

# **Ten Lies the Church Tells Women**

by **ANDY WOODS**

## **Introduction**

In *Ten Lies the Church Tells Women*, male feminist, Pentecostal writer, and editor J. Lee Grady claims that Christian women have been victimized and unnecessarily subjugated by the male dominated evangelical Church. Grady maintains that the Church has marginalized its women on the basis of a select few out of context and inappropriately applied Bible verses.<sup>1</sup> According to Grady, these misconstrued verses have resulted in ten pernicious lies that the Church has told to its women. These lies include the following: women are inferior, women are not equipped to lead the Church, women must not preach or teach to men in a Church setting, the husband is the high priest of the home, a man must “cover” a woman in her ministry activities, women exhibiting strong leadership qualities are a threat to the Church, women are more easily deceived than men, women cannot be spiritually fulfilled or effective without a husband and children, women should not work outside the home, and women must obediently submit to their husbands in all situations.<sup>2</sup>

Grady argues that these ten lies have had dire consequences within the Church. For example, he contends that they have resulted in a prejudiced view of women<sup>3</sup> and abuse of women.<sup>4</sup> They have also caused Christianity to look no different from other pagan religions, such as the Islamic and Hindu faith, which promote a debased view of women.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the net effect of these lies has been to keep talented women out of ministry thus inhibiting the Church’s ability to fulfill the Great Commission and usher in a global spiritual revival.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Lee Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women* (Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 2000), 7-10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-10.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 21-22, 182-183.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

Although Grady raises legitimate concerns regarding the abuse and marginalization of Christian women, his solution to these problems unfortunately resides in egalitarianism rather than doctrinal balance. For example, he does not view the solution to these problems in terms of presenting the husband's duty to sacrificially love his wife when discussing the duty of the wife to submit to her husband or presenting the significant role that women can play within the Church when discussing gender limitations on pastors and elders. Instead, Grady seeks to remedy his valid concerns by swinging to the opposite end of the spectrum and promoting the abolition of all biblically derived gender role distinctions.

To his credit, by not relying upon arguments traditionally used by many liberal feminist that directly attack the inerrancy of scripture,<sup>7</sup> Grady remains evangelical in his approach. Along these same lines, Grady is quick to distance himself from the man-hating, pro-lesbian, and pro-abortion agenda of radical secular feminism.<sup>8</sup> However, in order to reinterpret biblical gender distinctions, Grady cites numerous examples throughout Church history of how God spectacularly blessed the efforts of various Christian women who functioned outside of His alleged gender hierarchy. Such argumentation is insufficient because it merely furnishes anecdotal, non-exegetical evidence that ultimately fails to acknowledge the difference between God's perfect and permissive will. Moreover, Grady also attempts to abolish gender role distinctions by relying upon dated exegetical arguments utilized by evangelical feminists. Most, if not all, of these arguments have already been thoroughly refuted by evangelical traditionalists and conservatives. This article will expose the inadequacies of these faulty textual arguments employed by Grady throughout his book.

---

<sup>7</sup> Such arguments include the following misguided notions: Jesus contradicted the Old Testament, Paul did not understand the Old Testament, or Paul contradicted himself or Jesus or the Old Testament. For a fuller treatment of these views see H. Wayne House, *The Role of Women in Ministry Today* (Nashville, Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990), 19-28.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-15.

## **A Trinitarian Analogy**

In chapter 1, Grady argues that gender role distinctions within the Church has led to a view among Christians that women are less spiritual, intelligent, and qualified than men. However, the Trinity itself serves as an appropriate response to such a misunderstanding. The fact that both the Father and the Son play different roles within the Godhead in no way diminishes the notion that both are equal in terms of importance and deity. In other words, the Son is still God (John 8:58-59) even though He volitionally submits Himself to the will of the Father (Luke 22:42; Phil. 2:6-8). Similarly, even though God has required that men and women fulfill different roles within marriage and the Church, both men and women still enjoy equal value and status before God. As far as creation is concerned, both male and female retain the image of God (Gen. 1:27). As far as redemption is concerned, both believing male and female are co-heirs (Gal. 3:28; 1 Peter 3:7).

## **Gender Role Distinctions Before The Fall**

Rather than being satisfied with such a straightforward solution, Grady instead attempts to eradicate gender role distinctions as his method of ridding the Church of the notion that women are inferior to men. He reasons that gender role distinctions did not exist prior to the fall because the divine command to rule creation was given to both Adam and Eve (Gen. 1:28). He maintains that female subordination only came into existence as a result of The Fall when God for the first time said to Eve regarding Adam, “he shall rule over you” (Gen. 3:16, NKJV).<sup>9</sup> Therefore, according to Grady, God’s strategy in Christ is to reverse this fallen condition by allowing men and women to co-rule within marriage as they did prior to The Fall.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> All scripture quotation used throughout are taken from the New King James Version.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 25-28. Several scholars have advocated the notion that differences in authority between Adam and Eve only originated after sin’s entrance into the world. See Aida B. Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, 2d ed. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985), 20-42 and Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 21-58. Grady

However, according to Grudem, the Genesis narrative indicates that gender role distinctions existed among Adam and Eve even before sin's entrance into the world.<sup>11</sup> For example, Grudem points out that God first created Adam and then after a period of time created Eve (Gen. 2:7, 18-23). The fact that Adam was created first furnishes evidence that God intended him to be the leader of the marital relationship. Throughout the Old Testament the first born in any family has the leadership role in that family for that generation (Gen. 25:27-34; 35:23; 38:27-30; 49:3-4; Deut. 21: 15-17; 1 Chr. 5:1-2). Moreover, despite the fact that Eve sinned first (Gen. 3:6), God first spoke to Adam presumably to call him to account for the actions of the family (Gen. 3:9). Such accountability implies headship. In addition, Adam rather than Eve represented the human race. Even though Eve sinned first, humanity is still considered sinful because of Adam's sin rather than Eve's sin (Rom. 5:12, 15, 19; 1 Cor. 15:22, 49).<sup>12</sup> This consideration indicates that God had given Adam, rather than Eve, headship or leadership with respect to the human race.

### **Galatians 3:28 and Gender Role Distinctions**

Grady also believes that Galatians 3:28 abolishes all gender role distinctions among believers.<sup>13</sup> This verse says, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." However, several reasons militate against understanding Galatians 3:28 as abolishing all gender role distinctions among believers. First, the immediate context of Galatians 3:28 shows that Paul is speaking of salvation rather

---

is probably drawing upon their work here although no appropriate citation is included.

<sup>11</sup> Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 461-65.

<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, later on in his book, Grady also uses many of these same verses to point out that Adam was responsible for bringing sin into the world. Grady uses this point to argue that women are not more susceptible to spiritual deception as compared to men. See Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 132.

