

Women's Roles in the Church

By

Marc Wilson

(November 2009; Revised December 2013)

Recompiled and Condensed for Study on 4/9/14

wilsonxoxo@msn.com

1. Stott (BST, *The Message of 1 Timothy & Titus*, 1996, pp. 73-109 and 112-118):

- a. Stott succinctly poses the questions that will fundamentally lead us in this brief analysis. He writes,
 - i. “How should we define the created complementarity of the sexes...biblically? What does Scripture teach about the essence (permanent and universal) of our created maleness and femaleness? This question must be at the top of our agenda for debate, since whatever creation has established culture can express but not destroy.”

2. Creation (Pre-Fall) Ordinances

- a. *Egalitarian* = **Genesis 1:26-28**
 - i. Renewed and Recapitulated in Christ = **Galatians 3:28**
- b. *Complementarian* = **Genesis 2:18-24** (Note: **Genesis 3:16** is *not* an aspect of God’s curse but an affirmation that, despite the toil and pain as a result of the curse and amid our own fallen tendency to assert our desire for autonomy, men and women are still called to operate in and through their God-ordained roles)
 - i. Revealed, mysteriously, in Christ’s Person and works (Christology/incarnation) which points to the eternal relationship of the Godhead (Trinitarian/equal divine essence yet separate Persons with unique roles/functions) = **Ephesians 5:21-33 & 1 Corinthians 11:3**
 1. Mutual submission and servant leadership are key characteristics emphasized

3. Context of 1 Timothy in Ephesus

- a. The heretical teaching being addressed in 1 Timothy has a direct relation to Paul’s prohibition against women teaching and having authority as articulated in **2:12**.
 - i. Towner, *Philip (Commentary on the NT use of the OT, 1-2 Timothy and Titus, 2007, pp. 897-899)*:
 1. “Determining the use to which the Genesis material is put in this passage begins with the question of why Paul prohibited women from teaching and holding authority. If the reason was simply Paul’s general principle, based on Genesis (the creation order), then one has to correlate this assumption with the evidence that women took vital roles in ministry elsewhere, and one also has to accept the inescapable implication of 2:14 that Paul believed women to be more susceptible to deception than men or less capable by nature to deal with false teachers. If, however, the instructions and backing were given in response to a particular interpretation of the Genesis account in Ephesus that somehow fueled inappropriate activities of women (teaching in a way that shamed men/husbands, somehow furthering the heresy, eschewing marriage because of the false teaching, etc.), then 2:13-15a supports the measures to be taken (2:11-12) by reproducing a better reading of the Genesis story. There are strong indications that women were involved in the heresy and so were teaching false doctrine; there are strong indications that certain elements of the traditional role of women (marriage and childbearing) were being set aside on the basis of the false teaching or secular cultural

developments. [How can this first-century situation be compared to today's secular views currently predominate within the Church?].

