

A Lecture on 1 Timothy 2:8–15

As a reminder, 1 Timothy 2:1-4 are about the Nature of Prayer.

Then verses 5-7 are about the Nature of the Gospel where we spent time last week on the topic of the Atonement.

Verses 8-15 are on the Nature of Public Worship. This context will be important since many tend to pull these verses out of their context and inject meaning into them that is not present.

Let's roll through verses 8-10 quickly so we can spend the bulk of our time on the verses which cause much consternation.

Verse 8 I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling

It is interesting to note that the word “Therefore” is missing in many modern translations (including the NIV), but is in the original Greek. No idea what it is left out because it ties the “Nature of Public Worship” to what comes before...prayer and the gospel.

He starts with men... Don't let that pass by. This section of Timothy is not just about women!

Note that Paul is pointing to “holy” hands. The emphasis here falls on “holy” and not on hands. This isn't instructions for choreography, like “you must raise you hands in worship.” Instead it is pointing to the underlying heart of holiness

Because the text add “without anger or quarreling.”

The early church book of instruction, *The Didache* (written around 100AD) says, “Let no one who has a quarrel with his neighbor come to us, until they are reconciled.”

As one writer put it: “It is very difficult to pray for someone when you are fighting with them. Conflict interferes with prayer because prayer demands humility and conflict thrives on pride.

There is a reason for the admonition regarding the taking of the Lord's Supper if you have enmity with another.

Verse 9 & 10 likewise also that women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly attire, but with what is proper for women who profess godliness—with good works.

Evidently there was an issue during public worship that was creating problems. And not the only place or time. Because 1 Peter 3:3-4 reads, “Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear—but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God's sight is very precious.”

See the connection? In both churches there was an issue regarding outward appearance.

Please, when you read this 1 Timothy passage see that is really isn't about clothing or jewelry or hairstyle. It is about the heart. Notice its concluding statement! “adorn—with what is proper—good works”

The word for “adorn” is the Greek *kosmein* related to *kosmos* or “order” or “arrangement”

Then the word for “respectable” is the word *kosmios* also related to *kosmos* meaning “to be ordered.”

The word for “modesty” is *aidos* which carries a sense of reverent restraint.

Paul is addressing what was apparently a common temptation to turn public worship into public display. To create a “look at me” style.

Therefore, resist taking this out of context and declare war on braiding the hair or wearing jewelry. That creates a legalistic mentality. It certainly does not mean you can't look nice. That's not the point. Linger on the phrase “women who profess godliness.” *That* is the point.

We are to do good works because we profess the God who saves, not do good works in order to become godly.

Titus 2:10 “so that in everything they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior” ** read all of Titus 2 when you can, starting in verse 1!

Verses 11-15

We come to a passage that has provoked more heat and occasioned more ink than perhaps any five consecutive verses in all of the Pauline letters. The text before us has been treated in the last 50+ years as a battlefield upon which the contemporary debate over the ministry of women in the church has been fought like a cage match on pay-per-view.

Churches have divided over the issues, seminaries have been torn apart by these verses and friendship and family relationships have been strained, if not broken, over how best to read them.

I know one man who lost his job at his seminary because of the stance he took on this issue. I know of someone who was nearly denied their doctorate during their dissertation defense because of holding a position on *this* issue that was contrary to that of the faculty in that meeting.

Some will even make your opinion on this issue a litmus test for whether or not you are a Christian. Or at least if they should be in fellowship with you.

I sort of feel like that person who knows that no matter what I say today, or how carefully I say it, someone is going to be unhappy. I do NOT want to create division or disunity. This should be a *conversation* an opportunity to think about scripture and how to best understand what we have been given by God through his holy Word.

Unfortunately, as I mentioned at the outset, we tend to pick a verse of scripture (like one of these) and declare, “I don’t like this” and end up dealing with the temptation to use a “pick and choose” form of bible interpretation.

The worst example earlier this month came from a pastor of a United Church of Christ congregation when speaking at the Center for Public Theology and Public Policy.

Here is the quote from this pastor (I transcribed it from a video clip):

'This a very dangerous thing that I'm about to say now... a bit dangerous. I'm of the opinion that we need a Third Testament. because the Bible has become problematic.'

