

## Masculine Christianity

By Zachary Garris

### 1. **The Rise of Feminism and the Erosion of Masculinity**

1. First wave feminism and progressivism
  1. 1830s to 1920. Susan B. Equal wages, property rights, marriage rights. 19th Amendment, in past voted as family. Leaders were quakers or atheists or Unitarian.
2. Second Wave
  1. No fault divorce, abortion, equitable wages.
  2. Steinem: "Women needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle." The pill. Casual sex. Fruitless sex.
3. Goal of feminism is to push women out of the home and into the workplace, making them more like men." (24) "The tragedy of feminism is that it propagates precisely the opposite of the real interests of women. Instead of helping women to develop their femaleness to its optimum, it tends to encourage them to imitate men. Women should participate to the same extent as men in careers, in society, and in politics." Werner Neuer.

### 2. **Sexual Rebellion and Repentance**

1. Rebellion against God's design for the sexes
  1. Equality breaks down differences between the sexes. This is Jacobin equality.
2. Effeminate Men will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven (1Cor. 6:9-10)
  1. Drunk once, he repents. Drunk daily is a drunkard and won't go to heaven.
  2. ESV puts malakoi and aresenokoitai together for one word, passive and active member. Second word Paul most likely invented to combine Lev. 18:22 and Lev. 20:13.
  3. Effeminate is a soft man. Thus, effeminate men, not just homosexuals, will be excluded from kingdom of God.
3. Men must act like men
  1. Soft men do not act like men. They act like women who are supposed to be soft. Soft men refuse to work and provide for wife and kids, do not protect wife and leaves spiritual leadership to wife.
  2. Men are so attracted to entertainment they are content and will not be pained or discomforted. They are weak and soft.

3. Authority flows to those that take responsibility.
  4. Careful of the sin of niceness. We want to be agreeable and liked by everyone. Kind and gentle at appropriate times (Gal. 5:22). Niceness is weakness. It is people pleasing. Trying to keep with no peace. Full of fear but not feared. Apologize just bc someone was hurt.
4. Women must act like women (1Tm. 2:15)
1. Paul ties womanly behaviour to salvation in this verse. Childbearing refers to the process of childbirth and thus a woman's domestic sphere. Women saved by faith in Christ but this faith produces womanly behaviour, exemplified by the bearing of children, by working out salvation (Phil. 2:12). Synecdoche. Good works necessary for our salvation in the broader sense (Mt. 7:21; Phil. 2:12).
  2. Careful of machoism, bodybuilding (gross exaggeration of male physique, relying on hormonal supplementation or extreme dieting), extremely violent sports (MMA).
  3. Bible associates gentleness and affection with motherhood and exhortation and authority with fatherhood (1Th. 2).

### 3. Complementarianism's Compromise

1. Intro
  1. Formal resistance to feminism came in 1987 through "complementarianism" that believed (1) husbands hold leadership role in marriage and (2) pastors and elders must be men, standardised by Danvers statement in '87 and *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* in '91.
  2. Complementarianism is a clunky name. Should have used "patriarchy" (father rule) but they were afraid of negative connotations. Failed to realize that everyone believes that men and women complement each other in *some* sense. C took novel approach to 1Cor. 14:34-35 (weighing prophecy) and agreed that women could lead in prayer, public prayers and serving communion and position of Keller and Frame that "a woman can do anything a non-ordained man may do." Preferred the word "leadership" over "authority" and "rule", making them functionally egalitarian.
  3. Egalitarian Ronald Pierce wrote: "While authority was theoretically at the center of their argument, in actual practice it was often at the margins."
  4. Narrow complementarians saw male leadership only in the home and church but not broader society, as Danvers statement never addresses it and CBMW has women on council.