2. "...if women were guilty of teaching in a way that abused authority and disrespected their male counterparts, 2:13 is a reminder that the creation order is still in effect and men are to be respected (omission of the mitigating factor included in 1 Cor. 11 is understandable where women have already stepped over the line [and we will conclude with a clarifying look at this passage as well]). If heretical speculation on the early chapters of Genesis (fueled by mistaken notions of eschatology) somehow influenced women to think they were free from the constraints and limitations brought on by the fall into sin (or more specifically if they appealed to the Adam-sinner model of Rom. 5 to make their better claim to the right to teach...), 2:14 reminds women of their role in the fall and of the present unfinished nature of Christian existence, and it does so in a way that aptly illustrates the deception of women in Ephesus by false teachers (cf. 2 Cor. 11:3).
3. "Finally, 2:15a, with its allusion to Gen. 3:16, serves two related purposes. First, in response to confusion about the times and women's roles [again, note similarities between this first-century climate and the contemporary cultural climate which is pre-occupied with the equality of the sexes and the end of the world/civilization, such as those anticipated in 2012], it prolongs the allusion to Gen. 3 in a way that establishes the eschatological 'location' of the Ephesian Christian women as still being in that paradoxical place of pain (struggle, tension, sin, etc.) and divine promise. Second, it reinforces the continuing relevance, importance, and value of the traditional role model being subverted by the heresy (cf. 4:3)."
4. And here are some concluding comments from Towner on 1 Timothy 4:3-4 to add to our discussion.
 - a. "The statement goes on further to describe certain features of the heretics and their views. This is one of the letter's rare glimpses of the actual practices and views of the false teachers. And it is in the course of describing their abstention from (certain) foods that Paul engages the Genesis account again.
 - b. "In 4:3-4 Paul undoubtedly has drawn on Gen. 9:3 as a historical-theological precedent for the specific eating of meat, subsequently backing this by allusion to the more fundamental statement in Gen. 1:31 of the goodness of God's creation. The tougher question is, Why has he done so?"
 - c. "To answer that question we need to think creatively about heretical teaching alluded to in 4:2 (see commentary on 1 Tim. 2:13-15a above). On the assumption that we should link the ascetic tendencies alluded to here to the references to the heretics' speculative exegesis ("myths and genealogies" [1:4]), in the sense that the former were somehow grounded in the latter, it is likely that Paul is turning an apostolic interpretation of OT Scripture against some novel exegesis of Genesis by the opponents."

ii. **Stott (BST, *The Message of 1 Timothy & Titus*, 1996, pp. 73-109 and 112-118):**

1. Paul is addressing a particular heresy that has distorted the God-ordained male and female roles in relation to each other, and this distortion has led to the further teaching and perpetuation of such heresies at the hands of women. Stott, on pages 112-118, elaborates further regarding aspects of this Ephesian heresy as Paul discusses it in **1 Timothy 4:1-11**,

- a. “It is clear that the false teaching in Ephesus consisted of a false asceticism: *They forbid people to marry and order them to abstain from certain foods* (3a). Marriage and food relate to the two most basic appetites of the human body, sex and hunger. They are normal appetites too, although both can be abused by degenerating into lust and greed [I would add “gluttony”]. Yet from the beginning of church history some teachers have gone further, and have argued that sex and hunger are themselves unclean appetites...
- b. “One origin of these tendencies was Jewish. The Essenes of Qumran, for example, were said...to ‘reject pleasures as an evil, but esteem continence...to be virtue’, and to ‘neglect marriage’. Later this Jewish aberration came to be mingled with the dualism of Greek philosophy, and especially with incipient Gnosticism which regarded matter as evil and despised the material creation. The Encratites, for example, are described by Irenaeus as having ‘preached against marriage, thus setting aside the original creation of God, and indirectly blaming him who made them male and female for the propagation of the human race.’
- c. “Wherein lies the essence of the false teacher’s error? And how can it be detected? Paul now supplies two fundamental tests, which are widely applicable. The first is a theological test, the doctrine of creation (3-5). The second is an ethical test, the priority of godliness (6-10).
- d. “Marriage and certain foods, which the false teachers were forbidding, are gifts *which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and who know the truth* (3b).
- e. “Notice carefully, however, what Paul writes. It is not that ‘everything is good’, but that *everything created by God is good*. This is an indispensable qualification, since not everything that exists has come unsullied from the Creator’s hand. For the creation was followed by the fall, which introduced evil into the world and spoiled much of God’s good creation. We therefore need discernment to know what in our human experience is attributable to the creation, and what to the fall. [The reader is referred to the article on Genesis 3:16 by Busenitz and to an appended comment that quotes Stott further regarding human sexuality]. So we must be careful not to confuse creation and fall, order and disorder, but rather to ensure that we celebrate only what God created, and thankfully receive only what he gives.
- f. “For the truth is that a world-denying Gnosticism has not yet been altogether eradicated from our theology and practice. Instead, we pride ourselves on our super-spirituality, which is detached from the natural order, and we look forward to an ethereal heaven, forgetting the promise of a new earth. We tend to have a better doctrine of redemption than of creation, and so are more grateful for the blessings of grace than of nature and of art.
- g. “We should determine, then, to recognize and acknowledge, appreciate and celebrate, all the gifts of the Creator:...the unique privileges of our humanness...as we were created in God’s image and appointed his stewards; the joys of gender, marriage, sex, children, parenthood and family life. To reject these things is to *abandon the faith*, since it insults the Creator. To receive them thankfully and celebrate them joyfully is to glorify God...

