Pharos Journal of Theology ISSN 2414-3324 online Volume 107 (4) Regular Issue (2026)
Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

Submission and Collaboration: Reassessing *Ὑποτάσσω* across Trinitarian, Civic, Marital, Ecclesial, and Workplace Relations

Erwin Samuel Henderson
Extraordinary Theological Researcher
North West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7180-3108
E-mail: Erwin.Henderson@nwu.ac.za

https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.107.4022

Abstract

The research statement considers the extensive effects of cultural, contextual and theological suppositions on the meaning and use of the biblical concept of submission [ὑποτάσσω]. The research methodology analyses epistemologically the paradigms for existing affirmations; ontologically authenticating archetypal intra and extra Trinitarian relationship; historically and empirically corroborating early and contemporary Christian comprehension and praxis. Knowledge is drawn from authoritative theological and historical sources to assess and articulate the founding principles and assertions of traditional constructs. These findings are critiqued and appraised through the prism of etymology and exegesis to substantiate the old but new paradigm within the scriptural parameters of Trinity, government, marriage, church and work relationships. A critical reassessment of the meaning and usage of the data within these five spheres, examining existing biblical cultural, historical and theological perceptions, consents to a renewed theological hypothesis providing new cogency and coherence, reflective of historical and theological findings. This article articulates an alternate ὑποτάσσω thesis distinguishing subordinate and collaborative postures, correlating Trinitarian and Christocentric primacy defined as source and as a protraction of other forms of relationality. This ὑποτάσσω thesis extends the body of knowledge it's comprehensive articulation of the collaborative interpretation .

Keywords: Submission, Trinitarian relationship, Marriage, Church, Leadership

Introduction

The traditional theological views of ὑποτάσσω analysed in this paper will be shown to influence profoundly relationality with God, governance of peoples, conceptions and views of marriage, church: structure, leadership, ministry, and work rapports. These are the principal areas into which the Bible speaks. Observation of theological expositors on the subject suggests several weaknesses. Populism, Christian or otherwise, evidences implicit-implied comprehension and therefore accepted cultural norms. Challenging the implicit and encultured suppositions concerning the meaning and use of the term ὑποτάσσω requires the hermeneutical discipline of letting the text speak the author's inherent intention. This hypothesis, investigates the traditional substantiations as part of arguing a new hypothesis in response to the research statement.

Open Rubric

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

It is this hermeneutical exactitude which constitutes the hypothesis of this article that the use of subordinate ὑποτάσσω is limited to Godhead, while demonstrating the collaborative-reciprocal meaning as the prevalent intended reading of the Scriptures, in all other contexts. The new hypothesis will seek to restore the clarity between the creational order and the Christological order, whereby the latter accomplishes the former, a point of confusion in the arguments developed. In so doing, the principles of Christian relationality find coherence in source and expression. This paper will explicate in each of the five areas under examination, Trinitarian, marital, ecclesial and working relationality, historical and current biblical understanding of critical texts and the subsequent arguments.

Method

In each section etymological and exegetical methodology will enable a new apprehension of ὑποτάσσω upon the principal distinction of the subordinate and collaborative. Historical texts, taking into consideration Greek, Hebrew, Roman, South African and German contextualisation, corroborate empirical evidence in support of the proposed ὑποτάσσω thesis.

Etymological suppositions

Ὑποτάσσω, a composite term originating from "ὑπο" used in composition meaning under[1] in reference to subjection, dependency, or subordination (Zodhiates,1993: 1419-1420. Strong, 1996: 5259); or with or beside, in reference to place or position, time, or agency (Strong, 1996: 5259). Moulton (1978: 417) describes the expression of "influence, causation and agency" in a context of relationship and movement.

The verb τάσσω refers to putting or setting in order or arrangement, placing, assigning or establishing (Strong, 1996: 5021; Theological Dictionary of the New Testament [TDNT]: 1985 784). The active voice according to Zodhiates (1993: 1427-1429) pivots around subjugation by God of all the created order, "The word subdue … indicates the total subjugation of everything …". The middle voice underlines ontological and functional distinctions whereby equality asserted in the former is subjugated to the latter, "… man cannot change because God has ordained them" (Zodhiates, 1993: 1428). Likewise, the passive voice refers to "subjection without consent" (Zodhiates, 1993: 1429). Rienecker (1995: 538) describes a lining up of one's self under … in a military sense … with the "… primary idea of giving up one's own right and will." The TDNT concurs referring to spiritual, secular, relational or mutual subjection.
The imposed subordinate reading whether in the active, middle or passive voices (Zodhiates, 1993; Thayer, 1999: : 642, 645) blurs the scope of a more comprehensive reading. Synonymity likewise discloses the hypothetical imposition of a subordinate reading when the relationship is not in view (Henderson, 2022).[2] This research challenges the à priori subordinate or subjugate interpretation. Thayer (1999: 5293) accurately maintains a military and non-military differentiated interpretation and usage. The former being necessarily subordinate on authority

[1] Or underneath, below.
[2] "ἐντέλλομαι" often translated in keeping with the fact of giving orders, of prescribing or of ordering could easily be interpreted as submission under orders. However, the term accentuates the implications and the importance of the content of the order rather than the relationship between a leader "above" subordinates. To impose the latter direction amounts to an etymological assumption; this term cannot support such usage. In like manner, "κελεύω" translated as order or command, puts the emphasis upon the preponderance of the oral content of the word. The significance relates more to listening and answering, the weight or the importance of the word. It is thus not explicitly a reference to the superior position who gives, nor that of the subordinate who receives. "Παραγγέλλω" likewise means to transmit a message. To interpret a subordinate reading into the texts is a hypothetical imposition which deforms the intentional direction.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

grounds, while the latter is reciprocal and mutual in nature, "a voluntary attitude of … cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden [alongside]." This paper examines these categorisations within the five spheres mentioned.

Paradigm considerations

Human relationality and the correlation to submission sets a frame of reference, "the cornerstone of the new social order … The entire influence of the Church upon society depends upon right views on the relationship of man and woman and on the ethics of marriage" (Findlay, 1891: 355). It is therefore important to appraise the use and culturation of such a significant relational paradigm.

Greek-Hebrew context

Within the Roman-Greek empire, during the "age of the Caesars" (Findlay, 1891:365) where polytheism dominated by implicit submission to the gods, "every conceivable kind of immorality was attributed to the pagan gods and goddesses"[3] (Gundry, 1994: 50-51). A Greek woman held the unique responsibility for producing children-heirs, at her husband's beckon call; the remainder was a life given to beautification, to reinforcing the husband's status and ego, a leisure of ultimate boredom. Access to education and learning were not within her remit, (Fox, 2006: 577; Findlay, 1891: 364). Christianity inaugurated a new transformative view of relationality and morality which would profoundly affect every societal stratum. Greek women in particular would find freedom and meaning within Christian faith and church (Fox, 2006: 577). Likewise, Greek philosophers considered slavery as "a fundamental institution, indispensable to the existence of civilized society" (Findlay, 1891: 387). Outnumbering free citizens, often superior in education to Roman masters, albeit without social and judicial rights, they were put out for hire having been trained and educated to manage Roman households. This habitual position was one suggested reason why so many became Christians (Findlay, 1891: 388).

As the apostle Paul writes in Romans thirteen concerning submission to governing authorities, Nero's reign sets the historical context (Robertson, 1931: 5125; Trapp, 1655: 5125). Submission was taught under inordinate opposition and persecution. The Julio-Claudius dynasty[4] inaugurated emperor worship, one source of Christian persecution because of disobedience; the refusal to worship and offer allegiance to Cesar as deity (Gundry, 1994: 30, 57-58). The Jewish exile from Rome under Claudius[5] demonstrates the "belief that Jews were inimical to the imperial interests if not the aftermath of Jewish insurrection" (Murray, 1965: 146), an identity amalgamation concern for the majority Jewish Roman church (Hendricksen, 1988: 431). Paul's purpose is to distinguish Christians from Jews by reconciling through the Christological hermeneutical prism the collaborative posture in contrast to the subordinate passive or the antagonistic positions.

Rereading of the Ὑποτάσσω construct

This research paper analyses five biblical categories; Trinity, government, marriage, church and work, where the interpretation of ὑποτάσσω is theologically essential to constructing a view of God and correlated social mainstays reflective of the collaborative rather than subordinate hypothesis.

[3] According to Gundry (1994: 50-51), prostitution by both sexes was a well-recognised institution; pederasty and homosexual behaviour were socially accepted practices.
[4] Augustus (27 BCE – 14CE) to Nero (54-68 CE). See also Domitian (81-96 CE).
[5] 49 CE.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

God in Trinity

Generically, the assertation of hierarchal submission to God transcends temporal thinking as an absolute principle.[6] The question of ὑποτάσσω within the Godhead confronts the ontological and economical hypotheses describing interrelatedness and operation between the Father, Jesus-Christ, and the Spirit. The ontological perception affirms, according to the Nicaean creed under Athanasius' leadership, one 'οὐσία' and three 'ὑπόστασες', attesting co-eternity, co-equality and co-substantiality (Kelly, 1968: 265-268, 286; Lossky, 1991: 52-54; Schaff, *Augustine*, 1877: 744). Divine ontology invites the question, 'how do two or three persons in perfect equality relate?' In response according to Henderson (2019: 72), there is no distinction based on nature or works, there is however distinction in personhood expressing a "collaborative relationship of 'complicity among Perfects' remain[ing] faithful to the fundamental nature of Trinity." Gill (2012: 3083-84) speaks of "…a co-efficient cause, a co-operation with him in his divine works … of the same nature … the same perfections, …." The dependency implied by a subordinate reading of certain texts, "... not my will[7] … not my teaching[8] … as I hear I judge[9] … I come not of my own accord[10] …" is resolved through the apostolic πέμπω sending, emphasizing relationship and continuous accompaniment (Henderson, 2021: 8, 11). If upheld, the context portrays equality, inseparability and indivisibility in a common source of divine life. Only apostolic dependency can resolve the subordinate hypothesis, enhancing the collaborative operation.

