

**21.4 GRAVAMEN (IN TERME VAN KO, ART 46) – GK POTCHEFSTROOM-DIE BULT OOR DIE BESLUIT VAN ALGEMENE SINODE 2009 OOR VROUE IN DIE LEER- EN REGEERDIENSTE (Artt 21, 81, 325, 326, 328, 330)**

**21.4 GRAVAMEN (IN TERMS OF CO, ART 46) – GK POTCHEFSTROOM-DIE BULT REGARDING THE DECISION OF GENERAL SYNOD 2009 ON WOMEN IN THE TEACHING AND GOVERNING SERVICES (Arts 21, 81, 325, 326, 328, 330)**

- A. Die Gravamen is gestel.  
The Gravamen is tabled.
- B. Ds FJ Potgieter stel die Rapport van die Ordekommissie met betrekking tot die aanbeveling van die Ordekommissie dat Beswaarskrif 21.4 so gou as moontlik gestel word aangesien dit reeds deur die vergadering ontvanklik verklaar is.  
Rev FJ Potgieter tables the Report of the Order Commission with regard of the recommendation of the Order Commission that the Petition of protest 21.4 be tabled as soon as possible, seeing as the meeting already decided that the document is receptive.
- C. **Besluit:** Word verwys na Kommissie Beswaarskrifte 1 – Leerstellig.  
**Decision:** Referred to Commission Gravamina 1 – Doctrinal.
- D. Ds GP van Rhyn rapporteer namens Kommissie Beswaarskrifte 1 – Leerstellig.  
Rev GP van Rhyn reports on behalf of Commission Gravamina 1 – Doctrinal.
- E. **Besluit:** Word verwys na ad hoc kommissie. Die Kommissie bestaan uit dr JH Howell, ds HJP de Beer en prof J Smit.  
**Decision:** Referred to ad hoc commission. The Commission is made up dr JH Howell, Rev HJP de Beer and prof J Smit.
- F. Ds HJP de Beer rapporteer namens die ad hoc kommissie. Die Sinode oordeel dat die aanbevelings oor ontvanklikheid ten opsigte van Gravamen Potchefstroom-Die Bult nie volledig verwys na vorige besluite waarin die aangevoerde beswaargronde behandel en afgehandel is nie. Gevolglik verklaar die Sinode die Beswaarskrif ontvanklik. **Besluit: Goedgekeur.**  
Rev HJP reports on behalf of the ad hoc commission. The Synod judges that the recommendations on receptivity with regards to Gravamen Potchefstroom-Die Bult does not adequately refer to previous decisions was tabled and finalised. Therefore the Synod declares the Gravamen to be receptive. **Decision: Approved.**
- G. Ds GP van Rhyn stel die Kommissierapport.  
Rev GP van Rhyn tables the Commission Report.
- H. Bespreking word gevoer.  
Discussion is facilitated.
- I. Dr JH Howell stel die volgende voor: Dat die beredenering oor ontvanklikheid deel vorm van die beoordeling van die Kommissierapport. **Besluit: Goedgekeur.**  
Dr JH Howell proposes the following: That the arguments with regard to receptivity forms part of the adjudication of the Commission’s Report. **Decision: Approved.**

**J. GRAVAMEN / GRAVAMEN**

<p><b>1. Inleiding</b> Die Kerkraad van die GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult het na ‘n deeglike studie tot die oortuiging gekom dat – in terme van die formulering en reëling van KO, art 46 – dit noodsaaklik is dat die kerke die besluit van die Algemene Sinode 2009:667 oor die nie-toelaatbaarheid van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste,</p>	<p><b>1. Introduction</b> The Church Council of the GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult was convinced, following a thorough study, that – in terms of the formulation and regulation of CO, art 46 – it is necessary that the churches should revise the decision of the General Synod 2009:667 on the non-admissibility of women in the teaching and governing</p>
--	---

<p>behoort te hersien.</p> <p>1.1 <i>Die besluit van die Algemene Sinode van 2009</i> Die besluit van die Algemene Sinode van 2009:667 wat na ons oortuiging nie op oortuigende Skrifgronde berus nie, en verander behoort te word, lui soos volg: “<i>Besluit: Die vergadering besluit volgens die goedgekeurde aanbeveling, pt4.2, dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie</i>”.</p> <p>1.2 <i>Rasionaal</i> Die Kerkraad van die GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult is terdeë daarvan bewus dat die aangeleentheid van vroue in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling oor ‘n lang tydperk aan die hand van Rapporten en Beswaarskrifte deur Nasionale en Algemene Sinodes van die GKSA in behandeling geneem is, en dat daar selfs ‘n Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016 byeengeroep is om weer in terme van KO, art 46 oor die saak te handel. Uit die dokumente van verskeie Gereformeerde Kerke oor die wêreld blyk dit dat die GKSA die tersaaklike inligting wat betref die vrou in die dienste op die vlak van die eksegetiese, hermeneutiese, en so meer verreken en beoordeel het. Die eksegetiese taak is oor jare uitgevoer, maar het soos by verskeie kerkgemeenskappe in die buiteland nie tot konsensus oor die aangeleentheid gelei nie. Aan die een kant bestaan die oortuiging dat die Heilige Gees die Sinode van 2009 sodanig gelei het dat die saak nou as afgehandel beskou moet word. Aan die ander kant bestaan die standpunt dat die Skrifgegewens wat behandel is ook anders geïnterpreteer kan word, of nie so duidelik is dat die Sinode sulke sterk uitsprake oor vroue in die dienste kon maak nie. Die standpunt hou verder ook in dat daar Skrifgegewens is wat nie genoegsaam in ag geneem is nie. Die saak is met ander woorde, nog nie tot bevrediging afgehandel nie.</p> <p>1.3 <i>Verantwoording in terme van KO, art 46</i> ‘n Belangrike vraag is of daar steeds,</p>	<p>services.</p> <p>1.1 <i>The decision of the General Synod of 2009</i> The decision of the General Synod 2009:667 that to our conviction does not rest on convincing Scriptural grounds and that should be changed, is: “<i>Decision: The assembly decides according to the approved recommendation, pt4.2, that women may not serve in the special services of ministers and elders</i>”.</p> <p>1.2 <i>Rationale</i> The Church Council of the GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult is thoroughly aware that the matter of women in the special services of minister and elder has been dealt with over a long period of time through Reports and Petitions of Protest by National and General Synods of the GKSA, and that there even was an Extraordinary General Synod in 2016 to once more deal with the matter in terms of CO, art 46.  From the documents of various Reformed Churches worldwide it seems that the GKSA considered and judged the relevant information concerning women in the services on the level of the exegesis, hermeneutics, and so on. The exegetic task was performed over years, but like in various church communities abroad it did not lead to consensus on the matter.  On the one hand the conviction exists that the Holy Spirit guided the Synod of 2009 in such a way that the matter should now be viewed as dealt with. On the other hand the point of view exists that the Scriptural passages that was under study can also be interpreted differently, or is not so clear that the Synod could make such strong statements on women in the services. This point of view also indicates that there are Scriptural passages that were not considered sufficiently. Therefore, the matter has not been dealt with to satisfaction.</p> <p>1.3 <i>Accountability in terms of CO, art 46</i>  An important question to ask is whether,</p>
---	---

<p>nadat al die Beswaarskrifte sedert 2012 teen die besluit van Sinode 2009 by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode van 2016 afgewys is, teen die besluit beswaar gemaak kan word? Is al die moontlike besware op grond van art 46 nie reeds behandel en afgehandel nie?</p> <p>Dit is belangrik om daarop te let dat, indien 'n Beswaarskrif nie slaag nie, dit nie beteken dat die saak daarmee noodwendig afgehandel is nie. Kerklike besluite is steeds mensewerk en daarom feilbaar en onvolmaak. Die moontlikheid bestaan dat 'n beter begroonde Beswaarskrif moontlik teen dieselfde besluit sou kon slaag. Die werklike besluit waaroor ons in die lig van KO, art 46 handel, is dus steeds die aangehaalde besluit van 2009 wat die staande besluit is.</p> <p>Daarmee word nie ontken dat kerklike besluite onder leiding van die Woord en Gees geneem word nie. In die behandeling van die saak en in die argumente wat hier aangebied word, geld die reël van KO, art 46, naamlik nie om afgehandelde besluite of beslissings van die Algemene Sinode van 2016 oor bepaalde besware weer op te haal nie, maar om nuwe argumente en oorwegings aan te bied. Hierdie dokument sluit kritiek in teen sommige bevindings en besluite van die Algemene Sinode van 2016 mbt die “verdediging” van die besluit van 2009, soos hier verder aangetoon word.</p> <p>1.4 <i>Positiewe aspekte uit vorige Sinode-besluite</i></p> <p>1.4.1 Ons vereenselwig ons met die hermeneutiese vertrekpunte wat die Algemene Sinode in 2009:604 e.v. van kennis geneem het, sonder om daarmee te sê dat dit wat in pt 7 van die Rapport (p604 e.v.) staan, volledig is. Ons sal later hierop terugkom omdat daar na ons oortuiging meer eksplisiet gefokus moet word op die Christologie en pneumatologie in die Godsopenbaring, in besonder met betrekking tot die Skrifgedeeltes wat ten opsigte van die vraag na die vroue in besondere dienste ter sprake is.</p>	<p>after all the Petitions of Protest since 2012 against the decision of Synod 2009 were rejected by the Extraordinary General Synod of 2016, protest can still be made against the decision? Have all the possible protests on the grounds of art 46 not been dealt with?</p> <p>It is important to take note that, if a Petition of Protest does not succeed, it does not mean that the matter has necessarily been dealt with. Church decisions are still the work of humans and are therefore fallible and incomplete. The possibility exists that a better grounded Petition of Protest could possibly succeed against the same decision. The real decision that we are dealing with in the light of CO, art 46, is therefore still the quoted decision of 2009, which is the standing decision. This does not deny that church decisions are taken under the guidance of the Word and Spirit. In the handling of the matter and in the arguments that are presented here, the rule of CO, art 46 applies, namely not to deal with completed decisions or rulings of the General Synod of 2016 on specific protests again, but to present new arguments and considerations.</p> <p>This document includes criticism against some findings and decisions of the Extraordinary General Synod of 2016 w.r.t. the “defence” of the decision of 2009, as will be indicated further in this document.</p> <p>1.4 <i>Positive aspects from previous Synod decisions</i></p> <p>1.4.1 We associate ourselves with the hermeneutic points of departure of which the General Synod in 2009:604 et seq. took note, without saying with this that we agree that what is written in pt 7 of the Report (p604 et seq.), is complete. We will come back to this later on, because to our conviction there should be a more specific focus on the Christology and pneumatology in the God revelation, specifically with regard to the involved Scriptural passages on the question about women in the special services.</p>
--	--

<p>1.4.2 Net so onderskryf ons die standpunt (Algemene Sinode 2009:604) dat die eksegeese op grond waarvan besluite geneem word oor die vraag of vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien, oortuigend moet wees. Dit moet ook duidelik wees. Op grond van die openbaring in Galasiërs 3:26-29 het die Studiedeputate van 2009:625 soos volg geoordeel: “<i>in die lig van hierdie oorweldigende waarheid is dit duidelik dat wanneer onderskeid getref word tussen mans en vroue met betrekking tot die besondere dienste, daar duidelike Skrifgronde (Die Bult beklemtoning) voor moet wees. Net so: Alleen as God in sy Woord bepaal dat net mans in die besondere dienste mag dien, mag vroue daartoe verbied word</i>”.</p>	<p>1.4.2 In the same way we agree with the point of view (General Synod 2009:604) that the exegesis, on the grounds of which decisions are taken about the question of whether women may serve in the specific services, must be convincing. It must also be clear. Based on the revelation in Galatians 3:26-29, the Study Deputies of 2009:625 judged as follows: “<i>in the light of this overwhelming truth it is clear that when a distinction is made between men and women with regard to the special services, it must be based on clear Scriptural grounds (Die Bult emphasis). Also: Only if God determines in his Word that only men may serve in the special services, women may be prohibited to serve in them</i>”.</p>
<p>1.5 <i>Doelstellings</i></p>	<p>1.5 <i>Objectives</i></p>
<p>1.5.1 Ooreenkomstig die prosedures wat die Algemene Sinodes vantevore oor die toepassing van KO, art 46 goedgekeur het (vgl Acta 1991:526-528; 1994:53-54; Kerkordeboekie GKSA, 2015:57-59), word hier positief aangetoon waarom dit noodsaaklik is dat die Algemene Sinode 2018 die betrokke besluit moet hersien; en</p>	<p>1.5.1 In accordance with the procedures that the General Synods previously approved on the application of CO, art 46 (compare Acta 1991:526-528; 1994:53-54; Church Order book GKSA, 2015:57-59), there is a positive indication in this document that it is essential that the General Synod 2018 must revise this specific decision; and</p>
<p>1.5.2 Hier word verder ook aangedui dat die bestaande Sinodebesluit (2009) nie op oortuigende Skrifgronde geneem is nie, soos blyk uit die tersaaklike Rapport wat voor Sinode 2009 gedien het. Daarmee word gepoog om die Sinode tot die besluit te lei dat vroue tot die besondere dienste toegelaat behoort te word.</p>	<p>1.5.2 It is further indicated here that the existing Synod decision (2009) was not taken based on convincing Scriptural grounds, as is evident from the relevant Report that served before Synod 2009. With this an attempt is made to guide the Synod to the decision that women may be allowed to the special services.</p>
<p>1.6 <i>Benadering</i></p>	<p>1.6 <i>Approach</i></p>
<p>1.6.1 Ons het vanuit die Gereformeerde hermeneuse en eksegeese opnuut krities na die Skriftuurlike onderbou van die besluit van Sinode 2009 gekyk ten einde vas te stel of die betrokke besluit oor die diens van vroue werklik oortuigend is en op duidelike Skrifgronde berus. In ons dokument toon ons aan waarom ons meen dat dit nie die geval is nie.</p>	<p>1.6.1 From the Reformed hermeneutics and exegesis, we critically looked at the Scriptural foundation of the decision of Synod 2009 again in order to determine whether the involved decision on the service of women really is convincing and rests on clear Scriptural grounds. In our document we indicate why we are of the opinion that it is not the case.</p>
<p>1.6.2 ‘n Analise van die Rapport wat voor Sinode 2009:583-671 gedien het, asook van die Agenda en besluite van die Buitengewone Algemene</p>	<p>1.6.2 From an analysis of the Report that served before Synod 2009:583-671, as well as of the agenda and decisions of the Extraordinary General Synod of</p>

<p>Sinode van 2016 laat blyk dat die resultaat van die grammaties-historiese eksegesis (deur diegene van die Studiedeputate wat meen dat vroue nie in die leer- en regeerdienste mag dien nie) van die Skrifgedeeltes, naamlik 1 Kor 14:33-35, maar veral 1 Tim 2:11-15, die enigste deurslaggewende grondslag vorm vir die besluit van die Algemene Sinode. Ter illustrasie hiervan verwys ons na die Rapport (Algemene Sinode 2009:656 (10.13.7.2b)) wat soos volg lui: <i>“In die lig van 1 Kor 11:4 lyk dit of die “swyggebod” in 1 Kor 14:33-35 nie op absolute stilswye van vroulike lidmate dui nie, maar wel daarop dui dat hulle nie die Woord in gemeentelike byeenkomste amptelik mag bedien nie. Op sigself gee 1 Kor 14-34-35 nie duidelike blyke hiervan nie, maar in die lig van ander duideliker Skrifdele soos 1 Tim 2:8-15 word dit duidelik dat dit wel so verstaan moet word”</i>.</p> <p>In die Rapport (2009:637 (10.8.5.1b) asook 2009:659, (10.14.3b)) word dit bevestig dat die twee tekste uit 1 Kor 14 en 1 Tim 2 die twee Skrifgedeeltes is waarop die besluit van die Algemene Sinode uiteindelik berus.</p> <p>1.6.3 Die benaderingswyse wat in hierdie dokument gevolg word, is om aan te dui dat die Sinodebesluit inherent nie op duidelike en oortuigende Skrifgronde berus nie.</p> <p><b>2. Beswaargrond 1</b> <i>Die betrokke besluit van die Algemene Sinode berus nie op ‘n duidelike, aanvaarbare en oortuigende eksegesis en hermeneuse van 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35 en 1 Timoteus 2:8-15 nie.</i></p> <p><u>Motiverings</u></p> <p>2.1 Die uitgesproke vertrekpunt by die studie oor die saak of vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie, was by al die Sinodes dat <b>daar nie ’n teks in die Bybel is</b> waarin spesifiek gesê word of vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie. ‘n Bybelgefundeerde standpunt daarvoor is aangewese op afleidings uit ander Skrifuitsprake (Bylae by Nasionale Sinode, 1988:23).</p>	<p>2016, it seemed that the result of the grammatical-historical exegesis (by those in the Study Deputies that are of the opinion that women may not serve in the teaching and governing services) of the Scriptural passages, namely 1 Cor 14:33-35, but especially 1 Tim 2:11-15, form the only decisive foundation for the decision of the General Synod. As an illustration of this, we refer to the content of the Report (General Synod 2009:656, (10.13.7.2b)): <i>“In the light of 1 Cor 11:4 it seems as if the “silent commandment” in 1 Cor 14:33-35 does not indicate absolute silence of female members, but it indicates that they may not officially minister the Word in congregational meetings. In itself, 1 Cor 14-34-35 does not provide clear intentions of this, but in the light of other clearer Scriptural passages, like 1 Tim 2:8-15, it becomes clear that it should be understood in this way”</i>.</p> <p>From the Report 2009:637 (10.8.5.1b) as well as 2009:659 (10.14.3b), it is confirmed that the two texts, 1 Cor 14 and 1 Tim 2, are the two Scriptural passages on which the decision of the General Synod finally rests.</p> <p>1.6.3 The approach that is followed in this document is used to indicate that the decision of the Synod does not inherently rest on clear and convincing Scriptural grounds.</p> <p><b>2. Gravamen basis 1</b> <i>The involved decision of the General Synod does not rest on a clear, acceptable and convincing exegesis and hermeneutics of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15.</i></p> <p><u>Motivations</u></p> <p>2.1 At all the Synods the outspoken point of departure in the study on the matter of whether women should serve in the special services or not, was that <b>there is not a text in the Bible</b> indicating specifically whether women may serve in the special services or not. A Bible based point of view on this is designated on deductions from other Scriptural statements (Addendum of National Synod, 1988:23).</p>
--	--

<p>Die Rapport van 2009 het tot die konklusie gekom dat in 7 van die studies van 9 spesifieke Skrifgedeeltes nie tot die gevolgtrekking gekom kon word dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste mag dien nie. Slegs twee gedeeltes, maar eintlik slegs een sg. “duideliker” Skrifdeel soos 1 Tim 2:8-15 sou dit dan duidelik maak dat dit wel so verstaan moet word (vgl 1.4.4 hierbo).</p>	<p>The Report from 2009 came to the conclusion that in 7 of the studies of 9 specific Scriptural passages, no conclusion that women may not serve in the special services could be reached. Only two passages, but actually only one so-called “clearer” Scriptural passage, namely 1 Tim 2:8-15, could make it clear that it should be understood in that way (compare 1.4.4 above).</p>
<p>2.2 Eksegete en kerklike studies oor tekste soos 1 Kor 14 en 1 Tim 2 wys egter uit dat daar ‘n menigte verklarings oor hierdie tekste bestaan, wat uiteenlopend is en wat wesenlik van mekaar verskil. Ons haal aan uit een so ‘n kerklike studie van die <i>GKV 2017: Rapport deputaten M/V en ambt, Samen dienen</i>. Dit is ‘n kerkgemeenskap met wie die GKSA in Ekumeniese Eenheid staan, en wat pas besluit het dat vroue in al die kerklike dienste (dienste) mag dien. Die stelling lui soos volg: <i>“Over de interpretative van de zwijgtteksten zijn boekenkaste vol geschreven. In al dat exegetisch geweld wordt duidelijk dat de interpretasie van teksten voor een groot deel afhang van onze kennis en interpretasie van de cultuur in die tijd. We moeten daarom voorzichtig zijn met alte stellig uitsprake over wat in deze teksten bedoeld kan zijn. De zwijgtteksten kunnen we niet negeren, maar we kunnen er ook niet de lading aan toekennen die het in deze tijd lijkt te hebben gekregen; het is geen vaste grond op basis waarvan de ambten voor vrouwen gesloten moeten blijven”</i>.</p>	<p>2.2 However, exegetes and church studies on texts like 1 Cor 14 and 1 Tim 2 show that there are multiple interpretations for these texts, that are diverse and that differ in essence. We quote from one such a church study of the <i>RCF 2017: Rapport deputaten M/V en ambt, Samen dienen</i>. It is a church community with whom the GKSA is in Ecumenical Unity, and that recently decided that women may serve in all church offices (services). The statement is: <i>“Over de interpretative van de zwijgtteksten zijn boekenkaste vol geschreven. In al dat exegetisch geweld wordt duidelijk dat de interpretasie van teksten voor een groot deel afhang van onze kennis en interpretasie van de cultuur in die tijd. We moeten daarom voorzichtig zijn met alte stellig uitsprake over wat in deze teksten bedoeld kan zijn. De zwijgtteksten kunnen we niet negeren, maar we kunnen er ook niet de lading aan toekennen die het in deze tijd lijkt te hebben gekregen; het is geen vaste grond op basis waarvan de ambten voor vrouwen gesloten moeten blijven”</i>. [A lot has been written on the interpretation of the silent texts. From this exegesis it is clear that the interpretation of texts to a great extent relies on our knowledge and interpretation of the culture of the time. Therefore we must be careful to make statements about what is meant by these texts. The silent texts cannot be ignored, but we also cannot give them the meaning that they seemed to have in that time; that is not a basis on which to decide whether the offices must remain closed for women.]</p>
<p>2.3 Die Studiedeputate van 2009 se Rapport laat blyk dat daar meer as een verklaring van bg tekste binne die</p>	<p>2.3 It seems from the Report of the Study Deputies of 2009 that more than one interpretation of the above texts is</p>

