation and so forth. Given the range of options among the

drafters, it is remarkable that there is a statement at all. Not all in the final stages were able to sign. Some abstained because it appeared to be too direct an attack on fellow Christians. (After much discussion of this matter, it was decided by the final group to be quite explicit in the "protest" against the New Religious Right.) Others felt the statement was too general and lacked a positive prophetic edge speaking to definite issues. (Again after discussion, it was decided to maintain as much pluralism in the drafting group as possible—even at the cost of definiteness—because the basic thrust of the project was to have as broadly based a group of Christians as possible dissent from the platform of the New Religious Right.)

Even more important than the content of the statement was the process that produced it. The project brought together Christians that had not talked to each other before and made a significant contribution to greater understanding. Where else have Catholics, Lutherans, and Unitarians met with large contingents of Wheaton College faculty members and other evangelicals for a common purpose? Thus the statement is another sign of the ferment and realigning of coalitions taking place in the American religious scene.

THE CHICAGO STATEMENT

Preamble

We, members of many religious communities, wish to make a clear statement concerning many important issues of our common life, and to describe ourselves differently from our fellow citizens and fellow believers who have called themselves publicly with such terms as "The Moral Majority," "The Christian Voice," etc. Although the statement is occasioned by wide dissemination of the views of such groups, it is not simply a rejoinder; it appeals for a deeper and larger understanding of Scripture and Christian tradition.

Because we live in a time of personal and public moral crisis, we call upon the body of believers in Jesus Christ to exert prophetic responsibility and constructive engagement in the political process.

We affirm that God works in a special way through Christian communities which may not be on the side of merely the political right or the left. Yet, these various Christian communities, existing as "a society within the society," cannot ignore the structures of the political order. Because all orders of society are permeable to evil, these orders are themselves involved in the evils of violence, poverty, inequality, discrimination, military contests, hunger, greed, materialism, hedonism, and sexism.

Nevertheless, the vitalities of the Kingdom of God cannot be reduced to an agenda of moral legislation, coercive measures, and political power. We do not demand that our convictions dominate public education, public television, or any other public institution. We do not attempt to censor those who disagree with us whether they be minorities or controlling majorities. Therefore, we call upon the Christian communities of the church to acknowledge the mixed character of the human situation and the ambiguity inherent in all human choices. We call upon Christian people to be:

Pro-Human

We affirm the sanctity of all human life. We deplore the devaluation of personhood whether by irresponsible and permissive abortion, irresponsible genetic manipulation, infanticide, economic exploitation, or nuclear arms proliferation. Therefore, we call upon the church to affirm and honor such actions as respect all human life: the fetus, the mother, the unwanted child, the poor, the disadvantaged, the hungry, the aged, the disabled, the imprisoned, the innocent victimized by guns and brutality, and all caught in fear. We urge the church to address concrete alternatives to the violations of human rights. We also urge the church to continue previous discussions on the moral issues of capital punishment and active/passive euthanasia.