

The Biblical Response to Evangelical Feminism

I Tim. 2:11-15

1 Timothy 2:11–15 (NKJV)

¹¹ Let a woman learn in silence with all submission.

¹² And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. ¹³ For Adam was formed first, then Eve. ¹⁴ And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. ¹⁵ Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control.

Introduction

There has been in the last few years a tidal wave of information put out with the intent of redefining the roles of women and men in the church.

I'm not talking about the expected liberal teachings of liberal denominations and churches, but rather the amazing number of self proclaimed conservative evangelical denominations, seminaries, theologians, preachers and churches

that are saying and permitting things that would not have been conceived of 30 years ago.

In my studies the last couple of weeks, I have determined that the historic and conservative view of the role of women in the church is now clearly in the minority.

We are now the odd ball.

To teach what the Bible says about the woman's role in marriage, the family and the especially the church is completely out of line with the political and societal viewpoints. But most alarmingly it is out of sync with the church.

We are being told more and more that we are not inline with Biblical progressive thought regarding women's role in the church.

It is becoming more and more common to see women in pastoral leadership roles, and preaching roles in conservative evangelical churches.

Women like Beth Moore who is founder of Living Proof Ministries who materials are used extensively in SBC churches has on occasion preaches to men and women in churches

The Passion Conference, annual Conference, founded by Louie Giglio (close friend of Andy Stanley)

The recent **Passion 2020** in Atlanta, Georgia was an historic event as over 65,000 students gathered to lift up the name and renown of Jesus! College age students from around the world benefitted from the teaching and inspiration from a wide range of speakers including **Levi Lusko**, **John Piper**, **Sadie Robertson (Duck Dynasty)**, **Christine Caine**, **Ravi Zacharias**, **Louie Giglio**, **Shelley Giglio** and **Tim Tebow**.

Sadie Robertson

Robertson is a granddaughter of [Phil Robertson](#), founder of [Duck Commander](#).

Christine Caine In 2015, Caine founded Propel Women, an organization that aims to honor the calling of every woman, empower her to lead, equip her for success, and develop a sense of God-given purpose

graduated from [Hillsong College](#) in 1992.

the Biblical Mandate.

Caine has also been featured on several international television shows, including TBN's *Praise the Lord*, *The James Robison Show*, Joyce Meyer's *Enjoying Everyday Life*, and Joni Lamb, and is a Women of Faith speaker.^{[5][22][23][24][25]} In October 2016, TBN launched a weekly TV show featuring Caine called, "Equip & Empower".^[26]

Add to all of this the constant media presence of false teachers like Joyce Meyers and Gloria Copeland and many others whom most of the evangelical churches have no clue of their heresies.

All of these women preachers and teachers and false teachers along with all of their apparent success in ministry has caused many to rethink their positions on women in ministry.

Many now believe that what Paul wrote in I Timothy 2 and I Corinthians 14 was for his day and not ours, dealing with a particular issue in that church and is not applicable to our day.

Others have made the conclusion that Paul's words were not as authoritative as Jesus' Words.

While some have concluded that Paul was just heavily influenced by his Jewish Heritage and his chauvinistic male dominance that is what he was pressing on the churches.

Whatever the reasoning, it is clear that this is not just a wave coming at the church. It is a Tsunami. I have read that Tsunami Waves start when there is a certain type of earthquake deep in the ocean that causes the floor of the ocean to rise suddenly and the wave produced can travel as fast as 500 mph. And of course, when they strike land they can do horrible damage and killed 1000s of people.

This is exactly what the church is facing.

But this did not start over night and not just a few years ago either.

There was an earthquake deep in the ocean of self-centered female humanity that was called the feminist movement.

In a chapter titled “To Hell with Sexism: Women in Religion” in *Megatrends for Women*, [1] authors Patricia Aburdene and John Naisbitt show how modern culture celebrates feminism:

“Women of the late twentieth century are revolutionizing the most sexist institution in history—organized religion. Overturning millennia of tradition, they are challenging authorities, reinterpreting the Bible, creating their own services, crowding into seminaries, winning the right to ordination, purging sexist language in liturgy, reintegrating female values and assuming positions of leadership. [2]

It’s safe to say, that trend in the church—noted more than 30 years ago—has become a settled reality, and it is dangerous on many levels. Feminist theology teaches that God is not male, God does not exist in a trinitarian form, Jesus was a feminist, and the true history of women was edited out of the Bible. Aburdene and Naisbitt assert that once women’s perspectives “attain greater power, [that]

will signal revolutionary changes in church policies.” [3]

Aburdene and Naisbitt note that the organization Christians for Biblical Equality believes, “Women as well as men exercise the prophetic, priestly, and royal functions” of the church. [4]

And for years now we have seen a surge in attempts to purge male terminology out of Bible translations.

Feminism: A Reversal of Biblical Standards
by John MacArthur Monday, July 29, 2013

Much of this can be laid at the feet of the feminist movement, because it has overturned the thinking of women so dramatically that they have abandoned their God-intended role, and consequently, the family has felt the consequences. Unthinking believers, untaught Christians, have become prey to the ideology of the feminists. And frankly, most of us probably have no real idea of what the feminist agenda is at its core; it is frightening, and it is fatal.

What the public sees is that women want equal pay. Well, you can't really argue against that. What the public sees is that women want to be free from certain social strictures. Well that's certainly reasonable. But it goes way beyond that; way beyond that. A cry for equality, a cry for opportunity, a cry for equal privilege to use their abilities

unhindered and unrestricted, and the rhetoric sounds fairly sensible. But the real agenda is much more serious

Gloria Steinem - editor of *Ms. Magazine* :
“By the year 2000, we will, I hope, raise our children to believe in human potential, not God.” Satan’s ideologies can’t ever just stop with social issues; they always go to theological ones. It can’t just stop on the social level, it’s got to assault God; because unless God is dethroned, and the God of Christianity is eliminated from their thinking, they’re going to have to deal with the Bible, and that’s a problem. So, we get rid of God and everything supposedly attributed to Him; the Bible is out of the picture.

