



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Can women preach/teach in church?

Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by thevoice (), on: 2004/4/15 14:12

I TIMOTHY 2:12 "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

What is wrong with this scripture above or is it just that most churches ignore and allow women to teach/preach?

Re: Can women preach/teach in church?, on: 2004/4/15 15:23

Timothy (Paul) may have a problem with women preaching, but faith based on the direct experience of God shows women to be as worthy as men in the preaching department.

Jake

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/15 15:27

I think this has been discussed somewhere else around here, I think the thread name had the words "Egalitarian theology" in it if you want to look.

My own interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:12 and 1 Corinthians 14:34 is that Paul did not allow women to be in teaching positions within the church. I believe we should adhere to the New Testament example of church except where there is some compelling (and Scripturally acceptable) reason to do otherwise.

Much of the institutional Church throughout the world (but particularly North America and Europe) has been "absorbing" parts of the world while trying to "win" it. This is exceedingly dangerous and is why we see "churches" with lower standards of morality than the heathen had some decades ago (most of the heathen have since moved on to more rotten pastures). I think this has also led to secular feminism spilling over into the Church, and thus the above verses have to be essentially ignored in any church not willing to stand against the pressure to be egalitarian.

Some simply ignore the verses (those that don't accept Biblical inerrancy to begin with have no qualms of conscience here). Some try to relegate these verses (and others, on other topics) to "cultural" differences between the culture(s) of the New Testament church and those of today. I'm inclined to think there's some validity to that idea, but I suspect that inclination is due to my desire to not step on other people's toes. As I understand it, the "cultural" argument is used to defend homosexuality as well, though that is clearly foolish.

The best argument I can think of for female preachers is that there aren't enough good male preachers. The basis is that men have so thoroughly and disastrously failed to do their duty (in religion, politics, science, family life, etc) that the women cannot be reasonably expected to sit idly by. There's some Biblical support for this in that God (apparently) appointed Deborah as a prophetess and judge over Israel (Judges 4:4), and I've heard this was because there were no suitable men (I don't know if there's any verses that back this up, there may be).

I could go on for a while, but I'm sure this has been hashed and re-hashed and re-hashed all over the internet.

One thing comes to mind, though: if there's a congregation (with a reasonably even number of men and women) and the men are in such a spiritual state that they cannot properly perform the duties accorded to their role, and women have to fill in, something is terribly wrong.

God's grace be with you all,
-Keith

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/4/15 17:15

Remember that when that scripture was written, a woman speaking in public was socially unacceptable. Present culture dictates otherwise.

I think this verse has more to do with not being offensively and irrationally radical than it does with women preachers specifically.

God wants us to be separate from the world, and not conformed to it, but I think He also wants us to make sure we aren't being non-conformist just for the sake of shocking/offending other people, or to draw attention to ourselves. This turns people away from the Gospel, and that is selfish and in direct violation of a command of God.

Personally, I don't have a problem with women pastors. They are equally intelligent, obviously, and equally capable in my experience. They often bring insights into an issue that may be missed by men, and thus the two sexes complement each other.

Additionally, I have not seen anywhere that the male's authority extends anywhere beyond a marriage relationship, except under the Old Covenant, where the regulations were pretty much the same in this area as the culture of the time would have dictated anyway.

I hope my opinion helps-- feel free to disagree with me.

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/15 17:24

Quote:
-----God wants us to be separate from the world, and not conformed to it, but I think He also wants us to make sure we aren't being non-conformist just for the sake of shocking/offending other people, or to draw attention to ourselves. This turns people away from the Gospel, and that is selfish and in direct violation of a command of God.

I agree that we should not preach private convictions as if they were supposed to be universal. Preaching against ties, TVs, computers, beards, shaving, ham, et cetera in such a manner would be without New Testament scriptural backing and to be dogmatic about it would be a problem and a sin in the way you describe.

Preaching against lying, fornication, lust, stealing, blasphemy, idolatry, and the like has very firm New Testament scriptural backing and is not only permissible but mandatory.

I'd say letting women in the pulpit falls somewhere inbetween, the question is where.

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/18 3:52

The answer to your question in regard to scripture is simply: NO. Scripture is clear.

By the way Keith, I suppose that the spiritual condition of the aforementioned men necessitating a woman preach, is a suitable proof for your circular logic.

I am so limbered up now by the mental gymnastics, that I will now endeavor to touch the back of my neck with the tip of my nose. Yawn....
;-)

Re: - posted by HakkaMin (), on: 2004/4/18 6:11

Ready for some more mental gymnastics, Dave? :-) (Thanks for the laugh!)

Just a bit curious how far you'd take the "clear" meaning of these scriptures. Does it mean that a man shouldn't read books written by women Bible teachers? Does it mean that men shouldn't listen to the Corrie Ten Boom teachings found here on sermonindex? (Or that she shouldn't have taught them if men were present to begin with?) Does it mean that women shouldn't post their opinions on scripture here on the board? (Which several posters have likened to the church.)

I'm really just throwing out these questions to prompt a more detailed explanation of your views on this pretty complex (and relevant to what I'm doing) issue. Thanks for your input!

Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/18 11:33

HakkaMin,

Allow me to liven this up a bit.

Titus 2:3-5

3 "The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things;

4 That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children,

5 To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."

c.f.

1 Corinthians 14:34-35

"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law.³⁵ And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church"

c.f.

1 Timothy 2:1-15

1 "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men;

2 For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

3 For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour;

4 Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

5 For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;

6 Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

7 Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not;) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

8 I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.

9 In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array;

10 But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works.

11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

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

15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."

I read that over and over and I ask myself, "did he really say that?" Why yes, he did. He also said:

Philippians 4:2-4

2 "I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord.

3 And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellowlabourers, whose names are in the book of life.

4 Rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice."

Paul clearly labored along side saintly women.

The issue here is one of authority. Does that extend to the reading of a book? The ministry of Corrie Ten Boom? Posts by women on this site? I think that depends on the woman. My life was powerfully touched by the testimony of Corrie Ten Boom, but I do not think it would be scriptural to allow her to lead my men's bible study. I'm in trouble now, aren't I?

I have to stop typing now, I stepped on my hand as I was dragging my knuckles along the ground. It's very painful....

:D

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/4/18 11:50

wow, i am glad my husband does not know this. The Lord has allowed me to teach him practically everything he knows about his faith. And he will admit this wholeheartedly!!!! :-D

In Him, Chanin

Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/18 12:05

Chanin,
Thank you for helping me make my point. ;-)

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/18 12:13

Quote:

-----The answer to your question in regard to scripture is simply: NO. Scripture is clear.

Agreed.

Quote:

-----By the way Keith, I suppose that the spiritual condition of the aforementioned men necessitating a woman preach, is a suitable proof for your circular logic.

I wasn't really arguing either side; my interpretation of the related Scripture is that women should never be in a position of spiritual authority over Christian men (if they want to preach to sinners on the street, that's another matter), but I thought it would be essentially futile to argue that.

I suppose I see what you mean by circular logic: women preachers contribute to degrading spiritual conditions, contributing to a lack of qualified male preachers, contributing to the argument for women preachers, etc... As I said, I wasn't arguing for them, I was just mentioning the most compelling thing I saw in favor. I believe that, if the congregation gets to that point, they should all get on their knees and seek God, repenting of their sins, praying for their desperately needed revival.

Rightly or wrongly, I generally don't want to debate complementarian v. egalitarian, even though I'm strongly complementarian (if I preached my beliefs on the matter out in the University free speech area, I'd probably get lynched, at least in the figurative sense by the media, and possibly in the physical sense). It's very wearying. Sometimes I get into a mode of thought one might call "seperatarian," if the men and women really don't want to play their roles, very well, let us simply cease to regard gender in any decision: no romance, no marriage, no sex, no continuation of the race. Obviously I'm not truly serious, it would probably be disobedient considering God's command to be fruitful and multiply, but sometimes the situation is that exasperating.

May God guide us all,
-Keith

Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/18 12:35

Shucks Keith,
You just made my day. Well said.

Quote:

"Rightly or wrongly, I generally don't want to debate complementarian v. egalitarian, even though I'm strongly complementarian (if I preached my beliefs on the matter out in the University free speech area, I'd probably get lynched, at least in the figurative sense by the media, and possibly in the physical sense). It's very wearying. Sometimes I get into a mode of thought one might call "seperatarian," if the men and women really don't want to play their roles, very well, let us simply cease to regard gender in any decision: no romance, no marriage, no sex, no continuation of the race. Obviously I'm not truly serious, it would probably be disobedient considering God's command to be fruitful and multiply, but sometimes the situation is that exasperating."

I hope you didn't take offense at my characterization of your logic. I was just provoking you to elucidate, and you have. Thank you. The answer is indeed NO, as it applies to authority.

I found a great article contrasting the two points of view at this link:
<http://www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/abletoteach.php>

His Spirit will lead us into all truth!
:-)

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2004/4/18 15:17

Was Paul For or Against Women in Ministry?

By Craig S. Keener

The question of a woman's role in ministry is a pressing concern for today's church. It is paramount first, because of our need for the gifts of all the members God has called to serve the Church. The concern, however, has extended beyond the Church itself. Increasingly, secular thinkers attack Christianity as against women and thus irrelevant to the modern world.

Increasingly, secular thinkers attack Christianity as against women and thus irrelevant to the modern world.

The Assemblies of God and other denominations birthed in the Holiness and Pentecostal revivals affirmed women in ministry long before the role of women became a secular or liberal agenda.¹ Likewise, in the historic missionary expansion of the 19th century, two-thirds of all missionaries were women. The 19th-century women's movement that fought for women's right to vote originally grew from the same revival movement led by Charles Finney and others who advocated the abolition of slavery. By contrast, those who identified everything in the Bible's culture with the Bible's message were obligated both to accept slavery and reject women's ministry.²

For Bible-believing Christians, however, mere precedent from church history cannot settle a question; we must establish our case from Scripture. Because the current debate focuses especially around Paul's teaching, we will examine his writings after we have briefly summarized other biblical teachings on the subject.

WOMEN'S MINISTRY IN THE REST OF THE BIBLE

Because Paul accepted both the Hebrew Bible and Jesus' teachings as God's Word, we must briefly survey women's ministry in these sources. The ancient Near Eastern world, of which Israel was a part, was a man's world. Because God spoke to Israel in a particular culture, however, does not suggest that the culture itself was holy. The culture included polygamy, divorce, slavery, and a variety of other practices we now recognize as unholy.

Despite the prominence of men in ancient Israelite society, God still sometimes called women as leaders. When Josiah needed to hear the word of the Lord, he sent Hilkiah the priest and others to a person who was undoubtedly one of the most prominent prophetic figures of his day: Huldah (2 Kings 22:12–20). Deborah was not only a prophetess, but a judge (Judges 4:4). She held the place of greatest authority in Israel in her day. She is also one of the few judges of whom the Bible reports no failures (Judges 4,5).

Although first-century Jewish women rarely, if ever, studied with teachers of the Law the way male disciples did,³ Jesus allowed women to join His ranks (Mark 15:40,41; Luke 8:1–3)—something the culture could have regarded as scandalous.⁴ As if this were not scandalous enough, He allowed a woman who wished to hear His teaching "sit at his feet" (Luke 10:39)—taking a posture normally reserved for disciples. Other Jewish teachers did not allow women disciples; indeed, disciples were often teachers in training.⁵ To have sent women out on the preaching missions (e.g., Mark 6:7–13) might have proved too scandalous to be practical; nevertheless, the Gospels unanimously report that God chose women as the first witnesses of the Resurrection, even though first-century Jewish men often dismissed the testimony of women.⁶

Joel explicitly emphasized that when God poured out His Spirit, women as well as men would prophesy (Joel 2:28,29). Pentecost meant that all God's people qualified for the gifts of His Spirit (Acts 2:17,18), just as salvation meant that male or female would have the same relationship with God (Galatians 3:28). Subsequent outpourings of the Spirit have often led to the same effect.

PASSAGES WHERE PAUL AFFIRMED THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

Paul often affirmed the ministry of women despite the gender prejudices of his culture. With a few exceptions (some women philosophers), advanced education was a male domain. Because most people in Mediterranean antiquity were functionally illiterate, those who could read and speak well generally assumed teaching roles, and—with rare exceptions—these were men.⁷ In the first centuries of our era, most Jewish men—like Philo, Josephus, and many later rabbis—reflected the prejudice of much of the broader Greco-Roman culture.⁸

Women's roles varied from one region to another, but Paul's writings clearly rank him among the more progressive, not the more chauvinistic, writers of his day. Many of Paul's collaborators in the gospel were women.

Paul commended the ministry of a woman who brought his letter to the Roman Christians (Romans 16:1,2). Phoebe was a servant of the church at Cenchrea. "Servant" may refer to a deacon, a term that sometimes designated administrative responsibility in the Early Church. In his epistles, however, Paul most frequently applied the term to any minister of God's Word, including himself (1 Corinthians 3:5; 2 Corinthians 3:6; 6:4; Ephesians 3:7; 6:21). He also called Phoebe a "succorer" or "helper" of many (Romans 16:2); this term technically designated her as the church's patron or sponsor, most likely the owner of the home in which the church at Cenchrea was meeting. This entitled her to a position of honor in the church.⁹

Phoebe was not the only influential woman in the church. Whereas Paul greeted about twice as many men as women in Romans 16, he commended the ministries of about twice as many women as men in that list. (Some use the predominance of male ministers in the Bible against women in ministry, but that argument could work against men's ministry in this passage.) These commendations may indicate his sensitivity to the opposition women undoubtedly faced for their ministry and are remarkable, given the prejudice against women's ministry that existed in Paul's culture.

If Paul followed ancient custom when he praised Priscilla, he may have mentioned her before her husband Aquila because of her higher status (Romans 16:3,4). Elsewhere we learn that she and her husband taught Scripture to another minister, Apollos (Acts 18:26). Paul also listed two fellow apostles, Andronicus and Junia (Romans 16:7). Although Junia is clearly a feminine name, writers opposed to the possibility that Paul could have referred to a female apostle,¹⁰ suggest that Junia is a contraction for the masculine Junianus. This contraction, however, never occurs, and more recently has been shown to be grammatically impossible for a Latin name like Junia. This suggestion rests not on the text itself, but entirely on the presupposition that a woman could not be an apostle.

Elsewhere Paul referred to the ministry of two women in Philippi, who, like his many male fellow ministers, shared in his work for the gospel there (Philippians 4:2,3). Because women typically achieved more prominent religious roles in Macedonia than in most parts of the Roman world,¹¹ Paul's women colleagues in this region may have moved more quickly into prominent offices in the church (cf., Acts 16:14,15).

Although Paul ranked prophets second only to apostles (1 Corinthians 12:28), he acknowledged the ministry of prophets (1 Corinthians 11:5), following the Hebrew Bible (Exodus 15:20; Judges 4:4; 2 Kings 22:13,14) and early Christian practice (Acts 2:17,18; 21:9). Thus those who complain that Paul did not specifically mention women pastors by name miss the point. Paul rarely mentioned any men pastors by name, either. He most often simply mentioned his traveling companions in ministry, who were naturally men. Paul's most commonly used titles for these fellow laborers were "servant" and "fellow worker"—both of which he also applied to women (Romans 16:1,3). Given the culture he addressed, it was natural that fewer women could exercise the social independence necessary to achieve positions of ministry. Where they did, however, Paul commended them and included commendations to women apostles and prophets, the offices of the highest authority in the church.

While passages such as these establish Paul among the more progressive writers of his era, the primary controversy today rages around other passages in which Paul seemed to oppose women in ministry. Before turning there, we must examine one passage where Paul clearly addressed a local cultural situation.

PAUL ON HEAD COVERING

Although Paul often advocated the mutuality of gender roles,¹² he also worked within the boundaries of his culture where necessary for the sake of the gospel. We begin with his teaching on head coverings because, although it is not directly related to women's ministry, it will help us understand his passages concerning women in ministry. Most Christians today agree that women do not need to cover their heads in church, but many do not recognize that Paul used the same kinds of arguments for women covering their heads as for women refraining from congregational speech. In both cases, Paul used some general principles but addressed a specific cultural situation.

When Paul urged women in the Corinthian churches to cover their heads (the only place where the Bible teaches about this), he followed a custom prominent in many Eastern cultures of his day.¹³ Although women and men alike covered their heads for various reasons,¹⁴ married women specifically covered their heads to prevent men other than their husbands from lusting after their hair.¹⁵ A married woman who went out with her head uncovered was considered promiscuous and was to be divorced as an adulteress.¹⁶ Because of what head coverings symbolized in that culture, Paul asked the more liberated women to cover their heads so they would not scandalize the others. Among his arguments for head coverings is the fact God created Adam first; in the particular culture he addressed, this argument would make sense as an argument for women wearing head coverings.¹⁷

PASSAGES WHERE PAUL MAY HAVE RESTRICTED WOMEN'S MINISTRY

Because Paul, in some cases, advocated women's ministry, we cannot read his restrictions on women in ministry as universal prohibitions. Rather, as in the case of head coverings in Corinth, Paul addressed a specific cultural situation. This is not to say that Paul here or anywhere else wrote Scripture that was not for all time. It is merely to say that he did not write it for all circumstances and that we must take into account the circumstances he addressed to understand how he would have applied his principles in very different situations. In practice, no one today applies all texts for all circumstances, no matter how loudly they may defend some texts as applying to all circumstances. For instance, most of us did not send offerings for the church in Jerusalem this Sunday (1 Corinthians 16:1—3). If our churches do not support widows, we can protest that most widows today have not washed the saints' feet (1 Timothy 5:10). Likewise, few readers today would advocate our going to Troas to pick up Paul's cloak; we recognize that Paul addressed these words specifically to Timothy (2 Timothy 4:13).

LET WOMEN KEEP SILENT

Two passages in Paul's writings at first seem to contradict the progressive ones. Keep in mind that these are the only two passages in the Bible that could remotely be construed as contradicting Paul's endorsement of women in ministry.

First, Paul instructed women to be silent and save their questions about the service for their husbands at home (1 Corinthians 14:34—36). Yet, Paul could not mean silence under all circumstances, because earlier in the same letter he acknowledged that women could pray and prophesy in church (1 Corinthians 11:5); and prophecy ranked even higher than teaching (12:28).

Knowing ancient Greek culture helps us understand the passage better. Not all explanations scholars have proposed have proved satisfying. Some hold that a later scribe accidentally inserted these lines into Paul's writings, but the hard evidence for this interpretation seems slender.¹⁸ Some suggest that Paul here quoted a Corinthian position (1 Corinthians 14:34,35), which he then refuted (verse 36); unfortunately, verse 36 does not read naturally as a refutation. Others think that churches, like synagogues, were segregated by gender, somehow making women's talk disruptive. This view falters on two counts: First, gender segregation in synagogues may have begun centuries after Paul; and, second, the Corinthian Christians met in homes, whose architecture would have rendered such segregation impossible. Some also suggest that Paul addressed women who were abusing the gifts of the Spirit or a problem with judging prophecies. But while the context addresses these issues, ancient writers commonly used digressions, and the theme of church order is sufficient to unite the context.

Another explanation seems more likely. Paul elsewhere affirmed women's role in prayer and prophecy (11:5), so he cannot be prohibiting all kinds of speech here. (In fact, no church that allows women to sing actually takes this verse to mean complete silence anyway.) Since Paul only addressed a specific kind of speech, we should note that the only kind of speech he directly addressed in 14:34—36 was wives asking questions.¹⁹ In ancient Greek and Jewish lecture settings, advanced students or educated people frequently interrupted public speakers with reasonable questions. Yet the culture had deprived most women of education. Jewish women could listen in synagogues, but unlike boys, were not taught to recite the Law while growing up. Ancient culture also considered it rude for uneducated persons to slow down lectures with questions that betrayed their lack of training.²⁰ So Paul provided a long-range solution: The husbands should take a personal interest in their wives' learning and catch them up privately. Most ancient husbands doubted their wives' intellectual potential, but Paul was among the most progressive of ancient writers on the subject.²¹ Far from repressing these women, by ancient standards Paul was liberating them.²²

This text cannot prohibit women's announcing the word of the Lord (1 Corinthians 11:4,5), and nothing in the context here suggests that Paul specifically prohibited women from Bible teaching. The only passage in the entire Bible that one could directly cite against women teaching the Bible is 1 Timothy 2:11—15.

