

# **“Your Position Against Women Pastors Is Outdated”**

Question for Sue Bohlin regarding [women pastors](#):

It seems like your reasoning centers on one verse: 1 Tim. 2:12. [But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet.] My question about that verse would be: Is it a timeless teaching? Wouldn't you agree that there are some culturally relevant areas of the Bible? Is the particular application of the principles of this passage timeless or are they culturally relative? When I study the Bible, to determine whether the teaching is timeless or culturally relative, I ask, was the teaching taught uniformly throughout the Bible. If it is a timeless teaching, then there won't be any variations on it. If it is culturally relative issue, sometimes it might be there and sometimes not. For example, throughout the Bible you hear differing views on drinking wine, but there is a consistent message about getting drunk. The view that states that women cannot be in leadership in a church context is drawn mainly from 1 Timothy 2:9-13. Due to the pagan religions in Ephesus in Paul's day this prohibition was necessary to distinguish Christianity from other religions. However, that cultural context is no longer applicable to the church today.

If you think that 1 Tim. 2:12 is timeless, then what do you do with the fact that women wrote parts of the Bible? Luke 2:38 (Anna); Luke 1:42-45 (Elizabeth); Luke 46-55 (Mary); Exodus 15:20-21 (Miriam); Judges 5 (Deborah—was leader of Israel). What do you do with the fact that woman are prophets? Ex.15:20-21 (Miriam); 2Kg 22:14 (Huldah), Isa 8:3 (Isaiah's wife); Luke 2:38 (Anna); 1 Cor. 11:5 (others). Another thing to consider is that many women are described as having authoritative roles, over men and women in the Bible. Deborah (Judges 5), Anna (Luke 2:38), Isaiah's wife (Isa. 8:3),

Aquilla and Pricilla (Acts 18:26) and others to name a few.

Women were not only recorded as being prophets but also judges and apostles (Rom. 16:7). The cultural restriction of women in leadership roles is not a timeless principle. This restriction denies women who are called into leadership from fulfilling their unique role in God's kingdom. Also, women not being allowed in leadership denies the church from the benefit of half of its leaders, pastors, visionaries, prophets and so on. Men and women are different but together in leadership they can complement one another by bringing out different characteristics of God's character. Not all women, just as not all men, are called into leadership roles in the church. Each person should follow their personal calling. However, women can be free to follow God's call into roles of leadership if God chooses to gift, equip and call them into that role. How can all this be ignored? I am a conservative Christian, but I use my mind to study issues like this to learn the truth. Can you explain how all these references can be ignored?

I completely agree that we must seek to separate timeless principles from cultural, time-bound issues. That is an essential part of reading and interpreting the Bible accurately.

I believe the pivotal verse of 1 Tim. 2:12 is but one link in a chain that teaches male headship and leadership because of the way God reveals Himself through the teaching that men are to assume the mantle of leadership for the church and the family: the husband as the head of the wife; male elders in church leadership; Jesus choosing twelve men as the foundation of his church (even though He was constantly flying in the face of the anti-female culture of His time, elevating and honoring women in a way no one had seen before). I am particularly struck by Eph. 3:14-15, which can (and I think should) be translated "For this reason I bow my knees before

the Father, from whom every *fatherhood* in heaven and on earth derives its name." I am struck by how, as a woman, I am unable to represent the Fatherhood of God, which is why male leadership (who can manifest the Fatherhood of God) is so crucial. (There are other aspects of God that I and all other women are able to represent particularly well, such as His beauty, compassion, nurturing, comfort, relational sensitivities—but not His Fatherhood.)

*Then what do you do with the fact that women wrote parts of the Bible?*

I would respectfully disagree that women wrote these parts. Luke and Moses wrote the verses you cited, quoting these women. Which is awesome, considering the cultural value of women at the time. It shows that God speaks and blesses through women, and the Holy Spirit made sure godly women were credited with being the conduits of praise and blessing that they were. But they didn't write those passages.

*What do you do with the fact that woman are prophets?*

I thank the Lord for using believing women in this way. A prophet is a servant, the mouthpiece of God. A conduit. This is a separate issue from being a pastor or elder or serving in leadership over men.

*Another thing to consider is that many women are described as having authoritative roles, over men and women in the Bible. Deborah (Judges 5), Anna (Luke 2:38), Isaiah's wife (Isa. 8:3), Aquilla and Pricilla (Acts 18:26) and others to name a few.*

**Deborah:** Indeed, she did serve as a judge. But note how she led—not as a man would. She called herself "a mother in

Israel.” Her role was more one of advisor and counselor, the way a mother would counsel her children, and making judicial decisions. She used her “authority” in indirect ways to influence, as opposed to the direct kind of leadership as the male judges did. When the need for military leadership arose, she called on Barak to lead the men into war with the Canaanites.