5. The authors dodge a significant point and ignore that Scripture speaks about women in combat and in civil office (more in ch. 11)
2. Complementarianism's Discomfort with Hierarchy
    1. Compromise in two areas: (1) discomfort in using terms like "authority" and "hierarchy" (2) fail to root gender roles in differing natures of men and women. Thus they gave too much ground to E.
    2. Hierarchy (groups of persons arranged in order of rank, grade, class) is good bc it aptly describes man has authority over wife and in this sense ranks above her. "Equality" is vague. Yes, equal value but not equal abilities.
    3. But even Grudem and Piper, who affirm hierarchy, prefer "leadership" instead of "authority". Danvers statement never mentions "hierarchy", "authority" only once and "leadership" four times.
    4. But Christ is Head and thus has "authority", not just leadership. Would we like to say Christ has just "leadership"?
  3. Complementarianism's failure to root gender roles in Nature
    1. This deals with ontology, the nature of being. God's commands were connected to male and female nature. Man is wired to exercise authority and woman is wired to submit.
    2. Grudem says men and women are equal in "personhood" but this is confusing. Does this mean worth? Then yes. Does it mean "nature"? Then no.
  4. Egalitarian forces their hand
    1. Rebecca Groothuis accuses C. of saying women are inferior ontologically, says "equal in value" but "unequal in role" is historically novel claim and says "roles" are a matter of ontology or being. She's right. Can't disconnect role from being.
    2. Male authority is rooted in male nature and female submission is rooted in female nature.
  5. Embracing Hierarchy and nature
    1. Because we separate roles from nature, not surprising C refuse to apply differing roles of men and women to civil sphere.
    2. Men, for example, have greater physical strength and emotional strength.
    3. Benjamin Palmer: "Men are strong, forceful, massive, fond of adventure, full of dash and courage. The woman is not less equipped for her station by the qualities which distinguish her. She is endued with grace and beauty, to win rather than subdue..."

4. "It is the dictate of common sense, that female government is improper and unseemly." - John Calvin
  5. Duns Scotus believed gender roles were rooted only in God's decree and not in differing natures. Thomist view says nature and Scotus view says decree. Doriani believes C take a middling position between these two. He also said in RBMW, the strongest advocates of ontological differences between the sexes were a sociologist and a biologist.
  6. C is new. It is a softened position.
6. Error of rooting gender roles in the Trinity instead of Nature
1. Eternal functional subordination of the Son (ESS or EFS). Some want to root gender roles in the Trinity. Grudem does this to show that equals can submit to another. Def: God the Son was functionally subordinate to the Father prior to the incarnation.
  2. Grudem says Father and Son ontologically equal but functionally subordinate. Thus wife should be functionally sub to her husband as Son was to Father. George Knight argued for this in 1977.
  3. Some charge Grudem with heresy. Truth is that Jesus submitted to Father *in the incarnation*. Yes, Jesus submitted to Father (Jn. 4:34; 6:38; 1Co. 15:28) but as a human being.
  4. There is an order (taxis) of relationship, but Bible doesn't teach eternal subordination. This calls into question one will of God. Christ has two wills because he has two natures (human and divine), God (a being) has one will because he has one divine nature (*ousia*). Monothelism is teaching that Jesus had two natures but one will, a view rejected at the Third Council of Constantinople in 681. The will is a property of nature. Subordination of nature would be heresy of subordinationism.
  5. Regarding 1 Cor 15:28, Christ is submissive in his humanity. the Son cannot eternally submit to the Father in his divinity because they share one nature and thus one will.
  6. Trinity should not be ground for gender roles as created being. Scripture never does this.
  7. In Eph. 5 husband's authority over his wife is compared to Christ's authority over the church, not Father's authority over the Son.
7. Failure of Complementarianism
1. Academia has become more emotional, less logical and men reject this. Publishers are often run by women and push feminism. Even P&R published Rachel Miller's book *Beyond Authority and Submission*. Churches have all kinds of Women's ministries now and women targeted teaching.

#### 4. Christianity is Patriarchal

1. God our patriarch
  1. P means "father rule", describes men providing for and protecting women children. Is that really that bad?
  2. Men are designed to rule. Yes, God is Spirit, is neither male or female but has revealed himself in masculine terms because he has authority over us (Mt. 5:48), provides for our needs (Mt. 5:25) and gives good gifts (Lk. 11:13). He is not a she.
2. Patriarchy in the OT - Patriarchs
  1. Abe called patriarch, so is David (Ac. 2:29) and the twelve (Ac. 7:8).
3. Patriarchy in the OT - elders, prophets etc.
  1. 12 tribes were sons, Moses, 12 judges all men except for Deb, who is described differently than other judges and didn't serve as military leader, used Barak instead. Samuel and all kings, except for Queen Athaliah who was wicked. All priests men. Abe, David, Jacob all fought and were men.
  2. Some prophetesses like Miriam, Deb. Huldah and Noadiah. Problem:
    1. Different role for prophetesses than prophets. No formal leadership and never publicly.
    2. Prophecy not the same as ruling for teaching God's word.
4. Patriarchy in the OT - house
  1. Father had right to annul daughter's marriage (Num. 30:6 etc.)
5. Jesus our patriarch
  1. Son of God, not daughter and Son of Man. "Behold the Man".
6. Patriarchy in the NT - Apostles
  1. 12 apostles, "mature manhood", Junia (Rm. 16:7) may have been a man or may have been woman simple known "among the apostles" or simple non-technical one sent out as missionary. Epaphroditus also called apostolon.
7. Patriarchy in the NT - Elders and Deacons
  1. Elders plainly to be "a man" of one wife, similar setting as widow is to be "wife of one husband" in 1 Tm. 5:9.
  2. Deacons should be men too, and "their" wives/women are spoken of in one verse. If deaconess real office, why just one verse. Verse 11 is just a parenthesis bc makes sense they'll work beside their husband in their role.