<p>Gereformeerde eksegese en hermeneuse moontlik is. Wat van besondere belang is, is dat daardie Deputate wat die onderskeie standpunte oor die vrou in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling handhaaf, wedersyds oordeel dat die ander Deputate nie leerstellig verkeerd is nie. Die vlak van verskil lê volgens die Deputate (wat beide standpunte verteenwoordig), op die vlak van eksegetiese sintese (Algemene Sinode, 2009:664, 10.16).</p>	<p>possible in the Reformed exegesis and hermeneutics. What is very important, is that those Deputies that maintain the different points of view on women in the special services of minister and elder, mutually judge that the other Deputies are not incorrect in doctrine. The level of difference, according to the Deputies, (representing both points of view), lies on the level of exegetic synthesis. (General Synod, 2009:664 10.16).</p>
<p>2.4 Die Algemene Sinode het in terme van die uitsprake van Die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode van 2016:132, (4.2.1.1) “per implikasie” gekies vir die Skrifgetuienis (soos vervat in die Rapport) volgens die een standpunt. Maar hierdie bepaalde standpunt sluit dit op sigself in dat daar op eksegetiese gronde ook ’n ander standpunt kan wees.</p>	<p>2.4 The General Synod “per implication” chose, in terms of the statements of The Extraordinary General Synod of 2016:132, (4.2.1.1), the Scriptural evidence (as contained in the Report) according to one point of view. But this specific point of view includes in itself that there can be another point of view on exegetical grounds.</p>
<p>2.5 Vergaderings (Sinode 2009, 2016) het die verantwoordelikheid om besluite te motiveer. ’n Vergadering mag nie slegs ’n uitspraak maak sonder om die besluit te begrond of te verdedig nie. Beide Sinodes het hulle besluite egter slegs by wyse van ’n meerderheid van stemme sonder verdere motivering geneem.</p>	<p>2.5 Meetings (Synod 2009, 2016) have the responsibility to motivate decisions. A meeting may not only make a statement without a basis or defence for the decision. However, both Synods took their decisions only by way of a majority of votes without further motivation.</p>
<p>2.6 Die betrokke Studiedeputate het met hulle Skrifstudie bewyse verskaf vir hulle standpunt, maar die Algemene Sinode het dit sonder enige bewyse of motivering vanuit die Skrif afgestem. Verder het die ander standpunt wat die betrokke Sinode wel aanvaar het nie bewys gelewer dat die standpunt ten gunste van vroue in die dienste eksegeties foutief is nie. Intendeel, daar is inderwaarheid toegegee dat laasgenoemde standpunt bestaanbaar is. Die aspek wat die Sinode nie raakgesien het nie, is soos volg: <i>die Sinode moes vanuit die Woord aantoon waarom slegs die een standpunt eksegeties houdbaar en aanvaarbaar is.</i> Deur dit na te laat, het die sinode versuim om die eksegese en Skrifargumente wat deur een bepaalde standpunt ten gunste van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste aangebied was, te beantwoord.</p>	<p>2.6 The involved Study deputies provided evidence with their Scriptural study for their point of view, but the General Synod voted against it without any evidence or motivation from Scripture. Furthermore, another point of view that this Synod did accept, did not provide evidence that the point of view in favour of women in the services is exegetically wrong. On the contrary, they actually admitted that this point of view can exist. The aspect that the Synod did not look at, is the following: <i>the Synod had to show from the Word why only one point of view is maintained and accepted exegetically.</i> By refraining from doing this, the Synod failed to answer to the exegesis and Scriptural arguments that were presented by one specific point of view in favour of women in the teaching and governing services.</p>
<p>2.7 Die besluit van die Buitengewone</p>	<p>2.7 The decision of the Extraordinary</p>

<p>Algemene Sinode (2016:130-133), naamlik dat kerklike vergaderinge onder leiding van die Gees en Woord besluite neem, is opsigself korrek. Indien die Sinode slegs 'n beroep op die leiding van die Gees sou doen, sonder om oortuigende Skrifbewyse te lewer, soos blyk uit die uitspraak van 2016, word die Woord en Gees foutiewelik van mekaar losgemaak (Joh 14:25-26; HK, So 20).</p>	<p>General Synod (2016:130-133), namely that church meetings take decisions under the guidance of the Spirit and Word, is in itself correct. If the Synod only depends on the guidance of the Spirit, without providing convincing Scriptural evidence, as is evident from the statement of 2016, the Word and Spirit are incorrectly separated (John 14:25-26; HC, Sun 20).</p>
<p>2.8 Van nader beskou is dit duidelik dat die standpunt teen die vrou in die diens van predikant of ouderling, of ten gunste daarvan, dikwels nie die ander standpunt se argumente en gevolgtrekkings weerlê nie. Daar word slegs 'n ander standpunt geformuleer (vgl die gedeeltes oor die twee betrokke Skrifgedeeltes: 2009:633-651; ons verwys veral na een voorbeeld: 2009:649, ook saam met voetnoot 93). Die eksegetiese oortuig in die opsig dus nie na die een of die ander kant toe nie (vgl die bogenoemde punte).</p>	<p>2.8 From further consideration it is clear that the point of view against women in the service of minister or elder, or in favour of it, often does not refute the arguments and conclusions from the other point of view. They only formulate another point of view (compare the parts on the two involved Scriptural passages: 2009:633-651; we specifically refer to one example: 2009:649, also with footnote 93). The exegesis therefore does not convince, either one or the other way (compare the abovementioned points).</p>
<p>2.9 <i>Toespitsing op 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35</i></p>	<p>2.9 <i>Focus on 1 Corinthians 14:33-35</i></p>
<p>2.9.1 Die gevolgtrekking (Sinode 2009:638) vanuit die eksegetiese t.g.v. die standpunt teen die vrou in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling is hier van belang, naamlik: “<i>Op sigself gee 1 Kor 14:34-35 nie duidelike blyke hiervan nie, maar in die lig van ander duideliker Skrifdele soos 1 Tim 2:8-15 word dit duidelik dat dit wel so verstaan moet word</i>”.</p> <p>Die aanduiding is daarom duidelik dat daar nie vanuit 1 Kor 14:34-35 oortuigend oor die vrou in die besondere dienste geredeneer kan word nie. Beide die standpunte teen en ten gunste van die vrou in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling stem dus op hierdie eksegetiese punt saam.</p>	<p>2.9.1 The conclusion (Synod 2009:638) from the exegesis in favour of the point of view against women in the special services of minister and elder is important here: “<i>In itself 1 Cor 14:34-35 does not provide clear evidence of this, but in the light of other clearer Scriptural passages, like 1 Tim 2:8-15, it is evident that it must be understood in that way</i>”.</p> <p>Therefore, the indication that no convincing arguments can be made from 1 Cor 14:34-35 about women in the special services is clear. Both points of view, against and in favour of women in the special services of minister and elder thus agree on this exegetical point.</p>
<p>2.9.2 Die logiese gang van 1 Kor 11-14 is nog nie genoegsaam in die standpunte by Sinodes verreken nie. Indien dit verreken word, dien dit as 'n bevestiging van die bogenoemde gevolgtrekking. Leemtes in die standpunt van die Algemene Sinode van 2009:633-638 en 665-667 oor die bedoeling en betekenis van 1 Kor 14:33-35, trek in die volgende punte</p>	<p>2.9.2 The logical course of 1 Cor 11-14 has not been dealt with sufficiently by the statements of Synods. If it is taken into account, it serves as a confirmation of the abovementioned conclusion. Gaps in the point of view of the General Synod from 2009:633-638 and 665-667 on the intention and meaning of 1 Cor 14:33-35, can be summarised in the following points:</p>



<p>saam:</p> <p>2.9.2.1 die betrokke Skrifgedeelte word nie deeglik in samehang met hoofstukke 11, 12 en 13 bespreek nie;</p> <p>2.9.2.2 uit die konteks van die brief, asook in hoofstuk 11-14, word dit duidelik dat die swygverbod op 'n spesifieke situasie dui: Paulus verbied dit nie dat daar in die gemeentes gespreek mag word nie, maar reël dit;</p> <p>2.9.2.3 die skerp onderskeid wat die Rapport van 2009 tref tussen leraars en profete (Acta:632 en 637), asof profesie en profeteer nooit deel was van lering nie, kan nie gehandhaaf word nie. (Kyk o.a. Timmerman, 2015). Ons heg hierby 'n Bylae (Ongepubliseerde Bylae 1) aan wat na ons oordeel en in lyn met die bogenoemde 'n verantwoordelike eksegeese van 1 Kor 11-14 daarstel. Die boek van <i>Daniël Timmerman, Heinrich Bullinger on Prophecy and the Prophetic Office</i> (2015), VandenHoek &amp; Ruprecht, bied waardevolle insigte in die verband vanuit die hoek van die 16e eeuse Reformasie.</p> <p>2.10 <i>Toegespeits op 1 Timoteus 2:8-15</i> In 1.4.4 hierbo is gewys op die prominensie van 1 Tim 2, en dat die besluit van 2009 eintlik berus op die grammaties-historiese eksegeese hiervan, soos aangebied in die Deputate-rapport deur bepaalde lede van die Studiedeputate van 2009 wat meen dat vroue nie toegelaat mag word tot die leer- en regeerdienste nie. In 2.2.2 is verder gewys op die feit dat hierdie teks uiteenlopend verklaar kan word, nie in alle opsigte oortuigend en duidelik is nie, en dat die neiging by sommige eksegete en kerke bestaan om die teks te oorlaai. Ons motiveer dit verder soos volg:</p> <p>2.10.1 Sinode 2009 het verkeerdelik aanvaar dat 1 Tim 2:8-15 die duideliker gedeelte is om die vraag van vroue ten opsigte van die besondere dienste te belig. Dit geld veral daarvan om 1 Kor 14:33-35 te verstaan, soos ons hierbo aangedui</p>	<p>2.9.2.1 The involved Scriptural passage is not discussed thoroughly in connection with chapters 11, 12 and 13;</p> <p>2.9.2.2 From the context of the letter, as well as in chapters 11-14, it becomes clear that the silent commandment indicates a specific situation: Paul does not prohibit it that there can be preached in congregations, but organises it;</p> <p>2.9.2.3 The sharp distinction that the report of 2009 makes between ministers and prophets (Acta:632 and 637), as if prophesy and prophesying were never part of doctrine, cannot be maintained (See amongst others Timmerman, 2015). We also attach an Addendum (Unpublished Addendum 1) that, according to our judgement and in line with the abovementioned, provides a responsible exegesis of 1 Cor 11-14. The book of <i>Daniël Timmerman, Heinrich Bullinger on Prophecy and the Prophetic Office</i> (2015), VandenHoek &amp; Ruprecht, presents valuable insights in this regard from the angle of the 16th century Reformation.</p> <p>2.10 <i>Focus on 1 Timothy 2:8-15</i> The prominence of 1 Tim 2 was indicated in 1.4.4 above, as well as the fact that the decision of 2009 actually rests on the grammatical-historical exegesis of it, as presented in the Deputy report by certain members of the Study deputies of 2009 that are of the opinion that women may not be allowed to the teaching and governing services. In 2.2.2 it was further indicated that this text can be interpreted in diverse ways, is not convincing and clear in all regards, and that the tendency exists among some exegetes and churches to overload the text. We motivate it in the following ways:</p> <p>2.10.1 Synod 2009 incorrectly accepted that 1 Tim 2:8-15 is the clearer passage to shed light on the question of women in the special services. It is especially valid in order to understand 1 Cor 14:33-35, as we indicated above.</p>
--	---

<p>het.</p> <p>2.10.2 Daar bestaan ernstige eksegetiese verskille, soos blyk uit die Studie-rapport van 2009 en die behandeling van die Beswaarskrifte in 2016, oor die betrokke Skrifgedeelte. Sinode 2009 het nie die verskille besleg nie, behalwe om sonder redes die een standpunt daaroor by implikasie sy eie te maak. Dit is dus nie moontlik om aan te voer dat die Timoteus-tekste die “duidelike” tekste is nie.</p> <p>2.10.3 Die genoemde Studierapport – in die behandeling van die Skrifgedeelte is self dikwels onseker oor die presiese betekenis en bedoeling van die gedeelte: vgl bv Acta 2009:640 en 644 (10.9.4.1a: “verskil van mening” oor of dit oor voorskrifte vir die erediens of samekomste van die gemeente, of oor die huwelik handel).</p> <p>2.10.4 Daar is bepaalde onsekerhede in die Skrifgedeelte en die Sinode se verstaan daarvan:</p> <p>2.10.4.1 Die vertrekpunt dat die teks duidelik is, staan nie vas nie.</p> <p>2.10.4.2 Die standpunt van die Sinode oor die inhoud van die gedeelte kom in botsing met ander Skrifgegewens, soos ons in 4.4.1 en verder sal aantoon.</p> <p>2.10.4.3 Hermeneuties gesien komplimenteer die resultaat van die Sinode se standpunt oor 1 Tim 2 nie ander duidelike Skrifgegewens en openbarings nie, en omgekeerd. Aan die hand van die bogenoemde punte bevestig die volgende vrae die onsekerhede in die Sinode se verstaan van die teks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Gaan dit beslis in die Skrifgedeelte net oor die gedrag van mans en vroue in die samekomste/eredienste?</li> <li>(2) Kan dit moontlik ook gaan oor die gedrag en voorskrifte aan die gelowiges of gemeente met die oog op hulle gedrag in die huis van God (plaaslike kerk) asook in die samelewing as kerk van Jesus Christus? Die brief aan Timoteus laat blyk dat dit oor albei aspekte</li> </ol>	<p>2.10.2 There are serious exegetical differences, as is evident from the Study report of 2009 and the treatment of the Petitions of Protest in 2016, on the involved Scriptural passages. Synod 2009 did not resolve the differences, apart from making one point of view regarding this its own without reason. It is therefore not possible to indicate that the Timothy texts are the “clear” texts.</p> <p>2.10.3 The mentioned Study report, in the treatment of the Scriptural passage, in itself is often uncertain about the precise meaning and intention of the passage: compare e.g. Acta 2009:640 and 644 (10.9.4.1a: “difference of opinion” whether it is about prescriptions for the church service or meetings of the congregation, or dealing with marriage).</p> <p>2.10.4 There are determined uncertainties in the Scriptural passage and the Synod’s understanding of it:</p> <p>2.10.4.1 The point of departure that the text is clear, is not fixed.</p> <p>2.10.4.2 The point of view of the Synod about the content of the passage is in opposition of other Scriptural data, as we will indicate in 4.4.1 and further.</p> <p>2.10.4.3 Hermeneutically viewed, the result of the Synod’s point of view on 1 Tim 2 do not compliment other clear Scriptural data and revelations, and vice versa. On the basis of the abovementioned points, the following questions confirm the uncertainties in the Synod’s understanding of the text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Does the Scriptural passage definitely only deal with the behaviour of men and women in the gatherings/services?</li> <li>(2) Can it also possibly be about the behaviour and prescriptions to the believers of the congregation with regard to their behaviour in the house of God (local church) as well as in society as church of Jesus Christ? It seems from the letter to Timothy that it is about</li> </ol>
--	--

<p>gaan. Die woorde “op elke plek” het inderdaad meer as een betekenis- moontlikheid. Wanneer dit gelees word saam met 1 Kor 1:2 en ook met 2 Kor 1:1 kan die geldige afleiding gemaak word dat die verwysing “in elke plek” wys op die feit dat daar op baie plekke (soos ook in die hele Achaje) gelowiges in gemeentes versamel het. Die kerk van Christus bestaan immers op baie plekke en as kerk aanbid hulle op sulke plekke ook saam. Die volgende aspekte moet dus in ag geneem word:</p> <p>2.10.4.4 Die woorde “in elke plek” verwys na oral waar gelowiges bestaan en funsioneer, in die kerk en in die samelewing. Dit moet blyk uit hulle gedrag, voorkoms en optrede dat hulle aan Christus behoort.</p> <p>2.10.4.5 Waarna verwys “vroue” in 1 Tim 2: 8-15? Is dit getroude vroue of vroue in die algemeen?</p> <p>2.10.4.6 Lei sommige formuleringe in die Studierapport van 2009 tot die afleiding dat die Sinode ten gunste is van die sg algemene of universele hoofskap van die man oor die vrou? Die Rapport skep die indruk dat die teksgedeelte die standpunt van die sogenaamde “algemene” hoof- skap van die man oor die vrou handhaaf. Dit blyk onder meer uit die volgende (p663, 10.14.5b): (1) Daar word van <b>die</b> man en <b>die</b> vrou (bepaalde lidwoorde) gepraat in plaas van die man en sy vrou en van die vrou en haar man; (2) Die eksegeese van punt 10.9.4.3b (p642) dui daarop dat die hoofskap van alle mans oor alle vroue geleer word. Daar is ook ander gedeeltes in die Rapport van 2009:631 en 637, waar ook oor die hoofskap van die man gehandel word, waar die algemene hoofskap van die man oor die vrou afgewys word. Die standpunt word gehandhaaf ten</p>	<p>various aspects. The words “in every place” has indeed more than one possible meaning .When it is read in connection to 1 Cor 1:2 and also to 2 Cor 1:1 the valid deduction can be made that the reference to “in every place” points to the fact that many believers gathered in congregations in many places (as was also the case in Achaia). The church of Christ exists in many places and as church they also worship together in such locations. The following aspects have thus to be considered:</p> <p>2.10.4.4 The words “in each place” refer to everywhere where believers exist and function, in the church and in the community. It has to become evident through their behaviour, their appearance and conduct that they belong to Christ.</p> <p>2.10.4.5 To what does “the women” in 1 Tim 2: 8-15 refer? Are they married women or just women in general?</p> <p>2.10.4.6 Do certain formulations in the Study report of 2009 suggest the conclusion that the Synod favours the so-called general or universal authority of man over woman?</p> <p>The Report gives the impression that the text section maintains the point of view of the so-called “general” supremacy of man over woman. This becomes clear from i.a. the following (p663, 10.14.5b): (1) Mention is made of <b>the</b> man and <b>the</b> woman (definite articles) instead of the man and his wife and of the woman and her husband; (2) The exegesis of 10.9.4.3b (p642) indicates that the supremacy of all men over all women is being taught.</p> <p>There are also other sections in the Report of 2009:631 and 637, where the topic of supremacy of the man over the woman is also dealt with and where the general supremacy of man over woman is rejected. This point of view was maintained</p>
---	--

<p>spyte daarvan dat die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 die standpunt van die algemene hoofskap van die man oor die vrou ontken 2016:125.</p> <p>2.10.5 Die Sinode verreken nie in die besluit oor 1 Tim 2:8-15 dat die Bybel nie met 'n teenstelling tussen getroude en ongetroude vroue werk nie. Die Bybel praat van die man se verhouding tot die vrou vanuit 'n huweliksverhouding. God het die mens, manlik en vroulik geskape, en man en vrou staan gelykwaardig naas mekaar in 'n twee-eenheidsverhouding. Dit beteken dat die groot verskille wat tussen 'n man en vrou ten opsigte van gesag en dienswerk gemaak word, ongegrond is (vgl GKV: Rapport Deputate M/V en ambt, Samen dienen, 2017:9 en 24).</p> <p>2.10.6 Kerke en teoloë verskil oor die betekenis en bedoeling van die woorde <i>didaskhein</i> (om onderrig te gee) en <i>authenthein</i> (om gesag uit te oefen). Die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode van 2016:116 e.v. het indringend hieroor besluit in die beantwoording van die Beswaarskrif van die Kerkraad van Krugersdorp. Die aanname dat albei handelinge (onderrig gee en gesag uitoefen) verwys na die erediens/gemeentelike samekoms, is egter nie so seker nie.</p> <p>2.10.7 Die feit dat die werkwoord <i>authenthein</i> 'n <i>hapax legomenon</i> is, dui daarop dat die betekenis daarvan slegs afgelei is. Die betekenis daarvan is volgens Louw en Nida (1996:VI, 473) "to control in a domineering manner"; of "to act like a chief". Vroue moenie (oor hulle mans) 'n dominerende houding inneem nie (1 Tim 2:12), en netso moet die mans (in die dienswerk) ook nie heerskappy uitoefen oor die vroue nie (1 Tim 5:2-3). Die vraag wat nie beantwoord is nie, is waarom Paulus die uitsprake oor die vroue in hierdie gedeelte gemaak het. Daar is besliste leemtes in die standpunt van die Algemene Sinode oor die betekenis en bedoeling van Paulus in hierdie Skrifgedeelte. Die volgende dien as bewys hiervoor:</p>	<p>despite the fact that the Extraordinary General Synod of 2016 denied the fact of the general supremacy of the man over the woman 2016:125.</p> <p>2.10.5 The Synod doesn't misconstrue the decision over 1 Tim 2:8-15 that the Bible isn't dealing with a contradiction between married and unmarried women. The Bible speaks of the man's relationship towards the woman as seen from a marital relationship. God created man, male and female, and man and woman stand as equals next to each other in a dual-unity relationship. That means that the great distinctions made between a man and a woman in regard to authority and office are unfounded (cf. RCA: Rapport deputies M/F and office and serve together 2017:9 and. 24).</p> <p>2.10.6 Churches and theologians differ over the meaning and intention of the words <i>didaskhein</i> (to teach) and <i>authenthein</i> (to administer authority). The Extraordinary General Synod:116 of 2016 d.v. had to decide urgently about this in their response to the Gravamen of the Church Council of Krugersdorp. The assumption that both activities (teaching and exercising authority) refer to the worship service/congregational gathering is, however, not so certain.</p> <p>2.10.7 The very fact that the verb <i>authenthein</i> is a <i>hapax legomenon</i> is an indication that its meaning can only be deduced. The meaning according to Louw and Nida (1996:VI, 473) is "to control in a domineering manner" or "to act like a chief". Women shouldn't assume a domineering attitude (over their husbands) 1 Tim 2:12, and similarly men (in the ministry) shouldn't execute dominance over women (1 Tim 5:2-3). The question which is not dealt with is why Paul made these announcements regarding women in this section. There are definitely shortcomings in the point of view of the General Synod regarding the significance and intention of Paul in this section of Scripture. The following serves as evidence to this end:</p>
--	---

