



Allison Quient

Equating “Feminisms”

“All I ask of our brethren is, that they will take their feet from off our necks, and permit us to stand upright on that ground which God designed us to occupy.”
—Sarah Grimké¹

Throughout history, movements have arisen to challenge the status quo of society and the institutional church. In the history of the United States and into the present, many have spoken out against the way women are perceived and treated. These voices have fought to open to women spaces and leadership positions in the church and society that have traditionally been exclusively for men. These movements, known collectively as *feminism*, have requested—sometimes demanded—a transformation in the ways evangelicals conceive of women’s roles.

For evangelicals, the Bible is the ultimate, infallible and inerrant authority, which serves as the arbiter of acceptable views, and theological liberalism exists as a looming menace to biblical authority. Unfortunately, evangelicals are often confused over who is challenging their biblical and cultural perceptions. They generally do not understand the critiques of liberal feminists or of their own evangelical sisters and brothers, nor do they recognize

that they are dealing with separate movements in important and foundational ways. For many, feminism is a recent phenomenon, a threatening force, liberal in origin, which in the end rejects the authority of Scripture in order to conform to modern culture. Evangelicals commonly known as biblical *egalitarians* are quickly tied to liberal forms of feminism because it is commonly supposed that “liberalism and the approval of women’s ordination go hand in hand,” and inevitably lead the church down the slippery slope into the abandonment of scriptural authority.²

This paper seeks to begin to correct the equation of biblical egalitarianism with liberal feminism by considering them on a foundational level—looking at where each locates its authority and how each understands the Bible’s authority. Given the limited nature of this paper, I will focus on two individuals—Sarah Grimké and Elizabeth Cady Stanton—who have been widely considered seeds or prototypes of their respective movements and whose beliefs and

approaches to Scripture today correspond to those of egalitarians and liberal feminists, respectively. Finally, I will consider the question of whether the beliefs of egalitarians logically lead to the acceptance of a form of liberal feminism and the subsequent abandonment of Scripture as the ultimate authority. It is my hope that, as evangelicals, we will be engaged “in a more earnest search after truth and a more loyal devotion to it once it is found.”³

Egalitarianism and Sarah Grimké

Evangelical *egalitarianism* is a view committed to what it understands to be the biblical principle of mutuality. “According to this principle, there can be no moral or theological justification for permanently granting or denying status, privilege, or prerogative solely on the basis of a person’s race, class, or gender.”⁴ In the introduction to *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy*, the essential message of egalitarianism is:

Gender, in and of itself, neither privileges nor curtails one’s ability to be used to advance the kingdom or to glorify God in any dimension of ministry, mission, society or family. The differences between men and women do not justify granting men unique and perpetual prerogatives of leadership and authority not shared by women.⁵

While most egalitarians today affirm gender differences and the necessity of hierarchies in some situations, all deny that gender is a key deciding factor in determining gifts and leadership. It is only in this sense that men and women are no different. Egalitarians believe their convictions are taught in Scripture and are grounded in the Bible as the inerrant word of God.⁶ Is egalitarianism really an effort to give scriptural validation to a recent, feminized, liberal culture?

Evangelical egalitarianism did not originate with the feminist liberation movements of the 1960s or 1970s, or even with the found-

ing of Christians for Biblical Equality in 1987–1988. Rather, it came out of the reformations and revivals following the Second Great Awakening and continues on today. More directly, egalitarianism as a *movement* in the United States arose when many women found that the equality principle of the abolitionist movement also applied to them. In their fight against slavery, they naturally found par-

allels with their own condition. A seed of this egalitarian movement is Sarah Grimké, a Quaker woman who faced gendered opposition to her preaching and public speaking against the evils of slavery. In response, she wrote one of the first American scriptural defenses of the equality of women and a justification for their public speaking, titled, *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes*.