3. Yes, Phoebe is called a deacon in Rom. 16:1, but just a servant, just as Epaphras (Col. 1:7) and Tim. in 1Tm. 4:6. All deacons men in Ac. 6 where verb for deacon is found. Ordination of deacons is found in AC. 6:6.

#### 8. Final

1. Some old theologians use "superior" or "inferior" in gender roles to show authority and rank, not value.
2. C.S. Lewis: "There must be something unnatural about the rule of wives over husbands, because the wives themselves are half ashamed of it and despite the husbands whom they rule."

### 5. Gender Roles in the Creation Order

#### 1. The glory of man and woman

1. Two sexes, male and female (Gn. 1:27). Woman is crown of creation and a helper for man (Gen. 2:18). Obvious in entire being, physically, minds, personalities and dispositions. Or, they have different natures.
2. From beginning Adam was to guard and keep (gen. 2:15).

#### 2. Man's role to provide affirmed post-fall

1. God told Adam to provide and protect. He failed to protect from the serpent from entering the garden.
2. God did not curse man but the ground. God *punishes* Adam and Eve. God punished the realm of Adam's role as well as the woman's role.

#### 3. Man's Role to Protect Affirmed Post-fall

1. Men should be willing to die for wife. Men are physically stronger than women (1Pt. 3:7) and not hindered by pregnancy or nursing (Tit. 2:4-5).

#### 4. God's Roles for women at Creation

1. Woman is "fit" for man. She complements him and supplies what he lacks and vice versa.
2. God's helping role is voluntary, woman's role is not. God did not create woman to pursue her own career path. Woman was made for the man (1Cor. 11:8-9) to help him and to be his companion and to bear him children.
3. She is called "woman" because of her nature and bc of her ability. She is "life-giver".

#### 5. Woman's roles affirmed post-fall

1. Childbearing is called the "way of women" (Gn. 18:11) and is central role of women throughout the Bible. God punished her in her primary role (Gn. 3:16). She is to work at home (Tit. 2:4-5). Manage the home (1Tm. 5:14).

2. different Greek words when men said to be household managers. For man, word is *proistemi* (1Th. 5:12; 1Tm. 3:4-5). Means to exercise leadership, rule and direction, woman's management is *oikodespoteo* in 1 Tm. 5:14, which is domestic-oriented and a keeper at house.
3. She manages what her family eats (Pr. 31:14-16) wears (31:19-24) etc.

## 6. Hierarchy and Authority in the Creation Order

1. Does Creation Teach Hierarchy in Marriage?
  1. Gender roles are rooted in creation and before the fall.
  2. Garris gives five points in contra with Davidson
2. Adam's authority over Eve in the Fall (Gen. 3)
3. Ten Arguments Adam's authority over Eve in Genesis 1-3
  1. Adam was created first (Gn. 2:7)
  2. Adam had a protective role over Eve in the garden (Gn. 2:15)
  3. Adam had a teaching role over Eve as the one who taught her God's law (Gn. 2:16-17)
  4. Eve was created as a helper for Adam (Gn. 2:18)
  5. Adam named Eve (Gn. 2:23)
  6. God went to Adam first after he and Eve sinned (Gn. 3:9)
  7. God rebuked Adam for listening to Eve (Gn. 3:17)
  8. God only told Adam he would die, yet Eve also died (Gn. 3:19)
  9. God named humanity after Adam (Gn. 5:1-2)
  10. Adam represented the human race in the garden (Rm. 5:12-21)
4. Conflict and rule in Marriage (Gn. 3:16) "Your desire shall be contrary to your husband, but he shall rule over you"
  1. reaffirms creation marital hierarchy (both statements are positive)
  2. describes the perversion of marital roles (either both statements are negative or first is positive but second is negative; Calvin's view)
  3. Predict and prescribe (wife's actions negative but husband's positive)
5. Interpretive Challenges
  1. "Desire" should probably mean "devotion"
  2. Should be "to" or "towards" husband not "against"
  3. "Rule" can be positive but probably negative here
  4. "He may rule" is best as opposed to "he will rule" or "he must rule"

5. Best to connect this with Genesis 4:7; Genesis 3:16 describes a perversion of the marital relationship but places the negative emphasis on the role of the man. "Even though you are devoted to your husband, he may abuse authority over you." This fits context of judgement, "devotion", "to", and parallels 4:7. This says that a husband may abuse his authority over his wife bc of the fall, even if she is devoted to him, just as 4:7 isn't a prediction that Cain would overcome sin but that he had the ability to overcome it but gave in and murdered.