Attribution of a specific function to one Person inadequately discerns the nature of Trinitarian collaborative and apostolic life. For Clarke (1967: 3008) "the Father acts not without the Son, nor the Son without the Father; their acts are common, their power equal." Therefore, the purpose of operations attests the Father-Son union relationality and collaboration rather than divinity. The ontological view of Trinitarian glory is an apostolic culture of reciprocal and mutual glorifying and honouring. The Eastern church fathers perceived … in the κενόω of Christ, the Son revealing the Father, as the Spirit reveals the Son; each one concealing self in Godhead to authenticate the veracity of the other, " [each One] … leaves His own Person concealed beneath His Godhead" (Lossky, 1991: 168).

If all things,[11] all persons,[12] all judgment,[13] all authority,[14] and all operations[15] have been delegated to Christ; necessarily, he is seated far above: ὑπεράνω [to place, rank or power], ἀρχή [the 'firsts' originators, authors, leaders, initiators], ἐξουσία [authorities], δύναμις [inherently capable powers], κυριότης [prevailing mastery, seigneuries] and ὄνομα [named identities or persons in all their attributes].[16] This position is uniquely Christ's in this world and eternity. To Christ alone is ὑποτάσσω due that He be established κεφαλην υπερ παντα.[17] In view is the absolute pre-eminence over universe, heaven, earth, etc. Christ in the cosmic sphere of archetypal primacy is filling all in all.[18] This makes reference to accomplishment or

[6] For example, Clement in Lightfoot, 1912: 57.
[7] John 6:38.
[8] John 7:16.
[9] John 8:16.
[10] John 7:28.
[11] John 3:35, 13:3.
[12] John 6:37, 39-40, 10:27-28.
[13] John 5:22, 27, 17:2.
[14] John 5:27, 10:17-18, 17:2.
[15] John 4:34, 5:20, 36, 9:4, 10:25, 17:4.
[16] Ephesians 1:19-23.
[17] Κεφαλη translated as the Head and Source.
[18] Philippians 3:21; 1 Peter 3:22; Acts 10:36.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

perfection that is the outcome of his ἀποκαταλλάσσω of the cosmos and the church to God.[19] In this God is perfectly comparable to Christ, "all in all," in recognition of the Father's Christo-centricity. Jesus, proprietor of all things, relates apostolically in perfect mutuality to the other members of the Godhead. Apostolic autonomy functioning ontologically and collaboratively, affirms three consubstantial sources of the one divine life in the one purpose of communicating divine life to the believer (Henderson, 2021: 9-15).

Proponents of the "Eternal Relational Authority Submission" theory [E.R.A.S],[20] find grounds for subordinate submission of Christ and the Spirit in an economical understanding of Trinitarian relationship between Father-Son, Father-Spirit. The generate and spirate eternal relationships, defined by these names or roles, justify a pre-incarnate state.[21] The Son's earthly ministry is clearly subordinate and hierarchal, under the Father's leadership will and authority (Ware and Starke, 2015: 20, 28, 42-43, 48); "… the relationship between the Father and the Son is not reciprocal" (Ware and Starke, 2015: 55).

The authors suggest that the subordinate relationship belongs not to the incarnate relationship and function of Christ but to his equality in the eternal relationship or more accurately, ontological relationship (Ware and Starke, 2015: 55). Ware, (2015: 243). E.R.A.S' defence of Trinity affirms "… one common divine nature possessed eternally and fully by each of the three persons of the Godhead, and person-specific properties that are not of each of the persons of the Godhead." Ware (2015: 242) refers to E.R.A.S not as a personal property but as an attribute. In doing so he mutates the distinct properties from presuppositional economy outside the economic framework to inside, to ontology and οὐσία [essence]. What began in economy becomes one defining principle of inter-Trinitarian being and relationship (Henderson, 2019: 51-52).

A final argument is from the etymology of ὑποτάσσω's two principal meanings: The military use suggests a defined hierarchal submission. The latter use, refers to being beside and assuming a part in responsibility, in cooperation alongside.[22] In the relationship of Trinity to mankind, only in Christ does the former application apply,[23] the latter applies to all other human relationships and structures.[24] In conclusion, the ontological hypothesis of intra-Trinitarian relationality affirms that Christ's ultimacy and unity with the Father and Spirit are grounds alone for extra-Trinitarian hierarchal-subordinate submission by humanity and Christian believers in particular. There are no conceivable grounds to suggest intra-Trinitarian submissive, hierarchical or subordinate interrelating or operating, as demonstrated, thereby affirming equality and collaboration ontologically and economically.

Governance

Contextual considerations from Romans thirteen

The polemical context of ὑποτάσσω to secular authorities and the seemingly absolute Pauline imperative, requires examination to avoid populist and fundamentalist superficial readings.

[19] Colossians 1:15-20; Ephesians 2:13-19. [TLT] "God restoring all things to His original intentions in Christ."
[20] B.A. Ware, J. Starke, W. Grudem, C.W. Cowan, et al. *One God in Three Persons*, Crossway, 2015.
[21] The assumption is remarkably identifiable with Monarchianism.
[22] Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, Zodhiates Word Study Dictionary.
[23] James 4:7; Romans 8:20; 1 Corinthians 15:27; Hebrews 2:8; Ephesians 1:22; 1 Peter 3:22; Philippians 3:21.
[24] Romans 8:7; 1 Corinthians 14:22, 16:16; Colossians 3:18; 1 Peter 3:1; Romans 13:1; James 4:7.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

While Barnes qualifies Paul's words as general principle rather than universal absolute (Barnes, 1834: 5125), because of the conditional clause giving primacy to God's absolute authority as origin of all other delegated forms, it is appropriate not to read "a universally valid principle … [rather a refutation of] an exclusively negative attitude towards civil authorities" (Hendriksen, 1982: 433-434); as Calvin (*Romans* 1540: 5123) concords, "the right of government is ordained by God for the wellbeing of mankind." Likewise, Clarke (1967: 5123) also confirms "… civil government is of God, who is the fountain of law, order, and regularity, the civil governor, who administers the laws of a state according to its constitution …"[25]

The first contextual qualification is the reputation of Jews as independent, seditious, always seeking to shake off Roman subjugation as idolatrous, illegitimate, and opposed to God and theocratic rule (Murray, *Romans* 1965: 146; Hendriksen, 1982: 430; Barnes, 1834: 5123; Hodge 1873: 5123). The cause of expulsion from Rome under Claudius (41-54 CE) was "because they were constantly making disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus" (Hendriksen, 1982: 431-432; Barrett, 1987: 13-14).[26] Paul effectively removes justification of antagonism with Roman institutions, albeit the tension between Jews and Christian-Jews seems apparent, and may have included Christians (Clarke 1967: 5123). Barnes, (1834: 5123) goes as far as to suggest that Paul's warning concerned the politicisation of Christians drawn into the dissensions of the empire.[27]

The second concerns Christian identification with Judaism and liberty in the light of absolute allegiance to Christ's lordship. What genre of submission could be offered to civil pagan institutional authorities? The danger of obstinate refusal of politico-religious fused instances was real (Murray, 1965:146; Barnes, 1834: 5123). The rebel precept polarised the absolute elevated kingdom reign of Christ with the abolition of all earthly powers to be truly free (Calvin, *Romans* 1540: 5123), motivated more likely by personal and arbitrary inclinations (Hodge 1873: 5123). After all Christians were charged with "turning the world upside down" (Jamieson et al. 1866: 5127).[28]

The third consideration is the historical context of Nero's reign,[29] during which Paul travelled and wrote most of his epistles.[30] If Paul spoke of submission and governance in a period of social peace and stability, some would justify his approach. However, it is the contrary that is true; an emperor of extremes, directed against Christians through prohibition laws, and to Paul himself. Fox (2006: 504,505, 506, 507; Barrett, 1987: 17) describes the effects of Nero, the individual and his action, "he combined vanity with irresponsibility … pathologically vain and jealous … egotism and cruel perversion prevailed … his extravagance was atrocious, megalomaniac, [renowned for] gross debauched parties … the defining patron of the Roman orgy." The responsibility for the great fire of Rome for which Nero was the origin, rode upon the rising persecution of Christians accused as culprits, resulting in the Golden House atrocities. Fox (2006: 508, 507, 537-538; Barrett, 1987:15-17) suggests that Nero's extravagances were

[25] Clarke (1967: 5123) distinguishes the private and civil life of the magistrate, indicating that no personal misconduct in the ruler … can justify rebellion against him or contempt for his authority, as long as he exercises the law correctly.
[26] The reference to Chrestus could infer Jewish animosity or hostility to Christ-followers, or it may refer to Jewish-Christians. In the eyes of the authorities this new Christian sect could have been confused as integral to Judaism.
[27] Barnes traces the controversial transitions of Cesars as grounds.
[28] Acts 17:6; Luke 23:4-5; Acts 19:23, 26-27, 40).
[29] 54-68 CE
[30] Only Galatians and 1 and 2 Thessalonians date prior to this period. Three of ten letters.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

the root of his downfall and the end of his lineage. These uninhibited excesses provoked a generational reaction in search of a moral and ethical society and government orientation.