In *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes*, it is evident that Sarah Grimké believed that, like slaves, women were being denied their God-given positions as equals alongside white men and that the inferior position women occupied was the product of sinful oppression, not nature as God intended it.⁷ Women were created to be equals. Equality meant that women were also made in the image of God, and were indeed moral beings with an immortal nature.⁸ This notion of equality assumed functional equality (most of her opponents were not making a case for ontological equality alongside functional subordination). Men were the ones who decided that the position of a female preacher and public reformer was “unnatural” and they were the inventors of the idea that there was a “distinction between the duties of men and women as moral beings.”⁹ Grimké writes:

I surrender not our claim to equality. All I ask of our brethren is, that they will take their feet from off our necks, and permit us to stand upright on that ground which God designed us to occupy. If he has not given us the rights which have, as I conceive, been wrested from us, we shall soon give evidence of our inferiority, and shrink back into obscurity, which the high souled magnimity of man has assigned us as our appropriate sphere . . . He has done all he could to debase and enslave her mind; and now he looks triumphantly on the ruin he has wrought, and says, the being he has thus deeply injured is his inferior.¹⁰

For Grimké, the problem was not only the mere fact of gender discrimination, but also that it violated God’s design for women and thus hindered them from their service as “helpers.” Only one who was truly an equal could fulfill her place as the helper of man.¹¹ Men usurped God’s authority and molded women into the images they themselves desired, rather than what God wanted, and this had unfortunate implications for the “welfare of the world.”¹² Women were meant to occupy a mutual place alongside men and when this does not happen, the benefit that naturally arises from understanding and submitting to God’s intention does not follow, diminishing even the woman’s service as wife and mother.¹³

On the surface, Grimké’s egalitarianism could still look suspiciously like forms of theologically liberal feminism in that both deny any God-given distinction in the moral duties or “roles” of men and women, both devote significant attention to the problem of the oppression of women, and both use the rhetoric of “equality.” However, Grimké does not base her authority in women’s experience nor does she use female oppression as her starting point. For her, Scripture, which is inerrant in the original autographs, is the authority on which all else is judged, including the position of women. She explains, “I will depend solely on the Bible to designate the sphere of woman . . . I therefore claim the original as my standard, *believing that to have been inspired*” (emphasis mine).¹⁴ Scripture is her final authority and it alone decides the place of women. It is upon this notion that her arguments against female oppression and for the equality of women is based. Without it, her views on the plight of slaves and women do not make sense.

Continually throughout *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes*, Grimké brings our attention to the fact that nowhere does the Bible teach that men are to have dominion over women or that women were created

While most egalitarians today affirm gender differences and the necessity of hierarchies in some situations, all deny that gender is a key deciding factor in determining gifts and leadership. It is only in this sense that men and women are no different.

to be dependent on men. Many of Grimké's positive arguments are the same as those made by today's egalitarians. Some of these are:

1. Man and woman were both made in the image of God and given dominion over the earth (as opposed to dominion over each other).¹⁵
2. The woman's position as "helper" indicates that she is a companion, not merely an instrument of the man's pleasure.¹⁶
3. Galatians 3:28 teaches that we should in a sense forget about gender insofar as our ideas about gender have negatively influenced how we relate to one another socially and domestically and kept us from benefiting from each other the way God intended.¹⁷ She believed that women must be allowed to "glorify God to the fullest extent that God enables them, and the prerequisite of women's liberation is an unprejudiced translation and interpretation of the biblical passages that have traditionally been used to keep women in subjection."¹⁸ For Sarah Grimké, the problem was not the Bible or its authority, but human corruption, a perverted *interpretation* of Scripture and incorrect translations.¹⁹ She abhorred the evils of slavery and sexism rampant in a society claiming to be enlightened by Christianity and used Scripture to speak prophetically against such evils. She found *in Scripture* the keys to the liberation of slaves and women according to the glory and desire of God and the benefit of his people. Scripture was the standard by which she judged her place as a woman, and it was by this standard—not her own experience as a woman—that she judged the evils of slavery and sexism in her society.

Liberal Feminism and Elizabeth Cady Stanton

Feminism and liberalism are diverse concepts, so some attention will be paid to the definitions of each before identifying the basic claim of liberal feminism and taking a closer look at the thought of Elizabeth Stanton. *Feminism*, although diverse, has been defined as "a social vision, *rooted in women's experience* of sexually based discrimination and oppression, a movement seeking the liberation of women from all forms of sexism, and an academic method of analysis being used in virtually every discipline" (emphasis mine).²⁰ Gary Dorrien defines theological *liberalism*, specifically of a "Christian" variety, as:

A tradition that derives from the late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century Protestant attempt to reconceptualize the meaning of traditional Christian teaching in the light of modern knowledge and modern ethical values . . . Fundamentally it is the idea of a genuine Christianity not based on external authority. Liberal theology seeks to reinterpret the symbols of traditional Christianity in a way that creates a progressive religious alternative to . . . theologies based off of external authority.²¹

In other words, theological liberalism seeks to accommodate Christian teaching to modernity. Wayne Grudem rightly points out that theological liberalism is a "system of thinking that denies the complete truthfulness of the Bible as the Word of God and denies

the unique and absolute authority of the Bible in our lives."²² *Liberal feminism* maintains this basic foundation, but makes the female experience its guide.