## 7. **Masculine Authority Starts in the Home**

1. Male Headship in the Home
  1. Wives are to submit (Col 3:18-19; 1 Pt. 3:1; Eph. 5:22)
2. Male Headship and Authority (1 Cor. 11:2-16)
  1. ESV obscures v. 3 by saying husband and wife. Should say man and woman like NASB, KJV and NET. Nothing in context says this is about marriage. This implies unmarried women are free to uncover their heads, though she's under covenantal authority of her father (Num. 30:3-5).
  2. ESS can't appeal to v. 3, since this refers to God the Father as head over the *incarnate* Son.
  3. Per v. 7, woman was made to glorify man, to bring him honour as the one in authority over her. Man is glory of God, woman glory of man, long hair is the glory of woman (v. 15). Man uncovers his head to honour God and woman covers her head to honour man (v. 5, 10). "Glory" points to dignity, or honour or station of something.
3. Objection 1: *Kephale* as source not authority (blah blah blah)
4. Objection 2: Paul commands mutual submission.
  1. Eph. 5:21 means we are submissive to those who all who have authority over us.
5. Men has Covenantal Authority in Marriage
  1. Not mere tie breaking vote. He has power over her and leads her.
  2. He is spiritual leader of the home (Dt. 6:6-7).
  3. He protects and provides, just as Adam was to guard the garden (Gn. 2:15). Adultery is common because men do not guard their wives and daughters.
  - 4.

## 8. **Pastors and Elders must be men** (1Tim. 2)

1. God's Call not ours



1. All the spiritual leaders of old were men and in part this was because they had to fight.
  2. God only calls men to be elders. Garris argues for two orders of elders, the teaching elder and ruling elder because some elders both rule and preach in 1Tm. 3:2,5 and this implies that only some elders labor in preaching and teaching.
  3. Conclusions: women may not teach theology to men or exercise authority over them; women may not serve as elders.
2. Elders must be men (1Tm. 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9)
    1. Paul requires elders to be a man; husband of one wife or man of one woman; more than prohibits polygamy. Exact opposite phrase for widows in 1Tm. 5:9, and no one argues Paul was enrolling male widowers there.
    2. Elders must be skilled in teaching word, which is only for men. Only male Levites taught in Israel (Dt. 21:5; 33:10; Neh. 😊)
    3. Role of elder connected to head of household. A woman is not even the head of her own house, let alone the church. Woman elder would practice authority over her husband and other men in the church. Seeing how patriarchal Israel was in OT, Paul would have to be clear and unambiguous to overturn male rule.
  3. Women are not to teach or exercise authority over men (1Tm. 2:8-15).
    1. Paul is speaking about public church assembly here bc (1) Paul only desires men to pray (2:8) and speaks not of women praying, and (2) teaching and exercising authority happens in the local church.
    2. Paul prohibits women from doing two tasks: (1) teaching and (2) exercising authority over men. Second verb is hapax. Some say it means domineering, so Paul is only speaking about a certain kind of authority. Not so. Why would Paul prohibit only *women* from domineering and not men?
    3. Some also say these two verbs make one function. No. (1) *oude* is between the two verbs, making negative coordinating conjunction "nor" or "or". (2) Far apart verbs in Greek. (3) in 1Tm. 5:17, Paul distinguishes these two tasks.
    4. Plus, if consistent and one function, then teaching must be taken negatively as well.
    5. Women must not teach or have authority over "a man". They may teach women and kids (Ti. 2:3-5).
    6. Paul gives a negative command (women not permitted to teach or exercise authority) and a positive (remain quiet), thus ruling out that women can teach men in a certain way.