<sup>13</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 21.

than roles (Gal. 3:22, 24, 26, 27).<sup>14</sup> Second, in every passage dealing with functional roles, the terms “man” and “woman” or “husband” and “wife” appear. Yet Galatians 3:28 uses the terms “male” and “female.” If Paul is speaking of functional relationships in Galatians 3:28, why does he not use the language which he uses in every other passage? Why does he not say that there is neither “man nor woman in Christ” rather than “male and female”?<sup>15</sup> Third, oneness in Christ does not obliterate the functional differences between slaves and masters (1 Cor. 7:20-24), parents and children (Eph. 6:1-4), believing citizens and rulers (Rom. 13:1-7). Why then should we assume that it does so between men and women?<sup>16</sup>

### **The Pattern of Scripture**

In chapters 2 and 6, Grady argues that women are capable and divinely called to assume all forms of leadership within the Church. Grady points out that just as white churches opposed racial desegregation, many of today’s evangelical churches remain closed to the notion of a woman assuming the role of senior pastor even though women have achieved remarkable status in diverse fields.<sup>17</sup> Grady further contends that the ultimate motive of men opposing the idea of a woman leading a church is rooted in a fear that women will be able to do the job better than they can.<sup>18</sup> Thus, insecurity regarding the threat of the diminishment of their own maleness causes men to oppose strong female leadership within the local Church.<sup>19</sup>

In order to support the abolition of all gender restrictions in ecclesiastical leadership, Grady cites numerous biblical examples illustrating strong female spiritual leadership. Grady’s

---

<sup>14</sup> John MacArthur, *1 Timothy*, The MacArthur New Testament Commentary (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1995), 84.

<sup>15</sup> Robert L. Saucy, “The Negative Case Against the Ordination of Women,” in Kenneth S. Kantzer and Stanley N. Gundry, eds., *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, 283.

<sup>16</sup> MacArthur, *1 Timothy*, 84-85.

<sup>17</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 32.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

Old Testament examples include Miriam (Exod. 15:20), Deborah (Judg. 5), Huldah (2 Kings 22:14), Esther, Rahab (Josh. 2), Jael (Judg. 4), and the Jewish midwives (Exod. 1). Grady's illustrations from the gospels include Anna (Luke 2) as well as the various women who followed Christ and played significant roles in His ministry (Matt. 26:6-13; Luke 8:1-3; John 4: 7-42; 20:17). Grady's examples from Acts include Peter's quotation of Joel 2:28 on the Day of Pentecost when he proclaims, "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (Acts 2:17), Priscilla teaching Apollos (Acts 18:24-28), and Philip's four daughters who prophesied (Acts 21:9). Grady's examples from the epistles include Lois and Eunice's instruction of Timothy (2 Tim. 1:5), Junias being named among the apostles (Rom. 16:7), Chloe (1 Cor. 1:11), Euodia and Syntyche (Phil. 4:3), the fact that Phoebe is called a deacon (Rom. 16:1-2), and the many other women that Paul mentions who played a strategic role in his ministry (Rom. 16).

Although Grady accuses conservatives of reading scripture through the cultural lenses of suburban America,<sup>20</sup> in actuality it is Grady who has imposed his own cultural grid of modern day feminist thinking upon the text. Grady ignores the fact that throughout the Bible there is a consistent pattern of male leadership and congregational teaching among God's people. For example, in the Old Testament, there were no queens in Judah or Israel. The single exception was Athaliah (2 Kings 11:1-20) who was a usurper and therefore hardly an example worthy of imitating. Also, there were no women priests. Thus, those who had formal teaching responsibilities in Old Testament times were exclusively male. Furthermore, there were no female authors of the Old Testament books. Moreover, no female had an ongoing public speaking ministry like Elijah and Elisha.<sup>21</sup> Although there were occasional female leaders and prophetesses, such as Deborah and Huldah, they represent rare exceptions in unusual

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 157.

<sup>21</sup> MacArthur, *I Timothy*, 83-84.

circumstances. They occur in the midst of an overwhelming pattern of male teaching and leadership and therefore can hardly serve as patterns for New Testament office.<sup>22</sup>

In the New Testament, there are no examples of women pastors, congregational teachers, or elders. Moreover, there are no female authors of any of the New Testament books. Furthermore, the New Testament fails to record a single sermon given by a woman.<sup>23</sup> In sum, there is not one example in the entire Bible of a woman doing the kind of congregational teaching that is expected of pastors and elders in the New Testament Church.<sup>24</sup> Because of facts such as these, the overwhelming pattern throughout the entire history of the Church has been to view the office of pastor or elder to have been reserved for men.<sup>25</sup> However, in order to make his case appear more persuasive, Grady selectively uses Church history. For example, even though his book is filled with examples of God's apparent blessing upon women throughout the history of the Church who supposedly functioned outside of His gender hierarchy, Grady simultaneously and conveniently ignores the dominant interpretation that existed throughout Church history that placed gender limitations on the office of pastor and elder.

Not only does Grady ignore the totality of scripture's message on the subject of female spiritual leadership, but also some of his specific scriptural examples ignore the surrounding context and contain linguistic errors. For example, the illustration of Miriam (Exod. 15:20) does little to help Grady's case due to the fact that scripture only attributes to her one recorded prophecy and fails to describe her permanent calling to office.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the story of Deborah cannot be effectively used as a normative for female leadership because, unlike the other male prophets, she prophesied in private rather than public (Judg. 4:5). The case of Deborah is also

---

<sup>22</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 941.

<sup>23</sup> MacArthur, *I Timothy*, 85.

<sup>24</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 941-42.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 942.

<sup>26</sup> MacArthur, *I Timothy*, 84.

problematic because she declined to lead a military campaign against the Canaanites. Instead she opted to hand over her leadership role to a man (Judg. 4:6-7). In addition, there is no explicit affirmation of the fact that God raised Deborah up. This fact makes Deborah distinct from the other Judges such as Othniel (Judg. 3:9), Ehud (Judg. 3:15), Gideon (Judg. 6:14), Jephthah (Judg. 11:29), and Samson (Judg. 13:25; 14:6) where scripture records a specific statement of their calling from God. Similarly, Huldah, like Deborah, prophesied only in private.<sup>27</sup>

Furthermore, while it is certainly true that many women played instrumental roles in Christ's ministry, it is also interesting to observe that the twelve disciples that Jesus selected after spending all night in prayer (Luke 6:12) to be the foundation of the Church (Eph. 2:20) and rulers in the millennial age (Matt. 19:28) were all male. Grady postulates that Jesus only selected male apostles because women were not allowed to occupy positions of authority in first century Judaism. Thus, for Christ to have appointed female apostles would have challenged existing cultural taboos so severely that the lives of Christ and His apostles would have been put in immediate danger.<sup>28</sup> However, this explanation is unsatisfying. It challenges Christ's courage, integrity,<sup>29</sup> and ability to protect His own life and the lives of His disciples until the appointed time of their deaths. It also ignores the numerous instances where Jesus did jeopardize His life and the lives of His followers by challenging culture and tradition when it violated scripture or moral principle. For example, the Gospels record Christ publicly criticizing the Pharisees (Matt. 23: 13-36), healing on the Sabbath (Mark 1:21-27), cleansing the temple (John 2:14-17), speaking with a Samaritan woman (John 4:7-9), eating with tax gatherers and sinners (Matt 9:11), and eating with unwashed hands (Mark 7:1-23).<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 941-42, n. 73.