**Anna:** All scripture says about this godly woman is that “she never left the temple, serving night and day with fastings and prayers. She came up and began giving thanks to God, and continued to speak of Him to all those who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.” There is nothing here to indicate an authoritative role. She served in the temple and testified about God. This does not constitute authority.

**Isaiah’s wife:** she is described as “the prophetess,” which I understand from Bible scholars may well refer to her role as the prophet’s wife. But even if she were a full-fledged prophet in her own right, she had no authority. She would have been a mouthpiece for God. The authority was in the words that would have come through her, not in the woman herself.

**Priscilla,** along with her husband Aquila, “took Apollos aside and explained to him the way of God more accurately.” This doesn’t mean she was in leadership; it means she sat and explained things, in tandem with her husband, peer-to-peer. Not as a church leader.

*Women were not only recorded as being prophets but also judges and apostles (Rom. 16:7).*

I’m sorry, but we cannot know that Junias was a woman. The argument that Junias was a female apostle is shaped by modern feminist thought rather than by robust Biblical scholarship.

*Also, women not being allowed in leadership denies the church from the benefit of half of its leaders, pastors, visionaries, prophets and so on.*

Women are not denied a place of leadership in the church. We are restricted from CERTAIN positions of leadership. Some of the most gifted leaders, teachers, pastors (it helps to use the term “shepherds,” which means the same thing) and visionaries in the church are women, and when we use our gifts to lead and serve and teach women and children (which is over half the church), I think God is making a statement about the value of women and children. When we use our gifts and strengths to influence in indirect ways—note the importance of character and maturity in requirements for elders’ and deacons’ wives or deaconesses, 1 Tim. 3:11—we see the complementarity of male and female gifts and strengths combined to glorify God and serve the Kingdom.

For what it’s worth, when my husband served as an elder in our church and it was time to find new elders and deacons, they wisely went to the nominated men’s wives first to ask in private, “Your husband is being considered for this role in our church. Please be honest: is there any reason he should be disqualified?” A wife’s “yes” was a deal-breaker. That’s a powerful position! Not a direct position of authority, but an indirect position of influence. Also, some of the best ideas, and valuable warnings, and concerns borne of sensitivity and awareness of the needs of people, come from women. Wise men in leadership listen to wise, godly women. When men dismiss the contributions and gifts of women, everyone misses out. But that doesn’t mean women should be in all positions of authority and leadership.

*However, women can be free to follow God’s call into roles of leadership if God chooses to gift, equip and call them into that role.*

God will not call women into a role that is outside His stated limitations for us. I think it's extremely important that these new ways of attempting to throw off millennia-old understandings of the scriptures only came after feminist philosophy invaded the church.

You write to me because you are aware of my position (which is shared by my colleagues) at Probe Ministries where I have a platform and a voice through our website and radio ministry. I am grateful for this example of how women can use our gifts and callings to serve the Kingdom without transgressing God's order of male leadership. None of the women at Probe are in positions of authority over men, but we are still able to make a difference through our stewardship of influence. And as a woman (and one with an intense personality and pastor-teacher gifts), please let me assure you that this position of influence without authority is not in the least bit demeaning or disrespectful to me.

Thank you for writing.

Sue Bohlin

© 2007 Probe Ministries

**See Also *Probe Answers Our E-Mail*:**

- [Should Women Be Pastors?](#)
  - [I Have Some Questions About Women in the Church](#)
  - [So Are All Women Pastors Deceived and Going to Hell?](#)
-

# **“Sue Bohlin a Hypocrite for Teaching at Probe.org”**

If women are not to teach men or have authority over them, I find it odd that Sue Bohlin responds to questions on this website. Doesn't that constitute teaching authority???? And doesn't the fact that she writes a response ABOUT women in ministry absurdly ironic (i.e., if women are not to teach men or have authority over them by instructing them, then a woman speaking about women in ministry is absurd)???

Scripture does not forbid men to learn from women. It says we are not to be in teaching authority over men. I have no authority over anyone. I just offer my perspective on this website. If a man chooses to consider what I say and learn from it, that's fine, but it's a very different (and indirect) thing than me standing in the pulpit or on a platform in a position of spiritual leadership over him.

Thanks for writing.

Sue Bohlin

© 2007 Probe Ministries

---

## **“Should Women Be Pastors?”**

Hi Sue,

I hope it is ok to email you and ask your opinion (biblical) of this whole issue with—

1. Should woman be pastors?

2. In a church is there any ministry a woman can lead, whilst men are in that group?

3. In 2 Tim the verse regarding women not to teach and have authority etc. I have come across an interpretation which says that it is talking about wives, because the word translated women can either mean wife or woman... but the word translated man... is actually translated husband. Which should therefore give the whole sentence its context...(What is your opinion)?