<p>2.10.7.1 Dit is nie oortuigend uitgemaak dat dit te doen het met die vraag na die leer- of regeerdiens nie. Paulus ag ook nie vrou as minderwaardig teenoor die man nie (vgl bv Gal 3:28). Dit is wel moontlik – in die lig van 1 Tim 2:11 – dat sy vermaning voortkom uit die gebrek aan kennis van vroue in daardie tyd en omstandighede. Daarom roep hy die vroue op om hulle (eers) te laat onderrig.</p>	<p>2.10.7.1 It hasn't convincingly been decided that this is dealing with the office of teaching or governing. Paul doesn't regard woman as inferior towards man (cf. e.g. Gal 3:28). It is however possible that – in the light of 1 Tim 2:11 – this admonition comes from ignorance about women at that time and circumstances. That is why he appeals to the women to be taught/instructed first.</p>
<p>2.10.7.2 Die werkwoord <i>manthaneto</i> beteken om so te leer dat jy 'n volwaardige leerling (<i>mathetes</i>) van Jesus Christus kan wees. Kultureel was dit nie gebruiklik in daardie tyd nie, hoewel Paulus wanneer vroue onderrig is, hulle by hom en by die onderrig betrek het, soos die geval was met Priscilla (vgl GKV a.w.:20).</p>	<p>2.10.7.2 The verb <i>manthaneto</i> means that one should learn in such a way that one may be a fully-fledged pupil (<i>mathetes</i>) of Jesus Christ. Culturally it wasn't customary in that time, although Paul, when women were being taught, always involved them with his teaching, as the case was with Priscilla (cf. RCA op.cit. 20).</p>
<p>2.10.7.3 Die Skrif laat blyk duidelik dat ook mans eers onderrig moet word voordat hulle ander kan leer (bv 2 Tim 2:2). Dus, die strekking van die Skrif wat as agtergrond van hierdie gedeelte in ag geneem moet word, is dat almal gawes ontvang het, mans en vroue, en dat mans en vroue mag praat en bid in die samekomste en in die samelewing. Almal moet egter versigtig wees: daar moet verstandig opgetree word, en elkeen wat wil leer moet toegerus wees met die nodige kennis van die evangelie.</p>	<p>2.10.7.3 Scripture makes it abundantly clear that men too must first be instructed before they can teach (e.g. 2 Tim 2:2). Thus the relevance of the Scripture which must be taken into consideration as background to this section is that everyone has received gifts, men and women, and that men and women may speak and pray at gatherings and in the community. Everyone however must be careful: they should behave wisely, and everyone that wishes to teach must be equipped with the essential knowledge of the gospel.</p>
<p>2.10.8 Die voorafgaande vrae en onsekerhede wat na al die eksegetiese steeds oor die Timoteus-teks bestaan, bevestig wat reeds hierbo aangedui is, naamlik: “<i>in al dat exegetisch geweld wordt duidelijk dat de interpretasie van teksten voor een groot deel afhang van onze kennis en interpretasie van de cultuur in die tijd ... De zwijgtteksten kunnen we niet negeren, maar we kunnen er ook niet de lading aan toekennen die het in deze tijd lijkt te hebben gekregen; het is geen vaste grond op basis waarvan de ambten voor vrouwen gesloten moeten blijven</i>”.</p>	<p>2.10.8 The preceding questions and uncertainties that still exist on the Timothy text, just confirm what has been indicated above, namely: “<i>in al dat exegetisch geweld wordt duidelijk dat de interpretasie van teksten voor een groot deel afhang van onze kennis en interpretasie van de cultuur in die tijd ... De zwijgtteksten kunnen we niet negeren, maar we kunnen er ook niet de lading aan toekennen die het in deze tijd lijkt te hebben gekregen; het is geen vaste grond op basis waarvan de ambten voor vrouwen gesloten moeten blijven</i>”.</p> <p>[in all the exegetical analysis it becomes clear that the interpretation</p>

<p><b>3. Beswaargrond 2</b>  <i>Die bestaande besluite van 2009 onderbeklemtoon die belangrike en insiggewende lig wat die openbaringshistoriese lyne en gegewens deur die Ou en Nuwe Testament oor die vraag van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste bied.</i>  Die hermeneutiese reël (Acta 2009:605, 7.4.1.1), dat die openbaringshistoriese lyne of gegewens ten opsigte van die verstaan en bedoeling van Skrifgedeeltes en tekste is, is besonder belangrik. Daarmee ook die gepaard-gaande hermeneutiese reël dat Skrif met Skrif vergelyk moet word. Dit hou onder meer in dat van die duidelike na die onduidelike beweeg moet word.</p> <p>3.1 Die bogenoemde hermeneutiese reëls het klaarblyklik nie 'n prominente en deurslaggewende rol gespeel by die besluite van die Sinodes van 1988 en 2009 nie. Veral omdat die probleem erken is dat daar nie 'n teks is wat spesifiek aandui of vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste mag dien nie of nie (Acta 2009:611). Ter staving hiervan die volgende:</p> <p>3.1.1 Die Studierapport van 2009 verwys wel na die teoretiese relevansie van die openbaringshistoriese lyne by die Skrifverstaan, maar bly in gebreke om dit konkreet toe te pas. Die Rapport stel ook nie vas wat dit beteken om die saak oor die vrou se posisie ten opsigte van die besondere dienste te belig en te verhelder nie. Die Rapport fokus vir die grootste deel (vgl pt 10) op die verstaan van bepaalde Skrifgedeeltes, waarvan volgens die grammaties-historiese-benadering eksegetiese gedoen is. Die aksent van die studie</p>	<p>of the text depends to a large extent on our knowledge and interpretation of the culture of the time....we can neither ignore/ negate/ deny the silent-text, nor can we apply our own version of what we imagine the text to have meant at the time; that is no solid ground or basis upon which the office for/ to women must be closed-(so that they are excluded from it)]</p> <p><b>3. Gravamen basis 2</b>  <i>The standing decisions of 2009 understate the important and insightful light that the revelational-historical lines or data have been presenting throughout the Old and New Testament regarding the problem of women in teaching and governing services.</i>  The hermeneutical rule (Acta 2009:605, 7.4.1.1.), that the revelational-historical lines or data are indicative of the understanding and intention of Scriptural passages and texts, is particularly important. Along with that is also the accompanying hermeneutical ruling that Scripture must be compared to Scripture. This then also holds that one should move from the unclear to the clear.</p> <p>3.1 It would seem that the above-mentioned hermeneutical rules didn't play a very prominent and conclusive role in the decisions taken by the Synods of 1988 and 2009. Especially since the problem was acknowledged of there not being any text which specifically indicated that women should or should not serve in a teaching or governing capacity (Acta 2009:611). To impress this fact, the following is stated:</p> <p>3.1.1 The Study report of 2009 does, in fact refer to the theoretical relevance of the revelational-historical lines that accompany the understanding of the Scripture, but falls short when it has to apply it in concrete terms. The Report neither ascertains what is meant by the woman's role in regard to illuminating and clarifying her special offices. The Report, for the most part (cf. pt 10) focuses on the understanding of specific Scriptural passages, of which exegesis was done along the grammatical-historical approach. The emphasis of the study lies on the level</p>
---	--

<p>lê op die vlak van tersaaklike Skrifgedeeltes, kerkregtelike vertrekpunte, Skrifbeskouslike vertrekpunte en hermeneutiese vertrekpunte, volgens die getuienis van die Deputate self. Die feit dat die openbarings-historiese aspek nie genoem word nie, is opvallend (Acta 2009:611, 10.1).</p> <p>3.1.2 Die Studierapport (Acta 2009:612-615) gee samevattende inligting oor vroue wat in die Ou en Nuwe Testament ten opsigte van besondere werksaamhede – ook in die formele en amptelike sin – werksaam was. Die Rapport spel byvoorbeeld nie onder meer die volgende punte in praktiese terme uit nie, naamlik:</p> <p>3.1.2.1 hoe daar aan vroue genoegsame erkenning en ruimte gegee was om veral profeties in die kerk betrokke en diensbaar te wees;</p> <p>3.1.2.2 dat mans en vroue gelykwaardig voor God is, oor gawes beskik, en ook ontvangers van die Heilige Gees was (Hand 2).</p> <p>Bogenoemde word nie in praktiese-konkrete terme uitgespel nie. Die verhelderende lig wat hierdie Skrifgegewens op die vraagstuk oor die vrou in die tersaaklike besondere dienste kon laat val, net soos ten opsigte van die tekste waarvan in diepte eksegetiese gedoen is, is dus nie oorweeg nie.</p> <p>3.2 Dit kan as 'n leemte in die besluit van 2009 aangedui word dat daar oor die saak van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste eensydig klem op sekere tekste geplaas is. Die eksegetiese werksaamhede was gefokus op 'n aantal relevante Skrifgedeeltes, veral ten opsigte van die sg swyggebooie/tekste. Op die wyse is die klem eensydig op aspekte soos die stilswye van vroue en oor hul onderdanigheid aan die hoofskap van die man geplaas.</p> <p>3.3 Die openbaringshistoriese aspekte oor die vrou in die besondere dienste is op die wyse selfs onderspeel. Ons wys op die volgende aspekte, naamlik die aktiewe betrokkenheid van vroue in die NT kerke en die profetiese werk-</p>	<p>of relevant Scriptural passages, church-politic viewpoints, Scriptural points of departure as well as hermeneutical viewpoints according to the evidence of the Deputies themselves. The fact that the revelational-historical aspect isn't even mentioned, is striking. (Acta 2009:611,10.1).</p> <p>3.1.2 The Study report (Acta 2009:612-615) gives condensed information about women who were also involved in the Old and New Testament in various occupations – in the formal and official sense. The Report doesn't, for example, stipulate the following points in practical terms, namely:</p> <p>3.1.2.1 How women are awarded sufficient recognition and space to enable them to be especially prophetically involved and to be of service;</p> <p>3.1.2.2 That men and women were equal before God, both availed over gifts and and were receivers of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2).</p> <p>The above is not spelt out in practical-concrete terms. The enlightening glow which could light up the Scriptural information about the problem on woman in the relevant particular services (just like those regarding the texts of which the exegesis was done in depth), wasn't even done.</p> <p>3.2 It can be regarded as a shortcoming in the decision of 2009 that there was unilateral emphasis placed upon certain texts regarding the case of women in the teaching and governing services. The exegetical activities focused upon a number of relevant Scriptural passages, especially in regard to the so-called silent-commandments. In this way the emphasis was placed unilaterally upon aspects such as the silence of women and their subservience to the dominance of the man.</p> <p>3.3 The revelational-historical aspects of the woman in the special offices were in this way even underplayed. We would like to point out the following aspects, namely the active involvement of women in the New Testament churches and the</p>
---	---

<p>saamhede van vroue, hul geestesgawes en hul gelykwaardigheid aan die mans.</p> <p>3.4 Behalwe die vroue wat in die Ou Testament besonderlik genoem word (Acta 2009:612-613) en wat in en onder God se volk aktief werksaam was, is daar ook in die Nuwe Testament die aanduidings van pratende, verkondigende vroue. (Skrifgedeeltes soos oor Aquila en Priscilla, oor die dogters van Filippus, oor die vroue as medereisgenote van Paulus, van Lydia en vele ander; vroue by die gebeure by die kruisiging en opstanding van die Here Jesus Christus). Die Nuwe Testament vervul die verlange waarvan Numeri 11:29 praat: “Ek sou wou wens dat die hele volk van die Here profete was, en dat Hy sy Gees op almal mag lê”.</p> <p>3.5 Die belangrikheid hiervan is dat dit vanuit ‘n hermeneutiese hoek die duideliker gedeeltes is wat lig werp op die moeiliker tekste, soos veral die sg swygtekste.</p> <p><b>4. Beswaargrond 3</b>  <i>Die besluit van die Algemene Sinode 2009 bly in gebreke om die saak van die vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste indringend vanuit ‘n Christologiese en pneumatologiese perspektief te bestuur en te verreken.</i>  Hierdie beswaargrond hang saam met beswaargrond 2 hierbo wat verband hou met die feit dat die waarde en betekenis van die openbaringshistoriese lyne en gegewens grootliks onderbeklemtoon is.</p> <p>4.1 Met die Christologiese en pneumatologiese perspektief word die volgende bedoel: dit is duidelike rigtinggewende beginsels wat met die kern en fokus van die evangelie van die koninkryk van God te doen het, soos dit in die Woord van God aan ons geopenbaar is, en ons dit onder leiding van die Gees van God kan verstaan en gebruik. Hierdie beginsels sluit die sentrale Bybelse eis van die liefde en ook die Christologie en pneumatologie as besonder sentrale en prominente aspekte en waardesisteme van die Christelike geloof in, soos in die Skrif aan ons geopenbaar is.</p>	<p>prophetic activities of women, their spiritual gifts and their equality to men.</p> <p>3.4 Besides the women who are especially mentioned in the Old Testament (Acta 2009:612-613) and who were actively operational in and among God's people, there are also indications of talking, proclaiming women in the New Testament. (Scriptural passages such as those about Aquila and Priscilla, about the daughters of Philip, about the women as fellow-travellers of Paul, about Lydia and many others; women present at the events around the crucifixion and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ.) The New Testament satisfies the longing of which Numbers 11:29 speaks: “Would that the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his Spirit on them”.</p> <p>3.5 The importance of this is that seen from a hermeneutical point of view the clearer sections throw light on the trickier texts, as especially the so-called silent texts.</p> <p><b>4. Gravamen basis 3</b>  <i>The decision of the General Synod remains deficient in its handling of the case of women in the teaching and governing services as studied incisively and accounted for from a Christological and pneumatological perspective.</i>  This gravamen is closely connected to the gravamen basis 2, above, which relates to the fact that the value and significance of the revelational-historical lines and data are greatly underemphasized.</p> <p>4.1 The Christological and pneumatological perspective implies the following: it is clearly a directional principle dealing with the core and focus of the gospel of the kingdom of God, as it has been revealed to us in the Word of God and as we can understand and use it under the guidance of the Spirit of God. These principles include the central Biblical demand of love as well as the Christology and pneumatology as special central and prominent aspects and value systems of the Christian faith, as revealed to us in the Scripture.</p>
---	---



<p>4.2 In die geval van moeiliker vraagstukke waaroor die Bybel nie in bepaalde tekste direkte antwoorde gee nie, beteken dit dat gekyk moet word na die sentrale openbaringe in die Skrif. Dit geld onder meer van die doop van kinders, oor slawerny en oor die posisie van vroue in die besondere dienste. Dit bring ons by die koninkryk van God (en die verbond) waar die Christologie en pneumatologie die groot lyne en raamwerke bied waarbinne antwoorde gesoek moet word.</p>	<p>4.2 In the case of more difficult problems about which the Bible doesn't give direct answers in specific texts, one needs to study the central revelations in the Scripture. This would include matters such as the baptism of children, and slavery, as well as the position of women in the special services. That brings us to the kingdom of God (and the covenant) where the Christology and pneumatology present the great lines and frameworks within which answers must be sought.</p>
<p>4.3 Naas die mikro-fokus op bepaalde tekste of Skrifgedeeltes wat in 'n probleem relevant is by wyse van die grammaties-historiese eksegeese daarvan, is daar – as deel van die eksegetiese proses – ook die makro-fokus of groter en sentrale lyne wat uit die Skrif na vore kom, soos die Christologie en pneumatologie. Hierdie aspek is grootliks onderbeklemtoon in die besluit van die Algemene Sinode van 2009.</p>	<p>4.3 Besides the micro-focus upon specific texts or Scriptural passages which may be relevant in a problem using the grammato-historical exegesis of it, there is too, as part of the exegetical process, the macro-focus of greater and more central lines which becomes apparent from the Scripture, like the Christology and pneumatology. This aspect was underemphasized to a large extent in the decision of the General Synod of 2009.</p>
<p>4.4 Die betekenis van die Christologie vir die beantwoording van die vraag na die diens van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste – as 'n sentrale en rigtinggewende aspek – behels kernagtig die volgende:</p>	<p>4.4 The significance of the Christology in answering the question regarding the office of women in the teaching and governing services – as a central and directional aspect – in short, entails the following:</p>
<p>4.4.1 Dat elke Skrifgedeelte vanuit Christus gelees en verstaan moet word (Luk 24:44; Heb 1:1, 2; Joh 14:25-26). God het in Christus die nuwe skepping en nuwe bedeling gebring (2 Kor 5).</p>	<p>4.4.1 That each section of Scripture should be read and understood from out of Christ (Luke 24:44; Heb1:1, 2; John 14:25-26). God has brought the new creation and new dispensation in Christ (2 Cor 5).</p>
<p>4.4.2 Christus bring verlossing en vryheid van die sonde en dood; Hy bring gelykwaardigheid tussen mense, ook tussen mans en vroue (Gal 3-27-29).</p>	<p>4.4.2 Christ brings salvation and freedom from sin and death; He brings equality between people, also between men and women (Gal 3:27-29).</p>
<p>4.4.3 Vanuit die Christologie beskou het slawerny geen bestaansreg nie, en so gee die Christologie ook helderheid op die vraag oor vroue in besondere dienste: elkeen is lid van die liggaam van Christus en vervul 'n taak en funksie soos God dit in sy vrymag gee en eis (1 Kor 12). Nêrens word hierdie funksies van die lede binne die liggaam van Christus in terme van die geslag van mense gedefinieer of aangedui nie.</p>	<p>4.4.3 As seen from Christology slavery has no justification for existing, and so too Christology also provides clarity to the problem of women in special services: each of us is a member of the body of Christ and performs a task and a function as God in his omnipotence gives and demands (1 Cor 12). There is no mention whatsoever anywhere that these functions of members within the body of Christ are defined or indicated in terms of the gender of people.</p>
<p>4.5 Die betekenis van die pneumatologie</p>	<p>4.5 The meaning of the pneumatology is</p>

<p>sluit nou aan by die Christologie en behels kortliks die volgende:</p> <p>4.5.1 Die Gees van God die Vader en die Seun word uitgestort oor mans en vroue, seuns en dogters. Elkeen wat lid van die liggaam van Christus is, het 'n gawe en opgawe ontvang. Hierdie gawes en genadegawes wat God in sy vrymag gee, is ter wille van die opbou van sy kerk gegee en verleen ook die reg aan elkeen om langs die ordelike riglyne wat die Skrif bied, hierdie gawes te beoefen. Geen Skrifgedeelte onderskei hier op grond van die geslag van mense oor die beoefening van hul gawes nie. In Hand 2, asook in Paulus se briewe (oa in Rom 12-14; 1 Kor 12-14) word die gawe van die Gees aan almal (hele liggaam van Christus) gegee. Dit geld ook van die genadegawes en geestesgawes: dit vra vir die konkretisering daarvan in 'n diens of amp; soos by mans so ook by vroue.</p> <p>4.5.2 Hierdie Christologiese en pneumatologiese aspekte en sentrale en rigtinggewende beginsels in die Skrif is onderbeklemtoon in die besluite van die Algemene Sinodes oor die betrokke saak. Dit behoort, indien dit in ag geneem word, die duideliker en deurslaggewende lig te verleen om besluite te neem waarvolgens vroue wel in die leer- en regeerdienste mag en behoort te dien.</p> <p>4.6 Soos vantevore al opgemerk behoort die resultaat van eksegesis van enige Skrifgedeelte en die Christologiese en pneumatologiese aspekte (so-ook die openbaringshistoriese lyne) met mekaar in harmonie te wees en mekaar te komplimenteer. Die besluit van die Sinode in terme van die grammaties-historiese eksegetiese proses waarvolgens vroue nie in die erediens in die lerende en regerende dienste mag dien nie, is nie in lyn met wat die Christologiese, die pneumatologiese en openbarings-historiese gegewens bied en leer nie.</p> <p><b>5. Gevolgtrekking</b></p> <p>5.1. Die Sinode het vir dekades goeie grammaties-historiese eksegesis oor</p>	<p>linked closely to Christology and briefly entails the following:</p> <p>4.5.1 The Spirit of God the Father and the Son is poured out over men and women, boys and girls. Everyone who is member of the body of Christ has received a gift and an account. These gifts and graces that God has given us in his omnipotence, have been given towards the edification of his church and also awards each one the right to exercise these rights along the orderly guidelines which the Scripture presents. There is no Scriptural passage which makes any distinction based upon the gender of people and their exercising of their gifts. In Acts 2, as well as in Paul's letters (amongst others in Rom 12-14; 1 Cor 12-14) the gift of the Spirit is given to everybody (whole body of Christ). This goes for the gifts of grace and the gifts of the spirit; this demands the concretisation of those in a service or office; as with men, so too with women.</p> <p>4.5.2 These Christological and pneumatological aspects and central and directional principles in the Scripture were understated in the decisions taken by the General Synods in the relevant case. This ought to, if it were taken into consideration, allow a clearer and more conclusive light to enable taking decisions regarding women who may and should serve in teaching and governing offices.</p> <p>4.6 As noted before, the results of exegesis of any Scriptural passage and the Christological and pneumatological aspects (similar to the revelational-historical lines) ought to be in harmony with and complementary to each other. The decision of the Synod in terms of the grammatical-historical-exegetical process by analogy of which women were not allowed to serve in the worship service in the teaching and governing offices, is not in line with what the Christological, the pneumatological and the revelational-historical data present and teach.</p> <p><b>5. Conclusion</b></p> <p>5.1 For decades the Synod performed good grammatical-historical exegesis over the</p>
--	---

<p>die bogenoemde tekste gedoen en nie by 'n bevredigende antwoord gekom oor die vraag of vroue in die besondere dienste van leer en regering mag dien of nie. Dit bevestig die bevinding waartoe verskillende Sinodes in die verlede gekom het, naamlik dat daar nie 'n teks is wat oor die vraag van die vrou in die besondere dienste uitsluitend gee nie. Dit is nie nodig om weer oor dieselfde tekste eksegeese te doen nie.</p>	<p>above-mentioned texts and was not able to reach a satisfying answer regarding the question whether women should be allowed to serve in the special offices of teaching and governing. That confirms the decision to which various Synods came to in the past, namely that there was not a single text which could allow finality to the question of women in special offices. It is not necessary to do exegesis over the same texts again.</p>
<p>5.2. Die voorafgaande beredenering bevestig dat die sogenaamde duidelike tekste oor die aangeleentheid nie stand hou nie. Hierdie dokument dui daarop dat die antwoord eerder te vind is in 'n omvattende toepassing van die grammaties-historiese metode, waarin die openbaringshistoriese lyne ooreenkomstig die bedoeling van die metode deurgaans in die eksegeese deeglik verreken word.</p>	<p>5.2 The preceding argumentation confirms that the so-called obvious texts about this case don't hold water. This document indicates that the answer is rather to be found in a comprehensive application of the grammatical-historical method, in which the revelational-historical lines, according to the intention of the method, is to be considered thoroughly throughout the exegesis.</p>
<p>5.3. Duidelike tekste soos hierbo aangedui, wat in harmonie met die openbaringshistoriese lyne is, bied die perspektief dat geslagtelikheid nie die bepalende rol behoort speel in die verkiesing van vroue tot die besondere dienste nie. Die uitkoms daarvan is dat iemand nie as 'n man of 'n vrou tot die besondere dienste toegelaat word nie, maar as 'n toegeruste persoon.</p>	<p>5.3 Clear and evident texts as indicated above, which are in harmony with the revelational-historical lines indicate the perspective that gender issues oughtn't to play a determining role in the election of women for the special offices. The outcome thereof implies that nobody is allowed to the special services as a man or woman but as an equipped person.</p>
<p>5.4. Wanneer die openbaringshistoriese gegewens konsekwent in die eksegeeseprosesse verreken word, is die gevolg dat (i) geslag nie 'n rol in die vereiste tot die kerklike dienste speel nie, (ii) die gesagsverhouding in die huwelik onbetwis bly staan, (iii) volgens die vereistes wat die Nuwe Testament vir die dienste stel, dieselfde reëls wat vir mans sowel as vir vrouens wat tot die diens toegelaat word geld.</p>	<p>5.4 When the revelational-historical data are cleared consistently in the exegetical process, the result would be that (i) gender does not play any role in the demands for a specific church services, (ii) the role of authority in marriage remains undisputed, (iii) according to prerequisites set for offices in the New Testament, the same rules apply for men and women who are allowed to the office.</p>
<p>5.5. Die GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult is van mening dat hierdie dokument daarin slaag om, anders as in die Rapport wat by Sinode 2009 gedien het, die openbaringshistoriese lyne konsekwent in die eksegeese te verantwoord.</p>	<p>5.5 The GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult is of the opinion that this document succeeds in, different than the Report that served at Synod 2009, accounting for the revelational-historical lines consistently in the exegesis.</p>
<p><b>6. Versoek</b> Die GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult versoek die Sinode om, indien die Gravamen</p>	<p><b>6. Request</b> The GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult, requests that the Synod, should the Gravamen</p>