'Slaves obey your masters as you do the Lord.' It's a text. 'Let the women keep silent in the churches and if they have any questions let them ask their husband at home.' Now I'm a believer. My whole heart I trust God with my whole heart. I wake up in the morning talking to God and talking to God and God talking to me. But I am completely frustrated with the ways in which texts speak to the kind of vitriolic God that makes those kinds of things... And people will say, 'Well, it's in the book.' And I said, 'Then we need to tore that page out.' And they said, 'Well, you can't do it. It's the Word of God.' I said, 'No, it's words about God.' Come on now. 'But is it the Word of God?' No. 'It is not the Word of God.'

(Quoting Yvette Flunder, senior pastor of the City of Refuge United Church of Christ (UCC) in Oakland, California, as well as the Presiding Bishop of The Fellowship of Affirming Ministries. She is married to another woman and is a multi-published author with a chapter contribution to a book called *Queer Christianities: Lived Religion in Transgressive Forms* (NY University Press, 2015).

Obviously, that is not where anyone hearing this class are coming from, but it is something to think about.

We cannot treat the words in this passage from 1 Timothy 2 with either belligerence or embarrassment. We must not fight over them or apologize for them. We must READ them ...and try to understand.

Let us view this as words written under the direction of the Holy Spirit to the church. A church that for nineteen centuries held a particular understanding of this text with remarkable unity. It is interesting to note that it wasn't until 1969 that counter ideas about this passage began to proliferate.

Let me first define two terms.

Complementarian: a theological view holding that men and women are equal in dignity and value, but possess distinct, complementary roles in marriage and the church. It teaches that men are called to servant leadership (headship), while women are called to support and submit to that leadership, and together reflecting the relationship between Christ and the church

Egalitarian: the belief that all people are equal in fundamental worth, deserving of the same rights, opportunities, and treatment in social, political, economic, and religious life

Each will read these five verses differently.

Show and Tell of books from both sides. (only ½ of the books on my shelves on the topic)

I highly recommend you have the chart I have created in front of you.

Both views are presented without a filter.

Since I am your teacher today, let me tell you where I stand.

I am a complementarian.

You are free to agree or disagree with what is going to be said here today.

I have wrestled with these issues and the various biblical texts for over 40 years. I read material from both sides.

I believe Scripture teaches the full equality of men and women in dignity, worth, and standing before God (Gen. 1:27; Gal. 3:28), their equal redemption through the blood of Christ, and their equal endowment with spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 12:7–11; 1 Pet. 4:10)—and yet also teaches that God has ordained certain complementary role distinctions between men & women in the home and in the church (Eph. 5:22–33; 1 Cor. 11:2–16; 1 Tim. 2:11–15; 3:1–13).

I am ***not*** anti-woman. To quote Vance Havner, “A good woman is the best thing on earth. Women were last at the cross and first at the open tomb. The church owes a debt to her faithful women which she can never estimate, to say nothing of the debt we owe in our homes to godly wives and mothers.”

I will present the opposing egalitarian view as fairly as I am able, because a good teacher is not afraid of the strongest form of an opposing argument.

Two preliminary observations are in order.

First, the question of women's roles in the church has become global and cross-denominational, reaching across cultures and communions. For example, we have recently seen the installation of the first female Archbishop of Canterbury. Therefore, what we are discussing is something deeper than a narrow ecclesiastical question of polity.

Second, as mentioned, the egalitarian reading is comparatively recent. When a reading goes unchallenged for nineteen centuries and then comes under sudden trial just as the surrounding culture undergoes a transformation of its assumptions about gender, any honest interpreter is obligated to raise a question: Is the new reading best explained by a long-delayed exegetical breakthrough, or is it that cultural pressures have produced interpretive accommodation? I'm just asking the question, not saying I know the answer.

And I believe I can point to a deeper issue here: The arguments around 1 Timothy 2 are not only an arguments about Greek words or historical settings. They end up crossing into many other much more dangerous issue.

It can almost be boiled down to a question about whether contemporary cultural values are the lens through which Scripture is read, or whether Scripture is the lens through which cultural values are evaluated.

Our culture has made equality the supreme virtue, defining it in terms of sameness rather than acknowledging any difference, and then viewing differences as the culprit of injustice.