4. The Bible shows that Deborah was a married woman who led the people of Israel and from the character portrayed, she seemed to be a woman of God as opposed to someone like Jezebel. Hence I would assume that she was submitted to her husband at home as the word of God says to all married woman, but her role as wife did not hinder her ministry as a leader over the country....So isn't it possible for a married woman to maintain her submissive role in the home, but does not necessarily need to be carried over into the church sphere ...Also, isn't submission when mentioned in the bible only mentioned in the context of marriage...and hence all women are not submitted to all men...so why is it that she cannot teach or lead men?

Thanks in advance,

A (hopefully) teachable young woman of God...who just wants to get a right understanding on this whole issue

*I hope it is ok to email you and ask your opinion (biblical)*

Sure!

*1. Should woman be pastors?*

I make a distinction between exercising the GIFT of pastor (shepherd) and holding the OFFICE of pastor. Many, many women are given the spiritual gift of being a pastor-teacher (Eph.



4:11), including me, and we are given the responsibility and privilege of being a shepherd to other women. The OFFICE of pastor, however, is biblically limited to men. 1 Tim. 2:12 makes that very clear.

*2. In a church is there any ministry a woman can lead, whilst men are in that group?*

That's the tough question. I think so, if it's a support ministry. For example, I think a woman can function very well as the director of children's ministries, where there are male Sunday School teachers who serve under her leadership—AS LONG AS she is under the leadership of the church pastor and elders and not in any position of final authority.

There is a book called *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* that is excellent, and one chapter gives some suggested guidelines to what women can do in the church without crossing the line. Christian bookstores can get it, and you can also check the website for Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: <http://cbmw.org>.

*3. In 2 Tim the verse regarding women not to teach and have authority etc. I have come across an interpretation which says that it is talking about wives, because the word translated women can either mean wife or woman.... but the word translated man... is actually translated husband. Which should therefore give the whole sentence its context... (What is your opinion)?*

In the Greek, the word translated *man* means "male adult." It is not limited to "husband," and generally is not translated husband. So this translation you came across was done by someone with an agenda, seeking to read a loophole into this verse that's not there. Particularly when you read the REASON for limiting women to positions of authority over men, which

comes immediately after that verse.

*4. The Bible shows that Deborah was a married woman who led the people of Israel and from the character portrayed, she seemed to be a woman of God as opposed to someone like Jezebel. Hence I would assume that she was submitted to her husband at home as the word of God says to all married woman, but her role as wife did not hinder her ministry as a leader over the country.*

I think it's important to look beyond the FACT that Deborah was a leader at the values associated with Deborah being a leader:

1. Deborah considered the fact that she was Israel's leader (judge) as a shameful indictment of the men who refused to take leadership. In Judges 4:6, in her role as prophetess she gives Barak instruction from the Lord to take the responsibility of military leader to go and attack the wicked Sisera. The apparently wimpy Barak balks, telling her (vs. 8), "I'll only go if you go with me. If you aren't going, neither am I." Deborah responds with a reproach: "Well, okay, I'll go with you, but because of the way you are going about this, you lose the honor in this expedition. Yahweh is going to deliver Sisera into the hand of a woman." God was going to discipline Barak for his lack of leadership by giving the honor of killing Sisera to a woman. Yes, that says something positive about women's ability, but we shouldn't lose track of the fact that awarding the honor to a woman was a slap in the face to the man who was SUPPOSED to earn it.

2. Consider Deborah's and Barak's song in Judges 5, which starts out: "When the princes in Israel take the lead. . .praise the Lord!"(NIV) Something is wrong when men fail to take their God-given place of leadership.

3. I found this recently and it was a real eye-opener for me: In a passage where the context is the judgment of God's

people, Isaiah 3:12 says, "Youths oppress my people, women rule over them." When women rule, it is in the context of judgment. Again, something is wrong.

*So isn't it possible for a married woman to maintain her submissive role in the home, but does not necessarily need to be carried over into the church sphere?*

Two thoughts here:

1. We need to draw a distinction between women in church leadership, and women in leadership OUTSIDE the church. The Bible never forbids a woman to assume political or civic leadership. It is only church hierarchy that is addressed in the scriptures.

2. If a married woman is submissive to her husband in the home, how would she take off that submissive hat in the church and be the spiritual leader of her husband? A wife is NEVER to be the spiritual leader of her husband; it's the other way around. Ephesians 5:23 says that the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. The wife's role is to lovingly, respectfully submit; the husband's role is to lovingly, sacrificially lead.

So does that mean an unmarried woman could be a spiritual leader in the church? No. 1 Tim 2:12 is a categorical statement against women exercising authority over men. Marital status doesn't matter.