IN QUIETNESS AND SUBMISSION

In 1 Timothy 2:11—15, Paul forbade women to teach or exercise authority over men. Most supporters of women in ministry think that the latter expression means "usurp authority,"²³ something Paul would not want men to do any more than women, but the matter is disputed.²⁴ In any case, here Paul also forbade women to "teach," something he apparently allowed elsewhere (Romans 16; Philippians 4:2,3). Thus he presumably addressed the specific situation in this community. Because both Paul and his readers knew their situation and could take it for granted, the situation which elicited Paul's response was thus assumed in his intended meaning.

It is probably no coincidence that the one passage in the Bible prohibiting women teaching Scripture appears in the one set of letters where we explicitly know that false teachers were targeting and working through women. Paul's letters to Timothy in Ephesus provide a glimpse of the situation: false teachers (1 Timothy 1:6,7,19,20; 6:3—5; 2 Timothy 2:17) were misleading the women (2 Timothy 3:6,7). These women were probably (and especially) some widows who owned houses the false teachers could use for their meetings. (See

1 Timothy 5:13. One of the Greek terms here indicates spreading nonsense.)²⁵ Women were the most susceptible to false teaching only because they had been granted the least education. This behavior was bound to bring reproach on the church from a hostile society that was already convinced Christians subverted the traditional roles of women and slaves. ²⁶ So Paul provided a short-range solution: "Do not teach" (under the present circumstances); and a long-range solution: "Let them learn" (1 Timothy 2:11).

Today we read, "learn in silence," and think the emphasis lies on "silence." That these women were to learn "quietly and submissively" may reflect their witness within society (these were characteristics normally expected of women). But ancient culture expected all beginning students (unlike advanced students) to learn silently; that was why women were not supposed to ask questions (as noted above). The same word for "silence" here is applied to all Christians in the context (2:2). Paul specifically addressed this matter to women for the same reason he addressed the admonition to stop disputing to the men (2:8): They were the groups involved in the Ephesian churches. Again it appears that Paul's long-range plan was to liberate, not subordinate, women's ministry. The issue is not gender but learning God's Word.

What particularly causes many scholars to question this otherwise logical case is Paul's following argument, where he based his case on the roles of Adam and Eve (1 Timothy 2:13,14). Paul's argument from the creation order, however, was one of the very arguments he earlier used to contend that women should wear head coverings (1 Corinthians 11:7—9). In other words, Paul sometimes cited Scripture to make an ad hoc case for particular circumstances that he would not apply to all circumstances. Although Paul often makes universal arguments from the Old Testament, he sometimes (as with head coverings) makes a local argument by analogy. His argument from Eve's deception is even more likely to fit this category. If Eve's deception prohibits all women from teaching, Paul would be claiming that all women, like Eve, are more easily deceived than all men. (One wonders, then, why he would allow women to teach other women, since they would deceive them all the more.) If, however, the deception does not apply to all women, neither does his prohibition of their teaching. Paul probably used Eve to illustrate the situation of the unlearned women he addressed in Ephesus; but he elsewhere used Eve for anyone who is deceived, not just women (2 Corinthians 11:3).²⁷

Because we do not believe Paul would have contradicted himself, his approval of women's ministry in God's Word elsewhere confirms that 1 Timothy 2:9—15 cannot prohibit women's ministry in all situations; rather, he addressed a particular situation.

Some have protested that women should not hold authority over men because men are the head of women. Aside from the many debates about the meaning of the Greek term "head" (for instance, some translate it "source" instead of "authority over"),²⁸ Paul spoke only of the husband as head of his wife, not of the male gender as head of the female gender. Further, we Pentecostals and charismatics affirm that the minister's authority is inherent in the minister's calling and ministry of the Word, not the minister's person. In this case, gender should be irrelevant as a consideration for ministry—for us as it was for Paul.

CONCLUSION

Today we should affirm those whom God calls, whether male or female, and encourage them in faithfully learning God's Word. We need to affirm all potential laborers, both men and women, for the abundant harvest fields.

Craig S. Keener, Ph.D., is professor of New Testament at Eastern Seminary, Wynnewood, Pennsylvania. He is the author of 10 books, including, *Paul Women & Wives*, and 2 books that have won the highest biblical studies awards in Christianity Today in 1995 and 1999: the IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament (InterVarsity) and a Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew (Eerdmans).

ENDNOTES

1. Victor Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 188,89.

2. See S. Grenz and D. Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1995), 42—62; N. Hardesty, *Women Called To Witness* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1984); G. Usry and C. Keener, *Black Man's Religion* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996), 90—94, 98—109.
3. Ibid.
4. See G. Stanton, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford, 1989), 202; J. Stambaugh and D. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 104; W. Liefeld, "The Wandering Preacher as a Social Figure in the Roman Empire" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967), 240. Critics often maligned movements supported by women. See E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (New York: Penguin, 1993), 109.
5. To "sit before" a teacher's feet was to take the posture of a disciple (Acts 22:3; m. Ab. 1:4; ARN 6, 38 A; ARN 11, Å§ 28 B; b. Pes. 3b; p. Sanh. 10:1, Å§8). On women in Jesus' ministry, see especially B. Witherington III, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus*, SNTSM 51 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1984).
6. Jesus' contemporaries generally held little esteem for the testimony of women (Jos. Ant. 4.219; m. Yeb. 15:1, 8—10; Ket. 1:6—9; tos. Yeb. 14:10; Sifra VDDeho. pq. 7:45.1.1; cf., Luke 24:11). In Roman law, see similarly J. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1986), 165.
7. Although inscriptions demonstrate that women filled a prominent role in some synagogues (see B. Broton, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*), they also reveal that this practice was the exception rather than the norm.
8. E.g., Philo Prob. 117; see further Safrai, "Education," JPFC 955; R. Baer, Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female, AZLGJHJ 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1970).
9. See further Keener, *Women*, 237—40.
10. Because Paul nowhere else appeals to commendations from the apostles, "notable apostles" remains the most natural way to construe this phrase (see, e.g., A. Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry*, 102).
11. See V. Abrahamsen, "The Rock Reliefs and the Cult of Diana at Philippi" (Th.D. dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1986).
12. See, e.g., comments in C. Keener, "Man and Woman," pp. 583—92 in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 584—85.
13. Jewish people were among the cultures that required married women to cover their hair (e.g., m. B.K. 8:6; ARN 3, 17 A; Sifre Num. 11.2.2; 3 Macc 4:6). Elsewhere in the East, cf., e.g., R. MacMullen, "Women in Public in the Roman Empire," *Historia* 29 (1980): 209—10.
14. Sometimes men (Plut. R.Q. 14, Mor. 267A; Char. Chaer. 3.3.14) and women (Plut. R.Q. 26, Mor. 270D; Char. Chaer. 1.11.2; 8.1.7; ARN 1A) covered their heads for mourning. Similarly, both men (m. Sot. 9:15; Epict. Disc. 1.11.27) and women (ARN 9, Å§25B) covered their heads for shame. Roman women normally covered their heads for worship (e.g., Varro 5.29.130; Plut. R.Q. 10, Mor. 266C), in contrast to Greek women who uncovered their heads (SIG 3d ed., 3.999). But in contrast to the custom Paul addressed, none of these specific practices differentiates men from women.
15. Hair was the primary object of male desire (Apul. Metam. 2.8,9; Char. Chaer. 1.13.11; 1.14.1; ARN 14, Å§35B; Sifre Num. 11.2.1; p. Sanh. 6:4, Å§1). This was why many peoples required married women to cover their hair but allowed unmarried girls to go uncovered (e.g., Charillus 2 in Plut. Sayings of Spartans, Mor. 232C; Philo Spec. Leg. 3.56).
16. E.g., m. Ket. 7:6; b. Sot. 9a; R. Meir in Num. Rab. 9:12. For a similar custom and reasoning today in traditional Islamic societies, see C. Delaney, "Seeds of Honor, Fields of Shame," pp. 35—48 in *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*, ed. D. Gilmore, AAA 22 (Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987), 42, 67; cf., D. Eickelman, *The Middle East: An Anthropological Approach*, 2d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1989), 165.
17. On Paul's various arguments here, see more fully Keener, *Women*, 31—46; or more briefly, in "Man and Woman,

" 585—86. For a similar background for 1 Timothy 2:9,10, see D. Scholer, "Women's Adornment: Some Historical and Hermeneutical Observations on the New Testament Passages," *Daughters of Sarah* 6 (1980), 3—6; Keener, *Women*, 103—7.

18. G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699—705. Fee may be right that the entire Western tradition displaces this passage, but this might happen easily with a digression (common enough in ancient writing), and even in these texts the passage is moved, not missing.

19. E.g., K. Giles, *Created Woman: A Fresh Study of the Biblical Teaching* (Canberra: Acorn, 1985), 56.

20. See, e.g., Plut. *On Lectures* 4,11,13,18, *Mor.* 39CD, 43BC, 45D, 48AB; cf. *tos. Sanh.* 7:10.

21. One of the most progressive alternatives was Plut., *Advice to Bride and Groom*, 48, *Mor.* 145BC, who, nevertheless, ended up accusing women of folly if left to themselves (48, *Mor.* 145DE).

22. For more detailed documentation, see Keener, *Women*, 70—100; similarly, B. Witherington, III, *Women in the Earliest Churches*, SNTSM 59 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1988), 90—104.

23. See further discussion in Keener, *Women*, pp. 108,9.

24. For recent and noteworthy arguments in favor of "exercise authority," see the articles by Baldwin, Kästner, and Schreiner in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9—15* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995).

25. The Greek expression for the women's activities here probably refers to spreading false teaching; see G. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, NIBC (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988), 122.

26. Given Roman society's perception of Christians as a subversive cult, false teaching that undermined Paul's strategies for the church's public witness (see Keener, *Women*, 139—56) could not be permitted (cf., 1 Timothy 3:2,7,10; 5:7,10,14; 6:1; Titus 1:6; 2:1—5,8,10; A. Padgett, "The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the hina Clauses of Titus 2:1—10," *EQ* 59 (1987) 52; D. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*, SBLDS, 71).

27. First Timothy 2:15 may also qualify the preceding verses; see Keener, *Women*, 118—20.

28. Catherine Clark Kroeger and others believe it implies "source," Wayne Grudem and others that it implies "authority over." With Gordon Fee, I suspect that ancient literature allows both views but that Paul used an image relevant in his day (see further Keener, *Women*, 32—36, 168).

Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/18 15:40

Hulsey,

Thank you for that exhaustive treatment of "biblical egalitarianism". A point by point refutation would be senseless. I will only say that not a few of his assertions were made based on biblical silence. Were it not for that, I believe he would have refuted his own perspective.

This is not a matter of spiritual pride, but I wouldn't necessarily boast about some of those pentecostal and AG women preachers.

In any case, I don't think anyone proposed that women cannot serve, the question is one of office and authority, not of the exercise of gifts.

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/4/18 17:12

I can honestly say that i don't have all the answers about this. I do know what gifts that the Lord has given me. If I happen to teach anyone anything- I don't want to do it with "authority" over anyone. That is not my desire in any way. If I teach anyone anything it is because I am just a vessel that is offered up to the Lord to be used by Him in any way He wants.

I say to Him- "here I am Lord, an empty vessel for you to use- use me however you choose." I do not look for opportunities to be "over" anyone or undermine anyone's authority. I just go where He leads and do what He says.

I hope I am humble enough not to do anything that will make someone stumble- so if they are weaker in the faith and feel they need to follow more closely to the law- I will discern this and try to keep from offending or be a stumbling block. It is what is good for others not myself- that matters. (Romans14)

I wonder though, if Paul says not to wear braided hair and a few other things he says- then is it wrong for me to wear my hair braided?

If you are walking in the Spirit, you will know what is right and wrong to do. I have no desire to be in a position of authority with anyone. I don't think anyone should. We are all to submit one to another and be in the "posture" of footwashing.

If men feel that their authority is at risk- why is that? Are some being overly cautious because someone might come and steal their authority away.

My husband is the head of our home- yet i am the spiritual leader. it is a given. Those are my gifts. My husband owns a business and his gifts deal with giving and business things.

I really don't know all the answers- I just know what God calls me to do and when He tells me not to do something. (He always makes this perfectly clear!) He has never once shown me not to talk to a man about spiritual matters- and usually if I am, I am teaching them something or we are teaching each other something.

I am very open to the Lord showing me the truth on this. He knows this. I am always asking for His cleansing and purging of my heart. If i am wrong - maybe He just hasn't gotten to that yet. :-)

Satisfied in Him, Chanin

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/18 17:37

Dave, your last line or so is of great value to this debate

Quote:
----- I don't think anyone proposed that women cannot serve, the question is one of office and authority, not of the exercise of gifts.

Office and authority and exercise of gifts, how crucial this is my brief thoughts are
Even in the Godhead there is hierarchy and each in total union and communion with each other, The Father has specific work as does the Son all by the Spirit.
to me this shows an order of things eternal. Then in creation the roles of the 3 in 1 are plain.
Then in creation of man then woman, Also given specific roles different yet in perfect togetherness,
A picture is given in all this so strongly, then the fall, then everything is now out of its proper ordained order. Man, created spiritual became carnal.
All through the ages Male has dominated and often abused women because of this malfunction. Also Woman has lost her God given role as set out in the beginning.
Christ came to return and enable us to that first state of relationship (most of Romans etc)
In light of this, there is now neither male nor female, Jew or Greek, IN CHRIST.
spiritually the same
but practically there are different roles that are unchangeable.
That is why, in an earlier post the cultural difference argument is not valid, although on first investigation it looks plausible.
It's the Authority issue and church government practical issue that is the point. I hope this helps!
There is a good book I read called 'Equal but Different' by Michael Harper which helped me :-)

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2004/4/18 18:03

Delboy, we are very close in the way we see this issue. You are describing ontological equality, and functional subordination. Men and women are totally equal as to their being, but functionally the wife subordinates to the husband. But that is in a marriage. The only marriage as far as the Church is concerned is that of Christ and the Church. I guess that makes me a future wife. And as you correctly quoted Galatians, There is no male or female, but all are one in Christ.

Chanin, I have enjoyed reading your posts, and as a man, I have learned many things from your writings. I hope you keep on.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/18 19:15

Chanin,

You imply that perhaps men feel that their authority is at risk or they feel threatened. This is, I'm afraid, a bit more academic and fundamental than that. Regardless of whether or not we ordain women in a functional capacity, and whether or not they are able to perform (and many have shown that they are more than capable, and, in fact, more capable at times), this does not preclude the admonition of scripture. DelBoy's assessment was quite lucid. It is absolutely a matter of role and position, not exercise of gift. There are not male or female in Christ, but as a practical matter in the church there are different roles advanced by God's word.

By the way, Hulsey, if you support the view of the paper that you posted, then you are in error when you assert that you are aligned with DelBoy's comments. You cannot have it both ways.

Let me say this, I started posting to this thread in a light hearted manner. This is, however, a serious issue. The same people that supported the ordination of women are the same individuals who are now screaming that we should ordain homosexuals. So, in all seriousness, it is time that we get back to the bible in all things. Like someone posted a week or so ago...Rise Up 'O Men of GOD !

If anyone takes exception with this, I have stated my position and what I feel is a correct exegesis of the text, and since I sense that the tone is about to get dark and emotions are about to run high, this is all I have to say on the matter, I will not post again to this thread.

.....

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/18 20:00

In My particular post i have tried to look at the more complete picture as i see it. Please forgive me guys if i've strayed. Admittedly, the very first post was taken from Timothy. But I feel to do this subject justice there is a bigger picture hence returning to Genesis etc,

Hulsey, Graig S. Keener's paper only really tackles the issues from Paul I feel. The issue of men and women etc is not restricted to a view on marriage

When we look at the heart of God He has made ALL things clear, (in regard to my last post) It's not about subordination or domination or authority primarily. No it's about standing and position. We are bought back into the original perfect spiritual relationship as first intended. Remember, the very descriptive words we have been using have been bent and twisted and our views coloured by those abuses. The fall changed so much as we know.

My conviction is, when we receive that same SPIRIT as was in Christ, We do become as Adam and Eve. Or as God intends

Chanin, your posts are a blessing and BigDave, Yours too, thanks
:-D

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/18 22:04

Quote:
-----I say to Him- "here I am Lord, an empty vessel for you to use- use me however you choose." I do not look for opportunities to be "over" anyone or undermine anyone's authority. I just go where He leads and do what He says.

I ask no more, less, or else than that, of anyone.

Quote:
-----I wonder though, if Paul says not to wear braided hair and a few other things he says- then is it wrong for me to wear my hair braided?
d?

I assume you are referring to:

1 Timothy 2:9

In like manner also, that women should adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobermindedness, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly array,

and/or:

1 Peter 3

1 Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that if any obey not the Word, they also may be won without the word by the conduct of their wives

2 while they behold your chaste manner of living coupled with fear.

3 When adorning yourselves, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing gold, or of putting on apparel;

4 but let it be the hidden man of the heart which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which in the sight of God is of great price.

5 For in this manner in olden times the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands,

I understand the prohibition of braided hair to be an application of the principle of modesty and "modest apparel." Two parts to it, as I see it:

1) Modesty in dress, not wearing anything that will attract undue attention, nor expensive adornment. I agree with the principle of "no unnecessary adornment," which would probably appear radical if I preached on it. John Wesley took it farther, as I understand it: <http://gbgm-umc.org/umhistory/wesley/sermons/serm-088.stm>

2) Modesty in attractiveness (for lack of a better term, i.e. not doing anything unnecessary that will significantly attract the opposite sex (other than your spouse, of course). One doesn't usually think of braided hair as a lust-causer, and it's certainly not in quite the same category as tight jeans, short skirts, and too-low-neckline shirts, but it can still be a problem. Personally I only really look at the face and hair of a woman, for a number of reasons, and I've found that certain arrangements or adornments of hair catch my eye far more than if it were worn naturally. God's done enough in me that I don't lust, of course, but it makes it that much harder to not pay too much visual attention.

Anyway, that's a long way of saying "it's not exactly morally wrong, but it's easier on the men if you don't."

Quote:

-----If you are walking in the Spirit, you will know what is right and wrong to do.

Agreed. That's a mighty big "If" for many people, but the statement is thoroughly true.

Quote:

-----I have no desire to be in a position of authority with anyone. I don't think anyone should.

Should be in a position of authority, or desire to be? I agree that no one should desire to be in authority for the sake of being in that position, but rather because leadership and authority are necessary and the person wishes to serve in that capacity rather than let it go undone.

Quote:

-----We are all to submit one to another and be in the "posture" of footwashing.

Agreed.

Quote:

-----If men feel that their authority is at risk- why is that? Are some being overly cautious because someone might come and steal their authority away.

If the men are resisting female authority simply because they don't want to lose their authority, I'd say the men are in the wrong. However, as others have pointed out (not in as many words), the issue isn't male authority, it's Biblical authority, it's God's authority.

If the only one that would be harmed by whatever was me, and there was some halfway compelling reason to do it, I generally wouldn't object. Respect me, disrespect me, treat me kindly, abuse me, use my talents, despise them, listen to me, ignore me, support me, persecute me, love me, hate me... all of it may have some kind of minor effect, but I don't really care about any of that; the real issue is "are we obeying God?"

