TOWARDS AN EGALITARIAN FUTURE: EMPOWERING GIRLS TODAY TO BECOME LEADERS TOMORROW

by

G. Leanne Friesen

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of McMaster Divinity College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Divinity

McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
2005

MASTER OF DIVINITY

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE:	Towards An Egalitarian Future: Empowering Girls Today to Become Leaders Tomorrow
AUTHOR:	G. Leanne Friesen
SUPERVISOR:	Dr. Joyce Bellous
NUMBER OF PAGES:	90

McMASTER DIVINITY COLLEGE

Upon the recommendation of an oral examination committee, this thesis-project by

LEANNE FRIESEN

is hereby accepted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Divinity

First Reader and Advisor

Second Reader

Dean

Date: March 28, 2005

Abstract

Toward An Egalitarian Future: Empowering Girls Today for Leadership Tomorrow

G. Leanne Friesen Master of Divinity, McMaster Divinity College, 2005

The purpose of this thesis is to develop an educational model for congregations that will help move the Church towards becoming more egalitarian. Recognizing a biblical mandate for egalitarianism, the author uses feminist theory to illustrate that true equality requires that all members of a community be allowed to exercise their giftedness in all forms of service. Unfortunately, many women continue to face oppression in their church communities, which is evidenced in particular when one considers the obstacles women continue to face in their journey to church leadership. Acknowledging the harm caused to community by such non-egalitarian practices, the author suggests that the best starting place for an educational model moving towards teaching egalitarianism is girls in the church. Such a model must include healthy modeling of egalitarian behaviours and intentional mentoring among women and girls. The author concludes that through such practices we can start a process whereby girls will grow to embrace church leadership roles as a step towards creating egalitarian church communities.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to everyone who has helped me not only through the actual process of writing this thesis, but also through the journey in which I developed the ideas found within it. Thank-you most of all to Dr. Joyce Bellous for your ongoing feedback, collaboration, insight, wisdom, and personal support. You have helped me believe a great future is possible, and shown me that I can be a part of that. I am eternally grateful. Thank-you as well to Dr. James Peterson, my second reader, for your support of this project and your useful feedback. To all the staff and faculty at McMaster Divinity College I say a huge thank-you for all you did during my three years at MacDiv to help me learn, from teaching classes and providing challenging dialogue to completing course registrations and making pancake breakfasts. It has been an honour to be a part of this community.

I also wish to thank the large number of friends and colleagues who took time to dialogue with me about this project, and who provided invaluable insight and ideas about how to make the pieces come together. Thank-you to the members of the "Tuesday Thesis Group" (Karen, JP, Verna, David, Carol) for helping me to become comfortable sharing my thoughts and accepting constructive criticism of my work. Thank-you to my husband, Dallas, for his encouragement during the process. Finally, I want to thank my friends and sisters on my Mac journey, Sherri Trautwein and Alexandra Meek for listening to me work through my thoughts, reminding me this thesis was important, and joining in the dream for egalitarian futures. In many ways, you two were the inspiration for this work. May your voices be heard.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The following thesis is about women, girls, and the Church. Believing that the Church must be egalitarian, I will seek to examine how the Church can create egalitarian communities, and suggest that we must start an educational process with girls towards this end. Specifically I ask the question: What must we do in our churches today to help girls embrace their role as Church leaders in the future? I believe answering this question will bring us one step closer to helping the Church become truly egalitarian.

I trace my interest with this question of how we teach girls in the Church back to three incidents in my life. The first occurred when I visited some of my husbands' friends one Christmas. I had never met them before, and knew little of their story, except that my husband had become friends with the couple during their time together in a young church plant. Paul had become a Christian later in his life, while Susan had grown up in an extremely conservative church.[1]

As we were chatting, Susan spoke about her experiences growing up in her church culture. She had been taught that women were to have no leadership role in the Church except for teaching children or other women, yet had come to realize the oppression women in her church experienced as a result of this teaching. She now believed that women ought to have roles equal to men in the Church, and expressed sadness that her mother and sisters still accepted the subordination she had come to reject.

Later in that conversation, Susan talked about the church she and Paul had started attending since their son was born a few months before. Longing for a more established church with youth programs, they moved to a vibrant and large church community, with

[1] Not their real names.

contemporary worship and many young families. They were all enjoying it. My husband, however, was confused by her choice. He asked her if she was aware that this church had quite restrictive views on women in ministry: they took an extremely conservative approach to women's roles and did not permit women to lead or to teach publicly. Susan acknowledged that she did know that, but did not mind, since she felt that she was personally at a place where she would no longer feel swayed by such teachings, and was not interested in serving in leadership. This response proved fascinating to me. Despite her personal views on the equality of women in ministry, she is willing to stay in a church setting that teaches the opposite to what she believes, and is further willing to let her son be raised in such an environment. Her willingness to live with such an obvious contradiction in values intrigues me.

Another good friend of mine lives with a similar contradiction. Karen is an activist, an environmentalist, a socialist, a feminist. She is passionate about equality and has been active in social services groups that fight for human rights in various contexts. She plans to pursue a career in ministry as a chaplain. However, Karen continues to attend the church where she became a Christian as a teenager, despite its restrictions on women in leadership. She admits that she is frustrated by the constraints on women she experiences in this context, but is still very positive about her choice of church. When I asked her how she felt about attending a church that so obviously teaches views of women with which she disagrees (and actively disputes in other areas of her life) she responded: "Well, it won't really affect what I want to do, since I want to be a chaplain and I would be hired by an outside group anyway." Karen, unwilling to accept oppression in any other area of her life, is tolerant of it in her church.

Finally, I think back to a statement a friend once made to me. I grew up in an egalitarian church, where women and men both served as pastors. I knew many wonderful women leaders, and never doubted that women should preach, teach, or exercise authority in the Church. In a discussion with a friend one day when we started talking about my confidence in my own call and place in a ministry, he made a passing, but I believe, relevant, comment: "You know, Leanne, I have never met a Salvation Army girl that is not like you." I jokingly responded "Well, that's because we're not oppressed!"

Looking back on that statement, and considering the stories already cited, I began to ask myself: Is there a way that churches educate girls to accept oppression, and how does that happen? How did Susan and Karen reach a place where they were willing to live with their church's teachings about women, even though they disagreed with them? Moreover, how might the Church educate girls so that they will *not* accept oppression in their church communities?

This last question became the inspiration for this thesis. It is a significant question for those who acknowledge that the Church must be egalitarian as it challenges us to ask what we must do in our churches in order to ensure that egalitarianism will be lived out in our communities. Further, it is a question that focuses on the need to reconstruct how women see themselves, as opposed to how men see women. In the quest for egalitarianism, I suggest that we focus less on teaching men to be egalitarian, and more on teaching women to expect, and even demand, egalitarianism in their church communities. Recognizing that an important element of egalitarianism involves the

incorporation of women into leadership roles in the church, I contend that the best way to continue to move towards an egalitarian future is to begin an educational process with young girls that will empower them to embrace leadership as they grow older. The goal of the following thesis is to illustrate this point, and to discuss the processes that will bring liberation about.

In Chapter One, I will propose that the Bible calls the Church to be an egalitarian community that allows both men and women to function in all forms of leadership and service. In Chapter Two, I will describe what egalitarian communities would look like through an exploration of feminism and the lessons it teaches. In Chapter Three I will show that the Church has not yet reached a point where egalitarianism is being fully practiced and will then discuss why the absence of egalitarian practices is harmful in Chapter Four. Finally, in Chapter Five I will outline an educational model that focuses on teaching girls in the Church that I believe will help churches move towards being more egalitarian both now and in the future.

It is my hope that the ideas discussed here will challenge all Christians to think about the future of their churches, and the Church in general, in terms of how to find places for women to live and serve as God as calls them.

CHAPTER ONE: A BIBLICAL VIEW OF WOMEN

When we ask how to make the Church egalitarian, it is essential to begin by illustrating that egalitarianism has a biblical foundation. In this chapter, I will argue that the Bible has a clear egalitarian mandate that should be the Church's model for determining gender roles.[1] By exploring the biblical ideas of the old and the new creation, I will suggest that an equal role for women's leadership is not only biblically permitted, but represents the most appropriate model for living as Scripture calls us to do.

It is first of all necessary to examine what the Bible says specifically about women and their roles in the Church. Of most interest are those passages that have traditionally been used to suggest that women should not exercise leadership. There are seven prominent texts that seem to support the view that men should lead women: 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 (about the necessity for women to wear head coverings), 1 Corinthians 14: 34-35 (commanding women to be silent in church), Ephesians 5:22-33, Colossians 3:18-19, 1 Peter 3:1-17 (each telling wives to submit to their husbands), and 1 Timothy 2:8-15 (restricting women from having authority over or teaching men). These passages have been used and interpreted in a variety of ways throughout Christendom to support patterns of Church life that limit women's leadership and/or involvement in their Church communities. Indeed, it can be difficult to understand, based on these passages, how one could suggest that the Bible is egalitarian.

I wish to argue, however, that the view reflected by reading these passages in isolation from Scripture as a whole does not accurately reflect the true message of the Bible, or often even of the texts themselves. I contend that the Bible calls for egalitarianism, which is evidenced by the equality of their being as shown in the original

creation (Genesis 2) and the equality of their nature as shown in Paul's theology of the "new creation" (2 Corinthians 5:14-17). The verses referred to above, which have been used to limit women, must be viewed within a biblical framework for how we regard each other. As Grenz states, "[i]t is ultimately in the context of foundational doctrinal commitments that the biblical texts find their cohesion."[2] Indeed, when studied in its entirety, we see that the Bible presents a clear egalitarian message, which values women as equal and useful members of the Church family, often in a radical way when considered against the backdrop of the culture of the time. The Bible's call for equality is perhaps best understood by considering the profound theological insight about what it means to live as the "new creation," an extremely important theological theme that underscores much of the New Testament. To understand this theme, it is particularly important to explore Galatians 3:28-29, which tell us what this new creation looks like. In the following chapter I will therefore begin by describing the equality of women in creation before examining the implications of the expression of the "new creation." I will then return to the some of the verses cited above that appear to limit women's leadership in the Church and illustrate how they should be understood in light of the Bible's message of equality.

Women in Creation

The earliest reference to woman in the Bible shows woman, like man, being created in the image of God (Genesis 1:26-30). The *imago dei* presented in Genesis reminds us that women and men were indeed created equal.[3] Although this may seem obvious to some, there are many who hold the view that men more accurately reflect the

image of God. The creation narrative, however, challenges this proposition, since it shows women and men being given identical responsibilities by God: "be fruitful and increase in number…rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air." Furthermore, to argue that one class of people can reflect God's image "more" implies that the image of God is somehow an individual possession. In truth, however, we must understand the image of God as a relational concept, whereby humanity reflects the nature of God through community with each other.[4] This understanding of God's image would imply not only the equality of men and women with each other, but would also remind us that, as we reflect the image of God by sharing in community, we must welcome the participation of all individuals, male and female, in our church communities in order to most accurately reflect this image.[5]

The equality of creation first allows us to consider what egalitarianism means. The power of the biblical creation story is so meaningful, Pojman argues, that all human rights theories stem from the egalitarianism found in this narrative.[6] It is important to note here, however, that equality is not synonymous with "sameness." Indeed, while some egalitarians might argue for "androgyny," a term which denies that there is any distinction between male and female, when it comes to the Church, assuming that all are created equal does not suggest that all are created without different ways of perceiving and living in the world.[7] To believe that women and men are created equal does not require one to adopt the view that there are no differences between men and women in how they think, act, or navigate their place in the world.

Women were indeed created as equal to men by God. However, despite the equality of responsibility granted women in creation, women throughout Old Testament

times continued to live in a patriarchal society in both social and religious spheres. Women were restricted from entering the Temple and the priesthood was limited to men.[8] Restrictions developed in a patriarchal system also granted men far greater status in society.[9] This treatment of women, however, should not be understood as a result of creation, but rather as a result of the fall.[10] Grenz and Kjesbo maintain that it was sin's advent into the world that started the process whereby men began to dominate women in a way that countered creation's call for equality, and that led to women's further reinforcement of these patterns through their acceptance of them. The truth of the "new creation," which freed us from all sin, therefore allows the Church to return to an appropriate treatment of women in the Kingdom of God, and encourages women and girls to expect to live as equals in the Church.

Women in the New Creation

God's purposes for humanity, illustrated in creation, reach their culmination in Christ,[11] and reinforce the view that women and men are equal. To understand this theological basis of equality in the Church, we must begin by looking at Christ's life.

Jesus as the Model for the New Creation

Jesus is our model for the new creation. So, what should we learn from Him about how to treat women? To answer this question, it helps to understand some of the context in which Jesus found Himself ministering. Jesus lived in a socio-cultural context in which the male view of women was usually negative, and in which women's role was limited to the domestic sphere.[12] Many Jewish writers from the era reinforced this view, although it is important that we not assume all Jewish conceptions of women were

negative.[13] Still, "as a Jewish male in an androcentric, patriarchal society, Jesus' respect for women as persons of dignity and worth…was very significant in its own first century context."[14]

Indeed, we see that Jesus treated women with a respect that far exceeded what would have been expected in His culture at the time. Jesus healed women (Matt.8: 14-15, Luke 13:11-7), affirmed their identity (Luke 7:36-50, John 4) and used women as positive examples in His teaching (Matt. 24:41, Luke 13:20-21).[15] Similarly, while rabbis avoided even mentioning women,[16] and public dialogue was often restricted to men,[17] Jesus openly spent time with women, teaching and instructing them. In the Gospels, it is also evident that women were disciples, that is, followers of Jesus.[18]

Furthermore, the resurrection account, particularly as told in Mark, relies heavily on the account of women as the final witnesses to Jesus' burial, and the first witnesses to the resurrection. This meant that evidence for the resurrection lay primarily with women, which "empowered women to continue the movement."[19] This is a position of incredible importance given to women's testimony, particularly given a historical context in which the rabbinic notion was that women were liars.[20]

Scholer argues that this respect for and inclusion of women as shown by Jesus laid the foundation for the positive place of women in early churches.[21] In the books of Acts and Romans we easily see the radical new position of women in the early church. These texts record women experiencing freedom that would likely have been unparalleled in a culture where women were not considered morally or intellectually equal to men.[22] Acts frequently cites women as being in important positions of leadership within the fledgling Christian community. These women include Dorcas (Acts

9:36), Lydia (Acts 16: 14-15), Phillip's four unmarried daughters (cited as prophetesses, Acts 21:9), Phoebe (Romans 16: 1-2), Chloe (1 Corinthians 1:11), Nympha (Colossians 4:15), and Priscilla (Acts 16:11-15, 18:1-3, 18-28). Priscilla, Lydia and Nympha prove particularly interesting. It has been suggested that Priscilla may have been a more prominent teacher than her husband Aquilla, based on the fact that in the majority of the times their names are mentioned, hers is listed first. This was an unusual practice in the ancient world that typically listed a man's name first as part of a patriarchal system.[23] Similarly, it is significant that churches met in Nympha and Lydia's home. Fee argues that householders would naturally have served as the leaders of a house church, which means that a church is not likely to gather in a person's home unless the householder also serves as the leader.[24] This lends further credence to the idea that Nympha and Lydia served as leaders in the early church, following Jesus' model of equality and liberation for women.

Finally, it is now commonly believed that the apostle Junia, listed in Romans 16:7, was a woman.[25] This new evidence is particularly important since it means that "in no instance is a man named for church office that does not also include women for that same office" in these early texts.[26] It is therefore clear that Scripture records a radical and unique system of egalitarianism in the early church that was modeled after Jesus' example. This clearly laid the foundation for the writings of Paul, which outline what the "new creation" means - specifically, a Church founded on a new social order that transcended previous gender inequalities.