<sup>28</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 42.

<sup>29</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 940-41.

<sup>30</sup> James A. Borland, "Women in the Life and Teachings of Jesus," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), 120.



Grady also repeatedly uses Peter's quotation of Joel 2:28 in Acts 2:17 as evidence that God desires for women to be preachers in the present age.<sup>31</sup> These verses say, "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." However, it is possible that Peter was only comparing the events taking place in Acts 2 with the eschatological events prophesied in Joel 2. In other words, when Peter quoted Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2:16-21, he was merely comparing what was happening in Acts 2 with the prophecies in Joel 2. He was not indicating that the prophecies in Joel 2 were actually being fulfilled or partially fulfilled in Acts 2.

This view fits well with the context of Acts 2. In Acts 2:13, some Jews, who were observing the believers being effected by the work of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, attributed the Spirit's supernatural work to the natural cause of drunkenness. In Acts 2:16-21, Peter explained to the Jewish skeptics that they should have been able to recognize the events of Pentecost as the Holy Spirit's activity because their own scriptures in Joel 2:28-32 indicate that the Holy Spirit would do something similar in the distant future of the nation of Israel.

This analogy view is based upon several pieces of textual evidence.<sup>32</sup> The context of the book of Joel indicates that Joel was speaking of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the entire nation of Israel in the last days. This is what Joel meant by "all flesh." In Acts 2, the Holy Spirit was poured out only on the twelve apostles and the 120. This was not the "all flesh" that Joel predicted. Also, a literal interpretation of the prophecies in Joel 2 indicate that Joel was speaking of the Holy Spirit's work with Israel during the future Tribulation (Joel 2:30-31) and Millennium (Joel 2:28-29). These events were not fulfilled in Acts 2.

Moreover, it is obvious that Joel 2:30-31 as quoted in Acts 2:19-20, was not fulfilled on Pentecost. The sun did not turn into darkness and the moon did not turn into blood on Pentecost.

---

<sup>31</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 44-45.

<sup>32</sup> Thomas L. Constable, "Notes on Revelation," online: [www.soniclight.com](http://www.soniclight.com), accessed 22 June 2002, 38-43.

In addition, Peter stopped quoting halfway through Joel 2:32. The rest of Joel 2:32 says, “For in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be deliverance, as the Lord has said, among the remnant whom the Lord calls.” Thus, the rest of verse 32 deals specifically with Israel’s deliverance in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem. These events were not fulfilled on Pentecost. Furthermore, many of the things that happened in Acts 2, such as believers speaking in tongues (Acts 2:4), were not predicted in Joel 2. In addition, many of the things which Joel did mention in Joel 2, such as believers experiencing dreams and visions (Joel 2:28), did not even take place in Acts 2.

Also, when quoting Joel 2 in Acts 2, Peter changed certain features of Joel’s text. For example, Peter changed “After this” in Joel 2:28 to “last days” in Acts 2:17. Joel 2:29 does not contain the words “and they will prophesy.” Peter, however, added these words in Acts 2:18. Such editing seems to indicate that Peter himself, did not believe that the prophecies of Joel 2 were being fulfilled in Acts 2. Finally, if Peter wanted to indicate that the prophecies in Joel 2 were being fulfilled in Acts 2, he could have easily indicated this by using the word “fulfilled.” Peter used this word in a previous speech in Acts 1:16. By Peter’s use of the word “fulfilled” in this passage, he was showing that certain Old Testament prophecies were being fulfilled in Acts 1. However, Peter’s omission of the word “fulfilled” in Acts 2 makes it difficult to conclude that he believed that the prophecies of Joel 2 were being fulfilled in Acts 2.

Viewing Peter’s quotation of Joel 2:28 in Acts 2:17 as an argument from analogy rather than a fulfillment of prophecy means that Joel 2:28 awaits a future eschatological fulfillment. This fact alone prevents feminists from arguing based upon Joel 2:28 and Acts 2:17 that God desires for women to preach in the present age. Of course, Grady completely overlooks this valid exegetical option and instead dogmatically insists based upon Joel 2:28 and Acts 2:17 that God desires women to preach in the present age.

Grady's other arguments from Acts are equally unpersuasive. Although Priscilla did instruct Apollos (Acts 18:26), this instruction took place in private rather than during a formal worship session of the church.<sup>33</sup> In addition, while Philip's daughters are said to have prophesied (Acts 21:9), scripture does not define the occasion or their message. Nothing in the text indicates that they prophesied during a formal worship service. There is no reason to assume that Philip's daughters had an ongoing preaching ministry.<sup>34</sup>

Grady's arguments from the epistles fair no better than his arguments from the Old Testament, the Gospels, and Acts. Romans 16:7 says, "Greet Andronicus and Junia, my countrymen and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me." Grady would have his readers believe that Romans 16:7 teaches that Junia, a female, was an apostle.<sup>35</sup> However, this interpretation suffers from three translation difficulties.<sup>36</sup> First, "who are of note among the apostles" can also be translated "who are noted by the apostles." In other words, the verse could be communicating that Junias was known to the twelve as one of the first converts to Christianity rather than being among the twelve.<sup>37</sup> Second, the female name Junia can also be translated Junias, which is a man's name. Although grammatical considerations leave open the possibility that the verse could be referring to a female apostle, this possibility has much less credibility in view of the fact that only men were chosen to be apostles and the lack of evidence elsewhere for a female apostle.<sup>38</sup> Third, the word "apostles" may not necessarily refer to the office of an apostle but rather may simply mean "messengers." This broader designation is frequently used elsewhere in scripture (Phil. 2:25; 2 Cor. 8:23; John

---

<sup>33</sup> MacArthur, *I Timothy*, 87; Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 943.

<sup>34</sup> MacArthur, *I Timothy*, 85.

<sup>35</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 40-41.

<sup>36</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 908-9; Thomas R. Schreiner, "The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), 214, 221-22.

<sup>37</sup> Stephen Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1980), 130.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

13:16).<sup>39</sup> These three translation difficulties make it difficult to dogmatically assert that Romans 16:7 is referring to a female apostle.

In addition, Grady maintains that Phoebe held the office of deacon in the early church because Paul refers to her as a *diakonon* in Romans 16:1.<sup>40</sup> This view is prevalent in part because this verse associates Phoebe with a particular Church, Cenchrea. However, the preferred view is that Paul uses *diakonon* to refer to Phoebe's status as a servant or minister rather than her status as holder of the office of deacon. The New Testament frequently uses the term *diakonos* to associate individuals with specific churches without intending to confer upon them the office of deacon. For example, Epaphras is associated with the Church in Colosse and is called a *diakonon* in Colossians 1:7. Yet no contemporary translation regards him as a deacon. Also, Timothy was associated with the Church in Ephesus. Paul calls Timothy a *diakonon* in 1 Timothy 4:6. Yet Timothy was not a deacon. It should also be noted that within the New Testament the word *diakonon* rarely functions with a technical nuance.<sup>41</sup>

Finally, Grady's other illustrations of female leaderships, which include Lois and Eunice (2 Tim. 1:5), Chloe (1 Cor. 1:11), and Euodia and Syntyche (Phil. 4:3), do not really help his case for female elders and pastors because none of these examples represent congregational teaching in a public worship service. In sum, the message of the totality of scripture is that while God expects women to make great contributions to His work, the office of pastor and elder remains limited to men.