Quote:

-----My husband is the head of our home- yet i am the spiritual leader. it is a given. Those are my gifts. My husband owns a business and his gifts deal with giving and business things.

It would appear God has honored the choices your household has made, I won't endeavor to argue against empirical fact. I'll be frank, though, and I hope you won't take this wrong: Your husband, and any healthy male that's been Christian for long, should be qualified at least to be spiritual leader/authority/main teacher over his own household. If that's not the case, something is wrong. Nothing wrong with the mother teaching the children (and even the husband, in some situations) about spiritual things, but the husband should know his Bible through and through, and be qualified to make final decisions (well, God makes the final decisions, but in the context of the household...).

Quote:

-----I really don't know all the answers

Nor I.

Quote:

-----I just know what God calls me to do and when He tells me not to do something. (He always makes this perfectly clear!)

Always? I wish that were true with me, but "most of the time" has worked pretty well.

Quote:

-----He has never once shown me not to talk to a man about spiritual matters

There's a difference between having a spiritual conversation, and preaching from the pulpit. There's a difference between teaching a family Bible study, and teaching a Church Bible study. Lord knows He's gifted you such that you'd preach better from the pulpit and teach a better Bible study than most (male or female), but that's more an indication of the despicable state of the quality of most preachers and teachers than it is an indication that you should be in those roles.

Quote:

-----I am very open to the Lord showing me the truth on this. He knows this. I am always asking for His cleansing and purging of my heart.

I ask no more than this. If someone isn't persuaded that Scriptural principle is for/against something, I don't really expect them to act as if it were.

God guide us all,
-Keith

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2004/4/18 23:06

Quote:
-----By the way, Hulsey, if you support the view of the paper that you posted, then you are in error when you assert that you are aligned with DelBoy's comments.

I said we were close to each other's view, not completely aligned, and yes I whole heartedly agree with the paper I posted :-D

Quote:
-----The same people that supported the ordination of women are the same individuals who are now screaming that we should ordain homosexuals.

Not so. The Assemblies of God has ordained women almost since its inception and there is not even a hint of support for the homosexual agenda in the A/G's. David Wilkerson supports women preachers. Teresa Conlon, Carter Conlon's wife, preaches regularly at Times Square Church and their stand against homosexuality is more than firm.

You and I have a disagreement about how to interpret these passages. We are probably not going to ever agree. The paper I posted states pretty clearly the way I stand.

Quote:
-----If anyone takes exception with this, I have stated my position and what I feel is a correct exegesis of the text, and since I sense that the tone is about to get dark and emotions are about to run high, this is all I have to say on the matter, I will not post again to this thread.

While I don't think your exegesis is correct, you don't have to worry about the tone. I'm sure you don't think mine is either. I'm not the least bit angered with the fact that you disagree with me. I hope you aren't angry with me. I'm sure we'll find many issues that we do agree on. That fact that we both post on this site should tell us that we have much more in common than we think.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/4/19 0:00

No hard feelings.....

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2004/4/19 0:07

Quote:
-----By the way, do you carry Hamish MacKenzie's Preaching the Eternities/ i can't find it anywhere. God bless you richly, thanks for taking up the challenge.

I'm not sure. Greg Gordon is the one to ask. He's the administrator of this site. His nick name is sermonindex. Do you have some info on Hamish MacKenzie? Perhaps we could send some feelers out and try to find some of his sermons.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/19 7:20

Can i just say,Jeremy,Keith,big Dave,and chanin all your posts are what this site is about,building one another up in our most holy faith, i'm growing are you lot? :-D

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/4/19 7:46

Derek (and others), I have had the wonderful opportunity to grow in Forbearance on this forum. This is what i know the Lord has wanted me to learn. :-)

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I have become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and ALL KNOWLEDGE, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, but have not LOVE, I am NOTHING. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it PROFITS ME NOTHING.

Love SUFFERS LONG and is KIND; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up; does not BEHAVE RUDELY, does not SEEK ITS OWN, is not PROVOKED, thinks no evil; does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth; bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.

Love never fails. But whether there are prophecies, they will fail; whether there are tongues, they will cease; whether there is knowledge, it will vanish away. For we know IN PART and we prophesy in part.

This is the most EXCELLENT way! Amen!
:-)

Satisfied in Him, Chanin

Re: - posted by Will (), on: 2004/4/20 19:01

Firstly I must admit that I haven't read all the posts in this thread.

The Word of God says:

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

For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.

Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control." - 1 Timothy 2:11-15

Many say that this is to do with the culture at the time Paul wrote the epistle. But I remind you of what Warren Wiersbe says on the issue, and how people try to put fences up in the Bible saying, 'Oh that was for the Jews, that was for the Christians at that point in time' etc etc

"**All** Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work." - 2 Timothy 3:16-17

I've noticed people are giving examples of how Jesus allowed woman to be involved in ways at which culture wouldn't allow him. Or other biblical examples of woman in authoritative roles. But do these examples do not take away the authority of other passages of scripture?

Men and woman were created by God and were designed for different roles and purposes.

Isn't it about time we got back to biblical Christianity?

Isn't it about time we stopped chopping and cutting and translating Scripture to be in line with our own personal beliefs?

I believe the correct guidelines for a Church are found in the New Testament, and we need to get back to those guidelines.

There are many people who truly believe the greatest key to revival is obedience.

Just a few thoughts of mine on the subject.

wm

Re: The role of women in ministry - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/4/20 23:29

Quote:

-----Isn't it about time we got back to biblical Christianity?

It's been time. It's always time. The reason there's an argument about this at all is because people have often vastly different ideas about what biblical Christianity is. That's why you have so many denominations and so many non-denominational churches with opposing beliefs.

It all boils down to this: Man is not perfect. We all try our hardest to do what we think is right in the eyes of God, realize that mercy is available for the areas where we've got it wrong, and remember always that God will straighten us out when we die (I, for one, am looking forward to it. I quite dislike stumbling around in my human ignorance and stupidity).

Re: - posted by Everlast (), on: 2004/4/21 1:25

Well...I guess if I went according to apparently the majority of the posters view on this topic...I had better not preach tomorrow night in the youth service I am scheduled for! Man (humans) have tried for centuries, nay thousands of years to put a limit on what God is capable of doing (through whomever He chooses!) Heaven forbid God should deign to choose, or call a woman to any knowledge about the revelations of God and not be able to teach or preach it! I don't want to appear offensive...but I know what God has called me to do and that he has prepared my heart and my messages to be heard by those He chooses. Just my two cents! :)

SHELLY

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/21 2:22

Quote:

-----Well...I guess if I went according to apparently the majority of the posters view on this topic...

Actually, though I'm not sure, I think the majority here are at least egalitarian enough to let you be a guest preacher. I'm not one of them, but you don't answer to me, you answer to God.

Quote:

-----I had better not preach tomorrow night in the youth service I am scheduled for!

For the record, I agree. (I realize there's a responding chorus from humans and demons alike, "For the record, nobody cares.")

Quote:

-----Man (humans) have tried for centuries, nay thousands of years to put a limit on what God is capable of doing (through whomever He chooses!)

That's true, many have misguidedly attempted that. I am not currently one who does so, however. Frankly, I believe God could make a square circle if He really wanted to. More to the point, I believe God could anoint women as extremely powerful and effective preachers of His Word. I believe God could use Jesus-hating heathen to preach His Word and bring people to salvation (I've even heard of one such case!). The middle of those three is by far the more likely, I'm not trying to use that old tired "take to logical extremity and argue ad absurdum against that," but I think we should really realize

e something:

It's not a question of whether God **can use us** if we act a certain way, it's a question of whether God's given revelation shows that he **wants** us to act a certain way.

I do hope I've made myself clear, as I'm very reluctant to try to be more so, for I do not wish to unnecessarily offend any of the readers (if I have not yet done so).

Quote:
-----Heaven forbid God should deign to choose, or call a woman to any knowledge about the revelations of God and not be able to teach or preach it!

I'm not quite sure what you're saying here (if the "not" weren't there I could see it as an example saying of the strawman complementarian). Nonetheless, I wouldn't say there's anything necessarily wrong with a woman preaching or teaching (if God's thus called them, as I'd ask of any man) to, for example, the heathen, or to her children in a family setting. It's when a woman gets behind the pulpit and starts exercising spiritual authority over a congregation including men that I think a potentially dangerous departure is made from New Testament Christianity. Why do I think so? I think every Scripture and argument I would bring up has been brought up already in this thread.

Quote:
-----I don't want to appear offensive...

Nor do I, but you appear petulant, and I probably appear stubborn and sexist. Let us trust the Lord to judge our hearts and try not to judge too harshly by appearance.

Quote:
-----but I know what God has called me to do and that he has prepared my heart and my messages to be heard by those He chooses.

If that's what you honestly believe God wants you to do, even in light of Scripture, there's no way I can expect you to do otherwise, because it would be sin for you to disobey what you think to be God's will. Never cease seeking the Lord in prayer, for direction, correction, encouragement, and power (and the innumerable other things we need from Him).

God's grace be with you,
-Keith

Re: hierarchy - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/21 3:47

Hi Delboy
you write Even in the Godhead there is hierarchy and each in total union and communion with each other, The father has specific working as does the Son all by the Spirit.

technically, among trinitarians, the word hierarchy would be heresy. There is chosen role within the godhead, but hierarchy would produce a graded trinity of the kind that Origen held.

We need to remember that all we know of the Word of God (I mean a person here not an utterance) is what has been revealed in connection with His human mission. In that mission He chose submission to the will of the Father, and in that role 'the Father is greater than I'. According to Philippians 2:6ff He emptied himself, He took upon Himself the form of a servant, He humbled Himself, He became obedient to death. Notice, these were all His choices. In a hierarchy they would have been imposed not chosen. In His essential nature He is co-equal, co-substantial, co-eternal.

Pertaining to this thread it may be interesting to note my word 'choice'. Submission is not subservience. This is moment by moment choice not the fixed positioning of hierarchy.

Re: women - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/4/21 9:04

I was wondering what others might think about this. I am finding that it to be more and more true as I grow in Christ and I learn to lay my life down for others:

The Lord chose to compare a family with the Trinity. In so doing, He called the head of the family, the man, after His own name, Father. Then He likened the children in the family to His own Son. The second named person in the trinity. So, we have in the family a person who represents God the Father, and we have a person who represents God the Son. By process of elimination, we come to realize who represents the Holy Spirit in the family. There is only one person left, and that's the lady. That means that you-the woman, wife, mother—represent the Holy Spirit. If you would like to find your duties in life, just find in the Bible what the Holy Spirit is supposed to do. He comforts; so does Mother. He teaches; so does Mother. He instructs; so does Mother. He leads; so does Mother. Think of all the ministries the Holy Spirit has in the world. He's the unseen One; so is Mother. He is the one who gives the others attention; so does Mother. If you want to know what your duties are in the family, all you have to do is find out the duties of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, for you are the Holy Spirit of the home.

I've heard it said before that woman was not taken from man's head to lord over him, nor from his heel to be crushed by him. But this magnificent creation of God was taken from man's rib, near his heart, so she could be loved and protected by him.

There she is Miss Universe! She was created because all of the perfection of the Garden did not give Adam what he needed. There she stands with the beauty of Sarah as she made Abraham her lord, with the courage of Deborah as she stood beside Barak in the battle against the enemy, with the unselfishness of Hannah as she prayed for and reared her son, with the devotion of Rizpah as she vowed to protect even the dead bodies of her own, with the royalty of Esther as she stood before the king and spared a nation. There she is again with the grace of Lydia, the poise of Mary, the humility of Phoebe, the friendship of Dorcas, the faith of Rhoda, the ambition of Salome. The patience of Anna, the loveliness of Rachel, the love of Jochebed, the gentleness of Elisabeth...I'm sure you get the idea.

Take your Bible, look up the term Holy Spirit, and find all He does. Then decide that you are going to do what He does. Get alone somewhere with God and tell Him... "Oh God thank you for making me a woman...help me to be the kind of woman you need. I'm satisfied with being a woman. That where I go things will become brighter. ~Chris Cheedie

I am finding that this is what is going on with my husband and I. He is doing a small group at work studying My Utmost for His Highest. I give him the insight and the extra "depth" to understand it better and then he takes that wisdom into the small group. The group members are really growing. They think he is so smart and wise. :-D

I thought the Holy Spirit analogy was good. I felt it witnessing to me right away.

Any thoughts on this?

Walking with Him, Chanin

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/21 14:31

I thought I would hold my fire on this one for a while. The original question of this thread was "Can women preach/teach in church?". I haven't noticed that anyone has specifically mentioned the 'in church' context so I will add a word or two.

1st Corinthians is unique in the way it gives us a glimpse into 'a church' meeting together in the 1st century. It is very different to what most folk experience as 'a church meeting' and yet this was clearly the norm in the earliest days. 1st Corinthians is also significant in the opening verses in the way that Paul clearly expected this letter to be read by more than the church in Corinth. It is written to "the church of God which is in Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." Those who interpret Paul's instructions as having just local significance seem to have missed this important point. The writer of this letter was very conscious that he was not just writing to Corinth. What he wrote to Corinth was what he was teaching in every church. For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every church. (1Co 4:17 KJV)

Added to this we see that in the later chapters Paul was evidently referring to the gathering of the saints in Corinth. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. (1

Co 14:35 KJV) There is a clear distinction here between 'at home' and 'in the church'. We know that Priscilla and Aquila took Apollos home with them and taught him together, but that was not 'in the church'. We know the stories of Deborah, Huldah etc but those were not 'in the church' either.

This question also distinguished between 'preaching' and 'teaching'. Have we addressed that in our forum?

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/21 17:19

Quote:

I haven't noticed that anyone has specifically mentioned the 'in church' context

I don't know if I got at what you mean here, but I distinguished between preaching in "church" (i.e. a church meeting) to the congregation, and preaching outside "church" to the heathen, or preaching (more likely teaching) to children at home. Or at least I remember distinguishing between them, my memory is far from perfect.

Quote:

-----This question also distinguished between 'preaching' and 'teaching'. Have we addressed that in our forum?

I don't think we've discussed that, at least not in this thread. To me most, if not all, of the sermons I heard until recently were "teaching," in that the moral state of the audience was not forcibly addressed (though sometimes it was addressed). Then I heard a good Holiness preacher, and he "preached." One might, only partly joking, define it thus:

Preaching n. pree-ching

- 1) the Christian recreation where a congregation selects an individual to scream at them, preferably with Biblical support, for anywhere from 15 minutes to 4 hours.
- 2) the practice whereby an individual selects themselves to perform the aforementioned, but in public among a less willing audience.

I'll leave a serious definition to someone more qualified.

As for the stuff you quoted, Chanin, I find it interesting, but I'm inclined to think there is no earthly type of the Trinity, and that all such attempts to analogize (is that a word?) the Trinity into an earthly example will have serious flaws. For example, the attempting to compare it with the tripartite nature of man (if you believe we have body, soul, and spirit), Jesus can be paralleled with the body (being the only member with one), and "the Holy Spirit" sort of leaps out as a parallel with the spirit, but that leaves the Father (by process of elimination, as was used in the quoted article to loosely suggest the "motherhood" of the Holy Spirit) as the soul, which doesn't make a lot of sense (to me, at least).

Biblically, just briefly, I'd mention Matthew 1:18 ("... was found with child of the Holy Ghost") and that the idea of "Comforter" may have a very different connotation than we're used to; as I understand it there's a tapestry of the 1066 invasion of England by William the Conqueror, and it depicts either William or the English commander prodding his troops with a spear, the caption being "comforting his troops." That connotation is certainly consistent with my experience with the Holy Ghost, and is something I'd generally attribute to a masculine, rather than feminine, being, if I had to choose. I may be totally off-base reading that connotation in to the text, though, I wonder if anyone knows more about the issue.

I also thought I'd at least make the quip that every time I know of where the idea of "God the Mother" has emerged, there's been trouble. But I won't advance it as a serious argument, not wanting to be mean.

If I may espouse my own opinion on the matter (a right I perhaps too often presume), which I acquired more or less in total from a book, I'd say that we humans are intended the "vessels," "receptacles," etc, in essence the "spiritual female." Your average Texan cowboy Christian might have some difficulty with the idea of being spiritually "female," but I think it's at least reasonable given the references to the Church as the "Bride" of Christ. It's quite possible I've taken this in entirely the wrong direction, if so feel free to let me know.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/21 17:34

I don't know if I got at what you mean here, but I distinguished between preaching in "church" (i.e. a church meeting) to the congregation, and preaching outside "church" to the heathen, or preaching (more likely teaching) to children at home. Or at least I remember distinguishing between them, my memory is far from perfect.

a Corinthian/1st century true meeting of a church took place under the Lordship of Christ and the conscious leading of the Holy Spirit. It had no 'order of service' or 'designated preachers'. We might get closer to understanding what a New Testament teacher is if we reminded ourselves that such a person was not expounding Ephesians, as it had not been written. The preacher/evangelist relayed the good news. The preacher/herald proclaimed what God had accomplished in Christ. I see no reason in the book why a woman may not do this. The teacher was, almost certainly to my mind, systematising and standardising revelation. Such a person, in the church, was setting doctrinal standards and limits; the New Testament does not allow a woman to do this.

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/4/21 17:49

About the analogy of the Trinity to the family:

I did think it was interesting and relatable where in Gen. 2:18 The Lord makes a helper suitable for Adam - then in John 14:16 Jesus comforts His disciples with the promise of the Holy Spirit, referring to Him as "another Helper".

I am not saying that women are the same as the Holy Spirit- I am just relating the similarities in the job of a "helper". If a woman wants to know how to be a "helper"- look at what the Holy Spirit does. Comforts, teaches, etc....

I thought it was neat.

Walking with Him, Chanin

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/21 18:07

Quote:
-----The preacher/evangelist relayed the good news. The preacher/herald proclaimed what God had accomplished in Christ. I see no reason in the book why a woman may not do this.

I agree with that. Evangelism is fine, sharing testimonies (personal or otherwise) is fine, etc.

Quote:
-----The teacher was, almost certainly to my mind, systematising and standardising revelation. Such a person, in the church, was setting doctrinal standards and limits; the New Testament does not allow a woman to do this.

I agree with that too.

Well, that was simple. Thanks for the definitions of preaching/teaching, never quite thought of it that way before.

Re: hierarchy - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/21 18:43

Hi Ron, Yes upon reflection maybe hierarchy is not the best descriptive to use, although I did mean it in the purest sense of the word.

Quote:
-----We need to remember that all we know of the Word of God (I mean a person here not an utterance) is what has been revealed in connection with His human mission. In that mission He chose submission to the will of the Father, and in that role 'the Father is greater than I'. According to Philippians 2:6ff He emptied himself, He took upon Himself the form of a servant, He humbled Himself, He became obedient to death. Notice, these were all His choices. In a hierarchy they would have been imposed not chosen. In His essential nature He is co-equal, co-substantial, co-eternal.

Thanks for that. I also mentioned the misuse of words such as submissive, authority, dominance, etc in one of the earlier threads. I concluded that from the perfect relationship man had and then after the fall, man's being was first spiritual and then became carnal. And ever since. Until the second Adam came there was no way out. I also take the line of Keith's posts in the main,

I think your points about the early church Ron are very helpful to this debate :-D

Re: - posted by Everlast (), on: 2004/4/22 0:25

One final question...what do those of you who say women shouldn't preach think about women of God in modern history? I mean such pioneer missionaries/ministers as Lillian Trasher, Florence Steidel, Aimee Semple McPherson, etc. Women who were alone (or dominant in the ministry) yet served God with all of their hearts. There are other women as well, and I would be glad to get their names. All of the work they accomplished...all of the souls added to the kingdom of God. Was God's hand and blessing not upon their ministries? I guess I don't understand that if it is not scriptural for a woman to preach then how did these women do so much for God? If they were in defiance of Scripture, why were they blessed and used so mightily? I am not trying to be argumentative...I truly don't understand how they could do so much, yet according to some be in defiance to Scripture. I really would appreciate any thoughts. :)

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/22 0:44

First, there's the question of whether they were really acting contrary to Scripture; were they exerting spiritual authority over Christian men? were they laying down doctrine?