Unlike the evangelical egalitarian, who believes error is found only in the human interpreter and that the Bible conceptually affirms the mutuality of men and women in ontology and function, the theologically liberal feminist agrees with those who claim the Bible teaches the exclusive subordination of women. Liberal feminism, though, rejects these portions of Scripture because they are believed to oppose female experience and liberation. Therefore, liberal feminism and evangelical egalitarianism differ in their *interpretations* of Scripture and in their views about the *nature* of Scripture.

Theologically liberal feminism has its prototype in *The Woman's Bible* of the late nineteenth-century.²³ *The Woman's Bible* was the first "book-length challenge to male interpretations of the Bible"²⁴ and is considered by many to be the "original" feminist attack on Scripture.²⁵ While it was not well received and was formally repudiated by the National Woman's Suffrage Association, Elizabeth Stanton, who is considered to be a forerunner of twentieth-century feminism, considered it "a step in progress."²⁶ She reasoned:

It still requires courage to question the divine inspiration of the Hebrew Writings as to the position of woman. Why should the myths, fables, and allegories of the Hebrews be held more sacred than those of the Assyrians and Egyptians?²⁷

For Stanton, the key problem was not in how the Bible was interpreted, and it did not matter a great deal whether the women working on its critique knew the original languages.²⁸ Rather, the *Bible itself* and its use for the oppression of women were the primary problems.

Bible historians claim special inspiration for the Old and New Testaments containing most contradictory records of the same events, of miracles opposed to all known laws, of customs that degrade the female sex of all human and animal life, stated in most questionable language that could not be read in promiscuous assembly, and call all of this "The Word of God."²⁹

Stanton also claims:

From the inauguration of the movement for woman's emancipation the Bible has been used to hold her in the 'divinely ordained sphere,' prescribed in the Old and New Testaments . . . The canon and civil law; church and state; priests and legislators; all political parties and religious denominations have alike taught that woman was made after man, of man, and for man, an inferior being, subject to man.³⁰

Elizabeth Stanton, like many liberal feminists today, did not believe all of the Bible was wrong or should be rejected. "There are some general principles in the holy books of all religions that teach love, charity, liberty, justice and equality for all the human family" and such notable women such as Deborah, Huldah, and Vashti serve to show us that the Bible is diverse and cannot be thrown out in its entirety.³¹ Within the Bible we find the means for both female oppression and female liberation.

Before proceeding, it must also be noted that not all liberal feminists share Stanton's stance on Scripture. While many deny the inerrancy of all or portions of Scripture, a good number maintain a Christian commitment to the essentials of the faith and have an ethos that is "not revolutionary but reformist in spirit and substance."³² For many of these individuals, the Bible contains a valuable message of equality and liberation, which is contradicted only by portions of the canon. While they believe that the Bible itself is not the Word of God, at least parts of Scripture might express true words *about* God and be influenced by real events.

Throughout *The Woman's Bible*, whether a given passage adds or detracts from the status of women is the standard Stanton uses to detect what should remain and what should be thrown out, reformulated, or understood in the light of modernism. This criterion for evaluating Scripture is suspiciously similar to the feminist critical hermeneutic used by more recent feminists such as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, who also understands Elizabeth Stanton as some sort of precursor to her view.³³ The liberal feminist hermeneutic "seeks to assess the function of the Bible in terms of women's liberation and wholeness" and "derives this canon, *not* from the biblical writings, but from the contemporary struggle of women . . . It places biblical texts under the authority of feminist experience."³⁴ These women transform their biblical heritage. Stanton believed this could be accomplished even in light of the fact that "not only biblical interpretations but the biblical texts themselves were androcentric." They could still "serve to recover a feminist biblical heritage" because female experience could draw from those portions of the Bible deemed to be liberating.³⁵