Scholars converge upon the affirmation that governance is firstly divine institution, therefore of submission to God, rather than to the human constitution of government that has authority, and is established for the purpose of social order and peace (Trapp 1655: 5123; Murray 1965:149, 152; Barnes 1834: 5123; Hodge 1873: 5123; Calvin *Institutes* 1599: 904). A magistrate may act justly or unjustly in the pursuit of the institution's purpose of authority and subjection (Murray 1965:150), "… the apostle speaks of powers, and not persons … [rather] … the office and dignity of magistracy itself" (Gill 1810: 5123). Hodge (1873: 5123) concurs, "[Submission] … does not infer submit yourselves to good magistrates … It is not with regard to personal merit … it is with regard to the post they occupy," the general principle is to the office, as God intended.[31] Contextually, the restraining of evil[32] correlates to this good governance, while ἀνομία is antithetical to social order, which led to the deification of state, a totalitarian system defying God (Ladd 2002: 605-606). Scripture suggests that believers living in Christ are to be the demonstration of kingdom values[33] within a societal order that will be fully realised.[34] The enduring tension and the failure of the former are interpreted in the light of Christ's παρουσία.

The distinctive Christian perspective

The distinctive Christian perspective, according to Paul, perceives governing civil authority and subjection as of divine origin and initiative, "… not only to be subject because insubjection brings upon us penal judgment but also because there is the obligation intrinsic to God's will irrespective of the liability …" (Murray, 1965: 154, 149; Calvin, *Institutes* 1599: 901). Calvin (*Institutes* 1599: 903-904), suggests that the form of governance: monarchy, aristocracy, populism or whatever other form in free states, requires the Christian response of submission. The purpose of proper normative good governing authority is legitimate preservation of justly ordered good and peaceful society, "for the wellbeing of mankind" (Calvin, *Romans* 1540: 5123, 5126; Murray, 1965: 152; Hendriksen, 1982: 432-434), for "natural good … moral good … civil good … spiritual and religious good"[35] (Gill, 1810: 5126; Trapp, 1935: 5126; Hodge, 1873: 5128).

---

[31] A fourth argument, secondary to the purpose of this paper, reflects Oscar Cullmann's interpretation of angelic powers operating behind the human figures, "the evil angels who by their subjection under Christ … have rather lost their evil character and … now stand under and within the Lordship of Christ" (Cullmann cited in Murray 1965: 147, 252). Hendriksen (1982: 431) observes that "the double-meaning theory has lost much of its earlier fascination." Some trace it back to second century gnostic influences, or to Philonic allegorical methodology. Contextually, expositors generally agree to a literal and natural meaning of human rulers. The supposition that bad angels defeated under the authority of the risen Christ, became good and therefore acted upon nations and rulers finds no New Testament precedence; likewise, the responsibility for the crucifixion. Submission to evil or good angels-spirits contradicts the submission the absolute and sovereign authority of Christ; in the same manner paying taxes because of or to angelic forces seems absurd.The double-meaning is also the expression of a dualist metanarrative: God-Satan, good-evil; whereas the natural creational order is excluded as a sphere of operation, which is more in keeping with the context of earthly-human rulers. (See Murray 1965: 252-253; Hendriksen 1982: 430 and footnotes; Ladd 2002: 477. That is not to deny the Pauline teaching concerning spiritual powers at work (Ephesians 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Colossians 1:16; 2:15).

[32] Romans 13:4; 2 Thessalonians 2:4-6.

[33] Peace, justice, truth, in society, the product of Christ, his reign expressed in these Kingdom values demonstrated within society, reflective or the eternal and realised perfect quality of his reign.

[34] 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4, 5-8; Matthew 24:36-39; 2 Peter 3:3-4, 13; Isaiah 9:7; 1 Peter 4:3-6; Romans 13:11-14.

[35] Trapp emphasizes the magistrate's role in religion and morality. The logic being that if the magistrate's exercise is of God, it is God's law that is applied, then conscience is correlatively

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

Christian conscience is the voice of justice or guilt[36] of proper submission to God and civil authorities (Murray, 1965: 154; Hendriksen, 1982: 436; Gill, 1810: 5123), avoiding the contentions of resistance or conformity, through a principle of honour (Barnes, 1834: 5123; Calvin, *Institutes* 1599: 912). The qualifier that leads to the clash exception principle is expressed as "obeying their lawful commands, which do not contradict the laws of God [spiritual], nature [creational], and right reason [ethical]" (Gill, 1810: 5123). Brown's (1866: 5127) comment on the polarisation of government: despotism or pure democracy is worthy of citation,

The inalienable right of all subjects to endeavour to alter or improve the form of government under which they live is left untouched here. But since Christians were constantly charged with turning the world upside down, and since there certainly were elements enough in Christianity of moral and social revolution to give plausibility to the charge, and tempt noble spirits, crushed under misgovernment, to take redress into their own hands, it was of special importance that the pacific, submissive, loyal spirit of those Christians who resided at the great seat of political power, should furnish a visible refutation of this charge.

Barnes (1834: 5129) will argue institutional reformation positively as, "… to put them on a proper footing, to diffuse a mild and pure influence over all, and to secure such an influence in all the relations of life as shall tend best to promote the happiness of man and the welfare of the community."[37] Hendriksen (1982: 386) on the other hand reflects a passive submissive posture,

To those … who not only actually rule but as such have also been invested with divine authority … believers must not only in a general way outwardly subject themselves but must even be inwardly obedient, carrying out with a willing heart all the particular commands … [The exception referred to in Acts 5:29 holds whenever any human regulation clashes with the law of God].

The God given clash exception principle

There are two explicit literal examples of non-submission in the New Testament [NT],[38] asserted by the apostles before the Jewish authorities,

> This moreover Peter and John being given a response towards them, they said whether just it is before the presence facing your God to listen to you more willingly than this God, judge yourselves … persuaded[39] by the pre-eminent ones, it is necessary God much more and willingly than men. (Transliteration [TLT], Acts 4:19; 5:29)[40]

concomitant. Conscience before being the Christian's compass. Clarke distinguishes civil and religious ministers here (1967: 5128).

[36] John 8:9; Acts 24:16; Romans 2:15; 9:1; 13:5; 1 Corinthians 10:27-29; 2 Corinthians 1:12; 1 Timothy 4:2; Titus 1:15; Hebrews 10:22; 1Peter 2:19.

[37] In contrast to revolutionary tactics to overturn.

[38] The historical context gives understanding that there were so many more implicit examples.

[39] "Πειθαρχειν" literally means to be persuaded by those first ones who lead. A submissive connotation can only implicitly be understood on the hierarchal creational submission supposition.

[40] Also finds echoes in several philosophers: Socrates before the authorities "I shall obey God rather than you" Plato's apology of Socrates (Bruce, 1988: 96). Antigona in Sophocles, "Better obey God with whom we must ever live, than men with whom we have bit a whom to continue" (Trapp, 1655: 3897).

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

It is evident that the authorities, needed reminded of the ultimacy of divine authority and due submission, of which they assumed to be representatives. Consequently, a polarisation of attitudes opposes the preceding forms of reformative-revolutionary posture on the grounds that

> Paul is not arguing for the divine right of kings or for any special form of government, but for government and order. Nor does he oppose here revolution for a change of government, but he does oppose all lawlessness and disorder (Robertson, 1931: 5123),

With the unconditional passive-submissive position[41] of Calvin (*Romans* 1540: 5124),

> Let us then continue to honour the good appointment of God … provided we impute to ourselves whatever evil may accompany it … there can then be no tyranny which does not in some respects assist in consolidating the society of men,

a reflection on his determinist theodicy wherein Satan, demons, and evil powers are subservient instruments of God, (Calvin, *Institutes* 1599: 138, 148). Supportive of absolute submission,

> Christians were to be a class of men born to endure affronts and injuries, and be exposed to the iniquity, imposture, and derision of abandoned men, and not only so, but were to be tolerant of all these evils … promising themselves nothing during the whole of life but the endurance of a perpetual cross (Calvin, *Institutes* 1599: 911).

The grounds being that divine law is, by revelation or innate conscience, common to humanity, encapsulating natural, moral and religious law, “Hence it alone ought to be the aim, the rule, and the end of all laws” (Calvin, *Institutes* 1599: 909).

The clash exception principle corroborates the case where civil governance, while instituted divinely, opposes divine, creational, and ethical law. While subversion is negated, when governance perverts or diverts its divine purpose,[42] the primacy of divine allegiance applies,

> when they make their own will a law, or exercise a lawless tyrannical power, in defiance of the laws of God, and of the land, to the endangering of the lives, liberties, and properties of subjects, they may be resisted (Gill, 1810: 5124, 5125).[43]

Even Calvin (*Institutes*,1599: 917) concedes a dignified disregard for commands that set believers against God, “[do] not yield a slavish obedience to the depraved wishes of men, far less do homage to their impiety.” It is clear from Paul’s experience that he did not stop exercising ministry in the face of opposition, and therefore was in disobedience not ἀνομία to civil and religious authorities. Atkinson and Field (1995: 822) distinguish a posture of submission in general from obedience or disobedience. The apostolic hallmark of the latter

[41] Clarke, 1967: 5125 concurs
[42] See the utility definition page four.
[43] See also Barnes 1834: 5125, 5123; Hendriksen 1982: 432, 434; Murray 1965: 149; Gill 1810: 5123.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

was a conscious acceptance of the consequences of disobedience within the wider context of submission,[44] in the words of Polycarp,

> we are taught to render to authorities and the powers ordained of God honour as is fitting … repentance from better to worse is not a change permitted to us; but to change from cruelty to righteousness is a noble thing. (Polycarp quoted in Bettenson, 1963: 11).