Radical feminist leader Sheila Cronin -says this:
“Since marriage constitutes slavery for women, it is clear that the women’s movement must concentrate on attacking this institution. Freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage.”

As far back as 1971, there was produced by these feminists a document called “The Declaration of Feminism.” It says this: “The end of the institution of marriage is a necessary condition for the liberation of women.

“Therefore it is important for us to encourage women to leave their husbands and not live individually with men. All of history must be re-written

in terms of oppression of women. We must go back to ancient female religions like witchcraft.”

By the way, this is largely lesbian-led, and that’s why they have that attitude toward men. Annie Laurie Gaylor, writing in *The Humanist* - July/August 1988, has an article called “Feminist Salvation.”

This is what she says - and this affects the elite thinkers at the university level, and it gets taught to the students in the system, so it works its way into the culture - she says this: “Let’s forget about the mythical Jesus.” Again, it never stops with a sociology; it always has to ascend to a theology, because you’ve got to get God out of the picture, so you can make the Bible a non-issue. “Let’s forget about the mythical Jesus and look for encouragement, solace, and inspiration from real women.

“Two thousand years of patriarchal rule under the shadow of the cross ought to be enough to turn women toward the feminist salvation of the world” - end quote. Get rid of Jesus; the real salvation of the world is not in Him, it is in feminism.

Dr. Mary Jo Bane, the feminist and Assistant Professor of Education at Wellesley College - a elite women’s college - Associate Director of the school’s Center for Research on Women a deadly think tank -

says this: “In order to raise children with equality, we must take them away from families and communally raise them.” We’ve got to get them away from any male influence. (sounds like Hillary Clinton, view, “it takes a village.”)

Margaret Sanger - founder of Planned Parenthood, leading the parade in abortion - said, “The most merciful thing a large family can do to one of its infant members is kill it.” Now, the reason we have to take these ideas seriously is because they are influencing law. They are influencing the courts. They have a massive influence on education. All you have to do is realize that this is how the university system thinks; that’s where the school teachers are all trained, and you see how it filters all the way down through the educational system. They’re creating laws at the highest level in our land, laws we have to live by, laws that are obliterating all sense of historic culture. They’re being taught through every avenue to our young people, and even Christians, as I said, are falling under the spell of the feminists.

Sheila Cronin - again, one of their most respected leaders - says, “Since marriage constitutes slavery, we have to attack marriage” - attack marriage. And from the *National Organization of Women Times*: “The simple fact is, every woman must be willing to

be recognized as a lesbian before she is fully feminine.” This isn’t something philosophical; this is something theological. But it’s not just philosophical, social and theological, it’s moral.

What you’ve got here is the perversion of lesbianism, mixed with all of this ideology, driving something that is at every point satanic. From the standpoint of the social, it destroys the family. From the standpoint of the theological, it destroys God and the church. From the standpoint of the moral, it destroys the normal human relationship, and replaces it with an abnormal, wicked role reversal and homosexuality.

The feminist movement has successfully influenced many women to abandon these divinely ordained roles. Unfortunately, this movement has made headway even in the church, creating chaos and confusion regarding the role of women both in ministry and in the home.

How did we get here

Now, most people would say, “This is new. This is a new movement. This is something brand new.”

But the truth is, it is very, very old; very old. In fact, it’s Satanic, and its origins came very early after the fall. You remember Eve? Liberated herself from

Adam's authority, plunged the whole human race into sin, wanted to operate independently without the headship of her husband. That's precisely what Satan wanted, and that's when it all got cranked up.

Genesis 3:1–6 (NKJV)

3 Now the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said to the woman, “Has God indeed said, ‘You shall not eat of every tree of the garden’?”

² And the woman said to the serpent, “We may eat the fruit of the trees of the garden; ³ but of the fruit of the tree which *is* in the midst of the garden, God has said, ‘You shall not eat it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die.’ ”

⁴ Then the serpent said to the woman, “You will not surely die. ⁵ For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”

⁶ So when the woman saw that the tree *was* good for food, that it *was* pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make *one* wise, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ate.

Genesis 3:16 (NKJV)

¹⁶ To the woman He said:

“I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception;
In pain you shall bring forth children;
Your **desire** *shall be* for your husband,
And he shall rule over you.”

Genesis 4:3–7 (NKJV)

³ And in the process of time it came to pass that Cain brought an offering of the fruit of the ground to the Lord.

⁴ Abel also brought of the firstborn of his flock and of their fat. And the Lord respected Abel and his offering,
⁵ but He did not respect Cain and his offering. And Cain was very angry, and his countenance fell.

⁶ So the Lord said to Cain, “Why are you angry? And why has your countenance fallen? ⁷ If you do well, will you not be accepted? And if you do not do well, sin lies at the door. And its **desire** *is* for you, but you should rule over it.”

A sinful desire to control. it is not good.

The very sin of independence and usurpation and insubordination to her husband, would become a

curse of desire to continue in this state to the ruin of the woman and the man.

Wayne Grudem, wrote in
“Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?”

I am concerned that evangelical feminism (also called “egalitarianism”) has become a new path by which evangelicals are being drawn into theological liberalism.¹

When I use the phrase “theological liberalism” I mean a system of thinking that denies the complete truthfulness of the Bible as the Word of God and denies the unique and absolute authority of the Bible in our lives. When I speak of “evangelical feminism” I mean a movement that claims there are no unique leadership roles for men in marriage or in the church. According to evangelical feminism, there is no leadership role in marriage that belongs to the husband simply because he is the husband, but leadership is to be shared between husband and wife according to their gifts and desires. And there are no leadership roles in the church reserved for men, but women as well as men can be pastors and elders and hold any office in the church.