Similarities and Dissimilarities between Two Movements

Throughout this study, one thing has been clear: biblical egalitarianism is not to be equated with liberal feminism when considering their most basic beliefs regarding the authority of Scripture. One believes Scripture is its ultimate authority with any fault lying exclusively in a bad interpretation or translation. The other believes it is not interpretation that is the only or primary problem, but the Bible itself, which contains errors and contradictory messages. It is the latter group that believes the female experience dictates what in Scripture is authoritative and what must be reformulated or conformed to fit modern female perceptions. Rebecca Groothuis sums up the implications well. "In liberal theology, religious symbols do not stand in a true/false relationship to objective theological realities, but serve as elements of a circular, self-enclosed system. Human imagination creates religious myths and metaphors—for the purpose of evoking the desired response in the imaginations of the religion's adherents."³⁶ The enormous difference between egalitarianism and liberal feminism lies in the fact that egalitarians go to the Scriptures to diagnose the problem and to find the solution whereas liberal feminists ultimately must look to themselves. Only superficially are the two movements similar, and this is in a shared recognition that exclusive male authority is a problem and that women have something to contribute at the highest levels of authority.

The Logic Behind the Equation of Feminisms

Despite the differences enumerated herein, many evangelicals continue to equate egalitarianism with liberal feminism. Further, they fear that one "feminism" logically entails the other, even though the two differ in their historical development and have radically different views on the authority of Scripture, resulting in very different diagnoses of and solutions to the problem of female oppression. For example, in his *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?*, Wayne Grudem attempts to warn evangelicals of the dangers of those he calls "evangelical feminists," claiming that they're sliding into liberalism. He appeals to Mark Chaves's *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations* in order to draw attention to a *recent pattern* where the ordination of women is supported by those who do not accept the Bible's authority and is opposed by those who do. It should be noted that he also gives examples of individuals or institutions upholding both women in ministry and the authority of Scripture. Yet, in making his case, he tends to disregard these individuals and institutions.³⁷

There are two basic problems with his approach:

1. Grudem's claim is logically invalid.
2. Dr. Chaves' work, upon which Grudem builds his argument, contradicts Grudem's argument that evangelical feminism is a path to liberalism.

How is Grudem's argument logically invalid? The clear aim of the book (as the title suggests) is to warn evangelicals that accepting what he calls "evangelical feminism" will eventually lead to liberalism and ultimately undermine the gospel. He articulates this fear: "I am concerned that evangelical feminism (also called 'egalitarianism') has become a new path by which evangelicals are being drawn *into* theological liberalism" (emphasis mine).³⁸ For Grudem, liberalism is a "direct consequence" of egalitarianism because the "nature" and key "principles" of egalitarianism undermine Scripture.³⁹

Grudem's reasoning is internally inconsistent. First, he argues that the data shows a seven-step process. The first step is "abandoning biblical inerrancy," which is followed by "endorsing the ordination of women." Given his argument that egalitarianism leads to liberalism, we would expect these steps to be reversed, with the ordination of women preceding and leading to the abandonment of inerrancy. This inconsistency is unsurprising, however, when we consider that Grudem's data demonstrates only a correlation, not a logical consequence—even though he is trying to convince us of a logical connection. He says, "It is unquestionable that theological liberalism leads to the endorsement of women's ordination. While not all egalitarians are liberals, all liberals are egalitarians."⁴⁰ He appears to be, in a big picture sense, arguing in an "If p then q, q, therefore p" fashion. He notices that liberal denominations are also egalitarian, and then concludes that if a denomination is egalitarian it must be liberal or become liberal. This is a well-known formal fallacy called *affirming the consequent*. Instead of establishing a valid logical connection, all he has managed to show is that liberals endorse a form of egalitarianism or feminism, not the reverse.

What Grudem is trying to accomplish is an equation of other types of feminism with egalitarianism. If people can start identifying them as the same in their minds, they will wish to reject egalitarianism in order to avoid the unsubstantiated slippery slope into the liberalism that he fears. The argument assumes the equation of these two movements as well as the related assumption that if one endorses biblical inerrancy, one will be resistant to women's ordination. Of course, if Grudem wishes to label egalitarianism as "liberal" on the grounds that it functionally undermines biblical authority by advocating an incorrect biblical interpretation, then he himself is open to the charge of liberalism by all who believe his interpretations are incorrect.

