

Let Your Women Keep Silent in the Churches

by: Thomas Ackerman

kodeshkallah@yahoo.com

It's hard to keep track of all the compromises in the churches today. Even passing over mainline Protestantism, and its complete apostasy, there are countless churches with an apparently kosher doctrinal statement which minimize sin, allow full participation to members living in sodomite relationships, and very commonly feminize the ministry. For that reason, what some people judge to be smaller compromises, such as my topic today of women preachers, get overlooked, and minimized as much as possible. Some go so far as to defend such practices, while maintaining a profession in the Bible as our authority and in its inerrancy. One of the easiest compromises to see today, at least from the Bible believers, is to pretend that the prohibition on women preaching and having authority in the Church does not apply outside of the weekly gatherings inside the church walls. They make very narrow the application of this teaching, thus making very narrow what the Church is, and manage to heavily feminize the ministry this way. It is, despite their justifications, disobedience to God, and a plain breaking with Scripture.

Often ministers who feminize the churches will profess to respect the gender roles taught in the New Testament. They will give a nod to 1 Timothy 2:11-12, which teaches that women may not teach or have authority over men. They will affirm the truth of 1 Corinthians 14, which says, "Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says" (vs. 34). Yet they will turn around and claim this submissive and silent role only applies to gatherings of the local church, with a pastor present. Beyond that, they give the green light to all kind of female preaching and teaching. They allow it in all kinds of ministries, ones which are clearly Christian, have a faith statement, teach doctrine, and often even have a pastor or two connected to the ministry to oversee it. They'll allow women to do the preaching and teaching, for example, in books, on the radio, in apologetics ministries, in creationist ministries (two major ones which have fallen already), on social media pages, and on other similar religious forums. Basically, women can do all the preaching and teaching over men that they want, as long as it stays out of that weekly gathering where the pastor and the whole local church are present.

Even before examining the passages closely, there is something that ought to simply feel very wrong to the Christian. He ought to recognize very quickly that what is going on is exactly what God prohibits in Scripture, because he has read the Scripture, and he knows that women are not to teach over men. He should recognize something wrong essentially in gender relations, because teaching and preaching are themselves authoritative, even if they are not formally so. They impress truth on others, and correct the beliefs of others. This is glaringly out of step with gender from start to finish in the Bible, in which men are the leaders, and women in the submissive and helping role. This difference in gender roles which appears in the home, in religious worship, and the large majority of the time in government is rooted in something natural, and all of us know that. It is rooted in our differing natures, with the man clearly stronger, and the woman clearly

following him. It is rooted in the man's greater grasp of truth, and the woman's deception in the garden. We all know this both from Scripture and our natures, so there is something immediately we can sense wrong when women are teaching over men, and doing so especially on spiritual matters.

The claim that the biblical teachings on gender only apply to church gatherings can be seen to be wrong on several fronts. Firstly, in the passages themselves, there are teachings which take us beyond the local church gathering with pastor present. For example, in 1 Timothy 2, we have teachings about praying, and about women's modesty (vss. 8–9). If these teachings only apply to church gatherings, then we don't need to take prayer too seriously outside of church gatherings, and women can dress as immodestly and lewdly as they desire, as long as it's not in church. Clearly, these are things which, while applying to church gatherings, also extend far beyond them. Moreover, nothing in verses 8 to 15 ever says this is about church gatherings with everyone present. They are simply instructions to Christians who are, when you think about it, the Church wherever they go. They will worship, pray, live godly, and respect gender well outside the halls of the local church on Sunday. Finally, the apostle roots the woman's silence, and the man's authority and teaching role, to something very basic in our natures: to the creation and the fall (vss. 13–14). Women are not to teach or have authority because of the man's primacy, and Eve's deception. Why would that primacy of the male and that female deception cease being relevant outside of the local church gathering? These are things that relate to our God-given roles and our natures. The woman is pointed to her sanctification, which comes through virtue and child bearing (vs. 15). She is pointed away from teaching or having authority over men. This goes back to the beginning of creation, so naturally it is practiced throughout our lives, and not just in church on Sundays.