7. Quiet may mean a quiet demeanour (eg. 2Th. 3:12) but usually this word does not entail speaking when used (1k. 23:56; 1th. 4:11-12; 2 thess. 3:12). The word often means silence (1k. 14:4; ac. 21:14; 22:2). So, not just "don't teach" but be silent.
4. The Basis of Paul's Prohibition (1Tm. 2:13-14)
    1. (1) the creation order, Adam first, he names woman, she's his helper, not overturned by Christ's work, whole creation account here. and (2) Eve's deception by the serpent (Paul uses same GK word for Eve being deceived as is used in Gn. 3:13)
    2. Significance of Eve's deception (1Tm. 2:14)
      1. Option 1: Eve by her womanly nature was more prone to deception than man. Common historical position. Shocking today. But men and women can be equal in value but have different strengths and weaknesses. Some are weaker (1Pt. 3:7). Women are more prone to deception because of their emotional wiring. Doesn't mean less intelligent, just different. Why did Satan approach the woman and not the man? because she follows more easily and is more easily deceived. Her strength is also her weakness.
      2. Option 2: Eve forgot her role and thus was deceived. Problem is that the issue was being *deceived*, not a role reversal. And Adam was *not* deceived. Not necessarily his lack of leading. There are ontological differences between men and women. But if women can teach just as good as men, what's the problem?
      3. Option 1 is best. There was a role reversal for sure in option 2, but not Paul's main point.
  5. Is 1 Timothy 2:8-15 Limited to the Public Church Assembly?
    1. Paul has public assembly in mind. But not just church. Men should still pray and women should still dress modestly. But women shouldn't teach in religious settings, like SS, Bible classes at college etc.
    2. Half the women in the church have the responsibility to teach the other half (Col. 3:16).
    3. Don't put too much into Priscilla and Aquilla, since we don't know the extent of her teaching. Plus it's descriptive. At most she can instruct a man in the gospel in a private setting.
  6. Objection 1 - 1 Tim. 2:12 is Limited by Culture and Context
    1. They say Paul was dealing with specific group of false teachers. False teachers urging women to leave married life and kids. Or they'll say

prohibition is based on woman's lack of education, but Paul never mentions this. Cites problem of deception.

2. If *all* women were deceived, then it shows that women are more deceived, or if *some* were deceived, why would Paul prohibit all unless there was some kind of ontological difference?
3. Point: Paul grounds prohibition in creation order, not culture or circumstance.
4. Animal argument also weak. Yes, animals created first, but much different than humans.
5. Others say we can't take 1 Tim. 2 too seriously bc we don't take Paul's prohibition in 1Cor. 11:2-16 and head coverings seriously. But if the head covering is long hair, then we do follow it. But also, Paul never says in 1Cor. 11 that *creation* requires women to wear head coverings. He says nature teaches it. Hats are custom, long hair is creation.
7. Objection 2 - 1 tim. 2:12 applies only to husbands/wives, not men/women
  1. How can a woman that is married not teach over her husband but can over other men, especially when husband is part of congregation? No sense.
  2. Moreover, 1Tm. 2 is not only for married couples (prayer and modest dress). Paul uses language in 1Pt. 3 and 1Cor. 14:34-35 to show that married people in mind but not so in 1Tm. 2. Further, Paul appeals to creation order and woman deceived, not the marriage relationship.

## 9. **Women Should Keep Silent in the Church** (1Cor. 14:34-35)

### 1. Intro

1. This passage even more controversial than 1 Tim 2, in part because sounds like Paul is prohibiting women from speaking publicly in assembled church, but this appears to contradict 1Cor. 11:5, "Every wife who prays or prophecies with her head uncovered dishonours her head..."
2. Options: (1) Paul prohibits women from *all public speech* in worship and 1Cor. 11:5 does not sanction public speaking by women in worship, (2) Paul prohibits women from *some public speech* in worship in 1Cor. 14:34-35, and 1Cor. 11:5 permits women to pray and prophesy (called "particular-speech solution" and very common today).
3. In #2, they believe "remain silent" prohibits only *some* kind of speech, like tongues, teaching (as in 1Tm. 2:12), evaluating/weighing prophesy, or asking disruptive questions (but then why address this to "all the churches" and make such sweeping claims of submission and silence if this is only a particular matter with some people?)

4. Weighing prophecy view is most common form of particular-speech. Says Paul is forbidding women from weighing prophecy. VV. 26-28 regulates prophetic speech, 30-35 regulates weighing and sifting of prophecy and v. 29 joints them together. Four reasons to reject this view:
  1. Weighing of prophecy View (WPV) is not historic interpretation of the church.
  2. WPV has serious exegetical problems.
  3. Historic interps better explain how 1 Cor. 11:5 and 14:34-35 work together.
  4. WPV doesn't clearly explain the words in 34-35 (words so clear that many now say it is an interpolation).
  