In every generation there are popular views in the culture that contradict what the Bible says, and it is so easy to compromise at one point or another. In the early twentieth century it was so easy to give in to the liberal emphasis on “the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man” and say that people are essentially good, and they don’t need a Savior who died for their sins, and there is no such thing as hell. By following this reasoning many Christian churches followed the culture and drifted into liberalism.

Through much of the twentieth century it was easy to give in to the dominant “scientific” worldview and say that genuine miracles can’t happen because they violate the “laws of nature,” and so the virgin birth of Christ and other miracles in the Bible did not really happen, but that does not matter because the Bible still teaches us how to live a moral life. By following this reasoning many Christian churches followed the culture and drifted into liberalism.

Today, for scholars who work in the scientific community, it would be so easy to give in to the dominant view in the culture and say that all living things simply “evolved” from nonliving matter through random mutation and did not come about by direct design and creation by God. But those

who adopt evolution as their explanation for the origin of life just follow the culture and drift into liberalism.

It can happen in any area. It happens when people grow weary of defending Jesus' words, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6). Then it can be so easy to give in to the pressures of our tolerance-riddled culture and say that "all religions are different paths to the same God." And then the unique message of the gospel that alone tells us how our sins can be forgiven is lost, and Christian churches just follow the culture into liberalism.

I believe the same thing is happening today with evangelical feminism. There is tremendous pressure in present-day culture to deny male leadership in the home and the church. To prove that, just ask any pastor if he enjoys preaching and teaching about male headship in marriage and the church today. Almost nobody wants to tackle the subject! It is "too controversial,"

It is not easy to stand against the culture. It is much easier to give in and say women can do whatever men can do in the church and in the home.

And I believe that evangelical feminism is leading Christians down that path one step at a time today.

The late Francis Schaeffer, one of the wisest and most influential Christian thinkers of the twentieth century, warned of this exact trend just a few months before his death in 1984. In his book *The Great Evangelical Disaster* he included a section called “The Feminist Subversion,” in which he wrote:

There is one final area that I would mention where evangelicals have, with tragic results, accommodated to the world spirit of this age. This has to do with the whole area of marriage, family, sexual morality, feminism, homosexuality, and divorce. . . . The key to understanding extreme feminism centers around the idea of total equality, or more properly the idea of equality without distinction. . . . the world spirit in our day would have us aspire to autonomous absolute freedom in the area of male and female relationships—to throw off all form and boundaries in these relationships and especially those boundaries taught in the Scriptures. . . . Some evangelical leaders, in fact, have changed their views about inerrancy as a direct consequence of trying to come to terms with feminism. There is no

other word for this than accommodation. It is a direct and deliberate bending of the Bible to conform to the world spirit of our age at the point where the modern spirit conflicts with what the Bible teaches.²

² Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Great Evangelical Disaster* (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway, 1984), 130, 134-135, 137, italics in original. Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* . Good News Publishers. Kindle Edition.

There may be no way the authority of Scripture is being undermined more quickly or more thoroughly in our day than through the hermeneutics of egalitarian readings of the Bible. And when the authority of Scripture is undermined, the gospel will not long be acknowledged.

³ "Undermining Tolerance of Egalitarianism," posted May 31, 2006 by Mark Dever at <http://blog.togetherforthegospel.org>, accessed 6/23/06; Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* . Good News Publishers. Kindle Edition.

In more liberal denominations such as these, a predictable sequence has been seen (though so far only the Episcopal Church has followed the sequence to point 7):

1. abandoning biblical inerrancy
2. endorsing the ordination of women
3. abandoning the Bible's teaching on male headship in marriage

4. excluding clergy who are opposed to women's ordination
5. approving homosexual conduct as morally valid in some cases
6. approving homosexual ordination
7. ordaining homosexuals to high leadership positions in the denomination¹⁷

Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* . Good News Publishers. Kindle Edition.

Does it seem likely that all of the liberal churches who no longer believe the Bible have suddenly gotten the interpretation of the Bible regarding men's and women's roles exactly right, and that the most conservative churches who hold strongly to biblical inerrancy have gotten it exactly wrong? And does it seem likely that as soon as a denomination begins to abandon belief in inerrancy it suddenly discovers new skill and accuracy in interpreting the Bible on the roles of men and women so that it finally arrives at the correct answer?

Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* . Good News Publishers. Kindle Edition.

In 1966, Joseph Fletcher published *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*.¹⁷ He argued that people at times needed to break God's moral laws in the Bible in order to do the greatest good for the greatest

number of people. But as these ideas worked their way through American society, the “new morality” of Fletcher’s situation ethics brought about a tremendous erosion of moral standards and widespread disobedience to all of God’s moral laws.

Grudem, Wayne. *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* . Good News Publishers. Kindle Edition.

There is nothing commendable to a society or a church when the women abandon their God ordained roles and reverse what God intended Pauls shock is noted in Romans 1 when he says

Romans 1:26 (NKJV)

²⁶ For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their women exchanged the natural use for what is against nature.

Also the Prophet Isaiah has noted that when women rise to leadership position in a nation, it is not a sign of blessing but rather Judgment

Isaiah 3:16–26 (NKJV)

¹⁶ Moreover the Lord says:

“Because the daughters of Zion are haughty,
And walk with outstretched necks

And wanton eyes,
Walking and mincing *as they go*,
Making a jingling with their feet,
17 Therefore the Lord will strike with a scab
The crown of the head of the daughters of Zion,
And the Lord will uncover their secret parts.”