While 1 Timothy 2 does not speak uniquely of the gathering of the local congregation, 1 Corinthians 14 does (vs. 26). However, it is still nonsensical to think this teaching only applies to the local gathering with pastor present. For even in this chapter, it points to a greater logic, as well as the nature of men and women. This submission of the woman is also affirmed in the law (vs. 34b), they are to learn from their husbands even at home (vs. 35a), and it is pointed out that they have not been the ones to originally share the word of God, but rather to receive it (vs. 36). If women are to be learning the word from their husbands at home, for starters, it's hard to imagine that home worship would involve women preaching any more than local church worship does. Clearly even in the less formal religious setting of the home, with the pastor not usually present, the man is the one who teaches. I believe this alone ought to seal the deal for us that women do not teach over men even outside of the pulpit on Sundays. She is in the learning, not the teaching position, even in the home. Further, if women have been receiving the word of God from the start, being taught by men, that fact relates to their position and to woman's history of being submissive, both of which take us beyond the local church gathering.

Paul's reference to the law confirming his teaching on women's silence is also worth exploring. While exactly which law he is referring to is not clear, we can still make some reasonable deductions. Since Jesus did not give specific instructions on these kinds of gender roles, we can safely say Paul is not writing about the law of Christ. He naturally would be speaking of the Old

Testament law, either the Torah in general or the commandments. We do see roles and differences of the sexes here several times starkly. As in 1 Timothy 2, Paul may have been referencing Genesis itself, with the man being created as the head, and the woman as his helper. This, like the other teaching, would then show these differences to be based on our nature and roles, which clearly are not locked into local church gatherings. If Paul is referring to commandments, the closest may be the role of the Levites, who were all men. This is still a “church” setting for certain, but since it refers to priests, there is not a direct application today, but simply a comparison. If the commandment Paul mentions refers to the home, and the woman needing permission from either husband or father to do things, then it takes us widely beyond the local church gathering. For example, either husband or father could overrule a woman’s vow, having more authority (Numbers 30:3-8). Any way you look at it, the reference is broader than the New Testament Church, quite likely pointing outside of religious worship entirely. However, if you find this short reference to the law unclear, that’s fine. We already have multiple clearer points in the passage which take us beyond the local church meeting, even to the home, as I have pointed already out.

When it comes to this whole chapter from 1 Corinthians, as we have seen in 1 Timothy 2, there are verses within it which we apply to home and to personal life. Just as we can apply the passages of prayer and modesty apart from the church gathering, we also apply the teaching on orderly worship found in 1 Corinthians 14 to home worship, or worship in a similar fellowship (vss. 33, 40). We do not have chaos and irreverence when we worship apart from the gathering of the entire local church. We apply those teachings to all of our worship. See, if we use the logic that feminizers use, we’d have to say that once we are worshipping apart from church on Sunday, we can be as chaotic as we’d like. Even if we go to other chapters about Church practices, such as head coverings, receiving the eucharist with order and reverence, we apply them to religious activities we do, even when the entire congregation and the pastor are not present. The men take off their hats to say a simple prayer. We recognize that we are the Church, and we live and worship accordingly.

We are the Church wherever we go. That’s the key point here. We have prayer, worship, and teaching that extends beyond the one to three gatherings the local church has every week. I think you all know that at heart. We preach apart from that gathering. We teach and learn apart from that gathering. We have worship apart from it, and we should do so regularly. We can see this in the New Testament, as every single example of public preaching is by a male, even when it’s clearly not the regular worship of the entire congregation. The apostles went out and preached the Word house to house, not their wives. Paul spoke at Mars Hill to the pagans, not some woman. Paul taught from house to house, with no indication given that the whole congregation was present, and the brethren broke bread together from house to house as well, and came together in their houses to pray. Jesus preached to large crowds in informal gatherings all the time, and we never see a woman replace Him in doing that. Jesus said, “where two or three are gathered together in My name, I am there in the midst of them” (Matthew 18:20), showing the present power of the Church even in a small gathering, and the presence of Christ, which more than anything else makes the Church real. Just as two or three witnesses settle a matter in the Bible, two or three Christians have power as the Church.

I honestly believe that many of the same ministers who have feminized the churches recognize this fact. They DO understand that the Church extends beyond the Sunday meeting, and that there are unique church practices that we do at home and in fellowship, and not just when the pastor and everyone else is there. However, they pass over this truth in order to facilitate feminism. They've got to find some excuse for it. Ministers are under constant pressure from the already more feminized churches and their ministry friends. They are under pressure to expand and make money as well. They have women with higher degrees knocking on their door wondering why they can't use that higher education they have and teach a bit, when the ministry down the road lets them do it. Then heads of ministry see a brighter future with feminism, and leap at whatever justification they find, convincing themselves they are still being true to the God they worship. However, I tell you this: Do not let them do this. If ministers gender bend outside of the Sunday meeting, tell them this is wrong. If they do not repent of this error, find another ministry to support or to work for. The Christian should not be gender bending and it is not a minor thing.