2. Historic Interp of 1 Cor. 1:5 and 14:34-35
  1. Historic position is that while women may sing, they are not to address or speak in front of public assembly.
  2. Three solutions to these two passages:
    1. Public/private worship solution: 11:5 speaks of private worship or semi-private gatherings and 14:34-35 prohibits women from speaking in publicly assembled church (Origen, Warfield, Gordon Clark, Calvin, Hodge, MacArthur).
    2. Delayed-condemnation solution: 11:5 speaks of public praying and prophesying for arguments sake but waits until 14:34-35 to condemn it (Dabney, Calvin, Hodge)
    3. Extraordinary-situation solution: general rule is 14:34-35 that women should not speak in public worship but gives an exceptional case in 11:5 (Luther; Plummer and Robertson consider this and 11:5 as hypothetical).
  3. WPV introduced by Anglican W.C. Klein in 1962 and followed by female minister Margaret Thrall in 1965. Then Grudem and Carson promoted this (also Gardner and Garland). Now predominant view among complementarians and even some egalitarians (e.g. Thiselton's commentary).
  4. New doesn't mean wrong, but suggests modern cultural changes have played key role. If we want to limit offense, and women silent in churches is offensive, push is to get women more involved (publicly read, lead prayer).
  
3. Problems with the Weighing of Prophecy View of 14:34-35

1. Paul forbids "speaking", with no qualifier, prohibiting speech broadly and not just weighing prophecy. Could have prohibited "weighing" if that is what he meant, or "speaking in tongues". In fact, he doubles down and uses "silent". Instead, most interpret 34-35 through the grid of 11:5 and ch. 14 as a whole.
  2. Doesn't fit the flow of the passage. Last mention of "weighing of prophecy" is v. 29, yet this is what some interpret v. 34 to mean. It would make more sense to connect v. 34 to closer v. 31 and prophesying, not weighing prophecy. Vv. 36-40 is concerned with more than just prophecy. Paul is concerned with the whole church service being done in order (v. 40).
  3. Paul's phrase "if there is anything they desire to learn" (v. 35) does not fit context of weighing prophecy. Appears that issue was not women weighing prophesy but women not understanding and thus publicly asking questions to the elders. Women were asking questions about prophecies and then giving assessments. Solution is not speaking and asking questions in the church but remaining silent and asking husbands at home.
  4. Fourth, no indication "weighing" prophecies was audible. Example of silent evaluation in 1Cor. 11:31. Plus, Paul doesn't mention "weighing of prophecy" in gifts of public speaking in v. 26. Also, no mention of number of people allowed to do this like speaking in tongues and prophecy (v. 27, 29). The entire church is to do silent weighing of prophecy.
  5. Fifth, it holds untenable position that prophesying is less authoritative than weighing of prophecy. They can prophecy but not weigh prophecy, even though prophecy is high position in the church and listed ahead of teachers (Eph. 2:20; 3:5). NT prophecy is continuation of authoritative prophecy of the OT. Actually, some women could prophecy privately, like prophetesses of old, but not in public worship.
4. Absolute Prohibition of Women speaking publicly in Church
1. Three views of 1 Cor. 11:5 that prohibits women: (1) public/private worship, (2) delayed-condemnation, (3) extraordinary-situation solution.
  2. #1 is best option. Paul is direct and clear. Three times in the section he mentions silence.
  3. "Law" in v. 34 refers to Genesis 1-3, specifically Gen. 3:16
  4. 11:5 is private prophecy and prayer; should be veiled; public church not mentioned until v. 16. Previous section in ch. 10 not public worship. 11:17-34 clearly moves to public, as 17-18 makes clear.
  5. We have examples of private prophecy by Agabus in Ac. 11:28 and 21:9-11 and Philip's daughters in Ac. 21:9

6. 1 Timothy 2:11-14 and 1 cor. 14:34-35 are very similar (doesn't permit, women no speaking, submission, women learning, creation order). In fact, 1 Cor. 14:34-35 so clear, some say it must be interpolation.
7. Point: women are not to speak at all in public worship, not even to ask questions.
8. Weighing prophecy view gives absurd conclusion that women can prophecy but not weigh prophecy.
9. "Each one" in v. 26 is referring only to men.
10. 14:34-35 is far clearer than 11:5; 11:5 is descriptive, 14:34-35 is prescriptive. Just take at face value.
11. Regarding 14:34-35, honest liberals say it is "sexist"; dishonest liberals call it interpolation; complementarians say only weighing of prophecy; plain meaning is not speaking publicly in worship.