Distinction of spheres

The tension of passive submission, spiritual conscious disobedience, or reformation-revolution postures, requires confronting the question of spheres of government and the correlation between the divine origins, secularisation, or humanisation whereby, the supposition expressed is questioned. While the initial threat later became beating, the Sanhedrin principally composed of Sadducees,[45] aristocratic, patriotic and politically oriented rather than religiously, as the Pharisees, puts the authority of this body, not only perceived as God-given but representational of Godhead (Barnes, 1934: 3954) and therefore conform to His will. Gill (1810: 3944), distinguishes "civil and lawful" categories of societal submission. Calvin, (*Romans* 1540: 3944, 3897), however, sets civil authority as directly subordinate to God's authority,

> it is not denied that magistrates are to be hearkened to, and obeyed: but not more than God, or in things that are contrary to his nature, will, law, honour, and glory: whatever is agreeable to the law and will of God, commanded by magistrates, should be attended to, and cheerfully obeyed … (also Gill, 1810: 3897)

Calvin (*Romans* 1540: 3897 ,3944) will argue from the hypothesis that divine law and principle is to be the measure of secular law – a Christianisation of secular state (Gill, 1748: 3944, 5124). In secular France the separation of state and church,[46] resulted in religion being restricted to the private and personal sphere – the means of lawfully gagging the church's public voice and influence upon the divine institution of human government. It's legality and legitimacy are dependent upon secular state law dictate. (Ministère d'Intérieur, 2025).

The distinction of spheres is therefore integrated into a state-religion correlation whereby holders of judicial authority are bound to reflect in practice divine law. Barnes (1834: 3954) places opposition and preservation in the midst as a critical principle. Opposition is not ἀνομία it serves to defend and preserve divinely originated social order. Clarke (1967: 3896) incites,

when he commands us to speak, dare we hold our tongue? We have received our authority from God through Christ, and feel fully persuaded of the truth by the Holy Spirit which now dwells in us; and we should be guilty of treason against God.

The reason for institutional persecution, martyrdom and bloodshed in the early history of Christianity and the church lie herein, "Christianity resisted the claim, and asserted the

[44] Acts.4:19; 5:29; 7:54-60; 11:1-18; 13:44-50; 16:16-25; 17:5-9; 18:5-6, 12-15; 19:23-29; 20:18-24; 21:8-14.
[45] The first source of persecution towards the defiance of prohibitions by the Church (Machern, 1976: 69-70).
[46] Law of 1905.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

independent and original rights of conscience and the right of religion to a free exercise, acknowledged throughout the empire" (Bettenson, 1963: 15-16).[47]

There may not be uniformed separation of state and church but clear distinction is essential. The collaborative ὑποτάσσω reconciles perfectly the subordinate-resistance tension with due honour on the grounds of God's eternal kingdom governance and the transience of human separatist institutions[48] notwithstanding the correlation of subjection, the reformation to which Paul incites. Concerning Paul's approach, Glasser (Reader, 1992: A-133) suggests, were he among us today he would call for our active resistance to all that hinders the ongoing purposes of God- the powers in religious … intellectual structures ['ologies and 'isms] in moral structures [codes and customs] and in political structures [the tyrant, the market, the school, the courts, race and nation] ... the breaking in of the kingdom of God by One who rendered inoperative all opposing forces. But those who serve in his name will suffer.

Three contextual cases studies

Apostolic and Patristic persecutions till 313 ap .J.C.

The origins of the almost three centuries of Christians' persecution remain ambiguous, although under Nero the first wave of persecution outlawed Christianity, "there is no other foreign religion whose treatment by the Romans parallels the treatment of Christianity closely enough to support the idea that their refusal to practice polytheism or participate in public religious ritual was itself punishable with death …" (Schaff, 1890: 401; McKechnie, 2001: 62).[49] The consecutive waves of persecution between 64 and 313 CE.[50] endured till the East found relief through Licinius' and Constantine's Edict of Milan. During that period Christianity was illegal and therefore against the law of the Caesar's and the Roman empire. The grounds for the barbaric atrocities and the extent of persecution seem to repeatedly revolve around the absolute refusal to worship "the genius of Caesar," (McKechnie, 2001: 128), to make sacrifice and offerings, an act of emperor worship and allegiance. The anathema is expressed by Pliny,

> … I ask them if they are Christians. If they admit it, I repeat the question a second and a third time, threatening capital punishment; if they persist I sentence them to death. For I do not doubt that whatever kind of crime it may be to which they have confessed, their pertinacity and inflexible obstinacy should certainly be punished. All who denied that they were or had been Christians I considered should be discharged, because they called upon the gods at my dictation and did reverence, with incense and wine, to your image which I had ordered … together with the statutes of the deities; and especially because they cursed Christ a thing which it is said, genuine Christians cannot be induced to do (Pliny quoted in Bettenson:1963: 3).

[47] As documented under Constantine's Edit of Toleration, of Milan (311, 313 CE): the right to exist, the free and unrestricted practice of their religions, to places of worship, restitution of property. (Bettenson, 1963: 15-16).

[48] Peter's qualification of human government holds sway at this juncture. "Hupotagēte oun pasē anthrōpinē ktisei dia ton Kurion" (1Pe.2:13-16)

[49] Reference to emperor Hadrian's leniency should not be confused with favour, rather his concern for due judicial process (McKechnie, 2001: 116-117).

[50] Eusebuis (Schaff, 1890:833-834, 839; McKechnie, 2001:129-135, 224-227) identifies a first wave: Decian's persecution [249-251 CE.], purging the army of multitude of Christian soldiers; a second: Valerian's persecution [257-260 CE.]; a third Diocletian's great persecution [303-312] containing three decrees destroying churches and sacred books, and Christians' personal properties, possessions, and status, then clergy and leadership.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

The Christian phenomena, while growing exponentially during this period, did not rely on numerical mass, rather the qualitative characteristics of: passive resistance, conscious acceptance of consequences, as per Dionysius' witness in Egypt, " But I answered him, neither unsuitably nor in many words: We must obey God rather than men. And I testified openly that I worshiped the one only God, and no other; and that I would not turn from this nor would I ever cease to be a Christian" (Eusebius quoted in Schaff, 1890: 964). The prefectural prohibition to assemble was also disobeyed as Eusebius records "a large church gathered with us of the brethren that followed us from the city, and those that joined us from Egypt; and there, God opened unto us a door for the Word" (Schaff, 1890: 765). The curbing of religious freedom did not alter the pre-persecution witness to indescribable Christian freedom to speak openly God's word in every stratum of public and government spheres and the public favour demonstrated to Christians (Schaff, 1890: 830).[51] In the testimonies collated by Eusebius from across the empire, the qualitative portrait reiterates the Christian temperament in the face of the barbaric tortures inflicted indiscriminately of any Christian profession,

The invincible firmness [of] these truly wonderful athletes of religion … Christ-bearing martyrs, the marvellous endurance … the marvellous ardour, and truly divine energy, eagerness and zeal … confessing themselves Christians … indifferent … [to the] tortures, receiving the final sentence of death with joy and laughter and cheerfulness … offered up hymns and thanksgivings … resolute, unmoved … their victorious courage … enduring and immovable constancy … everywhere astonished those who beheld their manliness; and the evidences of the truly divine and unspeakable power of our Saviour were made manifest through them (Schaff, 1890:840-843, 846, 849, 851, 856).

The evidence bears witness to the apostolic and patristic understanding of ὑποτάσσω as firmly founded on a collaborative rather than hierarchal subordinate. The exception clause defined the posture in relations to state and its incompatibilities with Christian faith and church. The general posture indicates not only resistance, but a conscious acceptance of the consequences, rather than the absolute and passive theology of Calvin's determinist posture. The witness is to a superior reality founded upon redemption and transformational engagement. Vondey, (2017: 207, 217, 221), reiterates in contemporary concept the apostolic ethos of redemption of culture and social transformation by the penetration of Christians into every social stratum. The apostolic history is the mutation from this penetration movement towards counter-cultural resistance of destructive opposition to the incoming kingdom of God, "The eschatological Spirit determines the coming into existence of the church not only as the embodiment of the kingdom but also as the embodiment of the confrontation of the world with its own future" (Vondey, 2017: 222).

Apartheid in South Africa

The church's relationship to Apartheid correlates directly to the comprehension of ὑποτάσσω found in the historical emergent positions between State, "apartheid's own nation-building project" (Czégledy, 2008: 301), and Church. Barkat (1982: 297, 300; Richardson, 1986:3) describes the apartheid system as, "a [global] model for racism … institutionalized in South African ideology, politics, and culture and perpetuated in the name of Christian faith," sustaining connections to "economic and colonial domination." Balcomb (2004: 5-38) helpfully evaluates five positions of relationship between apartheid state and the church:

[51] Eusebius (Schaff, 1890: 831) testifies to in-house quarrels, disputes, laxism and hypocrisy, as precursor to the waves of persecution.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

1. Support – Dutch Reformed Church,[52] as official state religion on Calvinist or neo-Calvinist theological grounds and Germanic concepts of nationhood (Czeglédy, 2008: 289; Richardson, 1986: 3), created a racial and segregational structure.[53] The affirmation of compliant submission to state on these principles drawn from Roman's chapter thirteen. The same principle applied to post-apartheid government found great resistance (Balcomb, 2004: 8-9, 14). If God does ordain government, why this inconsistency?

2. Apolitical pragmatists[54]- from indifferent attitudes transitioned to public rejection of apartheid as sin, strong support for the new democratic dispensation, and equally strong criticism of fundamentalist, conservative evangelical positions (Balcomb, 2004: 15-17). The rereading of the Gospel of Jesus terms of morality, ethics, justice, and equity, engendered this change towards social transformation, because of its social and political implications.

3. Protagonists[55] - opposing [Afrikaner] apartheid and subversive violent [African] opposition called for interracial trans-political and denominational reconciliatory[56] gatherings (Balcomb, 2004: 19). Adelman, (1982: 50, 54, 57) anticipates the mass uprising of low-level and random acts of protestation, repeatedly quenched due to the "almost total concentration of economic, political, and military power in Afrikaner hands." The denunciation of evil and injustice, apartheid law, inequality, while professed "did not translate into socio-political reality" (2004: 19, 21), the black community needed justice as precedent to reconciliation.