---

<sup>39</sup> Schreiner, "The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership," 221.

<sup>40</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 38-39.

<sup>41</sup> *Net Bible* (Biblical Studies Press, 1997), 2137, n. 10.

## 1 Timothy 2:12-14

In chapter 3, Grady attempts to explain away two of the greatest scriptural obstacles seemingly preventing him from doing away with gender roles within the Church. The first of these scriptural obstacles is 1 Timothy 2:12-14, which says, “And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.” Grady uses four tactics in an attempt to by pass the plain reading of these verses. First, he argues that traditionalists base their view of gender limitations upon pastors and elders on the single verse of 1 Timothy 2:12.<sup>42</sup> This contention is patently untrue. As indicated by the preceding discussion, the totality of scripture supports the traditional view. Moreover, 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:5-9 also assume male elders. Because it is impossible for a woman to be the “husband of one wife” (1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:6) and for a woman to “rule his own house well, having his children in submission” (1 Tim. 3:4), this assumption should be obvious.<sup>43</sup>

However, even if Grady’s contention was true and 1 Timothy 2:12 was the only place in scripture that placed a gender limitation on pastors and elders, should that in any way minimize the meaning of the verse? How many times does God have to say something before we believe and obey it? Why is not one command enough? Furthermore, other important theological concepts are also only mentioned once in scripture. For example, the Old Testament only predicts in one place that Christ will be born in Bethlehem. Scripture only tells us in one place the duration of the millennial kingdom, the length of the tribulation period, or how the tribulation period will begin. However, these grand theological concepts cannot be marginalized or

---

<sup>42</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 53.

<sup>43</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 940.

explained away simply because they receive scant attention in only one verse or one section of scripture.

Second, Grady questions whether 1 Timothy 2:12 should be interpreted literally. He derisively refers to those who take this verse at face value as “biblical literalists.”<sup>44</sup> Such rhetoric is typical of those who desire to dismiss the clear teaching of God’s word. For example, those who reject a literal interpretation of either prophecy or the early chapters of Genesis frequently ridicule their theological opponents by labeling them “fundamentalists” or “biblical literalists.” Moreover, Grady seems quite selective concerning when he chooses to dispense with or employ a literal hermeneutic. He is quite content to apply a literal hermeneutic to those verses that further his egalitarian view. For example, he has no problem taking the teaching of Acts 2:17 that “your sons and your daughters shall prophesy” quite literally.

Because Grady rejects a literal hermeneutical approach to I Timothy 2:12, he instead creates his own interpretive standard when understanding this verse. He contends, “We must interpret this verse not solely on what it says or on what we think it says, but on what the rest of the Bible says about the subject being addressed in the passage.”<sup>45</sup> Because Grady does not want to interpret this verse on the basis of “what it says,” he desires to use the rest of scripture to reinterpret it. Notice that Grady has no desire to even harmonize verses that appear to be in tension with one another. Rather, he wants some verses to be totally reinterpreted on the basis of what he perceives as majority rule. Interestingly, homosexual apologists also employ this identical hermeneutical method. They maintain that because only a handful of verses condemn homosexuality and because scripture routinely speaks of God’s love and mercy, the verses that pertain to God’s love should reinterpret those few verse that condemn homosexuality. However,

---

<sup>44</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 53.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

as has already been pointed out, the rest of scripture is entirely consistent with the message of 1 Timothy 2:12. Thus, harmonization, let alone reinterpretation, is not necessary.

Third, Grady seeks to minimize 1 Timothy 2:12 due to its ambiguity and potential over breadth. He reasons that because there is no consensus as to the specific meaning of the verse, it could easily be used to prevent women from teaching in any setting, teaching men, or speaking with authority in Church.<sup>46</sup> However, much of this confusion is cleared up upon noticing that the verb “to teach” or *didaskein* in 1 Timothy 2:12 is a present infinitive rather than an aorist infinitive. The aorist infinitive denotes that which is eventual or particular while the present infinitive indicates a condition or process.<sup>47</sup> By using the present infinitive rather than the aorist, Paul is not preventing women to teach under appropriate conditions and circumstances. Preventing women from teaching under any circumstances could hardly be Paul’s meaning. Elsewhere Paul admonishes women to teach younger women (Titus 2:4) and praises Lois and Eunice because they taught Timothy (2 Tim. 1:5). Rather, in 1 Timothy 2:12, Paul is simply preventing women from fulfilling the office or role of pastor or teacher in the ongoing life of the Church.<sup>48</sup>

Grady also contends that 1 Timothy 2:12 could be used to argue against women gaining positions of authority in secular employment.<sup>49</sup> However, such an overly broad interpretation is obviously unwarranted. 1 Timothy is a pastoral letter written for the purpose of explaining how God’s people should conduct themselves in the house of God (1 Tim. 3:15). Thus, any application of the gender limitations of 1 Timothy 2:12 to the realm of secular employment goes far beyond what its author originally intended.

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 55-56.

<sup>47</sup> H.E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Toronto: MacMillan, 1957), 199.

<sup>48</sup> MacArthur, *1 Timothy*, 86.

<sup>49</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 56.

Fourth, Grady does not view 1 Timothy 2:12-14 as a universal command but merely a local injunction designed to address a specific, cultural situation taking place in Ephesus. According to Grady, women from the cult of Diana began to invade the Church at Ephesus and wrestle control of the Church meetings away for the leaders in order to teach their own doctrines. Among their teachings was the idea that Eve was created before Adam and that she liberated the world when she listened to the voice of the serpent. Thus, in order to rectify this situation, Paul commands that women are not to teach or exercise authority over a man (1 Tim. 2:12). Paul also explained that Adam was formed first and Eve sinned first (1 Tim. 2:13-14) in order to counter the false teaching of the cult of Diana that Eve was created before Adam and that she liberated the world when she listened to the voice of the serpent.<sup>50</sup>

Grady buttresses this view by pointing out that the Greek word used for “to have authority over” in 1 Timothy 2:12 is *authentēin* rather than the normal Greek word for authority, which is *exousian*. *Authentēin* is a hapax legomenon, which means that 1 Timothy 2:12 is the only place in the New Testament where this word is used. According to Grady, *authentēin* has a more forceful and negative connotation than *exousian* and can be translated “to dominate,” “to usurp,” or “to take control.” Grady believes that Paul used *authentēin* instead of *exousian* because of the cultural situation in Ephesus where women from the cult of Diana were trying to control the meetings of the Ephesian Church.<sup>51</sup> In sum, Grady sees the injunction in 1 Timothy 2:12 no differently than the injunction given by Paul in 1 Timothy 5:23 where Paul tells Timothy to take a little wine for his upset stomach. Both injunctions are local in nature for the express purpose of

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 57-58. In order to reconstruct this specific cultural situation taking place in Ephesus, Grady draws heavily from the work of evangelical feminist scholar Catherine Kroeger. See Richard and Catherine Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1992), 87-98, 122-25.