The Church in the New Creation

Paul's writings describe what the Church living in the new creation will look like, and it is evident that such a Church would be egalitarian. Galatians 3:28-29, written by Paul, remains the key text in the New Testament for understanding a biblical perspective on women. It reads:

> There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

Fee argues that we must focus on this text, together with 2 Corinthians 5:14-17, in order to accurately understand Paul's views on gender. This text reads:

> For Christ's love compels us, because we are convinced that one died for all, and therefore all died. And he died for all, that those who live should no longer live for themselves, but for him who died for them and was raised again. So from now on we regard no one from a worldly point of view. Though we once regarded Christ in this way we do so no longer. Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation; the old has gone, the new has come!

Remaining focused on the principles in these verses allows us to ground our thinking about women in Paul's theology of the new creation. In this passage, Paul argues that the new creation brought about by Christ's death and resurrection prevents us from viewing things from our former point of view. Thus, we can no longer view anyone, or anything, "according to the flesh." Fee contends that, "this radical new point of view...lies at the heart of everything [Paul] thinks and does."[27] This shapes how he calls the Church to function.

As we study Paul's proclamation in Galatians 3: 28-29, we must remember that it is part of his larger argument found in Galatians 2:16-4:7, in which he contends that Gentiles no longer have to conform to markers of the old covenant (made between God and Israel in the Old Testament) in order to be part of the new covenant (founded in faith

in Christ). To those suggesting that new Gentile converts must submit to standards of the old covenant, Paul responds in Galatians 3:26 by saying that "all are children of God." He thus recognizes in verse 28 that there is neither Jew nor Greek, a point, which, undoubtedly, is his main purpose for writing the passage.[28] However, Fee argues that at this point Paul seems to recognize that the new creation has, in fact, obliterated *all* old sociological categories - and thus applies this new system to "slave and free, male and female" as well.[29] Paul states that while differences between these groups will not cease to exist (a relevant issue that will be discussed at later points throughout this thesis), the significance of their distinction in God's kingdom will. This does not mean that Paul advocated a "sameness" of all people in Christ (an idea later asserted by Gnostic heresy); instead, he believed that within the Church community these distinctions become irrelevant.[30] As Bruce argues, Paul is concerned in this passage with practical Church life, arguing that inequality of religious role is abolished in the new order.[31] Thus, patriarchy is "no longer constructive of the new community in Christ."[32] The old has gone, the new has come. The new will be founded in true egalitarianism.

Fee clearly states the radical nature of Paul's assertions about equality in Christ. In Paul's context, where status and social position prevailed, one's entire existence was based on the these distinctions. The boundaries created by these status symbols could not be crossed, so that Paul's affirmations of equality in Christ were radical in every way.[33] This is what has led some to conclude that Paul was, in fact, "radically egalitarian."[34] Indeed, this text shows that Paul had strong concern that old distinctions, including gender, should not play a role in the new covenant community. How, then, do we

understand passages written by Paul that seem to indicate that Paul did not approve of women serving as equal to men within the Church?

At this point, I want to return to some of the verses cited at the beginning of this chapter (1 Corinthians 14:33-34, 1 Timothy 2:12-15) in order to illustrate how texts that initially appear to limit women's leadership in the Church can fit with the biblical message of egalitarianism. As we read these verses, one option is to argue, as some scholars have, that the passages that negatively present roles of women are in fact not Pauline at all, but, instead, later writings based on the Pauline tradition of more conservative writers.[35] However, we do not necessarily need to make such a sweeping claim in order to make sense of these texts. Passages that seem to challenge women's leadership can in fact be found to adhere to Paul's overall theology of egalitarianism, when studied in light of Paul's missional priorities and/or cultural situations. Indeed, while Paul does point towards egalitarian ideals, we remember that New Testament letters were written to communities still struggling with these new ideas. In terms of Paul's missional priorities, Wiebe summarizes well when he writes:

> The vision is of a community living in tension between the new and the old, the coming and the "present evil age." On the one hand, the old hierarchy binding men and women, slave and free persons has been broken. On the other hand, the idea that the church as the eschatological community is already beyond the constraints of the old age is an illusion.[36]

Paul must minister in the realities caused by this tension. As to the issue of culture, two passages in particular (each of which has been used to argue that women are not meant to serve equally in leadership in the Church) help to illustrate the importance of understanding cultural context. Each of these will be discussed in turn here.

1 Corinthians 14:33-34 instructs women in the church to be silent. While it has often been used to prohibit all women from leadership, this passage is more about orderly worship than it is about the role of women.[37] Paul was writing to a church struggling to maintain a Christian lifestyle in a city replete with debauchery and pagan worship, a situation in which it was common for women to let their hair down and "babble" as a means of pagan worship.[38] In an attempt to distinguish Christian worship from paganism, Paul calls for orderly worship. He begins in 1 Corinthians 11:13-16 with an admonishment to women to prophesy with their head's covered. It is clear that Paul did not intend to restrict women from speaking in church. If this were the intention, why would he instruct them about what to do while they were speaking in church? The later admonition made in 1 Corinthians 14:33-34, in this continuing context of a call to orderly worship, was to women speaking out of turn in worship gatherings.[39] Some suggest that women in the church were speaking out of turn in a way that was inappropriate in their culture, or that they were arguing with their husbands in public - a practice that shamed their husbands in this context.[40] Thus, Paul tells these women that they should wait to have their questions answered at home. While this may seem an extreme way to deal with disorderly worship services to modern readers, we see again how this passage should not be understood to counter Paul's egalitarian views. Indeed, the fact that Paul allowed women to come out and learn at all shows that he called for the Church to provide women freedom unlike that granted elsewhere in society. As Witherington suggests, in this context, women were singled out simply because women were the cause of a very specific cultural problem.[41] By speaking out of turn, women were creating disorderliness in this particular church. Paul writes to admonish these actions.

The importance of the situational context for understanding Paul's view of women in the Church is also relevant to the passage found in 1 Timothy 2:12-15, which states that women should not teach or have authority over men. Again, however, while many traditions have taken this passage as a normative text about women's roles in the Church, Fee argues that, in Paul's writings, this is clearly the "odd text out."[42] Thus, instead of giving priority to this text's teaching on women over Galatians 3:28-29 (which happens in many churches), we must understand the Timothy text as an *ad hoc* document, written to a very particular situation.[43] Numerous commentators have explained this passage in light of its cultural context, pointing out that the women in Ephesus (the church to which 1 Timothy was written) seemed to be falling prey to false teachers and theologies, and then attempting to pass these teachings on in the church. Thus, Keener summarizes the situation by stating that the issue here was that women needed to learn, and that, in this context, they needed to remain silent in order to do so. He too, however, argues that the point we should take from this passage is that women were included in early church learning opportunities and that this is remarkable. This illustrates again that Paul aspired to dismantle gender role divisions that existed in society within the Church.[44] Grenz and Kjesbo summarize the situation in this passage when they state: "Paul proposes a twofold solution to the problem of women involved in false teaching [in Ephesus]. In the short term, he prohibits them from teaching and usurping authority over men, who were their teachers. But the long range answer requires that they be taught."[45] Again, this would have been an enlightened suggestion in the eyes of a culture that did not value women as learners.[46]

While these passages still have important lessons to teach us (for example, about order or the necessity to learn before we teach), it would be inappropriate to see them as normative in terms of teaching us how to view women in the Church. The theology of the new creation calls us to return to Paul's egalitarian views as expressed in Galatians 3:28-29, and therefore to embrace egalitarianism in all its forms as the true goal for the Church. While limitations were placed on certain women in certain contexts for the sake of the Church's greater mission,[47] Paul's vision was for the Church to be egalitarian. It is the post-Pauline tradition that distorted some of the biblical restrictions in order to challenge the equality of women and men.[48]

The Bible As the Basis for Egalitarianism

In conclusion, the Bible is the basis for egalitarianism in the Church. As has been shown in this chapter, the Bible says the following about gender roles:

- Women and men were created equal, and equally reflect the image of God
- Despite living in an androcentric society, Jesus valued and respected women in a way that modeled egalitarianism
- Following Jesus' example, women served as useful leaders in the early Church
- In light of the new creation, Paul wrote about the eradication of gender roles in the Kingdom of God and the Church. Even in cases where texts may seem to place women in subservient roles, the Church remained *ahead of its time* in how it treated women, granting them freedom that they rarely experienced in broader society and that would lead towards building an egalitarian community.

Thus, in the area of gender, the Bible must be understood to be egalitarian. In the Church, therefore, our goal must be egalitarian communities. Yet, what would they look like? Although many Christians may agree with the ideals of egalitarianism, how to live this out may differ drastically from one person or church to the next. At this point it proves useful to turn to feminism to help us understand what egalitarianism looks like in a practical sense. This is the task of the next chapter.

CHAPTER TWO: LEARNING FROM FEMINISM AND FEMINIST THEORY

In Chapter One, we illustrated the biblical mandate for churches to live as egalitarian communities. In this chapter, I propose that feminism helps fill out our Christian understanding of what "egalitarian" means. In contrast to those who think that the Church must fight feminism, I suggest that the Church has a great deal to learn from it about what it means to be egalitarian. When understood properly, feminism presents valuable insights into political, personal, and sociological realities that affect women and that convey clearly how egalitarian communities might work. Yet, feminism remains a contentious issue for many Christians. For some, the term "feminism" represents ideals of female superiority and male degradation that counter the Church's goal of unity and mutual edification. However, while some feminists hold views that would undoubtedly adhere to these stereotypes, it would be incorrect to assume that these images accurately convey what feminism is about. This chapter presents insights about feminism that prove valuable for all communities seeking to understand what egalitarianism means and how to live it out.

The Values of Feminism

To perceive what the Church can learn from feminism we first must accurately understand its nature. On one hand, we must distinguish between feminism as a movement and "feminist theory." The feminist movement is likely what comes to most people's minds when they consider feminism. "Feminism" is associated with seeking women's rights, and became mainstream in this century during the activism of the 1960s.[49] This was known as the "second wave" of feminism, since it was actually

preceded by women in the previous century. In the "first wave," activism centred in part around the suffragist movement, although it was not limited to it.[50] The second wave, which brings to mind names such as Betty Friedan or Gloria Steinham, called numerous women to action to fight for women's rights and led to such ground-breaking events as the passage of the Equal Pay Act in the United States (1963) and the formation of the National Organization for Women (1966). While the twentieth century movement proved effective in bringing about positive changes for women on many systemic levels, feminism itself was surprisingly atheoretical; it was more concerned with government and legal change than it was with theory building as such.[51] This created a distinction between the feminist movement and feminist theory. While the former represents activism on women's behalf, the latter was invented during conversations between the feminist movement and the political Left, in an attempt to name the foundational values and concepts on which feminism is built.[52] The feminist movement and feminist theory are each important components of feminism, although it is more often the latter that provides useful theoretical foundations from which we can glean lessons for the Church.

It is equally important to distinguish clearly between different kinds of feminist theory. Indeed, it is perhaps the range of types of feminism that can create the most difficulty in defining it. Some have argued, in fact, that there is no one feminist theory; that feminism is multicentred and, therefore, undefinable.[53] Scholars have identified numerous categories of feminism. Stacey, for example, argues that there are three "classic" types of feminist theory: radical, Marxist, and liberal.[54] Radical feminism (that which is perhaps most offensive to those who oppose feminism) sees men as responsible for women's oppression, and focuses on male violence against women and men's control

of women's sexuality and reproduction. Marxist feminism, however, finds the root of women's oppression in capitalist exploitation of labour, analyzing "women's work" in relation to its function within a capitalist economy. Finally, liberal feminism, the form of feminism most associated with the feminist movement, is focused on rights and choices that are denied to women and the ways in which society should rectify injustices towards women.[55] To these divisions, however, other writers add the categories of "psychoanalytic feminism" (which explores revisions and reinterpretations of Freudian conceptions of gender) or "socialist feminism " (which expands on Marxist feminism, contending that its views focus too much on "the worker" at the expense of women's issues).[56] Tong adds to these categories "existentialist feminism" (an exploration of human nature that seeks to honour women's perspective) and "postmodern feminism" (a form of feminism that argues there is no "right" way to understand women).[57] Maintaining that none of these types accurately speak to the experiences of black women, writers such as Bell Hooks and Audre Lorde developed "womanist theory" to explore the oppression facing women of colour.[58] Finally, "mujerista" feminism works from the lived experience of American Latinas.[59]

While these apparently different conceptions of "feminism" may leave one asking how it could be possible to determine any set of core feminist values, there are fundamental similarities which allow them to fall into the "feminist" category. Smith states that feminism is "the political theory and practice that struggles to free *all* women."[60] Similarly, feminist theory in general offers critical explanations of women's subordination and suggests how the power differential between men and women can be challenged.[61]

Feminist theorists, however, articulate the core values of feminism in several different ways. Rogers list several values that she argues unite most feminists. These values include social justice, the democratic process (valuing the idea that every voice must be heard), and individuality, while also suggesting that responsibility should be extended beyond oneself and one's circle of loved ones to care for those who depend on others. Another key value of feminism that Rogers suggests is inclusionary thinking. Modern feminism seeks to include the perspectives of a range of women. At the same time, this value suggests that we must go beyond dualistic differentiations that have been built up between, for example, male and female or strong and weak and avoid the idea of the "superiority" of one group. A final value central to feminist thinking, under this categorization, is freedom, with liberation (the act of granting freedom to those who do not enjoy its privilege) closely tied to it. In feminism, this goal of freedom does not just apply to women, but often refers to the goal of liberation of all oppressed people.[62]

Jones, a feminist theologian, also presents several common themes in feminist and women's studies' texts that help describe some of the core beliefs of feminism. According to Jones, feminist texts are united on the following values:

- A common goal – the liberation of women;
- "Preferential option" for women, suggesting that we do not focus on women because we believe they are better than others or more in need of freedom, but simply because they have been overlooked in the past and treated as objects of oppression;
- A lifting up of the aspects of flourishing women;
- A desire to listen to women in their own words;

- A questioning of language and how it is used in terms of how it represents gender and women; and
- The sustained belief that things can get better.[63]

Both Rogers and Jones illustrate key values that are central to feminist theory. For my purposes, however, we will rely on the summary of core feminist values used by Grant, which include:

- "Women:" Women are oppressed simply because they are women,
- "Experience:" The experience of each woman's oppression is valuable,
- "Personal Politics:" The personal is political.

The first core value in this system she labels "women." This term is used to represent the feminist value that women are oppressed simply because they are women. While many challenge the notion that "women" can be understood as a universal concept, the key point in feminist theory is that women, by nature of being female, face systemic oppression from much of society.[64]

The second core concept according to Grant is labeled "experience." Recognizing that there is no way to "measure" women's oppression, feminism acknowledges that oppression must be defined subjectively, namely through the experience of women. Quoting the "Manifesto of the Red Stockings," she writes:

> We regard our personal experiences and our feeling about that experience as the basis for our analysis of our common situation....We question every generalization and accept none that are not confirmed by our experience.[65]

Finally, Grant argues, the third key concept is "personal politics." This value goes back to the famous feminist slogan "the personal is political," a phrase that articulates that women's oppression is not simply a "psychological" or "personal"

phenomenon. Instead, feminism believes that there is a system of oppression, which is political, that oppresses women on a larger level.[66] Furthermore, the experiences of women ought not to remain the "issue" of one person experiencing oppression; instead, we must look to the political and social systems surrounding women as not only responsible for causing, but also for changing, this oppression. For example, if a woman in a church feels hindered from sharing her gifts, this value would suggest that this is an issue for the Church as much as it is an issue for that woman.[67]

Learning From the Values of Feminism

As we look to what the Church can learn from feminism about living as egalitarian community, I have chosen to discuss the lessons to be gleaned from feminism by using Grant's three core value summaries. First of all, the value labeled as "women" contains important lessons for churches to hear. After centuries of oppression towards women that was touted as biblical and normative for the Church, it is essential that we recognize the ways in which church structure can systemically oppress our women. We must continue to ask ourselves how women are treated in our churches, and to consider if there are ways in which women experience oppression through church practices. I have often heard that arguing for the recognition of women's oppression is a moot point when many women themselves in the Church do not feel that they are oppressed. As we explore the lessons from this feminist value, we must begin by asking: (1) what is meant here by oppression, and (2) does oppression require that someone be aware of its existence for it to be real?