<p>slaag soos volg te besluit: <i>Dat mans en vroue met die nodige gawes en wat aan die vereistes wat die Skrif stel om tot die dienste van ouderling en predikant verkies te word voldoen, daartoe toegelaat word.</i></p>	<p>succeed, make the following decision: <i>That men and women with the required gifts and who comply with the demands set by Scripture for election, be allowed to the offices of minister and elder.</i></p>
---	--

## K. RAPPORT VAN DIE KOMMISSIE / REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

<p><b>1. Inleidende opmerkings</b></p> <p>1.1 <i>Kommissie se vertrekpunt</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Die Beswaarskrif moet behandel word, en tydens die behandeling moet ontvanklikheid bepaal word volgens KO, art 46. Die Kommissie beredeneer daarom albei.</li> <li>2. Die Kommissie lê sy werkswyse aan die Sinode voor vir goedkeuring. Dit is tog wenslik dat die Deputate vir Ontvanklikheid hierdie werk vooraf sal afhandel, en hulle opdrag sodanig uitgebrei word indien hulle in hulle opdrag beperk is.</li> <li>3. Die werkswyse om tydens die beoordeling van 'n Beswaarskrif ook die ontvanklikheid te beoordeel, mag daartoe aanleiding gee dat KO, art 46 effektief omseil word; of daarop neerkom dat 'n ander werkswyse aangelê word wat nie deur Sinode 2012 besluit is tov die ontvanklikheid van Appelle nie.</li> </ol> <p>1.2 <i>Werkswyse</i></p> <p>By die beoordeling van ontvanklikheid het die Kommissie, na aanleiding van die opmerkinge van die Deputate vir Ontvanklikheid in hulle Rapport: pt 3.7.1.2.2 en die feit dat hulle eintlik daarmee erken dat dit nie vir hulle moontlik was om ontvanklikheid te bepaal tensy beoordeling ook reeds plaasvind nie, die volgende as vertrekpunte geneem:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ons aanvaar die dilemma dat dit baie moeilik is om ontvanklikheid te beoordeel vlg KO, art 46 sonder om reeds die meriete van die argumente daarmee saam te beoordeel, veral as die bewoording relatief is, met ander woorde terme soos: "te min" of "onvoldoende" of "nie duidelik nie" ens gebruik word. Dan moet bv beoordeel word of die saak voldoende was, al is die saak reeds in 'n Rapport behandel. <b>Dus:</b> 'n Beswaar wat hom beroep op</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Introductory remarks</b></p> <p>1.1 <i>Commission's point of departure</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Gravamen must be handled, and during this handling the receptivity must be decided upon according to CO, art 46. The Commission thus argues both.</li> <li>2. The Commission explains its approach to the Synod for approval. It is best if the Deputies for receptivity do this work beforehand and that their mandate is expanded if they feel their mandate is limited.</li> <li>3. The approach of deciding on the receptivity of a Gravamen during the adjudication thereof could lead to CO, art 46 being circumvented, or that it comes down to another approach being followed which was not decided upon by Synod 2012 with regards to the receptivity of Appeals.</li> </ol> <p>1.2 <i>Approach</i></p> <p>In the adjudication of receptivity, the Commission dealt with the comments made by the Deputies for receptivity in their Report pt 3.7.1.2.2 and the fact that they actually acknowledged that it was not possible for them to decide on receptivity unless the adjudication of the content is already done; the following points of departure is taken</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We accept the dilemma that it is very difficult to adjudicate receptivity according to CO, art 46 without already weighing the merits of the arguments along with it, especially if the wording is relative, in other words terms like: "too little", or "insufficient" or "not clear" etc is used. Then for example it must be decided whether the matter has already served in a report. <b>Thus:</b> A grievance that calls upon relative arguments, like an aspect in the Report or Reports of</li> </ol>
--	--

<p>relatiewe argumentasie, soos dat 'n aspek in die Rapport of Rapporte van die Sinode "te min was, onvoldoende of nie genoegsaam in berekening gebring of geweeg is nie, dat 'n saak eensydig gesien is", is nie ontvanklik nie, tensy duidelik aangedui word waar die besluit verkeerd was. Die beswaardes moet immers bewys waar die Sinode gefouteer het sodat die saak reggestel kan word. Veralgemeende stellings en relativisme is nie 'n maatstaf nie, want wat vir die een te min is, is vir die ander genoeg. Die vraag is dus nie of daar genoeg gedoen is nie, maar of dit wat gedoen is ooreenstemming met Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde. Maw, is daar dus ander getuienis wat die huidige besluit verander. Hierdie kriteria is reeds al aangewend by die beoordeling van beswaargronde (Acta 2016:75, 2). "Dit is moeilik om "genoegsaam" te verreken ten opsigte van die impak op 'n besluit".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Ons aanvaar ook dat 'n saak afgehandel is met die besluit wat deur die Sinode geneem is en dat 'n Beswaarskrif wat sodanige besluit wil verander, nuwe argumente of inligting moet bevat wat nog nie in 'n Sinodebesluit of Rapport vervat was nie en wat ook nog nie in 'n Beswaarskrif behandel is nie.</li> <li>3. Ons verwerp die argument dat 'n saak vlg KO, art 46 ontvanklik is bloot omdat die beswaardes van mening is dat die saak nog nie afgehandel is nie, of nie klaar deurgepraat is nie, aangesien hulle nie tevrede is met die besluit wat die Sinode geneem het nie, of van mening is dat die saak nie genoegsaam deur die Sinode begrond is nie, sonder om te <b>bewys</b> waar die besluit verkeerd geneem is.</li> <li>4. Ons aanvaar voorts dat 'n Beswaarskrif ontvanklik is al is daar slegs een argument wat in die hele Beswaarskrif nog nie deur 'n Sinode beoordeel of behandel is nie, met dien verstande dat slegs sodanige beswaar beoordeel sal word.</li> <li>5. 'n Beswaar moet behoorlik begrond</li> </ol>	<p>the Synod was "too little, or not sufficiently reckoned or weighed, that a matter is seen as one-sided", is not receptive unless it can be clearly shown where the decision was wrong. The aggrieved must prove where the Synod erred so that the matter can be corrected. General statements and relativism is not a yardstick because what is enough for one is not enough for another. The question is thus not whether enough was done, but whether what was done agrees with Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order. In other words, if there is other testimonies that can change the current decision. This criteria was already applied during the adjudication of grounds for objection (Acta 2016:75, 2): "It is difficult to argue "satisfactory" in terms of the impact on a decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. We accept that a matter is finalised with the decision that is taken by the Synod and that a gravamen that wishes to change such a decision, must contain new arguments or information which has not yet been dealt with in another gravamen.</li> <li>3. We reject the argument that a matter is receptive according to CO, art 46 simply because the aggrieved are of the opinion that the matter is not yet finalised, or sufficiently discussed, because they are not happy with the decision that the Synod took, or are of opinion that the matter was not sufficiently based by the Synod, without <b>proving</b> where the decision was wrongly taken.</li> <li>4. We accept going forward that a Gravamen is receptive even if there is a single argument in the whole of the Gravamen that has not yet been dealt with by a Synod with the understanding that only such a grievance will be evaluated.</li> <li>5. A grievance must be decently based</li> </ol>
---	--

<p>word op Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde (KO, art 31). Die blote uitspraak van 'n opinie, kritiek, vrae ens, gee geen grond vir beoordeling nie, en as sodanige grond uit Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde nie gegee word nie, is die beswaargrond onontvanklik (byvoorbeeld sogenaamde “<b>onwyse optrede</b>”), is geen afdoende bewys nie.</p> <p>Hoewel pte 1 en 5 nie deel is van ons opdrag nie, en reeds by ontvanklikheid in ag geneem is, noem ons dit wel aangesien dit so dikwels voorkom dat dit die gewone beoordeling van die beswaargronde bemoelijk.</p> <p>Dit is moontlik dat bogenoemde werkswyse vir Deputate wat ontvanklikheid beoordeel, tog as kriteria kan dien sonder om die inhoud te weeg.</p> <p>Hierdie Rapport van die Kommissie handel oor die ontvanklikheid en die beoordeling van die Beswaarskrif. Indien die Sinode die Beswaarskrif as ontvanklik sou aanvaar, moet die Sinode die aanbevelings rakende die beoordeling ter tafel nie. <b><u>Die dele wat oor ontvanklikheid handel word as A gemerk en die dele wat oor die beredenering en beoordeling handel word as B gemerk.</u></b></p> <p><u>Behandeling van die Beswaarskrif</u> Die GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult (GKPB) teken Gravamen aan teen die besluit van die Algemene Sinode 2009: “Besluit: Die vergadering besluit volgens die goedgekeurde aanbeveling, pt 4.2, dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie”. GKPB versoek die Sinode om, indien die Gravamen slaag, soos volg te besluit: “Dat mans en vroue met die nodige gawes en wat aan die vereistes wat die Skrif stel om tot die dienste van ouderling en predikant verkies te word voldoen, daartoe toegelaat word”.</p> <p>Die Gravamen bevat 3 beswaargronde. Hierdie 3 beswaargronde word genoem en beoordeel. <b>Besluit: Punte 1.1 en 1.2 kennis geneem.</b></p> <p><b>2. Beswaargrond 1</b> GKPB beweer dat die besluit van die</p>	<p>in Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order (CO, art 31). The simple expression of an opinion, criticism, questions, etc. does not provide a basis for the evaluation, and if necessary basis from Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order is not given the basis for objection is not receptive (for example so called “<b>unwise acts</b>”), is no dismissive proof.</p> <p>Although pts 1 and 5 is not part of our mandate and was already taken into account during adjudication of receptivity, we mention it because it appears so regularly that the normal adjudication of the basis for objection is made difficult.</p> <p>It is possible that the above-mentioned approach can serve as the approach for Deputies that adjudicate receptivity and could serve as criteria without having the content serve.</p> <p>This Report of the Commission discusses the receptivity and the evaluation of the Gravamen. If the Synod accepts the Gravamen as receptive, they must table the recommendations regarding the evaluation. <b><u>The parts dealing with receptivity are marked as A and the parts dealing with the evaluation and arguments is marked as B.</u></b></p> <p><u>Discussion of the Gravamen</u> The GK Potchefstroom-Die Bult (GKPB) levels objection against the decision of General Synod 2009: “Decision: The meeting decides according to the approved recommendation, pt 4.2, that women may not serve in the specific offices of minister and elders”. GKPB requests the Synod to, if the Gravamen succeeds, decide as follow: “That men and women with the necessary gifts, and which meets the requirements that Scripture places to be elected to the office of elder and minister, be allowed to it”.</p> <p>The Gravamen contains 3 bases for objection. These 3 bases are mentioned and evaluated. <b>Decision: Points 1.1 and 1.2 noted.</b></p> <p><b>2. Basis for objection 1</b> GKPB claims that the decision of the</p>
---	---

Algemene Sinode nie berus op 'n duidelike, aanvaarbare en oortuigende eksegetiese en hermeneutiese van 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35 en 1 Timoteus 2:8-15 nie.

#### Motivering 2.1

##### **Bewering**

GKPB wys in hierdie motivering op 2 sake

1. Dat daar nie 'n teks in die Bybel is waarin spesifiek gesê word of vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie en dat 'n Bybelgefundeerde standpunt daarvoor aangewese is op afleidings uit ander Skrifuitsprake.
2. Dat die Rapport van 2009 tot die konklusie gekom het dat in 7 van die studies van die 9 spesifieke Skrifgedeeltes nie tot die gevolgtrekking gekom kon word dat vroue nie in die besonder dienste mag dien nie. Slegs 2 gedeeltes, maar eintlik slegs een sg "duideliker" Skrifdeel, 1 Tim 2:8-15, sou dit dan duidelik maak dat dit wel so verstaan moet word.

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die beswaardes het reeds in 2016 die saak van onduidelike Skrifgegewens op die tafel gesit, en dit is deur die Sinode afgewys (2016:132:4.2). In die kerkregtelike beoordeling word hierdie argument ook afgewys (2016:132:4.2.3).

Hier bring hulle weer die saak, en maak die twee beweringe soos hierbo aangetoon as motivering. Wat op die oog af nuut lyk, is die verwysing na die betrokke Skrifgegewens. Ook dit is egter nie nuut nie. Dieselfde beskuldiging van onvoldoende getuienis word gemaak in die Beswaarskrif van GK Bloemfontein-Suid by Sinode 2016, maar voeg dan reeds die genoemde tekste van hierdie Beswaarskrif by as verwysing (Acta 2016:52, 5). Ook dit word deur die Sinode afgewys: "Die Rapport van 2009 stel egter met die woord "opsigself" dat 1 Kor 14:34-35 alleen nie duidelike Skrifgronde gee nie, maar dat dit met 'n duideliker gedeelte soos 1 Tim 2:8-15 saam gelees moet word om 1 Kor 14:34-35 te verstaan. Dit is immers 'n algemene Skrifverklaringsreël om Skrif met Skrif te vergelyk om tot 'n duidelike gevolgtrekking te kom" (Acta 2016:59, 2.4). "Die Skrifverklaring waarop die besluit van 2009 rus het duidelik Skrifgronde en verreken die reëls van Skrifverklaring deeglik en konsekwent. Daar is elemente in die verklaring wat

General Synod does not rest on clear, acceptable and convincing exegesis and hermeneutics of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

#### Motivation 2.1

##### **Claim**

GKPB refers to 2 matters in this motivation

1. That there is no text in the Bible in which specifically is said that women may or may not serve in the specific offices and that a Biblically-founded point of view on it is found from what is derived from other parts of Scripture.
2. That the Report of 2009 came to the conclusion that in 7 of the 9 studies of specific parts of Scripture no clear indication is given that women may not serve in the specific offices. Only 2 parts of Scripture, but actually only 1 so-called "clearer" part of Scripture, 1 Tim 2:8-15, showed clearly that it should be understood as such.

##### **A. Receptivity**

The aggrieved already put the matter of unclear Scriptural evidence on the table in 2016, and was subsequently rejected by the Synod (2016:132, 4.2). In the church political evaluation this argument is also rejected (2016:132, 4.2.3).

Here they bring the matter to table again and lay two claims as mentioned above as motivation. What seems to look like something new, is the reference to the involved parts of Scripture. Also this is not new. The same accusation of unsatisfactory witness is made in the Gravamen of GK Bloemfontein-Suid at Synod 2016, but then already lists the named texts of this Gravamen as reference. (Acta 2016, 52, 5) It is also rejected by the Synod: "The Report of 2009 states in the words "in itself" that 1 Cor 14:34-35 by itself does not give clear Scriptural basis, but that it must be read together with a clearer part such as 1 Tim 2:8-15 in order to understand 1 Cor 14:34-35. It is a general Exegesis-rule that Scripture is referenced with Scripture to come to a clear understanding" (Acta 2016:59:2.4). "The Exegesis on which the decision of 2009 rests, has clear Scriptural basis and takes the rules of Exegesis for their account clearly and concisely. There are elements in the explanation that could be

duideliker toegelig kon word. Tog sou hierdie enkele elemente nie die besluit van 2009 ongeldig maak nie” (Acta 2016:59, 2.10).

Die beswaardes se standpunt word reeds beredeneer en bewys deur die Studierapport van Sinode 1988 (6, pt 1.3), waar onder andere onder punt **1.3.1.1 Sacra scriptura sui ipsius interpres: Skrif-met-Skrif-vergelyking**, genoem word: “Hierdie reël gee die eksegeet die goeie reg en plaas hom ook onder verpligting om ‘n Skrifuitspraak nie in isolasie van die res van die Skrif te probeer verklaar nie, maar om dit juis in die lig wat die res van die Skrif op die saak werp, te verstaan”.

Die beswaargrond maak stellings maar bevat geen Skrif, Belydenis of Kerkordelike grond nie, en bied geen beredenering aan hoe die besluit verander behoort te word nie.

**A1. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

Die feit dat daar nie ‘n teks is waarin daar spesifiek iets gesê word nie, beteken nie noodwendig dat die Bybel nie lig op die saak werp nie. Verskeie Gereformeerde leerstukke, bv die kinderdoop en die leer van die Drie-Eenheid, word bv gehandhaaf sonder dat daar tekste is wat dit uitdruklik sê. Indien daar dan wel 2 Skrifgedeeltes, of slegs een “sg duideliker” Skrifdeel is wat duidelikheid gee oor die vrou in die besondere dienste, maak dit nie die besluit van ‘n meerdere vergadering minder seker nie, maar juis meer seker.

Motivering 2.2

**Bewering**

In Motivering 2.2 gee GKPB aandag aan die twee Skrifgedeeltes (1 Kor 14:33-35 en 1 Tim 2:8-15) waarna in Motivering 2.1 verwys is. In hierdie motivering word daar gesê dat eksegete en kerklike studies wys dat daar ‘n menigte verklarings oor hierdie tekste bestaan, wat uiteenlopend is en wat wesenlik van mekaar verskil. GKPB haal aan uit een so ‘n kerklike studie van die GKV 2017.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Wat hier gesê word is ‘n gegewe in die Rapport van 2009. In hierdie gedeelte maak die beswaardes ‘n stelling, sonder om enige beswaar aan te teken. Hierdie inligting word

more clearly elucidated. Yet this would be one or two elements that would not make the decision of 2009 invalid” (Acta 2016:59, 2.10).

The aggrieved’s views are already argued and proven by the Study report of Synod 1988 (6, 1.3), where amongst other is mentioned in point **1.3.1.1 Sacra scriptura sui ipsius interpres: Scripture-with-Scripture-reference**: “This rule gives the exegete the right and places him under the obligation to not try and explain a part of Scripture in isolation with the rest of Scripture, but to understand it in the light that the rest of Scripture shines upon it”.

The basis for objection makes claims but does not contain any Scriptural, Confessional, or Church Orderly bases, and supplies no argument on how the decision should be changed.

**A1. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

The fact that there is not a text where something is specifically mentioned, does not necessarily mean that the Bible does not shine light upon the matter. Many different Reformed doctrines for example, the infant-baptism, doctrine on the Trinity, are defended without there being explicit texts that clearly states it. If there is then 2 parts of Scripture, or even then only one so-called “clearer” part of Scripture that gives clarity on the women in specific offices, it does not make the decision of a greater meeting less certain, but in fact more certain.

Motivation 2.2

**Claim**

In Motivation 2.2 GKPB pays attention to the two parts of Scripture (1 Cor 14:33-35 and 1 Tim 2:8-15) referred to in Motivation 2.1. In this motivation it is said that exegetes and churchly studies show that there are many explanations of these texts, which divert and are essentially differing with one another. GKPB quotes one such a ecclesiastical study of the GKV 2017.

**A. Receptivity**

What is said here is a fact in the Report of 2009. In this part the aggrieved make a statement without levelling an objection. This information was used as foundation for many



in verskeie Beswaarskrifte as onderbou gebruik (Acta 2016:63, 3.1).

**A2. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

Net omdat daar 'n menigte verklarings oor hierdie tekste bestaan, beteken nie dat al hierdie verklarings reg is nie. God sal tog nie in dieselfde gedeelte openbaar dat vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien en in dieselfde gedeelte openbaar dat hulle nie in die besondere dienste mag dien nie.

Motivering 2.3

**Bewering**

GKPB wys dat die Studiedeputate van 2009 se Rapport dit laat blyk dat daar meer as een verklaring van bg tekste binne die Gereformeerde eksegetiese en hermeneuse moontlik is en dat die Deputate wat die onderskeie standpunte oor die vrou in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling handhaaf, wedersyds oordeel dat die ander Deputate nie leerstellig verkeerd is nie. GKPB noem dat die vlak van verskil volgens die Deputate op die vlak van eksegetiese sintese is.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Weereens word 'n stelling gemaak, sonder om 'n beswaar te opper. Die stelling is reeds geopper in vorige beredenerings oor die saak (Acta 2016:63, 3.1).

**A3. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

Uit die Rapport wat voor Sinode 2009 gedien het, is dit duidelik dat daar tov die eksegetiese sintese van die twee gedeeltes 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35 en 1 Timoteus 2:8-15 verskille na vore getree het. Die Sinode moes 'n keuse maak oor watter eksegetiese sintese duidelik maak wat God in die gedeeltes openbaar oor die vraagstuk of vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie. Dit is nie moontlik dat al twee die sinteses korrek gedoen kon wees nie. Die Sinode het biddend geoordeel dat die eksegetiese sintese wat aandui dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling mag dien nie, korrek is en daarom nagevolg moet word. Daarmee het die Sinode per implikasie aangedui dat hulle eersgenoemde sintese as korrek beskou, en dat laasgenoemde sintese nie korrek is nie.

Gravamina, (Acta 2016:63, 3.1).

**A2. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

Just because there are several explanations of these texts does not make them all correct. God will not reveal in the same part of Scripture that women may serve in the specific offices and in the same part of Scripture reveal that women may not serve in the specific offices.

Motivation 2.3

**Claim**

GKPB shows that the Report of the Study deputies of 2009 lets it seem as though there is more than one explanation possible of the abovementioned texts within the Reformed exegesis and hermeneutics and that the Deputies that hold different views on the women in the specific offices, judge back and forth that the other Deputies are not doctrinally wrong. GKPB mentions that the level of difference rests in exegetical synthesis.

**A. Receptivity**

Once again a statement is made without raising an objection. The statement was already raised in the previous argument on the matter (Acta 2016:63, 3.1).

**A3. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

From the Report that served before Synod 2009, it is clear that there are differences raised in the exegetical synthesis of the two parts of Scripture, 1 Cor 14:33-35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The Synod had to make a choice on which exegetical synthesis makes clear what God reveals in these parts on the question whether women may serve in the specific office or not. It is impossible that both synthesis was done correctly. The Synod judged, prayerfully, that the exegetical study that shows that women may not serve in the specific offices of minister and elder is correct, and should subsequently be followed. With this the Synod by implication showed that they take the first-mentioned synthesis to be correct, and the last-mentioned synthesis to be wrong.

#### Motivering 2.4

##### **Bewering**

Volgens GKPБ het die Algemene Sinode in terme van die uitsprake van die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode “per implikasie” gekies vir die Skrifgetuies (soos vervat in die Rapport) volgens die een standpunt. Maar hierdie bepaalde standpunt sluit volgens GKPБ dit op sigself in dat daar op eksegetiese gronde ook ‘n ander standpunt kan wees.