#### **10. Masculine Authority in the Church**

1. May a Woman do anything an unordained man can do?
  1. This line is promoted by Keller and Frame. Schreiner is more conservative but allows women to serve communion or publicly praying, as does Grudem. This shows how important interpretation of 1Cor. 14 is. Plus, serving communion and baptism are task for elders.
2. May women still preach a sermon
  1. Paul doesn't make strict separation between teaching and exhortation. Teaching in the OT is just that (Dt. 4; 2Chron 17:9; ezra 7:10; Neh. 8:8). Also related in 1Tm. 4:13.
  2. Plus, teaching often associated with elder (1Tm. 5:17; 3:2).
  3. Pastoring is a masculine task of keeping, serving and guarding, just like back in Gn. 2:15. Only male teaching in OT (Dt. 21:5; 33:10 etc.). Man's body better suited for teaching (deeper voice, larger body). Women built to bear children.
  4. Also, pastors made to protect, again, a male duty (Mt. 7:15; Ac. 20:28-30).
  5. Goal not to be nice; we are to be tough and guard. Too many soft today. Too afraid of tone to hurt.
  6. Sadly Piper says: "leadership and submission" do not have anything to do with "muscles and skills" and are "not a matter of capabilities and competencies." False (p. 234).

#### **11. Masculine Authority Beyond the Home and Church**

## 1. The Creation Order Applies Everywhere

1. Creation order applies to men and women right where they are, not just home and church. Same nature prohibiting authority in home and church does the same in society. A woman's weakness doesn't just go to church or home (1Pt. 3:7) but also battlefield and crime busts.
2. Some Eg. rightly see inconsistencies of C who ignore ontological differences, saying they can't be preachers (women) but can right a commentary on Hebrews or be President.
3. Bible mocks woman governors (Is. 3:12) and forbids women soldiers (Dt. 22:5). Even natural law teaches us this, as women's bodies different and bleed etc.
4. Woman who holds civil office has authority over husband. Plus, her domestic responsibilities should keep her out of office.
5. Knox: "A woman promoted to sit in the seat of God, that is, to teach, to judge or to reign above man, is monstrous in nature, contumelious to God, and a thing most repugnant to his will and ordinance." *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*.

## 2. Women Governing in the Bible (including Deborah)

1. Almost all rulers in the OT were men, with two possible exceptions. One is women rulers Jezebel and Athaliah. They were wicked and usurped rule. They murdered and apostatized.
2. Other is Deborah, godly prophetess and judge. Judges were primarily military heroes. (1) Not described in same way as male judges. Never says she saved like other judges and never says "the Lord raised her up" like others or that the Spirit of the Lord worked through her. (2) Didn't serve as military leader. Urged Barak to fight. He eventually did fight and he is listed instead of Deborah in Hebrews 11 & 1Sm. 12:11. Descriptive not prescriptive. She's mother of Israel (judg 5:7).
3. Scripture never speaks of women in civil leadership as good or normative. Calls for male leaders (Dt. 1:13) and mocks women rulers (Is. 3:12).

## 3. Women Warriors

1. A woman soldier is even more abominable than women civil ruler. She is to be protected, not protect. Doesn't have body to fight but to bear children. Ban for women in ground combat lifted in 2013 for US military.
2. Women have lower physical requirements. Women bleed. Women are distraction to soldiers. Women are sexually assaulted. we could easily avoid this.

## 4. The Bible condemns Women soldiers

1. Embarrassment. WE are to guard women (Gn. 2:15). Why?
  1. God only instructed men to fight in Israel (Num. 1:2-4).
  2. Soldiers in Scripture always men. Abe, Moses, Josh, David. Levites were warrior priests. Yahweh is man of war. Mocks men fighting like women (Nah. 3:13; Jer. 50:37; 51:30). David's mighty men. We could on and on.
  3. God condemned women soldiers as an "abomination"
    1. Dt. 22:5. Case could be made more than just transvestite clothing. Really battle Armor.
    2. Of course women can defend themselves but not go out to initiate fighting
2. Toward a Biblical Patriarchy
  1. "God's design for men and women applies to all of life."
  2. Trueman calls himself an "accidental feminist". Narrow C is not attractive. People want consistency.

## 12. Leaving a Manly Legacy

1. A Call to Men
  1. Seek spiritual vitality. Read Bible and pray regularly.
  2. Love your wife and lead her in the way of godliness.
  3. Raise godly children.
  4. Seek an economic niche. Work a job that provides for your family and seek to enable your wife to stay and home. The more she is out of the home, she has less time to her home and children. Life is expensive, but many women work outside the home bc families live beyond their means. Don't be greedy and keep expenses low. Convince wife of glory of what she does. Smaller house? One car? Homeschool? Stay close to home fathers if you can.
2. The Women will follow
  1. Women are attracted to masculine men and Christian women are attracted to godly masculinity. Women are made to follow.
  2. Christian should have many children. God loves children. God does not only work through missions and evangelism but through godly seed.
  3. Christians should order their entire lives around the task of bearing and raising up children. Read *Being there: Why prioritizing Motherhood in the First Three years matters*.