Oppression has many meanings but several broad ideas are pertinent to helping us conceive the concept for our context. Rogers gives the following definition of oppression: "an experiential notion concerning how people in the lower reaches of social hierarchies - those more dominated than dominating - react over time by way of their identities and emotions."[68] Oppression, then, is more about understanding how systems affect people than it is about labeling some groups or individuals as "victims." Jones supports this idea, describing oppression as "dynamic forces, both personal and social that diminish or deny the flourishing of women."[69]

With this understanding of oppression, feminism suggests that it is quite possible for oppression to exist without someone being cognizant of its presence or impact. Indeed, it is possible for intimacy and care to coexist with domination.[70] As Rogers states, "without coercing, without demanding, without ridiculing or belittling, the men we live with or call kin can hold us back even while loving us."[71] This is the concept that can lead the Church to misunderstand feminism's call for freedom. Many mistake "loving" and "finding a place" for women in a Church as freedom, without realizing that oppressive systems still exist. For example, some might argue that women are not "oppressed" in a particular church or denomination that restricts women's leadership because women still have important roles that they enjoy, and they feel happy in their church home. Yet, while this proves that the church might love and care for women, it does not prove that women in this context remain free from oppression. Oppression refers to how a system affects people within it, so that the system of restriction can still exist, even as the church cares for those it oppresses. In the same way that is inappropriate to deny the oppression of a slave who enjoys working for his master, we

cannot dismiss oppression in a church simply because many women feel content with things as they are.

The Marxian idea of "false consciousness," often borrowed by feminism, helps explain why women may not be aware of the oppression that exists within a system. False consciousness is a distortion of reality that takes the lived facts of a situation (for example, not being allowed to speak publicly in a church meeting or not being allowed to serve as a senior pastor) and fits them into some scheme where they make sense.[72] Using this concept, feminism has argued that women in oppressive systems who do not feel that they are oppressed have simply justified in their own minds a distortion of their lived realities. For example, a woman who is restricted from preaching in a church may justify this reality by convincing herself that men are naturally better preachers, that she does not want to preach anyway, or that this allows her to focus on things that she feels are more important in the church setting. In this way, women are able to justify or accept systemic oppression as a logical fact of life.

In her watershed book "The Feminine Mystique" (1963), Betty Friedan explored what happened to women who succumbed to the "mystique" that all they wanted was to be housewives and mothers, and found that many women suffered without knowing how to put words to their emotions. Friedan interviewed countless housewives who expressed feelings of despair and worthlessness, most of whom felt bewildered and uncertain about where these feelings were coming from. She determined that the cause stemmed back to a concept of the ideal of femininity that had been propagated through the media and broader society during the previous decades, which suggested that all women needed to be happy was a home and family. While some women certainly found happiness from

these things, Friedan discovered that many in her study were depressed, uncertain or even suffering from what one doctor eventually labeled "housewife fatigue,"[73] based on the fact that living this "ideal" had turned out not to be the road to happiness after all. She labeled this situation simply "the problem that had no name," suggesting again that women can experience, and be hurt by, oppression without ever being able to articulate their experiences as such.[74]

Thus, one of the first lessons we need to take from feminism as a Church is that systemic oppression *can* exist without someone labeling it as such. We should not assume that all is well simply because no one has articulated their discontent with a system that has often been in place for centuries. To consider the examples of Susan and Karen used earlier, we cannot dismiss the oppressiveness of their church contexts on the basis that they appear to feel content within them. Instead, we need to take depression and discontent seriously – and as a sign of oppression – even when it is not called by that name.

The second lesson we take from feminism is based on the value of experience; this is the value that reminds us that we must appreciate the voices of those women who express that they feel oppressed. The main difference between this lesson and the previous lesson is awareness. In this point, we refer to women who recognize their oppression and attempt to share their experiences of it. For those women who are able to articulate their feelings of oppression in a church setting, we must treat their stories as being enough evidence in and of themselves to prove oppression exists. It is easy to underscore the experience of one "malcontent" by labeling it simply "that person's opinion," and therefore of no value. It is essential, however, that we not listen to a story

of a woman's experience of oppression and tell her that what she feels simply isn't the case. When we do this, we make the person the problem, instead of acknowledging the problem for what it is. This can lead the "complainant" to feel marginalized, or even demonized. I can think of many incidents in my own life when I shared an incident that offended me as a woman and an authority figure dismissed my claim as "not how it was meant" or "not really what happened." I remember, for example, being laughed at when I shared with a member of a committee in which I was the only woman member that I felt the male members of the group dismissed my opinions because I was a woman. Recently, a Seminary instructor told me that I should not be offended by a book that specifically stated that women should not serve as pastors because the lessons in it were "still good." Feminism challenges practices such as ridiculing the marginalized, reminding us that we must listen to women and their stories as a Church if we are to hear how our church *really* affects women.

Finally, we move to the last value of personal politics, which teaches us that the personal is political. Indeed, in the Church as in society we must also continue to appreciate this truth. Acknowledging that a woman is, or women are, suffering in our church and seeing that simply as an issue with which they must deal on a personal level without considering the church's role in their oppression is inappropriate. Indeed, the biblical writings discussed in chapter one support the necessity that we act to alter systemic oppression: the passages that talk about women such as 1 Corinthians 14:33-34 and 1 Timothy 2:12-15 do not suggest to leave each woman to her own, but instead argue for a system within a congregation that deals with the issues particular women were facing. Consider, for example, the issue of the women teachers in 1 Timothy who were

not simply dismissed, but were instructed to learn in an appropriate way. While this is not meant to suggest that the teachings about how to deal with women in particular situations were normative for the Church in its entirety, it does remind us that we ought not to ignore the plight of the "personal" without considering the role of the "political" in our church gatherings.

Before closing this section on the values of feminism from which the Church might learn, two further lessons that result specifically from the feminist movement also bear mentioning in this context. The first lesson stems from what the feminist movement has learned about the danger of categorizing all women together only on the basis of their sex. In the early days of the feminist movement, women were invited to join together simply because of their womanhood. While this had value, as time went on, feminists came to appreciate the difficulty of speaking for all women using this category alone. For example, a white middle-class housewife's experience of oppression differs from a working class Hispanic woman's experience. An emerging "third wave" of feminism is taking shape that hopes to allow for the expression of all voices within the female community.[75] McClintock Fulkerson suggests this movement is important, as it reminds us that gender cannot be our only "identity marker" – while women experience oppression by nature of being women, other aspects of their personal identities will affect how this is lived out.[76]

I believe the Church should also acknowledge the danger of relying too heavily on "identity markers," a term the feminist movement has coined to refer to the labeling of an individual based on one personal characteristic. Feminism reminds us that ways of being should not be assumed based on one aspect of a person's identity (specifically

gender). In other words, we cannot assume a person's experience simply because they are a woman, or make decisions based on that one "identity marker." This raises the question: Do we, as a Church, allow gender to be our only "identity marker?" Practices that restrict a woman from leadership or certain roles in the Church simply by nature of a person's sex certainly suggest that we do. The Church, therefore, has much to learn from the feminist movement's renewed appreciation for diversity. Indeed, we must recognize that gender ought never be our only "identity marker" when determining where someone fits in our church communities.

A second lesson comes from the research in Friedan's book about the necessity of offering women choice so that they might be truly liberated. After tracing the history of the first wave of feminism in the 1800s, during which women passionately fought for new rights to vote, be educated, and enjoy careers as men did, she expresses fascination with women's later "return to the home" just generations later. She points to the return to domesticity in the 1940s and 1950s, when women started to marry younger, have more children at a younger age, and end education earlier than previous generations in order to live as a "housewives" (a term birthed during this era). Why were women so quick to apparently reject the newfound freedoms won for them by their grandmothers' generation?

To answer this question, she points to the limited options available to the early pioneering feminists, who indeed seemed to find their only sense of freedom in behaving like a "man." With no role models of what a liberated woman might look like in modern society, first wave feminists were forced to see their only models of liberation in the men around them, and often expressed their freedom by acting as such (for example, by

wearing unflattering trousers, or refusing to marry). Thus, after the right to vote had been won, "feminist" became a "dirty word" to many women who did not want to join this radical crusade.[77] Friedan summarizes the situation by saying:

> The daughters who grew up with the rights the feminists had won could not go back to their old image of genteel nothingness, nor did they have their aunts' or mothers' reasons to be angry copies of man...they were finally free to be what they chose to be. But what choice were they offered? In that corner, the fiery, man-eating feminist, the career woman – loveless, alone. In this corner, the gentle wife and mother – loved and protected by her husband, surrounded by her adoring children. Though many daughters continued on the passionate journey their grandmothers had begun, thousands of others fell out – victims of mistaken choice.[78]

This discussion makes an interesting point about choices. Indeed, when it is suggested that women do not need to be granted positions of leadership in a church, it is common for people to support their argument by saying: "Well, that is not what women want."[79] Yet, Friedan's insight suggests that it is not enough to assume that women will embrace more freedom simply because it has been technically made available. In order for women to feel that they can move beyond traditional life paths, they must have alternate routes modeled for them. If not, it remains likely that they will continue to revert to previous patterns. Friedan uses the following example to illustrate this point:

> How did Chinese women, after having their feet bound for many generations, finally discover they could run? The first woman whose feet were unbound must have felt such pain that some were afraid to stand, let along to walk or run. The more they walked, the less their feet hurt. But what would have happened if, before a single generation of Chinese girls had grown up with unbound feet, doctors, hoping to save them pain and distress, told them to bind their feet again? And teachers told them that walking with bound feet was feminine, the only way a woman could walk if she wanted a man to love her?...Would many little Chinese girls, then grow up wanting to have their feet securely bound, never tempted to walk or run?[80]

Although Friedan applies these ideas to her understanding of why women in her generation chose to succumb to the "feminist mystique," which we examined earlier and that produced the effects that the second wave of feminism had to address, as a Church the lesson we take from Friedan's insights is that it is not enough simply to say to women "you're equal!" if we hope to see them live in egalitarian Church communities. Instead, we must also provide real ways for this equality to be modeled and lived out. When we tell women in our churches that they are equal, we must then provide ways for them to stand, walk, and run, instead of limiting their options in such a way that they continue to feel forced to "bind" themselves.

The Meaning of Egalitarian Communities

In the previous chapter, we discussed how the Bible presents an egalitarian view of women. We then asked what "egalitarian" means and how we might start to live this out. The lessons from feminism, the movement and theory, help us with this task. In summary, from feminism we learn several key lessons that help us move towards egalitarian living.

Firstly, the value of "women" helps us recognize that women in our churches are often victims of oppression, and that oppression occurs even in situations where women are not able to articulate the cause of their suffering. Secondly, from the value of "experience" we learn to listen to the voice of women and hear their stories as having something valuable to offer the Church when striving to be egalitarian. Thirdly, because of "personal politics" we acknowledge that the personal experience of a woman feeling oppressed is not just "her" issue, but is a political issue that must be addressed by the

church as a system. In addition, from the feminist movement, we are reminded that gender cannot be the only "marker" by which we decide how one might be involved in church life, and we also learn that we must offer viable choices to women in order to help them move into roles that will allow our churches to function in more egalitarian ways.

As we consider these five lessons, we are reminded of concepts of community that we must reject within the Christian Church that falsely operate under the guise of equality. We must reject, for example, complementarian teachings that stress that women and men have been differently gifted by God in a way that allows only men to serve in leadership roles. While it is not without basis to suggest that women bring unique contributions to church life, feminism reminds us that egalitarian communities allow individuals to use their gifts without restricting certain leadership roles from them because of their sex. While we can affirm that men and women might have distinctive gifts and differing modes of leadership (as will be discussed later), this does not mean that we must embrace a complementarian system. Indeed, a complementarian proposal that ultimately places women in a subordinate role to men[81] could not be seen as egalitarian when using feminist or biblical principles (Chapter One), and would in fact be seen as an example of an oppression system.

With this view of egalitarianism that is grounded in Scripture and further developed by lessons from feminism, we thus attain an understanding of what egalitarian communities would look like. They are communities in which all people are free to exercise gifts they have been given by God and recognized by others, where all voices are heard, where difference is valued, while circumstances of oppression are also acknowledged. Egalitarian communities encourage and provide choice. Using this

model, then, we ask ourselves: how is the Church doing? Have we created these egalitarian communities of choice and liberation for our women and girls? To answer this question we must consider situations women and girls continue to find in churches, which we will do in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: HOW ARE WE DOING?

After considering the Biblical call to egalitarianism in our churches, as described in Chapter One, and the contribution that feminism makes to our understanding of egalitarianism, we must then ask: How is the Church in general doing? In the following chapter, I will suggest that the Church still has significant strides to make before it can say that women as a whole are living in healthy egalitarian communities. While it is true that different church settings have a range of views about women's participation in their communities, and that some churches may be egalitarian, the Church as a whole remains replete with examples of oppressive practices. Some Christians would be shocked at such a suggestion. At a recent meeting of a local ministerial I spoke with a doctoral student in religious studies, who, upon hearing the topic of my thesis, asked in surprise, "Isn't that a non-issue today?" Like many who have witnessed the growth of women's freedom in many churches (which should not be overlooked), he made the mistake of assuming that the Christian community had "arrived" in terms of egalitarianism because his own church now ordained women. The immediate reaction of the women ministers present at the meeting reported an alternate reality; they expressed their concerns and frustrations about the challenges they still faced as women in their churches.

To make the case that churches generally are not egalitarian, I will use personal stories, research, and statistics to show how women are treated in the Church. I will propose that women continue to suffer in church communities and that how women are treated in the Church is, indeed, still an issue. While many areas could be explored to illustrate this point, this chapter will focus specifically on women and Church leadership as a tangible way of explaining the difficulties many women continue to face.

One Church's Struggle

"Isn't this a non-issue?" The man who asked this question had a valid point. In his mind, his church's openness to women in leadership left him surprised that women would still be concerned about their role in the Church. I find my initial response to this question begins with the stories, and experiences, of those who continue to struggle. I will share here the story of women in one particular denomination.

The first illustration of the continued struggle of women in this church involves a woman whose pastor discouraged her from pursuing her call to ordination. She shared her story in a Seminary class that I also completed in the summer of 2004. As students were introducing themselves, she talked about her call to ministry, and her current struggle to decide between taking a Master of Religious Education degree or a Master of Divinity degree, which would prepare her for ordination. Although she wanted to serve as a minister, she was leaning toward a career in education, because her pastor had told her that women in her denomination do not get jobs. He pointed to a recent female Seminary graduate now serving as a custodian in her own church to prove his point. When we asked what denomination she belonged to, I was shocked to learn that she not only belonged to a denomination that did ordain women, but to the church tradition in which I was personally hoping to become a minister! When we spoke later, her confusion was evident. She longed to follow her call, but had been discouraged and dissuaded by her pastor's remarks. She wondered if she should "settle" for a ministry job that was different from where she felt led, in order to avoid the heartbreak of doing so much education only to be rejected from pastoral leadership when she graduated.

Interestingly, only several days later, my husband spoke with a pastor in the same denomination who told him that it was not only difficult to find jobs in this church, but "especially difficult for women." He said that we should be grateful that his church was "willing" to dialogue with us about job possibilities in future for us as a ministry couple, saying that, "not many churches would do it" (that is, not many churches in his denomination, which claimed to be egalitarian, would be willing to consider hiring a woman).