<sup>51</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 58.



dealing with a specific cultural situation in Ephesus and were never designed to be universally applicable to the Church at large.<sup>52</sup>

However, this cultural view suffers from significant drawbacks. For instance, although false teaching was certainly taking place at Ephesus, it is difficult to determine with any certainty its nature and the number of people involved.<sup>53</sup> This difficulty is evidenced by the fact that there are numerous contradictory scholarly reconstructions of this false teaching.<sup>54</sup> Kelly notes that the picture of the false teaching is “incomplete and tantalizingly vague.”<sup>55</sup> Thus, it is dangerous for Grady to allow a specific reconstruction to significantly shape his exegesis.<sup>56</sup>

Moreover, there is no clear statement in 1 Timothy that says women were teaching false doctrines.<sup>57</sup> 1 Timothy 5:13 speaks of women who were gossiping but does not mention false doctrine. Furthermore, Paul does not simply tell women who were teaching false doctrine to be silent. Rather, he says that he does not permit *any* woman to teach or exercise authority over a man.<sup>58</sup>

Also, the reason that Paul gives for the prohibition is not to stop the infiltration of female usurpers from the Diana cult. Rather, Paul’s reasoning had to do with reversal of headship between Adam and Eve before sin entered the world. Such reasoning is not limited to the situation in Ephesus but has universal application.<sup>59</sup> Moo observes that by citing creation rather than a local situation or cultural circumstances as his basis for the prohibition, Paul makes it clear

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>53</sup> Douglas J. Moo, “The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder,” *Trinity Journal* 2, no. 2 (Fall 1981), 215-21.

<sup>54</sup> Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), 32-38; J.N.D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London: Black, 1963), 10-18.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>56</sup> Douglas J. Moo, “What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), 181.

<sup>57</sup> Interestingly, Grady himself seems to make this identical point later on while refuting the notion that women are more vulnerable to spiritual deception than men are. See Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 128-32.

<sup>58</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 938.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

that while local or cultural issues may have provided the context of the injunction, they do not provide the reason for it. His reason for the injunction has to do with the created relationship of man and woman. Thus, it is safe to conclude that the injunction remains applicable as long as the reason remains true.<sup>60</sup> In addition, it is doubtful that *authenthein* means “to dominate” or “to usurp” or “take control.”<sup>61</sup> Recent studies of all the occurrences of *authenthein* in extant Greek literature confirm the rendering “have authority” as the natural rendering.<sup>62</sup>

Finally, if cultural argumentation can be used to dismiss the clear teaching of 1 Timothy 2:12-14, then similar cultural argumentation can similarly be employed for the purpose of dismissing other significant sections of scripture. For example, what is to prevent other interpreters from utilizing Grady’s hermeneutical method in order to construct an intricate cultural argument explaining why Paul told Timothy to preach the full counsel of God’s Word in and out of season (2 Tim. 3:16-4:2)? Perhaps it is possible to argue that Paul only told Timothy to preach the word to address a specific cultural problem in Ephesus. Therefore, such a command is no longer binding upon pastors within the Church today. It is easy to see how allowing cultural argumentation to effect one section of scripture can suddenly open up Pandora’s Box thus allowing other sections of scripture to be rendered obsolete to the contemporary Church. In fact, later on in his book, Grady seems to go down this path when he uses cultural arguments to dismiss the woman’s duty to be a worker at home as outlined in Titus 2:4-5.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Moo, “What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?,” 190-91.

<sup>61</sup> House, *The Role of Women in Ministry Today*, 35.

<sup>62</sup> George W. Knight II, “In Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12,” *New Testament Studies* 30 (January 1984), 143-57; Leland Edward Wilshire, “The TLG Computer and Further Reference to in 1 Timothy 2:12,” *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988), 120-34.

<sup>63</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 157-61.

### 1 Corinthians 14:34-35

The next scriptural obstacle that Grady attempts to explain away is 1 Corinthians 14:34-35. These verses say, “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. And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church.” To his credit, Grady does not follow the pattern of many egalitarian theologians who attempt to explain these verses away by insisting that Paul did not write them and therefore they do not belong in the text of 1 Corinthians.<sup>64</sup> Instead, Grady follows the thinking of other scholars, such as Kaiser,<sup>65</sup> who argue that Paul in verses 34 and 35 is actually quoting from a letter written to him by the leaders of the Corinthian Church. According to this view, the quotation of the Corinthian letter is given in verse 34-35 and Paul’s horrified response to this quotation is then given verse 36.<sup>66</sup>

This view is primarily based upon three pieces of evidence.<sup>67</sup> First, the disjunctive particle  $\eta$  with a grave accent is used at the beginning of verse 36 to signal to the reader that the preceding statement is quoted. Because Greek did not have quotation marks, this device was used in lieu of them. Second, verse 34 says that women are not allowed to speak “as the law also says.” Because there is no specific law in the Old Testament teaching that women cannot speak, the quotation must be referring to a rabbinical tradition that the Corinthian Church had adopted. Third, verses 34 and 35 are not Pauline because they blatantly contradict what Paul said

---

<sup>64</sup> Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, gen. ed. F.F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699-708.

<sup>65</sup> Walter C. Kaiser Jr., “Paul, Women, and the Church,” *Worldwide Challenge* 3 (September 1976), 10-11.

<sup>66</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 61-64.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 63.

elsewhere. For example, in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, Paul clearly allowed women to prophesy during a worship service. Yet he tells women to remain silent in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35.

However, it is best to regard verses 34-35 as a Pauline statement rather than a quotation from a letter sent to Paul by the Corinthian Church because the three previously described arguments can quite easily be refuted. First, in every instance where a similar disjunctive particle  $\eta$  is used in a construction analogous to verses 34-36, it has the effect of reinforcing the truth of the verse or clause that precedes it. Yet Grady would have us believe that Paul uses the disjunctive particle  $\eta$  at the beginning of verse 36 for the purpose of using this verse to dismiss, discount, or contradict the subject matter of verses 34-35 rather than for the purpose of reinforcing the content of verse 34-35.<sup>68</sup>

Second, it is inappropriate to assume that the reference to the “law” in verse 34 is a non-Pauline reference to a rabbinical tradition that the Corinthian Church had adopted. Many evangelical scholars believe that the law refers to Genesis 3:16 or some other portion of the Old Testament. Because Paul referred to the Creation-Fall narratives in other passages where he imposed gender limitations (1 Cor. 11:9; 1 Tim. 2:13-14), it is probable that he is doing the same thing in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, in 1 Corinthians 14:37, Paul indicted that all things he had written were a command from the Lord. Thus, it is difficult to maintain that just a few verses earlier Paul quotes extra biblical rabbinical tradition.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, when Paul uses the term “law” elsewhere in the New Testament, it never refers to Jewish tradition. Paul uses the full expression “the law says” in Romans 3:19 and 1 Corinthians 9:8. Both of these instances refer to the Mosaic Law.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> D.A. Carson, “Silent in the Churches,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), 149-151.