- h. “Looking back over the first half of [chapter 4], we can now bring together the two tests which Paul gave Timothy, and which can still be applied to doubtful teaching today. The theological test is the doctrine of creation: does this teaching honour God as the Creator and giver of all good things? The second test is ethical, and concerns the priority of godliness: does this teaching honour God by drawing out our worship? We need have no hesitations about any teaching which glorifies God the Creator and promotes godliness.”

iii. **Context of 1 Corinthians**

1. **Ciampa, Roy and Rosner, Brian (Commentary on the NT use of the OT, 1 Corinthians, 2007, pp. 732-734):** Ciampa’s and Rosner’s commentary on 1 Corinthians 11:7-9, in my opinion, offers more biblical-theological support for the above contribution by Towner and further simplifies the primary issues that are likely at the heart of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The following is their analysis:

- a. **1 Corinthians 11:2-16** “First Corinthians 11:7-12 reflects Paul’s thinking on men and women in light of creation (as expressed primarily in Gen. 1:26-27; 2:18-23). First, there is the image and glory of God and man. The traditional (and majority) reading of 11:7-9 takes these verses to reflect Paul’s understanding that Gen. 2 establishes a functional hierarchy reflected in the order in which the man and woman were created and in their respective purposes...Others think that the point is that gender distinctions are reflected in the distinct origins of men and women (Adam and Eve) and should be maintained in the church.
- b. “Paul uses the term glory [in 11:7 that the man is ‘the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of man’] because it is associated with image...and can substitute for ‘likeness’ or ‘image’ in references to Gen. 1:27... He can move smoothly from ‘image’ to ‘glory’, which ‘then becomes the key term in 1 Cor. 11:7-9 and counterbalances the notion of “shame” in 11:4-6’ (Garland 2003: 523).
- c. “The close relationship between Paul’s clear allusion to Gen. 1:26 in 11:7b and his statement in 11:7c that the woman is the glory of the man suggests that he understands Adam to have been uniquely made in God’s image (without any other human contribution), while God’s image was passed to Eve through Adam. Therefore, 11:7 is probably best understood as an interpretation of Gen. 1:26-27 ‘through the creation account in Gen. 2’ (Garland 2003:522).
- d. “But the question of whose glory each one reflects (and not just that it is of another) seems important to Paul’s argument. It is important because it is appropriate for God’s glory to be reflected in worship, but not that of a man. One of the reasons Paul does not mention that a woman was also created in God’s image is probably ‘because he wants to stress the point that she is the glory of man’ (Garland 2003: 523; cf. Gundry-Volf 1997: 156). Thus, Paul’s point is not that women are not made in God’s image, but rather that the way the creation narrative distinguishes between the origin and purpose of the man and the woman suggests that the man (not originating from the woman or being created to complete her) does not reflect the woman’s glory (but only God’s), while the woman does reflect the glory of man. In 11:8-9, Paul uses details from Gen. 2 to explain why the man cannot be understood as the glory of the woman, while the woman can be understood as the glory of the man.