Second, God has used many that were pretty far off on this and other issues. I don't want to speak ill of Martin Luther, but I've read a number of very unfavorable things about him, nonetheless God used him mightily. John Calvin was apparently not without his dark side, but God used him. I've not heard anything against Charles Finney's moral character (indeed I'd be very surprised to hear such), but I've noticed that he's generally known for two things: strange (many say heretical) theology, and being mightily used of God. I don't want to compare women preachers with Judas, but I think there's something in the fact that God worked through him as he worked through the other apostles (if Judas hadn't exhibited any of the gifts of the Spirit, I doubt the other apostles would have had as much trouble determining who the traitor was when Jesus mentioned it).

Indeed, overstepping one's gender role could be seen as a fairly minor offense compared with the flaws in some of God's more famous vessels. Doesn't mean it's not an offense, but I think that's either proven or not at this point.

edit- oh, and I forgot to mention the entire Catholic church

Re: - posted by Will (), on: 2004/4/22 4:49

Quote:
-----...what do those of you who say women shouldn't preach think about women of God in modern history? I mean such pioneer missionaries/ministers as Lillian Trasher, Florence Steidel, Aimee Semple McPherson, etc.

Who are they? I can only vaguely recall hearing the first name.

In fact you have raised an interesting point; I mean the most famous woman preacher I can think of would be Catherine Booth (husband of William Booth who founded the Salvation Army). And when it comes down to it she is more known for the fact that she was a preacher than her actual preaching. The most famous Woman of God that come to my mind were not preachers.

But really, we shouldn't bring protagonism into the debate. The question is not whether woman preachers bring results, or are famous, but rather is it according to the Word of God?

Quote:
-----I guess I don't understand that if it is not scriptural for a woman to preach then how did these women do so much for God?

Was Jeremiah a successful preacher? There are many things that come into the Church that appear successful but are wrong.

The only reason I am speaking out against this is because I believe the Scriptures are clear on the issue, and I long to see the Church becoming obedient to all that God has called both men and woman to.

I am looking at the quote from Finney above me right now, "Revival is a renewed conviction of sin and repentance, followed by an intense desire to live in obedience to God."

And as Ravenhill says, "We have to make up our minds if this Book is absolute or obsolete. It's either got the answer for our generation or forget it."

Re: women speaking preaching teaching, on: 2004/4/22 14:05

This essay is by Margaret Fell, a 17th century Quaker and associate of George Fox. Sorry its long but it is very relevant here. Jake

Women's Speaking

Justified, Proved, and Allowed of by the Scriptures, All such as speak by the Spirit and Power of the Lord Jesus.

And how Women were the first that Preached the Tidings of the Resurrection of Jesus, and were sent by Christ's own Command, before he Ascended to the Father, John 20. 17.

Whereas it hath been an Objection in the Minds of many, and several times hath been objected by the Clergy, or Ministers and others, against Women's speaking in the Church; and so consequently may be taken, that they are condemned for meddling in the things of God: The ground of which Objection is taken from the Apostle's Words, which he writ in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. 14. Vers. 34, 35. And also what he writ to Timothy in the first Epistle, Chap. 2. Vers. 11, 12. But how far they wrong the Apostle's Intentions in these Scriptures, we shall shew clearly when we come to them in their course and order. But first let me lay down how God himself hath manifested his Will and Mind concerning Women, and unto women.

And first, when God created Man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he them, Male and Female; and God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply: And God said, Behold, I have given you of every Herb, &c. Gen. 1. Here God joyns them together in his own Image, and makes no such Distinctions and Differences as Men do; for though they be weak, he is strong; and as he said to the Apostle, His Grace is sufficient, and his Strength is made manifest in Weakness, 2 Cor. 12. 9. And such hath the Lord chosen, even the weak things of the World, to confound the things which are mighty; and things which are despised, hath God chosen, to bring to nought things that are, 1 Cor. 1. And God hath put no such difference between the Male and Female, as Men would make.

It is true, The Serpent, that was more subtle than any other Beast of the Field, came unto the Woman with his Temptations, and with a Lye; his Subtlety discerning her to be the weaker Vessel, or more inclinable to hearken to him, when he said, If ye eat, your Eyes shall be opened; and the Woman saw, that the Fruit was good to make one wise: There the Temptation got into her, and she did eat, and gave to her Husband, and he did eat also; and so they were both tempted into the Transgression and Disobedience; and therefore God said unto Adam, (who hid himself when he heard his Voice) Hast thou eaten of the Tree, which I commanded thee that thou should'st not eat? And Adam said, The Woman which thou gavest me, she gave me of the Tree, and I did eat. And the Lord said unto the Woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the Woman said, The Serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. Here the Woman spoke the Truth unto the Lord. See what the Lord saith, ver. 15. after he had pronounced Sentence on the Serpent, I will put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed; it shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel, Gen. 3.

Let this Word of the Lord, which was from the beginning, stop the Mouths of all that oppose Women's Speaking in the Power of the Lord; for he hath put Enmity between the Woman and the Serpent; and if the Seed of the Woman speak not, the Seed of the Serpent speaks; for God hath put Enmity between the two Seeds; and it is manifest, that those that speak against the Woman and her Seed's Speaking, speak out of the Envy of the old Serpent's Seed. And God hath fulfilled his Word and his Promise, When the fulness of time was come, he sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons, Gal. 4. 4, 5.

Moreover, the Lord is pleased, when he mentions his Church, to call her by the Name of Woman, by his Prophets, saying, I have called thee as a Woman forsaken, and grieved in Spirit, and as a Wife of Youth, Isai. 54. Again, How long wilt thou go about, thou back-sliding Daughter? For the Lord hath created a new thing in the Earth, a Woman shall compass a Man, Jer. 31. 22. And David, when he was speaking of Christ and his Church, he saith, The King's Daughter is all glorious within, her Cloathing is of wrought Gold, she shall be brought unto the King; with gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought; they shall enter into the King's Pallace, Psal. 45. And also King Solomon in his Song, where he speaks of Christ and his Church, where she is complaining and calling for Christ, he saith, If thou knowest not, O thou fairest among Women, go thy way by the Footsteps of the Flock, Cant. 1. 8. c. 5. 9. And John, when he saw the Wonder that was in Heaven, he saw a Woman clothed with the Sun, and the Moon under her feet, and upon her Head a Crown of twelve Stars,

rs; and there appeared another Wonder in Heaven, a great red Dragon stood ready to devour her Child. Here appears the Envy of the Dragon, Rev. 12.

Thus much may prove, that the Church of Christ is represented as a Woman; and those that speak against this Woman's speaking, speak against the Church of Christ, and the Seed of the Woman, which Seed is Christ; that is to say, Those that speak against the Power of the Lord, and the Spirit of the Lord speaking in a Woman, simply by reason of her Sex, or because she is a Woman, not regarding the Seed, and Spirit, and Power that speaks in her; such speak against Christ and his Church, and are of the Seed of the Serpent, wherein lodgeth Enmity. And as God the Father made no such difference in the first Creation, nor ever since between the Male and the Female, but always out of his Mercy and Loving-kindness, had regard unto the Weak. So also his Son, Christ Jesus, confirms the same thing; when the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, if it were lawful for a Man to put away his Wife? He answered and said unto them, Have you not read, That he that made them in the beginning, made them Male and Female; and said, For this Cause shall a Man leave Father and Mother, and shall cleave unto his Wife, and they twain shall be one Flesh; wherefore they are no more twain, but one Flesh? What therefore God hath joyned together, let no Man put asunder, Mat. 19.

Again, Christ Jesus, when he came to the City of Samaria, where Jacob's Well was, where the Woman of Samaria was, you may read in John 4. how he was pleased to preach the Everlasting Gospel to her; and when the Woman said unto him, I know that when the Messiah cometh, (which is called Christ) when he cometh, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he. Also he said unto Martha, when she said, she knew that her Brother should rise again in the last day. Jesus said unto her, I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet should he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth, shall never die. Believest thou this? She answered, Yea, Lord, I believe thou art the Christ, the Son of God. Here she manifested her true and saving Faith, which few at that day believed so on him, John 11. 25, 26.

Also that Woman, that came unto Jesus with an Alabaster Box of very precious Ointment, and poured it on his Head as he sat at meat; it is manifest that this Woman knew more of the secret Power and Wisdom of God, than his Disciples did, who were filled with Indignation against her; and therefore Jesus saith, Why do ye trouble the Woman, for she hath wrought a good Work upon me? Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole World, there shall also this that this Woman hath done, be told for a Memorial of her, Mat. 26. Mark 14. 3. Luke saith farther, She was a Sinner, and that she stood at his Feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his Feet with her Tears, and did wipe them with the Hair of her Head, and kissed his Feet, and annointed them with Ointment. And when Jesus saw the Heart of the Pharisee that had bidden him to his House, he took occasion to speak unto Simon, as you may read in Luke 7. and he turned to the Woman, and said, Simon, seest thou this Woman? Thou gavest me no Water to my Feet; but she hath washed my Feet with Tears, and wiped them with the Hair of her Head: Thou gavest me no Kiss; but this Woman, since I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my Feet: My Head with Oil thou didst not annoint; but this Woman hath annointed my Feet with Ointment: Wherefore I say unto thee, her Sins, which are many, are forgiven her; for she hath loved much, Luke 7. 37. to the End.

Also, there was many Women which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him, and stood afar off when he was Crucified, Mat. 28. 55. Mark 15. Yea even the Women of Jerusalem wept for him, insomuch that he said unto them, Weep not for me. ye Daughters of Jerusalem; but weep for your selves, and for your Children, Luke 23. 28.

And certain Women which had been healed of Evil Spirits and Infirmities, Mary Magdalen, and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's Steward's Wife; and many others which ministered unto him of their Substance, Luke 8. 2, 3.

Thus we see that Jesus owned the Love and Grace that appeared in Women, and did not despise it: and by what is recorded in the Scriptures, he received as much Love, Kindness, Compassion, and tender Dealing towards him from Women, as he did from any others, both in his Life time, and also after they had exercised their Cruelty upon him; for Mary Magdalene, and Mary the Mother of James, beheld where he was laid; And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the Mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet Spices, that they might annoint him: And very early in the Morning, the first Day of the Week, they came unto the Sepulchre at the rising of the Sun; and they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the Stone from the Door of the Sepulchre? And when they looked the Stone was rolled away, for it was very great, Mark 16. 1, 2, 3, 4. Luke 24. 1, 2. and they went down into the Sepulchre, and as Matthew saith, The Angel rolled away the Stone, and he said unto the Women, Fear not, I know whom ye seek, Jesus which was Crucified: He is not here, he is risen, Mat. 28. Now Luke saith thus, That there stood two Men by them in shining Apparel, and as they were perplexed and afraid, the Men said unto them, He is not here, remember how he said unto you when he was in Galilee, That the Son of Man must be delivered into the Hands of sinful Men, and be Crucified, and the third Day rise again; and they remembered his Words, and return'd from the Sepulchre, and told all these things to the Eleven, and to

o all the rest.

It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the Mother of James, and the other Women that were with them, which told these things to the Apostles, and their Words seemed unto them as Idle Tales, and they believed them not. Mark this, ye despisers of the Weakness of Women, and look upon your selves to be so wise: But Christ Jesus doth not so; for he makes use of the weak: For when he met the Women after he was risen, he said unto them, All Hail! And they came and held him by the Feet, and worshipped him; then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid, go tell my Brethren that they go into Galilee, and there they shall see me, Mat. 28. 10. Mark 16. 9. And John saith, when Mary was weeping at the Sepulchre, that Jesus said unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? what seekest thou? And when she supposed him to be the Gardener, Jesus said unto her, Mary; she turned her self, and said unto him, Rabboni, which is to say, Master; Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my Brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God, John 20. 16, 17.

Mark this, you that despise and oppose the Message of the Lord God that he sends by Women; What had become of the Redemption of the whole Body of Mankind, if they had not cause to believe the Message that the Lord Jesus sent by these Women, of and concerning his Resurrection? And if these Women had not thus, out of their Tenderness, and Bowels of Love, who had received Mercy, and Grace, and Forgiveness of Sins, and Vertue, and Healing from him; which many Men also had received the like, if their Hearts had not been so united and knit unto him in Love, that they could not depart as the Men did; but sat watching, and waiting, and weeping about the Sepulchre until the time of his Resurrection, and so were ready to carry his Message, as is manifested, else how should his Disciples have known, who were not there?

Oh! Blessed and Glorified be the Glorious Lord; for this may all the whole Body of Mankind say, though the Wisdom of Man that never knew God, is always ready to except against the Weak; but the Weakness of God is stronger than Men, and the Foolishness of God is wiser than Men, 1 Cor. 1 25.

And in Acts 18. you may read how Aquilla, and Priscilla, took unto them Apollos, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly, who was an Eloquent Man, and mighty in the Scriptures; yet we do not read that he despised what Priscilla said, because she was a Woman, as many now do.

And now to the Apostle's Words, which is the Ground of the great Objection against Womens Speaking. And first, 1 Cor. 14. Let the Reader seriously peruse that Chapter, and see the end and drift of the Apostle in speaking these Words: For the Apostle is there exhorting the Corinthians unto Charity, and to desire Spiritual Gifts, and not to speak in an unknown Tongue; and not to be Children in Understanding, nor to be Children in Malice; but in Understanding to be Men. And that the Spirits of the Prophets, should be subject to the Prophets; for God is not the Author of Confusion, but of Peace: And then he saith, Let your Women keep Silence in the Church, &c.

Where it doth plainly appear, that the Women, as well as some others that were among them, were in Confusion: For he saith, How is it Brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a Psalm, hath a Doctrine, hath a Tongue, hath a Revelation, hath an Interpretation? Let all Things be done to Edifying. Here is no Edifying, but Confusion speaking together: Therefore he saith, If any Man speak in an unknown Tongue, let it be by two, or at most by three, and that by course, and let one Interpret: But if there be no Interpreter, let him keep Silence in the Church. Here the Man is Commanded to keep Silence, as well as the Woman, when in Confusion and out of order.

But the Apostle saith farther, They are commanded to be in Obedience, as also saith the Law; and if they will learn any thing, let them ask their Husbands at home; for it is a shame for a Woman, to speak in the Church.

Here the Apostle clearly manifests his intent; for he speaks of Women that were under the Law, and in that Transgression as Eve was, and such as were to learn, and not to speak publicly, but they must first ask their Husbands at home; and it was a shame for such to speak in the Church: And it appears clearly, that such Women were speaking among the Corinthians, by the Apostles exhorting them from malice and strife, and confusion, and he preacheth the Law unto them, and he saith, in the Law it is written, With Men of other tongues, and other Lips, will I speak unto this People, Vers. 2.

And what is all this to Women's Speaking? that have the everlasting Gospel to preach, and upon whom the Promise of the Lord is fulfilled, and his Spirit poured upon them according to his Word, Acts 2. 16, 17, 18. And if the Apostle would have stopped such as had the Spirit of the Lord poured upon them, why did he say just before, If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace, and you may all Prophesie one by one? Here he did not say, that such Women should not Prophesie as had the Revelation and Spirit of God poured upon them: But their Women that were un-

der the Law, and in the Transgression, and were in Strife, Confusion and Malice; for if he had stop'd Womens Praying or Prophesying, why doth he say, Every Man Praying or Prophesying, having his Head covered, dishonoureth his Head; but every Woman that Prayeth or Prophesieth with her Head uncovered dishonoureth her Head? Judge in your selves, Is it comely that a Woman pray or prophesie uncovered? For the Woman is not without the Man, neither is the Man without the Woman in the Lord, 1 Cor. 11. 3, 4, 13.

Also that other Scripture, in 1 Tim. 2. where he is exhorting that Prayer and Supplication be made every where, lifting up Holy Hands without Wrath and Doubting; he saith in the like manner also, That Women must adorn themselves in modest Apparel, with Shamefacedness and Sobriety, not with brodered Hair, or Gold, or Pearl, or costly Array. He saith, Let Women learn in Silence with all Subjection; but I suffer not a Woman to Teach, nor to usurp Authority over the Man, but to be in Silence; for Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived; but the Woman being deceived was in the Transgression.

Here the Apostle speaks particularly to a Woman in relation to her Husband, to be in subjection to him, and not to Teach, nor usurp Authority over him, and therefore he mentions Adam and Eve: But let it be strained to the utmost, as the opposers of Womens Speaking would have it, that is, That they should not Preach nor Speak in the Church, of which there is nothing here: Yet the Apostle is speaking to such as he is teaching to wear their Apparel, what to wear, and what not to wear; such as were not come to wear modest Apparel, and such as were not come to Shamefacedness and Sobriety; but he was exhorting them from brodered Hair, Gold, and Pearls, and costly Array; and such are not to usurp Authority over the Man, but to learn in Silence with all Subjection, as it becometh Women professing Godliness with good Works.

And what is all this to such as have the Power and Spirit of the Lord Jesus poured upon them, and have the Message of the Lord Jesus given unto them? Must not they speak the Word of the Lord, because of these undecent and unreverent Women, that the Apostle speaks of, and to, in these two Scriptures? And how are the Men of this Generation blinded, that bring these Scriptures, and pervert the Apostles Words, and corrupt his Intent in speaking of them? And by these Scriptures, endeavour to stop the Message and Word of the Lord God in Women, by condemning and despising of them. If the Apostle would have had Womens speaking stop'd, and did not allow of them; Why did he intreat his true Yoak-Fellow to help those Women who laboured with him in the Gospel? Phil. 4. 3. And why did the Apostles join together in Prayer and Supplication with the Women, and Mary the Mother of Jesus, and with his Brethren, Acts 1. 14. if they had not allowed, and had Union and Fellowship with the Spirit of God, where-ever it was revealed, in Women as well as others? But all this opposing, and gainsaying of Womens Speaking, hath risen out of the Bottomless Pit, and Spirit of Darkness, that hath spoken for these many Hundred Years together in this Night of Apostacy, since the Revelations have ceased and been hid. And so that Spirit hath limited and bound all up within its Bond and Compass; and so would suffer none to Speak; but such as that Spirit of Darkness approved of, Man or Woman.

And so here hath been the Misery of these last Ages past, in the time of the Reign of the Beast, that John saw when he stood upon the Sand of the Sea, rising out of the Sea, and out of the Earth, having seven Heads and ten Horns, Rev. 13. In this great City of Babylon, which is the Woman that hath sitten so long upon the Scarlet colour'd Beast, full of Names of Blasphemy, having seven Heads and ten Horns. And this Woman hath been arrayed and decked with Gold, and Pearls, and precious Stones; and she hath had a Golden Cup in her Hand, full of Abominations; and hath made all Nations drunk with the Cup of her Fornication; and all the World hath wondred after the Beast, and hath worshipped the Dragon that gave Power to the Beast; and this Woman hath been drunk with the Blood of the Saints, and with the Blood of the Martyrs of Jesus. And this hath been the Woman, that hath been Speaking, and usurping Authority for many Hundred Years together: And let the Times and Ages past testify how many have been murdered and slain, in Ages and Generations past; every Religion and Profession, (as it hath been called) killing and murdering one another, that would not join one with another: And thus the Spirit of Truth, and the Power of the Lord Jesus Christ, hath been quite lost among them that have done this. And this Mother of Harlots hath sitten as a Queen, and said, She should see no Sorrow: But though her Days have been long, even many Hundred of Years; for there was Power given unto the Beast to continue forty and two Months, and to make War with the Saints, and to overcome them: And all that have dwelt upon the Earth have worshipped him, whose Names are not written in the Book of the Life of the Lamb, slain from the Foundation of the World.