4. Alternative protagonists[57]- addressed apartheid theologically from out with the political social tensions,[58] providing an alternate path with spiritual and ontological God given truths as grounds for profound change in societal stratum. Vindication was not grounded comparatively, between the powerful advantages of the white Afrikaners and the impoverished weakness of Blacks. Value, recognition, potential, dignity, equality, were not to be sought from whites; these qualities were inherent self-determinant core prerequisites to any significant social, economic or political transformation (2004: 25-26). The liberation in South Africa is not the amelioration of apartheid, but its total eradication, "We do not want our chains made more comfortable, we want them removed" (Barkat, 1982: 303).

5. Liberationists[59] - stood against apartheid from within the centre of the political struggle, within the economic poor-rich tension;[60] many Christian voices were concerned by

[52] English speaking churches generally were opposants, while Pentecostal churches broadly sat on the wall of indifference; political activism being difficult to reconcile with an apolitical view of church (Czeglédy, 2008: 289).
[53] Apartheid was condemned as sin and heresy by The Council of World Alliance of Reformed Churches (Canada, 1982); World Conference on Church and Society (1967:204); Reformed Churches ecumenical conference, (Johannesburg, 1962).
[54] Balcomb quotes from proponents: MacCauley, Rhema Church, Steele, Retief.
[55] Balcomb quotes from proponents: Michael Cassidy and African Enterprise.
[56] Labelled "The Third Way" (Balcomb, 2004: 21).
[57] Balcomb quotes Nicholas Bhengu, Back to God movement.
[58] Bhengu's approach never denied the atrocities, the suffering, the injustice and need for liberation.
[59] Balcomb quotes Frank Chikane, Apostolic Faith Mission.
[60] This position deepens the tension, setting the poor against the rich. The incoherence appears in post-apartheid when the then poor have become rich.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

> authoritarian-freedom issues (2004: 9-10, 27-32), resistant and outspoken on moral values against liberalism, meanwhile liberal capitalism found global embrace. Balcomb (2004: 32, 33, 34) describes the ambivalent spectrum of evangelical political contributions as, "active opposition to change and preservation of the status quo, to apparent neutrality and indifference, to active participation in the democratic processes of change."

Post-apartheid state and church have incorporated core values whereby the intertwining of political freedom, social transformation and religious redemption impetuses construct South African identity, renewal, and prosperity (Czeglédy, 2008: 285, 300, , 303, 305; Balcomb, 2004: 6), "the aim of converting individual consciences was superseded by that of transforming social, economic and political structures" (Richardson, 1986: 11). Terminology employed to describe apartheid would apply equally to the new South Africa. The potential in this symbiotic relationality is that the divine roles of state and church are blurred. Richardson, (1986: 3) defining heresy, identifies "the ongoing process of establishing boundaries between what is and is not the church." The World Council of Churches articulated the need for artificial separation of spiritual and secular, or be bereft of Christian moral ethics and action (Barkat, 1982:304). While South African history testifies to an insubordinate submission relationship; the ὑποτάσσω construct requires the distinctive relationship between government and church; that both retain their divine destiny and purpose in the world.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer

The personal example of Bonhoeffer articulates with clarity the raison d'être of state and church, the former "… established by God for the preservation of order … to law and order and not to lawlessness …" (Metaxas, 2010: 153). The concurrence of the church's relation to state, recognising two distinct entities with specific attributed functions, advocates an active rather than passive posture. "The church must continually ask the state whether its action can be justified as legitimate action … the church's role is to help the state be the state …" (Metaxas, 2010: 153).

This sentinel-accountability role of Church, "because of its better knowledge of the state and of the limitations of its action" (Metaxas, 2010: 153, 226, 194) within State is grounded upon divine parameters for the purpose and praxis of state action. In the case of failure, excess, dictatorship or totalitarianism socially and religiously, provoking the servility of Church to State or regime, incites the Church to action, as a means of preventing the proliferation of evil. Bonhoeffer observes the passive confession as impotent where active resistance is necessary. Every Christian must be "fully human" by bringing God into his whole being not merely into some spiritual realm. To be an ethereal figure who merely talked about God but somehow refused to get his hands dirty … was bad theology. (Metaxas, 2010: 364)

The weak independent posture of the Church within the Reich Nazi regime resulted in a state church, a confused commixture of Germanism and subservient Christianity within a radical social reordering. Under Rosenberg's plan, Christianity was emptied of its Christian

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

fundamentals[61] (Metaxas, 2010: 155, 157, 171, 172). Bonhoeffer resisted this pseudo-church[62] (Metaxas, 2010: 185, 194, 226).

Bonhoeffer's views corroborate the collaborative ὑποτάσσω view of the submission in the State-Church relationality. His proactive view of Church as state sentinel mutates Church from passive grounds. Only as Church bears this posture, can Church autonomy and integrity before God define purpose for her and State, and serve such a purpose, "a state which includes within itself a terrorised church has lost its most faithful servant" (Metaxas, 2010: 154).

Conclusion in governance

To summarise so far, good governance of justice, peace, equity, reflective of the values of God's eternal Kingdom that incite the Christian response of an active collaborative ὑποτάσσω, recognising reflected divine intent, contributing a unique spiritual transformative dynamism in view of realisation of the eternal Kingdom. Likewise, the collaborative ὑποτάσσω resolves the confusion of government of divine or secular nature through liberated distinctiveness. The clash clause exception postures freedom, an independent conscience, and unambiguous allegiance to God, to whom solely subordinate submission is due, whether government acknowledges or not. Collaborative ὑποτάσσω is the freedom and integrity to oppose, resist, revolutionise, with the objective of defending and preserving divine value based societal order, which is not ἀνομία; prophetically reminding government of the divine mandate. Assuming this posture is divine submission, civil disobedience and the conscious bearing of the consequences. The apostolic-patristic case study reiterates the collaborative posture in active resistance and impregnating societal stratum transformatively. The apartheid study underscores the diversity of approaches from assimilation to violent opposition, reflective of the power necessary to overcome evil governance. The recovery of an ethical, transformative, just, peaceable and liberational Gospel has provided foundations for identity and cultural renewal. Although the blurring of the lines of unambiguous distinction assumed between Church and State in a collaborative ὑποτάσσω, could weaken the integrity and power to act of both. Bonhoeffers' witness emphatically sets the distinction between church and state and the dignified calling of Church to understand divine government and teach human government good Kingdom reflective societal values, for fear of losing herself. That distinction maintained avoids the collapse of both entities, rendering them both efficient powers within their functions.

Other spheres

The hierarchal interpretation of submission from Romans thirteen is generically transposed to the biblical interpretations concerning church, marriage, slave[work] relationships, "maintaining due subordination in the various relations of life" (Barnes, 1834: 6181), be it civil, ecclesial, or familial (Gill, 1810: 6181; Poole, 1685: 6181). The archetypal relationship of Christ and the Church is foundationally prototypical to the three core relationships[63] according to Jamieson et al.(1866: 6181, 6182).[64] "As Christ exercises authority over the Church" (Clarke, 1967: 6182) encapsulates the hierarchal principle translated generically from its unique Christ-centric

[61] Rosenberg's plan … the clearest proof that exists of the Nazis plans for the churches:
13. The cessation of publishing and disseminating the Bible in Germany.
14. Fuehrer's *Mein Kampf* is the greatest of all documents … the purest and truest ethics.
18. The National Church will remove all altars, crucifixes, Bibles and pictures of saints.
19. On the church's altars … nothing but Mein Kampf … and to the left a sword.
30. Christian crosses … must be superseded by the only unconquerable symbol the swastika.

[62] Bonhoeffer's plea through the compromised 'Bethel Confession' birthed the Confessing Church, as the only legitimate German church.

[63] Church, marriage, parents-children. Masters-slaves or work relationships should be added.

[64] The of God as primary motivation (Calvin, 1540: 6181; Poole, 1685: 6181; Trapp, 1655: 6181).

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

application, void of hermeneutical and contextual consideration, is at least suppositional if not erroneous.

Marriage

Interpretation of Ephesian chapter five relates to Christ and the church, employing a husband-wife figuration, according to Findlay (1891, 354) "is not that of the particular to the general [rather] of image and object, of type and antitype." It does however set out Christ as the Institutor of human collective existence and founder of social order, "The entire influence of the Church upon society depends upon right views on the relationship of man and woman and on the ethics of marriage" (Findlay, 1891: 355).

The subordinate argument appeals to divine order, the creational order, and instinctive-intrinsic natural order for validity (Findlay, 1891: 356, 358). The presuppositions that result argue for male leadership and female subordination analogous with Christ-Church, so with husband-wife, "such subordination implies no inferiority … a free and sympathetic obedience – which is true submission – can only exist between equals" (Findlay, 1891: 356). The sacrosanct remains male headship,[65] public authority and guidance. Hendriksen (1993: 365), affirms both equality in spiritual standing before God in Christ, but insists upon the creational mandate to define the nature of their relational standing. This is to put creation and Christ in unnecessary thesis-antithesis tension. It is to miscomprehend the correlation of Creator and fulfilment of created order. Subordination from the creational order argues: man first, supports headship, management and authority, "being better qualified for ruling … a perfect government is that where the known wish of the lawgiver [man] is a sufficient rule to the subject [woman]." (Barnes, 1810: 6182; Clarke, 1967: 6182-6183). This superiority is justified by "… being the seat of reason, and the fountain of sense and motion …" (Poole, 1685: 6183). Woman according to the creational order, is likened as equal in character, however, her sphere is family, only in conscience and belief does she stand autonomously, although compliance and consent to the husband takes primacy (Barnes, 1834: 6181; Gill, 1810: 6183), "… from the time, matter, and end of the woman's creation, she was made after him, out of him, and for him; and from her fall, and being first in the transgression; and from her being the weaker and inferior sex" (Gill, 1810: 6183).