Interestingly, the denomination discussed in each of these examples is the denomination of the student that felt that women in ministry was a "non-issue!" Clearly, even in his progressive church setting, egalitarianism has not fully arrived. This, unfortunately, is a common scenario, as research shows many women continue to struggle as they seek to serve as leaders in their churches.

Evidence From Research

The idea that women continue to face challenges in the Church is illustrated particularly well when one charts the potential journey of a woman towards pastoral leadership. A review of research about the stages of progress towards ordination shows that women's experiences often prove different than men's all through the process. This difference starts as early as the initial decision to follow the call to ordained ministry and attend Seminary, and continues through the process as women seek to find churches and then serve as pastoral leaders in them. The experience of women in each of these phases will be discussed in turn here.

When Nason-Clark asked women in ministry what had made them decide to pursue a ministry career, she found that while women and men were equally likely to cite a call from God as their reason for seeking a ministerial vocation, women rated the influence of other clergy and their own minister as having particularly less influence on their decision than did men.[82] This did not result from women paying less attention to their pastors. Instead, further research confirmed that women received less encouragement to pursue their call than did men, a finding that was echoed in a study of Seminary women which showed that pastors and family members were less encouraging to women entering seminary than for men.[83] Women in Seminary were also more likely to have chosen ministry as a second career, after a longer decision making process, and to report that they had no role model in ministry – a complaint made by none of the men in the same study. Charlton summarizes:

> The career choice process (to be ministers) seems to be a longer, more difficult one for women than for men entering seminary. It takes women longer to make it, they often come to it after having tried other things, and they face obstacles in getting there that seem to be different for them than for men.[84]

In other words, hearing a call to ministry, and acting upon it, is harder for women than it is for men, as the research shows.

After hearing a call and responding to it by attending Seminary, women continue to face obstacles after ordination,[85] beginning with finding a placement in a church.[86] In discussing a denominational committee looking to place pastors, Lehman describes the following scenario when a woman's name is brought to the table:

> They carefully singled out women candidates for separate consideration. One executive would say, "I have a woman who is seeking a pastorate. Do you have any churches where a woman might work out?" "Do you know of any churches open to a woman?" Then the others became visibly nervous. Some of them glanced over at me. Sometimes the response was that they had a church where a

> woman pastor had just left, but they did not think that the church would want another woman this soon. More often than not, a reply about a possible opening would involve a small congregation struggling to survive. It was noteworthy that they never asked, "Do you know of a church that was recently served by a woman but is now willing to accept a man?" Women are still defined as a problem to be solved, not as a pool of resources to be tapped.[87]

This quotation well illustrates challenges that women face as they seek to find a church in which to serve. Thus, after responding to the call of vocational ministry, women are more often prevented from living out their calling than are men.

The issue of Seminary-trained women finding church placements is indeed wrought with many struggles. Lehman found that, for example, even in congregations where many or most members have positive views towards women ministers, others oppose the idea of a woman minister in their own congregation in the name of church harmony.[88] Thus, even when women have allies, churches may not see the placement of women in their churches as a priority over "keeping the peace." The position of their first placement also proves more crucial for women than it does for men; women who start by serving in associate or assistant pastor positions in a church find it difficult to move into solo positions, while those who take positions outside of a local church find that the door to future opportunities in church ministry virtually closes for them.[89] Indeed, Nesbitt found that while first placements for men and women often found both serving in "associate" or "assistant" positions, second placements differed drastically, with women more often continuing in similar placements while men moved "up" into positions equivalent to senior pastor roles.[90] Finally, when actually serving in ministry, a woman faces other unique difficulties, including the pressure not only to live up to personal expectations she places on herself; she also must prove that "all women can do it."[91] She may also struggle with the use of traditional symbolism and liturgy for the Church[92] in

contexts where she is forced to use gender exclusive language or symbols that do not reflect female experiences, as is required in certain traditions. Further, a woman will often face resistance from the laity and other clergy people because of her sex.[93]

When moving into ministry, receiving respect as an authority figure may prove difficult for women in a way that it does not for men. This point is illustrated by Maybury and Chickering in research that studied the influence of gender on the evaluation of sermons. These researchers speculated that individuals would more highly rate a sermon they believed to be written by a man than a sermon they thought was written by a woman. To prove their hypothesis, they asked subjects to read a sermon and rate it on various elements including creativity, interest, inspiration, and relevance to life. They told half the subjects the writer was female and the other half the writer was male. Further, they told half of each of the two groups that the writer was a recent Seminary graduate, while the other halves were told the writer had been in ministry for twenty years.[94] The groups themselves were composed of a range of students attending Christian universities.

The authors' original hypothesis that gender would be a determining factor in sermon evaluations did not prove to be the case as literally as they expected. Instead, a more complex relationship seemed to affect how readers rated the sermons. In the first case, status appeared to play a bigger role in evaluation; low-status (recent graduates) were graded more positively than higher-status authors. However, the lowest ratings came from male subjects on their evaluation of sermons they believed to be written by females of high status (those with twenty years experience in ministry). Researchers concluded that "the most likely explanation is that women in positions of clear authority

(as a senior pastor would be) are seen as more inappropriately authoritative."[95] In other words, in this research the men did not seem to have an issue with the women's sermon until it appeared to come from a woman who was serving in a greater leadership role (that is, someone with twenty years experience).

Thus, while the idea of women in ministry may be slowly receiving more support in church communities (as many studies also illustrate), it is evident that barriers built by negative attitudes continue to affect women as they move into positions of greater leadership. This is further evidenced by the continued existence of what has been dubbed the "stained glass ceiling"- a metaphor meant to illustrate that women move "up" only so far in denominational and church settings and have difficulty moving into certain "elite" positions of leadership.[96] Nesbitt found that what was considered normative career attainment for male clergy (such as holding solo or senior pastorates), remained elite status for female clergy. Furthermore, evidence continues to show that even in those places where women do hold "elite" positions, they often do so in more symbolic ways, by fulfilling simply "ground-breaking" or "token" roles.[97] The majority of women clergy remain in associate, part-time, or voluntary positions.

The journey to ministerial leadership thus proves challenging to women. They face less encouragement than men when they are called, and upon completion of Seminary struggle with issues in finding placements that men do not experience in the same way. In leadership, they face more opposition because of their sex, and are less likely to move into "elite" positions of solo pastoring or denominational leadership. Finally, many women will also face systemic barriers in churches that simply do not allow women to serve in ministerial or leadership positions, or from churches that have

not reached a place where women are as likely as men to become church leaders. A look at the positions regarding women in leadership of many Canadian churches illustrates this point, and is the focus of the next section.

The Place of Women in Canadian Churches

In their churches, women in Canada will likely find themselves attending a church that holds one of the following three positions on women in pastoral leadership: (1) women are allowed to serve in all leadership positions, (2) women are allowed to serve in certain leadership roles (or in certain contexts), but not in others, or (3) women are restricted from serving in pastoral leadership. While we might assume that churches in the third category are most oppressive to women, women continue to face numerous barriers in each of these church contexts, which will be each discussed in turn.

In those churches that do ordain women, male clergy still significantly outnumber female clergy in most cases. In the case of the United Church, for example, long known for being "progressive" in this area, the ratio of male to female leaders still remains three to one.[98] In the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, a church that has claimed to be open to the ordination of women since 1947, only 10% of its ordained pastors are women, despite a high percentage of female graduates from its Seminary in recent years.[99] Even in a denomination where female clergy often outnumber male clergy, the Salvation Army, subtle forms of inequality still linger. In this denomination, which fully supports the equal participation of women and has had women serve in its highest office, ordained clergy are required to be married to another clergyperson of the denomination. Hence, officers (clergy) are most often appointed to positions together as a couple. When

the position involves an appointment to denominational leadership, the man will most often (there have, in fact, been few exceptions to this case) receive the official title, while his wife is given the "assistant" role (for example, the Divisional Secretary, and the Assistant Divisional Secretary). Women who have served in especially high positions without the designation of "assistant" in this denomination have usually been single. Thus we see that even in egalitarian denominations, women continue to find themselves in the minority in many ways when it comes to church leadership.[100]

Other churches in Canada grant women privileges while putting certain restrictions on particular roles, an act that can prove especially hurtful to women serving in such churches. For example, the Christian and Missionary Alliance clearly states on its website that women cannot serve as ministers or as elders, believing that the church should "submit to a male as its head."[101] However, there remains freedom in some cases for a local church to decide as a body to allow female elders. While this may seem like a progressive stance to take, such conflicting messages about women's role can be equally frustrating for women longing to serve in the church. As one woman (who has received recognition as an "official worker" in the Alliance Church, allowing her to perform marriages and other official ministry functions) put it to me: "It's not good enough to say to a church 'you can have a woman elder if you want;' until the denomination shows that it is truly behind this idea, no change will come. For those of us waiting for change, this is the hardest part." There are indeed a number of Canadian denominations that take similar stances to women in leadership. Many churches, for example, allow women to serve in Associate or directorship positions, but draw the line at allowing women to serve in a Senior Pastor role. Again, while these systems may operate under the guise of

granting women freedom, their continued restrictions send conflicting messages about the true place of women's giftedness in the church.

Finally, a significant number of Canadian churches continue to refrain from granting women official ordination to serve as pastoral leaders. To cite one very recent example, The Fellowship Baptist Church revised its bylaws this year to state that the "pastoral office" in their 400 congregations is open only to men, a vote which passed with a seventy-four percent majority.[102] Interestingly, the vote had failed to pass in the two previous conventions because a two-thirds majority had not been reached on the issue; thus, it would seem that in this denomination restrictive attitudes towards women have actually grown over the past three years. Unfortunately, many Protestant churches take similar stances towards women serving in ordained ministry.

When we look at the opportunities for women to serve in leadership in various Canadian contexts, we see that women continue to face unique challenges that are not faced by men on a structural level. It is clear that we are wrong to dismiss women's struggles in the Church as a "non-issue." As one colleague recently put it, sometimes, for women, it comes down to the simple concept of "privilege," which refers to the idea that men hold certain innate, and often undetectable privileges in the Church that are not shared with women. This woman summarized it well when she stated simply: "When someone asks a man what he is studying, he does not have to worry when he tells someone that he is going to be a minister that he will have to defend his choice based on his gender. This is a privilege that I do not have."

Messages We Send Our Daughters

Thus far we have illustrated that women face unique challenges as they move into leadership, and that, on systemic and practical levels, women are restricted from leadership in many church settings. However, when we consider how we talk to women about leadership, one particularly interesting area to explore involves the question of what we teach the next generation about women's roles in the Church. Even as women moving into Seminary or ordination face obstacles on their road to leadership, our Christian daughters also continue to receive messages that usurp the value of a female's leadership role.

Girls' lives are often defined and limited in non-egalitarian ways. Christian literature written for teenaged girls often encourages them to take submissive roles in their relationships with young men. For example, the recently developed "Revolve" New Testament – a Bible presented in magazine format for teenaged girls – makes the following statement in an advice section about why young men should be the initiators and leaders in romantic relationships:

> Get a grip on the truth. Guys love a challenge. They love the chase. The game. When a girl asks a guy out, he likes it. It stokes his ego. But he will get bored! And when that happens…next! So guys need to step up and be the man; you need to be the woman.[103]

The message sent to girls here is that men are only men if women remain passive.

Similarly, in his follow-up to his best seller "I Kissed Dating Good-Bye," Joshua Harris teaches young people looking to meet a mate "how to embrace your God-given role as man or woman." He encourages women to "practice mature femininity" by encouraging and making room for men to practice servant leadership. He writes:

> If a man's biggest temptation is to be passive, a woman's biggest temptation is to take control. The man isn't setting the course, so the woman grabs the steering wheel. It might fix things in the short term, but in the long run it only discourages men from playing their God-given role as initiators. You can encourage men to be men by refusing to do the work of leading for them...Sylvia gave me one example of how women can let men lead. "We ladies can be too quick to fill the silence in a conversation," she said. "We're like 'Oh no, he's not talking! I need to say something.' But I think it's important for us to let there be awkward moments of silence so the men can step up and lead the conversation.[104]

In this way, even in ordinary conversation, Christian women are encouraged to let men initiate and lead.

These examples do not talk about women serving as leaders in Church settings, but refer specifically to dating situations. Yet, we see how, even in this context, girls are encouraged to see themselves as passive followers. In this case, they are told that it is a sign of their femininity, and it is implied that boys will not like them if they act in any other manner! Thus, the idea that males should more naturally revert to a leadership role is passed on to a new generation of Christian young women. Many Christian cultures continue to oppress girls not simply by restricting leadership roles, but by teaching them that being passive in many settings is necessary for something as personal as finding a boyfriend, or even a mate. These lessons are ones that boys in the same phase of life do not hear. If boys read literature such as that cited above, they are in fact encouraged to accept greater leadership as a key to success in their personal life, while girls are granted still another mental obstacle to overcome if they are to embrace the potential for their own leadership gifts in the Church. Thus, we send messages to our daughters that men ought to lead, while women should not.

The Silencing of Women and Girls

The leadership dilemma is just one way in which women continue to face oppression in many church settings. However, even for those women who do not aspire to serve in leadership, the messages sent about women's roles in the Church can hurt women in other ways. For example, one study found that women who valued feminism were likely to experience dissonance in their church experiences, leading to lower measures of church attendance, prayer, and reported nearness to God.[105] The researchers suggested this illustrates that a disconnect occurs for many women who value egalitarianism; they cannot reconcile their desires with their church experience and that disjuncture hurts their spiritual lives in a tangible way. This again challenges the Church to consider how well egalitarianism is being lived out in many church settings. Therefore, we cannot assume that Susan and Karen will be able to be content with their restriction from leadership for the rest of their lives.

The language the Church uses can also prove powerful in its message. Consider, for example, the World Council of Churches' theme for the 1990s: "The Church in Solidarity With Women." McKinnish Bridges well articulates the hurtful nuances of this seemingly positive slogan:

> Are women not considered a part of the Church so that the Church would have to make a point in their public slogan to identify them in relationship to the Church, as if they are a separate entity apart from the Church? Was this seemingly innocent theme revealing the stark and sad reality that the Church truly did not consider women as part of the body of Christ?[106]

Again, even in these subtle ways we continue to oppress women by sending messages of their difference, their "strangeness" in the Church. Women continue to be, somehow, a group onto themselves when it comes to leadership, teaching, and Church structure.

However, it is perhaps the idea, already discussed, of the "ideal" women, continually propagated in many churches as passive, docile, and collectively submissive to male authority that is of most danger to women. In the Church and in society at large, girls and women are taught to silence themselves.[107] Further, as illustrated in the study mentioned earlier about those in favour of women in leadership voting against women in order to avoid conflict in their churches,[108] there is a sense that church harmony ought to take priority over the "fight" for women's equality in the Church. Thus, even as women are labeled as a "separate" issue, when it comes to challenging their need for equality, the Church does not seem willing to fight for their unique cause. Take for example, a recent article that discussed the various positions people may take on women in leadership. Position A rejects women in leadership and is angry that anyone suggests otherwise; position B rejects women in leadership, but recognizes that people hold different opinions; position C believes that women can lead, but does not make acceptance of women in leadership an absolute necessity; position D believes that women should lead and enforces this viewpoint.[109] Interestingly, although his entire article illustrates women's rightful place to leadership in the Church, the author argues that positions B and C are the most useful, and suggests that he would be "much more comfortable with Bs than with Ds."[110] He argues that peacemaking is more important than equality for women. He writes: "[T]he issue of women's ordination is not like the evils of slavery or abortion, in which innocent victims have no recourse,"[111] but he fails to say why slavery differs from the oppression of women.