But blessed be the Lord, his time is over, which was above Twelve hundred Years, and the Darkness is past, and the Night of Apostacy draws to an end, and the true Light now shines, the Morning Light, the bright Morning Star, the Root and Offspring of David, he is risen, he is risen, Glory to the Highest for evermore; and the Joy of the Morning is come, and the Bride, the Lamb's Wife, is making her self ready, as a Bride that is adorning for her Husband; and to her is granted, that she shall be arrayed in fine Linen, clean and white; and the fine Linen is the Righteousness of the Saints; the holy Jerusalem is descending out of Heaven from God, having the Glory of God; and her Light is like a Jasper Stone, clear as Crystal.

And this is that free Woman, that all the Children of the Promise are born of; not the Children of the Bond-woman, which is Hagar, which genders to Strife and to Bondage, and which answers to Jerusalem, which is in Bondage with her Children; but this is the Jerusalem which is free, Which is the Mother of us all. And so this Bond-woman and her Children, that are born after the Flesh, have persecuted them that are born after the Spirit, even until now: But now the Bond-woman and her Seed is to be cast out, that hath kept so long in Bondage and in Slavery, and under Limits; this Bond-woman and her Brood is to be cast out, and our holy City, the new Jerusalem, is coming down from Heaven, and her Light will shine throughout the whole Earth, even as a Jasper-Stone, clear as Chrystal, which brings Freedom and Liberty, and perfect Redemption to her whole Seed; and this is that Woman and Image of the Eternal God, that God hath owned, and doth own, and will own for evermore.

More might be added to this purpose, both out of the Old Testament and New, where it is evident that God made no difference, but gave his good Spirit, as it pleased him, both to Man and Woman, as Deborah, Huldah, and Sarah. The Lord calls by his Prophet Isaiah, Harken unto me, ye that follow after Righteousness, ye that seek the Lord; look unto the Rock from whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the Pit from whence ye were digged; look unto Abraham your Father, and to Sarah that bare you; for the Lord will comfort Sion, &c. Isa. 5. And Anna the Prophetess, who was a Widow of fourscore and Four Years of Age, which departed not from the Temple, but served God with Fastings and Prayers night and day; she coming in at that instant, (when old Simeon took the Child Jesus in his Arms) and she gave Thanks unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them who looked for Redemption in Jerusalem, Luke 2. 36, 37, 38. And Philip the Evangelist, into whose House the Apostle Paul entred, who was one of the Seven, Acts 6. 3. he had four Daughters which were Virgins, that did prophesie, Acts 21.

And so let this serve to stop that opposing Spirit that would limit the Power and Spirit of the Lord Jesus, whose Spirit is poured upon all Flesh, both Sons and Daughters, now in his Resurrection; and since that the Lord God in the Creation, when he made Man in his own Image, he made them Male and Female; and since that Christ Jesus, as the Apostle saith, was made of a Woman, and the Power of the Highest overshadowed her, and the Holy Ghost came upon her, and the Holy Thing that was born of her, was called the Son of God; and when he was upon the Earth, he manifested his Love, and his Will, and his Mind, both to the Woman of Samaria, and Martha, and Mary her Sister, and several others, as hath been shewed; and after his Resurrection also, manifested himself unto them first of all, even before he ascended unto his Father: Now when Jesus was risen, the first Day of the Week, he appeared first unto Mary Magdalene, Mark 16. 9. And thus the Lord Jesus hath manifested himself and his Power, without Respect of Persons; and so let all Mouths be stopt that would limit him, whose Power and Spirit is infinite, who is pouring it upon all Flesh.

And thus much in answer to these two Scriptures, which have been made such a Stumbling-block, that the Ministers of Darkness have made such a Mountain of: But the Lord is removing all this, and taking it out of the way.

M. F.

A further Addition, in Answer to the Objection concerning Women keeping silent in the Church: For it is not permitted for them to speak, but to be under Obedience; as also saith the Law, If they will learn any thing, let them ask their Husbands at home, for it is a shame for a Woman to speak in the Church: Now this as Paul writing in 1 Cor. 14. 34. is one with that of 1 Tim. 2. 11. Let Women learn in silence with all Subjection.

To which I say, If you tie this to all outward Women, then there were many Women that were Widows, which had no Husbands to learn of; and many were Virgins, which had no Husbands; and Philip had four Daughters that were Prophetesses; such would be despised, which the Apostle did not forbid. And if it were to all Women, that no Women might speak, then Paul would have contradicted himself; but they were such Women that the Apostle mentions in Timothy, that grew wanton, and were Busie-bodies, and Tatlers, and kicked against Christ: For Christ in the Male and in the Female is one, and he is the Husband, and his Wife is the Church; and God hath said, that his Daughters should prophesie as well as his Sons: And where he hath poured forth his Spirit upon them, they must prophesie, though blind Priests say to the contrary, and will not permit holy Women to speak.

And whereas it is said, I permit not a Woman to speak, as saith the Law: But where Women are led by the Spirit of God, they are not under the Law; for Christ in the Male and in the Female is one; and where he is made manifest in Male and

Female, he may speak; for he is the end of the Law for Righteousness to all them that believe. So here you ought to make a Distinction what sort of Women are forbidden to speak; such as were under the Law, who were not come to Christ, nor to the Spirit of Prophecy: For Huldah, Miriam, and Hannah, were Prophetesses, who were not forbidden in the time of the Law, for they all prophesied in the time of the Law; as you may read in 2 Kings 22. what Huldah said unto the Priest, and to the Ambassadors that were sent to her from the King, Go, saith she, and tell the Man that sent you to me, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and on the Inhabitants thereof, even all the Words of the Book which the King of Judah hath read; because they have forsaken me, and have burnt Incense to other Gods, to anger me with all the Works of their Hands: Therefore my Wrath shall be kindled against this place, and shall not be quenched. But to the King of Judah, that sent you to me to ask Counsel of the Lord, so shall you say to him, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Because thy Heart did melt, and thou humbledst thy self before the Lord, when thou heard'st what I spake against this place, and against the Inhabitants of the same, how they should be destroyed; Behold, I will receive thee to thy Father, and thou shalt be put into thy Grave in peace, and thine Eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place.

Now let us see if any of you, blind Priests, can speak after this manner, and see if it be not a better Sermon than any of you can make, who are against Women's Speaking. And Isaiah, that went to the Prophetess, did not forbid her Speaking or Prophesying, Isai. 8. And was it not prophesied in Joel 2. that Hand-maids should Prophesie? And are not Hand-maids Women? Consider this, ye that are against Women's Speaking, how in the Acts the Spirit of the Lord was poured forth upon Daughters as well as Sons. In the time of the Gospel, when Mary came to salute Elizabeth in the Hill-Country in Judea, and when Elizabeth heard the Salutation of Mary, the Babe leaped in her Womb, and she was filled with the Holy Spirit; and Elizabeth spoke with a loud Voice. Blessed art thou amongst Women, blessed is the Fruit of thy Womb. Whence is this to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me? For lo, as soon as thy Salutation came to my Ear, the Babe leaped in my Womb for Joy; for blessed is she that believes, for there shall be a Performance of those things which were told her from the Lord. And this was Elizabeth's Sermon concerning Christ, which at this day stands upon Record. And then Mary said, My Soul doth magnifie the Lord, and my Spirit rejoiceth in God my Saviour, for he hath regarded the low Estate of his Handmaid: For, behold, from henceforth all Generations shall call me blessed; for he that is mighty, hath done to me great things, and holy is his Name; and his Mercy is on them that fear him, from Generation to Generation; he hath shewed Strength with his Arm; he hath scattered the Proud in the Imaginations of their own Hearts; he hath put down the Mighty from their Seats, and exalted them of low degree; he hath filled the Hungry with good things, and the Rich he hath sent empty away: He hath holpen his Servant Israel, in remembrance of his Mercy, as he spake to his Father, to Abraham, and to his Seed for ever. Are you not here beholding to the Woman for her Sermon, to use her Words, to put into your Common Prayer? and yet you forbid Women's Speaking.

Now here you may see how these two Women prophesied of Christ, and preached better than all the blind Priests did in that Age, and better than this Age also, who are beholding to Women to make use of their Words. And see in the Book of Ruth, how the Women blessed her in the Gate of the City, of whose Stock came Christ: The Lord make the Woman that is come into thy House like Rachel and Leah, which built the House of Israel; and that thou may'st do worthily in Ephratha, and be famous in Bethlehem, let thy House be like the House of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah, of the Seed which the Lord shall give thee of this young Woman. And blessed be the Lord, who hath not left thee this day without a Kinsman, and his Name shall be continued in Israel. And also see in the first Chapter of Samuel, how Hannah prayed and spake in the Temple of the Lord, O Lord of Hosts, if thou wilt look on the Trouble of thy Hand-maid, and remember me, and not forget thy Hand-maid. And read in the second Chapter of Samuel, how she rejoiced in God, and said, My Heart rejoiceth in the Lord; my Horn is exalted in the Lord, and my Mouth is enlarged over my Enemies, because I rejoice in thy Salvation; there is none holy as the Lord, yea, there is none besides thee; and there is no God like our God. Speak no more presumptuously; let not Arrogancy come out of your Mouths, for the Lord is a God of Knowledge, and by him Enterprises are established; the Bow, and the mighty Men are broken, and the Weak hath girded to themselves Strength; they that were full, are hired forth for Bread, and the hungry are no more hired; so that the Barren hath born seven, and she that had many Children is feeble. The Lord killeth, and maketh alive; bringeth down to the Grave, and raiseth up; the Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich; bringeth low, and exalteth; he raiseth up the Poor out of the Dust, and lifteth up the Beggar from the Dunghil, to set them among Princes, to make them inherit the Seat of Glory: For the Pillars of the Earth are the Lord's, and he hath set the World upon them; he will keep the Feet of his Saints, and the Wicked shall keep silence in Darkness; for in his own Might shall no Man be strong: The Lord's Adversaries shall be destroyed, and out of Heaven shall he thunder upon them; the Lord shall judge the ends of the World, and shall give Power to his King, and exalt the Horn of his Anointed.

Thus you may see what a Woman hath said, when old Eli the Priest thought she had been drunk; and see if any of you, blind Priests, that speak against Women's Speaking, can preach after this manner; who cannot make such a Sermon as this Woman did, and yet will make a Trade of this Woman and other Women's Words.

And did not the Queen of Sheba speak, that came to Solomon, and received the Law of God, and preached it in her own Kingdom, and blessed the Lord God that loved Solomon, and set him on the Throne of Israel; because the Lord loved Israel for ever, and made the King to do Equity and Righteousness? And this was the Language of the Queen of Sheba.

And see what glorious Expressions Queen Hester used to comfort the People of God, which was the Church of God, as you may read in the Book of Hester, which caused Joy and Gladness of Heart among all the Jews, who prayed and worshipped the Lord in all places; who jeopardized her Life contrary to the King's Command, went and spoke to the King, in the Wisdom and Fear of the Lord, by which means she saved the Lives of the People of God; and righteous Mordecai did not forbid her speaking, but said, If she held her Peace, her and her Father's House should be destroyed. And herein, you blind Priests, are contrary to righteous Mordecai.

Likewise you may read how Judith spoke, and what noble Acts she did, and how she spoke to the Elders of Israel, and said, Dear Brethren, seeing ye are the Honourable and Elders of the People of God, call to Remembrance how our Fathers in time past were tempted, that they might be proved if they would worship God aright: They ought also to Remember how our Father Abraham, being try'd through manifold Tribulations, was found a Friend of God; so was Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, and all they pleased God, and were steadfast in Faith through manifold Troubles. And read also her Prayer in the Book of Judith, and how the Elders commended her, and said, All that thou speakest is true, and no Man can reprove thy Words; pray therefore for us, for thou art an holy Woman, and fearest God. So these Elders of Israel did not forbid her speaking, as you blind Priests do; yet you will make a Trade of Women's Words to get Money by, and take Texts, and preach Sermons upon Women's Words; and still cry out, Women must not speak, Women must be silent: So you are far from the Minds of the Elders of Israel, who praised God for a Woman's speaking. But the Jezabel, and the Woman, the false Church, the great Whore, and tattling and unlearned Women, and Busie-bodies, which are forbid to preach, which have a long time spoke and tattled, which are forbidden to speak by the true Church, which Christ is the Head of; such Women as were in Transgression under the Law, which are called a Woman in the Revelations.

And see farther how the wise Woman cried to Joab over the Wall, and saved the City of Abel, as you may read, 2 Sam. 20. how in her Wisdom she spoke to Joab, saying, I am one of them that are peaceable and faithful in Israel, and thou goest about to destroy a City and Mother in Israel: Why wilt thou destroy the Inheritance of the Lord? Then went the Woman to the People in her Wisdom, and smote off the Head of Sheba, that rose up against David, the Lord's Anointed: Then Joab blew the Trumpet, and all the People departed in Peace. And this Deliverance was by the means of a Woman's speaking. But Tatlers and Busie-Bodies are forbidden to preach by the true Woman, whom Christ is the Husband, to the Woman as well as the Man, all being comprehended to be the Church. And so in this true Church, Sons and Daughters do prophesie, Women labour in the Gospel: But the Apostle permits not Tatlers, Busie-bodies, and such as usurp Authority over the Man, who would not have Christ to reign, nor speak neither in the Male nor Female; such the Law permits not to speak; such must learn of their Husbands. But what Husbands have Widows to learn of, but Christ? And was not Christ the Husband of Philip's four Daughters? And may not they that are learned of their Husbands speak then? But Jezabel, and Tatlers, and the Whore, that deny Revelation and Prophecy, are not permitted, who will not learn of Christ; and they that are out of the Spirit and Power of Christ, that the Prophets were in, who are in the Transgression, are ignorant of the Scriptures; and such are against Women's Speaking, and Men's too, who preach that which they have received of the Lord God; but that which they have preached, and do preach, will come over all your Heads, yea, over the Head of the false Church, the Pope; for the Pope is the Head of the false Church, and the false Church is the Pope's Wife: And so he and they that be of him, and come from him, are against Women's Speaking in the true Church, when both he and the false Church are called Woman, in Rev. 17. and so are in the Transgression, that would usurp Authority over the Man Christ Jesus, and his Wife too, and would not have him to Reign; but the Judgment of the great Whore is come. But Christ, who is the Head of the Church, the true Woman, which is his Wife, in it do Daughters prophesie, who are above the Pope and his Wife, and a-top of them. And here Christ is the Head of the Male and Female, who may speak; and the Church is called a Royal Priesthood; so the Woman must offer as well as the Man. Rev. 22. 17. The Spirit saith, Come, and the Bride saith, Come; and so is not the Bride the Church? and doth the Church only consist of Men? You that deny Women's Speaking, answer: Doth it not consist of Women, as well as Men? Is not the Bride compared to the whole Church? And doth not the Bride say, Come? Doth not the Woman speak then, the Husband, Christ Jesus, the Amen? And doth not the false Church go about to stop the Bride's Mouth? But it is not possible; for the Bridegroom is with his Bride, and he opens her Mouth. Christ Jesus, who goes on Conquering, and to Conquer; who kills and slays with the Sword, which is the Word of his Mouth; the Lamb and the Saints shall have the Victory, the true Speakers of Men and Women over the false Speaker.

Re: - posted by Everlast (), on: 2004/4/22 18:18

Quote:
-----But really, we shouldn't bring protagonism into the debate.

I am really not trying to be antagonistic...I am serious about my question. Keith answered it in part, but I really am wondering about the works these women have done...if they are out of alignment with Scripture, how could they be blessed in their ministry? That's all.

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/22 18:46

Quote:
-----I am really not trying to be antagonistic...

I'm not sure what he meant by the term (my first thought is "what do main characters have to do with this?") but it's not a synonym of "antagonistic" if that's what you thought.

Quote:
-----I am serious about my question. Keith answered it in part, but I really am wondering about the works these women have done...if they are out of alignment with Scripture, how could they be blessed in their ministry? That's all.

Are you asking "if they are out of alignment with Scripture, *how* could they be blessed in their ministry?" , as in the literal mechanisms by which God blessed these women? Or "if they are out of alignment with Scripture, *why* did God bless them in their ministry" as in what motivated God to bless them despite their disobedience, and how does such an act on God's part mesh with Scriptural revelation of His character and actions?

I don't know how I'd answer the first possible question, but the second could be answered "for the same reason He blessed and anointed the ministries of other partially-obedient vessels He's used in history (in OT/NT times and later)."

In order to give a better answer about the ministries of these women, I'd need more information:

- 1) What exactly did they do? I ask because I need to determine if they were really overstepping their proper role to begin with, because if they weren't then there's no mystery as to why God used them.
- 2) What indications are there that the ministry was blessed? I'm not saying they weren't, but specifics help.

I should probably investigate it myself, so as to not just keep throwing the burden back, but I'm a bit short on time at the moment.

God be with you all,
-Keith

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by MyBeloveds (), on: 2004/4/22 20:20

I would like to share a bit on this subject and will first comment on Deborah as someone mentioned before.

Not only was Deborah appointed by the Lord as the judge of Israel (talk about Old Testament vs. New Testament issues), but she also had a husband. Wow that sure puts a twist on things.

Judges 4:4 Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, was judging Israel at that time.
Verse 5b says that the children of Israel (I am sure men were those going to her as well) came up to her for judgment.

Judges 4:8-9 says "And Barak said to her, "If you will go with me, then I will go; but if you will not go with me, I will not go!" So she (Deborah) said, "I will surely go with you, nevertheless there will be NO GLORY FOR YOU in the journey you are taking, FOR THE LORD WILL SELL SISERA UNTO THE HAND OF A WOMAN." Then Deborah arose and went with Barak to Kedesh.

Seems like God was appointing women in other ways at that time as well. God is no respecter of persons.

The Word of God clearly states in Gal. 3:28 that there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither MALE or FEMALE; for you are ALL ONE IN CHRIST JESUS.

I recall a time I was studying this subject due to the call on my life. I wanted the truth and while I was in prayer the Lord spoke to me saying, "Karen, when you see a woman teach, preach, etc., (not exact words) and all you see is a woman, you will not hear what the Spirit is saying through her."

That is so very true. If we are looking at the person in the flesh and not in the Spirit, we will only see them according to the flesh. We will not hear what the Spirit of the Lord is saying and miss God. I believe that is why many that are truly sent from the Lord are rejected by those that call themselves Christians. They can only see, hear and perceive based on the flesh or their own fleshly desires.

We are a people that are united in Christ and are to live by the Spirit not the flesh under all circumstances. That would include the vessel the LORD CHOOSES to have His Spirit flow through.

We could say the same for a child appointed for the glory of the Lord. There is no age limit in the Spirit, but many children get placed in a class for kids only, instead of allowing them the opportunity to be a part of the body as a whole. The Lord is the one in charge of whom He chooses to flow through, not man.

We limit the Spirit in so many ways. God loves to surprise us with His ways. His ways and thoughts are FAR from our ways and thoughts. I mean, if He can speak through a donkey, by golly He can speak through a woman in any function He so chooses.

I believe He would be glorified through those that man would least expect for the sake of showing that He truly is God of ALL FLESH.

All For His Glory,
Karen Francis

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/4/23 7:58

Hi Karen, please explain what you mean by "use".

Re: - posted by MyBeloveds (), on: 2004/4/23 8:28

Nasher,

I should have been more careful with my "use" of words. Although, I am not into debating over words as scripture clearly points out, however I have edited the word "use" or "used" in my previous post to a more correct usage.

Use is a common word that is used often here in America in a figurative sense in many ways.

All For His Glory,
Karen

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/23 8:37

Quote:

-----If the Lord can speak through a donkey, by golly He can speak through a woman.

Amen. We serve an **absolutely sovereign God**.