The principle, in Christ, is interpreted from the creational order hypothesis, thereby reinforcing the model in which Christlikeness salvifically requires authority that protects, comforts and provides (Clarke, 1967: 6183; Poole, 1685: 6183). Interpretation of the salvific nature of the husband is varied: Jamieson et al. (1866: 6183), state the husband is not the saviour of the wife, in this Christ is superior; Calvin (1540: 6183) sees subjection to the husband and salvation in Christ as intertwined "… to refuse that subjection [to the husband], by means of which they might be saved, is to choose destruction," or in Poole's (1685: 6183) words, "so likewise the husband is given to the wife to be a saviour to her."

This article's antithetical response is constituted in the non-military, non-hierarchical collaborative ὑποτάσσω hypothesis, defined as a reciprocal and mutual voluntary attitude of cooperation, assuming responsibility, and carrying an assigned part alongside. If man and woman are both made in the image of God, if the ontological intra-Trinitarian relationality is to be coherent with the believer's reciprocal union in Trinity, then the marriage relationship is destined to be an extended expression of Trinitarian interrelatedness. If woman is called

[65] Defined as a hierarchy of authority and patriarchy (Atkinson and Field 1995: 822).

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

kneged ‘ēzer, a name of God,[66] transliterated as “someone capable, powerful, intelligent, competent, and equal, like you and alongside you” (Henderson: 2019, 575), then relationship between man and woman is characterised by mutuality, reciprocity, complicity, completeness, equality and fullness as opposed to hierarchal, authoritarian and subjugator. Paul’s argument from 1 Corinthians eleven must respect the structure of his thought development: beginning with the factual creational order from Genesis;[67] he seeks to restore a culture of honour;[68] he speaks of the glory of creation[69] however, the conclusion to his development is the glory of being, in Christ, where ontological and relational interdependency, inseparability and equality are the point, originating from God,[70] profoundly reflective and coherent with intra-Trinitarian relationality. The danger is that hierarchy is argued from the Fall and not the creational order, and less so the redemptive order in Christ (Strauch 1995: 61), “… we must assert on the basis of Scripture that in the Kingdom of God women are on a complete par with men – in creation, in sin, and in redemption” (Summerton, 1994: 136). Paul’s ontological understanding is reflected in his existential understanding in Christ where cultural and societal categories, while existent and recognised, are fulfilled by the greater “in Christ” reality.[71] Therefore, personhood and gender, ontology and functionality, strength or weakness in morality or character, public and domestic, superiority and inferiority categorisations simply do not stand in the light of biblical exegesis. Ontological differentiation in Christ acknowledged, hierarchal and functional categorisations for men and women are refuted through the Pauline “in Christ” prism.

The argument from headship in support of hierarchal ὑποτάσσω requires Jesus’ own interpretation and normative use of the term, referring to foundation stone or capstone;[72] Christ then is portrayed as source, centre and foundation. These are not hierarchal nor subjugator categories, “for Paul to use ‘κεφαλή’ to mean Head or ruler would be a rare usage of the word, as seen by the evidence of the Septuagint” (Hamilton, 2000: 163). That the appropriate response to Christ who holds all authority in heaven and on earth is a hierarchal subordinate submission is not disputed, but the husband is not Christ to any wife in the Christological ontology of the NT. From Ephesians five verse twenty-three the subordinate cannot be argued sufficiently for Christ is not revealed as κύριος, explicit of authority bearing, rather as Χριστός – Saviour, deliverer, rescuer, protecter, carer. On this basis, the antithesis to the authoritarian subordination relationship is affirmed and assumed, that the overarching reading of Scripture clearly asserts a collaborative, cooperative egalitarian mutual reciprocal relationship; an imperfect reflection of Trinitarian collaborative relationality. “The ‘headship’ language … should probably therefore not be interpreted as signalling hierarchical authority and patriarchy, but intimacy, union and responsibility; and ‘submission’ … as self-giving in love, rather than recognition of status” (Atkinson and Field, 1995: 822).

Church

Ignatius (Lightfoot, 1912: 183,149) begins with a positive assertion, “that ye run in harmony with the mind of God: for Jesus Christ also, our inseparable life.” However, this collaborative understanding is diverted by the episcopalian construct whereby theological error is introduced

[66] Psalm 33:20; 70:5; 89:19; 31:22; Numbers 2:2; Jeremiah 16:17; Nehemiah 13:21; Genesis 31:32; 1 Chronicles 8:32; Judges 9:17.
[67] Verse 3.
[68] Verses 4-6.
[69] Verses 7-10.
[70] Verses 11-12.
[71] Galatians 3:26-27; Colossians 3:9-10.
[72] Matthew 21:42; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

through bishop-centricity which is essentially idolatry, decentring believers, church ontology, and existence in union,

> Run in harmony with the mind of the bishop … your honourable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop … I congratulate you who are closely joined with him as the Church is with Jesus Christ and as Jesus Christ is with the Father … submitting yourselves to the bishop as to the commandment, and likewise also to the presbytery (Ignatius quoted in Lightfoot, 1912: 183, 149).

This consequence of episcopalism upon NT church created an amalgamation between the episcopalian offices[73] and the Trinitarian persons, "submitting yourselves to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ" (Polycarp quoted in Lightfoot, 1912: 179). Clement writing to the Corinthian church expresses concern regarding submission to elders, "… submit yourselves unto the presbyters and receive chastisement unto repentance, bending the knees of your heart laying aside the arrogant and proud stubbornness of your tongue" (Clement quoted in Lightfoot, 1912: 81). Gill (1810: 6181) reinforces the hierarchal episcopal theory justifying a subordinate relationship to leadership and an exalted view of the office, "God has set them in the highest place in the church."[74] Robertson (1931: 6181) employs a generalised military signification to mutual forms of submission, "old military figure to line up under." Findlay (1891: 353-354) perceives inter-relationality within church on mutual submissive grounds, the diversity of gifts within the body of Christ being built into a temple of the Holy Spirit, "the inward fellowship of the Spirit becomes a constructive and organizing force reconstituting human life and framing the world into the kingdom of Christ and God."

Trinitarian-Christological-ontological error

The dilemma of the post-apostolic NT period concerned continuity, preserving the apostolic deposit, and succession. Harnack (1962: 286), traces the effects of discontinuity through the "demise of the sacred triad": the apostles, then the prophets, followed by the teachers.[75] Discontinuity took the form of transference to the episcopate construct in which, the bishop office succeeds the apostle, the canon of Scripture the apostolic witness, and the episcopalian catechism the Bible teachers (Henderson, 2021: 3-5). Bishop office represents authority and governance divergent from the inherent spiritual nature and quality of the five charismatic ministries in and through which Christ builds his Church. Cyprian (*c.*200-258), championed an "advanced theory of apostolic succession" (Ferguson, Wright, 2008: 184). He affirms that the command of Christ was "the office of bishop and the episcopate system of Church." His bishop-centricity led to a fundamental Christological error whereby, "the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop" (Bettenson, 1963: 73-74; Henderson, 2021: 4-5). According to Kelly (1968: 35), the book of second Clement imposes "a strict obedience to the presbyters … [as] their instructions are identical with those of Christ Himself." Ignatius, (110-117), bishop of Antioch, imposed strong ideas of authority and control over the church and believers, "respect the bishop as a type of God, and the presbyters as the council of God and the college of

[73] Bishop, Elder, Presbytery, Deacon.

[74] Gill's (1810: 6181) qualifier distinguished pastors and leaders from Christ the head of the church, and the submission due to their position, title and teachings. The only conditionality referred to is concordance with the Bible. See also Jamieson Brown and Fausset, 1866: 6181, 6184; Calvin, 1540: 6182.

[75] Harnack identifies the three phased premature end as: mid-second century for the apostle; end-second century for the prophets, and early fourth century for the teachers. (1962: 286, 273, 289, 294; Henderson, 2021: 2-3).

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

apostles. Apart from these there is not even in name church"[76] (Harman et Renwick, 1985: 26). For Ignatius, unity is defined by declared allegiance to the bishop rather than to Jesus Christ. This human mediation demonstrates further estrangement from the unique mediation of Jesus Christ by a hierarchy and a purely human structure upon the administration of an office (Henderson, 2019: 396). The epistle of Ignatius to the church in Smyrna lays the foundation which gave lieu to ministerial hierarchy in the form of the papacy.

> All of you follow the bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and follow the presbytery as the Apostles; and respect the deacons as the commandment of God. Let no man perform anything pertaining to the church without the bishop. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as, wheresoever Christ Jesus is … (Bettenson, 1963: 63-64).

Besides the argument from coalescence, structuration and officering, this episcopalisation paradigm mutation from NT apostolic foundations, enunciates a fundamental theological ontological and Trinitarian error. The incarnate representation of offices as God and Christ on hierarchal grounds of authority and governance, corroborates a divinised form of human clergy in favour of allegiance to the office of bishop. The Christological antithesis, recognizes Christ the κεφαλή, that is unique legitimate foundation, centre, source ontologically and relationally creating Church.[77] Mediation depends directly upon Christ and the Spirit, rather than human office.[78]

Creational or Christological order

The dualism maintained between creational and Christological order fails to embrace the primacy of the latter as the redemptive work of Christ, vital to the restoration of creational order.[79] This dualism is founded upon the order of the Fall[80] rather than the original creation order and the redemptive Christological order, "Christian women [having] equality in spiritual standing before God and the great liberty [salvation alone], must not forget about God's creation-ordinance" (Hendriksen, 1983: 365).[81] The distinction between creational order inter-relatedness and being "in Christ" as spiritual equals, deduces public teaching or preaching ministry as,

> [the] exercise [of] authority over a man, to dominate him, is wrong for a woman. She must not assume the role of a master … it is natural for him to lead, for her to follow. The tendency to follow was embedded in Eve's very soul as she came forth from …. her Creator … Why should a woman be encouraged to do things that are contrary to her nature? (Hendriksen, 1983: 109-110).

