context to justify women pastors and deacons. Rhonda Kelley then deals with "Communication between Men and Women in the Context of the Christian Community." Ann Bowman’s “Women, Spiritual Gifts, and Ministry” examines the roles women could and should play in the context of the priesthood of every believer. Finally Dorothy Patterson’s “A Biblically Based Women’s Studies Program” offers an academic framework in which women can be prepared to function in the ministries to which God has called them.

Too often in the modern era evangelicals have been forced into reactive postures by the world. As the first-century church did, we need to “turn the world upside down” for Christ in our generation. With the Word of God as our guide, we need to live the Christian life in such a way that the worldlings will wonder what it is that they are missing (and by missing Christ, they miss all). By living out proper theology, we give the lie to every false theology. By living Spirit-filled Christian lives as men and women called by God to be the body of Christ in this generation, we will not have to live by writing evangelical answers to the worldlings’ questions and writing footnotes to the texts the unbelievers have written. Live for God and let the world spend its time writing footnotes on Him! Let us be a kingdom of priests full time—to His praise and glory and honor forever.

David E. Lanier
Editor, Faith and Mission

1 Pet. 2:9 (All Scripture references are to the NKJV unless otherwise noted). Cf. Exod. 19:6.
2 Rom. 1:7.
3 Eph. 4:12.

“For Such a Time as This”:
A Defining Moment in Christian Ministry

Karen H. Jobes
Assistant Professor of Religious Studies
Westmont College
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

The Book of Esther in the Old Testament may seem like a most unlikely place to look for a biblical, evangelical basis for principles for women in ministry.1 It was written by an unknown Jewish author about an event in the history of the Jewish people that occurred some five centuries before Jesus was born. The book does not even mention God, the covenant, the temple, the law, or prayer (although it may allude to the latter). Moreover, the people in the story do not clearly exemplify the qualities we associate with godly character. While such characteristics would not be expected of the Persian king, Xerxes, and his power-hungry advisor Haman, it is disconcerting that even the behavior of Mordecai and Esther seems morally and spiritually ambiguous at best.

We find Mordecai and Esther still living in pagan Susa almost fifty years after Cyrus had decreed that the Jewish people should return to Jerusalem and rebuild the temple and the city. Nehemiah, who later served Xerxes’ successor in Susa (Neh. 1:1), mourned and wept that Jerusalem’s walls were still in ruins at his time. In contrast, neither Esther nor Mordecai shows any concern for the state of their homeland. Unlike Ezra, another near-contemporary who devoted himself to the study and observance of God’s Law, Esther and Mordecai seem either ignorant of or disinterested in the Law and its demands for their personal conduct.

Esther’s behavior does not measure up to the standards of other biblical heroes, such as Joseph in Egypt or Daniel in Babylon. When taken into the harem of the Persian king, Esther, unlike Daniel and his friends, utters not a word of protest about the king’s food. To the contrary, she submits to Mordecai’s advice to hide her Jewish identity, which must have meant at least that she adopted the dress, customs, and manner of the Persian court, arguably in violation of the Torah. Esther probably had no choice about being gathered into the king’s harem in the first place. However, she did not protest the sexual encounter with the king. Esther lost her virginity in the bed of an uncircumcised gentile to whom she was not married, and in one night she pleased the king more than any other virgin of the harem (2:17). Some readers might assume that God granted her favor in Xerxes’ eyes (cf. Dan. 1:9), but the fact that the favor was
found in the bedroom adds an undeniably carnal element to Esther's story. In contrast, Joseph repeatedly refused a sexual encounter with Potiphar's wife at great personal cost because he would not so “sin against God” (Gen. 39:9).

Esther's apparent brutality also casts aspersions on her character. When she learns that the Jews have killed five hundred men in Susa, she asks that a second day of killing be allowed, and that the bodies of Haman's sons be displayed on the city wall (9:13). The Aramaic targums explain that the Persians gave her the name “Esther.” Perhaps it was fitting, for this was the name of the Babylonian goddess of love and war, both characteristic of Esther's role in the events of her day.²

Mordecai's character and motives are similarly disquieting. The 16th-century Jewish sage Abraham Saba faults Mordecai for his treatment of Esther, saying,

Now when Mordecai heard the king's herald announcing that whoever had a daughter or a sister should bring her to the king to have intercourse with an uncircumcised heathen, why did he not risk his life to take her to some deserted place to hide until danger should pass? . . . She too should by right have tried to commit suicide before allowing herself to have intercourse with him.³

Whether or not one agrees with Saba that death would have been the honorable choice, both Mordecai and Esther cooperated, at least passively if not actively, where other heroes of the faith resisted at great personal risk.