18 In that day the Lord will take away the finery:
The jingling anklets, the scarves, and the
crescents;

19 The pendants, the bracelets, and the veils;
20 The headdresses, the leg ornaments, and the
headbands;
The perfume boxes, the charms,
21 and the rings;
The nose jewels,
22 the festal apparel, and the mantles;
The outer garments, the purses,
23 and the mirrors;
The fine linen, the turbans, and the robes.

24 And so it shall be:
Instead of a sweet smell there will be a stench;
Instead of a sash, a rope;
Instead of well-set hair, baldness;
Instead of a rich robe, a girding of sackcloth;
And branding instead of beauty.

²⁵ Your men shall fall by the sword,
And your mighty in the war.

²⁶ Her gates shall lament and mourn,
And she *being* desolate shall sit on the ground.

Why such judgment

Isaiah 3:11–13 (NKJV)

¹¹ Woe to the wicked! *It shall be ill with him,*
For the reward of his hands shall be given him.

¹² *As for* My people, children *are* their oppressors,
And women rule over them.

O My people! Those who lead you cause *you* to
err,

And destroy the way of your paths.”

This leads us to the concern to have a proper Biblical Response to this surge of Evangelical Feminism in the church.

The Context of the Passage

Let me remind you of the fears of the apostle Paul had come to pass in the church at Ephesus. If you will remember in Acts chapter 20 when Paul gathered together the Ephesian elders at Miletus in verse 17 of that chapter, and then went on to discuss with them the priorities of ministry, he concluded the discussion with a warning section.

That warning section expressed his deepest fears for that congregation.

Let me read you just a few verses out of Acts 20 so that you'll be familiar with his statements. Beginning in verse 29 he says,

“For I know this that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you not sparing the flock, also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore, watch and remember that for the space of three years I ceased not to warn everyone night and day with tears. And now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the word of His grace which is able to build you up and give you an inheritance among all men who are sanctified.”

Now, in that, Paul expresses his great fear that false teachers would arise within the church as well as come in from the outside. The church at Ephesus had great beginnings, marvelous beginnings. It was born out of a great revival. It was born out of paganism with a clarity of purpose and intent that is without a surpassing experience in the book of Acts. And yet, Paul knew inevitably no matter how good the beginning, no matter how effective his own three-year ministry in that city, it was inevitable that the enemy would begin to attack that church by bringing in false teachers, unholy leaders to bring it

down from its place of effectiveness for God and to be sure Paul's worst fears did come to pass.

Now, the primary problem in the church at Ephesus was false and unqualified leadership. And beginning in chapter 3 and running all the way to the end of the epistle, really, there is a preoccupation with these false leaders. Some chapters are more totally devoted than others, but the theme that is woven through 3 through 6 in 1 Timothy is the theme of dealing with false leaders. The book then is a polemic; it is a treatise against the false leaders who have arisen in the church at Ephesus.

Now, these false leaders brought with them a lot of baggage. Their ungodliness manifested itself in many ways. One of the ways in which their false leadership brought problems to the church was in the matter of the women's role. It is apparent that in this church there were certain women who were desirous of taking the place of official teacher in the church and usurping authority from the men to lead the church. That was one of the problems, no doubt, under the false leadership of those who had risen to the role of pastor or elder and were doing all they could to undermine the Word of God.

There was a feminist movement in the day of the New Testament church.

No doubt in response to the oppressive and possessive attitude men had towards women, there was a rebellion in play.

For instance

In the midst of the Greek, Roman, and Jewish cultures, women were viewed almost on the level of possessions, Jewish rabbis did not teach women and the Jewish Talmud said it was better to burn the Torah than to teach it to a woman

In response to there new found freedom in Christ, there were some women and false teachers taking advantage of this overthrow the God ordained pattern of the role of women and men in the church.

It is apparent that there were women seeking to be teachers in the church and to usurp authority over the man, and with that issue Paul must deal in specifics

So as he writes he says

1 Timothy 3:14–15 (NKJV)

¹⁴ These things I write to you, though I hope to come to you shortly; ¹⁵ but if I am delayed, *I write* so that you may know how you ought to conduct yourself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

So in chapter 2 :9-15 Paul gives us six elements of this very important instruction regarding the role of women in the church.

1 Timothy 2:8–10 (NKJV)

8 I desire (boulemai) therefore that the **men** (**andras**) pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting;

9 in like manner also, that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with propriety and moderation, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly clothing,

10 but, which is proper for women professing godliness, with good works.

Now, you'll remember that the first thing he speaks about is their appearance. How are women to appear in the church? You remember verse 9 says that women are to adorn themselves in a proper adorning. In other words, they are to appear in a way that expresses love for God, reverence for His holiness, an attitude of worship. The latter part of the verse indicates that they are not to occupy themselves with outward fashion. They are not to flaunt their wealth, and he refers in the plaiting of the hair, and gold and pearls to a common custom where since women were so fully clad in that culture from neck to the ground, the way they would flaunt their wealth is in their hair. And they would weave gold and pearls, and tortoise-

shell combs would be placed into their hair, and this way they could show their wealth. They could flaunt themselves. That was the way women adorned themselves in a carnal expression in that time, and what he is saying here is that that should not happen in the church. A tendency of women to be occupied with their adornment is only a manifestation of the carnality of their hearts, dressing to flaunt wealth, dressing to manifest lust and sexual desire, dressing to express a spirit of insubordination to one's husband. We went into all of those things in detail in a prior message. These are forbidden a woman who appears to worship God.

Secondly, he discussed their attitude. In the middle of verse 9, their attitude is to be that of godly fear and self-control. Godly fear comes from a root word meaning they have a sense of shame. In other words, they are to be ashamed of causing anyone to be distracted from the worship and the glory of God. They have a proper sense of shame that results in modesty, and self-control refers to being able to control your passion and your desire. Women are to present themselves then in modesty and humbleness of heart, demonstrating total control over their passion and appearing in such a way that draws attention to their godliness and their virtue.