[76] Extract of Ignatius' *letter to the Trallians.*

[77] Matthew 21:42; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7; Ephesians 1:22; 4:15; Colossians 1:18; 2:19. See also 1 Corinthians 11:3, 11; Ephesians 5:23, interpreted Christologically.

[78] Romans 8:26-27; 31-35; 1 Timothy 2:5; Hebrew 8:6; 9:15.

[79] Colossians 1:15-20; Matthew 19:28 The παλιγγενεσια of all things; Romans 8:18-23; 1 Corinthians 15:46-49; 2 Peter 3:4.

[80] The domination of man over woman, the woman's desire to conquer man. This hierarchal conflict founded upon fear of one and the other on no way reflects the created or Christological order and yet is misused to justify authority-subordination hierarchy.

[81] Findlay (1892: 357) upon the creational paradigm affirms spiritual equality with the exception to headship, public, church ministry, authority and guidance, governance, (See also Hendriksen 1983:109).

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

The Christological antithesis rests upon Jesus' words to the disciples in direct response to the hierarchical supposition identified within the nations, of the first-ranked leaders exercising subjugating lordship and wielded authority over or on the people. His response, "it will absolutely not be in this manner in you …" (TLT Mark.10:43-43), incarnates the διάκονος and δουλος spirit and opposes the hierarchal thesis.[82] This is further compounded by Paul's in Christ theology and the categorisation of spiritual-ontological and creational distinctions; being found in Christ, putting on Christ, discards as obsolete racial, social, gender and religious categories and distinctions establishing one unique antithetical in Christ reality in the new Christological order distinct and realised.[83] Ephesians chapter four explicitly articulates, "to each one in particular and to all the grace being received according to the measure of the gift of the person of Christ" (TLT, Ephesians 4:7), whereby the spiritual-creational distinction is superseded by undetermined access to salvation and to ministry originated in the gift of Christ.[84]

The Christological antithesis, recognizes Christ the κεφαλή: foundation, centre, and source, ontologically and relationally creating Church.[85] The ordering of Church relies upon the δωρεά, the central presence of Christ and the Spirit[86] acting incarnationally in the believer to apostolically manifest their ministry to glorify God and build the body of Christ into her κεφαλή.

> Paul clearly warns the Colossian church of 'religious traditions and practices' that would dangerously threaten as substitute source. The ontological church is radically distinct from the religious church where Christ may be revered, ritually or ceremonially worshiped but He is not 'κεφαλή' as presently defined. Church of human intent or construction with religious sentiment offered to God for acceptability; church where every human and religious resource is thrown into making church something; church where religious observance, allegiance, obedience, practice and good work are reverently observed, does not demonstrate God's church – Christ's body on the principle that nothing of the mentioned aspects can make church the body of Christ for the origin is in human construct or intent and not the Person of Christ. (Henderson, 2019: 493)

This seminal understanding finds its ontological and relational outworking,

> "… And He, gave some of them as apostles, some of them as prophets, some as evangelists, some as shepherds and teachers, destined for the perfecting of the believers …; according to the operating in measure of each one and every part, the growth of the body produces the building up of herself in love" (TLT, Ephesians 4:11, 16).

[82] The distinction in terms can be articulated as follows: διάκονος, the free and willing choice to follow the will of another while maintaining his own; δουλος, the free choice to enter into and accomplish the will of another over one's own. (Zodhiates, 1993: 429-431, 483).
[83] Galatians 1:26-27; Colossians 3:9-10; see also Acts 2:16-21 [Joel 2:28-32] – Pentecostal Spirit experience; 1 Timothy 2:1 – all are to pray.
[84] By consequence Romans 12:6 ; 1 Corinthians 12:11 are read synonymously.
[85] Matthew 21:42; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7; Ephesians 1:22; 4:15; Colossians 1:18; 2:19. See also 1 Corinthians 11:3, 11; Ephesians 5:23, interpreted Christologically.
[86] For Christ: Romans 5:15; 2 Corinthians 9:14-15; Galatians 1:15. Of the Holy Spirit: Luke 11:13; John 4:10; 7:37-39; Acts 2:38; 10:45; Hebrews 6:4; Of God Father: Ephesians 3:7; 1 Corinthians 12:6; 15:10; 2 Corinthians 6:1.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

The non-hierarchal Christological ontology of church ministers, identified as πρεσβύτερος, επίσκοπος or προΐστημι, correlates these roles or titles to the exercise of the five charismatic ministries for legitimisation from within the Church body, rather than over.[87] The etymology of the terms emphasizes the posture of ministry before the face of God in Christ,[88] and therefore accentuates the primacy of demonstration within the Church of the incarnate life and praxis in Christ, in Spirit, (Henderson, 2019: 560-563),[89] being the first to show how to live in Christ in a non-hierarchal subordinate framework.

Jesus alone, who holds all authority in heaven and on earth, exercises ἐξουσία ἐπί.[90] His authority reflects the primary definition to set free or freedom to exercise influence (Henderson, 2019: 565). The Christological view understands authority as the incarnate exercise through the believer of the manifestation of the Spirit's gifts, of Christ's ministries and the Father's operations as opposed to a governing over position, taken from obscured creational suppositions, the nature of the Fall, transposed into the nature of Church and ministry. It is in this Christological framework that ὑποτάσσω, the voluntary attitude of … cooperating, assuming an assigned part of responsibility alongside, on reciprocal and mutual grounds, integrates cohesively. Ὑποτάσσω ecclesial relationships for all distinct categories, (elders, leaders, ministers, Christians, male-female, etc.) demonstrate this one reality.[91] The resulting paradigm reflects an all-inclusive participative and collaborative reality for believers in Christ.[92]

Work relationships

The biblical context of the δουλος[93] in Christ[94] and subsequently in the apostles' self-understanding,[95] in the collective church and ministries,[96] identifies the δουλος spirit and posture as "the spirit of Christian brotherhood" (Findlay, 1891: 389). The equalizing of the ontological and existential value of a person in Christ overruled accepted social constructs.[97] No-one in NT history sought to overturn the master-slave social construct, although the spirit, character and posture[98] for both slaves and masters in Christ were clearly addressed ontologically and relationally,[99] "their work will thus be rendered from inner principle, with thought and affection and resolution …" (Findlay, 1891: 392). The δουλος ὑποτάσσω social relationship status was not contested, rather redefined in Christ which would implicitly reform from "within the context of existing social structures" (Ladd, 2002: 575). Hendriksen (1982:

[87] Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:2-3.
[88] 2 Corinthians 2:17; 4:2; 12:19; 1Timothy 6:13.
[89] Ephesians 5:1; 1 Corinthians 11:1; 41:16; 1 Thessalonians 1:6; 2:14; Philippians 3:12, 17; 1 Peter 5:3.
[90] The use of ἐξουσία ἐπί uniquely applies permanently to Christ in scripture: Matthew 9:6; 28:18; Colossians 1:16. Luke 9:1; 10:19 exemplary exceptions that refer to temporary delegation for a specific mission task.
[91] Hebrews 13:17; 1 Peter 5:1-5; 1Corinthians 14:32; Ephesians 5:21.
[92] Through its ontological theological foundations, this view takes precedence over the Anabaptist tradition, "the new world is seen as intruding with revolutionary effect into the present age … the hierarchies of secular government were banished … [and avoided] within the churches … so that believers are thought to submit only to Christ through the Spirit." (Atkinson and Field, 1995: 822).
[93] Δουλος refers to the servant who enters into the will of another, distinct from other forms of servanthood.
[94] Philippians.2:7.
[95] Romans 1:1; Philippians 1:1; Titus.1:1; James.1:1; 2 Peter 1:1; Jude 1:1; Revelation 1:1.
[96] 1 Peter 2:16; 2 Timothy 2:24.
[97] Galatians 3:26-27; Colossians 3:9-10; Acts 10:28-29, 34; James 2:1-9.
[98] See also Hendriksen, 1983: 368-369.
[99] Ephesians 6:5-9; Colossians 3:22, 4:1; 1 Timothy 6:1-2; Titus 2:7-8.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

368), contextualising conditionally the injunction outside any form of absolutism, also corroborates the antithesis.
Christian theology and faith were primarily to be integrated into believers and church, lived out in whatever context; any social reformation or change would be a consequence of this, likewise of Christians becoming socially influential. While Christology transcended social classes in relationships within church, civil social distinctions were recognised (Ladd, 2002: 574-575). Paul's approach was revolutionary by the definition of a new relationship theologically between slaves and masters from within the Church and deontologically in the workplace environment, "Paul exploded slavery … he did not start a social revolution. The new relationship must be expressed within the old institution" (Atkinson and Field, 822).

The master-slave work environment reflects this character-spirit: trustworthiness, honesty, well-pleasing countering rebellion, resistance, conflict, dishonesty (Hendriksen, 1982: 368-369). Δουλος, biblically defined and applied to Christ, the apostles and the apostolic believers, reinforces this pervasive spirit of voluntarily choosing the will of another (Thayer, 1999: 1401). This spirit of in Christ relationality within church produced indifference "… to social class and slavery bypassed these barriers [citizenship, class property, political order] as irrelevant … " (Fox, 2006: 539). The fruit within societal structures was not rebellion or insubordination rather an intensified spiritually grounded subordinate relationship, the cause being the egalitarian posture towards hierarchal submission to Christ in his ultimate authority.[100] Transference of the same posture to the δεσποτης-οἰκέτης work relationship is replaced by the collaborative because of the submissive spirit in Christ. The conscious choice was to bear the assigned part under God alongside and in favour of the master in his service and that of the household.[101] Whether in Paul or Peter's writings the purpose is one of honour – knowing the true value [τιμάω] of the person (Thayer, 1999: 5091).

This article questions whether the hierarchal-subordinate military interpretation of ὑποτάσσω legitimizes the theological spirit of δουλος ὑποτάσσω. The argument from the perspective of a delegated measured authority by the Christ of all-authority, the δουλος spirit clearly corroborates the subordinate relationship to Christ and favours a voluntary collaborative engagement within this context.