People who excuse women teaching over men based on the argument I am addressing need to understand one more thing: very similar arguments to their own are used to justify women preaching in churches, something which they claim they are against. They are using the same line of argument. They will say that when the women preach, it's just not that "authoritative" kind of preaching, but is a notch down, making it okay. When the man, who is usually a pastor preaches, it's authoritative, and when the woman, who is not a pastor preaches, it's not authoritative. They will actually pull something like this and then claim they are being faithful to the Bible. Even if you are against that, you have to see the same reasoning being used, one which simply splices between two kinds of preaching, one more official than the other. If women preaching over men is alright, assuming it's not too authoritative, then what's wrong with doing that in the church gathering on Sunday as well. Nothing. It's the very same distinction, one which Scripture never tells us to make, nor even demonstrates. Preaching doctrine is preaching doctrine, whether it happens in the most official or authoritative way or not, and that preaching according to the Bible needs to be done by men.

Let's also use the argument that feminizers use back on them, and see if they are willing to apply it to themselves. If the prohibition on women teaching over men only applies to weekly gatherings, and not to ministries that don't identify themselves as a church, then the need to preach doctrine also only applies to weekly gatherings, and not to ministries that don't identify themselves as a church. That means to be fair, if independent ministries don't have the church rules applied to them, then they don't have the church calling to preach and teach applied to them either. What would that mean? That means they stop preaching and teaching, since they simply are not a church. Let the church do that, to the entire congregation, with the pastor present, and stop doing it yourself. By your own logic you're pretending to be a church, which you admit you are not. If those promoting feminism outside of the church walls would see their own point, they'd be forced to do one of two things: either stop teaching doctrine either by men or women, or admit they are part of the Church, and not allow women preachers. You can't have it both ways. Be consistent, and you will see this point.

One needs to also look at the practical end of this decision to allow women preachers, as long as it's apart from the weekly gathering with pastor present. The practical end looks like this. The average man could sit under female preaching on the radio. He could read female teaching from a wide variety of parachurch ministries. He could be preached to by women in a home gathering, and on a Christian video platform, and maybe go home and be taught by his wife as well. He could turn on the television and hear a variety of very popular and admired female preachers explain the Bible to him, and how he should live as a Christian. Then, on Sunday, or Wednesday, he goes to his small local church and hears a man preach from behind a wooden pulpit. The idea that the mind can just suddenly distinguish between the unofficial and the official is silly. It's all preaching and teaching and he's going to have a very hard time subordinating the mass amount he got from women to that special authoritative kind he heard come from behind a pulpit, from the voice of a man. Yet the Bible teaches women may not teach over men. It teaches women are to be silent and in submission, and if they have a question, they should ask their husbands at home, who will explain it to them. To try and create the reality I've described above, and to approve of it, is in total conflict with Holy Scriptures, regardless of what excuses they make. It is exactly what we are not to do.

The other important element of the practical side is the effect that it has. When you consider that the Bible ties gender roles in to the creation itself, it's hard to imagine we ought to expect that female teaching will be just the same as male teaching. We ought to rather expect it to be softer, and looser with the truth. We ought to expect it to fall more easily for deception. This is does. The obvious trend is that when churches bring on female preachers and pastors, they abandon other teachings as well. They become more liberal, some to the point of apostasy. If you look at the denominations and individual churches which have gone full apostate, they generally started with females in leadership and preaching to the flock. Even those which did not end up in full theological apostasy did become more liberal, treat immorality as a small matter, and jump on board with the latest leftist political trends. These things generally go together. That is because women are not only instructed not to teach over men, but they are not cut out to teach over men. They're not going to do such a good job. We see a similar effect since the dawn of women voters in the West. In America, the female vote has weakened the American character. It has brought on a nanny-state government, broken up families, increased single motherhood, promoted abortion, lewdness, sodomy, and transsexualism. It has voted in the avowed enemies of Christian America to openly destroy it. That is weakness. Women have voted with their emotions, and greatly weakened the character of the entire country, to the point it is not recognizable anymore. Why should we think we won't see an effect when women teach to the brethren as well? Why should we think that bad effect is only dangerous on Sunday mornings, and not when teaching is done through various other forums? This is not a matter of what is appropriate for Sunday mornings, but a matter of what we are cut out to do, and women are not cut out for leadership or teaching.