Unfortunately, the problems with Grudem's argument do not end here. He uses Mark Chaves's study, *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations*, to support his idea that liberalism follows from egalitarianism. The great irony of his appeal to Chaves's study is that *Ordaining Women* indicates that the key to the difference in the practice of ordaining women is not whether a denomination affirms inerrancy or is sacramental. Belief in inerrancy does not logically predispose one away from female ordination. Instead, *a subculture needing to define itself against liberalism does*. Liberalism is not inherently a logical corollary from egalitarianism; instead we have made it a symbol of what we are resisting. Chaves writes:

Within the religious world itself, biblical inerrancy and sacramentalism are the most significant *cultural boundaries* when it comes to women's ordination . . . Why are biblical inerrancy and sacramentalism so deeply and so tightly connected to resistance to female clergy? . . . *for both of these denominational subcultures, gender equality has come to symbolize the liberal modern world that they define themselves against.* (emphasis mine)⁴¹

And later, Chaves states:

These examples are meant to illustrate the basic point that a commitment to biblical inerrancy does not require, either logically or historically, opposition to women's ordination . . . If it is not logically or intellectually difficult to combine inerrantism with full gender equality, why has it become so culturally difficult to do so? . . . Because gender equality is such a defining core of the modern liberal agenda, resisting women's ordination became a way to symbolize antiliberalism within the religious world. (emphasis mine)⁴²

Dr. Chaves's study describes a situation where evangelicals feel threatened by liberalism, so they resist other causes or ideas that liberals affirm, even when these are not necessarily connected exclusively to liberalism. Is this a fair assessment by Chaves? Grudem gives us reason to believe it is.

Does it seem likely that all of the liberal churches who no longer believe the Bible have suddenly gotten the interpretation of the Bible regarding men's and women's roles exactly right, and that the most conservative churches who hold strongly to Biblical inerrancy have gotten it exactly wrong? And does it seem

likely that as soon as a denomination begins to abandon belief in inerrancy it suddenly discovers new skill and accuracy in interpreting the Bible on the roles of men and women so that it finally arrives at the correct answer?⁴³

Recall Grudem's earlier grouping of those with a high view of Scripture with those who hold to his view of women in leadership, as opposed to those with a low view who accept women in leadership (a grouping assumed in the quote above). He is appealing to our newfound sensibility that the two are inseparable. Under this paradigm we should apparently be suspicious of the likelihood of a "liberal"—who rejects the Bible's authority—correctly interpreting the Bible's teachings on gender. If liberals believe it, it is likely false and we should resist. However, liberal methodology does *not* interpret the Bible in the same way as biblical egalitarianism does (many liberals believe biblical passages are actually sexist). Moreover, this is a dangerous way to decide church polity, as it effectively gives the opposing group, rather than the Bible itself, control over church decisions. It may be that today secular or "sacred" culture tells us to "uncritically reject everything associated with any particular movement . . . but Christians need not buy into such force-choice logic."⁴⁴

Conclusion

This paper challenges the notion that biblical egalitarianism and liberal feminism are equivalent movements. Considering the examples of Sarah Grimké and Elizabeth Stanton, who are widely considered either seeds or prototypes of their movements, revealed that the two movements have widely divergent views on the authority of Scripture. Further, not only are the two movements dissimilar in what they profess, but the argument that one logically or necessarily leads to the other is invalid.

The church is not infallible in its understanding of God's will. Only through dialogue with those who differ from us will we begin to see what we may have missed and make changes for the better. Listening carefully to their critiques should spur us on to look at the Scriptures and allow God's eternal and unchanging truths—not uncritical rejection of anything associated with particular movements—to shed light on our situation and determine church polity. If egalitarianism is true, more than half the church is being underused, and not only do we contradict God's will for men and women, but we also cripple the church and undercut the power of the gospel. When we stand on Scripture and fully use the gifts God has given his people, we will release the gospel and the body of Christ to transform the world for God's glory.

Notes

1. Sarah Grimké, *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes And the Condition of Woman* (Boston: Isaac Knapp, 1838), 10.