Thirdly, in verse 10, we discussed their testimony. If they make profession of godliness, they should support that with good works. So, you have not only their appearance and their attitude, but their activity or their action. Their deeds should also demonstrate that profession of godliness which they bear.

Now, that takes us fourthly to their role,
Their role in relation to leadership and teaching in the church.

I. The Rule

II. The Reason

III. The Reclamation

I. The Rule

¹¹ Let a woman **learn** in silence with all submission. ¹² And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence.

Γυνη εν ησυχια **μανθανετω** εν παση υποταγη
 γυναικι δε διδασκειν ουκ επιτρεπω ουδε
 αυθεντειν ανδρος αλλ εινα εν ησυχια

¹¹ Let a woman **learn** in silence with all submission.

manthánō Pres. Act. Imperative

μανθανετω akin to **3101** /mathētés, "a disciple") – properly, learning key facts; gaining "fact-knowledge as someone learns from experience, often with the implication of reflection – 'come to realize' "

When the church gathers, however, women are to listen to the men who teach **quietly ... with entire submissiveness**. *Hēsuchia* appears at the

beginning of verse 11 (**quietly**), and the end of verse 12 (**quiet**), thus bracketing Paul's teaching on the role of women with the principle of silence.

Submissiveness translates *hupotagē*, which means "to line up under." **With entire** emphasizes the complete subjection called for. In the context of the worship, then, women are to be silent and content in the role of the learner.

MacArthur, J. F., Jr. (1995). *1 Timothy* (p. 85). Chicago: Moody Press.

12 And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence

δε διδασκειν ουκ επιτρεπω ουδε αυθεντειν ανδρος αλλ εινα εν ησυχια

διδασκειν **Is in preeminent positions in the sentence**

In verse 12, Paul actually interprets the meaning of verse 11. He defines exactly what he means by women staying quiet in the worship: **But I do not** (as the apostle of Jesus Christ, who speaks through me) **allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man.** Women are to keep quiet in the sense of not teaching. They are to demonstrate subjection

by not usurping the authority of the elder or preacher.

That is true not because women are in any sense inferior to men, but because God's law commands it (1 Cor. 14:34), in line with His design for the weaker vessels. Those who insist that subordination and equality are mutually exclusive would do well to consider Christ's relationship to the Father. While on earth, Jesus assumed a subordinate role, yet He was in no way inferior.

First Corinthians 11:3 states, "But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ."

12 And I do not **permit** a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence

These are all Present tense verbs

***Epitrepō* (allow)** is always used in the New Testament to speak of permitting someone to do what they desire to do. Paul's choice of words may imply that some women in Ephesus desired to be the public preachers, and thus have authority over the congregation—as in today's church. Paul, however,

speaking as the official apostle of Jesus Christ, does not **allow** that. The role of the elder as evangelist or pastor-teacher is only for men.

The present infinitive *didaskein* (**to teach**) would best be translated “to be a teacher.” The noted Greek grammarians H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey wrote the following on the distinction between the aorist infinitive and the present infinitive:

It is well to notice particularly the difference between the aorist and present infinitive. The aorist infinitive denotes that which is eventual or particular, while the present infinitive indicates a condition or process. Thus *pisteusai* [aorist] is to exercise faith on a given occasion, while *pisteuein* [present] is to be a believer. (*A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* [Toronto: MacMillian, 1957], 199)

By using the present infinitive instead of the aorist, Paul does not forbid women to teach under appropriate conditions and circumstances, but to fill the office and role of the pastor or teacher in the life of the church.

Paul also adds the prohibition that forbids women to **exercise authority over a man**. *Authentein* (**exercise authority over**), another present infinitive, appears only here in the New Testament. Some

have attempted to evade the force of Paul's prohibition by arbitrarily supposing that *authentein* should properly be translated "abusive authority." Women, according to that view, can exercise authority over men so long as it is not abusive authority. A study of the extrabiblical uses of *authentein*, however, makes clear that the word means simply authority. It carries no negative connotation, such as abusive or domineering authority. Paul, then, in an unqualified directive, forbids women from exercising any type of authority over men in the church. It is the "elders [clearly men, since 1 Tim. 3:2 states they must be 'the husband of one wife'] who rule" (1 Tim. 5:17)

MacArthur, J. F., Jr. (1995). *1 Timothy* (pp. 86–87). Chicago: Moody Press.

1 Corinthians 14:33–37 (NKJV)

33 For God is not *the author* of confusion but of peace, *as in all the churches of the saints.*

34 Let your women keep silent *in the churches,*

1 Corinthians 14:27–30 (NKJV)

²⁷ If anyone speaks in a tongue, *let there be two or at the most three, each in turn, and let one interpret.* ²⁸ But if there is no

interpreter, let him keep silent in church, and let him speak to himself and to God.
²⁹ Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others judge. ³⁰ But if *anything* is revealed to another who sits by, let the first keep silent.

34 for they are not permitted to speak; but *they are* to be submissive, as the **law also says**.

[1 Corinthians 14:21](#)

In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord.

35 And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is **shameful** for women to speak in church.

shameful

in var. senses from ‘ugly’ in an external sense to ‘base’ as in moral deformity

behavior that flouts social and moral standards, *shamefulness, obscenity*

Arndt, W., Danker, F. W., & Bauer, W. (2000). [A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature](#) (3rd ed., p. 29). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

36 Or did the word of God come *originally* from you? Or *was it* you only that it **reached**?

ΚΑΤΑΝΤΆΩ

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: katantaó

Phonetic Spelling: (kat-an-tah'-o)

Definition: to come down to, reach

Usage: (a) I come down, either from high land to lower (or actually to the sea-coast), or from the high seas to the coast; hence met: I arrive at, reach (my destination), (b) of property: I come down (descend) by inheritance to an heir.