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Ook hier maak die beswaardes ‘n stelling sonder om beswaar te maak. Hierdie argument is reeds al gebruik in vorige Beswaarskrifte en die stelling se implikasie geweeg (Acta 2016:69, 4.3).

**A4. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

##### **B. Beredenering**

Beredenering sluit aan by die beredenering by 2.2. Net omdat daar ‘n ander standpunt kan wees, beteken nie dat beide standpunte korrek is nie. God sal nie in 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35 en 1 Timoteus 2:8-15 openbaar dat vroue wel in die besondere dienste mag dien asook dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste mag dien nie.

#### Motivering 2.5

##### **Bewering**

GKPБ sê dat vergaderings (Sinode 2009, 2016) besluite geneem het sonder om die besluite te begrond. Volgens GKPБ het die bg Sinodes hul besluite slegs by wyse van ‘n meerderheid van stemme sonder verdere motivering geneem.

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie stelling is ‘n herhaling van ‘n Beswaarskrif by Sinode 2016 (Acta 2016:64, 3.2; 71, 2). Hierdie bewering is reeds in 2016 deur Kommissie Kerkregtelik hanteer (Acta 2016:133, 4.2.5: “Die Sinode het op grond van die studie soos vervat in die Rapport, wat rus op die Skrif, besluit”. Sinode 2016 spreek hom so oor die saak uit: “Daar moet gewaak word om te redeneer vanuit die Kollegialistiese siening dat dit die Sinode is wat besluite neem en afforseer. Wanneer kerke byeenkom in meerdere vergaderings word daar nie deur ‘n “hoër vergadering” besluite op mindere vergaderings afgedwing nie, maar die kerke besluit saam op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde (Acta 2016:80, 4, spesifiek 4.1.1.5)”.

#### Motivation 2.4

##### **Claim**

According to GKPБ the General Synod, in terms of the statements of Extraordinary General Synod, “by implication” chose for the Scriptural evidence (as explained in the Report) of one view. But this specific view includes, according to GKPБ, that there could be another view based on exegetical grounds.

##### **A. Receptivity**

Here the aggrieved once again make a statement without laying an objection. This argument was already used in previous Gravamina and the implications thereof was weighed (Acta 2016:69, 4.3).

**A4. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

##### **B. Argument**

This argument ties in with the argument at 2.2. Just because there can be another view, does not mean that both views are correct. God will not in 1 Cor 14:33-35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15 reveal that women may serve in the specific offices, as well as reveal that women may not serve in the specific offices.

#### Motivation 2.5

##### **Claim**

GKPБ claims that Meetings (Synod 2009, 2016) made decisions without basing the decisions. According to GKPБ the abovementioned Synods only took their decisions based upon a majority of votes without any further arguments levied.

##### **A. Receptivity**

This statement is a repeat of a Gravamen of Synod 2016 (Acta 2016:64, 3.2; 71, 2). This claim was already dealt with by Commission Church Polity in 2016 (Acta 2016:133, 4.2.5): “The Synod decided based upon the grounds of the study as found in the Report, that rest upon Scripture”. Synod 2016 expresses itself on this matter as follow: “There must be guarded against arguing from the Collegial view that the Synod makes decisions and enforces them. When churches gather in greater meetings, there is no “higher meeting” that enforces decisions on a “lower meeting”, but that churches decide together based upon Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order (Acta 2016:80, 4, specifically 4.1.1.5)”.

**A5. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

Hierdie argument maak 'n skeiding tussen die besluit, en die gronde waarop die besluit hom beroep. Dit is nie 'n etiese manier om met die besluite van 'n Sinode om te gaan nie. Hierdie stelling word ook nie bewys nie. Inteendeel, hulle weerspreek hulleself as hulle in die volgende punt en vorige punt erken dat die studie bewyse verskaf het vir hulle standpunt!

Motivering 2.6

**Bewering**

Volgens GKPB moes Sinode 2009 vanuit die Woord aantoon waarom slegs die een standpunt in die Rapport voor Sinode 2009 eksegeties houdbaar en aanvaarbaar is. Deur dit na te laat, het die Sinode versuim om die eksegetiese en Skrifargumente wat deur een bepaalde standpunt ten gunste van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste aangebied was, te beantwoord.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie bewering is reeds in 2016 gemaak (Acta 2016:64, 3.2), en deur die Kommissie Kerkregtelik hanteer (Acta 2016:69, 4.3): "Die vraag word gevra of gestem mag word oor 'n saak waar twee Skrifinterpretasies moontlik is. Die vraag is egter of daar werklik twee korrekte interpretasies is? Daar kan tog net EEN wees. En daarvoor is gekies. Die ander interpretasie is afgewys. Per implikasie is die besluit dat die een interpretasie korrek is en die ander foutief is".

Verder ook (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.1.2): "Beide die Skrifverklarings is dus in oorweging geneem en daar is vir die een verklaring bo die ander gekies. Die keuse wat gemaak is, word dan die prinsipiële standpunt, tensy die teendeel uit die Woord bewys kan word deur beswaar of Appèl (KO, artt 31 & 46)".

**A6. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

Die Sinode het nie die plig om een standpunt teenoor die ander verkeerd of reg te bewys nie. Die Sinode oordeel op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde wat reg is. "Wanneer 'n Sinode besluite neem, word die Here gesmeek om aan die vergadering leiding te gee deur sy Gees (vgl KO, art 32). Alle Skrif-

**A5. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

This argument makes a distinction between the decision, and the basis upon which the decision is made. This is not an ethical way of dealing with the decisions of Synod. This statement is also not proved. Rather, they contradict themselves when they acknowledge in the previous, as well as the following point that the study provided proof for their view!

Motivation 2.6

**Claim**

According to GKPB, Synod 2009 had to show from the Word why only the one view in the Report before Synod 2009 was exegetically sound and valid. By not doing so, the Synod did not answer the exegesis and Scriptural-arguments that was held by one specific view in favour of women in the teaching- and governance-office.

**A. Receptivity**

This claim was already made in 2016 (Acta 2016:64, 3.2), and handled by the Commission Church Polity (Acta 2016:69, 4.3): "The question is asked whether there may be voted on a matter where two interpretations of Scripture is possible. The question is rather whether there are two correct interpretations? There can be only ONE. And that one was chosen. The other interpretation is rejected. By implication the decision is that one interpretation is correct and the other is faulty".

Furthermore also (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.1.2): "Both the interpretations of Scripture was taken into consideration and one was chosen above the other. The choice that was made becomes the principle view unless the opposite can be shown from the Word by way of gravamen or appeal (CO, arts 31 & 46)".

**A6. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

The Synod does not have the task of proving one view to be correct versus another. The Synod judges based upon the Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order what is right. "When a Synod makes a decision, the Lord is begged to provide guidance to the meeting through His Spirit (ref CO, art 32). All

verklarings, motiverings en beredenerings word in oorweging geneem voordat daar tot stemming oorgegaan word.

Die besluit wat geneem word, staan, tensy die teendeel uit die Woord bewys kan word deur beswaar of Appèl (KO, artt 31 & 46), (Acta 2016:79, 3.4).

In pt 4.2.5.1 van Acta 2016:133 staan die volgende: "Die onus rus op die beswaarde om te bewys dat besluite nie volgens Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde is nie. Die onus rus dus nie op meerdere vergaderings om te bewys dat dit wel die geval is nie... Die Sinode het op grond van die studie soos vervat in die Rapport, wat rus op die Skrif, besluit". Woord en Gees is dus nie van mekaar geskei nie.

#### Motivering 2.7

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat Sinode 2016 slegs 'n beroep op die leiding van die Gees sou doen, sonder om oortuigende Skrifbewyse te lewer en dat die Woord en Gees foutiewelik van mekaar losgemaak word.

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die beswaardes maak hier 'n veronderstelling wat korrek is, sonder om 'n beswaar te opper.

**A7. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

##### **B. Beredenering**

Daar word beweer, maar nie bewys dat Sinode 2016 Woord en Gees van mekaar losgemaak word nie.

In pt 4.2.5.1 van Acta 2016:133 staan die volgende: "Die onus rus op die beswaarde om te bewys dat besluite nie volgens Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde is nie. Die onus rus dus nie op meerdere vergaderings om te bewys dat dit wel die geval is nie... Die Sinode het op grond van die studie soos vervat in die Rapport, wat rus op die Skrif, besluit." Woord en Gees is dus nie van mekaar geskei nie.

#### Motivering 2.8

##### **Bewering**

Volgens GKPB is dit duidelik dat die standpunt teen die vrou in die diens van predikant of ouderling, of ten gunste daarvan, dikwels nie die ander standpunt se argumente en gevolgtrekkings weerlê nie. Daar word slegs 'n ander standpunt geformuleer. Die ekse-

planations of Scripture, motivations, and arguments is taken into consideration before voting is done".

The decision that is made stands, unless the opposite can be shown from the Word by way of Gravamen or Appeal (CO, arts 31 & 46), (Acta 2016:79, 3.4).

In pt 4.2.5.1 of Acta 2016:133 the following is written: "The burden of proof is on the aggrieved to show that decisions were as not taken according to Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order. The burden does not rest upon the greater meetings to prove that it is indeed the case. The Synod decided based upon the study as found in the Report, which rests on the Scripture, Word and Spirit was thus not separated from one another.

#### Motivation 2.7

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that Synod 2016 only does a calling on the guidance of the Spirit without the convincing Scriptural evidence and that Word and Spirit is thus wrongly separated from one another.

##### **A. Receptivity**

The aggrieved make a statement here that is correct, without levelling an objection.

**A7. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

##### **B. Argument**

There is claimed, but not proven that Synod 2016 separated Word and Spirit.

In pt 4.2.5.1 of Acta 2016:133 the following is written: "The burden rests upon the aggrieved to prove that decisions are not according to Scripture, Confession and Church Order. The burden does not rest upon the greater meetings to prove that it is indeed the case. The Synod did decide based on the Study as found in the Report, which rests on Scripture decide" Word and Spirit was thus not separated from one another.

#### Motivation 2.8

##### **Claim**

According to GKPB it is clear that the view against the woman in the office of minister or elder, or the view in support of it, many a time does not disprove the other view's arguments and conclusions. There is only a different view that is formulated. The

gese oortuig in die opsig dus nie na die een of die ander kant toe nie.

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie argument is selfs 'n herhaling van pt 2.6. Dit het al gedien in 2016 (Acta 2016:78, 3.2; 80, 4) en deur die Sinode afgewys (Acta 2016:68, 4.1; 69, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4), (Acta 2016:132, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6). Die uitspraak maak dit duidelik: "Die *onus* rus dus nie op meerdere vergaderings om te bewys dat dit wel die geval is nie (KO, art 31). Die Sinode moes bloot stem in die lig van die motivering, aanbevelings en beredenering staande die Sinode (Acta 2016:100, 4.1.2.3).

**A8. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

#### **B. Beredenering**

Dit was nie die doel van die studie om in "debat" te tree of om mekaar se standpunt te beredeneer nie. Elkeen het sy eie argument weergegee. Hierdie bewering van GKPB dien nie as motivering vir die Beswaargrond 1 dat die besluit van die Algemene Sinode nie op 'n duidelike, aanvaarbare en oortuigende eksegetiese en hermeneuse van 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35 en 1 Timoteus 2:8-15 berus nie. Wanneer 'n Sinode, soos Sinode 2009, met "diepgaande" studie van die Skrif tot oortuiging gekom het dat vroue nie in die besondere diens van predikant mag dien nie, is dit nie noodsaaklik dat alle argumente van "die ander standpunt" weerlê moet word nie.

#### Motivering 2.9

Toespitsing op 1 Kor 14:33-35.

#### Motivering 2.9.1

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat daar nie vanuit 1 Kor 14:34-35 oortuigend oor die vrou in die besondere dienste geredeneer kan word nie. Beide standpunte teen en ten gunste van die vrou in die besonder dienste van predikant en ouderling stem dus op hierdie eksegetiese punt saam. GKPB begrond die bewering op die gevolgtrekking (Sinode 2009:638): "Op sigself gee 1 Kor 14:34-35 nie duidelike blyke hiervan nie, maar in die lig van ander duideliker Skrifdele soos 1 Tim 2:8-15 word dit duidelik dat dit wel so verstaan moet word".

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die beswaardes maak 'n stelling sonder om 'n beswaar te opper.

exegesis does not convince to the one or the other side.

#### **A. Receptivite**

This argument is a repeat of pt 2.6 it has already served in 2016 (Acta 2016:78, 3.2; 80, 4) and was rejected (Acta 2016:68, 4.1; 69, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4), (Acta 2016:132, 4.2.1; 4.2.2; 4.2.5; 4.2.6). The judgement makes it clear: "The *burden* rests not upon the greater meetings to prove that it is indeed the case (CO, art 31). The Synod must simply vote in the light of the arguments, recommendations and motivation during the Synod (Acta 2016:100, 4.1.2.3).

**A8. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

#### **B. Argument**

The goal of the study was not to enter into a "debate" or to argue one another's views. Each gave their own argument. This claim of GKPB does not serve as motivation for basis of objection 1 that the decision of the General Synod does not rest upon a clear, acceptable, and convincing exegesis and hermeneutics of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15. When a Synod such as Synod 2009, after "deep study of the Scripture comes to the conviction that women may not serve in the office of minister, it is not necessary that all arguments of the "other view" be disproved.

#### Motivation 2.9

Application to 1 Cor 14:33-35.

#### Motivation 2.9.1

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that the woman in the specific office cannot be argued sufficiently from 1 Cor 14:33-35. Both views, for and against the woman in the specific office of minister and elder this agrees on this exegetical point. GKPB bases the claim on the conclusion (Synod 2009:638): "In itself, 1 Cor 14:33-35 does not provide clear showings of this, but in the light of other parts of Scripture like 1 Tim 2:8-15 it becomes clear and must be understood as such".

##### **A. Receptivity**

The aggrieved makes a statement without levelling an objection..

**A9. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

Hierdie stelling van die beswaardes is op die oog af dalk korrek, maar nie volledig nie. Al is dit nie oortuigend nie, word sulke tekste juis beredeneer vanuit meer duidelike tekste. Met hierdie bewering laat GKPB die eksegetiese reël dat minder duidelike Skrifdele in die lig van duideliker Skrifdele verstaan moet word, buite rekening. Hierdie reël berus op die beginsel in die Gereformeerde hermeneutiek dat die Heilige Skrif homself verklaar, en dat Skrif-met-Skrif-vergelyking onontbeerlik is. Om dan te beweer dat daar nie vanuit 'n bepaalde teks op sy eie oor 'n bepaalde saak geredeneer kan word nie, kom neer op verontagsaming van 'n basiese eksegetiese reël.

Motivering 2.9.2

GKPB beweer dat die logies gang van 1 Kor 11-14 nog nie genoegsaam in die standpunte by die Sinodes verreken is nie. Die volgende word as leemtes voorgehou:

Motivering 2.9.2.1

**Bewering**

Die betrokke Skrifgedeelte word nie deeglik in samehang met hoofstukke 11, 12 en 13 bespreek nie.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die hele 2.9.1 tot 2.9.2.2 toon 'n samehang. Die hele saak is egter deel van die Rapport wat in 1988 gedien het (44, 7.5 tot 7.8). van hierdie sake dien ook in 2003 (Acta 2003:579, 3.10, 3.11)

**A10. Hierdie punte van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat die betrokke Skrifgedeelte nie deeglik in samehang met hoofstukke 11, 12 en 13 bespreek word nie, maar toon nie aan waarom hierdie bewering waar sou wees nie. Daarteenoor blyk dit uit die Rapport by Sinode 2009 dat daar wel deeglik rekening gehou is met die gedagtegang van hoofstukke 11 tot 14, naamlik dat hierdie hoofstukke "die briefdeel is waarin oor die goeie orde in die gemeente gehandel word (11:2-14:40). Hierdie briefdeel kan soos volg ingedeel word:

- 11:2-16: Die gedrag van die vrou in die gemeente.

**A9. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

At first glance this statement of the aggrieved seem correct, but not complete. Although it is not convincing, such texts are argued from the more clear texts.

With this claim GKPB leaves out the exegetical rule that less-clear parts of Scripture must be understood in the light of clearer parts of Scripture. This rule in itself rests in the reformed hermeneutic-principle that the Holy Scriptures explains itself, and that Scripture-with-Scripture reference is necessary. To then claim that there is not a specific text on its own that argues a specific case, comes down to a disregard for a basic exegetical rule.

Motivation 2.9.2

GKPB claim that the logical flow of 1 Cor 11-14 is not sufficiently taken into account by the Synods. The following is seen as deficiencies.

Motivation 2.9.2.1

**Claim**

The involved part of Scripture is not discussed sufficiently in coherency with chapters 11, 12, and 13.

**A. Receptivity**

The whole 2.9.1 to 2.9.2.2 shows a coherency. The whole matter is part of the Report that served in 1988 (44, 7.5 to 7.8). Some of these matters also serve in 2003 (Acta 2003:579, 3.10; 3.11).

**A10. These points of the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

GKPB claims that the parts of Scripture was not clearly discussed with the coherency of chapters 11, 12, and 13, but does not show why this claim would be true. Against this it seems from the Report of Synod 2009 that there was decent account given of the thought-pattern of chapters 11 to 14, namely that these chapters "is the part of the letter in which the good order in the congregation is dealt with (11.2-14:40). This part of the letter can be divided as follow:

- 11:2-16: The conduct of a woman in the congregation.

- 11:17-34: Wanpraktyke by liefdesmaaltye by nagmaal.
- 12:1-14:25: Verantwoordelike gebruik van geestesgawes.
- 14:26-40: Samevatting oor die goeie orde in die gemeente” (vgl 6.4.1, 6.2.5.1).  
By die verklaring van hoofstuk 14 word die verhouding met hoofstuk 11 deur albei eksegetiese standpunte wel op belangrike punte beredeneer, bv “Volgens hierdie verklaring word ‘praat’ dus anders gesien as die profeteer in 11:5, waar dit gaan oor die nie-amptelike optrede in die gemeentelike samekoms” (6.2.5.4.2); en “In 34 word die opdrag gemotiveer met ‘soos die wet sê’, en in 35 met ‘dit is lelik (αἰσχρόν) vir ‘n vrou om in die kerk te praat’. Hierdie αἰσχρόν is, anders as in 11:6, nie net horisontaal skandelik nie, maar ook vertikaal (‘soos die wet sê’)” (6.2.5.4.1).  
Dit blyk dus dat die bewering dat die logiese gang van hoofstukke 11 tot 14 nie “genoegsaam” verreken nie, nie deur die beswaardes bewys is nie.
- 11:17-34: Misconduct at meals and communion.
- 12:1-14:25: Responsible use of spiritual gifts.
- 14:26-40: Summary of the good order in the congregation (ref. 6.4.1; 6.2.5.1).  
With the explanation of chapter 14 the relationship with chapter 11 is argued by both exegetical views especially on important points, e.g. “According to this explanation “speaking” is thus seen differently to prophesy in 11:5, where it regards the non-official acts in the congregational gathering” (6.2.5.4.2); and “In 34 the assignment is motivated with ‘as the law commands’, and in 35 with ‘it is unbecoming (αἰσχρόν) for a woman to speak in church’. This αἰσχρόν is, different that in 11:6, not only horizontally shameful, but also vertically (‘as the law commands’)” (6.2.5.4.1).  
It seems that this claim of the logical coherency of chapters 11 to 14 having not “sufficiently” been accounted for, is not proved by the aggrieved.

Motivering 2.9.2.2

**Bewering**

Uit die konteks van die brief, asook in hoofstuk 11-14, word dit duidelik dat die swygverbod op ‘n spesifieke situasie dui: Paulus verbied dit nie dat daar in die gemeente gesprek mag word nie, maar reël dit.

**Beredenering**

GKPB maak die bewering dat uit die konteks van die brief, asook hoofstuk 11-14, dit duidelik word dat die swygverbod op ‘n spesifieke situasie dui: Paulus verbied dit nie dat daar in die gemeente gesprek mag word nie, maar reël dit. Hulle toon nie aan waarom hierdie bewering waar sou wees nie.

Motivering 2.9.2.3

**Bewering**

Die skerp onderskeid wat die Rapport van 2009 tref tussen leraars en profete, asof profesie en profeteer nooit deel was van lering nie, kan nie gehandhaaf word nie.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie saak is reeds deeglik geopper en bespreek op Sinodes. Dit figureer in die Studierapport van 1988 (44:7.5 tot 7.8). Die

Motivation 2.9.2.2

**Claim**

From the context of the letter, as well as chapter 11-14, it becomes clear that the command to silence points to a specific situation: Paul does not prohibit the speaking in the congregation, but simply arranges it.

**Argument**

GKPB makes the claim that from the context of the letter, as well as chapter 11-14, it becomes clear that the command to silence points to a specific situation: Paul does not prohibit the speaking in the congregation, but simply arranges it. They do not show why this claim would be true.

Motivation 2.9.2.3

**Claim**

The sharp distinction that the Report of 2009 makes between teachers and prophets, as well as prophets and prophecy, was never part of the teaching, and can not stand.

**A. Receptivity**

This matter was already raised and thoroughly discussed at Synods. It figures in the Study report of 1988 (44, 7.5 to 7.8). The

saak word ook bespreek in 2003 (Acta 2003:586:3.13) en in 2016 (Acta 2016:58:bylae). Dit dien in besware (Acta 2016:110:12).

**A11. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat daar 'n skerp onderskeid getref word tussen leraars en profete in Rapport 2009, asof profesie nooit deel was van lering nie en dat dit nie gehandhaaf kan word nie. Weereens word 'n bewering gemaak, maar nie bewys nie. Daar word na studiemateriaal verwys, maar die beswaargrond word nie beredeneer en bewys nie.

Motivering 2.10

In hul toespitsing op 1 Tim 2:8-15 sê GKPB dat hierdie teks uiteenlopend verklaar kan word, nie in alle opsigte oortuigend en duidelik is nie, en dat die neiging by sommige eksegete en kerke bestaan om die teks te oorlaai. GKPB gee 8 motiverings hiervoor.

Motivering 2.10.1

**Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat Sinode 2009 verkeerdlik aanvaar dat 1 Tim 2:8-15 die duideliker gedeelte is om die vraag van vroue ten opsigte van die besondere dienste te belig. Volgens GKPB geld dit veral daarvan om 1 Kor 14:33-35 te verstaan.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die sake vanaf 2.10.1 tot 2.10.4.4 hou verband met die verklaring van 1 Timoteus 2, en was al onder bespreking by verskeie Sinodes. Die vraag waarna die woorde “op elke plek” verwys, was reeds in Beswaarskrifte by Sinodes aan die orde bv in Sinode 2016 (Acta 2016:115, 4.3.5, 81:2), (vgl Acta 2016:103, 5.5.1 tot 5.5.3). Die res van die sake dien in vorige beswaargronde en word beoordeel in Sinode 2016 (Acta 2016:119, 3.3).