*Also isn't submission when mentioned in the Bible only mentioned in the context of marriage...and hence all women are not submitted to all men?*

No, submission is a much bigger concept than merely wives toward husbands:

- *Luke 10:17 – Demons submitted to the 72 disciples in Jesus'*

*name*

- *Rom. 13:1 – Everyone is to submit him/herself to the governing authorities*
- *1 Cor. 14:34, 1 Tim 2:11 – Women are to have an attitude of submission in church*
- *1 Cor. 16:16 – Paul exhorted the Corinthian believers to submit to a certain group of mature believers in the church*
- *Eph. 5:21 – Submit to one another [a general rule, but not always reciprocal: I mean, do you want parents submitting to their children, or employers (masters) submitting to their employees (slaves)?]*
- *Eph. 5:22 – Wives, submit to your husbands*
- *Eph. 5:24 – The church submits to Christ in everything*
- *Heb. 5:7 – The Lord Jesus submitted to the Father*
- *Heb. 12:9 – We are to submit to the Father*
- *Heb. 13:17 – The church is to submit to our church leaders*
- *1 Pet. 2:13 – Submit yourself to every authority instituted among men*
- *1 Pet. 2:18 – Slaves, submit yourselves to your masters with all respect*
- *1 Pet. 3:22 – Angels, authorities and powers (various kinds of angels, I believe) are in submission to Christ*
- *1 Pet. 5:5 – Young men, in the same way be submissive to those who are older.*

You're right, all women are not to submit to all men. As a woman, I am called to submit to my heavenly Father, to my Savior, to the Holy Spirit, to my husband, to church leaders, and to governing authorities. But not to my next-door neighbor, or my friend's husband, or *any* man just because he has a Y chromosome! <grin> On the other hand, we are all called to submit to each other (Eph. 5:21), meaning to serve and help each other in humility. This attitude of submission should carry over into all areas of life because it is the only attitude appropriate for a believer, who is to live his or her life in submission to God.

*So why is it that she cannot teach or lead men?*

It goes back to the creation order. In Genesis 2, when God created man and woman, he created man first as the initiator, and created woman second to be his helpmate and to be the responder. Adam and Eve got into trouble in the Garden of Eden when Eve was deceived by the serpent, and talked Adam into disobeying God by eating the forbidden fruit. Adam knew Eve was being deceived; she didn't. He was with her when the serpent tempted her to distrust God's goodness and provision for them, and instead of speaking up to defend God's word to them and defend Eve against the deceptions of the enemy, he was silent and became her follower instead of her leader. This went against the created order. Men are to lead and women are to respond, generally speaking, although on an individual basis there are times for men to respond and women to lead (each other, and our families).

Paul explains this in further detail in his first letter to Timothy (2:11-14):

11 A woman should learn in quietness and full submission.

12 I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent.

13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve.

14 And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.

Paul invokes the creation order (Adam was formed first, then Eve.) Then he reminds us that Eve was the one deceived, and became a sinner. The reason God doesn't want women in leadership over men isn't that we're second-class or less gifted than men; to the contrary, God says "woman is the glory of man" (1 Cor. 11:7)! What a great statement of the value of woman! It's because we do need the protection that God gives us through men, and we need to maintain the creation order. We can be deceived more readily than men, because of the way God

was pleased to make us; more emotional, more relational, where men tend to be more analytical. That doesn't make one better than the other, and it doesn't mean that women are deceived all the time, but it does set the mold for the roles He wants us to take.

I do think it's interesting that God never forbids a man to LEARN FROM a woman; indeed, Apollos was disciplined by both Priscilla and Aquila, a married couple who were very instrumental in his spiritual growth and training. (See Acts 18.) I think the prohibition against women teaching men needs to be seen in the context of the Ephesian church to whom Paul was writing, where apparently women teachers were bringing in false doctrine from the pagan culture into the church.

But when a pastor who knows and respects a woman's knowledge and insight asks her to share it with a group of people under his care, I think a case can be made that that pastor is stewarding the gifts of the Body of Christ without handing over authority and leadership to a woman. It's not that a woman's teaching is inherently suspect (after all, a man and a woman can teach the exact same thing using the exact same words), but that leadership and authority in the church is designed by God to be held by men. (I know, this is very politically incorrect, but that's our position.)

Let me get personal with you here and share how God has opened doors for me as a woman gifted to teach. Probe Ministries has a 3-minute daily radio program that airs on about 400 stations. I am one of the writers and speakers for that program. Every time a man listens to our program when I'm on, he might learn something he never knew before or gain an insight he didn't have before. There's nothing wrong with men learning from a woman. There's nothing wrong with men reading books written by women.

As a teacher of women, I have the privilege of standing before groups of women to teach the Bible and other subjects from a

Christian world view, both in our church and in other churches and conferences. I have full freedom to teach here.