When the Bible speaks of equal dignity accompanied by distinct roles, the modern ear hears a contradiction.

One is not allowed to say, "equal but different."

With those preliminaries behind us, let us turn to the text, as Paul writes to Timothy...

Verse 11: "Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness."

Before we examine the words or their Greek sources, notice what the verse commands: **a woman is to learn.**

This is an imperative... a command.

In the ancient Mediterranean world, the formal theological education of women was neither assumed nor valued. Some ancient rabbis even forbade that women to be taught the Torah at all.

For Paul to open his instruction in this passage by mandating that women learn is revolutionary.

But we see this throughout the New Testament!

Mary learning at the feet of Jesus (Luke 10:38–42),

the Berean women searching the Scriptures (Acts 17:11–12),

Priscilla, with her husband Aquila, expounding the way of God to Apollos (Acts 18:24–26).

These woman are regularly presented in the posture of the disciple.

Paul describes the manner of her learning with two phrases—

"quietly" and **"with all submissiveness"**—

Those words form an envelope around the command **"let her learn."**

The word translated **"quietly"** does not mean mute.

It mean a quiet disposition, a tranquility of spirit, an attentiveness that is receptive rather than disruptive.

The same word appears a few verses earlier in 1 Tim 2:2, where Paul urges intercession for kings "that we may lead a peaceful and quiet life." Paul is obviously not praying that Christians would live voiceless lives; he prays for conditions of public tranquility in which the gospel can go forward. The same sense carries here. Paul is describing the proper disposition of the learner.

This matters, because one common misreading of this verse assumes Paul is forbidding women to speak at all in church gatherings. (And point to 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 as further proof.)

That cannot be what he means, because in 1 Corinthians he himself presupposes that women will pray and prophesy in the Christian assembly (1 Cor. 11:5).

The phrase "**with all submissiveness**" takes us closer to the heart of what Paul is commanding. The word for submission is a relational word about the proper ordering of relationships, not a word of abuse or in any way demeaning. We've dealt with this before when we studied Ephesians and 1 Corinthians.

The word submission is used in the New Testament of the Son to the Father (1 Cor. 15:28), of Christians to civil authorities (Rom. 13:1), of wives to their husbands (Eph. 5:22), of the younger to the elder (1 Pet. 5:5).

Submission here is submission to the teaching authority of the church. A learner is, by definition, under the one who teaches.

Paul is saying that women, like all Christian disciples, are to place themselves under the authoritative teaching of the church as genuine learners.

In this they are not singled out for a lesser place. Every Christian man is required to do the same.

The difference will come in verse 12, where Paul draws a distinction concerning who may hold the office of authoritative teacher.

The egalitarian reading of verse 11 often makes much of the command to learn, as though this alone settled the debate in favor of ministerial equality. The observation about teaching is correct on the surface but the conclusion does not follow. Christian women are to be learners. This has never been in dispute. The question is not whether women may learn, but whether the learning mandate of verse 11 implies the teaching authority that verse 12 appears to withhold. To read verse 11 alone as though it settled any ministerial argument is to read past verse 12, which we will look at next.

Verse 12: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet."

This is the verse upon which the contemporary battle has been most fiercely waged.

FOUR questions arise out of it.

First, what is meant by "teach"?

Second, what is meant by "exercise authority"?

Third, what do those two verbs mean when joined together?

And **fourth**, is Paul's prohibition a universal rule for all time, or a local response to a specific Ephesian problem?

That fourth question is where much of the conflict centers.

Begin with "**teach**." In the books of Timothy and Titus this word doesn't refer to general instruction between any two Christians, but to the authoritative doctrinal instruction of the gathered people of God. The church. Not individual discipleship.

Paul speaks of elders who labor in preaching and teaching (1 Tim. 5:17), of Timothy's charge to teach (1 Tim. 4:11; 6:2), and of the requirement that an overseer be able to teach (1 Tim. 3:2).

Moreover, Paul has a separate word for *false* teaching, which he uses elsewhere in 1 Tim. 1:3; and 6:3.

He does not use it here.

He uses the ordinary word for authoritative teaching of the truth.

One egalitarian interpretation softens the verse by arguing that Paul's concern is with a specifically heretical teaching in Ephesus itself—perhaps tied to the worship of Artemis, whose Temple dominated the skyline. Or perhaps an early form of the Gnostic heresy that twisted the creation story and exalted Eve over Adam.