This article proves a telling example of the call to churches, and often women in particular, to put the "good of the Church" over their own feelings of injustice. I would

suggest, however, that this false dichotomy is not only inaccurate, but especially harmful to women. It not only ignores their role as victims of inequality, but also causes them to choose between living in an unequal position to being regarded as trouble-makers. In this way, the Church keeps women from living as equals, but also keeps them from challenging their position. This is perhaps the ultimate form of oppression: the continued teaching that the oppression of some must be accepted for the good of all. It is this culture that has shaped Karen and Susan, and persuaded them to be happy while living in contradiction

"How Are We Doing?"

As we close the chapter, we are forced to acknowledge that women in the Church continue to struggle to live as equals to men in many church settings. In terms of leadership, they face difficulties as they move into positions of ordained ministry, and experience further trials as they seek to serve as ministerial leaders. Also, many young girls are taught at an early age that leadership ought to be reserved for men. Finally, the Church continues to oppress many women by pitting a woman's fight for freedom against the good of the church community, thereby demonizing women who struggle for equality. When we ask, then, how the Church in general is doing with respect to egalitarianism, we might answer most simply by saying: "Not very well."

CHAPTER FOUR: DANGERS AND A STARTING PLACE

The previous chapter discussed the potential perils faced by women and girls who are part of the Church, and illustrated that, as a whole, the Church cannot yet be regarded as egalitarian when using the understanding of egalitarianism as discussed in chapters one and two. This brings us to the point in the argument where we might find ourselves asking, simply: "So what?" Does it matter if the Church is not egalitarian? If women and girls have a more arduous time serving as leaders, or seeing themselves as such, in the Church, do we need to be concerned about that? Some might argue that the Church has survived centuries as it is, while many would undoubtedly contend that a non-egalitarian system is the most ideal in the first place. However, I suggest that the continued oppression of women and girls in the Church must be regarded as a problem because it endangers Christian community in the following three ways: (1) it ignores the biblical mandate that men and women are to live as equals in the Church community, (2) it causes churches to miss out on the unique and valuable ways that women lead and share their giftedness and voice, and (3) it is hurtful to women and girls. After discussing these reasons, I will offer a perspective on how to move towards change, suggesting that we must begin by teaching our girls how to be egalitarian in order to create egalitarian communities.

Endangering Community

As mentioned, the egalitarian ideal for Christian community is endangered in three ways when women and girls are excluded from equal participation in Church life,

which will each be discussed in turn here. The first harm to Christian community is that non-egalitarian views and practices ignore the biblical mandate for egalitarianism.

As argued in the first chapter, the Bible clearly calls us to treat women and men equally. It further teaches that the Church is to allow all its members to exercise their various gifts as God has called them. On the most basic level, then, a church that does not afford the same privileges to women as it does to men shows a blatant disregard for Scriptural teachings. Although many churches that do so would maintain that their oppressive practices stem from their desire to honour the teachings of Scripture, in many of these cases improper exegesis or patriarchal tradition has led to gender biased readings of many texts that are actually texts of liberation. As churches, we must return to a place where we seek to live out the Bible's call to equality for all God's followers. When we fail to do so, we ignore the biblical mandate that does, indeed, appeal for equal treatment of men and women.

The second harm caused to community occurs when women's gifts and voices are dismissed. Throughout my argument, I emphasize that equality does not mean sameness. Thus, while women and men are created equal, there still remain many differences between the two sexes, both in areas of giftedness (the special abilities and capacities that God has granted) and expression of "voice" (the unique way that women express themselves based on their experience of the world). The Bible does not suggest at any time that men and women were created as androgynous creatures with no differentiation between them. Further, processes of socialization cause men and women to develop their gifts and find their "voices" in ways that differ drastically from each other. It is useful to

expand on this idea as we explore the unique contributions women can make as leaders to their church environments because of the gifts and voice they bring.

Gilligan argues that boys are socialized towards independence, while girls are socialized towards relationship and connection.[112] Therefore, while separation and individuation are critically tied to the male gender identity, the female identity is more founded on connection and intimacy. These differences, according to Gilligan, develop early and lead to a stronger ethic of care on the part of many women as compared to men. She writes: "Women not only define themselves in a context of human relationship, but also judge themselves in terms of their ability to care."[113] Women, therefore, seek to create a world where people will not be hurt and where relationships will be maintained. Much of their decision making will be based on these agendas, as they continue to define their own identity in the context of relationship. Further, there is a sense for many women that the attainment of power entails the loss of their femininity and compassion.[114] In summary:

> Male and female voices typically speak of the importance of different truths, the former of the role of separation as it defines and empowers the self, the latter of the ongoing process of attachment that creates and sustains the human community.[115]

For women and girls, failure equals the loss of connection with other people. Therefore, according to Gilligan, women speak of their world with "a different voice."

In *Women's Ways of Knowing,* the authors expand on the concept of voice as Gilligan describes it, pointing to five stages of development that women might experience as they acquire the ability to recognize and speak in their own voice.[116] These stages of development end with the ideal of integration, the phase during which women are able to integrate the voices of others, themselves, and objectivity to form a voice that

is their own. Like Gilligan, these authors argue that, "connected knowing comes more easily for women than separate knowing."[117] In other words, women make sense of their world best through their relationships with others.

The results of these developmental differences between women and men clearly lead to different ways of experiencing and knowing the world for women. Storkey, for example, argues that women show greater connectedness in their lives, and are more willing to show vulnerability.[118] Tannen highlights the difference in men's and women's conversational styles, maintaining that women's desire for connection leads to communication patterns that reflect this need (for example, by looking for points of connection to a speaker or by elaborating on the points of a speaker instead of challenging them), while men more often communicate in a way that looks to maintain different relational priorities.[119]

Given these deeply significant differences in the way they experience themselves and the world, it is logical to conclude, then, that women will often lead differently than will men. Few who dispute the place of women in leadership in churches contend this fact; however, many have traditionally used this point to argue that women should not lead because their styles and methods are inferior to men. Indeed, women's ways of experiencing the world have long been undervalued in our society, and in our churches. Yet, as Tannen argues in reference to communication styles, difference need not imply the superiority of one system over another.[120] Thus, in the same way that I would not suggest a male method of leading is "better" than a woman's, I do not suggest here that women's styles of leadership are better than men's. However, at this point it is useful to discuss the valuable methods of leadership that women have to offer as a result of their

relational focus that are missed when churches choose to keep women from exercising their giftedness in this area. Indeed, women have the potential to bring an incredible sense of care and interpersonal connection to leadership positions in our churches that provide for an increased capacity to remain connected to one another.

It is inaccurate to argue that women are inferior leaders.[121] In many cases in modern business, for example, woman leaders are proving to be effective in our current society. Helgesen has argued that women's styles of leadership include the following principles: caring, making intuitive decisions, not getting hung up on hierarchy, putting labour where one's love is, being responsible to the world in how one uses profits, and "recognizing that the bottom line should stay there - at the bottom."[122] She found that women lead from what she calls a "web of inclusion," in which they remain at the centre instead of ruling from the top down. Further, women focus on "voice over vision" - empowering and strengthening others through skillful listening, collaborative negotiation and less emphasis on competition in order to prioritize the development of a group.[123] It is these traits, Helgesen argues, that make women leaders the key to future success in business. She argues that, in business, "we cannot afford *not* to use women."[124]

In another marketplace study, Rosener concluded that women leaders tended to share power and information, strove to enhance the self-worth of others, and had the ability to energize others.[125] This, she argued, was further recognized as necessary for effective leadership in the developing business world, which is moving from a system of hierarchy to a system of collaboration. Glaser and Steinberg-Smalley agree, arguing that effective leaders ought to function as "dolphins" instead of "sharks," that is, as people who empower, motivate, and encourage others instead of people who look to lead

through fear or coercion. They suggest women more naturally function as "dolphins" than do many men.[126]

The interpersonal leadership styles that women have exhibited in the marketplace are also valuable to the Church. Research shows that women in the Church lead in more personal ways. Lehman found that, at the senior pastor level, men were more likely to use coercive power over the congregation, to seek positions of formal authority, and to manifest ethical legalism than were women in similar positions who used a more personal and congregationally empowering style.[127] Nason-Clark also found that women in church leadership tended to emphasize people and relationships in church life, while encouraging their congregation to participate in planning and decision making. She further maintained that women's skills in counseling and their unique forms of preaching also lead to their effectiveness as ministers.[128]

Indeed, women have gifts to bring to leadership roles in the Church that are missed when women are restricted from fulfilling certain roles in church life. While it would be incorrect to argue that these ways of leadership are better than those that are more traditionally associated with "male" forms of leadership,[129] it is clear that the empowering and motivating leadership style of many women is not only a valid form of leadership, but often one that is necessary in many church situations. There is a danger, then, in non-egalitarian church communities of missing the useful and valuable styles of leadership and know-how that women can bring to the community dynamic.

Finally, non-egalitarian practices harm community because of the specific hurt that they cause to women and girls. While some might contend that many women are happy in church settings where women, according to the discussion thus far, would be

labeled oppressed, I want to argue that women and girls are often negatively influenced by the impact of non-egalitarian communities, sometimes without even realizing it.[130] Indeed, I maintain that when messages are sent to women and girls that certain roles are unavailable to them on the sole basis of their gender, we not only undermine their sense of worth, but their sense of value in the Kingdom of God. This can create confusion for women in their experience of the Divine, and in the dissonance that can then be found to result in their day-to-day lives.

Brasher, for example, studied the religious experience of women in churches that did not allow women to serve in any public leadership capacity over men. This meant that in gatherings of their full communities, they saw only men speaking and leading from the front. However, as is often the case in such settings, these women did serve in a "parallel symbolic world" in which women formed the totality of the group and served as its leaders. In this study, women reported that their greatest religious experiences came from these "separate" (women's only) events, and that they felt marginalized in the Sunday morning gatherings, where they reported the fewest positive religious experiences. The location of their hindered religion experience was a setting in which women did not take a public role. These same women developed a sense of separation from their broader church communities that led Brasher to conclude that the churches "shortchanged female believers."[131] The women, whose only positive experiences of God were in times of critical breaks with the broader community, experienced "remarkably individualistic interpretations of faith."[132] The walls created by gender divisions in the churches led to "schism in congregational activities, providing men and women with variant circumstances of religious life."[133] This study teaches two lessons about the

dangers of non-egalitarianism. First, it shows that women, in a tangible way, may not connect to worship experiences that exclude women in leadership. Further, it highlights the destructive ways that faith can be developed when women are forced to "separate" to find fulfilling spiritual experiences. It is tragic that women in this study, who so value community, were forced to understand their faith apart from it. Both of these results indicate the harm caused to women by gender biased church structure. This is not to say, however, that there is no place for women or girls only groups in churches, as will be discussed in depth in the next chapter. Instead, this study reminds us that women need also to experience faith in the broader church community in order for all female groups to provide healthy avenues for faith expression that do not become exclusive.

A second study also highlights the dangers of sending conflicting messages to our women and girls that limit their roles and/or freedom in our churches. In her review of eating disorders and self-mutilation as it exists among women, Polinska found that such behaviours throughout the history of the Church existed as "disguised protest against the dominant sex."[134] Further, the rate of eating disorders among women in the last century was at its highest during times of changing roles for women, which Polinska explains by maintaining that higher incidents of such behaviours result from women's sense of disconnect between message and experience. In other words, women struggle the most when they are encouraged to be all that they want to be, but find that in the "real world" they still face obstacles to living this reality out. Arguing that women's manipulation of their bodies is a result of the questioning of their roles in society, Polinska asserts that: "[T]he scarred, mutilated, and self-injured bodies [of eating disorder victims] are visual

reminders of the plea for women's self-determination and self-actualization that we no longer should avoid."[135]

What does this mean for the Church? I suggest that it reminds us of the hurt caused to women when we limit their roles while trying to send the message that they are equal. For example (as discussed in the last chapter), some churches claim to empower women because they offer leadership to women in all areas – *except* the position of senior pastor. These churches may feel they are doing "well" because they have afforded women many opportunities to lead. Polinska's study suggests, however, that this contradictory message of freedom and restriction is, in fact, particularly harmful. Telling women that their "equality" only goes "so far" into lived experience creates a dissonance for girls that is mentally, and, as Polinska argues, even physically, harmful.

When we consider the harm caused to women and girls by non-egalitarian practices, we must finally recognize that when women are restricted in the Church we take away one of the most important aspects of a woman's existence – her voice. As already illustrated, this development of "voice" is necessary for a healthy development self-concept and sense of worth. In *Women's Ways of Knowing,* the search for voice is described as the categorical search for self-worth and understanding. Yet, when women are forced to allow others to speak for them, their sense of voice is challenged.[136] Thus, women are "silenced," a process which leads to lower appreciation of the self. In the Church, this silencing process is often particularly tangible. In many settings, girls literally learn that women are not to speak. In settings where women may have more freedoms, there may still be a sense for many women and girls that they must choose between speech and community because being the "nag," or "the squeaky wheel" in a

church meeting can lead to disregard in the community. Losing a sense of voice is a hurtful phenomenon,[137] and one that is virtually unavoidable for women in churches that are not egalitarian.

Clearly, non-egalitarian church structures and teachings harm community through the hurt they cause to women and girls. To prove that this is true, we have only to look to our women and girls and the stories they have to tell about their experiences. We might talk to an old roommate of mine, who spoke about the first time she was challenged about women in church leadership as a teenager and came home crying. We might talk to a discouraged woman Seminarian who feels that her voice is not heard in her classes because of the patriarchal systems to which her classmates are accustomed. We can talk to countless women who have left the Church because of wounds inflicted on them in the name of "appropriate gender roles." Indeed, it would not be difficult to find many women who are able to articulate their sense of hurt and loss at the hands of the Church. Tragically, it would perhaps be even easier to talk to women who are happy in their church setting, but who have embraced a definition of themselves and their worth in the church that is so harmful that they do not even realize its continued impact on them. Indeed, the Church must recognize how it hurts its daughters when it continues to reject egalitarianism. One wounded woman writes: "A shadow still lingers over woman's full freedom in society until the Church blesses her by welcoming her daughters home."[138] As we move into a discussion of how to move from hurt to healing, I will suggest that it is with our daughters that the process of healing a fractured Church must begin.

The Place For Renewal: Girls in the Church

By now it is evident that the Church must begin to explore how to allow egalitarian communities to develop. We must recognize the damage that is being done and move to a place of egalitarianism in order to strengthen our churches through what women have to offer, and to prevent further harm from coming to women and girls in the name of church harmony. Of most importance, we must change how we function in order to honour God as revealed in Scripture, who modeled love, compassion, and empowerment for all people.

I suggest the best place to begin to create egalitarian communities is with young girls, specifically those girls who are in pre-adolescence and adolescence stages of development. This may seem an odd starting place. On one hand, some might suggest that we ought to start by educating our men and boys, who, as the dominant gender in many churches, are often the perpetrators of the oppressive systems we have described. In this instance, however, I believe we must leave the power for change in the hands of those who must embrace their own power. We cannot simply encourage men to grant women "permission" to finally lead as they feel called, but instead must look to the women, who make up over half of most of our churches, to say that they will no longer accept the patriarchal norm. Ehrenreich and English make a similar argument in their call for increased gender equality in broader society, writing: "It remains possible…to foresee part of the answer in the continued growth of women's influence – but only if women decide, in their journey to power, that the point is not merely to adapt to the world men made but to change it."[139] This does not suggest, of course, that the education of men and boys in our churches is unimportant in the move towards egalitarianism. Rather, I

suggest the female gender as the best starting place, since women must see themselves as agents of their own freedom.