<sup>69</sup> House, *The Role of Women in the Ministry Today*, 46.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>71</sup> Carson, “Silent in the Churches,” 148.

Third, the fact that Paul allowed women to prophesy in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 does not necessarily contradict Paul's admonition for women to remain silent in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35. It is possible to reconcile and harmonize these passages. One possibility is that the idea of quietness in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 refers to an external quiet demeanor rather than not speaking at all.<sup>72</sup> Another possibility is recognizing that the context of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 pertains to the evaluation of prophecies (1 Cor. 14:29). Thus, in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, Paul is not prohibiting women from speaking at all but rather is simply prohibiting women from engaging the authoritative task of judging prophecies in the assembled Church.<sup>73</sup>

In addition to the above-described rebuttals, there are three other good reasons for viewing 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 as a Pauline statement rather than a mere quotation of a letter he had received from the Corinthians. First, 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 has little in common with the other places in the Corinthian letter where Paul quotes from an external source. There are certainly other sections in 1 Corinthians where Paul quotes from material sent to him by the Corinthians. For example, in 1 Corinthians 7:1, he quotes from the material sent to him by the Corinthians when he says, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman." Paul does the same thing in 1 Corinthians 8:1 when he says, "We know that we all have knowledge." Paul again follows this pattern in 1 Corinthians 10:23 when he says, "All things are lawful for me."

However, it is imperative to note the general characteristics of each of the statements where Paul quotes from an external source. Such notation is necessary because a recent trend in Corinthians studies has been to postulate that Paul is quoting the Corinthians in more and more places, particularly in those areas where Paul says something that is controversial or personally objectionable.<sup>74</sup> Unfortunately, Grady follows this trend. He views 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 as

---

<sup>72</sup> House, *The Role of Women in the Ministry Today*, 137.

<sup>73</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 939-40, n. 69.

<sup>74</sup> Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 148.

Paul quoting from material sent to him by the Corinthians despite the fact that 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 does not share the general characteristics of those instances in the Corinthian letter where Paul does quote from another source. For example, in those places where Paul quotes from material sent to him by the Corinthians, the citations are short and not complex. By contrast, 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 is lengthy and contains intricate argumentation by comparison.<sup>75</sup>

Second, 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 should be considered Pauline because its use of *epitrepo* or “permit” or “allow” is similar to Paul’s use of the same term in 1 Timothy 2:12.<sup>76</sup> Third, the ideas taught in verse 35 that women are to learn in silence and submission and that they are not to speak are similar to the Pauline ideas expressed in 1 Timothy 2:11-12.<sup>77</sup>

### **1 Corinthians 11:10**

In chapter 5, Grady deals with the idea that a man needs to “cover” a woman in her ministry activities. While raising some good points in this chapter, his method for explaining away 1 Corinthians 11:10 is objectionable. This verse says, “For this reason the woman ought to have *a symbol of authority* on *her* head, because of the angels.” Grady attempts to dismiss this verse in the same manner that he attempted to dismiss 1 Corinthians 14:34-35. He claims that 1 Corinthians 11:10 is not a statement that originated with Paul. Rather, Paul is merely quoting a letter that he received from the leaders of Corinth. Grady contends that after quoting from this letter in verse 10, Paul goes on to counter the subject matter of verse 10 in the subsequent verses (1 Cor. 11: 11, 13, 16).<sup>78</sup> One of Grady’s primary reasons for maintaining that 1 Corinthians 11:10 did not originate with Paul is its supposed lack of harmony with 2 Corinthians 3:18. For example, in 1 Corinthians 11:10, Paul indicates that women should wear head coverings during

---

<sup>75</sup> House, *The Role of Women in the Ministry Today*, 40-42; Carson, “Silent in the Churches,” 148.

<sup>76</sup> House, *The Role of Women in the Ministry Today*, 42

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 42-43.

<sup>78</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 98-99.

public worship. Yet, in 2 Corinthians 3:18, he exhorts believers to behold the Lord's glory with unveiled faces.<sup>79</sup>

However, these verses hardly contradict one another. The veil mentioned in 1 Corinthians 11:10 is a literal veil. However, the veil that Paul speaks of in 2 Corinthians 3:18 is a figurative veil signifying the spiritual blindness of Israel. The surrounding context of 2 Corinthians 3:18 makes this abundantly clear. In verse 14 Paul speaks of the blinded minds of the Jews. In verse 15, Paul speaks of the veil existing in the heart of the Jews. In verse 16, Paul explains that this veil is taken away when the Jews turn to the Lord. Because 1 Corinthians 11:10 concerns a literal veil and 2 Corinthians 3:18 concerns a figurative veil, Grady attempts to manufacture an artificial Pauline contradiction where none exists.

Two other reasons argue strongly in favor of viewing 1 Corinthians 11:10 as having originated with Paul. First, as in the case of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, the content of 1 Corinthians 11:10 does not share the characteristics of those other places in 1 Corinthians where Paul is quoting from an external source (1 Cor. 7:1; 8:1; 10:23). Not only is 1 Corinthians 11:10 not pithy enough, but it is also too theologically sophisticated. It introduces the theological complexity of the angels watching the Church that exceeds the simplicity of the statements found in those other places in Corinthians where Paul is obviously quoting from a letter that he received from the Corinthians. This entire discussion again illustrates Grady's propensity to follow the modern trend of theorizing that Paul quotes the Corinthians in more and more places, particularly in those places where the commentator does not like what Paul is saying. Second, 1 Corinthians 11:10 should be considered Pauline because it introduces the idea of the angels watching the Church, which is a concept that Paul also expounds upon elsewhere (Eph. 3:10).

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 98.

## 1 Timothy 2:15

In chapter 8, Grady criticizes the stereotype that views a woman's primary responsibilities in terms of being a wife and mother. The verse that seems to contradict Grady's egalitarian world view is 1 Timothy 2:15, which says, "Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control." Grady resorts to two tactics in an attempt to alter the plain meaning of this verse. First, Grady again draws from the writings of evangelical feminist Catherine Kroeger who maintains that Paul wrote this statement in order to contradict a Gnostic heresy that was taking place in first century Ephesus that instructed women to deny their femininity in order to gain salvation.<sup>80</sup> Thus, 1 Timothy 2:15 should be viewed as a local injunction rather than a universal command effecting the Church at large. Because the inadequacies of such cultural argumentation were already extensively dealt with when discussing 1 Timothy 2:12-14, they will not be rehashed here. It is enough to simply say that the counter arguments already furnished are sufficient to dispel the idea that 1 Timothy 2:15 was aimed only at the Church at Ephesus and therefore should not be considered normative for the Church today.