In this understanding, women had become conduits of false doctrine, and Paul is plugging the leak.

But the named heretics in these letters are all male:

Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim. 1:20),

Hymenaeus and Philetus (2 Tim. 2:17–18), and

Demas (2 Tim. 4:10).

Women do not seem to be the source of the problems but are victims, with their households invaded by false teachers who prey upon the vulnerable (SEE 2 Tim. 3:6–7).

Note that the reasons Paul gives in verses 13 and 14 have nothing to do with correcting heresy. They go back to Genesis. Therefore, if the problem were merely a local bad doctrine, Paul would not necessarily to appeal to the Garden of Eden to solve it. He doesn't do that elsewhere in the NT. But I'm getting ahead of myself.

The **second** contested word is the one translated "**to exercise authority.**"

The King James rendered this as "to usurp authority," which suggested Paul was forbidding some improper or aggressive form of authority.

The Greek word here *authentein* is rare—only found this one time in the entire New Testament making it hard to interpret.

Is it neutral (simply the exercise of authority)?

or negative (some domineering, illegitimate exercise)?

Egalitarian interpreters often argue for the negative.

But any thorough lexical study,—looking at every surviving occurrence across the vast expanse of all secular ancient Greek literature—concludes that there is no case in which the word means "to domineer."

Where a negative meaning appears, it comes from the surrounding context, not from the meaning of the verb.

The verb itself simply means to hold or exercise authority.

Note the grammatical structure. The two verbs “teach” and “authority” are linked by a conjunction (rendered "or" in English)

Whenever this Gk word “*oude*” is used it always share the same equivalence. They are both positive or both negative. They cannot be one or the other. There are entire scholastic articles written about this word *oude* if you’d like to pursue that line of study.

Apply this to our verse.

The first verb, "teach," is unquestionably positive. Teaching is what Timothy is to do, what elders are to do, what Paul himself does. As mentioned, Paul has a separate word for false teaching and does not use it here.

That means the second verb—"exercise authority"—must carry the same positive sense.

If teaching is good, then the authority being referred to is likewise good.

Paul is therefore not forbidding women to teach *badly* or to exercise authority *badly*.

He *is* saying a woman is *not* to engage in the good activity of authoritative teaching or authoritative oversight, if that teaching or authority would be directed over a man in the gathered congregation.

Paul is not saying women may not teach anyone.

The New Testament is full of women teaching other women, older women training younger women (Titus 2:3–5),

Priscilla teaching Apollos privately alongside her husband (Acts 18:26).

The prohibition is against a woman assuming the position of authoritative doctrinal teacher of men in the gathered congregation.

It is the office that is in view.

Now we turn to that last big question of the passage:

Is this permanently binding upon the church, or restricted only to the Ephesian situation of the first century?

Three considerations to review.

First, the nature of the letter itself.

The stated purpose of the letter is to instruct Timothy how one is to oversee the church (1 Tim. 3:14–15).

This is not a letter like Galatians, addressing a specific heresy, or like 1 Corinthians, sorting out local disputes.

In a sense much of the Timothy letters are about church order. The qualifications of elders or overseers (1 Tim. 3:1–7), caring for widows (1 Tim. 5:3–16), paying pastors (1 Tim. 5:17–18), and throughout, the need to address heresy.

The part about men and women in chapter two is in the same tone and flow as the instruction concerning elders in chapter three.

The two chapters form a unified block. If we view chapter three as intended for the church for all time, we cannot treat chapter two as merely local.

Second, the reasons Paul gives for the instruction. Common sense and consistent biblical interpretation will help us understand when a command is meant for the cultural convention of the time. For example: The kiss of greeting is a Mediterranean custom; a warm greeting. It is not explained or given biblical and theological reasons for its use. (Greet one another with a holy kiss is not then meant as a command for all time.)

But in verses 13 and 14, Paul grounds his instruction in the order of creation and the event of the Fall not in the cultural conventions of first-century Ephesus.

Third, the universality of the earlier verses. In verse 8 Paul expresses his desire that men pray "in every place" (1 Tim. 2:8). The phrase means throughout the whole church.