But I'm starting to feel like those coming into the discussion aren't reading the previous posts (which is fine, that's a lot of reading to expect), so allow me to reiterate:

The question is not can God use us when we behave a certain way, it is does God want us to behave a certain way.

If our only standard was "can God use me if I do thus and so?" We could very easily wind up doing some very bad things. It's a form of pragmatism, as I see it.

As to the specifics with Deborah, someone mentioned earlier that she never preached "open-air" (to use the modern term) like the other judges and prophets.

Re: - posted by MyBeloveds (), on: 2004/4/23 9:05

Quote:

-----The question is not can God use us when we behave a certain way, it is does God want us to behave a certain way.

Could the answer to that question be that we are to behave in the "way" of the Lord, or, the "way" He specifies or instructs us? Did anyone in that time period "preach?"

I still believe it just comes down to our being ONE in Christ Jesus and there is NO male or female in the SPIRIT. If we see a woman, we are still seeing with eyes of the flesh.

The Lord truly is Sovereign as you indicated. I think we debate too many issues that hold us all back from just moving forward in the ways of the Lord and doing what He commands us. It truly is time for us to be UNITED in Christ for the sake of glorifying the Lord in all things. The more sensitive we are to the Spirit, the more clearly we will see those that are sent of the Lord and those that are not, no matter who they are.

Just sharing :o)

All For His Glory,
Karen

Re: one in Christ - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/23 9:32

Hi Karen, welcome to the debate,

Quote:

-----The Word of God clearly states in Gal. 3:28 that there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither MALE or FEMALE; for you are ALL ONE IN CHRIST JESUS.

This surely is talking about the spiritual, please take a look at the very early posts which I made, not that there so great but we have explored right from Genesis and the relationship in the trinity and the fall and the man woman relationship, first to God then to each other.

Your above quote is not in isolation in the Bible and can't be so. There is order in all things Spiritual and Church practical / governmental.

This thread has grown and grown and is fruitful, can I encourage you to start from the beginning :-)

Re: - posted by MyBeloveds (), on: 2004/4/23 9:48

Keith in all honesty, I will admit that I did not read the "entire" thread, therefore I went back to read "some" of what I had not read. I will be careful to post next time prematurely and make sure I have read all that posted.

Jakes post sharing the essay by Margaret Fell, a 17th century Quaker is excellent. As I was reading that post, I was thinking how the Lord calls us "all" sons and yet He also refers to us as His bride. There we are both male and female in Him. Wow!!

I did a study that leads me to truly believe that Genesis chapter 1 is still being fulfilled to this day. The Lord spoke forth His Word that does not return to Him until it accomplishes what it was sent forth to do. In chapter one of Genesis, He created

created man in His image, male and female, He created them. "They" are referred to as "him" that the Lord created in His image. In Genesis chapter 2, you will read that the Lord looked upon the land and seen that there was "no" man to till it. From there the Lord "forms" man from the dust of the ground.

So, we have God speaking forth him who is both male and female to subdue and have dominion over every living thing. "They" have it as "one" in Him.

The law was fulfilled in Christ, therefore all the curses are broken for those that live by the Spirit and not by the flesh or place themselves under the law. Wouldn't that mean the curse of Adam and Eve? Does God limit the word "all" curses when He speaks?

I will stop there, but it was a very interesting study the Lord led me to do and so full of revelation of where the Lord is leading us. "We" are to make "ourselves" ready for "our" Bridegroom. All of "us" sons.

I love the ways of the Lord.

All For His Glory,
Karen Francis

Re: - posted by MyBeloveds (), on: 2004/4/23 9:59

Delboy,

Thank you. Well, it was clear that the word "use" was in many posts other than "just" mine in this thread and used in the same text. But, since I am new here I can understand the question.

I just pointed out in my last post that I can honestly admit that I have not read the entire thread nor all the subjects posted. I will also add that I doubt that I have the time to read all the subjects posted. However, I am sure or would be grateful for better use of words, that if I happen to post on a subject and it has been mentioned before, that someone will be so kind to point that out to me and where. I will then attempt to go back and read what was shared on that subject before posting.

Please be patient with me as I get to know those that share on this forum. It is very clear based on all that I have read so far, that there are many mature saints in the Lord here.

All For His Glory,
Karen

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/23 10:04

Quote:

-----Keith in all honesty, I will admit that I did not read the "entire" thread, therefore I went back to read "some" of what I had not read. I will be careful to post next time prematurely and make sure I have read all that posted.

It's not a problem, all I said was:

Quote:

But I'm starting to feel like those coming into the discussion aren't reading the previous posts (which is fine, that's a lot of reading to expect), so allow me to reiterate:

I wasn't saying there was anything wrong with jumping in, Lord knows I've probably done it more than I ought have before.

It does help avoid repetition if we read the previous posts, though. Also, it's a bit frustrating to see an objection, answer that objection, see little if any acknowledgement (positive or negative) of your answer, and see the same objection brought back up several times later by people seemingly unaware of the previous exchange.

Hmm, that might serve as a summary of modern politics.

So carefulness in reading before posting is appreciated, but it doesn't actually bother me if you don't.

Re: - posted by MyBeloveds (), on: 2004/4/23 10:27

Keith,

Thank you for the clarity. I can understand the frustration and should have realized that I may be sharing something that was already brought up and settled on. My zeal just got the best of me. (hand over mouth).

I appreciate your advice and will try real hard to be careful as I post in the future.

Re: women - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/4/23 12:04

The Lord has really been trying to teach me some things in this area of men/women in the church. When I say church, I do not mean a church building, I mean His church- the bride, the body of Christ- His called out ones. Because of some of my giftings in the prophetic, wisdom and knowledge- and even in dreams- I have had a hard time trying to find my "place" or purpose as a woman. I think the hardest thing to get past, as a girl is the equality in God's and human's eyes. When most discuss women and their positions the woman is many times put in a lower position or lower class as a man. When this is not the case in any way. The Lord IS no respecter of persons and sees a woman and a man (spiritually) the same. He loves them the same. He doesn't see a man as being "better" than a woman or a woman better than a man. To Him all humans are called "man" (human). He would never create people and put them in classes. He would never show preferential treatment to anyone based on things that they cannot change.

It is obvious that when he made man, man was not enough on His own. So man was lacking. Man is made complete when He is united with a woman. (I am not saying that all men have to be married) but that is the plan from the garden. It takes both a man and a woman to be complete for God. God possesses all the qualities he put in man and woman. The key here is to look at the role He made for Eve and - in succession, other women. She was created as a "helper" to him. She completes man. What I see here is that even though we are equal in God's eyes and equal spiritually speaking- here on earth, our roles are different. I still think the Holy Spirit analogy is one of the best I have heard. It has really changed my thinking on my "purpose". I can see where in my heart of hearts, I am made to be a comforter, a helper, a supporter, a vessel of gentleness and peace, a teacher of wisdom- even if it is unseen - or whether it is seen.

This has been very hard to come to grips with. I think mostly because when men speak of a woman being more "in the background" or behind the scenes, we think it means less important or less worthy. When that is not the case. To be content with being behind the scenes (knowing that you have much wisdom to give) and letting the Lord be in control of "how you give out the wisdom"- whether through your husband, your children, a women's study, or whatever- is much harder to be "unknown". It is much harder to let others get the credit. Only a very strong woman can do this. Only a strong woman has the selflessness to give of herself in this way. To lay down her own life, her own dreams, her own prerogatives, her own wishes, her own rights- for the benefit of others and in obedience to the Lord.

I am still lacking in words as to what all I'd like to say because the Lord is still in the process of revealing some of these things to me. Because of being hurt by men (emotionally, mentally), it is hard for many women to want to accept putting themselves in the position to be this vulnerable. To give up their rights to be "somebody" important in the eyes of the public. But in reality, they ARE somebody very, very important in God's eyes and in other's eyes who they have no idea is watching. It is the culture today, as well as the enemy that whispers to us that we need to show that we are somebody, that we have to prove that we are worth something, that we are worthy to be acknowledged for this or that. But if we are willing to die to self, then we will give up that right.

Even now as I type this, my heart goes right back to that question- why do I have to give up these rights and not the men? I am not responsible for them I am only responsible for me and how I obey the Lord. It is very easy to say-"that is not fair, we have so much giving up to do". Why not men? It is true that all men are called to give up their rights and their "self" and surrender all. And I hope and pray that many do- for even the benefit of their wives, and children who watch and learn by example. But again, I am only accountable for myself not for other men.

Some verses that have really hit me about this whole thing don't all have to do with the men/women debate at all. They have to do with my accountability.

" But I say to you that for every idle word men may speak, they will give account of it in the day of judgment. For by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned." Mat. 12:36-37

Romans 14 and part of 15 talks about receiving ones who are weaker in the faith and not causing them to stumble. And about pleasing others for the glory of God and not ourselves.

Also the Lord gave me a dream that had something to do with his heart (my husband's) and I was busy preparing things for him so that he could be looked upon as important because of his job. I had no idea what it was until two days ago I came across the verses in Proverbs 31:10-11 Who can find a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies. The HEART of her husband safely trusts her; So he will have no lack of gain.

This has all been very hard to put in perspective because of my spiritual giftings. How can putting my husband's needs first (support, comfort, listening ear, wise counsel about his job, etc...) be in line with these gifts that are unique and seem important in the body of Christ. But what I have realized is that I am first called to be his wife before I am called to minister to the body. I am called to be a mother before I am called to minister to the body. There will be many opportunities to get the Lord's word out, whether it be through my husband, my children (even their lives), through my website, through wise counsel for anyone who comes to me.

I have also realized that the Lord withdrew His presence from me as my "First Love" because now that I know how to have this love relationship with the Lord that I didn't have before two years ago- He now wants me to learn to love Dan as my first love again- since he is the head of our family as Christ is the head of the church. I see this now. I was loving Christ as my first love- which was wonderful, but I was not loving my husband as I loved Christ. And if I should love any one like Christ -it should be my husband who is the head (as Christ is).

Sorry this is so long- but I am putting my thoughts and heart down here and it is all still coming to me. I believe that I will be a teacher of the word (prophetic and wisdom) but I know I have been called in the long run to minister to women. It is hard for me to admit that because I feel that men need much work too - but that is not my responsibility. I pray that God raises up some very strong holy men who will do what I'd like to do- which is call all people to surrender and holiness. Yes, there may be many men who are affected by my words and teachings- which I hope this will be. Maybe in an indirect way, maybe directly. But that will not be my focus- to reach men.

When you see such a lack of good teachers of righteousness and holiness it is hard to let that go. You just want to get to everyone. That zeal starts to get a hold of you (me). But realizing that reaching all people is not purpose or responsibility - takes much pressure off of me and gives me more focus. I am responsible with obeying the Lord and that starts with "first things first".

These words and thoughts are still only in the processing stage. I don't know about other women, but I do know about me. Yes, I have some wonderful giftings but I am willing to lay them down (or at least keep them in perspective for now) for the building up of those who are closest to me - my husband and my kids. Who knows, maybe the only reason I have some of these gifts is because one of my children will be used very greatly of the Lord and my job is to prepare them. Only God knows.

Walking with Him, Chanin

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/23 16:35

Chanin, Your post is interesting, part of it says the following

Quote:
----- I think the hardest thing to get past, as a girl is the equality in God's and human's eyes. When most discuss women and their positions the woman is many times put in a lower position or lower class as a man.

This is a shame, firstly that you have experienced restriction through maybe over-bearing from men. This has given your view of roles as beneath and above so to speak.
The great truth is, that God has restored the equal spiritual standing before and in him. This has been achieved by Jesus, the second Adam.
Complementing this is that practical roles have not changed in direction. In Him all things are made new, Correct authority, Correct relationship(s), Fear has been taken away.

My wife tells me that she now has security in her role and in the church as well. Does this mean The Lord does not use her, of course not. I guess in essence the matter is of church government and headship. Carnal man is so threatened by all these descriptive words. The spiritual man/woman is not as these have been refined and made pure as in the beginning. I do hope this makes some sense!

Karen, Thanks for your post I mis-timed my last with yours :-)

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/4/23 16:50

Chanin, thank you for the wonderful post. I got typing a response but realized it might take a lot of time to address it properly, so I wanted to thank you first.

I assure you the internal striving and grieving and grinding are on both sides, among the true disciples.

Again you've made me confident that you have cast yourself into the same Consuming Fire as I have.

Re: - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/4/24 1:23

I asked our church's youth pastor what he thought of the issue. He said, "Behind every great minister of the Gospel, there is a loudmouth husband who takes all the credit."

:-)

Re:, on: 2004/8/16 1:34

I can truly feel your heart in this matter. Misguided men down thru time have read Paul's letters according to the carnal mind and not in the mind in which Christ intended. My Dad used to call my dear Mother stupid to keep her from being more than he was. For years I have been of that mindset that a woman ought not teach, let alone preach. But it was a woman teacher whom I clung to in Sunday School and heard the message of Christ, it was her dedication and love which moved me. It was my Mother's love for the LORD that taught me a few spiritual principles to observe. As time went on I grew cold to the ways of the LORD, all of the "killer ordinances" that our LORD nailed to the cross and of what Paul, Peter, James and the rest wrote I became steadfastly obstinate. The LORD removed the veil and showed me many things thru trials and tribulations and a whole lot of heartache and despair that without His Spirit's quickening the Word is useless. That word became alive in my spirit and thru much more difficulty He enabled me to know His true intentions. Oh the grace of our LORD Jesus Christ is such a wonderful force. I don't know if I have any Wisdom, knowledge or understanding, but what I do know, His work in me is His work and not my own. I have many failings, and a couple of bondages, but the LORD is faithful to bring His word to fruition. Keep up the openness and writings. Karl

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/8/18 8:43

Let the woman learn...

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/8/18 9:20

Blessed be the Lord our God who teaches. "Let God be true and every man a liar" His words are clear for those who are looking for his order and not trying to find our own order. I try to read thinking it's his word to me and I must follow, he is good and knows the end from the beginning. As a warrior of heaven I must follow orders from on high, knowing he is in command. Many a day I thank him for being in the place that is his, for he paid for it with his Blood. God Bless and let's follow his orders
Brother Raven

Re: Women - posted by butterflies (), on: 2004/8/19 14:30

I know Paul says that women should not have authority over the man, because man was made first. Man is the head of the woman as Christ is head of the church. I believe feminism is one of Satan's ploys to destroy the foundation of marriage and of the family. Think about it and you'll understand.

Us women are not to be like robot's mind you, but we are to revere our husbands and honor them as we would honor Jesus Christ I believe. I will have to think more on this and see what the Holy Spirit shows me.

Re:, on: 2004/9/7 10:05

I'd like to encourage all of you to read 1 Corinthians Chapter 14 and versus 34-36. I think most people stop reading way to soon. They read 34 and 35 where it says.

Let your women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are comanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

But lets not stop reading there, those two versus make millions of men very happy to read. To them it seems as though God is a respecter of persons, which the Bible cleraly says he is not. And that they can control women, they think submission, means they have total control over the woman, which is indeed, ignorant on their part. HOWEVER, keep reading.

Verse 36 - What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?

Now lets look at this completely. Paul writes these things, that women should not do, which is most likely, exactly what the Corinthians wanted, or what they had wrote to him in a letter, which he responds to. Paul in other occasions in his letters, has to address those things in which the churches were doing wrong, and in which they had asked him. So the first two versus there, he is most likely stating, how they feel about it. BUT he answers them, and is saying basically What?!? Do you think you (men) are the only ones the Word of God came to?

He is clearly saying Jesus did not come just for men. He is saying Jesus came for a woman, as much as he came for a man. There might be separate roles men and woman play in the family unit. But in the church, there is no such thing. Paul makes that very clear in that verse.

For those who want to ignore the rest of what Paul wrote concerning women in the church, I ask how come you don't take those two versus and apply it TOTALLY. If you think that verse 36 does not answer the question about women, then look at where verse 34 mentions the law. Which from what the Bible tells me, I no longer live under the old law anyways. I no longer have to offer burnt sacrifices, I am allowed to eat any meat. None of the old law, pertains to those who are in Christ Jesus. God is no respecter of persons.

So hopefully you can now take the entire scripture that is found in, and read verse 36 with it, and realize that Paul did not ever say that a woman cannot hold the same offices in the church as a man.

God Bless!
Mitch

Re:, on: 2004/10/3 12:39

Firstly i would like to apologize for a late reply but i am new to this site. This topic has been really edifying from what i have read so far and all done in a real spirit of love, Praise God. I thank God for brothers and sisters like you all. I have just had a truly disturbing experience on this very topic i need to share. I just registered with another forum site and happened to mention i was invited back on my course as a tutor. However what i failed to mention was that as a tutor we don't teach but support new students and just be there for them. I introduced myself and this was my reply:

"Geraldine,

Welcome to the board!

Just one little point that you obviously don't know yet; as a woman you are not allowed to teach the things of God, so being a tutor is not an option for you. But seeing as you have a bundle of work arriving soon I suspect you won't have time anyway. I hope that goes well too."

My reply was:

Thank you all for your replies. To put your mind's at ease as i don't like to offend and if i have then i do apologize, but as a tutor on this particular course we don't teach but we give support, guidance and any help new students might need. On the other hand they do have women that teach in many different areas such as prejudice, world issues, how to study God's word effectively, church history all of which doesn't pose a problem for me personally.

I read the rules before i came on this site and was WELL aware of what you believe so i am sorry if i have caused anyone any offence.

I came on this site because i belived i could recieve sound doctrine and great fellowship with my brothers and sisters in Christ, which i look forward to.

My in laws i must add are both pastors (inc. my mother in law) and missionaries and have a succesfull ministry in Africa which includes an orphanage. They are BOTH representatives for the whole of Europe for a worldwide ministry based in America. My brother in law (from Africa) is also my pastor! My point is wether or not i agree to women teaching or even if i don't have a choice, i respect my mother in law and will sit through a service if she is preaching and let the Good Lord d ecide on the day of judgement.

I am sorry to have caused you offence,
In his love,
Geraldine

And the moderators reply shocked me:

Moderators reply:

"Geraldine,

The issue is not really to do with whether anyone else is offended here. The issue is 'is God offended?' The Lord does n ot have to 'decide on Judgement Day', He has already stated what the Truth is. We are expected to seek out The Truth and move into it. If we are not, over a period of time, conformed to The Truth we will not be, ultimately, saved, we will not die in Christ Jesus, who IS The Truth.

I very much doubt if you have offended anyone here, and even if you did they would forgive you, and forget it. But to go on wilfully rejecting The Truth, and walking in error, is a gross offence to Christ. That makes Him weep.

When you read the rules (well done!) you were not just looking at 'what we believe', but a statement that only The Truth i s good enough here. Offending Christ is not allowed here. I also know couples who were missionaries and women who speak/preach in churches. But they would not do it in any assembly where I was an elder, and if I was around when your mother in law dared to get out of place she would be publicly rebuked and put back in it. If she would not accept The Tru th she would be told to leave the fellowship. Rebellion against Him who is The Truth is downright wickedness, and not s omething to be passed over, or even less, honoured."

Regardless of what we believe on this subject i pray that as brothers and sisters we can all still come together the way y ou all do on this site!

I'm not sure why but since recieving the above post from this other un-named forum site my spirit feels disturbed, why is that?

I want to do whats right by God and if that means i can't teach then so be it although i have no firm conclusion as of yet. sorry to go on but i really needed to get this off my chest and maybe someone can tell me if im right to feel disturbed by what this brother wrote. What do you think?

In his love, Geraldine.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/3 13:08

Quote:

-----if I was around when your mother in law dared to get out of place she would be publicly rebuked and put back in it.

Hi Geraldine

You will have seen that this is a long and honourable thread, and that folks don't always have exactly the same picture o f things.