- e. “Paul’s overarching point seems to be that nothing should happen in worship that detracts from God’s glory, including behavior that would draw attention to the glory of man. Hooker (1964: 415) points out that the woman’s head should be covered ‘not because she is in the presence of man, but because she is in the presence of God and his angels-and in their presence the glory of man must be hidden.’
 - f. “In these two verses Paul supports the principle that he drew in 11:7 from the creation of Adam and Eve as described in Gen. 2. That man did not come from women is patent in Gen. 2:7: he was formed from the dust of the earth. That the woman came from man is taught in Gen. 2:23. In fact, it is given as the explanation of her name.
 - g. “Paul’s statement that the woman was created for the sake of the man...is based on Gen. 2:18. The context indicates that the man would have been the only one of God’s creatures without a corresponding mate, and that was not good. That the woman originated from the man and that she was made because of him points to the anteriority of the man (see 1 Tim. 2:13...) and evokes the concept of primogeniture with the implied prominence and precedence.”
2. *Positive Treatment: “Glorify God” in Your Worship (11:2-14:40)*
- a. Chapter 11, Verses 4-6 (7-16): “References to shame in husband-wife or male-female relationships most often have to do with the transgression of some sexual expectation.”
 - b. **Shame verses Glory** (Chapter 11, Verses 7-16)
 - i. “...shame and honor may be transmitted from the wife to the husband (and in our text, through the husband to Christ and God). While the shame was probably based on an association with nakedness, the humiliation of having a woman’s hair shaved off may also have to do with the suggestion that she has forfeited her very identity as a woman (which is marked by the possession of her hair) similar to the way in which a married woman’s failure to cover her head in public could be understood as suggesting that she had forsaken her identity as a married woman. In the case of the lesbian the move indicated a desire to abandon a female identity for that of a man. Paul does not want anyone to suffer *disgrace* in the congregation’s worship, so the option of having the woman shave her head is not a real one, but it would have a similar effect to her uncovering her head, since in the latter case she would dishonor her head (cf. v. 5). **Head** in this last case probably refers both to her own head/self and also to her husband, who also serves as her head. She would bring shame on herself and her husband. The only real option, if honor is to be maintained for all those participating in the worship experience (and thus, presumably, for God to be honored as well), is for the woman to cover her head, at least when she prays or prophesies in church. It is important because it is appropriate for the glory of God to be reflected in worship, but not that of a man. For man’s glory (the woman [because she was created from and for man]) to be uncovered in worship does not bring glory to him and/or God but shame.”
 - 1. A parallel today (because hair, today, does not express the same gender distinctions and sexual identity as it did in 1st century Corinth) could involve a man’s wife who dresses provocatively and behaves flirtatiously among the congregation of Believers, even during worship and, more so, when she has an active part

within the Assembly for the worship Service. She brings negative attention to herself which brings shame to her husband who she is supposed to glory/image. This is the reason why she should (in 1st century Corinth, for example) have her head covered; because, she is the glory of the man/husband, and the man's glory is not to be present within the Assembly (much less when the woman brings not glory, but shame, to him) which is called to be focused on God's glory as represented in the man who should not have his head covered nor have long hair like that of a woman (in 1st century Corinth, for example) who is called to be a proper reflection of man.

2. Verses 7-10: "Paul is dealing with proper behavior and adornment in the context of Christian worship. Paul's ultimate point seems to be that nothing should happen in worship that would detract from God's glory, including behavior that would draw attention to the glory of man."
3. "The dress code that Paul had in mind was not seen merely as a symbolic expression of gender distinction to be manifested for the sake of respect...but was, at least in Paul's context, understood to be essential to avoiding the infiltration of anything that might distract worshipers' attention away from the glory of God. Clearly gender distinctions are important to Paul, and they are most certainly to be maintained by the church. Paul's concern, however, is ultimately with the need for an exclusive focus on God's glory (which would certainly be diminished by any apparent disrespect for gender distinctions in worship) which jealously avoids the promotion of human glory, and even more zealously avoids any behavior which would inappropriately introduce shame into the context of Christian worship."
4. **Angels** – "According to significant Jewish tradition, angels were the guardians of creation order, and some therefore suggest that Paul was concerned to make sure nothing in the worship service would offend them. In the presence of the angelic protectors of the purity of divine worship [Note: the whole company of heaven sings 'holy, holy, holy'] the veil [which likely only covered the hair] allowed women simultaneously to respect the men/husbands in the congregation and freely exercise a newly found authority to pray and prophesy alongside them in the sacred space of the church gathered for worship."
 - a. "*The New Creation has Dawned*" (cf. **Joel 2:28-32** and the new covenant outpouring of the Holy Spirit)... "Ideally, Christian women were worshipping side-by-side with the men of the community, even praying and prophesying along with the men, but in a way that did not bring shame or disgrace on those men or anyone else. They were worshipping in a way that respected the proper decorum expected in the presence of God and his angelic attendants, such that the community's full attention was on the glory of God without being distracted by either human glory or shame. It is just possible that Paul is thinking of behavior which is not only acceptable to the angels but also of behavior by which 'the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly places'