Conclusion

This article has responded to the research statement through in-depth analysis of biblical texts, historical empirical testimony, diverse theological interpretations and perspectives of ὑποτάσσω contextualised within Trinity, governance, church, marriage, work relationality. Hermeneutical, exegetical and contextual considerations critiqued provided the articulation of the cogence and cohesiveness of the ὑποτάσσω collaborative hypothesis. The argument has substantiated an egalitarian insubordinate view of Trinitarian relationality and operationality; relationship to state governance has proscribed a distinct collaborative relatedness for good, the reflection of Kingdom values, while recovering a distinct voice speaking into government –

[100] Ephesians 5:21; 1 Peter 2:18-21.
[101] The use of δεσποταις primarily refers to Christ or God as absolute ultimate master (Luke 2:29; Acts 4:24; 2 Timothy 2:21; 2 Peter 2:1; Jude 1:4; Revelation 6:10). The remaining four mentions (1 Timothy 6:1, 2; Titus 2:9; 1 Peter 2:18) apply to human masters. The common meaning is that of exercised authority in the absolute sense applied to Christ; to masters over households indicates a defined sphere of influence. In this context implied is the relationship of pedagogue to the slave rather than some form of absolutist despotism as normative. The bearing of tribulation under a warped or unreasonable master [σκολιοις], draws posture conduct and spirit from Christ.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

reminding of the divine vocation, and the Christian's ability to assume with audacious allegiance God over state, assuming fully the consequences. Church relationality finds restored Christology and Pneumatology, founded upon the unique criteria of being in Christ and in Spirit, the unique qualifier for collaborative reciprocal ὑποτάσσω; marriage and work relatedness likewise find Trinitarian reflections of egalitarian collaborative, reciprocal principles which restore the biblical sense of ὑποτάσσω. This article is limited to theological reinterpretation and the implications five biblical core areas of application. The cogency of the proposal suggests future research in the outworking as how it affects church operation and function, and relationality in community and corporate life with the sociological, psychological, and functional implications.

References

Adelman, K. L. (1982). Apartheid: Is There Any Hope Left in South Africa? *Journal of Black Studies,*13(1), pp. 45–58. Available online at http://www.jstor.org/stable/2783974.

Atkinson, D.J.; Field, D.H. (1995). *New dictionary of Christian ethics and pastoral theology.* Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.

Augustine (1887). *On Christian doctrine. De Trinitate*. 8 Volumes. Grand Rapids (Mich.), Edinburgh: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; T & T Clark, (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol.3, Series I). Available online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf103.html, checked on 14th May 2019.

Balcomb, A. (2004). From Apartheid to the New Dispensation: Evangelicals and the Democratization of South Africa. *Journal of Religion in Africa* 34(1), pp. 5–38. Available online at http://www.jstor.org/stable/1581479.

Barkat, A. M. (1982). Churches Combating Racism In South Africa. *Journal of International Affairs,* 36 (2), pp. 297–305. Available online at http://www.jstor.org/stable/24356442.

Barnes, A. (1834). *Notes on the New Testament: Explanatory and Practical*. 11 volumes. London: Blackie and Son.

Barrett, C. K. (1987). *The New Testament background. Selected documents*. Revised edition. Edited by Charles Kingsley Barrett. London: SPCK.

Bettenson, H.S. (Ed.) (1963). *Documents of the Christian Church*. Second édition. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press (Oxford paperbacks, 125).

Bruce, F.F. (1988). *The book of the Acts*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids (Michigan): W.

B. Eerdmans (1988). The New International Commentary on the New Testament.

Calvin, J. (1540). *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.

Calvin, J. (1599). *The Institutes of Christian Religion*. Grand Rapids Mich.: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Available online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.html, checked on Accessed.

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

Clarke, A. (1967, 2010). *Commentary on the Bible*. One Volume Edition. n.a.: Baker House Books.

Cunningham, L., Hamilton, D. J. & Rogers, J. (2000). *Why not women? A fresh look at scripture on women in missions, ministry, and leadership.* Seattle, Washington: YWAM [Youth With a Mission] Publishing.

Czeglédy, A. P. (2008). A New Christianity for a New South Africa. Charismatic Christians and the Post-Apartheid Order. *Journal of Religion in Africa,*38(3), Article 3, pp. 284–311. Available online at http://www.jstor.org/stable/27594469.

Findlay, G. G. (1892). *The Epistle to the Ephesians.* London: Hodder and Stoughton (The Expositor's Bible, 5).

Fox, R.L. (2006). *The classical world. An epic history from Greece and Rome.* London: Penguin.

Gill, J. (1810). *Exposition of the Old & New Testaments*. 9 vols. London: Matthews & Leigh.

Gundry, R. H. (1994). *A survey of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids Mich.: Zondervan Pub. House.

Harnack, A. (1962). *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the first three centuries*. Vol 1. Grand Rapids (Mich.): Harper Torchbook. Available online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/harnack/mission.html., checked on 11/16/2018.

Henderson, E. S. (2021). Apostolicity as Divine Attribute in Trinitarian Relationship: the origin and nature of apostolicity and how it is demonstrated. *Pharos Journal of Theology,* 102, Article 20, pp. 1–19. Available online at https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.102.20.

Henderson, E.S. (2019). *A Biblical Examination of an Ontological Reading of Theology in Trinity, in the Believer and in Church*. PhD. Atlantic Coast Theological Seminary, Florida, USA. Available online at 10.17613/g8jy-ds77.

Henderson, E.S. (2022). *Les gros mots bibliques. La méconnaissance de la soumission.* France, checked on 10/2/2024.

Hendriksen, W. (1982). *New Testament Commentary Romans*. 2 volumes. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust.

Hendriksen, W. (1983). *New Testament Commentary 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy and Titus*. 1 volume. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust (New Testament Commentary).

Hodge, C. (1873). *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Philadelphia: Alfred Martin.

Jamieson, R., Fausset, A. R. & Brown, D. (1866). *Commentary critical and explanatory on the whole Bible*. 6 volumes. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co. (vol 6).

Copyright: ©2026 Open Access/Author/s - Online @ http//: www.pharosjot.com

Kelly, J.N.D. (1968). *Early Christian Doctrines. Fourth Edition*. Edinburgh: R & R Clark Ltd. Available online at 103911481-J-N-D-Kelly-Early-Christian-Doctrines.pdf.

Kittel, G. & Friedrich, G. (1985). *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*. Abridged in one volume. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans.

Ladd, G.E. (2002). *A theology of the New Testament*. rev. ed. Edited by Donald Alfred Hagner. Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans.

Lightfoot, J. B. (1912). *The Apostolic Fathers.* London: MacMillan and Co. Available online at http://www.archive.org/details/a590752000clemuoft, checked on 12/4/2018.

Machen, J. Gresham (1974). *The New Testament. An introduction to its Literature and History*. Edinburgh, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth Trust.

McKechnie, P. (2001). *The first Christian centuries. Perspectives on the early Church*. Leicester: Apollos.

Metaxas, E. (2010). *Bonhoeffer. Pastor, martyr, prophet, spy : a righteous gentile vs. the Third Reich.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson (https://toc.library.ethz.ch/objects/pdf/z01_978-1-59555-138-2_01.pdf).

Ministère de l'Intérieur (1905). *La loi de 1905, pierre angulaire de la laïcité en France. La loi de séparation des Églises et de l'État.* Edited by Ministère de l'Intérieur. Gouvernement de France. Paris. Available online at https://www.interieur.gouv.fr/actualites/actualites-du-ministere/loi-de-1905-pierre-angulaire-de-laicite-en-france, updated on 6/20/2025, checked on 2/9/2026.

Moulton, H.K. (Ed.) (1978). *The analytical Greek lexicon revised*. [Réimpression en fac-similé]. Grand Rapids: Regency reference library.

Poole, M. (1685). *A Commentary of the Holy Bible*. Reprint. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust.

Reader, A. (1992). *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement*. Revised. California: Willian Carey Library.

Renwick, A. M. & Harman, A. M. (1985). *The story of the church*. 2nd ed. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.

Richardson, N. (1986). Apartheid, Heresy and the Church in South Africa. *The Journal of Religious Ethics,* 14(1), pp. 1–21. Available online at http://www.jstor.org/stable/40015022.

Rienecker, F. (1995). *A linguistic key to the Greek New Testament*. [15. impr.]. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publ. House.

Robertson, A. T. (1931). *Word pictures in the New Testament*. 4 volumes. Grand Raapids, Mich.: Baker House Books (IV).

Schaff, P. (n.d.). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Grand Rapids (MI): William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company (Series II, 1). Available online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf201.html, checked on 27th March 2024.

Strauch, A. (1995). *Biblical Eldership. An urgent call to restore biblical church leadership. Revised and Expanded*. Colorado Springs, Co.: Lewis and Roth Publishers.

Strong, J. (1996). *The new Strong's exhaustive concordance of the Bible*. Budget ed.: T. Nelson.

Summerton, N. (1994). *A Noble Task*. 2nd ed. Carlisle: Paternoster Press.

Thayer, J.H., & Wilke, C.G. (1887). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament. Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti*. Massachusetts: Harper & Brothers.

Trapp, J. (1655). *A Commentary on the New Testament.* London: R & W.

Vondey, W. (2017). *Pentecostal theology. Living the full gospel*. 1 edition. New York: Bloomsbury Bloomsbury T&T Clark An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Zodhiates, S. (1994). *The complete word study dictionary. New Testament.* Chattanooga TN: AMG Publishers.

***Conflict of Interest Statement**: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*

***This article is open-access and** distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence CC BY: credit must be given to the creator, the title and the license the work is under. This license enables re-users to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator.*