Probe also holds conferences for young people and adults to help them learn to think biblically. I am often the only woman speaker at these conferences. But I am not speaking as a church authority, only as a resource person.

I would not be comfortable filling the pulpit of a worship service as a preacher or teacher, although I am very comfortable in front of the church participating in a drama with a lesson in it that people, both men and women, can learn from. [Full disclosure since I originally wrote this article: a dear pastor friend asked me to give a short “Messages to Moms” on Mother’s Day. I directed my remarks to the women, inviting the men to listen, but my intended audience was women.] Again, there’s a difference between standing up as a teacher in authority over men, and being in a position where men can learn something without me being in a position of spiritual authority over them.

One final thought in this category. One day when I was praying about this issue, I asked the Lord to show me His heart about the whole subject of women teaching, and He led me to see that what He most cares about is that a woman gifted to speak and teach, cultivate an attitude of submission and humility.

*A (hopefully) teachable young woman of God.. who just wants to get a right understanding on this whole issue*

I am so delighted to hear you say you are teachable. I think maintaining a teachable attitude is so very vital to our spiritual growth and maturity, and it’s something I consciously seek in my life as well.

As a young woman, you have a challenge before you to think biblically on this issue of men and women in the church, because the world has squeezed many people in the church into

ITS mold instead of people going to the scriptures for understanding that allows us to be transformed by the renewing of our minds (Rom. 12:1).

Please feel free to ask for clarification on anything I've said. Let me add one point. The American actor James Dean was purported to have defended his bisexual preferences by saying, "I refuse to go through life with one arm tied behind my back." It was his way of saying he refused to be limited to only 50% of the population for his sexual expression.

I think God gives women teachers a broad range of ministry opportunities and ways to use our gifts with a full 50% (at least) of the church. Why isn't that enough (as it apparently wasn't for James Dean), when God knows better than we do? There are SO MANY women in the church who are desperate for godly, mature Christian women to teach them; why should some women resent the fact that men should teach men when there's this huge need that already exists?

Paul, when instructing Titus how to pastor his flock on Crete, told him to teach the older women so that THEY could mentor the younger women. Paul knew that the most effective way for young women to be taught many things was by older women, not by male pastors. It's God's plan, and it works, and there's always going to be more work to be done than there are people willing to do the work.

I think the place to put our energies is NOT in trying to force open doors for women to be pastors over entire churches, but to educate both men and women in the value and worth that God gives women so they don't see "women's ministry" as something lesser-than, something second-class—but as something exciting, vital, and important.

Most warmly in the Lord,

Sue Bohlin



**See Also *Probe Answers Our E-Mail*:**

- [I Have Some Questions About Women in the Church](#)
- [So Are All Women Pastors Deceived and Going to Hell?](#)
- [Your Position Against Women Pastors Is Outdated](#)

---

# **“What Do You Say to Someone Who’s Had Sex-Change Surgery?”**

I have heard of a man who has undergone a surgery to change his sexuality to female. After two years, “she” is married to another man.

What are the biblical references on sex-change surgery? How do we counsel if we meet someone like this? Furthermore, in an interview with this man, he said that inside him is a woman who is trapped in a man’s body. Please help me understand this issue.

This is a difficult situation since the developments of technology have made it possible to carry through on self-deception in ways the world has never seen before.

There is nothing in the Bible about sex reassignment surgery, but everything the Bible says about male and female pertains to those who are confused about their gender. The most important principle is that God chooses whether a child is boy or girl, and our bodies tell us what gender God intends for

us. If someone feels that their gender is mismatched to their genitals, then the solution is not to mutilate one's body, but to cooperate with God to change one's confused thinking.

"I am a woman trapped in a man's body" is a familiar statement made by a gender-confused person, but it's not accurate. The feelings are real, but the interpretation of the feelings are faulty. Several years ago, here in the U.S., Johns Hopkins University stopped doing sex-change surgeries because they learned that several years after the surgery, people weren't happy. That's because having a doctor change the outside, did nothing to change the heart, and the wrong thinking continued. Here is a link to a powerful essay written by the doctor who made the decision to shut down the program: [www.firstthings.com/article/2004/11/surgical-sex](http://www.firstthings.com/article/2004/11/surgical-sex)

Also, here is a website that I think you will find helpful in understanding the regret many people experience post-surgery: [www.sexchangeregret.com](http://www.sexchangeregret.com)

How do you counsel someone? Well, it depends on what they think. A person who is happy with their sex-change probably isn't going to be interested in talking to someone who thinks differently about it. If they're not happy, and suspect they made a colossal mistake, then I would suggest pointing them to the grace and mercy of God. Sometimes we make decisions we can't fix, and the only solution for a regret-filled person is to invite God into the mess they've made and ask Him to bring glory to Himself through it. God can make all things work together for good for those who love Him and are called according to His purpose (Rom. 8:28). He honors our choices, though, and a person who has chosen to mutilate their body will have to live with a mutilated body. But one can do it to the glory of God. The good news for the person who has trusted in Christ is that when they receive their new, glorified body in heaven (1 Corinthians 15), their original gender will be restored.