by the church as men and women (as well as Jews and Gentiles) worship God together as one (**Eph. 3:10**).”

- ii. Such complementarity between man and woman was intended at Creation, prior to the Fall, and is restored properly and progressively, only by grace, in the New Creation of the Church inaugurated by Christ at His first coming. This should be appropriately expressed in the Church’s corporate worship; a pre-Fall relationship between man (Adam) and woman (Eve).
 1. In verses 14-15, it is likely that ‘Paul is suggesting that the pattern established by nature or human custom provided a clue that women’s heads should be covered. As Watson argues, ‘the point is that women’s long hair (as opposed to men’s short hair) is *analogous* to the additional covering represented by the veil. In seeking to impose this extra covering on women but not men, Paul is following the example of nature [or convention] itself, which has similarly seen fit to provide women with an extra covering. These verses continue to reflect the concerns for shame and honor that have marked the whole passage. For a man to have long hair is a *disgrace*, but a woman’s long hair is her *glory*. The covering of her head may be understood to cover her glory so that only God’s glory is recognized in the worship setting, or it could be understood to be a glorious sign of the authority that she has to worship side-by-side with the men of the community (cf. Psalm 8, where mankind is ‘crowned with glory and honor’). Paul would have the women think of their head coverings as a sign of their honor, and would have them know that to omit it would be to bring them disgrace (just as long hair would bring disgrace to a man). Since glory is something reflected in kings and other royalty or bestowed by royalty, that God has bestowed *glory* on the woman, in the form of her hair, supports the idea that the authority mentioned in v. 10 is her own [as illustrated in the ESV’s translation of verse 10. Thus, the function of the veil seems to extend] beyond the simple ‘cloaking of man’s glory’ to the cloaking of the women’s beauty. Since she has been bestowed with glory, she should cover her head with a veil as a sign of the authority she has received.”
 2. Simply put, the woman’s veil is like her New Creational and New Covenant **Crown** granted by God through the gospel of Jesus Christ which reverses the loss of dignity and sinful power struggles that dishonor God as a result of the Fall and restores them to the intended pre-fall state with the hopeful anticipation of an elevation of that state above the angels, who we will judge, upon Christ’s Return and consummation of His Kingdom now inaugurated.

4. **Specific Considerations of our Current Study in 1 Timothy 2:8-15**

- a. Paul’s exhortations are means by which he addresses the repercussions of the heretical teachings which impacted the timeless and universal roles of men and women in relation to each other within the Ephesian community. Stott states:
 - i. “We should begin by affirming, against what is fashionable and ‘politically correct’, that a woman’s ‘submission’ to male ‘authority’ is in God’s purpose normative. Paul develops this teaching most fully in 1 Corinthians 11.