37 If anyone thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord.

38 But if anyone is ignorant, let him be ignorant. but if anyone ignores this, Let him be ignored.

II. The Reason

1³ For Adam was formed first, then Eve.

14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.

Αδαμ γαρ πρωτος επλασθη ειτα Ευα και Αδαμ ουκ ηπατηθη η δε γυνη απατηθειςα εν παραβασει γεγονεν

The reason Paul gives is not circumstantial or cultural

It is Creational. It is the order of Creation that He appeals to.

In the creation account of Genesis 1, God's first word on the subject of men and women is that they were equally created in the image of God (v. 27). Neither received more of the image of God than the other. So the Bible begins with the equality of the sexes. As persons, as spiritual beings standing before God, men and women are absolutely equal.

Despite this equality, there is in Genesis 2 a more detailed account of the creation of the two human beings that reveals differences in their God-given functions and responsibilities. God did not create the man and the woman at the same time, but rather He created Adam first and Eve later for the specific purpose of being Adam's helper. Eve was equal to

Adam, but she was given the role and duty of submitting to him. Although the word “helper” carries very positive connotations—even being used of God Himself as the helper of Israel (Deut. 33:7; Ps. 33:20)—it still describes someone in a relationship of service to another. The responsibility of wives to submit to their husbands, then, was part of the plan from creation, even before the curse. The first books of the Bible establish both the equality of men and women and also the support role of the wife (see Exod. 21:15, 17, 28–31; Num. 5:19–20, 29; 6:2; 30:1–16III).

A popular view today is that woman’s subordinate role is a corruption of God’s perfect design that was the result of the Fall. Since the effects of the curse are intended to be reversed in Christ, it is argued, differing male and female roles should be abolished. Paul, however, establishes woman’s subordinate role not in the Fall, but in the divine order of original creation. **For it was Adam who was first created, he writes, and then Eve.** God made woman after man to be his suitable helper (Gen. 2:18). The priority of man’s role is obvious.

Paul does not derive women’s role from the Fall, but he uses that event as further corroboration of God’s

intention. He points out that **it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into transgression.**

MacArthur, J. F., Jr. (1995). [1 Timothy](#) (p. 88). Chicago: Moody Press.

The whole human race thus fell into depravity and judgment. Eve was not suited by nature to assume the position of ultimate responsibility. When she stepped out from under the protection and leadership of Adam, she was highly vulnerable and fell. And, of course, when Adam violated his leadership role and followed Eve (though **it was not he who was deceived**), the perversion of God's order was complete. The Fall resulted, then, not simply from disobedience to God's command, but from violating God's appointed roles for the sexes. That is not to say that Adam was less culpable than Eve, or that she was more defective. Headship by the man, then, was part of God's design from the beginning, and he bears the responsibility for its success or failure. The tragic experience of the garden encounter with the serpent confirmed the wisdom of that design.

MacArthur, J. F., Jr. (1995). [1 Timothy](#) (p. 89). Chicago: Moody Press.

III The Reclamation

15 Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control.

σωθησεται δε δια της τεκνογονιας εαν μεινωσιν εν πιστει και αγαπη και αγιασμω μετα σωφροσυνης

It need should be noted that there is clear instruction by example and mandate that women do have ministry.

They are to speak the gospel to the lost,

They are to admonish one another

They are to encourage one another

They are to disciple one another.

They are to teach other women and children.

Titus 2:3–5 (NKJV)

³ the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things—⁴ that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, ⁵ to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed.

15 Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control.

Preserved is from *sōzō*, the common New Testament word for salvation. The word can also mean “to rescue,” “to preserve safe and unharmed,” “to heal,” “to set free,” or “to deliver from.” It appears a number of times in the New Testament without reference to spiritual salvation (cf. Matt. 8:25; 9:21–22; 10:22; 24:22; 27:40, 42, 49; 2 Tim. 4:18). Paul obviously does not intend to teach that women are eternally saved from the wages of sin **through the bearing of children**. That would contradict the New Testament’s teaching that salvation is by grace through faith alone (cf. Rom. 3:19–20). The future tense and the use of the plural pronoun **they** indicate that he was not even referring to Eve. The plural and the absence of any connection to the context show Paul was not referring to Mary, the mother of Jesus, as some suggest.

Paul teaches here that although a woman precipitated the Fall and women bear that responsibility, yet they may be **preserved** from that

stigma through childbearing. The rescue, the delivery, the freeing of women from the stigma of having led the race into sin happens when they bring up a righteous seed. What a perfect counter! Women are far from being second-class citizens because they have the primary responsibility for rearing godly children. Mothers spend far more time with their children than do their fathers, and thus have the greater influence. Fathers cannot know the intimate relationship with their children that their mother establishes from pregnancy, birth, infancy, and early childhood. Paul's point is that while a woman may have led the race into sin, women have the privilege of leading the race out of sin to godliness. That does not mean that God wants all women to bear children; some He doesn't even want married (1 Cor. 7:25–40). Paul speaks in general terms. The pain associated with childbirth was the punishment for the woman's sin (Gen. 3:16), but the joy and privilege of child rearing delivers women from the stigma of that sin.

For women to reverse the blight that has befallen them in the Fall and fulfill their calling they need to raise a godly seed. To do that, they must **continue in faith and love**, where their salvation really rests. And they must continue in **sanctity** (holiness) **with self-restraint** (the same word translated "discreetly")

in verse 9). It is the very appearance, demeanor, and behavior demanded of believing women in the church that becomes their deliverance from any inferior status, as they live godly and raise godly children.