The instructions for women that immediately follow are in parallel.

There is a grammatical parallel that is inescapable. Illustrating, again, the danger of pulling a verse out of its fuller context.

But before we leave verse 12, let me present the egalitarian counter-arguments.

The egalitarian reading generally follows one of these:

- a) Paul's prohibition responds to a specific Ephesian situation;
- b) it is tied to women's inadequate education and goes away once they have been educated;
- c) the New Testament's entire trajectory moves toward full equality, with Galatians 3:28 as the summit. (which we will get to next)

I think we addressed most of this. The archaeological evidence from first-century Ephesus does not support a feminist or matriarchal city.

Let's quickly at Galatians 3:28

Galatians 3:28: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

In the egalitarian view this verse has been elevated to a hermeneutical or interpretive key to unlock the controversy.

However, in deference to the brilliance of the scholars who hold that view, in my opinion, Paul does not say there is no difference between male and female in Christ; he says we are all *one* in Christ.

The unity he expresses is our common access to salvation by faith.

Galatians 3 is not a race statement, a gender statement, or a slavery statement. It, of course carries those connotations, but Paul is addressing how one becomes a child of God. And the answer is: by faith in Christ.

Jews, Gentiles, slaves, free, men, women ... all are justified by the same faith, all stand before the throne of grace.

It is the equality of salvation in Christ.

Not an equality that erases role distinctions in the life of the church and home.

NOTE:

Paul, after writing Galatians (and chronologically I believe he wrote Galatians first of all his epistles), he writes
wives submit to husbands (Eph. 5:22),
husbands love your wives as Christ loved the church (Eph. 5:25),
elders should be husbands of one wife (1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:6).

One more thing. The egalitarians view does not say that in Christ there is no longer any distinction at all between male and female. The distinctions remain.

Galatians 3:28 does not erase the difference between men and women;

it teaches that those differences do not affect a person's standing before God or access to his grace.

That truth does not cancel Paul's specific instructions elsewhere.

In verse 12, Paul restricts the authoritative teaching and governing role of the church, the office of pastor or elder, to men.

This conclusion rests on the broader principle Paul explains in the verses that follow.

Verse 13: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve."

Notice the ordinary connecting word, "for". Paul has just issued a command. He now gives the reason.

This is an extraordinary statement with massive implications.

One well known scholar said, "I would be an egalitarian if it weren't for verse 13."

Paul does not use local culture as the reason for this command. He uses the opening chapters of the Bible.

He points us to Genesis 2, the creation of Adam from the earth and the making of Eve from Adam's side (Gen. 2:7, 21–22).

He is saying the sequence carries theological significance.

Paul's argument is about order not worth, ability, or favor. Don't make the mistake of thinking he is claiming that whatever comes first is superior.

Read the account the way it is written.

The man (Adam) is created first,
placed in the garden,
given the command concerning the trees (Gen. 2:15–17),
given the task of naming the animals (Gen. 2:19–20).
Only after all this is the woman formed from his side as a helper
corresponding to him (Gen. 2:18, 21–22).
She is his equal in dignity and being and the image of God “bone of his
bones and flesh of his flesh” (Gen. 2:23).
But she is brought into a stewardship which has already been appointed.

Paul nowhere suggests women are weaker in intellect or less capable
of leadership than men.

Some egalitarian readers argue that male leadership is a consequence
of the Fall, a distortion that the gospel is aimed at reversing.

Paul's appeal to creation rules out that reading because he is not
talking about something *after* the Fall. He points to the order that was put
in place *before* the Fall.

This is crucial to our understanding of 1 Timothy.

If male headship were a consequence of sin, the redemption of the
Cross would require this sin to be abolished...like any other sin.

But the Bible points to male headship as a *feature* of creation itself

Something good and wise, like every good gift of God. Sin distorted
the gift of God and demanded a penalty to be paid.

But what the Cross restores is not an original androgyny but an
original goodness of the complementary order that the Fall perverted.

Verse 14: "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor."

Here Paul is making a historical observation.

When the serpent came, it was the woman whom he addressed, the woman who entered the dialogue, the woman who took the fruit and ate (Gen. 3:1–6). There is no disputing the story.

But what is the theological significance?

Here many, over the centuries, have often misinterpreted.