**A12. Hierdie punte van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat Sinode 2009 verkeerdlik aanvaar dat 1 Tim 2:8-15 die duideliker gedeelte is om die vraag van vroue ten opsigte van die besondere dienste te belig, maar lewer weereens geen gronde vir die bewering nie.

matter is also discussed in 2003 (Acta 2003:586, 3.13) and in 2016 (Acta 2016:58, addendum). It serves in Gravamina (Acta 2016:110, 12).

**A11. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

GKPB claims that a sharp distinction is made between teachers and prophets in Report 2009, as if prophecy was never part of teaching and that it cannot be held. Once again a claim is made, but not proven. There is referred to study-material but the basis for objection is not argued or proven.

Motivation 2.10

In their application of 1 Tim 2:8-15, GKPB claims that this text can be explained in multiple ways, are not convincing in and clear in all aspects, and that some churches and exegetes overload the text; GKPB gives 8 motivations for this.

Motivation 2.10.1

**Claim**

GKPB claim that Synod 2009 wrongly accept that 1 Tim 2:8-15 is the clearer part when shining light on the question of women in the specific offices. According to GKPB it is especially true of the understanding of 1 Cor 14:33-35.

**A. Receptivity**

The matters from 2.10.1 to 2.10.4.4. has to do with the explanation of 1 Timothy 2, and has been discussed at different Synods. The question of what the words “in every place” refers to, was already discussed in Gravamina at Synod, e.g. Synod 2016 (Acta 2016:115, 4.3.5; 81, 2), (ref. Acta 2016:103, 5.5.1 to 5.5.3). The rest of the matters has served in previous basis for objection and is evaluated at Synod 2016 (Acta 2016:119, 3.3).

**A12. These points of the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

GKPB claims that Synod 2009 wrongly accepted that 1 Tim 2:8-15 is the clearer part when shining light on the question of women in specific offices, but again does not provide basis for the claim.



### Motivering 2.10.2

#### **Bewering**

GKPB wys op verskille wat in die Studie-rapport van 2009 voorkom en ook in die behandeling van Beswaarskrifte van 2016 na vore kom. GKPB beweer dat Sinode 2009 die verskille nie besleg het nie, behalwe om sonder redes die een standpunt daaroor sy eie te maak. Dit is dus nie moontlik om aan te voer dat die Timoteus-tekste die “duidelike” tekste is nie.

#### **Beredenering**

Die bewering dat die Sinode sonder redes die een standpunt sy eie gemaak het, word in hierdie motivering ook nie deur GKPB beredeneer nie. Die samevattende gevolgtrekking dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling mag dien nie (Acta 2009:664, 10.1.15b) en waarmee die Sinode hom vereenselwig het, is immers gemaak nadat die Rapport aandag gegee het aan tersaaklike kerkregtelike, historiese, Skrifbeskoulike en hermeneutiese vertrekpunte” en nadat die Sinode, “uitgaande van hierdie vertrekpunte”, “verskillende relevante Skrifgedeeltes hanteer” het (Acta 2009:667, 4.3).

GKPB bly ook in hierdie motivering in gebreke om deeglik aan te dui waarom dit vir die gevolgtrekking wat in die Rapport 2009 gemaak word kan aandui dat die Timoteustekste die “duidelike” tekste is.

### Motivering 2.10.3

#### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die Studierapport van 2009 in die behandeling van die Skrifgedeelte (1 Tim 2:8-15) dikwels self onseker is oor die presiese betekenis en bedoeling van die gedeelte. As voorbeeld word na Acta 2009:640 en :644 verwys.

#### **Beredenering**

Dit is duidelik dat Sinode 2009 hom nie met hierdie standpunt vereenselwig het nie, maar aanvaar het dat die standpunt soos dit in 10.9.4.1b gestel word, die korrekte bedoeling van die gedeelte weergee.

### Motivering 2.10.4

Volgens GKPB is daar bepaalde onsekerhede in die Skrifgedeelte en die Sinode se verstaan daarvan:

### Motivation 2.10.2

#### **Claim**

GKPB refers to differences that are found in the Study report of 2009 and in the handling of Gravamina of 2016. GKPB claims that Synod 2009 did not settle the differences, apart from making the one view its own without reasons. It is thus not possible to hold that the Timothy texts are the “clear” texts.

#### **Argument**

The claim that the Synod made the one view its own without reasons, is also not argued by GKPB. The summarising conclusion that women may not serve in the specific office of the minister and elder (Acta 2009:664, 10.1.15b) and with which the Synod aligned itself, was made after the necessary church polity, historic, Scriptural, and hermeneutical points of departure” was dealt with, and that the Synod “departing from these points”, “dealt with different relevant Scriptures” (Acta 2009:667, 4.3).

GKPB lacks the motivation to clearly show why it was wrong for the 2009 Report to show that the Timothy-texts is the “clear” texts.

### Motivation 2.10.3

#### **Claim**

GKPB claims that the Study report of 2009 is uncertain in its handling of the Scripture (1 Tim 2:8-15) of the exact meaning of the part. As example is referred to Acta 2009:640 and :644.

#### **Argument**

It is clear that Synod 2009 does not take this view for its own reckoning, but accepted that the view as is stated in 10.9.4.1b, gives the correct meaning of the text.

### Motivation 2.10.4

According to GKPB there are certain uncertainties in the part of Scripture and the Synod’s understanding thereof.

Motivering 2.10.4.1

**Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die vertrekpunt dat die teks duidelik is, nie vas staan nie.

**Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat hierdie vertrekpunt nie vas staan nie, maar lewer geen bewyse vir hulle bewering nie.

Motivering 2.10.4.2

**Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die standpunt van die Sinode oor die inhoud van die gedeelte in botsing kom met ander Skrifgedeeltes, soos GKPB in 4.4.1 en verder sal aantoon.

**Beredenering**

Geen begroning word gegee waarop hierdie bewering beoordeel kan word nie. Die versekering word wel gegee dat daar by 'n verdere punt hieraan aandag gegee sal word.

Motivering 2.10.4.3 en 2.10.4.4

**Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die resultaat van die Sinode se standpunt oor 1 Tim 2, hermeneuties gesien, nie ander duidelike Skrifgewens en openbarings komplimenteer nie, en omgekeerd.

GKPB stel dan vrae om die punt wat beweer word, te bevestig.

1. Gaan dit beslis in die Skrifgedeelte net oor die gedrag van mans en vroue in die samekomste/eredienste?
2. Kan dit moontlik ook gaan oor die gedrag en voorskrifte aan die gelowiges of gemeente met die oog op hulle gedrag in die huis van God (plaaslike kerk) asook in die samelewing as kerk van Jesus Christus?

GKPB beweer dat die brief aan Timoteus dit laat blyk dat dit oor albei aspekte gaan. Ter motivering noem GKPB dat "op elke plek" inderdaad meer as een betekenis-moontlikheid het. Wanneer dit saam met 1 Kor 1:2 en 2 Kor 1:1 gelees word, kan die geldige afleiding gemaak word dat die verwysing "in elke plek" wys op die feit dat daar op baie plekke gelowiges in gemeentes versamel het. Die kerk van Christus bestaan immers op baie plekke en as kerk aanbid hulle op sulke plekke ook saam.

GKPB beweer dat "in elke plek" na oral verwys waar gelowiges bestaan en funk-

Motivation 2.10.4.1

**Claim**

GKPB claim that the point of departure holding that the text is not clear, does not stand strong.

**Argument**

GKPB claims that the point of departure does not stand strong but levels no proof for their claim.

Motivation 2.10.4.2

**Claim**

GKPB claim that the viewpoint of the Synod on the content if the part is in strife with other parts of Scripture as GKPB will show in 4.4.1 and further.

**Argument**

No basis is given upon which this claim can be evaluated. The assurance is given that there will be attention paid to this at a following point.

Motivation 2.10.4.3 and 2.10.4.4

**Claim**

GKPB claim that the result of the Synod's view on 1 Tim 2, hermeneutically seen, does not compliment other clear Scriptural evidence and revelations, and *vice versa*.

GKPB levels questions to confirm the point being claimed.

1. Does the Scripture-part specifically only deal with the conduct of men and women in the gatherings/worship?
2. Could it possibly also concern the conduct and prescriptions to believers of the congregation with the view towards their conduct in the house of God (local church) as well as the society as church of Jesus Christ?

GKPB claim that the letter to Timothy lets it seem as if both aspects are dealt with. For motivation GKPB mentions that "in every place" indeed has more than one meaning. When it is read with 1 Cor 1:2 and 2 Cor 1:1, the valid conclusion can be made that the reference to "in every place" refers to the fact that there in many places there were believers that gathered in congregations. The church of Christ exists in many places and worship as church in such places.

GKPB claim that "in every place" refers to everywhere where believers exist and

sioneer, in die kerk en in die samelewing. Dit moet blyk uit hulle gedrag, voorkoms en optrede dat hulle aan Christus behoort.

#### **Beredenering**

Dit is belangrik om daarop te let dat vooraanstaande eksegete soos Groenewald (1977:35), Hendriksen (1976:102), Marshall (1999:437), Van Houwelingen (2009:70-71) en ander aanvaar dat ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ op plekke dui waar gemeentes bymekaar gekom het om te aanbid.

Die gronde wat Die GKPB in pte 2.10.4.3 en 2.10.4.4 aanbied vir sy stelling dat Sinode 2009 se verstaan van die teks onseker is, dra nie werklik gewig nie.

Eerstens aanvaar Die GKPB sonder motive-ring dat, as Paulus in 1 Kor 1:2 en 2 Kor 1:1 ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ gebruik het om plekke aan te dui waar gelowiges vergader het, dit geldig is om af te lei dat Paulus ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ook in 1 Timoteus 2:7 daarvoor sal gebruik. Die feit dat ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ in 1 Kor 1:2 en 2 Kor 1:1 in 'n ander konteks as in 1 Timoteus 2 ge-bruik word, behoort enige eksegeet versigtig te stem vir die afleiding wat GKPB maak.

Dit is ook duidelik dat Die GKPB nie aandag gegee het aan die Sinode 2016 se beredenering van GK Krugersdorp se be-swaar dat die woorde “op elke plek” elders in die Nuwe Testament nêrens na die gemeen-telike samekoms verwys nie (vg. Acta 2016:119-120, (4).

#### Motivering 2.10.4.5

##### **Bewering**

GKPB vra waarna “vroue” in 1 Tim 2:8-15 verwys. Verwys dit na getroude vroue of vroue in die algemeen?

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die punte wat aangeraak word vanaf 2.10.4.5 tot 2.10.5 dien op verskeie Sinodes: (Acta 2016:55, 7.1; Acta 2003:546, 2.1.1; Acta 2003:551, 5.1; Acta 2003:574, 3.7; Acta 2003:579, 3.10.1; Acta 2016:60, H2; Acta 2016:110, 13).

**A13. Hierdie punte van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

##### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB vra 'n vraag, maar lewer geen bere-denering nie. As hul na 'n spesifieke antwoord met hierdie vraag soek, toon hul ook nie aan waarom hierdie antwoord belangrik vir die beswaargrond is nie.

function in the church and in the society. It must seem from their conduct and actions that they belong to Christ.

#### **Argument**

It is important to note that prominent exegetes such as Groenewald (1977:35), Hendriksen (1976:102), Marshall (1999:437), Van Houwelingen (2009:70-71) and others accept that ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ points to places where congregations gathered to worship.

The grounds that GKPB provides in pts 2.10.4.3 and 2.10.4.4 for its claim that Synod 2009's understanding of the text is uncertain, does not carry weight.

Firstly GKPB accepts without motivation that if Paul uses ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ in 1 Cor 1:2 and 2 Cor 1:1 to point to where believers gathered, it is valid to conclude that Paul will use ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ in 1 Timothy 2:7 for the same. The fact that ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ in 1 Cor 1:2 and 2 Cor 1:1 is used in a different context than in 1 Timothy 2, should make any exegete careful to make the conclusion that GKPB makes.

It is also clear that GKPB did not pay attention to Synod 2016's argument of GK Krugersdorp's Gravamen that the words “in every place” elsewhere in the New Testament does not refer to the congregational gatherings (ref. Acta 2016:119-120, (4).

#### Motivation 2.10.4.5

##### **Claim**

GKPB asks what “women” in 1 Tim 2:8-15 refers. Does it refer to married women, or women in general?

##### **A. Receptivity**

The points touched upon here from 2.10.4.5 to 2.10.5 served at several Synods: (Acta 2016:55, 7.1; Acta 2003:546, 2.1.1; Acta 2003:551, 5.1; Acta 2003:574, 3.7; Acta 2003:579, 3.10.1; Acta 2016:60, H2; Acta 2016:110, 13).

**A13. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

##### **B. Argument**

GKPB asks a question but delivers no argument. If they require a specific answer with this question, they also fail to make clear why this would be important for the basis of objection.

#### Motivering 2.10.4.6

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat sommige formulerings in die Studierapport van 2009 tot die afleiding lei dat die Sinode ten gunste is van die sg algemene of universele hoofskap van die man oor die vrou. Volgens GKPB skep die Rapport die indruk dat die teksgedeelte die standpunt van die sogenaamde “algemene” hoofskap van die man oor die vrou handhaaf. GKPB verwys na 2 voorbeelde:

1. Daar word van die man en die vrou gepraat (bepaalde lidwoorde), in plaas van die man en sy vrou en van die vrou en haar man (p663, 10.14.5b)
2. Die eksegeese van punt 10.9.4.3b (p642) dui daarop dat die hoofskap van alle mans oor alle vroue geleer word.

##### **B. Beredenering**

Dit is duidelik dat GKPB nie die Rapport se argumentasie vanaf 10.14.1b in ag neem nie. In 10.14.3b stel die Rapport die volgende: *Dit is duidelik dat die hoofskap van die man sentraal staan in die vraag of vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien. Dit is veral 1 Korintiërs 14 en 1 Timoteus 2 wat op hierdie saak lig werp. Paulus handel immers in die gedeeltes uitdruklik oor vroue se optredes in die besondere dienste asook oor die hoofskap van die man (vgl 10.8 en 10.9). Uit die twee gedeeltes is dit duidelik dat die hoofskap van die man spesifiek ter sprake kom wanneer vroue in die dienste van ouderling en predikant sou dien, dit wil sê wanneer vroue in 'n besondere diens sou staan waarin hulle herderlik sou waak, sou sorg en toesien dat die gemeente deur die Bybel gevoed en gelei word (vgl 10.8.4.3b en 10.9.4.3b). Wanneer vroue op hierdie terrein die gesag van Christus sou bedien, sou hulle daarmee nie hulle mans hoofskap erken nie.*

Die woorde wat GKPB hierdie punt gebruik, is opmerklik. Daar word gesê dat 2009 se Rapport “die indruk skep dat ...” en dat punt 10.9.4.3b “daarop dui dat...” Hierdie formulering wys beslis op 'n onsekerheid in GKPB se denke. Wanneer die sekerheid wat uit pt 10.14.5b van die 2009 Rapport na vore kom en spesifiek uit die woorde in die Rapport, naamlik: “Wanneer vroue op hierdie terrein die gesag van Christus sou bedien, sou hulle daarmee nie hulle mans hoofskap erken nie”, is dit duidelik dat die indruk wat by GKPB, nie geldig is nie.

#### Motivation 2.10.4.6

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that some formulations in the Study report of 2009 leads to the conclusion that the Synod is in favour of the so called General or universal headship of the man over the woman. According to GKPB the Report creates the impression that the Scripture holds the view of the so called “general” headship of the man over the woman, GKPB refers to 2 examples:

1. There is referred to the man and the woman (definite article), in stead of the man and his woman and the woman and her man (p663, 10.14.5b)
2. The exegesis of pt 10.9.4.3b (p642) shows that the headship of all men over all women are taught.

##### **B. Argument**

It is clear that GKPB did not reckon the arguments from 10.14.1b. In 10.14.3b the Report states the following: *It is clear that the headship of the man stands central in the question whether women may serve in the specific offices. It is especially 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Timothy 2 that throws light on this subject. Paul emphatically deals in these parts on the conduct of women in the specific offices as well as the headship of the man (ref. 10.8 and 10.9). From the two parts it is clear that the headship of the man is specifically important when women would serve in the office of elder and minister, which means to say when women were to serve in a specific office where they would shepherdly-guard, would care for, and see to the congregation being led and fed by the Bible (ref. 10.8.4.3b and 10.9.4.3b). When women would minister on this terrain the authority of Christ, they would thereby not acknowledge the headship of their men.*

The words that GKPB uses in this point is remarkable. There is said that 2009's Report “creates the impression that...” and that pt 10.9.4.3b “seems to show that...” This formulation certainly shows the uncertainty in GKPB's thoughts. When the certainty that flows from pt 10.14.5b of the 2009 Report comes forward and specifically the words in the Report, namely: “When women on this terrain would serve the authority of Christ, they would thereby not acknowledge their men's headship over them”, it is clear that the impression that GKPB holds is not valid.

Motivering 2.10.5

**Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die Sinode nie in die besluit oor 1 Tim 2:8-15 verreken dat die Bybel nie met 'n teenstelling tussen getroude en ongetroude vroue werk nie. Die Bybel praat van die man se verhouding tot die vrou vanuit 'n huweliksverhouding. God het die mens, manlik en vroulik, geskape, en man en vrou staan gelykwaardig naas mekaar in 'n twee-eenheidsverhouding. Dit beteken dat die groot verskille wat tussen 'n man en 'n vrou ten opsigte van gesag en dienswerk gemaak word, ongegrond is.

**Beredenering**

GKPB maak weereens 'n bewering sonder om die bewering te bewys. Daar word geen aanduiding gegee dat daar kennis geneem is van die belangrike gedeeltes in die Rapport 2009 waar daar gehandel word oor die man en die vrou se verhouding binne sowel as buite die huwelik nie (vgl bv Acta 2009:612-613, 10.2; Acta 2009:616-621, 10.4-10.5 en Acta 2009:625-623, 10.7).

Motivering 2.10.6

**Bewering**

GKPB stel dat kerke en teoloë verskil oor die betekenis en bedoeling van die woorde didaskein (om onderrig te gee) en authentein (om gesag uit te oefen). GKPB erken dat die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 indringend hieroor besluit het in die beantwoording van die Beswaarskrif van die Kerkraad van Krugersdorp. GKPB beweer dat die aanname nie so seker is dat albei handelinge (onderrig gee en gesag uitoefen) na die erediens/gemeentlike samekoms verwys nie.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hier word stellings gemaak, maar geen bewyse aangevoer nie. Dit word egter in 2016 reeds in 'n beswaar hanteer (Acta 2016:102, 4), (Acta 2016:106, 7), (Acta 2016:112, 3), (Acta 2016:117, 3).

**A14. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

GKPB gee geen grond vir die bewering dat die aanname (dat albei handelinge (onderrig gee en gesag uitoefen) na die erediens/gemeentlike samekoms verwys nie.

Deur te erken dat die BAS 2016 reeds 'n besluit hieroor geneem het, wys die beswaardes self dat KO, art 46 hier van

Motivation 2.10.5

**Claim**

GKPB claims that the Synod in their decision on 1 Tim. 2:8-15 did not take into account that the Bible does not work with a contradiction between married and unmarried women. The Bible speaks of the man's relationship to the woman from a marriage-relationship. God created the human, man and woman, equally next to one another in a dual-unity-relationship. This means that the big differences made between a man and a woman with regards to authority and service, is unbased.

**Argument**

GKPB once more makes a claim without proving the claim. There is no evidence that the important parts in Report 2009 dealing with the man and the woman's relationship within as well as outside of marriage (ref. e.g. Acta 2009:612-613, 10.2; Acta 2009:616-621, 10.4-10.5 and Acta 2009:625-623, 10.7) were noted.

Motivation 2.10.6

**Claim**

GKPB states that churches and theologians differ on the meaning and intention of the words didaskein (to teach) and authentein (to execute authority). GKPB acknowledges that the Extraordinary General Synod 2016 made an important decision on this in the answering of the Gravamen of the Church Council of Krugersdorp. GKPB claims that the assumption is not so certain that both actions (teaching and executing authority) refer to the worship/congregational gatherings.

**A. Receptivity**

Here statements are made, but no proof put forward, however it was already handled in 2016 in a Gravamen (Acta 2016:102, 4), (Acta 2016:106, 7), (Acta 2016:112, 3), (Acta 2016:117, 3).

**A14. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

GKPB provides no base for the claim that the assumption (that both actions (teaching and executing authority) refers to the worship/congregational gatherings.

By acknowledging that the BAS 2016 already made a decision on this, the aggrieved themselves show that CO, art 46

toepassing is.

In die Rapport 2009:641, 10.9.4.3b word uitdruklik gemotiveer waarom aanvaar word dat die verbod om onderrig te gee en die verbod om gesag uit te oefen met mekaar saamhang.

#### Motivering 2.10.7

GKPB wys daarop dat die werkwoord authentein 'n hapax legomenon is en aanvaar dat dit daarop dui dat die betekenis daarvan slegs afgelei kan word. GKPB aanvaar egter die negatiewe betekenis vir die woord soos in Louw & Nida weergegee word, "to control in a domineering manner; or "to act like a chief".

Volgens GKPB hou dit in dat vroue nie (oor hulle mans) 'n dominerende houding inneem nie en netso moet die mans (in die dienswerk) ook nie heerskappy uitoefen oor die vroue nie. Volgens GKPB is daar leemtes in die standpunt van die Algemene Sinode oor die betekenis en bedoeling van Paulus in 1 Tim 2:12 en 1 Tim 5:2-3. GKPB noem die volgende as bewys vir hul bewering:

#### Motivering 2.10.7.1

##### **Bewering**

GKPB sê dat dit nie oortuigend uitgemaak is dat dit te doen het met die vraag na die leer- of regeerdienste nie. Paulus ag ook nie die vrou as minderwaardig teenoor die man nie. GKPB gee 'n verklaring aan 1 Tim 2:11: Dat sy vermaning voortkom uit die gebrek aan kennis van vroue in daardie tyd en omstandighede. Daarom roep hy die vroue op om hulle (eers) te laat onderrig.

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die bespreking en vrae oor 2.10.7.1 tot 2.10.8 het reeds op Sinodes gedien (Acta 2009:522, 5.2.2.3ev), (Acta 2016:52, 5 en 55:5, en 64:3.2 en 102:4 en 103:5 en 104:6 en 106:7 en 107:8 en 108:10).

**A15. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

##### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat die saak nie oortuigend uitgemaak is nie, maar lewer geen begroning/bewyse vir hierdie stelling nie.

GKPB kom met 'n eie verklaring van 1 Tim 2:11 sonder om aan te toon waarom hierdie die korrekte verklaring sou wees. Wat GKPB nie in ag neem in hulle eie verklaring nie, is dat hierdie verklaring in stryd is met die

is applicable.

In the Report 2009:641, 10.9.4.3b it is distinctively motivated why the prohibition to teach and the prohibition to execute authority goes together.