Unlike Ezra, Mordecai seems to take a very pragmatic approach to the Torah. By ordering Esther to conceal her Jewish identity, he was demanding that she live like a pagan in the court, thus violating Torah. Moreover, he allows an interpersonal conflict with Haman to escalate into a national crisis that threatens the very existence of the Jewish people. The Greek historian Herodotus explains that it was a social custom of the Persians to prostrate oneself on the ground when meeting someone of superior rank (Herodotus 1.134). Mordecai refuses to bow to Haman though he himself accepts the same gesture of respect when he replaces Haman.

His treatment of Esther remains ambiguous throughout the crisis. After first ordering her to conceal her identity, he then seeks Esther's help by demanding that she reveal it at the worst possible moment. He makes what could easily be taken as a not-so-veiled threat, saying, “If you remain silent at this time, relief and deliverance for the Jews will arise from another place, but you and your father's family will perish” (Esth. 4:14). What was Mordecai thinking? Was he threatening to reveal her identity as a Jew if she would not, thus bringing her under Haman's decree of death? Was this an imperatory remark reminding her that if she remained silent God would ultimately punish her, even though it was Mordecai himself who previously had ordered her silence? Or was he taking matters into his own hands, saying that even if the Jews were delivered, he would see to it that Esther would nevertheless perish?⁴ Only in the face of this implied threat does Esther finally agree to risk her life by going uninvited to the king. Either way she turned, Esther's life was apparently in jeopardy.

Interpreters throughout history have found the moral and spiritual ambiguity of Mordecai and Esther to be troubling. The sensuality and brutality of the book, and the absence of the piety expected of God's people, led Martin Luther to denounce the book, saying he wished that it did not exist at all!⁵ Perhaps because we know the outcome of the story, both Jewish and Christian interpreters have been quick to give Esther and Mordecai the benefit of the doubt and absolve them of any real wrongdoing. For instance, one of the earliest interpretations of the Esther story is found in the Greek version. In that version, Esther is exonerated when in prayer she tells God that she “loathes the bed of the uncircumcised.” Similarly, Mordecai explains his refusal to bow to Haman not as insolence or arrogance, but because he would bow only to the Lord.⁶ These are clearly efforts to resolve discomfort with what are perceived as moral and spiritual shortcomings in the biblical story.

However, so quickly to resolve the moral ambiguity in the Book of Esther diminishes the power of its message. The divinely inspired author of the Book of Esther refrains from passing moral judgment on his hero and heroine, though he could easily have done so (and we might wish that he had!). The ambiguity of their spiritual and moral state is purposeful and contributes an important element to the book's message. Despite their questionable decisions and behavior, at the end of the story both Mordecai and Esther are renowned for their leadership of God's people. Esther's leadership and authority are unprecedented for a woman in biblical history. Esther's decree confirming the observance of Purim was written down in the records, something no other woman in biblical history achieved (Esth. 9:32). Not only was she the agent of the deliverance of the Jewish people, she also held sufficient authority within the Jewish community to institute a Jewish feast that is still celebrated today.

Although Esther and Mordecai were spiritual leaders in their generation, one must be careful in using their example for spiritual leadership today. In seeking the book's relevance for Christians today, interpreters have often used an exemplary approach, assuming that Esther and Mordecai are positive role models. However, because Mordecai and Esther are not held up as clearly positive role models (compared, for instance, to Joseph in Genesis), it is inappropriate and misleading to use an exemplary approach to interpreting the book.