Second, Grady believes that 1 Timothy 2:15 teaches that despite the sin of Eve and the results to her progeny, she would be saved through the childbirth. In other words, she would be saved through the birth of the Messiah as promised in the protoevangelium (Gen. 3:15). According to Grady, although women came under a curse of degradation as a result of sin in the Garden of Eden, the promised Messiah came to reverse this curse and bring women into a place of redemption and transformation.<sup>81</sup>

However, there are three primary problems with this view.<sup>82</sup> First, the future tense *sothesetai* is unnatural if referring to historical events such as the protoevangelium or the birth of

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 149; Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, 176-77.

<sup>81</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 149-150.

<sup>82</sup> Net Bible, 2221, n.8.



the messiah. Second, according to this interpretation, only women are singled out as recipients of salvation. This seems odd since the birth of the Messiah was necessary for the salvation of both men and women. Third, the term *teknogonia* refers to the process of childbirth rather than the product. Paul also uses the verbal infinitive form of this word in 1 Timothy 5:14 to denote bearing or raising children generally. We would expect this same word to have this same meaning in 1 Timothy 2:15 as well.<sup>83</sup> By contrast, Grady's view is predicated upon salvation coming as a result of the product of the messiah's birth.

Other interpretive options to 1 Timothy 2:15 are far more preferable than the one advocated by Grady. For example, it is possible that Paul is delineating the circumstances in which Christian women can demonstrate their salvation. In other words, Christian women can evidence their salvation by maintaining those key roles as given in scripture that God has especially called women to. Such roles include being a faithful wife, raising children to love and reverence God, and managing the household (1 Tim. 5:14; Titus 2:3-5).<sup>84</sup>

Other attractive interpretive options revolve around understanding the verb "to save" or *sozo* in a non-soteriological sense. *Sozo* appears a number of times in the New Testament without reference to spiritual salvation (Matt. 8:25; 9:21-22; 10:22; 24:22; 27:40, 42, 49; 2Tim. 4:18). In such instances, *sozo* can mean "to rescue," "to preserve safe and unharmed," "to heal," "to set free," or "to deliver."<sup>85</sup> With this understanding in mind, it is possible that Paul could mean that women are saved from lives of unfulfillment through bearing children. Another possibility is that women could be saved from the stigma of precipitating The Fall through childbearing. In other words, although women led the human race into sin, women have the privilege of leading the human race out of sin and into godliness through the rearing of Godly children.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority Over Men?," 192.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> MacArthur, *1 Timothy*, 89.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 89-90.

Each of these three options fits well within the total context of 1 Timothy 2:12-15. They explain how women are to find their place in the out working of God's purpose in light of the limitation placed upon them in verse 13-14. However, solely on the basis of his egalitarian bias, Grady rejects these attractive interpretive options choosing instead to embrace another interpretation riddled with deficiencies.

### **Titus 2:4-5**

In chapter 9, Grady claims that viewing a woman's primary responsibility as a worker at home is not a scriptural principle. Instead, he believes that this idea can be traced back to the Industrial Revolution and the Victorian era.<sup>87</sup> Grady desires that Christian women be liberated from such legalistic bondage and instead be given the freedom to pursue their "God-ordained career paths."<sup>88</sup> A problem passage for Grady that he must reinterpret is Titus 2:4-5. This passage says, "that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed." Paul uses the Greek word *oikourgos* to indicate that working at home is one of a Christian woman's primary responsibilities along with loving her husband and children. A similar admonition is found in 1 Timothy 5:14.

Grady argues that these passages teach that Christian women are to be workers at home simply because the opportunity to work outside the home was not an option for first century women. Grady maintains that these passages should simply be understood as teaching that women should pursue their responsibilities with faithfulness. Such a message was necessary for the Cretans and the Ephesians to hear because these groups had a tendency to gravitate toward laziness (Titus 1:12) and unprofitable gossip (1 Timothy 3:3; 4:7).<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Grady, *10 Lies the Church Tells Women*, 162-63.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 160.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 157-61.

Just as he did with 1 Timothy 2:12-14, Grady once again uses cultural argumentation to dismiss those portions of God's word that he finds personally objectionable. Because he has already opened up Pandora's Box by using cultural argumentation to dismiss other portions of scripture, perhaps he feels justified in repeatedly using this same approach when it suits his purposes. Moreover, Grady's contention that going to work was not an option for first-century women is probably too strong a statement. While first century women certainly did not enjoy the many employment options modern women experience, we do find examples of women working outside the home in the first century. One notable biblical example is the case of Lydia who was a dealer of purple (Acts 16:14). Another example is Priscilla who was a tentmaker (Acts 18:2-3).

In addition, Grady's ambition to obliterate gender role distinctions in the Christian home causes him to ignore God's method of rearing children. Deuteronomy 6:6-7 says, "And these words which I command you today shall be in your heart. You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down, and when you rise up." These verses communicate two interesting facts about rearing children. First, they teach that God has given parents the responsibility of transmitting His truth to the next generation through the diligent instruction of their children. This theme is also repeated in other sections of the Old Testament (Prov. 22:6) as well as the New Testament (Eph. 6:4; 2 Tim. 1:5).

Second, Deuteronomy 6:6-7 teaches that rearing children in the truths of God is a process that takes time. By indicating that such instruction is to take place while sitting, walking, and lying down, these verses communicate that parental instruction of children is to take place at appropriate times throughout the waking hours. There is no possible way that such an extensive process can transpire unless parents are willing and able to invest vast quantities of time with their children. Thus, God's method of teaching children is incompatible with modern feminist

thinking which places a primary importance upon the pursuit of a career and secondary importance on motherhood. There simply are not enough hours in the day for women to both pursue a career and rear children effectively. How could Lois and Eunice have spent the time necessary to effectively bring up young Timothy in the truths of the Lord if these women had been out pursuing their “God ordained career paths”?

Christian women violate this divine standard when they place other priorities above their responsibility of rearing Godly children. When they abdicate their God ordained responsibilities and instead leave their children to their own devices, Christian women create amoral children that eventually shame them (Prov. 29:15). Because of these important principles, Paul emphasizes in Titus 2:4-5 and 1 Timothy 5:14 that women are to be workers at home. The timelessness of these principles should cause believers to resist any attempt to explain them away through intricate cultural argumentation.

### **Ephesians 5:22-33**

In chapter 10, Grady attacks the concept of male headship and female submission within the context of the marital relationship. An obvious passage that seems to contradict Grady’s egalitarian marital view is Ephesians 5:22-33, which teaches male headship within marriage as well as the wife’s responsibility to submit to her husband. In his attempt to harmonize Ephesians 5:22-33 with his desire to eradicate gender role distinctions within marriage, Grady utilizes five tactics.