I hope this helps.

Sue Bohlin

© 2005 Probe Ministries, revised April 2019

---

## **“So Are All Women Pastors Deceived and Going to Hell?”**

Dear Sue,

I really have to write you this. I met you at the Mind Games conference in Fall 2004 at my university and asked about the role of women in the pastorate. You gave a convincing view from the Scriptures that women are not allowed in the office of pastor. Even when I asked when a husband and wife team found a church and the Husband serves as Senior Pastor and the Wife as Co-Pastor, you said without apprehension “They are well meaning people, but they are deceived.” Honestly I could just cry in my soul. “Deceived” meaning that Satan the deceiver purposely deceived these people to start a church to carry on the mission of Jesus Christ and go out into the world and save those who are lost and edify the Church? I cannot fathom this is going on between Bible-believing Christians (or so they say) about saving souls and ministering to the Body of Christ. I do believe in the complementary natures of male and female, males serving as the primary heads of their families.

Maybe I come from another perspective, being raised where women did serve in ordained ministry. As I read on more of this, I read that various evangelical denominations (who do believe male and females are complementarily created, who oppose the ordination of homosexuals, same-sex marriages and

abortions) for over a century have had women serve in ordained ministry.

**What is the divine judgment of this: Will these “deceived” people inherit the kingdom of God or go to hell? Only “complementarians” will be saved? What? I don’t get it! Clear this up for me because souls depend on it!!**

I am so sorry that my comments have caused you such grief. Had I known your question came from your heart and not just your head I’m sure I wouldn’t have responded so cavalierly.

I would gently suggest that you are making an unwarranted jump of logic here:

*“Deceived” meaning that Satan the deceiver purposely deceived these people to start a church to carry on the mission of Jesus Christ and go out into the world and save those who are lost and edify the Church?*

No, starting a church and saving the lost is not the same thing as installing a woman as pastor and leader in a church. “Deceived” meaning, convincing oneself that the end justifies the means. That even though God says in His word, “I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man” (1 Tim 2:12), somehow it’s OK for a woman to be in pastoral authority over men in the congregation. I believe that God calls people to start churches all the time, to carry on the mission of Jesus Christ and bring the gospel message to the lost and edify the church—but only within the limitations He has set up according to His design for men and women. I can see that God would call a couple to start a church, but there’s a big difference between working as a team to plant a church with the wife supporting her husband and contributing her gifts to the church, and the wife being a co-pastor. (Unless her pastoring [shepherding] is limited to women and children.)

As I have thought about your e-mail, I was reminded of Sarah, who believed that God was going to fulfill His promise of a son, but decided to help God out by doing things HER way. . . and the world's been dealing with the complication of Ishmael ever since. She was right to believe God for a miracle son, but she was wrong to go about it in the flesh. Women pastors are right to believe that God wants to do wonderful, marvelous things to build His kingdom, but wrong to go against and beyond His restrictions in the Word.

I don't believe women being pastors is a salvation matter. It's an obedience issue. I know these women say, "But God called me to this position," and my response can only be, "God would not call you to something He has restricted to men in the Word." They are mistaken in how they walk out their calling. I know God calls women to shepherding ministry all the time; in fact, one of my spiritual gifts is pastor-teacher. But that means I am called to minister to women (and children would be OK too but that's not where God called me), not be in any kind of teaching position or authority position over men.

Does this help explain my position more?

Blessings,

Sue

P.S. Something God showed me last year about a big reason women are not to be pastors is Eph. 3:14-15

*For this reason I bow my knees before the Father,  
from whom every family in heaven and on earth derives its  
name*

A much better translation of "family" is "the lineage descending from a common father" or "fatherhood." (The Greek word is *patria*, which is closely related to the word *pater*

[father].) Male leadership and headship is an earthly manifestation of our heavenly Father's role of leader, protector, and provider toward all of us, and women pastors cannot reflect the fatherhood aspect of God. This is a minor, but nevertheless important, supporting reason for God's restriction on women from having positions of leadership over men. It's backwards.