Most often Esther is considered a positive example of biblical womanhood, but only by overlooking the fact that the text does not actually present her as a chaste and faithful Jewish woman. If Esther is too quickly held up as a role model worthy of imitation, it is difficult to avoid implying a moral philosophy where the ends justifies the means. For instance, who would advise a young Christian woman to hide her Christian faith, rely on her sensual beauty, and allow herself to be taken to the bedroom of a powerful pagan man in order to gain a better position for God to work through her life?
Perhaps this is the reason that whenever Esther is taken as a positive role model, her submission to Mordecai’s male authority is often suggested to be the strength of her character. But this is also a questionable interpretation. Does the biblical concept of male headship entitle a man to order a woman under his authority to hide her Christian faith and live like a pagan? Is it really virtuous for a woman to obey that kind of male leadership? Esther’s story raises interesting ethical issues worthy of discussion, but the fact that it does so implies that her service as a positive role model must be carefully limited and qualified.

An exemplary approach to interpreting the story demands that Esther’s and Mordecai’s behavior be judged and found righteous, something that the author himself refuses to do. The story calls for a different interpretative approach. Instead of exonerating Esther and Mordecai by filling in details where the text itself is silent, whatever moral and spiritual ambiguity one perceives should be allowed to stand as an integral part of the message of the book. Had Mordecai chosen not to remain in Susa, and had Esther refused to go to the king’s bedroom, the history of the Jews in the Persian period may have ended quite differently.

The author could easily have resolved the ambiguities, but he allows them to stand (deliberately, I think). The divinely inspired author allows their moral and spiritual ambiguity to stand unresolved because it is so true to life as we experience it. It may seem strange that Esther was brought to that position of leadership through a chain of events that confronted her with situations that were morally and spiritually complicated, but that is the way life usually happens. Moreover, even if their motives and intentions were pure, Esther and Mordecai had little control over the circumstances in which they found themselves. This, too, is true to life as we know it. Perhaps Esther and Mordecai did not always respond to their situation in undivided faithfulness to God’s Law, but the point is that even so God’s purposes were not thwarted. The triumph of God’s purposes working through the decisions of even morally and spiritually ambiguous people is encouraging because it is a testimony to the nature of God’s omnipotence. In spite of their moral and spiritual ambiguity, and perhaps even their outright disregard and disobedience of God’s Law, Mordecai and Esther nevertheless were agents God used providentially to fulfill His covenant promises.

This is a message of great encouragement to readers in every generation, because we too, like Mordecai and Esther, are a morally ambiguous people. We face complicated situations over which we have little or no control and where right and wrong are not always so obvious. Even with our best intentions, our motives are not always pure (cf. Jer. 17:9). And then there are those times in every life when our hearts, for whatever reason, are not devoted to scrupulous obedience of God’s Word.

The lesson in Christian ministry to be found in Esther’s story lies not in her character, whether it was virtuous or not, but in her relationship to God’s covenant. The question of whether they were right or wrong is almost beside the point of the story. (Which is, of course, not to say that they were not responsible for their decisions before God). The point of the story is about God’s nature and character, not Esther’s or Mordecai’s. It is a lesson for Christian men and women alike, not only for those who hold positions of leadership, but for all those who would have their lives count for Christ, regardless of their titles, offices, or roles in the church.

The lesson for Christian ministry is integrally related to the theology of the book. It may seem odd to speak of the theology of a book that does not once even mention God. However, the “absence” of God is in fact particularly appropriate to the story because divine providence is the major theological message of the book. When we speak of God’s providence, we mean that God, in some invisible and inscrutable way, governs all creatures, actions, and circumstances through the normal and the ordinary course of human life, without the intervention of the miraculous. However, the Esther story shows more than an example of God’s providence at work. It teaches specifically the relationship between God’s providence and the promises of His covenant. It integrates redemptive history with all of life. The lesson in Christian leadership is found precisely in this relationship between divine providence and divine promise being worked out in the chain of human events.

One tiny detail links the seemingly “secular” story of Esther to redemptive history by linking it to the covenant God made with His people at Mt. Sinai. The villainous Haman is identified as an Agagite (3:1, 10; 8:5). Agag was the king of the Amalekites at the time Saul was the first king of Israel (1 Samuel 15). Because the Amalekites were the first nation to attack God’s newly formed covenant people right after the Exodus, God promised Moses that he would completely erase the memory of the Amalekites from under heaven and would be at war with them from generation to generation (Exod. 17:8-16). In Deut. 25:17-19, God commands Israel to fulfill his promise by blotting out the memory of the Amalekites.