Belief in inerrancy does not logically predispose one away from female ordination. Instead, *a subculture needing to define itself against liberalism does*.

2. Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* (Wheaton, IL: Good News Publishers, 2006), 29.
3. J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub, 1923), 17.
4. Rebecca Groothuis, "Sexuality, Spirituality and Feminist Religion," *Christians for Biblical Equality* (1999): cbeinternational.org/?q=content/sexuality-spirituality-and-feminist-religion, accessed January, 2013.
5. Ronald Pierce and Rebecca Groothuis, eds., *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 13.
6. See Philip Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009), 28 and John Piper and Wayne Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991), xiv.
7. Sarah Grimké believes the condition of white women is comparable to that of slavery in that the subjugation of slaves and women both break from the equality taught in Scripture and render them inferior or subjugated. However, she strongly believes the plight of black women is on another level incomparable to the situation of white women due to the sheer unique evil of their treatment. Black women are sold in market places and exploited sexually and because of this "the moral purity of the white woman is deeply contaminated" especially since she benefits from the exploitation and does not speak out against it. Sarah Grimké, *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes And the Condition of Woman* (Boston: Isaac Knapp, 1838), 15, 50–55.
8. *Ibid.*, 23.
9. *Ibid.*, 20.
10. *Ibid.*, 10–11.
11. *Ibid.*, 23.
12. *Ibid.*, 3.
13. *Ibid.*, 48–49.
14. *Ibid.*, 4.
15. *Ibid.*, 4, 23.
16. *Ibid.*, 5, 23.
17. One will quickly notice that Grimké does not even try to show why ontological equality (part of being made in the image of God) is antithetical to the idea that women are ordained by God to be functionally subordinate to men. This connection is assumed. The theological complementarianism of today simply did not exist as a movement in her time. The idea that somehow women were equal in essence, but forever subordinate in function had not become prominent, so most of her opponents were not asking those questions.
18. Rebecca Groothuis, *Women Caught in the Conflict: The Culture War between Traditionalism and Feminism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Pub, 1997), 51.
19. *Ibid.*, 3, 16.
20. Anne Clifford, *Introducing Feminist Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2001), 16–17.
21. Gary Dorrien, *The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion 1805–1900* (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), xxiii.
22. Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 15.
23. Stanton herself is considered a prototype and not a seed because her influence on feminism and liberalism was limited for her time even though feminists of a much later era saw in her their own experiences and beliefs.
24. Clifford, *Introducing Feminist Theology*, 46.
25. This idea is conveyed in the title of *The Woman's Bible*, which is introduced by Barbara Welter.
26. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *Eighty Years & More: Reminiscences 1815–1897* (NY: Schocken Books, 1971), 467.
27. *Ibid.*, 467.
28. *Ibid.*, 467.
29. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *The Original Feminist Attack on the Bible: The Woman's Bible* (New York: Arno Press, 1974), 12.

30. *Ibid.*, 7.
31. *Ibid.*, 12–13.
32. Dorrien, *The Making of American Liberal Theology*, xxiii, xxv.
33. Schüssler Fiorenza falls more into the liberation camp of feminism than the liberal.
34. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread Not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), 14.
35. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins: In Memory of Her* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 27.
36. Groothuis, "Sexuality, Spirituality and Feminist Religion."
37. Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism*, 23–25.
38. *Ibid.*, 15.
39. *Ibid.*, 17–18, 20–21.
40. *Ibid.*, 28–29. Also see note 4 on page 24 where Grudem acknowledges there are conservative denominations that were egalitarian without any liberal influence.
41. Mark Chaves, *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 10.
42. *Ibid.*, 101–102.
43. Grudem, 29.
44. Craig Keener, *Paul Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub, 1992), 6.

"Equating 'Feminisms'" was first published in *An Evangelical Tradition*, a special edition journal produced by Christians for Biblical Equality in 2013.



Allison Quient recently graduated with her MDiv from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Besides theology of gender, she is passionate about church history, the biblical canon, and apologetics.

Who, Me?!

"Discover Your Spiritual Gifts & Calling"

Women, ages 18-30



When: January 18, 6:00-8:00pm

Where: Biola University, Mosaic Cultural Center

RSVP: allisonquient@hotmail.com

Brought to you by **Metamorphae** -- "Be Transformed." Romans 12:2