Of all that you quoted the part above is the part that would disturb me most. I do believe that there is a difference betwe en male and female and their operation in the gathered church of God. (they are lots of implications in that last sentence) However, I am sure that women are to be 'given their place' rather than 'put back in it'. This phrase distresses me mor e than I can express. There are areas within the life of a gathered church which I do believe God has sectioned off from the woman, but for hers and the church's safety, not because she needs to be 'put back in her place'.

This may sound strong on the basis of limited information but I doubt that anyone who genuinely has this spirit could ever really function as an elder. He may have the role/office but not the heart. The man has a unique responsibility for protection of the woman in the gathered church, and this attack is the opposite of what ought to happen. I think this is what has disturbed your spirit. You sense that this is not only unjust but that there is something destructive in it.

That's 'what I think'.

Now what do you do? You keep your spirit open to the Lord and carry on doing what you were doing. Whom the Lord loveth he disciplines... and He always does it in that order. From the security of His love comes His rebuke as necessary, but His rebuke will never appear as an attack. His Fatherly rebukes come from relationship not from not aggressive 'leaders' defending their places. If God has more to say, He will say it. His sheep recognize His voice...

Re: women teaching - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/10/3 16:57

Geraldine,

all I know is that if what this moderator said was true, then Corrie Ten Boom, Amy Carmichael, Elizabeth Elliot, Nancy Deme Moss, and others are going against God's will; and sinning and are not/did not go to heaven. I think we all know that isn't true.

Even in Oswald Chamber's biography, he talks about how one of his bible teaching friend's wife is just a good of speaker - if not better than her husband.

It would be an idiotic thing to say that men should not and do not learn from women. Though, I don't think that I should be trying to teach a men's bible study. :-?

In Him, Chanan

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by Crysddd, on: 2004/10/4 22:11

God is not schitzo and the very first evangelist in the church was a woman, Mary Magdalene. it was to her that Christ first appeared and told her to go tell the disciples he had risen... second there are twenty four apostles talked about in the new testament if you study it out twelve were women. third that scripture has been twisted by ignorant men. He said in the literal greek that a woman is not to usurp authority over her husband not over just men in general.. but if you read the text before and after in the greek you will discover that he is talking about women adorning themselves with a meek and gentle spirit. but he also said likewise that men pray everywhere without wrath and doubting so he was talking there of everyone taking their rightful place. the wife is to submit to her husband if he is in his proper place in his spiritual life. men who are domineering and brutish are not in that place therefore women should not submit to a fool.... fourth

Col 2:8 Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

Col 3:10 And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:

Col 3:11 Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.

Gal 3:27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

Gal 3:28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

for anyone to argue against a woman shows they are carnal and unspiritual

fifth

Luk 2:36 And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher: she was of a great age, and had lived with a husband seven years from her virginity;

Act 21:8 And the next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came unto Caesarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven; and abode with him.

Act 21:9 And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy.

Paul was not against women preachers or else he would not have acknowledged these daughters who prophesied..

Joe 2:28 And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions:

Joe 2:29 And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.

God is not against them or He would have only said men here....the list goes on..

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/5 4:01

Quote:

-----Paul was not against women preachers or else he would not have acknowledged these daughters who prophesied..

This actually widens the issue. The original question was 'can women preach/teach in church?' Prophecy is a different dimension. It is very clear that Paul allowed and expected women to prophesy 'in church'; Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. (1Co 11:4-5 KJV)

Your Joel reference is also to prophesying rather than preaching/teaching.

Re: - posted by Crysddd, on: 2004/10/5 7:43

actually prophesying means to speak by divine inspiration. preaching is the lowest form of prophesying. also paul taught that God set in the church first, apostles, second prophets, third evangelist then pastors and teachers. if that is so and that is the order then why is a woman allowed to hold a higher office as a prophet but not as a preacher (evangelist) or a teacher or pastor. that would not make good sense.

Re: - posted by Crysddd, on: 2004/10/5 8:02

Quote:

-----This actually widens the issue. The original question was 'can women preach/teach in church?' Prophecy is a different dimension. It is very clear that Paul allowed and expected women to prophesy 'in church'; Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. (1Co 11:4-5 KJV)

also in this scripture he is saying that Christ is the spiritual head of man and that the husband is the head of the wife. when he is talking about praying or prophesying with it covered or uncovered, both of those in the greek speak of being in rebellion to your head. Christ is man's head, if a man in the church gets up and prays or prophesies and he is in rebellion against Christ and not submitted to Christ then He dishonors Christ. So also if a wife (who is disorderly) gets up and in contention is a troublemaker and prays or prophesies in rebellion or in division from her husband (if he is in his proper spiritual place) dishonors and disgraces her head which is her husband. He was not talking about natural physical head coverings or else all women would have to wear them today in the church and those who didn't would be in sin. we know that is not true because by grace are we saved through faith and that not of ourselves it is the gift of God. not of works lest we should boast. Paul was the greatest proponent of that day of not working for salvation by being circumcised or by ob

serving jewish customs. even to the point of having conflicts with James and Peter, he would not then turn around and tell the churches that they then must conform to jewish customs in the church.

in Christ there is neither male nor female, but we are all Christ. when we preach or teach it should be the Spirit of God speaking and not us. the Spirit of God will use whatever and whomever he can to testify of Jesus Christ. A man who puts himself above the Spirit of God is just as bad as a woman who is contentious. the key is that it is God speaking and we need not get tripped up over who the person is through whom he is speaking. if we become judges with partial thoughts then according to James we have sinned. the anointing we have received from him teaches us all things, that is who is speaking by the Spirit of God and who is not. that is the measure that we are to use to judge whether male or female. for as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God (male or female).

God bless and thanks for the wonderful discussion :-)

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 10:21

Crysddd says:

Quote:
-----actually prophesying means to speak by divine inspiration. preaching is the lowest form of prophesying. also Paul taught that God set in the church first, apostles, second prophets, third evangelist then pastors and teachers. if that is so and that is the order then why is a woman allowed to hold a higher office as a prophet but not as a preacher (evangelist) or a teacher or pastor. that would not make good sense.

I agree completely. First of all, if some men aren't doing the job, then God has to raise somebody up who will. I personally know some women who are preaching the Gospel. Second, Christ said in the "Great Commission" to "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." He doesn't say "Men, go ye into all the world..." does he? Thirdly, God's Word says he is "no respecter of persons". And fourth of all, remember Phillip the Evangelist? He had four daughters "which did prophesy". (Acts 21:9) The word "prophesy" comes from the Greek word "prophetousi" which means to "speak under the divine illumination of the Holy Spirit". You could very well say, "Preaching under the Power and Divine knowledge of the Spirit".

The Evangelist

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/5 10:49

Quote:
-----actually prophesying means to speak by divine inspiration. preaching is the lowest form of prophesying. also Paul taught that God set in the church first, apostles, second prophets, third evangelist then pastors and teachers. if that is so and that is the order then why is a woman allowed to hold a higher office as a prophet but not as a preacher (evangelist) or a teacher or pastor. that would not make good sense.

We need to distinguish between prophets and prophesying. I have driven a bus, but I am not a bus driver. I prophesy but I am not a prophet. It may be significant that Philip's daughters prophesy but Agabus is a prophet.

There are a few assumptions here that have probably been talked through earlier in the thread. I don't think it is accurate to say that preaching is the 'lowest' form of prophesying. Prophecy, teaching, preaching are all distinguishable functions in the New Testament. However teaching may include prophecy and some preaching; preaching may include prophecy and teaching etc., Nevertheless preaching is not prophecy and teaching is not preaching.

Re: - posted by Crysddd, on: 2004/10/5 12:59

religion always splits hairs about everything..the bottom line is the first person ever to be told to go preach was a woman ...why are religious men so afraid of women preachers??? I am a male pastor and was a traveling evangelist, I have seen women pastors and they were very good pastors so there is no argument as far as I am concerned....it is amazing that they can receive the same Holy Spirit as the apostles in the upper room but they can't preach????

Re: - posted by Crysddd, on: 2004/10/5 13:03

Quote:
-----We need to distinguish between prophets and prophesying. I have driven a bus, but I am not a bus driver. I prophesy but I am not a prophet. It may be significant that Philip's daughters prophesy but Agabus is a prophet.

what about the women mentioned in luke, "Luk 2:36 And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher: she was of a great age, and had lived with a husband seven years from her virginity; " if the scriptures are by divine authority then the Holy Spirit called this women a prophet...

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 13:32

Crysddd says:

Quote:
-----it is amazing that they can receive the same Holy Spirit as the apostles in the upper room but they can't preach????

Hey Philologos, He's got a point! ;-)

The Evangelist

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 13:41

his mind is far above our minds. Question do we follow the word or rewrite it, are we followers or improvers of his word. There is a king and I'm not him. I made a choice to follow where he leads. he made me and all that there is in heaven and earth. there is no vote in heaven for a new leader this YEAR.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/5 14:31

Quote:
-----what about the women mentioned in luke, "Luk 2:36 And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher: she was of a great age, and had lived with a husband seven years from her virginity; " if the scriptures are by divine authority then the Holy Spirit called this women a prophet....

There are several prophetesses in the Old Testament; Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Isaiah's wife, and Anna. (these are the good ones!) The question I was addressing was 'can a woman preach/teach in church. Everything I have said relates to the woman 'in church'. 'Outside the church' is a different world.

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 15:02

Let God be true and every man a liar. "there is a difference between testimony and preaching". Oswald Chambers I will hide your word in my heart that I might not sin against you. Was Paul correct in his writing to the churches everywhere? I know I am to follow orders and not question them. and having done all we must stand upon the sure foundation.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/5 15:09

Quote:
-----it is amazing that they can receive the same Holy Spirit as the apostles in the upper room but they can't preach????

Personally I am very happy about women preaching.

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 15:58

Well you are happy but is Christ happy about them preaching? he answered questions by the world with "as it is written" when we question his word we are questioning him for he is the word. god ask men to do some things in this world are we as men going to take the easy way and let others do our work? Adam did and look where we are today. I'm happy to follow his word as he is my leader.

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 16:01

Quote:
-----Well you are happy but is Christ happy about them preaching?

This statement is none other than foolishness brought on by a chauvinistic mentality.

Quote:
-----his mind is far above our minds. Question do we follow the word or rewrite it, are we followers or improvers of his word.

Try digging a little deeper than just the surface. II Tim. 2:15-16

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 16:04

Is his word foolishness? they will not hear sound doctrine in the last days. I would rather be foolish in him than to be wise in man's eyes.

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 16:11

No, "His" Word isn't, but your vain reasonings are.

ravin Quote:

his mind is far above our minds. Question do we follow the word or rewrite it, are we followers or improvers of his word.

Try digging a little deeper than just the surface. II Tim. 2:15-16

Re:, on: 2004/10/5 16:15

This might sound like a silly question because I'm very tired but as a woman if I'm not allowed to teach but can witness here do you draw the line when one of those you are witnessing to asks you to expound on a piece of scripture in or out of 'the church'. Is that classed as teaching? If I decided that as a woman I shouldn't teach where would I draw the line? I love God's word and love to study it day and night, I couldn't possibly contemplate stopping myself from sharing what God has revealed to me through his word. I can't keep that within me it would be impossible. For example what if I wrote a book on a topic in the bible because I wanted to share with others what God has revealed to me (something that I would be very honoured to do) is that a form of teaching? If so would that be acceptable or not? I'm making this too confusing for myself? HELP!

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 16:20

Then Paul also is vain? how did he ever get his writing in to the most holy book. I believe that he followed the Holy Spirit and also wrote as he was moved by the Holy Spirit. are we following his word or are we looking to have things our way? god wrote his word I would only follow it. I pray that we would do things as Jesus would have us to do. "As it is written" Sometimes, digging a little deeper is what people do, when actually what Christ is asking of us is to keep it simple "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Also, "Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, yet they are they which testify of Me. But ye do not come to me that, that ye might have life."

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 16:21

Quote:
-----This might sound like a silly question because im very tired but as a woman if im not allowed to teach but can witness where do you draw the line when one of those you are witnessing to asks you to expound on a piece of scripture in or out of 'the church'. Is that classed as teaching? If i decided that as a woman i shouldn't teach where would i draw the line? I love Gods word and love to study it day and night,i couldn't possibly contemplate stopping myself from sharing what God has revealed to me through his word. I can't keep that within me it would be impossible. For example what if i wrote a book on a topic in the bible because i wanted to share with others what God has revealed to me (something that i would be very honoured to do)is that a form of teaching? If so would that be acceptable or not?

Ma'am, you don't have to draw the line anywhere. Ravin was raised legalistically. As long as you're (if you're married) not rising above the authority of your husband, or your Pastor, you can preach God's word anywhere and at anytime you please. Remember the Great Commission. We are to go into "All the world" and preach the Gospel. He didn't just say men. He's giving a command to whoever will take His name to the lost and dying world. God Bless!

The Evangelist

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 16:24

Quote:
-----Then Paul also is vain? how did he ever get his writing in to the most holy book. I believe that he followed the Holy Spirit and also wrote as he was moved by the Holy Spirit. are we following his word or are we looking to have things our way?

You need to see more than just what is written. You also need to see when and why it was written(for what purpose). I don't have time to argue with a legalistic mind who has never taken time out to answer these questions himself.

Re: - posted by lwpray (), on: 2004/10/5 16:25

This said by an extraordinary female minister with little but the covering of Heaven:

"...Can he have followed far, who has no wound or scar?"
Amy Carmichael

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/10/5 16:58

Hi folks,
this has been covered well in other threads,it is also good here to!
Wayne Grudem in his "systematic theology" covers this whole topic well and is thorough.
Chapter 47 section D page 937 should women be church officers?
If anyone wants to look at this together we can discuss maybe put in a new thread. :-)

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 17:30

It's utter foolishness to base that belief from one scripture and try to make doctrine from it. In reality they've got II Corinthians 14:34-35 all wrong. God is no respecter of persons. Try digging into the roots of this passage.

II Corinthians 14:34-35 says :
(v.34) "Let your women keep silence in the Churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak;..."
(This passage is not referring to women being used by the Lord in the Gifts ; in Churches AT THAT TIME, men and women did not normally sit together, but rather on opposite sides of the room; the women would call out to their husbands as king for an explanation concerning things, which was interrupting the Services)

"...but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also says the Law.
(referring back to Gen. 3:16 and the Creation Model)

(v.35)"And if they will learn any thin, let them ask their husbands at home:...(proving what we just said in verse 34)

"...for it is a shame for women to speak in Church.

(To speak out in the manner Paul has just mentioned; it doesn't refer to women Teachers or Preachers, etc.; if so, it would be wrong for a woman to sing or say anything in Church, which we should know is not correct.)(KJV/JSM)

The Evangelist

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/5 17:37

Quote:
-----To speak out in the manner Paul has just mentioned; it doesn't refer to women Teachers or Preachers, etc.; if so, it would be wrong for a woman to sing or say anything in Church, which we should know is not correct.

This is not logical. Who said anything about singing or saying? What do you think a New Testament teacher taught?

Quote:
-----Try digging into the roots of this passage.

This is arrogant. Just because you disagree with someone it doesn't mean that they are insincere or that they have not studied the scriptures. Some of us were studying these passages 20 years before you were born.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/10/5 17:38

Quote:
-----It's utter foolishness to base that belief from one scripture and try to make doctrine from it. In reality they've got II Corinthians 14:34-35 all wrong. God is no respecter of persons. Try digging into the roots of this passage.

Your words and comments to others in this thread is not in the gentle spirit of Christ and is not conducive to edification and teaching in righteousness. Please evaluate yourself and look over your comments and posts. I hope we can continue in a proper spirit of communication.

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 17:40

Quote:
-----Some of us were studying these passages 20 years before you were born.

Arrogant? I was told to watch my comments so, may God bless you Brother inspite how old you are.(NOT A SMARTY COMMENT)

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 18:14

What dose it take to be a leader in the body. I believe it said a man with one wife. I don't believe that we are to change the wording or it's intent. "as it is written"

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/5 18:16

I'm sorry to all of those who I've offended with my personal comments. I guess I didn't realize I was offending anybody. I'm only 23 years old(not using as an excuse to justify myself) and am trying to learn to watch my comments (in a way of responsibility). Thanks to Greg and some others who are helping me understand and realize that there is a way to differ in doctrine and yet still get along and live peaceably among all. However, my doctrines still stand as are. God Bless! Glory to the Lamb forever more!

The Evangelist

Re: Can women preach/teach in church? - posted by Yodi (), on: 2004/10/5 18:49

Ah! So much to read! K... here's, just some input...

First, context of Scripture - I believe that in 1 Timothy 2, the chapter is about the order of church services. You know, what they should look like, how they should be conducted, and so forth. So, plain and simple, women, stay out of the pulpit and stay in the pew.

HOWEVER, I think there's an opportunity for women to *train* or *admonish* other women as seen in Titus 2:4, "*These older women must train the younger women to love their husbands and their children, to live wisely and be pure, to take care of their homes, to do good, and to be submissive to their husbands. Then they will not bring shame on the word of God.*" So women teaching women, like in Bible studies or at women's retreats, conferences and the like, I think is fine by God. I've had an opportunity to teach in these settings myself and I loved it! Hope maybe I'll get more opportunities in the future.

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/5 19:20

sister you are welcome breeze. I pray also for you to have all that the lord has for you in his kingdom. you and my wife would get along. thank you lord for mothers in Israel. and sisters.

Re:, on: 2004/10/6 2:43

Quote:
-----This might sound like a silly question because im very tired but as a woman if im not allowed to teach but can witness where do you draw the line when one of those you are witnessing to asks you to expound on a piece of scripture in or out of 'the church'. Is that classed as teaching? If i decided that as a woman i shouldn't teach where would i draw the line? I love Gods word and love to study it day and night,i couldn't possibly contemplate stopping myself from sharing what God has revealed to me through his word. I can't keep that within me it would be impossible. For example what if i wrote a book on a topic in the bible because i wanted to share with others what God has revealed to me (something that i would be very honoured to do)is that a form of teaching? If so would that be acceptable or not?

Hey guys i don't mean to be rude but can anyone answer this one for me? Brother Ron.B i'd appreciate your wisdom on this one.

In his love, a still very sleepy Geraldine :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/6 3:05

Quote:
-----II Corinthians 14:34-35'says :
(v.34) "Let your women keep silence in the Churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak;..."
(This passage is not referring to women being used by the Lord in the Gifts ; in Churches AT THAT TIME, men and women did not normally sit together, but rather on opposite sides of the room; the women would call out to their husbands asking for an explanation concerning things, which was interrupting the Services)

The 'churches at that time' did not exist. This view is often raised as an explanation of Paul's words in Corinth but they simply do not fit the facts. Christians did not meet in 'churches' until approximately 300 years after this time. Added to which Corinth is one church that we know did not meet like this. Acts 18 explains how the church there split from the synagogue and held its meetings, literally next door, in the home of Justus. The synagogue pattern of the women in the gallery could not have existed here, if it existed anywhere in the early church. There is no biblical or other evidence to support the idea that the women were separated and had to call to their husbands.

The church of which I am part is blessed with the spoken ministry of many sisters. I am not advocating that women are 'put in their place' but in a spirit of mutual enquiry I do want to do justice to the whole scripture and when Paul says Let a woman learn in silence, in all subjection. And I do not allow a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man, but to be in silence. (1Ti 2:11-12 LITV) I do want to understand what he is saying and why.

Corinthians is one of the few letters where the writer makes it plain that he knew he was writing for a larger audience than the receiving congregation; Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours: (1Co 1:2 KJV) That 'all in every place' includes Reading in the UK, Texas, South Africa and all the countries where Slers sojourn. That means we have a responsibility not to confine the Corinthian letters to a historical archive but to seek to apply the wisdom given to our beloved brother Paul in every location and era.

We have a great opportunity to learn together but not if we are trying to win an argument. The basic qualification for learning is lowliness and meekness of heart, without which we cannot learn and certainly cannot teach. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. (Mat 11:29 KJV)

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/6 3:06

Quote:
-----religion always splits hairs about everything

Oh no, we only split hairs on the important words in the bible...