As the first king of God’s people, it was Saul’s responsibility to be the agent through whom God would fulfill that promise. God instructs him through the prophet Samuel to “attack the Amalekites and totally destroy everything that belongs to them. Do not spare them,” God says; “put to death men and women, children and infants, cattle and sheep, camels and donkeys” (1 Sam. 15:1-3). Saul did attack the Amalekites as commanded, but he took Agag their king alive and spared his life along with the best of the sheep and cattle, in disobedience to God’s command. By disobeying, Saul refused to be the agent who would fulfill God’s promise, and therefore, he was disqualified to rule as God’s earthly king.

Over the centuries after Saul spared Agag’s life, other perennial enemies of Israel were called Agagites, even though they had no ethnic relationship to the Amalekites. In the first century, Jewish writers referred to the Romans as Agagites. Even as recently as February 27, 1994, the New York Times reported on
the Purim incident in Israel saying that “a core of militant Jews has preached a doctrine of intolerance, often with the Arab as the biblical enemy Amalek.” 7

By referring to Haman as an Agagite, the author is portraying him as the king of the enemies of the Jews. Similarly, the author portrays Mordecai as a new Saul through whom the promise will be fulfilled. Saul was a Benjamite whose father’s name was Kish (1 Sam. 9:21; 14:51). Mordecai was also a Benjamite who is a “son” of a man named Kish (2:5). Unlike Saul, Mordecai will not be seduced by the wealth and power of the Agagite. When the day of destruction comes, the author is careful to repeat twice that the Jews did not lay their hands on the plunder (Esth. 9:10, 15), just as God had instructed Saul in 1 Sam. 15:3.

In the Esther story, one has another episode of the ancient war between Israel and the Amalekites and by every indication it looks like Israel will suffer the annihilation once promised to their enemies. Mordecai’s refusal to bow to Haman and Esther’s insistence that the destruction of their enemies be complete, even though it meant a second day of carnage, must be understood within this larger context of redemptive history. Haman wore the king’s signet ring, which meant in fact he had all the power of the Persian empire behind him. The Jews had no king, no army, no prophet, no land, no temple, no priesthood, and no sacrifices. They were a small minority living at the mercy of a ruthless and powerful pagan monarchy. By every human expectation, they would have been destroyed. The remarkable reversal that dethrones Haman and empowers Mordecai shows that, despite their sin and despite their location away from Jerusalem, God’s promise to Israel made at the beginning of their nation still stood. He would still destroy the enemy of his people, no matter where they were living, no matter how powerful the enemy. The Book of Esther shows that the Jews of Persia were still under God’s covenant promises.

God’s covenant promise was remarkably fulfilled in this instance, not by a mighty redemptive miracle, but through the flawed decisions and actions of Xerxes and Vashti, of Haman and Zeresh, of Mordecai and Esther. God worked His purpose providentially through these people providentially to fulfill His ancient promise, whether or not their motives were righteous, and whether or not they consciously aligned themselves with His purposes. This is as good an example as one could find of Rom. 8:28, “And we know that in all things God works for the good of those who love Him, who have been called according to His purpose.”

When the situation had come to a crisis, Esther was brought to her own defining moment by circumstances over which she had no control. Mordecai said to Esther, “If you remain silent at this time, relief and deliverance for the Jews will arise from another place, ... and who knows but that you have come to royal position for such a time as this?” It was for “such a time as this” that she was forced to choose between identifying herself with God’s covenant people or continuing to live as a pagan in the king’s court. No one in the court, including her own husband, knew that she was a Jew. In order to reveal Haman to the king in the hope of saving her people, she had to reveal herself as well.

In this moment, Esther had to decide who she really was. As L. Ryken points out, Esther is the only person in the story with two names, her Hebrew name, Hadassah, and her Persian name, Esther. He reads this as an indication of the identity crisis with which she is faced when, after being raised as a Jew, she is thrust into the king’s court where she must live as a pagan.8 Her Jewish character led her to obey Mordecai, which meant, paradoxically, that she must deny that character and live as a pagan. She found favor in the court of King Xerxes, enabling her to become an agent through whom God would fulfill His ancient promise to her people, whether she was aware of it or not. Nevertheless, she had to overcome herself in order to do what God had created her and placed her to do.