The interpretation, with which I disagree, is that Paul characterized women as more easily deceived by some innate feminine weakness. This idea has done terrible harm and is not what Paul is saying.

Note how verse 13 appeals to the good order of creation but then verse 14 appeals to what happened when that order was inverted. The point is not that women are more easily deceived. The point is that when the creation order is reversed in the matter of theological leadership, the consequences are tragic.

But, again, don't misunderstand. Adam's sin was not excused.

Romans 5 makes very clear that it was through the one man Adam that sin entered the world (Rom. 5:12), and that Adam bears the responsibility precisely because he was the head.

If we had to rank things, his sin was worse than Eve's, because he sinned with his eyes open. He wasn't deceived. His act was a deliberate violation of the charge God had given him.

Verse 15: "Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control."

This is one of the most difficult verses in the Bible, not because it pits complementarians and egalitarians against each other, but because interpreters have never reached a firm consensus on what it means.

The key questions are

What does "**saved**" refer to and

What does "**childbearing**" represent.

In the New Testament, "saved" can mean final salvation, but it can also describe rescue from danger, deception, or spiritual harm.

One interpretation that resonated with me is to treat "**saved**" as more along the lines of a sense of preservation.

[I'm editorializing some material collated from different sources here.]

Specifically, preservation from the danger highlighted throughout the passage:

the danger of repeating Eve's reversal of God's created order and thus becoming vulnerable to the enemy's deception.

This fits with Paul's later warning in 1 Timothy 5:14–15, where he urges younger widows to embrace marriage, family life, and household management so that they do not "turn aside to follow Satan."

In both places, the idea is not restriction but protection: women are preserved from the adversary as they inhabit the sphere of life God has appointed.

“Childbearing,” then, is not a narrow reference to the physical act of giving birth, as though childless women were excluded.

It stands for married and domestic life, the place uniquely represented by the capacity to bear children.

Note that Paul immediately clarifies that this preservation is not automatic or biological. It is tied to continuance “in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.”

In other words, women are not silenced or sidelined; she walks faithfully in a fruitful, God-given calling

Below is a quick wrap up to give us some take away highlights.

The Passage Does Not Teach

It does not teach that women are inferior to men in dignity, worth, intelligence, or capacity. It teaches the opposite. Women are commanded to be learners, to be theologically formed.

It does not teach that women are to be silent or mute in church. The quiet mentioned is a receptivity (I could use the word listener here) not wordlessness. Throughout the New Testament, women pray, prophesy, sing, confess, and exhort in the church (1 Cor. 11:5; Acts 2:17–18; 21:9).

It does not teach that women may not teach at all. Women teach women. Women teach children. Women teach the nations. The one place the passage draws a line is the office of authoritative teaching and governing of the gathered congregation. I'll say more on this in a second.

It does not teach that women are confined to the home. A quick look at the woman of Proverbs 31 draws a different picture. She engages in commerce, real estate, and the relief of the poor (Prov. 31:10–31). The New Testament include businesswomen (Acts 16:14), hosts of house churches (Rom. 16:5; Col. 4:15), patronesses (Rom. 16:1–2), deacons, and benefactors.

What the passage **DOES TEACH** is this: in the gathered assembly, the office of authoritative teaching and ruling is entrusted to qualified men. (The office of pastor or elder.) Let us be clear. The woman's calling is not less than the man's. It is simply different and complementary.

The restriction of the authoritative teaching and governing office to qualified men is a *specific* ordering within the *specific* context of the church's gathered life.

Outside of that context, the bible opens up to women an enormous range of ministries.

This means women may teach other women with the full authority of the church's direction. (Remember, our church hosts the Charles Simeon Trust seminars for Women who teach the Bible, over 75 from around the country attended the last event.)

They may teach men individually and informally.

They may teach children.

They may write, publish, lecture, and contribute to the theological formation of the church.

They may lead in administration, mercy ministry, counseling, discipleship, evangelism, missions, music, and hospitality.

They may be deacons.

They may pursue theological education to the highest levels.

A Closing Word

We have walked through five verses that have been a battleground for a generation. We have found them to teach that women in the gathered assembly
are to be learners,
actively instructed in the truth, and
leaving to qualified men the office of authoritative teaching and oversight.