Others might then ask why I would suggest we should start specifically with our girls, as opposed to our women. There are a number of reasons that I regard this time of life as a useful season for teaching in the area of empowerment and identity. Developmentally, early adolescence is a time of change emotionally and physically for young people. In particular, it proves to be a period of "gender intensification," when boys and girls will be pressured to adapt their various interests and concepts of themselves to certain gender expectations.[140] At the same time, this phase of life is replete with new questioning and self awareness; no longer does a young teenager, for example, simply want to hear the stories of the Bible – she also wants to understand how they relate to her own life.[141] Further, by early adolescence formal operations have not yet clearly developed; this means that young teenagers still see the world in black or white: they are "nerd" or "cool," "in" or "out."[142] People fit into clear, manageable categories.

In light of all this, it is evident that what a girl learns about her place in her church at this time proves particularly relevant. Abstract reasoning is not necessarily available for a girl to understand, for example, that she is valuable *in spite* of the fact that all those like her are not allowed in certain positions that she sees as important. If men are leaders, that category can be regarded as very concrete. This common way of thinking during early adolescence proves especially detrimental for girls, who also find themselves experiencing disconnection between what they have been taught and their real life experiences. Pipher explains this phenomenon in her book *Reviving Ophelia*, using several examples of what girls experience in Junior High. For example, while once told

that looks do not matter, they discover that guys prefer the pretty girls; while once taught that they could be anything they want, they discover that not everyone likes them for being ambitious.[143] According to Pipher, this disconnect between attitude and experiences leads to personal struggles for girls in the Junior High phase that can have a lifelong impact on how a woman will understand herself. This provides valuable insight into why we must begin a process with girls to help them embrace egalitarianism for the Church. If, while she is negotiating her role and identity in her church, a young girl experiences disconnection between what she is taught and her experiences (for example, she is taught that the church loves and values her gifts, but experiences that women are not allowed to serve as leaders and use their gifts), this can prove harmful for her future identity formation in the church.

When we consider, then, why we should start with girls as we strive towards egalitarian futures, it is evident that part of the reason stems from the fact that adolescence is a crucial time of self-development and understanding in a woman's life. It proves to be a useful window for helping girls negotiate a sense of themselves that can appropriately align with the biblical teachings of how God sees them in His Kingdom. In this way, we want to use this time to help girls see the strengths and values of being women. It is at this season that girls can shape identities that will embrace their strength and the unique gifts and abilities they can bring to their church environments.

Furthermore, it proves crucial during early adolescence for girls to become confident in using their voice; as Mikel Brown and Gilligan point out it is commonly during the process of adolescence that girls begin to "silence themselves." These researchers completed a longitudinal study in an all-girls school, during which they

interviewed girls as they progressed from the third grade up into Junior High. They found that adolescence was a "risky time for girls," a time when they began to refrain from speaking out, and started to rely more heavily on the voices of others to guide their own experiences of the world. They stated that pre-adolescence, specifically, marked the time when girls hit a sort of "wall" - when their sense of self suddenly came into question and they turned to others for definition.[144] In essence, the girls began to lose their voice. Teachers at the school supported this finding, reporting that they needed to make conscious decisions at this time to encourage girls to continue "speaking out" in classroom settings, even in this all female environment.

One of the important elements of egalitarian communities is that women and girls have a voice. In order to help women have a voice, it logically follows that it is wise to start by intercepting the "silencing" process at the time that it might typically begin. By beginning to teach egalitarianism with adolescent girls, we can hope to prevent the silencing of our girls so that they will grow into women who will continue to share their voices. This is a helpful first step towards egalitarianism.

The development of a woman's identity and ability to share her voice is powerfully formed during the pre-adolescent and adolescent years of her life. I want to contend, therefore, that it is at this phase that we can best empower girls to embrace an identity of strength and value that will enable them to expect equality in their churches. This is why we must choose girls as the starting place for our educational process.

A Starting Place for Egalitarian Communities

In this chapter, I have explored three reasons that non-egalitarianism in the Church is inappropriate: it ignores the biblical mandate for equality, it prevents the church from enjoying the useful ways in which women lead, and it hurts our women and girls in numerous ways. These dangers indicate that the Church must move towards creating egalitarian communities. To this end, I have suggested that the most effective way to begin the process of developing greater equality for men and women in our churches is to work with our young girls. As young adolescence proves a significant time of change and personal development for women, starting in this phase can allow us to help girls integrate a healthy concept of their roles in the Church that can carry them into adulthood. Particularly, by working with young girls, we hope to intercept the process whereby women's voices are silenced. As we move into the final chapter of this thesis, we are then left with the question towards which the entire project has moved: How will we do this? I will discuss an educational model for churches that I believe will help girls in our communities flourish into women who will seek to live out their giftedness without hesitation.

CHAPTER FIVE: TOWARDS EGALITARIAN FUTURES

The Church must be egalitarian. Thus far, I have illustrated that egalitarianism is a biblical mandate that ought to be followed in a way that honours the experience of women as equals in all aspects of Church life. Unfortunately, the Church has yet to arrive at a place where women are entirely free from oppression. This is detrimental for all members of our Church community, but remains particularly harmful for our women and girls. Therefore, action needs to be taken to ensure that the Church will move towards egalitarianism for all its members. To this end, I have suggested that we begin an educational process with young girls, so that more women will grow up to assume roles as leaders in our various church communities. This, I believe, moves the Church one step closer to the egalitarian mandate outlined in Scripture.

How, then, do we educate girls so that they will be empowered to move towards leadership? Before exploring any type of educational model, it is important to consider the ultimate goals of the educational system itself. Ultimately, the goal in this case is to help promote egalitarianism, or, more appropriately, godly communities in which all people can function as God has enabled them to do. This leaves us with the question of what girls need specifically in order to embrace egalitarianism on a personal level. On one hand, girls must be able to develop an appropriate understanding of their own place in the Kingdom of God. This includes two elements: (1) girls must understand that they are equally made in the image of God, and (2) girls must understand the ways in which the new creation enables them to participate fully in the Kingdom of God as lived on earth. Our ultimate desire, therefore, must be to create communities whereby girls are confident in their equality in creation, salvation, and, finally, participation. Thus, our

goal is not to educate girls as to how to be leaders *per se*, as much as it is to educate them not to tolerate restriction from leadership, or any other role that they might feel called to fill in their congregations.

When we consider what this education ought to look like, we need to remember that girls learn and develop in particular ways so that certain methods of education will be more useful than others for them to learn effectively. For example, girls require confirmation and community in an educational setting, and look for a point of connection in their educational experiences.[145] They are less receptive than their male counterparts to methods of instruction that are competitive in nature, or that create a sense of uncertainly about one's own knowledge.[146] Belenky et al, therefore suggests that the education of women and girls ought to begin with what they as students know, instead of with what teachers know. They agree with Paulo Freire's critique of the "banking" method of education, in which teachers "fill" student's heads with deposits of information that the students are then supposed to store, as a useful method for teaching girls. Indeed, "one-directional" styles of teaching (teacher to student, with little interaction) are less effective for women.[147] Thus, an educational model that will teach and empower our girls need not be focused on traditional classroom settings with a teacher instilling information into his or her students' heads. Other methods of education may prove far more effective. In citing her goals for what she calls "democratic education," Hooks reminds us that "teachers who have a vision of democratic education assume that learning is never confined solely to an institutionalized classroom."[148] There are many ways through which we can teach our girls that may differ in some ways from traditional education models. As we consider how to educate our girls, we are well advised to create

educational opportunities that are encouraging, participatory, and focus on connection with girls as learners.

Therefore, I propose that churches adopt an educational model that relies on the following two components: modeling and mentoring. In this context, I use the term modeling to refer to actions whereby the whole community is invited to observe a way of community experience that honours all members. Mentoring is a more intentional process that allows girls to negotiate their ideas and personal development through interaction and relationship with various women and girls in their lives. Each of these educational elements is important. I contend that the integration of an educational model that focuses on these two processes into a church's life will help construct a community where girls are empowered and encouraged to serve in leadership roles, thereby helping to create communities that are more egalitarian. The remainder of this chapter will explore the components of this model in greater detail.

Modeling: Creating Community By Being Community

The term modeling, as used here, refers to the attempt of communities to teach egalitarianism through their actual living of it. I contend that churches need to model egalitarianism in two specific ways: (1) through the language they use, and (2) through their placement of women in key leadership positions. Each of these actions work together to model a community that shows that women are valued and respected in the Church as equals. This not only sends powerful messages to girls about their potential in a church setting; it also helps to build congregations into communities of equals. An in depth discussion of each of these areas helps to illustrate this point.

Modeling Through the Use of Inclusive Language

Modeling equality begins with the use of inclusive language in all areas of congregational life. This includes how we use language in the pulpit, in small group teaching settings, in liturgy, and even in church bulletins. Ought we to be surprised, after all, if a girl sees leadership as a male role if all illustrations she hears about leaders or pastors in sermons refer to these people as men? Should it shock us to learn that a girl has a reduced sense of the value of her own worth in God's Kingdom if she only hears that "God came to save all *man*kind?" Even these subtle ways of speaking of ministry in gender exclusive terms can send discreet messages that participation in God's Kingdom and in church communities is limited to the male members of the congregation. Schussler-Fiorenza proposes an example to illustrate the power of language that reverses the general tendency of male-dominated language in order to make this point. In reference to a fictitious University's religion department she writes:

> All language in [the University] has a distinctly feminine character. "Womankind" means all humanity; "women" as a generic word includes men (Jesus came to save all women). If a professor announces a course on "the doctrine of women" or speaks about the "motherhood of God" she of course does not want to exclude men.[149]

When read in this context, it might seem far easier to understand the power of language in how we represent God's Kingdom. Hearing only female language used to speak of God and our faith experiences highlights the ways language can leave a group feeling excluded.

The exclusive use of male language and pronouns to speak of God can also negatively shape a girl's perception of her place in a church setting. Johnson writes: "[T]he way in which a faith community shapes language about God implicitly represents

what it takes to be the highest good, the profoundest truth, the most appealing beauty. Such speaking, in turn, powerfully molds the corporate identity of a community and directs its praxis."[150] This is a crucial truth to remember as one considers how Church language impacts what our girls, and our entire communities, will learn about God. Indeed, to use language in such a way that we suggest God is exclusively male can damage a girl's sense of her own participation in the Divine. The idea that God is exclusively male is itself ridiculous, since God is beyond gender in the sense of how we conceive of the term. Further, Johnson writes: "Sexist God language undermines the human equality of women made in the Divine image and likeness. The result is broken community, human beings shaped by patterns of dominance and subordination..."[151] According to Johnson, the use of an exclusively male image to speak of God fails both human beings and divine mystery;[152] by ignoring the many traditionally "feminine" components of God's character, we dismiss entire elements of God's character and suggest an exclusivity in the nature of God that is simply not accurate.

Therefore, using female pronouns, metaphors and images to speak of God in the pulpit, liturgy, and other teaching settings presents the entire community with a fuller picture of God[153] and allows girls to embrace more completely their own creation in God's likeness. This ability on a girl's behalf to see herself as being made in the image of God, it will be recalled, was one of the first crucial goals towards helping girls conceive of the Church as egalitarian. The Church must use egalitarian language in how it speaks of ministry and how it speaks of God in order to facilitate healthy perceptions of God and self on the part of all members of the Church community. Schussler Fiorenza refers to this as the call for "equal participation in the Divine."[154]

The modeling of inclusiveness through language also involves the use of female examples in Church history. For example, in some churches it is possible to go months without hearing a sermon based on a female biblical or historical character. Listening to sermons repeatedly about male followers can keep girls from seeing their own selves in the history of the Church.[155] While it may be more difficult due to previous patriarchal realities to find cases or illustrations of women followers, the attempt to include such stories equally in sermons and teachings provides girls the opportunities to see themselves in stories of the faith. Preachers and teachers must create opportunities to teach about women such as Esther, Chloe or Priscilla. Illustrations from the lives of women saints or modern day female leaders also help to model egalitarian values. Stories of women such as Sojourner Truth (an early campaigner for suffrage and racial equality based on Scripture) have as much to teach the Church about God and the life of Christianity as the stories of Jim Elliott or Charles Spurgeon.

Modeling egalitarianism through the language we use teaches girls that they participate equally in the Divine, and also allows them to see themselves as potential participants in a myriad of ministry settings. Hooks contends that this is also the mark of a democratic educator, who seeks to renew education from its potentially oppressive practices.[156]

Modeling Through the Placement of Women in Leadership Positions

We must also model egalitarian communities by allowing women to serve in leadership positions. In Chapter Two, we discussed Freidan's important realization that

the modeling of choices is as important as the attainment of potential freedom for women to feel able to move beyond traditional positions of service defined by their gender. As was discussed, she argued that many of the women of the 1960s, who had been granted incredible new choices and freedoms to explore any field of life or work, chose traditional roles because they simply had no others modeled for them. After all, while a woman may be free to be a pilot or a C.E.O, will she pursue this career path when she has so few examples of women who have done it successfully?

Similarly, in the Church, girls need to have leadership by women modeled to them as a viable choice if they are to grow up believing that they, too, could be leaders. It is not enough to simply *tell* girls they can be leaders; they must have reasonable examples presented to them to illustrate that this possibility is indeed open to them. As Chase writes: "By definition, liberation allows choices."[157] Ensuring that we have women serving in a variety of leadership settings in our current church communities allows girls to see leadership as a viable choice for them in their own futures in the Church. Polinska argues that the encouragement of leadership among women also helps girls with their sense of self-actualization and creates healthy spaces for girls in our churches. [158] Seeing women in leadership allows girls to participate in environments free from the dichotomy between potential freedom and actual oppression that they often experience in broader society.

Furthermore, the use of women in leadership helps to model to the whole congregation that women are capable and called to fulfill a variety of roles. It is often not until congregations see an effective woman serving in ministry that they develop increasingly positive attitudes towards women leaders.[159] For example, I have talked with

a number of individuals who have argued that women should not preach because they have never heard a good woman preacher. Interestingly, I have found in almost all these cases that their experience of *any* female preachers has been minimal to nonexistent. In these cases, these people will need to see an effective woman preacher in order to shift some of their biased attitudes. Indeed, many with preexisting negative attitudes towards women in ministry will often change their minds after they have experienced a women's leadership in their church.[160] In this way, the modeling of women in leadership can build positive attitudes towards this idea not only among girls, but among those with whom our girls interact in their church homes.

The value of modeling women in leadership is so powerful that Schussler-Fiorenza argues that women's ultimate aspiration in each of their communities must be to the highest rung of their ecclesial ladders, contending that the participation of women in all forms of leadership is necessary for churches to accept women in Church leadership.[161] She maintains that it is only when, for example, women serve as Bishops in the Catholic Church that women will truly be regarded as equals in that setting. This reminds us once again of the dangers of allowing women in some roles in our churches to the exclusion of others. Girls can truly begin to see that all doors are open to them in the Church when they see women serving in any of the positions that are possible in that setting.

Through modeling the Church helps to create a "community of equals," a place where freedom and liberation for all members become the core values of those who participate in our various congregations. By seeing equality lived out and modeled as part of the community experience, girls start to be able to see themselves as leaders of the

future. Modeling, therefore, is a foundational part of an educational process that teaches girls to live in egalitarian communities. The second key element of this educational paradigm is mentoring, a concept to which we now turn.