Up to this point in the story, while Esther is pretending to be a pagan, she is controlled by her circumstances. She is passive in the story, not initiating action, but following along the path of least resistance. Then comes that defining moment when she is faced with taking responsibility for the life God has given her by identifying herself with the people of God. According to Ryken, through this traumatic ordeal Esther, “initially a beautiful young woman with a weak character, becomes transformed into a person with heroic moral stature and political skill.”

Had Esther decided to remain silent and to continue to live as a pagan, God would have used some other means to fulfill His covenant promises. Yet God had placed Esther in that era of history, in that city of Persia, and even in that bedroom of Xerxes, so that when the moment came He could fulfill through her life the ancient promise. In this tableau the interaction of human responsibility with divine sovereignty is eloquently pictured. Esther came to this defining moment through her past decisions, whether right or wrong. The decision she now faced would irrevocably define her future and affect the entire nation of her people. Her predecessor, Vashti, had been deposed for taking her own action. Esther had good reason to be afraid of the consequences of her decision. While her people fasted with her, she overcame herself and decided to reveal her identity as a Jew, though it would bring her under the edict of death they faced. Whether or not she was mindful of the covenant and its promises, her decision to identify with God’s people was a decision to risk being an agent through whom God could fulfill His promises.

After her decision to identify herself with God’s people, Esther becomes the active agent, commanding Mordecai, planning a strategy to save her people, even confronting Haman at his face. Her decision energizes her, gives her purpose, and emboldens her to face a threatening future. There is first a great reversal in Esther’s own life, through which comes the great reversal of the destiny of her people. The defining moment in Esther’s own life is at the same time the
crucial moment in which God would sovereignly fulfill His promise to His people. This is where wisdom and encouragement for Christian leadership are found in the example of Esther’s life.

Few of us will ever be in Esther’s dire predicament, but every one of us faces defining moments in our lives. Certainly the most fundamental of them is when we hear the gospel of Jesus Christ and decide how to respond to it. The decision to be identified with Christ energizes our lives. It gives us purpose. The new birth is only the beginning of decisions. It is followed by a continuous sequence of defining moments as we daily face decisions that demand we choose either to identify ourselves with Christ by obedience or to live as pagans in that moment.

The hallmark of a Christian leader is consistently and continually to choose to identify with Christ, even if it means great personal risk. Esther’s declaration, “I will go to the king... and if I perish, I perish” (Esth. 4:16), represents a decision analogous to that called for by the New Testament’s command of death to self in Christ. Such decisions take the kind of courage Paul prayed for when he was in prison for the cause of Christ, “I eagerly expect... [that I] will have sufficient courage so that now as always Christ will be exalted in my body, whether by life or death” (Phil. 1:20). Esther chose to identify herself with God’s people even though it meant facing the threat of death.

Many of our defining moments are private and personal, known perhaps only to ourselves. However, like Esther’s, they may at the same time be moments in which God is providentially working to fulfill His covenant promises to many other people in ways we could never predict or control. The Christian is a member of the body of Christ, and as such, every defining decision has a corporate effect. This is especially true of Christians in any form of ministry.

The evangelical church in our generation has been brought to a defining moment as it faces decisions on the role of women in Christian ministry. It is perhaps a moment thrust on us by the times in which we live, a moment we would not have chosen to face. The issues we face are not so clearly right and wrong, black and white, or they would not continue to be so hotly debated. The dynamic of decision is operating both at the corporate level of the church, as ecclesiastical assemblies debate the issue, and in the lives of individual Christian women. As Esther’s story shows, in God’s providence, the individual’s life is inextricably bound to the corporate people of God, and vice versa. As we live in such a time as this, it is comforting and encouraging to realize once again that God is working providentially through every human decision to fulfill His promise to His people.

This is an exciting time to be a woman of God in the church. There has never previously been a time in the two thousand-year history of the church when women have had more potential for effective ministry. Our education, our socioeconomic status, and our roles in society at large afford us opportunities of service and ministry that women of previous generations simply did not have. Women today must make decisions that our mothers and grandmothers never had to face, and the choices we make today will define the decisions our daughters face tomorrow. At the same time, the decisions and aspirations of women today have raised many thorny questions within the church about the relationship of male and female authority, the role of women in ministry in general, and the ordination of women in particular.