First, he notes that the traditional concept of marital submission should be dispensed with because it has led to physical abuse perpetrated against women in Christian homes.<sup>90</sup> Grady maintains that the concepts of male headship and marital submission inappropriately diminish

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 173-75.

women making Christianity's view of the female gender no different than that of the pagan religions of Hinduism and Islam.<sup>91</sup>

Second, Grady contends that Paul teaches that wives are not only to submit to their husbands but husbands are also to submit to their wives. Grady reaches this conclusion on the basis of Ephesians 5:21, which says, "submitting to one another in fear of God."<sup>92</sup> Third, he defines the Greek verb *hypotasso*, which is used for "submit" in Ephesians 5:24, to mean "identify with," or "be attached to," or "to be one with."<sup>93</sup> Grady reaches the conclusion that the submission spoken of in Ephesians 5:24 does not pertain to a top down hierarchical arrangement by noting that type of leadership modeled by Christ was servant leadership (Mark 10:44; Matt. 20:25-26).<sup>94</sup> Moreover, Grady indicates that if Paul intended to communicate a hierarchical arrangement in Ephesians 5:24 he would have used the term "obey," just as he does in Colossians 3:20, rather than "submit."<sup>95</sup>

Fourth, Grady notes that because *hypotasso* or "submit" is in the Greek middle voice in Ephesians 5:24, Paul intends to communicate a voluntary submission or a submission that individuals impose on themselves.<sup>96</sup> Fifth, Grady maintains that the Greek word *kephale* or "head" that is used in Ephesians 5:23 to communicate male headship within marriage does not refer to authority but rather to source. In other words, Paul uses *kephale* to communicate that the husband is the source of his wife rather than the authority over his wife due to the fact that Eve was created from Adam.<sup>97</sup>

However, because these arguments can be easily dispensed with, it becomes impossible to harmonize the plain teaching of Ephesians 5:22-33 with Grady's egalitarian view of marriage.

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 182-83

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 177.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 176-77.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 177.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 180.

First, the concepts of marital headship and submission cannot be fairly blamed for the physical and spiritual abuse frequently perpetrated against women. The remedy to the problem of abuse is teaching balanced doctrine. For example, although the husbands are the head of the marriage, they still have the responsibilities of loving their wives as Christ loves the Church (Ephesians 5:25) as well as treating their wives with honor and consideration (1 Peter 3:7). Such doctrinal balance immediately eliminates any justification for abuse. Just because a doctrine is twisted to justify abuse does not mean the doctrine itself is at fault. Sadly, Grady misdiagnoses gender roles and hierarchies as the primary culprit of spousal abuse and therefore views a redefinition of these roles as the only answer to the problem.

Second, Ephesians 5:21 does not teach that husbands are to submit to their wives just as wives are to submit to their husbands. The following context defines what Paul means when he says be subject to one another. Paul simply means that believers are to be subject to others who are in positions of authority over them. This meaning is explained in the verses that follow. Wives are to be subject to husbands (Eph. 5:22-24) but husbands are never told to be subject to their wives. Children are to be subject to their parents (Eph. 6:1-4) but parents are never told to be subject to their children. Servants are to be subject to their masters (Eph. 6:5-9) but masters are never told to be subject to their servants. Therefore, the notion of mutual submission in the sense that both husbands and wives are to be submissive to one another is not affirmed in Ephesians 5:21.<sup>98</sup>

Third, *hypotasso* or “submit” does not mean “identify with,” or “be attached to,” or “to be one with.” Rather, the word means “to rank under” and always has to do with submission to an authority when it is used in the New Testament. For example, *hypotasso* is used elsewhere in the New Testament to refer to the submission of Jesus to the authority of his parents (Luke 2:51), of

---

<sup>98</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 466.

demons being subject to the disciples (Luke 10:17), of citizens being subject to governmental authorities (Titus 3:1), of the universe being subject to Christ (Eph. 1:22), of unseen spiritual powers being subject to Christ (1 Pet. 3:22), of Christ being subject to the Father (1 Cor. 15:28), of Church members being subject to Church leaders (1 Pet. 5:5), of servants being subject to their masters (Titus 2:9), and of Christians being subject to God (Jas. 4:7).<sup>99</sup> Moreover, the servant leadership of Christ does not change this basic definition of submission. Although Christ served His disciples, he never nullified His authority over them.<sup>100</sup>

Fourth, the fact that *hypotasso* is in the Greek middle voice in Ephesians 5:24 does little to help Grady's case. *Hypotasso* still connotes the notion of authority whenever it is used in the middle voice in Greek throughout the New Testament.<sup>101</sup> Fifth, the notion that *kephale* or "head" in Ephesians 5:23 refers to source rather than authority has been utterly disproved. Grady completely ignores a recent study by Grudem who documented over 2,000 instances of *kephale* in all the major writings of the classical and Hellenistic Greek periods.<sup>102</sup> This study demonstrates that there is virtually no question that that *kephale* or "head" imparted the idea of leader or authority in the New Testament era and before. In fact, there is little, if any, evidence the *kephale* ever meant source.<sup>103</sup> According to Grudem, "Even the few examples where people have claimed that 'head' could mean 'source' when applied to a person, the person is always one in authority. No counter examples have ever been found in ancient Greek literature."<sup>104</sup> The enormity of this evidence was illustrated in a recent public debate featuring evangelical feminist Dr. Catherine

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 465-66.

<sup>100</sup> House, *The Role of Women in Ministry Today*, 36.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 35-36.

<sup>102</sup> Wayne Grudem, "Does Kephale ('head') Mean 'Source' of 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," appendix 1 in George W. Knight III, *The Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), 49-80; Wayne Grudem, "The Meaning of Kephale ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies," appendix 1 in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), 425-68.

<sup>103</sup> H. Wayne House, "Should a Woman Prophesy or Preach Before Men?," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 145, no. 578 (April-June 1988): 146.

<sup>104</sup> Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 459-60, n.6.

Kroeger, a scholar that Grady consistently relies on throughout his book. When Kroeger was asked for an example of *kephale* meaning “source” or “origin” in the singular in the extra biblical literature of the first two centuries of the Church era, Kroeger was not able to adduce even one such example. This lapse should be considered in light of the fact that Kroeger is a classicist specializing in Christian literature. Rather, she gave an example from the writings of Athanasius.<sup>105</sup>

### **Conclusion**

J. Lee Grady’s book *Ten Lies the Church Tells Women* should be both praised and faulted. It should be praised because it appropriately brings the issue of abuse and marginalization of Christian women to the Church’s attention. However, the book should also be faulted on two grounds. First, it wrongly “scape goats” biblically derived gender role distinctions rather than doctrinal imbalance as the primary culprit of abuse and marginalization of Christian women. Second, in its quest to abolish biblically derived gender role distinctions, the book relies upon poor scholarship and dated arguments. As has been demonstrated in this article, the author utilizes numerous egalitarian arguments that have already been thoroughly refuted by evangelical conservatives and traditionalists.

---

<sup>105</sup> House, *The Role of Women in Ministry Today*, 163, n.6; House, “Should a Woman Prophesy or Preach Before Men?,” 146, n. 20.