#### Motivation 2.10.7

GKPB shows that the verb authentein is a *hapax legomenon* and is accepted that the meaning thereof can only be derived. GKPB accepts that the negative meaning for the word as in Louw & Nida is given, "to control in a domineering manner; or "to act like a chief".

According to GKPB it holds that women not take a domineering attitude (over their men) and similarly the men must (in their service) also not dominate their women. According to GKPB there are gaps in the view of the General Synod on the meaning and intention of Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 and 1 Tim 5:2-3. GKPB provide the following for their claim:

#### Motivation 2.10.7.1

##### **Claim**

GKPB says that it is not convincingly proved that it has to do with the question of the teaching- or governance offices. Paul also does not take the women to be inferior to men. GKPB gives an explanation to 1 Tim 2:11: That his admonishment sprouts from the lack of knowledge of women in the time and circumstances. Therefore he calls upon women to firstly let themselves be taught.

##### **A. Receptivity**

The discussion and questions on 2.10.7.1 to 2.10.8 already served at Synods (Acta 2009:522, 5.2.2.3), (Acta 2016:52, 5 and 55, 5, and 64, 3.2 and 102, 4 and 103, 5 and 104, 6 and 106, 7 and 107, 8 and 108, 10).

**A15. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

##### **B. Argument**

GKPB claims that the matter is not convincingly proved, but delivers no grounds/proof for this statement.

GKPB comes with a own explanation of 1 Tim 2:11 without proving why this would be the correct translation. What GKPB does not take into account in their own explanation is that this explanation is in strife with the

motivering wat Paulus self in vers 13 gee vir dit wat hy in verse 11-12 sê (vgl Acta 2009:6.4.2-6.4.3, 10.9.4.3b). Die verband met ander tekste oor die hoofskap, bv Efesiërs 5:21 ev, word ook nie in berekening gebring nie.

#### Motivering 2.10.7.2

##### **Bewering**

GKPB sê dat die werkwoord manthaneto beteken om so te leer dat jy 'n volwaardige leerling (mathetes) van Jesus Christus kan wees. Volgens GKPB was dit kultureel nie die gebruik in daardie tyd nie, hoewel Paulus hulle, wanneer vroue onderrig is, hulle by hom en by die onderrig betrek het, soos die geval was met Priscilla. Daar word ook verwys na GKV a.w.:20.

##### **Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat dit kultureel nie die gebruik in daardie tyd was nie. GKPB maak weereens 'n bewering sonder om dit te bewys.

#### Motivering 2.10.7.3

##### **Bewering**

GKPB sê dat die Skrif dit duidelik laat blyk dat ook mans eers onderrig moet word voordat hulle ander kan leer. Volgens GKPB is die strekking van die Skrif wat as agtergrond van hierdie gedeelte in ag geneem moet word, dat almal gawes ontvang het, mans en vroue, en dat mans en vroue mag praat en bid in die samekomste en in die samelewing. Almal moet egter versigtig wees: daar moet verstandig opgetree word, en elkeen wat wil leer moet toegerus wees met die nodige kennis van die evangelie.

##### **Beredenering**

GKPB beredeneer nie in 2.10.7.2 en 2.10.7.3 waarom Paulus in 1 Tim 2:11-12 met die opdrag dat vroue hulle in stilte moet laat leer net wil hê dat vroue eers onderrig moes word voordat hulle self begin onderrig gee nie. GKPB gee bv. geen aandag aan die motivering wat Paulus in vers 13-14 gee nie.

#### Motivering 2.10.8

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die voorafgaande vrae en onsekerhede wat na al die eksegetiese steeds oor die Timoteus-tekste bestaan, bevestig wat reeds, volgens hulle, hierbo aangedui is, naamlik: "In al dat exegetisch geweld wordt

motivation that Paul himself gives in verse 13 for what he says in verses 11-12 (ref. Acta 2009:6.4.2-6.4.3, 10.9.4.3b). This relation with other texts dealing with headship, e.g. Eph 5:21 on, is also not brought into calculation.

#### Motivation 2.10.7.2

##### **Claim**

GKPB says that the verb manthaneto means to learn in such a way that you can be a complete pupil (mathetes) of Jesus Christ. According to GKPB it was a culturally not the practice of the time when women were taught, although Paul drew them in and involved them in the teaching as was the case with Priscilla. There is referred to GKV a.w.:20.

##### **Argument**

GKPB claims that it was not the cultural practice of the time. Once again GKPB makes a claim without proving it.

#### Motivation 2.10.7.3

##### **Claim**

GKPB says that Scripture makes it clear that men first had to be taught before they can teach others. According to GKPB the Scripture that serves as background of this part and that must be tied in, namely that everyone received gifts, men and women, and that men and women may speak and pray in the gatherings and in the society. Everyone must be careful though: wisdom should be applied and each one that wants to teach must be equipped with the necessary knowledge of the gospel.

##### **Argument**

GKPB does not argue in 2.10.7.2 and 2.10.7.3 why Paul in 1 Tim 2:11-12 with the assignment that women must let themselves be taught in silence, wants the women to firstly be taught before they themselves begin to teach. GKPB pays no attention to the motivation that Paul gives in verse 13-14.

#### Motivation 2.10.8

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that the abovementioned questions and uncertainties that still exists after all the exegesis on the Timothy-text, confirms what already was shown above, namely: "In al dat exegetisch geweld wordt

duidelijk dat de interpretasie van teksten voor een groot deel afhang van onze kennis en interpretasie van die kultuur in die tyd... De swijgttekste kanne we niet negeren, maar we kanne er ook nie die lading aan toekennen die het in deze tyd te hebben gekregen; het is geen vaste grond op basis waarvan die ambte vir vrouwe geslote moet blywen”.

#### **Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat die interpretasie van Skrifgedeelte grootliks afhang van ons kennis en interpretasie van die kultuur in die tyd. Hulle beweer dat om God se Woord reg te verstaan, dit nodig is om die kultuur van die mense aan wie die brief gerig is, te ken. So word kultuur verhef tot sleutel om die Skrif te verklaar. Die genoegsaamheid en volkomenheid van die Skrif (NGB, art 7) word sodoende verwerp.

Hierdie manier van omgaan met die Skrif is eie aan die Sosio-Historiese metode van Skrifverklaring en nie aan die Grammaties-Historiese metode wat die GKSA volg nie.

**Besluit: Punt 2 kennis geneem**

#### **Bevinding en aanbeveling oor Beswaargrond 1**

##### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

1. Dat beswaargrond 1 nie ontvanklik is nie.

##### **B. Indien die Sinode die Beswaarskrif as ontvanklik sou verklaar**

1. Dat beswaargrond 1 nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur dat beswaargrond 1 nie slaag nie.**

GKPB toon nie met hul motiverings aan waarom beswaargrond 1 geldig sou wees nie. Dit is verder opmerklik hoeveel bewerings daar gemaak word, sonder dat dit enigszins bewys word. Hierdie beswaargrond slaag nie daarin om aan te toon dat die besluit van die Algemene Sinode nie berus op 'n duidelike, aanvaarbare en oortuigende eksegetiese en hermeneutiese van 1 Korintiërs 14:33-35 en 1 Timoteus 2:8-15 nie.

#### **3. Beswaargrond 2**

GKPB beweer dat die bestaande besluite van 2009 die belangrike en insiggewende lig wat die openbaringshistoriese lyne en gegewens deur die Ou en Nuwe Testament oor die vraag van vroue in die leer- en

*duidelijk dat de interpretasie van teksten voor een groot deel afhang van onze kennis en interpretasie van die kultuur in die tyd... De swijgttekste kanne we niet negeren, maar we kanne er ook niet de lading aan toekennen die het in deze tyd te hebben gekregen; het is geen vaste grond op basis waarvan die ambte vir vrouwen gesloten moeten blijven.”*

#### **Argument**

GKPB claims that the interpretation of the Scriptures greatly depends on our knowledge and interpretation of the culture of the time. They claim that to understand the Word of God correctly, it is necessary to know the culture of the people to whom the letter was written. In this way culture is raised to the key to explaining Scripture. The sufficiency and completeness of the Scripture (BC, art 7) is thereby rejected.

This way of dealing with Scripture is unique to the Socio-Historic method of Exegesis and not of the Grammatic-Historical method that the GKSA follows.

**Decision: Point 2 noted.**

#### **Finding and recommendation on basis for objection 1**

##### **A. Receptivity**

1. That basis for objection 1 is found to be not-receptive.

##### **B. If the Synod finds the Gravamen to be receptive**

1. That basis for objection 1 does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved that basis for objection does not succeed.**

GKPB does not show with their motivations why basis for objection 1 should be valid. It is further remarkable how many claims were made without being proven. This basis for objection does not succeed in showing that the decision of General Synod does not rest upon clear, acceptable, and convincing exegesis and hermeneutics of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

#### **3. Basis for objection 2**

GKPB claims that the current decisions of 2009 underemphasise the insightful light that the revelation-historic lines and details in the Old- and New Testament on the question of woman in the teaching- and governance



regeerdienste bied, onderbeklemtoon.

### Motivering 3.1

GKPB beweer dat die bg Hermeneutiese reëls klaarblyklik nie 'n prominente en deurslaggewende rol gespeel het by die besluite van die Sinodes van 1988 en 2009 nie. Veral omdat die probleem erken is dat daar nie 'n teks is wat spesifiek aandui of vroue in die leer- en regeer dienste mag dien of nie.

### Motivering 3.1.1

#### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die Studierapport van 2009 wel na die teoretiese relevansie van die openbaringshistoriese lyne by die Skrifverstaan verwys, maar in gebreke bly om dit konkreet toe te pas. Die Rapport stel ook nie vas wat dit beteken om die saak oor die vrou se posisie ten opsigte die besondere dienste te belig en te verhelder nie. Die feit dat die openbaringshistoriese aspek nie genoem word nie, is volgens GKPB opvallend.

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

'n Beswaarskrif van Sinode 2016 spreek hierdie suggestie van die beswaardes aan (Acta 2016:50, 3; 72, 3).

**A16. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

#### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB erken dat Rapport 2009 aandag gee aan die openbaringshistoriese lyne. Kyk Acta 2009:608, 7.6.3.3.3, 658-663.

GKPB maak die bewering dat die Rapport in gebreke bly om die openbaringshistoriese lyne konkreet toe te pas en dat die Rapport nie vas stel wat dit beteken om die saak oor die vrou se posisie ten opsigte van die besondere dienste te belig en te verhelder nie. GKPB maak hierdie bewering sonder om dit te bewys.

### Motivering 3.1.2

#### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat hoewel die Studierapport samevattende inligting oor vroue wat in die Ou en Nuwe Testament ten opsigte van besondere werksaamhede – ook in die formele en amptelike sin – werksaam was. Volgens GKPB spel die Rapport nie die volgende belangrike punte uit nie:

3.1.2.1 Hoe daar aan vroue genoegsame erkenning en ruimte gegee was om veral profeties in die kerk betrokke en diensbaar te

offices.

### Motivation 3.1

GKPB claims that the abovementioned hermeneutical rules apparently did not play a prominent and decisive role in the decisions of the Synods of 1988 and 2009. Especially because the problem is acknowledged that there is no text that specifically prescribes whether women may or may not serve in the teaching- and governance offices.

### Motivation 3.1.1

#### **Claim**

GKPB claims that the Study report of 2009 does refer to the theoretical relevance of the revelation-historic lines at the understanding of Scripture, but that it fails to consequently apply it. The Report also does not find what it means to enlighten the matter of the woman's position with regards to the specific offices and clear it up. The fact that the revelation-historic aspect is not mentioned, is quite noticeable according to GKPB.

#### **A. Receptivity**

A Gravamen of Synod 2016 speaks to the suggestion of the aggrieved (Acta 2016:50, 3; 72, 3).

**A16. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

#### **B. Argument**

GKPB acknowledge that Report 2009 pays attention to the revelation-historic lines. See Acta 2009:608, 7.6.3.3.3; 658-663.

GKPB makes the claim that the Report falls short in concretely applying the revelation-historic lines and that the Report does not show what it means to enlighten and explain the matter of the woman's position with regards to the specific offices. GKPB makes this claim without proving it.

### Motivation 3.1.2

#### **Claim**

GKPB claim that although the Study report gives summarising information on women who worked in the Old- and New Testament with regards to specific tasks – also in the formal and official sense. According to GKPB the Report does not clearly spell out the following important points:

3.1.2.1 How enough acknowledgement and space was given to amongst others be involved prophetic and serving.

wees.

3.1.2.2 dat mans en vroue gelykwaardig voor God is, oor gawes beskik, en ook ontvangers van die Heilige Gees was.

Volgens GKPB sou die verhelderende lig wat hierdie Skrifgegewens op die vraagstuk oor die vrou in die tersaaklike besondere dienste kon laat val, net soos ten opsigte van die tekste waarvan in diepte eksegetiese gedoen is, is dus nie verreken nie.

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie uiteensetting het deeglik aandag ontvang in die Rapport van 1988 (10, 2.1.4; 26, 4).

**A17. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

#### **B. Beredenering**

Die doel van die Rapport was nie om in-diepte eksegetiese van elke teks te gee nie, maar om die betekenis daarvan in die saak rakende die vrou in die besondere dienste duidelik te maak.

Openbaringshistoriese lyne word verskraal na dit wat GKPB wil hê. Die lyne wat sedert 1988 wel blootgelê is ten opsigte van die hoofskap van die man oor sy vrou, word nie erken nie.

#### Motivering 3.2

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat dit as 'n leemte in die besluit van 2009 aangedui kan word dat oor die saak van vroue in die leer- en regeer-dienste eensydig klem op sekere tekste geplaas is. Die eksegetiese werksaamhede was gefokus op 'n aantal relevante Skrifgedeeltes, veral ten opsigte van die sg swyggebooië/tekste. Volgens GKPB is op die wyse die klem eensydig op aspekte soos stilswye van vroue en oor hul onderdanigheid aan die hoofskap van die man geplaas.

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie saak dien op Sinode 2016, hoewel die vraag dalk anders gestel word, kom dit neer op dieselfde beklemtoning dat die swyggebodtekste oorspeel word (Acta 2016:125, 5; 53, 5.2.5; 82, 2.5; 50, 3.8; 74, 5.3.3; 105, 6; 108, 10.2; 110, 12; 125, 5).

**A18. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

#### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat dit as 'n leemte in die besluit van 2009 aangedui kan word dat oor die saak van die vrou in die leer- en regeer-

3.1.2.2 that men and women are equal before God, received gifts, and are also receivers of the Holy Spirit.

According to GKPB, the enlightening light that these Scriptural details could shine on the question of the woman in the mentioned specific offices, just as in the case of the texts for which in-depth exegesis has been done, was thus not reckoned.

#### **A. Receptivity**

This explanation received decent attention in the Report of 1988 (10, 2.1.4; 26, 4).

**A17. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

#### **B. Argument**

The goal of the Report was not to give in-depth exegesis of every text but to make the meaning thereof in the matter of the woman in specific offices clear.

Revelation-historic lines are narrowed to what GKPB wants them to be. The lines which was shown since 1988, in terms of the headship of the man over his wife, is not acknowledged.

#### Motivation 3.2

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that it can be shown as a shortcoming in the decision of 2009 that the matter on the woman in the teaching- and governance offices places a one-sided emphasis on certain texts. The exegetical tasks were focussed on a number of relevant Scriptures, especially with regards to the so-called command to silence. According to GKPB in this way the emphasis was one-sidedly placed on aspects such as silence of women and on their submission to the headship of the man.

#### **A. Receptivity**

This matter serves at Synod 2016, although the question may have been put differently, it comes down to the same emphasis that the command to silence is overplayed (Acta 2016:125, 5; 53, 5.2.5; 82, 2.5; 50, 3.8; 74, 5.3.3; 105, 6; 108, 10.2; 110, 12; 125, 5).

**A18. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

#### **B. Argument**

GKPB claims that it can be shown as a shortcoming in the decision of 2009 that one-sided emphasis is laid on the matter of the

dienste eensydige klem op tekste geplaas is. Hierdie bewering word gemaak sonder dat dit bewys en aangedui word.

GKPB beweer dat daar op hierdie wyse eensydige klem op aspekte soos stilswye van vroue en oor hul onderdanigheid aan die hoofskap van die man geplaas word. Weereens word hierdie bewering nie bewys nie.

Rapport 2009 berus op voorafgaande studie wat sedert 1988 gedoen is, waar alle tersaaklike tekste wel oorweeg was. 2009 se Rapport moenie in isolasie gesien word nie.

### Motivering 3.3

#### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat die openbaringshistoriese aspekte oor die vrou in die besondere dienste selfs onderspeel is. "Ons wys op die volgende aspekte, naamlik die aktiewe betrokkenheid van vroue in die NT kerke en die profetiese werksaamhede van vroue, hul geestesgawes en hul gelykwaardigheid aan die mans".

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie saak dien deeglik in die Rapport van 1988 (50, 8) *Nuwe-Testamentiese Skrifgegewens toegespits op die plek van die vrou ten opsigte van die besondere dienste in die kerk*. 'n Uitspraak hieroor figureer ook in 2016 (Acta 2016:66, 3; 72, 3).

**A19. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

#### **B. Beredenering**

Hoewel GKPB beweer dat die openbaringshistoriese aspekte oor die vrou in die besonder dienste onderspeel is, word daar nie gronde vir hierdie bewering gegee nie. GKPB wys op sekere aspekte, maar beredeneer en bewys nie hoe hierdie aspekte onderspeel is nie.

### Motivering 3.4

#### **Bewering**

GKPB stel dat daar buiten die vroue wat in die OT besonderlik genoem word en wat in en onder God se volk aktief werksaam was, is daar ook in die NT die aanduidings van pratende, verkondigende vroue. Die NT vervul die verlange waarvan Numeri 11:29 praat: "Ek sou wou wens dat die hele volk van die Here profete was, en dat Hy sy Gees op almal mag lê".

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

Hierdie saak dien deeglik in die Rapport van

woman in the teaching- and governing offices in the texts. This claim is made without being proven.

GKPB claims that there in this way was one-sided emphasis placed on aspects such as silence of women and on their submission to the headship of the man. Once again the claim is not substantiated.

Report 2009 rests upon the preceding study that was done in 1988, but all relative texts were weighed. 2009's Report must not be seen in isolation.

### Motivation 3.3

#### **Claim**

GKPB claim that the revelation-historic aspects on the woman in the specific offices have been underplayed. "We refer to the following aspects, namely, that the active involvement of women in the NT churches and the prophetic work of women, their spiritual gifts, and their equality to men".

#### **A. Receptivity**

This matter serves thoroughly in the report of 1988 (50, 8) *New-Testament Scriptural-evidence applied to the place of the woman with regards to the specific offices in the church*. A judgement on the matter figures in 2016 as well (Acta 2016:66, 3; 72, 3).

**A19. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

#### **B. Argument**

Although GKPB claim that the revelation-historic aspects of the woman in the specific offices have been underplayed, they fail to provide basis for their claim. GKPB refers to certain aspects, but then does not argue and prove how these aspects are underplayed.

### Motivation 3.4

#### **Claim**

GKPB claims that apart from women who are specially mentioned in the OT and who were actively busy in and amongst God's people, that there are also in the NT evidence of speaking-ministering women. The NT fulfils the longing of which Numbers 11:29 speaks: "Would that all the LORD's people were prophets, that the LORD would put his Spirit on them!"

#### **A. Receptivity**

This matter serves thoroughly in the report of

1988 (50, 8) *Nuwe-Testamentiese Skrifgegewens toegespits op die plek van die vrou ten opsigte van die besondere dienste in die kerk.* 'n Uitspraak hieroor figureer ook in 2016 (Acta 2016:66, 3; 72, 3), (Acta 2003:561, 3.2ev), (Studierapport 1988:19, hfst 2).

**A20. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

GKPB maak die stelling dat daar buiten die vroue wat in die Ou Testament besonderlik genoem word en wat in en onder God se volk aktief werksaam was, daar ook Nuwe Testamentiese aanduidings van pratende, verkondigende vroue is. Volgens GKPB vervul die Nuwe Testament die verlange waarvan Numeri 11:29 praat. Daar moet gevra word hoe hierdie punt die beswaargrond ondersteun. Verder moet gevra word of hierdie gedeeltes dan werklik die duideliker dele is wanneer dit by die vraagstuk van die vrou in die besondere dienste kom.

Motivering 3.5

**Bewering**

GKPB stel dat die belangrikheid hiervan is dat dit vanuit 'n hermeneutiese hoek die duideliker gedeeltes is wat lig werp op die moeiliker tekste, veral die sg swygtekste.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Vir die argument duidelik en minder duidelik, staan die verwysing in 2009, want hier word geen bewys aangevoer waarom 2009 se onderskeid nie geld nie (Acta 2009:634, 10.8.5.2b).

**A21. Hierdie punt van die beswaar behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

**B. Beredenering**

GKPB gaan van die uitgangspunt uit dat die sg swygtekste die moeiliker tekste is. In die lig van die Ou Testamentiese en Nuwe Testamentiese Openbaring, is dit duidelik dat hierdie tekste nie moeiliker is nie, maar juis die duideliker tekste is.

**Besluit: Punt 3 kennis geneem.**

**Bevinding en aanbeveling oor Beswaargrond 2**

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

1. Dat beswaargrond 2 nie ontvanklik is nie.

1988 (50, 8) *New-Testament Scriptural-evidence applied to the place of the woman with regards to the specific offices in the church.* A judgement on the matter figures in 2016 (Acta 2016:66, 3; 72, 3), (Acta 2003:561, 3.2 on) (Study report 1988:19, chap 2)

**A20. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

GKPB claims that apart from women who are specially mentioned in the OT and who were actively busy in and amongst God's people, that there are also in the NT evidence of speaking-ministering women. The NT fulfils the longing of which Numbers 11:29 speaks. The question must be asked how this point supports the basis for objection. It must also be asked whether these parts are truly the clearer parts when it comes to the question on women in the specific offices.

Motivation 3.5

**Claim**

GKPB claims that the importance of this is that from a hermeneutical side, it is the clearer parts that shines light on the more difficult texts, especially the so called silence-texts.

**A. Receptivity**

For the argument of clear and less clear, the reference of 2009 stands because here there are no proof given as to why 2009's distinction does not count (Acta 2009:634, 10.8.5.2b).

**A21. This point in the Gravamen should be found to be non-receptive.**

**B. Argument**

GKPB holds the view that the so called silence-texts are the more difficult texts. In the light of the Old Testament-, and New Testament revelation, it is clear that these texts are not more difficult but rather the clearer texts.