...come to think of it, that's all of them... ;-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/6 4:52

Geraldine
this will be a long post. Get yourself a cup of coffee before you start. :-D

The church of Christ struggles with your question and has done for centuries. Much though I respect the thoughts of Slers we are unlikely to solve it this morning!;-) But we might find some pointers which help in our larger understanding. As a group leader, pastor, bible college tutor and now itinerant bible teacher, and in many different cultures, I have been asked these questions constantly and I have given much thought and prayer not only to the biblical statements but to a pastoral care for those involved. What follows will not be a quick fix and may provide more questions than answers but I don't think anyone will suffer from thinking a little more...

For me Paul's reference to the woman praying or prophesying is clear proof that a woman was not required to be absolutely silent in the gathering of the church. I know the cessationists would differ but that is a different topic.

One of the first things I discovered is that the word for 'silence' is frequently used in a comparative sense in the New Testament. One interesting passage is in the Acts; And when he had given him licence, Paul stood on the stairs, and beckoned with the hand unto the people. And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, saying, Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. (And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith,) (Act 21:40-22:2 KJV) This has a 'great silence' followed by even 'more silence'. It seems clear to me that we are not talking about absolute silences here and I do not feel that Paul is talking about absolute silences in the churches.

Another thing I noticed is that although some have interpreted some of these passages to mean that the woman must remain soundless in the assembly some of the words used have a different feel to them. The word used in 1 Tim 2:11 'let the woman learn in silence' is used elsewhere by Paul; Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread.(2Th 3:12 KJV) where the sense is obvious. This has to do with tranquility rather than decibels. In fact Paul uses it earlier in 1 Timothy; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. (1Ti 2:2 KJV) where it is translated 'peaceable'. The sense is 'without aggitation'. These uses show that the underlying sense is calm and tranquility rather

than an absolute silence.

The same word is used by Peter in a way which I think is deeply suggestive; Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. (1Pe 3:3-6 KJV) This is helpful because of its context. Peter does not want the woman to be conspicuous. It is also significant that Sarah is mentioned who was certainly not 'silent'; on one occasion God told Abraham to listen to Sarah and do what she wanted! But the 'feel' of the word is coming through again, God regards a woman's 'quiet spirit' as of great price. This is an unusual expression that God should highly value this characteristic in the woman. A similar expression is used in the Psalms where it says 'precious, in the eyes of the Lord, is the death of his saints'. I see an hidden truth here; all those little deaths that we die to 'our right to ourself', they are precious to God, perhaps because they carry the scent of Calvary?

Another thing I notice is that the notion 'silence' is often highly context-sensitive. The Corinthian references are all in one chapter, and are highly "context sensitive". The context is the gathered assembly. The whole of chapter 14 is in the public gathering of the saints. The phrase "whole church" shows us that at times "parts" of the church would meet together in "house-meetings". 1Co 14:19,23,28,34-35

The first "silence" in Chapter 14 is enjoined upon a speaker in tongues, who must be "silent" when there is no interpreter. 1 Co 14:27 If any man speak in an tongue, by two, or at the most three, and by course; and let one interpret. 14:28 But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God. This "silence" must be interpreted in its current context. This only means that the "tongue speaker" must refrain from giving a public utterance in an unknown tongue if there is no interpreter of tongues present. It does not mean that he must remain without sound with regard to other kinds of utterance e.g. prophecy or teaching.

The second silence in Chapter 14 is enjoined upon a prophet, who must give way to another who also has a revelation 1 Co 14:29 Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. 14:30 If be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace 14:31 For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted The same word is used here. This too must be interpreted in its current context. It simply means that a prophet who realizes that another has a revelation must make space for him. Subsequently the prophet who had been "silent" might add a further prophecy, or contribute to the meeting in some other way.

The third silence in Chapter 14 is enjoined upon women, whom the law has commanded to be "subject" 1 Co 14:34 Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be under obedience, as also saith the law. 14:35 And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. In what context is women to be "silent"? In the context of submission to God's order in authority.

We have already been told that a woman may pray or prophesy so it is obvious that the scriptures are not shutting the woman up to absolute soundlessness. If this did mean absolute soundlessness it would also constitute a ban on women singing in the meeting. It is a basic principle of reasoning that the second statement of 1 Co 14:34 must be added to the earlier statement of 1 Cor 11:5, and a conclusion reached which does justice to both statements. Having read plainly that a woman may pray or prophesy we need to be clear about the context in which she must be "silent". In those other forms of utterance she is not required to be "silent". It is important to identify the current context to determine when and why the woman must be "silent". The woman is to be submitted.. as also saith the Law. what does Paul have in mind when he makes this comment when discussing the relationship between man and woman the Lord drew his teaching from the beginning. In the tangle of relationship between man and woman it is essential to go back to first principles. In a related passage Paul links the role of the woman in the church with the creation. It is almost certain that Paul's mind in the beginnings of things when he refers to "as also saith the Law". The Law here referring to the books of Moses, including Genesis. Having announced to the Serpent that his head would be bruised by the woman's issue God then addressed the woman. He spoke of three facts of life for the woman. Sometimes this is expressed as the woman cursed, although the scripture nowhere uses that language. The pattern of God's dealing with the Serpent, the woman and the man is intertwining. Penalty came on the serpent because of the temptation. Penalty came on the man because of his yielding. But God's words to the woman do not contain the word "because". The scripture simply declares And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in s

orrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; (Gen 3:14-18 KJV)

The words to the woman are simply a statement of the will of God with no reference to their cause. They include three clauses there would be increase in pain and conception there would be pain in the birth of children the pattern of the relationship between the man and woman is described. It is this last clause which is most likely in the mind of Paul when he says that the Law saith that the woman is to be subject to the man. The relationship is described from two perspectives. The woman's; your desire shall be to your husband. The man's; he shall rule over you. Shall we regard this as a curse, a provision or just a plain statement of facts?

The woman's desire would be towards her husband. The word desire used here is thought to have the sense of "stretching out" towards something. It is a word of longing and affection used only seldom in the scriptures. The corresponding action of the man was to rule. Paul speaks of the woman's designated position under the law. The Law nowhere banned women from praying or prophesying. The examples of Deborah and Huldah illustrate this. In the New Testament we may add the daughters of Philip, Acts 21:8,9. Neither does the Law ever enjoin "silence" upon the woman. What the Law does do is make a clear distinction between the function of male and female in the question of authority. There is a pattern and order to the relationship of man to woman which may be expressed in a single idea. God holds the man responsible. This is codified in Numbers 30, where a woman's vows were to be endorsed by the man whom God held responsible for her well-being. In the case of single woman the man was the father. In the case of a married woman the man was the husband. The woman is the weaker vessel. This is a bible revelation. It may not be possible to give a positive statement to say in which sense she is weaker, but we are furnished with this plain truth that the woman is the weaker vessel. We can affirm that in many cases the woman is stronger physically, emotionally and intellectually, but we are still left with the bible statement that the woman is to be considered "as" the weaker vessel. Man's "strength" is not to be used against the woman's "weakness", for his own interests but for hers. His "strength" is at her service in her "weakness". This helps in an understanding of Numbers 30. The man is responsible in caring for the woman in the case of public vows which she may make. The man is not denying her her own responsibilities, but is covering her protectively. His silence is taken as his silent protection still operative. The man does not make decisions for the woman, which are then imposed upon her. His responsibility toward the woman can only operate in a veto of her ill-advised decision. He has the responsibility of saying yes or no, but she has the responsibility of whether to vow or not.

I do not allow a woman to teach... I have often wondered just what "teaching" means in these letters. When we think of a "teacher" we think of a Bible expositor or something similar, but a "teacher" or someone "teaching" in the Corinthian assembly would not be giving an exposition of 1 Corinthians! It seems to me that the "teacher" in the early church had a responsibility in actually formulating the "doctrine" of the early church. There were no credal statements to judge orthodoxy. The "teacher" then bore a very great responsibility, and his "teachings" would carry considerable authority. It is in the carrying of authority that the scriptures are most mindful of the woman's need for protection. Adam was not deceived, but Eve was. It seems to me that it is in this carrying of authority the woman is the "weaker vessel", and that the man must always keep that in mind. It is to be noted that Paul did not forbid woman to evangelize (preach), or to pray or to prophesy or to bear witness. It was only "teaching" which he would not allow. The woman must not carry the burden of systematizing truth nor of producing the assembly's "doctrinal statement". She may well have the ability to do so, and perhaps more so than many men, but "authority" in the church resides in the Man (Christ) who is represented in the church by the males. For this reason he is not permitted to cover his head, because that would symbolize that Christ's authority was still "veiled", whereas God has publically declared Him to be both Lord and Christ. In the gathered assembly "authority" must be male. Only in this context of "authority" is the woman is to remain "silent".

I do not equate authority with leadership. Leadership can be an event not a role. Often in our own meeting a woman will pray and the meeting will follow her 'lead'. Often they will prophesy and the meeting will follow their 'lead' but they do not hold recognized authority in the oversight of the church. Their opinions are listened to and as we seek God together every voice has the same value, but in terms of authority we do not allow a woman to exercise authority over a man.

One final comment on this 'introduction'.. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. (1Ti 2:12 KJV) Both these verbs are in the present infinitive form. Greek infinitives, unlike English ones, contain a tense, and this one is 'present'. Greek present tenses have more of a continuous sense than our simple English present tense. The consequence is that a super-pedantic translation of this verse would say I am not allowing a woman to be teaching or to be authoritizing a man. If this were an Aorist Infinitive it would mean 'to teach' but this is a Present Infinitive and it means 'to continually teach' I think Paul has in mind, not an event, but a regular role.

There's a lot to work through here, and your specific questions have still not been answered, but I felt this thread had got to the stage where some explanation, rather than a quick fix answer, was required. This is the distillation of over 45 years

s study and meditation on this topic! and even so I have to say that this is 'state of the art', my current understanding, and even here 'we know in part...'

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/6 10:35

I believe women shouldn't be pastor of a church. I believe that a the pastoral position was a position that God had intended for a man and he only. Pastor = Bishop (I Tim. Chapter 3)

The Evangelist

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/6 10:57

Hi Evangelist

Quote:

-----Pastor = Bishop (I Tim. Chapter 3)

I know I must annoy you and I wish I didn't but the scriptures you quote do not make this equation. I think you mean that elder = bishop/overseer. It is true that elders were charged with the pastoral care of the flock as Paul said to the elders from Ephesus; "Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock, among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers (bishops), to shepherd (or pastor) the church of God which He purchased with His own blood. (Act 20:28 NASB)The multiple eldership/oversight is being reminded of its collective responsibility. There is no record of single 'pastor' churches until 50 years after this statement.

Now if you say an elder must be a man, I would agree with you.

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/6 11:11

Philologos quote "There is no record of single 'pastor' churches until 50 years after this statement."

About the quote brother...it doesn't mean there weren't any. (In love and not hatred)I disagree. The office of the Bishop and Pastor are on and the same. Most Pastors were raised up out of the local church.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/6 13:28

Quote:

-----The office of the Bishop and Pastor

We talked a little about this elsewhere. If overseer/bishop - pastor were synonymous terms it would mean that all overseers/elders/bishops were pastors. Although all the elders in the oversight shared the pastoral responsibility there is no biblical reference to a 'pastor' in the sense of the leader of a local assembly. This did not occur until the end of the 1st century and was contested even then.

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/6 15:56

Quote:

-----We talked a little about this elsewhere.

No, WE never, you and Greg did.

Quote:

-----Although all the elders in the oversight shared the pastoral responsibility...This did not occur until the end of the 1st century and was contested even then.

Then that would've made them PASTORS brother. The second line - What BIBLICAL, NOT HISTORICAL proof do you

have of this? I would like to know more about what you're teaching and the roots of it though. God bless, and Glory to the Lamb!

The Evangelist

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/10/6 16:22

Quote:

-----No, WE never, you and Greg did.

I think the valid point brother Ron is making is that there are 20,000 posts in the forums and for you to jump in and discuss matters oblivious to the rest can be a type of ignorance. There is a search function that you can utilize and if you are seeking answers to certain questions and doctrines and it would be good to search out in the forums first before going to post your own opinions. There are many people that have been on these forums for a whole year time and I would respect that as much as possible.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/6 17:24

Quote:

-----Then that would've made them PASTORS brother. The second line - What BIBLICAL, NOT HISTORICAL proof do you have of this? I would like to know more about what you're teaching and the roots of it though. God bless, and Glory to the Lamb!

I think you do not really want a discussion, what you want is a fight. I have neither the time nor the inclination for a fight. Perhaps someone else will oblige you.

Re: - posted by theevangelist, on: 2004/10/6 17:29

Quote:

-----I think you do not really want a discussion, what you want is a fight. I have neither the time nor the inclination for a fight. Perhaps someone else will oblige you.

No, Honestly, I want to know your reasoning for it and where your information regarding this teaching is from. I have no intentions of fighting. You can ease up a little brother. I did not say anything rude to you that would cause a fight, did I? If I have I sincerely ask that you'd forgive me. However, surely you must be able to back up what you said, must you? God Bless.

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/6 23:23

how dose that go.. honey and flys well that is if your looking to find fly's.

I once was young and now am older. and I see we've learned little in our moving thru time but to think that we are learning by confrontation, and the younger having little respect for those who are of age. and this is called progress.

we question the word of god and call it seeking knowledge; being theological. what a wonder it would be to God himself if we were to just follow his word. Hmm what a thought.

Re:, on: 2004/10/7 3:59

Thanks for your reply Ron i appreciate it. I could quote much of what you said that really spoke me. You seem to have the gift of approaching scripture with an open mind seeking only the truth. As a result God reveals much hidden truths. I agree i truly don't believe women are to be totally silent and i believe we are allowed to preach, it's just this issue of 'teaching'.

Quote:

-----I do not allow a woman to teach... I have often wondered just what "teaching" means in these letters. When we think of a "teacher" we think of a Bible expositor or something similar, but a "teacher" or someone "teaching" in the Corinthian assembly would not be giving an exposition of 1 Corinthians!

This is very true! This gives me a good starting point to study this topic for myself. I want to be open to what God has to say i seek the truth for myself (with the wisdom of those older and wiser!).

I don't want to rub salt in a very deep and open wound but i can't help but notice that this whole argument is mainly between men and a lot of women seem comfortable with what they personally believe. Just an interesting point i noticed.

Also i believe what we call church today is very very different to what we have written in the new testament. Today we have all these rules, regulations, titles, denominations.....The early 'church' seemed to have the spirit in a cocentrated form and love for one another abounded! Acts of the apostles should be Acts of the early church.

I think we can narrow in on one passage of scripture, taking it out of context that we miss the bigger picture, which often involves literally standing back and looking at it from the perspective of the bible as a whole.

In his love, Geraldine

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/7 4:59

Geraldine

I'm glad it was a constructive provocation to you. ;-)

Quote:

-----I don't want to rub salt in a very deep and open wound but i can't help but notice that this whole argument is mainly between men and a lot of women seem comfortable with what they personally believe. Just an interesting point i noticed.

I think this is true and often muddies the waters for people trying to discover what the truth is. I think that sometimes men have a bad conscience about the whole thing. They (or at least some of them) have no real objection to a woman preaching but they have the niggles of our beloved brother Paul's words in their heads too. So they are in a tension. Background often has a lot to do with it, I think. I have discovered that men with a Muslim cultural background (I don't say Muslims or ex-Muslims specifically) often have a struggle with high-profile women in a church context. I have worked with colleagues from the middle east in particular and this is almost a 'no-go' area.

For some years I worked in an interdenominational Bible school. Around our seminar table we could have students from 10 nations. It drove me to a very basic question 'what is Christianity and what is Culture?' I certainly didn't want to teach UK culture! I recall a wonderful discussion on lawful foods where the fact that the East African ate ants was a nauseating discovery to the Chinese, and the discovery that the Chinese ate snakes was equally nauseous to the East Africans. The fact the Fins around the table ate blood pancakes was regarded as almost unbelievable. We then have to ask the questions 'what is Christianity?' as an irreducible minimum and wherein does our fellowship lie.

This is partly why I don't 'belong' to any specific 'school of theology'. I think such 'schools' are very often the consequence of culture, that is 'the prevailing Christian culture' where they grew.

To be fair to the men, I think we sometimes get what I call the 'headless woman' syndrome. In a fractured society women have often had to be 'assertive' and the man is no longer a symbol of protection but more a threat. Sometimes sisters from broken marriages or bad fathers find a new lease of life in a church fellowship, but their continuing lack of a proper male role model conspires to make them strident in their independence. I can give no full explanation but I see from the scriptures that, for reasons best known to Himself, God highly values a 'meek and quiet spirit' in the woman. Some can preach and lead with such a spirit, for others the very function of preaching or leading seems to militate against such a 'meek and quiet spirit'.

We are blessed in our home church here to have many godly women with 'meek and quiet' spirits. Their frequent 'lead' in prayer, prophecy, tongues, interpretation, worship, testimony, preaching and even some teaching is a rich source of blessing to me and others. Perhaps it is because they know they are free to function in such a way that they have no need to fight for their rights or to prove their point.

Re:, on: 2004/10/7 5:42

Quote:
-----Perhaps it is because they know they are free to function in such a way that they have no need to fight for their rights or to prove their point.

This is exactly what I was thinking! It's hard for some men to understand because they will never be in the woman's shoe so to speak which is why the debate will always go on until our Lord returns. Even though we don't intentionally go out to offend on these sensitive issues there will always be people offended even if we speak in the right spirit with love. You can't win on these topics not that it's a competition anyway. I always think to myself what God must be thinking. In his love, Geraldine

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/7 5:52

Question, is a woman allowed to "speak" to the congregation in a formal church meeting and "teach" them about a certain passage, expounding the scriptures etc.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/7 6:04

Hi Nasher,
Quote:
-----Question, is a woman allowed to "speak" to the congregation in a formal church meeting and "teach" them about a certain passage, expounding the scriptures etc.

On the basis of my long, long, earlier post to Geraldine (the one that talks about the Aorist Infinitive versus the Present Infinitive) I would say 'yes'.. occasionally, perhaps even frequently, but not routinely.

Mark, could you print off that posting (2004/10/6 9:52) and give a copy to David C? I would like to hear his views.

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/7 6:27

Sure, it was so good that I gave a copy to Doug M last night!

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/7 6:42

Quote:
-----On the basis of my long, long, earlier post to Geraldine (the one that talks about the Aorist Infinitive versus the Present Infinitive) I would say 'yes'.. occasionally, perhaps even frequently, but not routinely.

Hi Ron, the difference between doing something frequently and routinely could be a very grey area.

Would you say that your preaching at the mission is a routine?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/7 8:18

Quote:
-----Hi Ron, the difference between doing something frequently and routinely could be a very grey area.

Would you say that your preaching at the mission is a routine?

hi Nasher, yes I suppose it is a grey area. I am basing what I say here on the simple fact of Greek infinitive tense.

The Aorist Infinitive implies 'to preach'
The Present Infinitive implies 'to continually preach'
The Past Infinitive implies 'to have preached'

In our text Let a woman in quietness learn in all subjection, and a woman I do not suffer to teach, nor to rule a man, but to be in quietness, (1Ti 2:11-12 YLT+RB) the 'to teach' and the 'to rule' are both Present Infinitives.

In English we only have a simple infinitive. Paul's refusal allow is said to be referencing 'those who continually preach' and 'those who continually authorit-ize man'. The point I am making is that I think Paul's reference is to roles rather than events.

I think my teaching (notice I switched your word) at the Mission is a routine; next time I come I'll bring my bagpipes.

In that long posting I also asked the question what is a teacher in a New Testament sense. To me the central feature is authority, and its perception, rather than counting the times he teaches.