1. And here in verse 12 and 13 he supplies a biblical basis for it, especially that *Adam was formed first, then Eve* (12).
- ii. In addition to being created after Adam, Eve was created out of him and for him, to be a helper suitable for him and corresponding to him (cf. Gen. 2:18). In Ephesians 5:21ff, in the context of the reciprocal relations between husbands and wives, Paul interprets the husband's position as 'head' of his wife as modeled on Christ being 'head' of his church. And this is a caring not a crushing headship, a headship of self-sacrifice not self-assertion, of love not pride, intended to be liberating not enslaving. Nor is male headship incompatible with sexual equality, any more than the assertion that 'the head of Christ is God' [ref. 1 Corinthians 11:3] is incompatible with the unity [and I would add the *divine equality*; in essence] of the Father and the Son in the Godhead."
- b. In **1 Timothy 2:9**, clear arguments, based on the historical context of first-century Ephesus, reveal that there is obviously a desire of Paul that Christian women not look like the multitude of prostitutes employed by the temple of the goddess Diana. Perhaps there were aspects of such adornment associated with other idolatrous cults or early forms of Gnosticism that manifested itself in both the false teaching being addressed by Paul and the appearance of women in the Ephesian Church.
 - i. However, there is more in verses 11 and 12 than just an appropriate cultural expression of a timeless creation-based reality of male authority and female submission. This is why Paul feels the need to support his prohibition with verses 13-15. Stott, as previously affirmed, acknowledges that women have exercised such "servant-leadership throughout biblical history," so why this prohibition within this context?
 1. Answer: There is a middle point between interpreting 1 Timothy 2:11,12 as some universal function that women should take as an expression of submissiveness toward men and the complete rejection of this notion as something that is merely a manifestation of a first-century cultural expression of the truth behind male authority and female submission.
 - a. This middle position is based on the specific aspects of teaching and defending sound doctrine against heresy by those with the apostolic authority to do so as given by Paul to Timothy and Titus.
 - b. 2:11,12 are more of an apostolic direction clarifying that the male who has a created God-ordained authority and who is called to such a vocation is to exercise that authority within the Church through the designated roles of elder/overseer to refute false teaching causing problems within first-century Ephesus; a false teaching that may have fostered a false understanding of male-female relationships in the first place.

5. Analysis and Contemporary Relevance

- a. Paul's admonitions directed toward the women in chapter 2 verses 11 and 12 are not changeable cultural expressions of male authority and female submission but, instead, timeless and true directives especially when such false teaching is infiltrating and disrupting the proper order of the Church. The foundation for Paul's directions is pre-fall creation. Thus, while women indeed may, and have, served in leadership and teaching roles under the authority of Scripture and male-headship, when it comes to the foundational teaching of the Church and the guarding of sound doctrine against heresies, women, by the nature of their submissive role, must quietly receive and abide by the proper teaching of the overseers/elders/pastors who, by the nature of their maleness, are responsible for serving in these positions of authority.

- b. The primary cultural issue, then and now, is one that has infiltrated the Church and disrupted its governing structure with an amalgam of feminist theology, political correctness and equal rights that have altered our biblical understanding of male authority and female submission which are complementary. Therefore, the current situation of the Church interestingly parallels the situation of the false teaching that had infiltrated the first-century Ephesian Church.
- c. What's more is that what might have been acceptable practices among males and females in the secular culture of first-century Ephesus is not necessarily appropriate for the counter-cultural community of the Church. This was the issue for Paul in Corinth regarding the marked difference between first-century Greco-Roman meal fellowship which noted social class distinctions and the expected Christian table practices to be observed when the Body of Christ gathers for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