4. God has designed division of labour. Don't ask mother to work outside the home and raise the kids and home.
  5. Many think staying at home with kids is boring. But raising kids is most important task on earth and never boring.
  6. Bavinck: "There is then no more foolish requirement and no more unnatural compulsion than to propose to the wife that in the coming political state, she must give up her children, once they're weaned, to the community. The mother for whom maternal love is the unspeakable mystery and inexhaustible power in her life will never allow herself to be separated from her children in this way,; she desire not merely to give them birth, but also to raise them, and she remains bound to them until the hour of her death."
  7. Some women are so career driven because older women are not training the younger women in the domestic sphere.
3. Parenting is the most important task on earth
    1. A man's greatest legacy is his children. No or few children often means we don't care about our legacy, or legacy only in terms of wealth or career.
    2. Dabney called the "education of children for God is the most important business done on earth." He goes on: "Train up him who is now a boy for Christ, and you not only sanctify that soul, but you set on foot the best earthly agencies to redeem the whole broadening stream of human beings who shall proceed from him, down to the time when men cease to marry and give in marriage. Until then, the work of education is never ending."
4. Ordering life around children
    1. Christians should seek to have lots of children. Don't follow the culture and have just two. That is not multiplying. Have as many as you possible can support and raise well. This will probably mean having more children than you think you can afford. Birth control should be the exception, not the rule. Don't seek children on your own terms.
    2. Christians should order their household around supporting and raising many children. Men should bring home enough money to support his family and to keep his wife at home. Radical steps to save money. Value kids more than materials.
    3. Christians should provide for their children with a Christian education. Having kids is not enough. Can't send them to day care and gov school. Must teach our kids diligently from God's word. Home-school or Christian school, though former is cheaper. This will take hard work and sacrifice.

## **Review: Masculine Christianity**

Zachary Garris, Reformation Zion Publishing, 312 pages, 5 of 5 stars

I purchased this book on a whim. I was buying *It's Good to Be A Man* on Amazon when I noticed *Masculine Christianity*. It's by an author I'd not heard of by a publisher I'd not heard of. I first listened to the book on audio while driving with my wife and eight children through the U.S. Then I bought the paperback and read it through again. With skills and clarity, he confirmed most of my biblical convictions. Here's the 16-page summary.

### **Overview**

Garris shows from Scripture that husbands hold authority over their wives. He argues that only men should preach and be pastors, soldiers and civil leaders. He contends that "patriarchy" is a better and more biblical term than "complementarianism", the latter term which was built on shaky ground and has lost its way as of late.

Garris also believes women should submit to and help their husbands and have lots of babies along the way. The book has a 14-page, double-columned index of Scripture passages. Don't expect platitudes for personal opinions. Every argument rests on biblical exegesis.

### **Some Conclusions from Garris**

- A man's greatest legacy is his children.
- Per 1 Tm. 2, women are forbidden from two things (teaching men and exercising authority over men) for two reasons (the creation order and women are more easily deceived).
- The ESS (or EFS) position is wrong because Jesus only submits to the Father in his incarnation.
- Per 1 Cor 6, effeminate men (and not just homosexuals) will not inherit the kingdom of God.
- Per 1 Tm. 2:15, women that embrace their domestic sphere are working out their own salvation.
- Complementarianism is weak because it believes men should lead in the home and church but will not say the same about society.
- Per 1 Cor. 14:34-35, Paul prohibits women from all public speech in worship.

### **Weaknesses**

There were just a few areas where Garris could have improved. First, on page 67 he writes: "Women are not to hold authority over men", even in the civil sphere." But how is this even possible? Can a woman be a school principle, an English university prof, or a nurse? If so, she's going to exercise authority over men in some way. There were a plethora of "what if" questions that I wish Garris had addressed.

Second, Garris leaves out a crucial part of masculine Christianity: love. Ephesians 5 is *the* key passage in all of Scripture on a man's role toward his wife. He is to love her as Christ loved the church. He is to love her unconditionally, sacrificially, purposefully, affectionately, and completely. Garris references this passage in passing here and there, but does no serious exegesis of this passage. This surprised me, seeing as he unpacked so many other crucial passages in the book.

### **Conclusion**

Garris pastors a Presbyterian church, so it's not surprising the book is loaded with Scripture. Garris used to work as an attorney, so it's not surprising the book is logically tight. What is surprising is that a major publisher did not produce this excellent work. Or maybe this shouldn't be surprising at all. Gender roles ignite the greatest firestorms in our day.

So far, *Masculine Christianity* is my book of the year. We're already half way through October. I don't see another book catching it.