MacArthur, J. F., Jr. (1995). *1 Timothy* (pp. 89–90). Chicago: Moody Press.

Godly Christian women will raise the next generation. You want to know why there's a Women's Liberation Movement, because there's a devil who doesn't want God to get His work done. Her faith in the Lord, her sincere love for God, her holiness and purity of life, her modest self-control mark her spiritual state as such who will bring forth children who will bless the world. And as she brought forth once a curse, she now brings forth a blessing. That's her calling.

Susanna Wesley,

Susanna Wesley was the 25th of 25 children wife of a pastor and mother of 19 children.

She and [Samuel Wesley](#) were married on 11 November 1688. Samuel was 26 and Susanna was 19.^[2]

Susanna and Samuel Wesley had 19 children. Nine of her children died as infants. Four of the children who died were twins. A maid accidentally smothered

one child. At her death, only eight of her children were still alive.

Samuel Wesley spent time in jail twice due to his poor financial abilities, and the lack of money was a continual struggle for Susanna. Their house was burned down twice; during one of the fires, her son, [John](#), nearly died and had to be rescued from the second storey window.

She's gone down in Christian history as one of the greatest mothers. Here are the rules she kept.

No child was to be given a thing because he cried for it. If a child wanted to cry, cry softly. 19 children and it says, in her house was rarely heard loud cries.

Second rule, no eating and drinking between meals except when sick.

Rule number three, sleeping was also regulated.

When very small, the child was given three hours in the morning and three in the afternoon. This was shortened until no sleeping was allowed during the daytime to be productive.

Four, punctually the little ones were laid in the cradle and rocked to sleep. At 7:00PM each child was put to bed, at 8:00PM she left the room. She never allowed herself to sit by the bed until the children went to sleep.

The little ones, fifthly, had their own table near the main table. When they could handle fork and knife, they were promoted to the family table.

Sixth, each one must eat and drink everything before him. Seventh, children must address each other as sister and brother. Eighth, she never allowed herself to show through her ill temper or by scolding. She would always explain and explain.

She would spend one hour each day shut up with God alone in her room praying for every one of her children. And her two sons, under God, brought revival to England while France was bathed in a bloody war.

We know about John Wesley, but maybe behind all of that was a godly mother, surely that's true.

G. Campbell Morgan, that great preacher said, quote: "My dedication to the preaching of the Word was maternal. Mother never told it to the baby or the boy, but waited. When but eight years old I preached to my little sister and to her dolls arrayed in orderly form before me. My sermons were Bible stories which I had first heard from my mother."

And G. Campbell Morgan, by the way, had four sons, all four of whom became preachers. And on one occasion when G. Campbell Morgan was explaining all the preachers in his family, someone said to him, "Who is the greatest preacher in your

family?” And he replied without hesitation, “My mother.”

Joseph Parker once said that when Robert Moffit was added to the Kingdom of God, a whole continent was added as well, and a mother’s kiss did it.

Charles Spurgeon’s father once told Dr. Ford, an American minister, how when he had been taken away from home a good deal trying to build up congregations, there came a conviction that he was neglecting the religious training of his own children. So, he decided that he would preach less. On returning home, he opened the door and was surprised to find none of the children around the hall. Ascending the stairs he heard his wife’s voice and knew that she was engaged in prayer. One by one, she named the children. When she had finished her petition and instruction, Spurgeon said, “I can go on with my work, the children are well cared for.” Now, there is the role of a godly woman in the church. May God grant us such godly women.

It may seem obvious to us that women should be taught God’s Word, since they are spiritually equal in Christ and the commands of the New Testament are to all (1 Peter 2:1–2). It was not at all obvious, however, to those who came from a Jewish background. First-century Judaism did not hold women in high esteem. While not barred from attending synagogue, neither were they encouraged to learn. In fact, most rabbis refused to teach women, and some likened it to throwing pearls to pigs.

Nor was the status of women in Greek society much better. William Barclay writes,

The respectable Greek woman led a very confined life. She lived in her own quarters into which no one but her husband came. She did not even appear at meals. She never at any time appeared on the street alone; she never went to any public assembly. (*The Letters to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975], 67)

The existence of such a mind-set at Ephesus may have contributed to the reaction of the women against such denigration. Unfortunately, some went too far, overreacting to their suppression by seeking a dominant position. Before Paul confronts that overreaction, however, he affirms their right to learn.

The prevalent Jewish tradition about women did not come from the Old Testament. The Old Testament affirmed that women have a spiritual status equal to that of men. The Mosaic law was given to all Israel, women as well as men (Deut. 1:1). Both were to teach it to their children (Deut. 6:4–7; Prov. 6:20). The protection of the law applied equally to women (cf. Ex. 21:28–32). Women had inheritance rights (Num. 36:1–12). Men and women alike participated in the Jewish religious feasts (cf. Ex. 12:3; Deut. 16:9–15). The single greatest spiritual vow, the Nazarite vow, was open to both men and women (Num. 6:2). Women were involved in spiritual service (Ex. 38:8; Neh. 7:67). Nor did God hesitate to deal directly with women (Gen. 3:13; 16:7–13; Judg. 13:3).