**Decision: Point 3 noted.**

**Finding and recommendation on basis for objection 2**

**A. Receptivity**

1. That basis for objection 2 is found to be non-receptive.

**B. Indien die Sinode die Beswaarskrif as ontvanklik sou verklaar**

1. Die beswaargrond nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur dat beswaargrond 2 nie slaag nie.**

Uit die beredenering is dit duidelik dat GKPB daarin misluk om te bewys dat die bestaande besluite van 2009 die belangrike en insiggewende lig wat die openbarings-historiese lyne en gegewens deur die Ou en Nuwe Testament oor die vraag van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste bied, onderbektoon. Weereens maak GKPB verskillende bewerings, sonder om dit te bewys. 'n Beswaarskrif en daarom die beswaargrond ook, moet bewys dat 'n staande besluit verkeerd is en dit nie net beweer nie.

**4. Beswaargrond 3**

GKPB beweer dat die besluit van die Algemene Sinode 2009 in gebreke bly om die saak van die vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste indringend vanuit 'n Christologiese en Pneumatologiese perspektief te bestudeer en te verreken.

**A. Ontvanklikheid**

Die vraag of die dogma of belydenis as 'n aparte "korrektiewe" eksegetiese bron of metode gebruik mag word, soos die beswaardes wil impliseer, is reeds al gehanteer by die 1988 Rapport:15, 3.2.2: "Die eksegeet mag nie net die Belydenis as 'n "finale kontrole" aan die einde van sy eksegeses gebruik nie. Allermens mag die eksegeet die Belydenis opskuif en verontagsaam as hy eksegetiseer. Andersyds mag die eksegeet nie die Belydenis tot die bindende boeie vir sy eksegeses verhef nie".

By die beoordeling van tekste in die Studierapporte van 1988, 2003 en 2009 is telkens organies vanuit die tekste ter sprake, die Christologie en Pneumatologie in berekening gebring, bv Acta 2009:625, 6.3 en 6.4; Studierapport 1988:38, 7.2 en Studierapport 1988:7, 1.3.1.2.

**A22. Hierdie beswaargrond behoort onontvanklik te wees.**

Motivering 4.1

**Bewering**

Met die Christologiese en pneumatologiese perspektief word die volgende bedoel: dit is duidelike rigtinggewende beginsels wat met die kern en fokus van die evangelie van die

**B. If the Synod declares the Gravamen to be receptive**

1. The basis for objection does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved that basis for objection 2 does not succeed.**

From the Argument it is clear that GKPB fails to prove that the standing decisions of 2009 underplays the important and insightful light that the revelation-historic lines and details by the Old- and New Testaments on the question of women in the teaching- and governance offices. Once again GKPB makes several claims without proving them. A Gravamen, and therefore also the basis for objection, must prove that a standing decision is wrong and can not simply claim so.

**4. Basis for objection 3**

GKPB claims that the decision of the General Synod 2009 remains lacking in studying and in serious consideration from a Christological and Pneumatological perspective.

**A. Receptivity**

The question of whether the Doctrine or Confession can be used as a separate "corrective" exegetical source or method, as the aggrieved alledge, was already handled by the 1988 Report 15, 3.2.2: "The exegete may not use the Confessions as a "final control" at the end of his exegesis. The exegete may also not move the Confessions aside and ignore them when doing exegesis. The exegete may also not raise the Confessions to the place of binding books for his exegesis".

At the evaluation of texts in the Study reports of 1988, 2003, and 2009; the Christology and Pneumatology was brought into the fold organically, e.g. Acta 2009:625, pt 6.3 and 6.4, Study report 1988:38, pt 7.2 and Study report 1988:7, pt 1.3.1.2.

**A22. This Basis for objection should be found to be non-receptive.**

Motivation 4.1

**Claim**

The following is meant by the Christological and pneumatological perspective: it is a clear directive principle that has to do with the core and focus of the gospel of the Kingdom

Koninkryk van God te doen het, soos dit in die Woord van God aan ons geopenbaar is, en ons dit onder leiding van die Gees van God kan verstaan en gebruik. Hierdie beginsels sluit die sentrale Bybelse eis van die liefde en ook die Christologie en Pneumatologie as besonder sentrale en prominente aspekte en waardesisteme van die Christelike geloof in, soos in die Skrif aan ons geopenbaar is.

#### **B. Beredenering**

In 4.1 maak GKPB 'n stelling en brei uit op dit wat hul daarmee bedoel.

#### Motivering 4.2

##### **Bewering**

In die geval van moeiliker vraagstukke waarvoor die Bybel nie in bepaalde tekste direkte antwoorde gee nie, beteken dit dat gekyk moet word na die sentrale openbaringe in die Skrif. Dit geld onder meer van die doop van kinders, oor slawerny en oor die posisie van vroue in die besondere dienste. Dit bring ons by die Koninkryk van God (en die verbond) waar die Christologie en Pneumatologie die groot lyne en raamwerke bied waarbinne antwoorde gesoek moet word.

#### **B. Beredenering**

In 4.2 maak GKPB die stelling dat moeiliker vraagstukke waarvoor die Bybel nie in bepaalde tekste direkte antwoorde gee nie, dit beteken dat gekyk moet word na die sentrale openbaringe in die Skrif. Volgens GKPB bring dit mens by die Koninkryk van God (en die verbond) waar die Christologie en Pneumatologie die groot lyne en raamwerke bied waarbinne die antwoorde gesoek moet word. Dit wil voorkom of GKPB die Koninkryk en die verbond wil verskraal deur net die Christologie en die Pneumatologie as groot lyne te noem.

#### Motivering 4.3

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat naas die mikro-fokus op bepaalde tekste of Skrifgedeeltes wat in 'n probleem relevant is by wyse van die grammaties-historiese eksegeese daarvan, is daar – as deel van die eksegetiese proses – ook die makrofokus of groter en sentrale lyne wat uit die Skrif na vore kom, soos die Christologie en Pneumatologie. GKPB beweer dat hierdie aspek grootliks onderbeklemtoon is in die besluit van die Algemene Sinode van

of God, as it is revealed to us in the Word of God, and we can understand and use it under the guidance of the Spirit of God. This principle includes the central Biblical claim of love and also the Christology and Pneumatology as central and prominent aspects and value systems of the Christian religion, as revealed to us in Scripture.

#### **B. Argument**

In 4.1 GKPB makes a statement and elaborates on what is meant by it.

#### Motivation 4.2

##### **Claim**

In the case of more difficult questions to which the Bible does not give a direct answer in certain passages, it means that there should be looked at the central revelations in Scripture. This is valid regarding the baptism of children, slavery and the position of women in the specific offices. That brings us to the Kingdom of God (and the covenant) where the Christology and Pneumatology provides the broad lines and framework within which answers should be searched for.

#### **B. Argument**

In 4.2 GKPB makes the statement that more difficult questions to which the Bible does not give direct answers in certain passages, it means that there should be looked at the central revelations in Scripture. According to GKPB that brings one to the Kingdom of God (and the covenant) where the Christology and Pneumatology provides the broad lines and framework within which answers should be searched for. It seems as if GKPB wants to attenuate the Kingdom and covenant by only mentioning the Christology and the Pneumatology as broad lines.

#### Motivation 4.3

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that besides the micro-focus on certain passages or texts which is relevant in a problem by way of grammatic-historic exegesis thereof, there is – as part of the process of exegesis – also the macro-focus of greater and central lines that comes forward from Scripture, like the Christology and Pneumatology. GKPB claims that this aspect has been greatly underemphasised in the decision of the General Synod of 2009.

2009.

### **B. Beredenering**

Die bewering word gemaak dat die genoemde aspekte grootliks onderbeklemtoon is in die besluit van die Algemene Sinode van 2009. GKPB gee weereens nie 'n begroning vir 'n bewering nie.

#### Motivering 4.4

Die betekenis van die Christologie vir die beantwoording van die vraag na die diens van vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste – as 'n sentrale en rigtinggewende aspek – behels kernagtig die volgende:

#### Motivering 4.4.1

##### **Bewering**

Dat elke Skrifgedeelte vanuit Christus gelees en verstaan moet word (Luk 24:44; Heb 1:1, 2; Joh 14:25-26). God het in Christus die nuwe skepping en nuwe bedeling gebring (2 Kor 5).

##### **B. Beredenering**

Stelling word gemaak.

#### Motivering 4.4.2

##### **Bewering**

Christus bring verlossing en vryheid van die sonde en dood; Hy bring gelykwaardigheid tussen mense, ook tussen mans en vroue (Gal 3:27-29).

##### **B. Beredenering**

Die bewering wat hier gemaak word deur GKPB is waar: Christus bring verlossing en vryheid van die sonde en dood; Hy bring gelykwaardigheid tussen mense, ook tussen mans en vroue (Gal 3:27-29). Dit is belangrik om hier te noem dat die gedeelte in Galasiërs 3 wys dat mense – ongeag geslag, sosiale stand, ens – deel van Christus word en kinders van God word. Hier gaan dit dus daaroor dat alle gelowiges gelykwaardig voor God is. Tog beteken gelykwaardigheid nie gelykheid nie.

#### Motivering 4.4.3

##### **Bewering**

GKPB beweer dat vanuit die Christologie beskou slawerny geen bestaansreg het nie, en so gee die Christologie ook helderheid op die vraag oor vroue in besondere dienste: elkeen is lid van die liggaam van Christus en vervul 'n taak en funksie soos God dit in sy

### **B. Argument**

The claim is made that the mentioned aspects have been greatly underemphasised in the decision of the General Synod of 2009. GKPB once again does not provide grounds for a claim.

#### Motivation 4.4

The meaning of the Christology for answering the question on the service of women in the teaching- and governance offices – as a central and direction-giving matter – shortly comes down to the following:

#### Motivation 4.4.1

##### **Claim**

That each Passage must be read and understood from with Christ (Luk 24:44; Heb 1:1, 2; Joh 14:25-26). In Christ God brought the new creation and new dispensation (2 Cor 5).

##### **B. Argument**

Statement is made.

#### Motivation 4.4.2

##### **Claim**

Christ brings salvation and freedom from the sin and death; He brings equivalence amongst people, also between men and women (Gal 3:27-29).

##### **B. Argument**

The claim that is being made by GKPB is true: Christ brings salvation and freedom from the sin and death; He brings equivalence amongst people, also between men and women (Gal 3:27-29). It is important to mention that this passage in Galatians 3 shows that people – in spite of gender, social status, etc – becomes part of Christ and become children of God. Here it is thus about the fact that all believers are equal before God. Yet equivalence does not mean equality.

#### Motivation 4.4.3

##### **Claim**

GKPB claims that from the Christology that slavery has no validity, and in this Christology also gives clarity on the question regarding women in specific offices: each is a member of the body of Christ and fulfils a task and function as given by God in his free

vrymag gee en eis (1 Kor 12). GKPB beweer dat hierdie funksies nêrens van die lede binne die liggaam van Christus in terme van die geslag van die mense gedefinieer of aangedui nie.

### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB hanteer die bestaansreg van slawerny en die vraag oor die vrou in die besondere dienste op dieselfde vlak. Volgens hierdie redenasie beteken dit dat slawerny geen bestaansreg het nie en daarom ook dat vroue in die besondere dienste kan dien.

GKPB beweer dat die funksies nêrens van lede binne die liggaam van Christus in terme van geslag van die mense gedefinieer of aangedui word nie. Hierdie bewering word nie bewys nie. Teenoor hierdie bewering kan mens vra: Wat van 'n Skrifgedeelte soos 1 Timoteus 3:2 dat 'n ouderling getrou aan sy vrou ("die man van een vrou") moet wees?

### Motivering 4.5

Die betekenis van die Pneumatologie sluit nou aan by die Christologie en behels kortliks die volgende:

### Motivering 4.5.1

#### **Bewering**

Die Gees van God die Vader en die Seun word uitgestort oor mans en vroue, seuns en dogters. Elkeen wat lid van die liggaam van Christus is, het 'n gawe en opgawe ontvang. Hierdie gawes en genadegawes wat God in sy vrymag gee, is ter wille van die opbou van sy kerk gegee en verleen ook die reg aan elkeen om langs die ordelike riglyne wat die Skrif bied, hierdie gawes te beoefen. GKPB beweer dat geen Skrifgedeelte onderskei hier op grond van die geslag van mense oor die beoefening van hul gawes nie. In Hand 2, asook in Paulus se briewe (oa in Rom 12-14; 1 Kor 12-14) word die gawe van die Gees aan almal (hele liggaam van Christus) gegee. Dit geld ook van die genadegawes en geestesgawes: dit vra vir die konkretisering daarvan in 'n diens of amp; soos by mans so ook by vroue.

#### **B. Beredenering**

Die konkretisering van die gawes in 'n diens of amp kry veral gestalte in die amp van die gelowige. Volgens die lyn waarop GKPB hier redeneer, moet elke gawe in 'n diens of amp konkretisering kry. Dit gebeur in die amp van die gelowige. Hierdie motivering laat dit lyk asof elke gawe in 'n besonder amp gekon-

will and power (1 Cor 12). GKPB claims that that this function of the members within the body of Christ is nowhere defined or indicated in terms of people's gender.

### **B. Argument**

GKPB treats the validity of slavery and the question regarding the woman in the specific offices on the same level. Per this argument it means that slavery has no validity and therefore that women can serve in the specific offices.

GKPB claims that that this function of the members within the body of Christ is nowhere defined or indicated in terms of people's gender. This claim cannot be proven. Against this claim one can ask: What about a part of Scripture such as 1 Timothy 3:2 where an elder must be faithful to his wife ("the husband of one wife")?

### Motivation 4.5

The meaning of the Pneumatology now links to the Christology and in short entails the following:

### Motivation 4.5.1

#### **Claim**

The Spirit of God the Father and the Son was poured out onto men and women, boys and girls. Everyone who is part of the body of Christ has received a gift and task.

These gifts and mercies that God gives in his freedom has been given to the build-up of His church and provides the right to everyone to practice these gifts in accordance to the orderly guidelines provided in Scripture. GKPB claims that no passage in Scripture distinguishes based on the gender of people in the practicing of their gifts. In Acts 2, also in the letters of Paul (in Rom 12-14; 1 Cor 12-14) the gifts of the Spirit is given to everyone (whole body of Christ). This is also true of the gifts of grace as well as the spiritual gifts: this asks for the concretising thereof in the service of office; as with men also with women.

#### **B. Argument**

The concretising of the gifts in a service or office is formed in the office of believer. According to the line along which GKPB arguments, each. According to the line that GKPB takes in their argument here, every gift must find concretising in a service or office. This takes place in the office of



kretiseer moet word.

GKPB noem baie duidelik dat gawes en genadegawes wat God gee, die reg aan elkeen verleen om **langs die ordelike riglyne wat die Skrif bied**, hierdie gawes te beoefen. Hierdie stelling maak dit duidelik dat die Skrif, God se Woord, die finale sê oor die gawes en die ampte het.

Die bewering dat geen Skrifgedeelte op grond van die geslag van mense onderskei oor die beoefening van hul gawes nie, word in die vorige motivering (4.4.3) beredeneer.

#### Motivering 4.5.2

##### **Bewering**

GKPB stel dat hierdie Christologiese en Pneumatologiese aspekte en sentrale en rigtinggewende beginsels in die Skrif onderbeklemtoon is in die besluite van die Algemene Sinodes oor die betrokke saak. Dit behoort, indien dit in ag geneem word, die duideliker en deurslaggewende lig te verleen om besluite te neem waarvolgens vroue wel in die leer- en regeerdienste mag en behoort te dien.

##### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat die Christologiese en Pneumatologiese aspekte en sentrale en rigtinggewende beginsels in die Skrif onderbeklemtoon is in die besluite van die Algemene Sinode oor die betrokke saak. Vir die soveelste keer in hierdie beswaarskrif maak GKPB 'n bewering sonder om dit te bewys.

#### Motivering 4.6

##### **Bewering**

Soos vantevore al opgemerk behoort die resultaat van eksegeese van enige Skrifgedeelte en die Christologiese en Pneumatologiese aspekte (so ook die openbarings-historiese lyne) met mekaar in harmonie te wees en mekaar te komplimenteer. Die besluit van die Sinode in terme van die grammaties-historiese eksegetiese proses waarvolgens vroue nie in die erediens in die lerende en regerende dienste mag dien nie, is nie in lyn met wat die Christologiese, die Pneumatologiese en openbarings-historiese gegewens bied en leer nie.

##### **B. Beredenering**

GKPB beweer dat die besluit van die Sinode in terme van die grammaties-historiese ekse-

believer. This motivation makes it seem as if each gift must be concretised in a specific office.

GKPB clearly mentions that gifts and gifts of grace which God gives, gives each one the right to practice these gifts along the orderly lines that Scripture provides. This statement makes it clear that Scripture, the Word of God, has the final say in the gifts and offices.

The claim that no part of Scripture distinguishes on the basis of sex for a person to practice their gifts is argued on the previous Motivation (4.4.3).

#### Motivation 4.5.2

##### **Claim**

GKPB states that these Christological and Pneumatological aspects and central and direction-giving principles in Scripture were underemphasised in the decisions of the General Synod on the specific matter. It should, if it were to be considered, provide a clearer and more decisive light to make decisions according to which women can and should serve in the teaching- and governing offices.

##### **B. Argument**

GKPB states that these Christological and Pneumatological aspects and central and directive principles in Scripture was underemphasised in the decisions of the General Synod on the specific matter. Again in this Gravamen claims are made by GKPB without it being proven.

#### Motivation 4.6

##### **Claim**

As previously noted the results of exegesis of any passage in Scripture and the Christological and Pneumatological aspects (as well as the revelation-historic lines) must be in harmony with one another and complement each other. The decision of the Synod in terms of the grammatic-historic exegetical process according to which women may not serve in the teaching- and governing offices in the worship, is not in line with what the Christological, the Pneumatological, and revelation-historical evidence provides and teaches.

##### **B. Argument**

GKPB claim that the decision of the Synod in terms of the grammatic-historic exegetical

getiese proses waarvolgens vroue nie in die erediens in die leerende en regerende dienste mag dien nie, nie in lyn is met wat die Christologiese, die Pneumatologiese en openbarings-historiese gegewens bied en leer nie. Hier het ons weereens met 'n bewering te doen wat nie gegrond of bewys word nie.

### **Bevinding oor Beswaargrond 3**

#### **A. Ontvanklikheid**

1. Dat beswaargrond 3 nie ontvanklik is nie.

#### **B. Indien die Sinode die Beswaarskrif as ontvanklik sou verklaar**

1. Die beswaargrond nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur dat beswaargrond 3 nie slaag nie.**

GKPB bly in gebreke om aan te toon dat die beswaargrond dat die besluit van die Algemene Sinode 2009 in gebreke bly om die saak van die vroue in die leer- en regeerdienste indringend vanuit 'n Christologiese en Pneumatologiese perspektief te bestudeer en te verreken, geldig is. Dit is weereens opmerklik hoeveel onbewysde bewerings gemaak word.

Hierdie beswaargrond slaag nie.

### **5. Gevolgtrekking**

Aangesien die beswaargrond wat reeds beredeneer en geweeg is, by die gevolgtrekking saamgevat word, is daar nie verdere opmerkings hieroor nie.

**Besluit: Kennis geneem.**

### **6. Versoek**

Die GKPB versoek die Sinode om, indien die Gravamen slaag soos volg te besluit: Dat mans en vroue met die nodige gawes en wat aan die vereistes wat die Skrif stel om tot die dienste van ouderling en predikant verkies te word voldoen, daartoe toegelaat word.

**Besluit: Kennis geneem.**

### **7. Samevattende opmerkings oor Gravamen**

Met 'n Beswaarskrif lê die bewyslas by die beswaardes. Die beswaardes moet aantoon waarom 'n staande besluit verkeerd is aan die hand van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde.

Hierdie Beswaarskrif toon nie aan dat die staande besluite rakende vroue in die leer-

process according to which women may not serve in the teaching- and governing offices in the worship, is not in line with what the Christological, the Pneumatological, and revelation-historical evidence provides and teaches. Here once again we have a claim that is not based or proven.

### **Finding on Basis for Objection 3**

#### **A. Receptivity**

1. That basis for objection 3 is found to be non-receptive.

#### **B. If the Synod should declare the basis for objection receptive**

1. The basis for objection does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved that basis for objection 3 does not succeed.**

GKPB fails to show that the basis for objection, that the decision of the General Synod 2009 remains lacking in studying and in serious consideration from a Christological and Pneumatological perspective, on the matter of women in the teaching- and governing offices, are valid. It is once more noticeable how many unproved claims are made.

This basis for objection does not succeed.

### **5. Conclusion**

Because the bases for objection that has already been argued is summarised at the conclusion, there is no further comments.

**Decision: Noted.**

### **6. Request**

The GKPD requests the Synod to, if the Gravamen succeeds, decide as follow: That men and women with the necessary gifts and that conforms to the requirements for elder and minister found in Scripture, be allowed to it.

**Decision: Noted.**

### **7. Summarising comments on the Gravamen**

With a Gravamen the burden of proof lies with the aggrieved. The aggrieved must show why a standing decision is wrong by way of Scripture, Confessions, and Church Order.

This Gravamen does not show how standing decisions regarding women in the teaching-

en regeerdienste verkeerd is nie. Hierdie Beswaarskrif bevat baie bewerings wat nie bewys word nie. Verder is dit opmerklik dat die beswaargronde op die oog af na nuwe gronde lyk, maar dit wil voorkom of dit net sake is wat al reeds deur die Sinode op een of ander manier hanteer is.

**Besluit: Kennis geneem.**

## **8. Aanbevelings aan Sinode**

### 8.1 *Ontvanklikheid*

Die Kommissie beveel aan

8.1.1 Dat die Beswaarskrif nie ontvanklik is nie (A1-A22).

**Besluit: Goedgekeur.**

### 8.2 *Beoordeling*

Indien die Sinode sou besluit dat die Beswaarskrif/van die beswaargronde ontvanklik is, beveel die Kommissie in die lig van die beredenering by elke beswaargrond die volgende aan:

8.2.1 Beswaargrond 1 nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur.**

8.2.2 Beswaargrond 2 nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur.**

8.2.3 Beswaargrond 3 nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur.**

8.2.4 Die Beswaarskrif as geheel nie slaag nie.

**Besluit: Goedgekeur.**

and governing offices are wrong. This Gravamen contains many claims that are not proven. It is furthermore noticeable that the bases for objection initially seems to be new bases, but it would seem as though it is matter that was already handled by Synod in one or another way.

**Decision: Noted.**

## **8. Recommendations to Synod**

### 8.1 *Receptivity*

The Commission recommends

8.1.1 That the Gravamen is found to be non-receptive (A1-A22).

**Decision: Approved.**

### 8.2 *Evaluation*

If the Synod were to decide that the Gravamen/some of the bases for objection is receptive, the Commission recommends the following based on the arguments at each basis for objection:

8.2.1 Basis for objection 1 does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved.**

8.2.2 Basis for objection 2 does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved.**

8.2.3 Basis for objection 3 does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved.**

8.2.4 The Gravamen as a whole does not succeed.

**Decision: Approved.**