Mentoring: Teaching Equality Through Relationship

Mentoring involves the building of relationships; this proves relevant as girls develop and learn best in the context of relationship. This developmental reality has been substantiated by numerous psychologists and sociologists who recognize that girls value intimacy and connection as they negotiate their way into adulthood. For girls, "connected knowing comes more easily to women than separate knowing."[162] Therefore, an educational paradigm that helps to empower girls must rely heavily on intentional relationship in various forms. Mikel Brown and Gilligan contend that there is incredible need for adolescent girls to experience relationship during this time of transition with those that model "non-silencing" behaviours[163] (the willingness to speak out and share voices, opinions, and perceptions). They suggest that it is ultimately through their relationship with older, strong, women that girls learn to use their voice and refrain from silencing themselves, as is often common during the teen years. As we strive to empower our girls in the Church, it is our desire also to help girls keep and use their voices in our congregations. Therefore, an educational paradigm that helps to empower girls must rely heavily on the type of relationships that Brown and Gilligan suggest. This type of relationship is best described as mentoring.

Echevarria describes youth mentoring as external support from a non-parental role model, and argues that this is essential for the healthy development of young girls.[164]

Mentoring helps girls form support systems and learn how to form healthy relationships; it gives girls people to look up to, learn from, and share life with outside of the parent-child system. Mentors model healthy behaviour for those who look up to them, but do so in more deliberate ways than simple general modeling behaviours imply. Mentoring, however, occurs in many different ways.

Philip and Hendry list five types of mentoring that young people experience. They broaden the definition of mentoring to include "the processes by which young people feel they have been supported and challenged by individuals or groups in making the transition to adulthood."[165] Thus, mentoring includes:

- Classic mentoring – a one-to one relationship between an adult and a young person where the older, experienced mentor provides support, advice and challenge
- Individual-team mentoring, in which a group looks to an individual or small number of individuals for support advice and challenge (for example, a youth pastor)
- Friend to friend mentoring - mentoring for those distrustful of adults where they have a safe ground for disclosure
- Peer group mentoring, where an ordinary friendship takes on a mentoring role at specific times
- Long term mentoring with "risk taking" adults, which is similar to classic mentoring but usually involves a more "at risk" adult who is perceived as challenging social norms.

Philip and Hendry found that while all young people in the sample they studied stressed the importance of long-term relationships where trust was assured, the process of mentoring was much more significant for girls than for boys.[166] They write: "The process of mentoring appeared to be highly gendered: young men were less likely to identify mentoring or the need for mentoring as salient in their lives."[167] Furthermore, girls most often cited individual-team mentoring and friend-to-friend mentoring as the most valuable in their lives, while the "classic" mentoring model (one older individual regularly connecting to one younger individual) was generally best received by boys. The researchers found that "for young women in this study, elements of mentoring were highlighted within overlapping groups of relationships."[168]

This supports the suggestion of many authors who maintain the importance of allowing girls to learn in groups with other girls. Schussler-Fiorenza, for example, calls for "liberated zones" to explore feminist community, suggesting that the only way that women will experience true freedom is by joining together to explore the "ekklesia of women."[169] Johnson also foresees the value of bringing women together in a "solidarity of sisters" to discuss their shared experiences.[170] The logic of learning together for girls is unquestionable. Thus, I suggest that an educational model that teaches girls to be egalitarian is well advised to include the development of all girl networks under the leadership of a trusted and valued woman, following the individual-team mentoring style (as described by Philip and Hendry).

Many are uncomfortable with these suggestions, because it seems to imply the need for segregated learning.[171] This, however, is not the contention here. I would argue that mixed groups are still of importance for general teachings and for community within the

church. However, there is value in giving girls a time set apart to explore their experiences of being female and being part of the Church *in addition* to mixed-gendered community settings. As Philip and Hendry suggest, girls respond well to mentoring in which one female is leading a group of girls. In this way, girls are encouraged to learn and discuss with a woman they trust and admire, in the context of relationships with others. Furthermore, girls groups are valuable for helping girls develop their voice. Tannen illustrates this point in her analysis of how men and women experience both mixed and segregated groups. She argues that while men will often maintain that mixed groups differ little from all male groups, women find great differences between mixed groups and all women groups. She concludes that both groups are right. In other words, mixed groups will more often revert to functioning like all-male groups, so that the experience of women in all female groups is markedly different, and often more valuable to them, than their experience in groups of mixed genders.[172]

Developing all-female mentoring groups allows girls to experience two healthy types of mentoring as outlined by Philip and Hendry: Friend to Friend mentoring (in which peers mentor and support each other) and Individual-Team mentoring (in which one trusted adult mentors a group). This proves valuable on two levels. It honours the fact that girls learn best in relationship, and it also utilizes the two mentoring styles which Philip and Hendry found best resonated with young women. How such groups look might vary. Churches may choose to form a weekly "Girls Group" where girls join together for discussion, Bible study, or simple socializing time. Less structured models may involve more ad hoc encounters such as all girls sleepovers or an occasional "girls night out." In each case what is important is that the leader be intentional about building relationships

between the girls and herself, while encouraging the development of the relationships between the girls among themselves. I would further argue that looking for opportunities in these meetings to discuss issues relevant especially to girls in the Church proves of value, in order to provide a safe place for girls to explore their identity development in this context.

In suggesting the formation of these groups, I do not advocate that girls must be separated from the community for all effective learning. It can, in fact, prove detrimental to create an environment where girls feel they can only experience God when separated from the broader church context.[173] Instead the community needs to work as a whole to model egalitarianism to our girls, while also allowing them outlets to work together as their own group with a respected leader in a mentoring capacity. In these groups, mentoring takes place not only from the leader to the girls, but also from the girls to one another as they continue to negotiate what it means to be females in their own congregations.

Mentoring remains an essential component in the educational process. We cannot underestimate the value of having someone to look up to in a setting where freedom seems unlikely. As Hooks writes about her experience with black students: "When I interview black students and scholars who have achieved academic excellence, against the odds I almost always hear stories of the caring professor who functioned as a supportive mentor figure."[174] Mentoring, in all its forms, teaches that there is possibility in situations where this may not seem to be the case. This is why it remains the second of two key components in an educational model that seeks to empower girls in our churches.

Conclusion: Towards Egalitarian Futures

Deuteronomy 6:6-7 reads: "These commandments that I give to you today are to be upon your hearts; impress them on your children." We are called as a Church to educate our young towards what their future must be. When we acknowledge that we need to move towards egalitarianism in our church communities, we understand why it is so important to begin by teaching our young women how they ought to function in the Kingdom of God. The call to model and mentor towards egalitarianism is not always easy to live out in praxis. Many preachers, myself included, would fear the reaction they might receive on a Sunday morning were they, for example, to refer to God using a feminine pronoun. I have worked with three pastors (all males) who are adamantly against the formation of all girls groups since they believe it breeds exclusivity. It may even be difficult in some church communities to find women who are willing or able to model or mentor in the way we have discussed here. There are indeed many battles left to fight, on both personal on systemic levels. Yet, for those of us who long for egalitarian futures, we know that our hope lies with our girls, who we long to see grow into strong women of God who will never doubt that they are welcome to enjoy equal participation in His Kingdom work, and who will pass this value on to the next generation.

I began by writing that this thesis was about women, girls, and the Church. It remains of course the last of these three, which of course includes the first two,that is ultimately of most importance here. This is why we affirm biblical equality as a means instead of an end. Vaters summarizes well:

> When we get to heaven there will be no inequality. But equality is not the goal of our work here on earth. It is a necessary means to another end. To discover what that "end" is we turn to Paul, who was a champion of biblical equality. Paul said in Ephesians 4:12-13 that the work of the church is "to prepare God's people for

> works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ."
>
> God's desire is that we work together in unity, doing works of service, so that we all become more like Jesus. Equality is not the focus of that, Christ is. Equality is a necessary tool in bringing this about. After all, the requisite unity cannot take place without everyone working to his or her full potential.[175]

We move towards egalitarian futures to deepen the experience of all believers of what Church can be. We start with our girls in order to build a whole generation of women who look forward to Church being experienced in this way. In all things, we look to Christ, whose grace enabled there to truly be "no male and no female" in the experience of His Kingdom.

Chapter One

[1] In this discussion, it is important to clearly define both "sex" and "gender." While the former refers to one's anatomical state, namely one is a "male" or a "female," gender is a psychological concept that refers to what it means to be a "man" or a "woman" in a sociological sense. See Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
[2] Stanley J. Grenz and Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church* (Downer's Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1995), 143.
[3] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 172.
[4] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 171.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Louis P. Pojman, "A Critique of Contemporary Egalitarianism: A Christian Perspective," *Faith and Philosophy* 8 (4) (1991): 481-503.
[7] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 158.
[8] Carolyn Osiek, *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 83.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 174.
[11] Ibid.
[12] D.M. Scholer, "Women," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels,* eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downer's Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1992), 880.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 74.
[17] Mary Coates, "Women, Silence, and Fear," *Women in the Biblical Tradition* (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 155.
[18] Winsome Munro, "Women Disciples: Light From Secret Mark," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 8 (1992): 225-41.
[19] Elizabeth Schussler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1983), 139.
[20] Winsome Munro, "Women Disciples in Mark?," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 233-6.
[21] Scholar, *Women,* 886.
[22] Ben Witherington, *Women and the Genesis of Early Christianity* (Cambridge: University Press, 1990), 7.
[23] Lesley Massey, *Women and the New Testament: An Analysis of Scripture in Light of New Testament Era Culture* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 1989), 48.
[24] Gordon Fee, "Gender Issues: Reflections on the Perspectives of the Apostle Paul," *Crux,* 35 (3) (1999): 40.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 83.
[27] Fee, *Gender,* 34.
[28] Fee, *Gender,* 35.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Pamela Eisenbaum, "Is Paul the Father of Misogyny and Antisemitism?" *Cross Currents* 50 (4) (2001): 515.
[31] F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1982), 189.
[32] Schussler-Fiorenza, *In Memory,* 211.
[33] Fee, *Gender,* 26.
[34] William O. Walker, "The "Theology of Woman's Place" and the "Paulinist" Tradition," *Semeia* 28(1) (1983): 111.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ben Wiebe, "Two Texts on Women (1 Tim 2:11-15; Gal 3:26-29): A Test of Interpretation," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 16 (1994): 60.
[37] Schussler-Fiorenza, *In Memory,* 227.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.

[40] Schussler-Fiorenza, *In Memory,* 232.
[41] Witherington, *Women,* 178.
[42] Fee, *Gender,* 42.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 1992), 101-121.
[45] Grenz and Kjesbo, *Women,* 102.
[46] Richard Clark Kroeger & Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking I Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 75
[47] Schussler-Fiorenza, *In Memory,* 236.
[48] Walker, *Theology,* 106.

Chapter Two
[49] Judith Grant, *Fundamental Feminism: Contesting the Core Concepts of Feminist Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 18.
[50] Miriam Schneir, "Introduction," In *Feminism: The Essential Historical Writings* (New York: Vantage Books, 1972), xi-xxi.
[51] Grant, *Fundamental,* 18.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Grant, *Fundamental,* 1.
[54] Jackie Stacey, "Untangling Feminist Theory," in *Thinking Feminist: Key Concepts in Women's Studies,* eds. Dianne Richardson and Victoria Robinson (New York: The Guilford Press, 1993), 51.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Grant, *Fundamental,* 2.
[57] Rosemarie Tong, *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1989), 195-233.
[58] Mary F. Rogers, *Contemporary Feminist Theory: A Text/Reader* (United States: McGraw-Hill, 1998), 4-6.
[59] Mary McClintock Fulkerson, "Feminist Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology,* ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 109.
[60] Barbara Smith, "Racism and Women's Studies" in *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studie,* eds. Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith (New York: The Feminist Press, 1982), 49.
[61] Stacey, *Untangling,* 50.
[62] Rogers, *Contemporary,* 4-6.
[63] Serene Jones, *Feminist Theory and Christian Theology: Cartographies of Grace* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 3-9.
[64] Grant, *Fundamental,* 20-23.
[65] Grant, *Fundamental,* 31.
[66] Grant, *Fundamental,* 33.
[67] Margaret Marshment, "The Personal is Political: Representation of Women in Contemporary Popular Culture," in *Thinking Feminist: Key Concepts in Women's Studies,* eds. Dianne Richardson and Victoria Robinson (New York: the Guilford Press, 1993), 124.
[68] Rogers, *Contemporary,* 29.
[69] Jones, *Feminist,* 71.
[70] bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 63, 98.
[71] Rogers, *Contemporary,* 32.
[72] Sandra Lee Bartky, "On Psychological Oppression," in *Contemporary Feminist Theory: A Text/Reader,* ed. Mary Rogers (United States: McGraw-Hill, 1998), 49.
[73] Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: W.W.Norton & Company, 1997), 30.
[74] Friedan, *Feminine,* 15-32.
[75] Rogers, *Contemporary,* 446.
[76] McClintock Fulkerson, *Feminist,* 119.
[77] Friedan, *Feminist,* 100.
[78] Friedan, *Feminist,* 101.

[79] In fact, during my second last semester of Seminary (Fall, 2004), a Professor made this exact statement while teaching a class.
[80] Friedan, *Feminist,* 101-102.
[81] Stanley J. Grenz and Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downer's Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1995), 167.

Chapter Three
[82] Nancy Nason-Clark, "Are Women Changing the Image of Ministry? A Comparison of British and American Realities," *Review of Religious Research* 28(4) (1987): 333
[83] Joy Charlton, "Women In Seminary: A Review of Current Social Science Research," *Review of Religious Research* 28(4) (1987): 308.
[84]Ibid.
[85] Or, as is the case for some denominations, finding a church placement in which they can be first ordained. In Baptists churches, for example, ministers are ordained in their first placement site. This means that women who cannot find a placement might further struggle in this context with the inability to be ordained after finishing their Seminary education.
[86] Edward C. Lehman, Jr., "Clergy Women's World: Musings of a Fox," *Review of Religious Research* 43(1) (2001): 10.
[87] Lehman, *Clergy,* 8.
[88] Edward C. Lehman, Jr., "Research on Lay Church Members Attitudes Toward Women Clergy: An Assessment," *Review of Religious Research* 28 (4) (1987): 321.
[89] Lehman, *Clergy,* 10.
[90] Paula D. Nesbitt, *Feminization of the Clergy in America: Occupational and Organizational Perspectives* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 58.
[91] Nason-Clark, *Women,* 332.
[92] Nason-clark, *Women,* 333-5.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Karol Maybury and Sarah Chickering, "The Influence of Pastor Status and Sex on Evaluations of Sermons," *Review of Religious Research* 42(4) (2001): 418.
[95] Maybury and Chickering, *Influence,* 421.
[96] Paula D. Nesbitt, "Gender, Tokenism, and the Construction of Elite Clergy Careers," *Review of Religious Research* 35(3) (1997): 194.
[97] Ibid.
[98] See www.united-church.ca
[99] Barbara Neal of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, interview by author, November 2004, Email.
[100] Having grown up in the Salvation Army church, this is a well-known fact. A look at the list of officers serving in Divisional or Territorial positions throughout Canada will illustrate this point. I am proud to say that the current Territorial Commander of the Salvation Army Canada and Bermuda Territory is a woman; however, like many before her in similar positions, she is unmarried.
[101] See www.cmacan.org.
[102] Bill Fledderus, "No Women Pastors, Says FEBC," *Faith Today* 23(1) (2005): 17.
[103] Kate Etue (Managing Editor), "Revolve: The Complete New Testament Version," (Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2003), 339.
[104] Joshua Harris, *Boy Meets Girls: Say Hello to Courtship* (Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Publishers, 2000): 117-8.
[105] Sherri Steiner-Aeschliman and Armand L. Mauss, "The Impact of Feminism and Religious Involvement on Sentiment Toward God," *Review of Religious Research* 37(3) (1996): 256-7.
[106] Linda McKinnish Bridges, "Women in Church Leadership," *Review and Expositor* 95 (1998): 328.
[107] Lyn Mikel Brown and Carol Gilligan, *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).
[108] Lehman, *Research,* 321.
[109] Bruce Baron, "Putting Women in Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 and Evangelical Views of Women in Church Leadership," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 33 (1990): 458-9.
[110] Baron, *Putting,* 459.