Spiritual equality between the sexes did not, however, do away with the difference in their roles. There were no queens in either Israel or Judah (Athaliah was a usurper). It is true that Deborah served as a judge (Judg. 4:4–5:31). Her case, however, was unique. Dr. Robert L. Saucy comments,

There may be instances when the regular pattern of God's order may have to be set aside due to unusual circumstances. When, for example, the husband and father is absent, the woman of the house assumes the headship of the family. So it would appear, there may be unusual circumstances when male leadership is unavailable for one reason or another. At such times God may use women to accomplish his purposes even as he used Deborah. ("The Negative Case Against the Ordination of Women," in Kenneth S. Kantzer and Stanley N. Gundry, eds., *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979], 285)

It is significant that Deborah declined to lead the military campaign against the Canaanites, deferring instead to a man, Barak. No women served as priests. None of the authors of the Old Testament were women. No woman had an on-going prophetic (speaking before people) ministry like that of Elijah, Elisha, or the other prophets. While Miriam (Ex. 15:20), Deborah (Judg. 4:4), Huldah (2 Kings 22:14), and Isaiah's wife (Isa. 8:3) are called prophetesses, none had a permanent calling to that office. Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah gave only one recorded prophecy, and Isaiah's wife none. She is called a prophetess because she gave birth to a child whose name had prophetic meaning. A fifth woman mentioned as a prophetess, Noadiah, was a false prophetess (Neh. 6:14). While God spoke through women on a few limited occasions, no woman had an on-going role of preaching and teaching.

The New Testament, like the Old, teaches the spiritual equality and differing roles of the sexes. Galatians 3:28 teaches the absolute spiritual equality of men and women in Christ. While many use that verse to justify women assuming leadership roles in the

church, the context shows that Paul is speaking of salvation (cf. Gal. 3:22, 24, 26, 27). Again Saucy writes,

The interpretive question [in Gal. 3:28] is: What is the distinction between male and female which is overcome in Christ? To phrase it another way in light of the apostle's statement "for you are all one in Christ Jesus," what is the "oneness" which male and female share in Christ? We would like to suggest ... that the answers to these questions do not concern the functional order between man and woman at all. Rather the issue, as in the other two pairs mentioned [Jews and Greeks, slaves and freemen], concerns spiritual status before God... To impart the issue of the functional orders of human society into this passage is to impute a meaning not justified by a valid contextual exegesis. There is therefore no more basis for abolishing the order between man and woman in the church from Galatians 3:28 than for abolishing an order between believing parents and children or believing citizens and rulers. For they are all one in Christ in or out of the organization of the church. (Saucy, 281–82)

That interpretation is further strengthened by the use of the general terms "male" and "female." In every Pauline passage dealing with functional roles, the terms "man" and "woman," or "husband" and "wife" appear. "Why, if the apostle is speaking of the functional relationship in Galatians 3:28, does he not use the language which he uses in every other passage? Why does he not say, 'there is neither man nor woman' in Christ rather than 'male' and 'female'?" (Saucy, 283). Oneness in Christ did not obliterate the distinctions between Jews and Gentiles. Nor did it remove the functional differences between slaves and masters (cf. 1 Cor. 7:20–24). Why, then, should we assume it did so between men and women?

In no way does the New Testament treat women as spiritual inferiors. The first person Jesus revealed His messiahship to was a woman (John 4:25–26). Jesus healed women (Mark 5:25–34; Luke 13:11–13). In contrast to the prevailing practice of the rabbis, He taught women (Luke 10:38–42). Women ministered to Jesus and the disciples (Luke 8:2–3). Following His resurrection, Jesus appeared first to a woman (Mark 16:9; John 20:11–18). Women and men were involved in the prayer services of the early church (Acts 1:13–14). Peter reminds men that women are to be "[granted] honor as fellow [heirs] of the grace of life" (1 Peter 3:7). The fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:21–22) are for both men and women. In short, all the promises, commands, and blessings of the New Testament apply equally to women and men.

As in the Old Testament, spiritual equality does not preclude differing roles. There are no women pastor-teachers, evangelists, or elders in the New Testament. None of the authors of the New Testament were women. The New Testament nowhere records a sermon or teaching of a woman. While the daughters of Philip are said to have prophesied (Acts 21:9), neither the occasion nor the message is defined. There is no reason to assume they had an on-going preaching ministry, or that they taught during the public worship. They, like Mary the mother of Jesus (Luke 1:46ff.), or Anna (Luke 2:36–39), delivered some message of truth elsewhere. As noted in chapter 6 of this volume, a comparison of 1 Corinthians 11:5 and 14:34 indicates women are permitted to pray and speak the Word, but Paul here makes clear that such allowance is not in the assembly of the church.

MacArthur, J. F., Jr. (1995). *1 Timothy* (pp. 83–85). Chicago: Moody Press.

Dana and Mantey in their *Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (p. 199) have this to say on the subject: “The aorist infinitive denotes that which is eventual or particular, while the present infinitive indicates a condition or process. Thus *pisteusai* (πιστευσαι) (aorist) is to exercise faith on a given occasion, while *pisteuein* (πιστευειν) (present) is to be a believer; *douleusai* (δουλευσαι) (aorist) is to render a service, while *douleuein* (δουλευειν) (present) is to be a slave; *hamartein* (ἁμαρτειν) (aorist) is to commit a sin, while *hamartanein* (ἁμαρτανειν) (present) is to be a sinner.” Thus, *didaxai* (διδαξαι) (aorist), is to teach, while *didaskein* (διδασκειν) (present 2:12), is to be a teacher. Paul, therefore, says, “I do not permit a woman to be a teacher.” The context here has to do with church order, and the position of the man and woman in the church worship and work. The kind of teacher Paul has in mind is spoken of in Acts 13:1, I Corinthians 12:28, 29, and Ephesians 4:11, God-called, and God-equipped teachers, recognized by the Church as those having authority in the Church in matters of doctrine and interpretation. This prohibition of a woman to be a teacher, does not include the teaching of classes of women, girls, or children in a Sunday School, for instance, but does prohibit the woman from being a pastor, or a doctrine teacher in a school. It would not be seemly, either, for a woman to teach a mixed class of adults.

Wuest, K. S. (1997). [*Wuest's word studies from the Greek New Testament: for the English reader*](#) (Vol. 7, pp. 48–49). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.