6. Conclusion and the Good News

- a. Based on the Pastoral Epistles and the majority opinion of historic catholic and apostolic Christianity, there is a degree of authority associated with, and implicit in, the teaching ministries of pastoral elder and/or overseer.
- b. I think this is important to articulate; because, based on evidence to support that women likely served as deacons (e.g. - Phoebe in Romans 16:1), we are left with having to discern what is the "leadership" difference between being a deacon verses being a presbyter/overseer. I think the Pastoral Epistles clarify that it is the authority (headship, caring responsibility) of the pastoral elder overseers to ensure that they are refuting false teaching/teachers and teaching sound doctrine. In addition, it has been highlighted by many throughout Church history that the servant-leadership role of the deacon is that which most reflects Christ's redemptive ministry at His first coming. This is indeed the vocation of all Christians; to live a life in such service to others, and this type of servant-leadership coincides theologically and practically with the submissive role of women. Nevertheless, being entrusted with a position of teaching and guarding authority (an aspects of Adam's failure preceding the Fall; to guard the Garden and his wife) would naturally, because of the precedent established in creation, be given to men as their servant responsibility and burden to bear. Such an understanding would not prohibit women from teaching roles, even the teaching of men, within the Church; however, when controversies arise and false teaching needs to be refuted and sound doctrine maintained, men, by the nature of creation, should be in the positions of authority (elder/overseer) to guard the deposit of faith; and women, who may even normally be teachers and servant-leaders within the Church, must, along with the rest of the flock, quietly submit to the elders and overseers entrusted with the "faith once delivered to the saints."
- c. The complementarity of the male and female created roles is fully revealed in the Person and work of Jesus Christ who is the perfect authority Head of His Bride and the perfect Suffering-Servant who submitted to the shared divine will of His Father on our behalf. Amid all the sex and gender role confusion of our time that is a result of our fallen dispositions, there is Christ Who clarifies. This is the Gospel.
 - i. Our equal dignity as human beings created in the image and likeness of God is in Jesus Christ, through Whom alone we are made righteous and have access to the Father. All in Christ are holy, set-apart, to serve and honor God.
 - 1. Example: **2 Timothy 2:19-21** (parallel with wheat verses weeds)
 - ii. Our complementary functions in our service to God, as he created us male and female, are revealed fully in Jesus which, combined with our individual gifts of the Spirit, enable us to offer ourselves as an acceptable offering to the Father as the Body of Christ.
 - 1. Example: **1 Corinthians 12:12-31**

- d. As Jesus is equal with the Father, so are we equal to each other in Christ. As Father, Son and Holy Spirit each have their own role and function within the Godhead, so do we have our own creative and redemptive roles and functions in the Body of Christ.

- i. **READ Colossians 3:17-4:1**

General Conclusions on Women's Ministry Roles within the Church in Reference to 1 Timothy 1-4

- 1.) Women may have either assumed or been appointed to (via the laying-on of hands by the elders-?) the servant-leader ministry of *deacon*.
 - a. Such a role may include, both in and outside of the Church, teaching others. This would include men being instructed by women in some matters.
 - i. Nevertheless, within the Church, such teaching should be conducted under the authority of the Word of God and in accordance with His created order which includes being under some degree of male-headship (*pastoral elder overseers*).
 - b. *All* Believers, in a very fundamental aspect, are 'deacons' which means 'servants'/'ministers' modeled after Christ by His indwelling and empowering Spirit.
- 2.) Women should not minister within the Church in the pastoral-leader role of *elder* (presbyter/priest)/ *overseer* (bishop)/ *pastor* (shepherd).
 - a. These pastoral roles are, and have traditionally/historically been, positions of authority. And such authority, as expressed and understood historically/biblically, is commensurate with the authoritative functions inherent in created maleness. These pastoral positions not only involve teaching but, more so, are charged with guarding the faith and teaching of sound doctrine which includes authoritatively rebuking and disciplining (even to the point of excommunication) false teachers and refuting all heresies (which further implies that they, as doctrinal leaders, know the sound doctrine).
 - i. This is poignantly illustrated in St. Paul's correspondence to Timothy in which Paul affirms this function of Timothy's authoritative role within the Ephesian Church as he is charged to battle against a heresy that undermines the apostolic sound doctrine and the order of creation which, in all probability, was attacking and destroying the very essence and godly manifestation of the good order of creation between the men and women over whom Timothy was entrusted to serve.