Dear Sue,

I thank you for responding to the letter. It seems that "women CANNOT hold authority over men" sounds like a Universal Truth about women, therefore a bit contradictory. Why can women hold positions of civil authority and professional authority over men but not in the church. Doesn't the "order of creation" come to play in every facet of life on this side of glory? Women SHOULD not hold positions of authority over men in any shape form, or fashion if this is a UNIVERSAL TRUTH. For instance, a woman is president of a Fortune 500 company and "exercises authority" over five thousand men in her company. Why is that God, who in your position restricts pastoral authority to men, give Deborah, Huldah, Miriam, spiritual authority as prophetess. Yes, they were not in the priesthood which was restricted to men. But they were not called to be priests, but prophets. The old priesthood was done away with when Christ went to a cross. And how is that the gift of PASTOR is separated from the office of PASTOR? God's Word is spirit and life (Jn 6:63). What difference is the sermon if it comes out of the mouth of a man or a woman if it is thus saith the Lord, not Rev. Billy or Rev. Joan? God's Words have no gender distinction. Please explain.

*Why can women hold positions of civil authority and professional authority over men but not in the church.*

Civil authority and professional authority are of the world; ecclesiastical authority is of the church. Two different

realms.

*Doesn't the "order of creation" come to play in every facet of life on this side of glory? Women SHOULD not hold positions of authority over men in any shape form, or fashion if this is a UNIVERSAL TRUTH. For instance, a women is president of a fortune five hundred company and "exercises authority" over five thousand men in her company.*

I would respectfully suggest that things work better if women do not hold positions of authority over men, even in the world.

*Why is that God, who in your position retracts pastoral authority to men, give Deborah, Huldah, Miriam, spiritual authority as prophetess.*

To be a prophetess is to offer the words of God to His people, but there is no authority inherent in the position. There are many places for women to serve in the body of Christ, and prophetess was/is one of them. As webservant for Probe Ministries, I send out e-mails informing people of new files on our website, offering the words of Probe to people in effect, but I have no authority over anyone either.

*Yes, they were not in the priesthood which was restricted to men. But they were not called to be priests, but prophets. The old priesthood was done away with when Christ went to a cross. And how is that the gift of PASTOR is separated from the office of PASTOR?*

Because all of God's people need to be shepherded. Women are excellent at shepherding other women and children (a VERY powerful position of service!!) and we are called to do exactly that in Titus 2. There is a distinction between the gift of shepherding and the office of shepherding because God's way is to put men in positions of spiritual authority,

so only men should have the office of shepherding.

*God's Word is spirit and life (Jn 6:63). What difference is the sermon if it comes out of the mouth of a man or a woman if it is thus saith the Lord, not Rev. Billy or Rev. Joan? God's Words has no gender distinction. Please explain.*

God's Word DOES have a gender distinction when it comes to how things work in the church. We can't get around "I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man." We can't get around the requirements for elder as being HUSBAND of one wife, which is a very definite gender distinction. We can't get around the fact that Jesus chose 12 men as His apostles and leaders of His church, even though there were women who traveled with them and ministered to them in a service capacity.

There is also a difference between a person standing up reading scripture, which I would argue is open to both genders in a worship service, and a person standing up preaching a sermon, which is far more than simply reading scripture ("Thus saith the Lord.") A preacher is making statements about God and about the meaning of His word from a position of authority. God says only men belong in that position.

I understand the sweetness and compassion of your heart that wants women to have as much spiritual power and access to people as possible, and bless you for it, but what do you do with the Biblical restrictions of women in positions of spiritual authority? How do you deal with 1 Tim. 2:12-3:7?

**Dear Sue,**

**God bless you for your wisdom and conviction!! I totally admire that!! I guess there will be these FIERY (hopefully loving and prayerful) discussions within the Body of Christ til our Master comes back for His children. And in that day He will not come back for complementarians or egalitarians,**



Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, or Pentecostal-Charismatics. He's coming back for us! And joyfully all of his children will be on one accord. Because in its totality, ministry of any form is not about our self-promotion, or egos. It's about Him. And the fact that we can agree to disagree on the hermeneutics of the Scriptures without bashing each other because we want to serve our God in our total capacities (however we may view them!) is really evident that we do care for our brothers and sisters in Christ, and how we don't want to marginalize them because some in Church History have abused their authority and oppressed, repressed, and suppressed the voices of God's daughters for their own gain. And let just say that, you may not hold an OFFICE Mrs. Bohlin, you surely have a PASTOR's heart (for women anyway)!!!

May God Richly Bless You and Yours,

---

© 2005 Probe Ministries

**See Also:**

- [Feminism](#)

***Probe Answers Our E-Mail:***

- ["Should Women Be Pastors?"](#)
  - ["I Have Some Questions About Women in the Church"](#)
  - ["Your Position Against Women Pastors Is Outdated"](#)
-

# “How Do I Encourage My Gender Role-Reversed Kids?”

Thank you so much for [your commentary](#) on encouraging our children to feel blessed in their own unique gender. I have a boy (6) and a girl (7) (and a child of unknown gender on the way). I was really nervous about raising a little boy, because I am one of two girls in my family, and had an absentee father for most of my life.

