

Women's role - Problems for Both Sides

Problems for Egalitarians (see men & women as 100% same)

1. Passages that seem to clearly imply man is to be leader in church & home

1 Cor 11:3-10

1 Cor 14:29-38

Eph 5:23-24

Gen 3:16

1 Pet 3:1-7

Col 3:18

1 Tim 2:11-12

2. Overwhelming majority of male leadership figures in both Old & New Testament, including all the apostles ("the Twelve")

3. Primary relational metaphors for God are male (Father and Son)

4. Evidence of God's purposeful design for ordering of roles

1 Cor 11:8-9

1 Tim 2:13-15

5. What do you want for women that you/they don't have? I'm really unclear.

Power?

Position?

Title?

A voice?

Authority?

Opportunity to serve?

Recognition?

6. Lack of biblical support for an imperative based on perceived "gift" or "calling", to be used in whatever way the gifted/called chooses.

7. As long as eldership is understood to be exclusively a male role, that still says that men are ultimately to be leaders in the church. (Whatever "leaders in the church" means.)

8. If "head" in 1Cor 11 doesn't mean authority or imply subordination of the "not-head", then what does it mean and how would you honor it unilaterally ?

9. Arbitrariness -- It's easy enough to point out what seem to be arbitrary interpretations in others. Are egalitarians avoiding the same? Are they supporting arbitrariness or insisting on objective, consistent interpretation and application?

Problems for Complementarians (see men & women in different but complementary roles)

1. Passages that seem to imply there is no distinction between men and women in Christ

Gal 3:27-28

Acts 2:17-18

2. Clearly there were women prophets in the 1st century church. How did they function as such if not allowed to address other people, i.e. "to speak" and "to teach"?

3. How do you explain references to women like Phoebe (Rom 16:1) and Junia (Rom 16:7).

4. "Women" in 1Tim 3:12 regarding deacons must be clearly dealt with.

5. Some women are clearly "gifted" in the same ways that would qualify men for public roles. If we understand talent / aptitude / "giftedness" to be from God in all circumstances (and I think we do), how are these talents to be gratefully utilized?

6. Consistency -- If women should not lead men in the church, are complementarians consistent in applying that throughout the functions of the church? How about in the workplace? Government? PTA, kid's sports, family?

7. Arbitrariness -- Are complementarians picking and choosing which roles they define as "leader" roles based on what is convenient and traditional or do they have a standard to which they hold?

Problem for both sides

1. How to distinguish when "that was then, this is now" applies in a reasonable, consistent way. (see "Arbitrariness" in both listings above.)