It is natural to ask then, when and how can a woman share her faith, if so many activities of the church do not allow her to teach or preach. The answer is very simple. There is firstly ordinary conversation like the kinds we have all the time. This allows a woman to explain her faith in Jesus, as well as to answer questions about it. However, if it goes much beyond that, into real study and teaching of the Bible, she ought to pass the person along to a male brother or a pastor

to be taught. This is true of online communications as well; once it crosses that line from simply communicating one's faith in conversation to doing what is obviously regular ministry work and doctrinal teaching, it is something for the man to do. For the woman there is secondly teaching over other women, although this is work not primarily focused on Scripture study verse by verse, or on explaining doctrine in detail. According to Titus 2, women teaching other women is focused on godly womanhood – she is to teach Christian love, chastity, homemaking, and submission to husbands (vss. 4–5). Now those are some of the last things that women teachers want to teach, but it is the teaching role given to them by God. Naturally, there's nothing wrong if it is explained or defended with Scripture, but it is not in itself focused on expounding Scripture and doctrine, but on the character and life of a godly woman. These women teach other women with words and by example. This is valuable teaching work, even if it does not come in the same setting, or with the same focus. It is work that passes along the faith, and sanctifies the community. We cannot do without it.

Believe me, ministers will try to get away with feminizing with any trick they can. It is often to their advantage, at least from their perspective, because they see it allows them to expand, and to make more friends. One strategy they may use is to give it a different name. Call the teaching “counseling,” for instance, and fewer people will be likely to object, they accurately assume. So then under the moniker of counseling women end of preaching and teaching to men. I have seen this myself in an otherwise kosher church newsletter. While most of the articles are by men, you will see a “counseling” article is by a woman. Yet in reading the article it's clear there is little difference between the content and what you might hear from the pulpit or during Sunday school. It's a lesson on the Bible and doctrine. They have simply changed the name, but the disobedience to God's Word is the same. Other officials in the churches will also fiddle with the category of men. For example, if they want to have women teaching theology in their Bible college or seminary, they will claim that the men there are still boys, since most are presumably living off of their parents' money. Thus, despite their stage of development, which tells all of us they are men, they just don't quite qualify, and the college or seminary is free to be as feminized as they want, and women preach freely over men all the time. This is plain trickery, but don't be surprised if you see it. Women are not to do those jobs, and changing the name does not make it any better. The now ubiquitous church title of “worship leader” is used to similar effect. Once a woman is given this position, she uses the broad role to give all kinds of mini sermons to the entire congregation during weekly worship. Much of what you hear from worship leaders is also indistinguishable from a sermon, and in principle, when a woman is preaching to the entire congregation like this, she most definitely is not being silent and submissive.

The trend of having women preachers apart from gatherings of the local church is wrong for multiple reasons, as we have seen. It artificially limits what the Church is, limiting it to the full gathering of the congregation with the pastor present, when the Church is not so limited at all, even according to Scripture. It ignores that both passages teaching female silence and submission in the Church also connect that teaching to broader truths, including creation and the fall, and even teaches women in the domain of the home (definitely not the local church gathering) to simply learn from their husbands. It reflects an incoherent and inconsistent identity of their own ministry, being a church enough to have doctrinal teaching, but not a church enough to respect

the Bible's gender roles. It refuses to consider entirely that women are not cut out for the job, not being the ones from whom the Scriptures originally came, as well as being softer in character, and being more likely to be deceived. This they do usually while ignoring the true role given to women in Scripture, that of nurturing their children, keeping the home, and teaching other women in godly womanhood. Promoters of this form of feminism think they have a pat answer by claiming the rules don't apply to them, but they have no answer. They have a deception, just like any other false teacher, and what they are doing is wrong.

I will end with describing again what you will see if you join us for fellowship and worship in our home. A man will be leading it and a man will be preaching. I will take off my hat, since that is what the Bible teaches men to do. My wife will be covered during worship. We will have an order of doing things, and will be reverent in every step in our liturgy. We will sing hymns as the Bible instructs, and also read or sing the Psalms. Basically, we will do our best to worship in the way taught in Scripture, just as we do our best to live that way daily. When the brethren are gathered, the Church is gathered, even if it is not every one of us. We are the Church, you and I. The teaching of the Bible is for us, even if we do not all fill the unique role of elder or deacon. Christ does not cease to be present with us, and our worship is accepted even if the pastor is not there. Do not let anyone play games with you by limiting the definition of the Church, or by changing the meaning of words. The flock of Christ is always fed by a man.