[111] Ibid.

Chapter Four

[112] Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 8.
[113] Gilligan, *Different,* 17.
[114] Gilligan, *Different,* 97.
[115] Gilligan, *Different,* 156.
[116] Mary Field Belenky, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck Tarule, *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986).
[117] Belenky et al., *Ways,* 229.
[118] Elaine Storkey, *Origins of Difference: The Gender Debate Revisited* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academy, 2001), 76 –78.
[119] Deborah Tannen, *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1990).
[120] Tannen, *You,* 20.
[121] Linda McKinnish Bridges, "Women in Church Leadership," *Review and Expositor* 95 (1998): 337.
[122] Sally Helgesen, *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership* (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 38-9.
[123] Helgesen, *Female,* 222, 243, 247, 255.
[124] Helgesen, *Female,* 255.
[125] As cited in McKinnish Bridges, *Women,* 338.
[126] Connie Glaser and Barbara Steinberg Smalley, *Swim with the Dolphins: How Women Can Succeed in Corporate America on Their Own Terms* (New York: Warner Books, 1995).
[127] Edward C. Lehman, Jr., "Gender and Ministry Style: Things Not What They Seem," in *Gender and Religion,* ed. William H. Swatos, Jr. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1993), 3-14.
[128] Nancy Nason-Clark, "Are Women Changing the Image of Ministry: A Comparison of British and American Realities," *Review of Religious Research* 38(4) (1987): 332-3.
[129] It should also be noted here that, while characteristics of male and female leaders may generally fit these categories, it is impossible to assume a leadership style of any individual based on their gender. As there will be women who certainly lead in what have been traditionally seen as "male" ways of leading, there will also be men who exhibit the leadership traits discussed here as associated with women. This discussion is simply meant to highlight the general traits that more often are connected to female leadership styles.
[130] This discussion aligns itself well with the point I made in Chapter Two about the Marxist concept of "false consciousness," which maintains that people can be oppressed without realizing it. In the same way, a person can be negatively influenced by a particular environment without realizing the negative impacts they are experiencing. Consider, for example, individuals who are not able to articulate the effect of a volatile family life on their childhood until they have grown and removed themselves from the situation.
[131] Brenda E. Brasher, "My Beloved is All-Radiant: Two Case Studies of Congregational-Based Christian Fundamentalist Female Enclaves and the Religious Experiences They Cultivate Among Women," *Review of Religious Research* 38(3)(1997): 240.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Brasher, *My,* 244.
[134] Wendy Polinska, "Bodies Under Siege: Eating Disorders and Self-Mutilation Among Women," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68(3) (2000): 579.
[135] Polinska, *Bodies,* 584.
[136] Lyn Mikel Brown and Carol Gilligan, *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 2.
[137] Mikel Brown and Gilligan, *Meeting.*
[138] McKinnish Bridges, *Women,* 330.
[139] Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre Walsh, *For Her Own Good: Two Centuries of the Experts' Advice to Women* (New York: Anchor Books, 2005), 362

[140] Monique Bologinini, Bernard Plancherel, Walter Bettschart, and Olivier Halfon, "Self-esteem and Mental Health in Early Adolescence: Developmental and Gender Differences," *Journal of Adolescence* 19 (1996): 234.
[141] Mary Manz Simon, *How to Parent Your Tweenager* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1995), 80.
[142] Mary Pipher, *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1994), 59.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Brown and Gilligan, *Meeting,* 161.

Chapter Five
[145] See Mary Field Belenky, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck, Tarule, *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986).
[146] Belenky et al., *Women's,* 197.
[147] Belenky et al., *Women's,* 214-217.
[148] bell hooks, *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 41.
[149] Elizabeth Schussler-Fiorenza, *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesia-logy of Liberation* (New York: Crossroad, 1993), 65.
[150] Elizabeth Johnson, *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999), 4.
[151] Ibid.
[152] Johnson, *She,* 36.
[153] A word of caution is useful as we make this point, however. While we want to use language that helps women and men understand the depth of God's character, and that allows women to recognize aspects of God that resonate with their experiences, we must also be careful in our various church environments to deal with the theological issues involved in using feminine language to speak of God. Just as referring to God exclusively as Father can create theological confusion, so can referring to God exclusively as Mother or She. Oftentimes, the use of such language will have to be incorporated slowly and presented in a way that explains fully the issues involved (for example, making clear that we do not see God as solely female). Recommending books such as "She Who Is" to interested church members may also help with this transition.
[154] Schussler Fiorenza, *Discipleship,* 11.
[155] Schussler Fiorenza, *Discipleship,* 9.
[156] hooks, *Teaching,* 45.
[157] Janet Chase, *Daughters of Change* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1981), 16.
[158] Wioleta Polinska, "Bodies Under Siege: Eating Disorders and Self-Mutilation Among Women," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68(3) (2000): 584.
[159] Edward C. Lehman, Jr., "Research on Lay Church Members Attitudes Toward Women Clergy: An Assessment," *Review of Religious Research,* 28(4) (1987).
[160] Edward C. Lehman, Jr., "Clergy Women's World: Musings of a Sly Fox," *Review of Religious Research,* 43(1) (2001): 12.
[161] Schussler-Fiorenza, *Discipleship,* 36.
[162] Belenky et al., *Women's,* 229.
[163] Lyn Mikel Brown and Carol Gilligan, *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 216.
[164] Pegine Echevarria, *For All Our Daughters: How Mentoring Helps Young Women and Girls Master the Art of Growing Up* (Worcester, MA: Chandler House Press, 1998), 7
[165] Kate Philip and Leo B. Hendry, "Young People and Mentoring – Towards a Typology?" *Journal of Adolescence* 19 (1996): 190.
[166] Philip and Hendry, *Young,* 199.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Schussler-Fiorenza, *Discipleship,* 344.
[170] Johnson, *She,* 63.

[171] This statement may also seem to contradict the study highlighted in Chapter Four (Brenda Brasher) that pointed to the dangers of all-female groups. As was pointed out at that time, however, it was not all female groups that were creating difficulties in that scenario. At issue was the fact that women in this context had come to believe that they *only* had authentic worship experiences in all-female groups, creating an unintentional sense of segregation from the community at large and distorted view of faith. The idea of using girl's groups in this context differs, since it is assumed that girls and women would still be in communities where they take part in mixed-gendered learning (which did not happen for the women in Brasher's study).

[172] Deborah Tannen, *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1990), 218.

[173] See Brenda E. Brasher, "My Beloved is All-Radiant: Two Case Studies of Congregational-Based Christian Fundamentalist Female Enclaves and the Religious Experiences They Cultivate Among Women," *Review of Religious Research* 38(3)(1997).

[174] hooks, *Teaching*, 89.

[175] Karl Vaters, "Seven Steps For Bringing Biblical Equality to Your Church," *Mutuality* Fall (2004): 20

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, Bruce. "Putting Women in Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 and Evangelical Views of Women in Church Leadership." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 33 (1990): 451-459.

Bartky, Sandra Lee. "On Psychological Oppression." In *Contemporary Feminist Theory: A Text/Reader,* ed. Mary Rogers, 43-52. United States: McGraw-Hill, 1998.

Belenky, Mary Field, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger and Jill Maltuck Tarule. *Women's Ways of Knowing: the Development of Self, Mind, and Voice.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986.

Bolognini, Monique, Bernard Plancherel, and Walter Bettschart. "Self-Esteem and Mental Health in Early Adolescence: Development and Gender Differences." *Journal of Adolescence* 19(3) (1996): 233-245.

Brasher, Brenda E. "My Beloved is All-Radiant: Two Case Studies of Congregational-Based Christian Fundamentalist Female Enclaves and the Religious Experiences They Cultivate Among Women." *Review of Religious Research* 38(3)(1997): 231- 246.

Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Galatians.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1982.

Carmody, Denise L. *Christian Feminist Theology.* Oxford: Bracwell, 1995.

Charlton, Joy. "Women In Seminary: A Review of Current Social Science Research." *Review of Religious Research* 28(4) (1987): 309-316.

Chase, Janet. *Daughters of Change: Growing Up Female in America.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1981.

Clark Kroeger, Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger. *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992.

Coates, Mary. "Women, Silence, and Fear." In *Women in the Biblical Tradition,* ed. George J. Brooke, 150-166. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

Cunningham, Loren and David Joel Hamilton. *Why Not Women?* Seattle: YWAM Publishing, 2000.

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex.* New York: Vintage Books, 1989.

Denfeld, Rene. *The New Victorians.* London: Simon & Schuster, 1995.

Echevarria, Pegine. *For All Our Daughters: How Mentoring Helps Young Women and Girls Master the Art of Growing Up.* Worcester, MA: Chandler House, 1998.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Deirdre English. *For Her Own Good: Two Centuries of the Experts Advice to Women.* Revised Edition. New York: Anchor Books, 2005.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. "Is Paul the Father of Misogyny and Antisemitism?" *Cross Currents* 50(4) (2001): 506-524.

Etue, Kate (Managing Editor). "Revolve: The Complete New Testament Version." Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2003.

Fee, Gordon. "Gender Issues: Reflections on the Perspectives of the Apostle Paul." *Crux* 35 (3) (1999): 34-44.

Fraser, Elizabeth, Jennifer Hornsby, and Sabina Loribond. *Ethics: A Feminist Reader.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Frieden, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Gillingan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Glaser, Connie and Barbara Steinberg Smalley. *Swim with the Dolphins: How Women Can Succeed in Corporate America on Their Own Terms.* New York: Warner Books, 1995.

Graham, Lisa. *Growing Strong Daughters: Encouraging Girls to Become All They're Meant to Be.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2000.

Grant, Judith. *Fundamental Feminism: Contesting the Core Concepts of Feminist Theory.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Grenz, Stanley J. and Denise Muir Kjesbo. *Women in the Church.* Downer's Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1995.

Groothuis, Rebecca Merrill. *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality.* Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997.

Harris, Joshua. *Boy Meets Girl: Say Hello to Courtship.* Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Publishers, 2000.

Helgesen, Sally. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership.* New York: Doubleday, 1990.

hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

Inness, Sherrie A. (ed.). *Millennium Girls: Today's Girls Around the World.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998.

Johnson, Elizabeth A. *She Who is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse.* New York: Crossroad, 1993.

Jones, Serene. *Feminist Theory and Christian Theology: Cartographies of Grace.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Keener, Craig S. *Paul, Women and Wives.* Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 1992.

Kingston, Anne. *The Meaning of Wife.* Toronto: Harper Collins Publishers, Ltd, 2004.

Kroeger, Richard Clark and Catherine Clark Kroeger. *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992.

Lehman, Edward C. Jr. "Clergy Women's World: Musings of a Fox," *Review of Religious Research* 43(1) (2001): 5-13.

_____. "Gender and Ministry Style: Things Not What They Seem." In *Gender and Religion,* ed. William H. Swatos, Jr., 3-13. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1993.

_____. "Research on Lay Church Members Attitudes Toward Women Clergy: An Assessment." *Review of Religious Research* 28 (4) (1987): 319-329.

Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness: From the Middle Ages to 1870.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Manz Simon, Mary. *How to Parent Your Tweenager.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1995.

Marshment, Margaret. "The Personal is Political: Representation of Women in Contemporary Popular Culture." In *Thinking Feminist: Key Concepts in Women's Studies,* eds. Dianne Richardson and Victoria Robinson, 123-150. New York: The Guilford Press, 1993.

Massey, Lesley. *Women and the New Testament: An Analysis of Scripture in Light of New Testament Era Culture.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 1989.

Maybury, Karol and Sarah Chickering. "The Influence of Pastor Status and Sex on Evaluations of Sermons." *Review of Religious Research* 42(4) (2001): 415-424.

McKinnish Bridges, Linda. "Women in Church Leadership." *Review and Expositor* 95 (1998): 327-347.

McClintock Fulkerson, Mary. "Feminist Theology." In *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology,* ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, 109-125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Mikel Brown, Lyn and Carol Gilligan. *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girl's Development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Miller, Patrica H. and Ellin Kofsky Scholnick. (Eds). *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Differences.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory.* London: Methuen, 1985.

Munro, Winsome. "Women Disciples: Light From Secret Mark." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 8 (1992): 47-64.

_____. "Women Disciples in Mark?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 225-41.

Nason-Clark, Nancy. "Are Women Changing the Image of Ministry? A Comparison of British and American Realities." *Review of Religious Research* 28(4) (1987): 330-340.

Nelson, Alan E. *Spirituality and Leadership.* Colorado Springs: NavPress, 2002.

Nesbitt, Paula D. *Feminization of the Clergy in America: Occupational and Organizational Perspectives.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

_____. "Gender, Tokenism, and the Construction of Elite Clergy Careers." *Review of Religious Research* 35(3) (1997): 193-209.

Nicholson, Joyce. *What Society Does to Girls.* London: Virago, 1980.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Osiek, Carolyn. *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

Philip, Kate and Leo B. Hendry. "Young People and Mentoring – Towards as Typology?" *Journal of Adolescence* 19 (1996): 189-201.

Pipher, Mary. *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls.* New York: Ballantine Books, 1994.

Pojman, Louis P. "A Critique of Contemporary Egalitarianism: A Christian Perspective." *Faith and Philosophy* 8(4) (1991): 481-502.

Polinska, Wendy. "Bodies Under Siege: Eating Disorders and Self-Mutilation Among Women." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68(3) (2000): 569-589.

Regnerus, Mark D. "Religion and Positive Adolescent Outcomes: A Review of Research and

Theory." *Review of Religious Research* 44(4): 394-413.

Rogers, Mary F. *Contemporary Feminist Theory: A Text/Reader.* United States: McGraw-Hill, 1998.

Scholer, D. M. "Women." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels,* eds. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall, 880-887. Downer's Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1992.

Schneir, Miriam. "Introduction" In *Feminism: The Essential Historical Writings,* ed. Miriam Schneir, xi-xxi. New York: Vantage Books, 1972.

Schussler-Fiorenza, Elizabeth. *Discipleship of Equals: A Critique of Ekklesia-logy of Liberation.* New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1993.

_____. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins.* New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1983.

Smith, Barbara. "Racism and Women's Studies" in Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith (eds.), *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies.* New York: The Feminist Press, 1982.

Stacey, Jackie. "Untangling Feminist Theory." In *Thinking Feminist: Key Concepts in Women's Studies,* eds. Dianne Richardson and Victoria Robinson, 49-73. New York: TheGuilford Press, 1993.

Steiner-Aeschliman, Sherri and Armand L. Mauss. "The Impact of Feminism and Religious Involvement on Sentiment Toward God." *Review of Religious Research* 37(3) (1996): 248-259.

Steinmen, Gloria. *Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983.

Storkey, Elaine. *Origins of Difference: The Gender Debate Revisited.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academy, 2001.

Tannen, Deborah. *That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships.* New York: Ballantine Books, 1986.

_____. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation.* New York:Ballantine Books, 1990.

Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1989.

Vaters, Karl. "Seven Steps for Bringing Biblical Equality to Your Church." *Mutuality* Fall (2004): 19-21.

Walker, William O. "The "Theology of Woman's Place" and the "Paulinist" Tradition." *Semeia* 28(1) (1983): 101-112.

Walsh, Mary Roth (Ed.). *Women, Men, and Gender: Ongoing Debates.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Wiebe, Ben. "Two Texts on Women (1 Tim 2:11-15; Gal 3:26-29): A Test of Interpretation," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 16 (1994): 54-85.

Witherington, Ben. *Women and the Genesis of Early Christianity.* Cambridge:University Press, 1990.

Wright, Walter C. *Relational Leadership: A Biblical Model for Leadership Service.* Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002.

Wolf, Naomi. *The Beauty Myth.* Toronto: Vintage Books, 1990.