Esther’s decision to identify herself with God’s people is the example for the individual Christian woman today. The challenge for women in the church today is to continue to choose Christ in the midst of changing roles and swirling controversy. The decision to choose Christ may work itself out in one woman’s life differently than in another’s, but the principle remains the same. God has given each person a unique life to live to God’s glory. We are each responsible to Him for our defining moments. Our personal decisions are providentially the means through which God is fulfilling the promises of the covenant of grace, both to individuals and to the church as a body.

The decisions women make affect the church, and the decisions the church makes affects the lives of individual women. While this is an exciting time to be a woman in the church, it is also easy at such a time as this to become discouraged or impatient while the church is hammering out the issues on the role of women. Sadly, at their defining moments, many women either retreat from opportunities for ministry, finding the uncharted path too difficult, or even worse, leave the church altogether in anger and disillusionment. The example of Esther shows a better way. Continually to choose to identify ourselves with God’s covenant of grace in Christ means to continue in the church, exhibiting the fruit of the Holy Spirit and making the ethical and moral decisions consistent with the teachings of Jesus Christ. God will providentially achieve His ends as Christian women today consistently choose to identify themselves with Christ, even though they may find themselves in difficult situations as a result.

For its part, the church can relieve the frustration many of its women are experiencing today by refocusing the discussion of the role of women. It sometimes appears that a denomination feels it has addressed the issue once it has clearly articulated what women may not do, regardless of which specific roles or tasks are prohibited. A more positive statement is now needed. The discussion has been too narrowly focused on the heated issue of women’s ordination and the seemingly endless debate on the original meaning and contemporary significance of 1 Tim. 2:12. These are critically important considerations for the church to consider, but they do not exhaust the issue, which is much broader in scope.

The issue of gender must be clearly distinguished from the issue of ordination. Whether deliberately or not, most evangelical churches that prohibit women’s ordination to church office nevertheless allow unordained men to serve in ways barred to women. This inconsistency results because issues of gender and ordination have been confused. Laywomen are frustrated because they cannot serve in the ways open to their lay brothers. If the issue is ordination, then
laymen and women should serve in the same ways. If the issue is gender, then churches must consider whether their practice is truly biblical or merely traditional. Now is the time to create appropriate opportunities for women to use their gifts, education, and aspirations to serve the Lord in His church. Churches wanting to affirm the gifts of women could turn from the ordination question to examine what unordained men have traditionally been allowed to do and to consider if women could not serve in these ways as well.

The story of Esther provides an example of a man and woman working together where the complementary circumstances and qualities of each were required to achieve God’s purpose. Neither of them held an official religious office. Nevertheless, through Esther and Mordecai together, God providentially worked to fulfill His covenant promise. Their involvement in thwarting Haman’s plan and in sharing authority as leaders in the Jewish community after his downfall is so mutual that it is difficult to isolate their roles (see especially Esth. 9:29-32). One would not have succeeded without the other. This provides an example for the partnership of men and women in ministry. Woman is a necessary complement to man in a redemptive program not limited to the marriage relationship. Women are needed in the church’s ministry to complement and complete the work of men. The work of the church suffers where women’s gifts are not being fully developed and utilized in appropriate ways.

Traditionally, women in ministry have been the wives of pastors and elders. While this works well for some, not every pastor’s wife wishes to be involved in the ministry of the church, and many may not be called or gifted for the task. Moreover, many women in the church are not married to pastors or elders and have had little or no access to opportunities for ministry. Esther and Mordecai provide a model of a man and woman, not married to each other, who by God’s providence function as partners in God’s work. They came to leadership not through official positions within the Jewish community, but by virtue of how God had positioned and gifted them.

Esther and Mordecai were people through whom the Lord fulfilled His covenant promises in their generation. God has providentially placed women and men today in our generation to be people who will identify with Christ, people through whom His gospel can touch the lives of others. From one generation to the next, the gospel of Jesus Christ has come to us through two thousand years of women’s lives, starting with the Virgin Mary, the Samaritan woman at the well, and the women at the empty tomb. God calls women to Christ to be agents through whom He can providentially fulfill His covenant promises of life, peace, joy, and truth. Let us be the joyful and courageous women of faith that God has created us to be in “such a time as this.”
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