My little boy is the love of my life. He is so loving and sensitive. His dad has trouble dealing with this side of him. He also has many male qualities, but my girl child is rather rough and teases him unmercifully. How can I encourage them despite their apparent role reversals?

You brought up SUCH a great question, and I wanted to provide as powerful an answer as I could, so I asked a good friend for whom same-sex attraction is part of his story. God has done a huge work of grace in his life to bring him to the point where he can truly enjoy being a man, and has been healed from some of the woundings that came from not being supported in his masculinity when he was a boy. This was his answer for you, and I couldn't be more pleased with what he wrote:

It's OK to be nervous about raising a boy. I think that's natural. However, there are many very helpful resources out right now that will help you in guiding your little man in the right way (i.e., Dr. James Dobson's *Raising Boys* etc.). Dad is perhaps the most important factor in guiding the young man into gender security. Even though Dad might have difficulty dealing with sensitivity and other “less masculine” traits, I urge Dad to look at Jesus, study our Savior, see what godly masculinity is. Come to grips with the fact that what our society deems masculine is often brutal cruelty. The ultimate guidebook for healthy gender

security is none other than the Bible and Jesus is the ultimate example of the godly MAN.

That having been said, in the early years, I believe that it is very important to make sure your children are taught good manners and how to be accepting of people that aren't like themselves—even if they are siblings. If your little girl picks on or teases your little boy, I would encourage you to stop that behavior—through discipline, through reasoning or any other effective method. Your little boy must have an advocate in this early stage of life that is present and visible. It really is best if it is Dad but certainly someone he loves and trusts. And little girl must be taught to respect not only other people but the other gender as well.

On a more scientific note, there is a theory called the neuro-endocrine theory. This theory states that anywhere from the 8th to the 12th week of gestation, there is a hormone wash that is released in the womb that kind of kick-starts the development of gender depending on the chromosome makeup (xx being female and xy being male). Sometimes the hormone wash is not as strong as at others and the process by which the masculine moves into the left brain and the feminine moves into the right brain is not fully completed. This is not to say that any child is less male or female or more so. But it does apparently make some male children more sensitive and creative (right brain) and some female children more aggressive and decisive (left brain). It's not a bad thing or a good thing. Simply a scientific explanation of why some male children might be a bit more sensitive etc.

Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin

Probe Ministries

---

# **“Where Does Scripture Say That Men Should be Strong and Women Should be Soft?”**

**Re: God’s order for the “strong, leader” capabilities of men, and the “soft, nurturing” capabilities of women.**

**Chapter and verse, please, where is this laid out in scripture?**

**In the Bible we seem to have a wide mix of all characteristics in both genders, and no specific statement that “strong” characteristics belong only to men, and “soft” only to women.**

**Hi \_\_\_\_\_,**

**Thanks for your letter.**

*Re: God’s order for the “strong, leader” capabilities of men, and the “soft, nurturing” capabilities of women. Chapter and verse, please, where is this laid out in scripture?*

Well, I was thinking of Joshua 1:6-9, where Joshua is exhorted three times to be strong. And I was thinking of the role of the helpmate in Genesis 2, where Eve was created to respond and complement Adam, and a wife’s responsibility is further spelled out in the New Testament to submit to and respect her husband. Are there “chapter and verse” delineations where the observations about men and women are laid out? No, I don’t think so. We can’t point to specific chapters and verses for many of the things we believe (there is no specific verse, for instance, that says “abortion is sin” or “do not go into pornographic chat rooms”), but I do think we can draw

conclusions based on our observations of life that correspond with what we DO know in scripture.

*In the Bible we seem to have a wide mix of all characteristics in both genders, and no specific statement that “strong” characteristics belong only to men, and “soft” only to women.*

I agree, we do have a wide mix of all characteristics in both genders, and I see problems that arise when men and women go against the way we were created to be. For instance, when men become passive, weak responders (Adam, Ahab) and when women become harsh controllers (Jezebel, Michal, Rebekah).

I would agree with you that strength is not a male-only characteristic, for we see many examples of strong, godly women in scripture. But that doesn't cancel out God's call for men to be strong. (For instance, the qualifications of elder and deacon in the pastoral epistles.)

However, the concept of a “soft man” seems to call up unfortunate, unflattering images of milque-toast characters. Who wants a man to be spineless and too-easily influenced or intimidated? I don't see any place in scripture where wimps are held up as role models. **\*\*BUT\*\***—there is a huge difference between a “soft man,” and a “gentle man,” or a “sensitive man.” The Lord Jesus was hardly a soft man, but He was certainly gentle and sensitive, while at the same time charismatically attractive to the most masculine types of men.

I hope this has communicated my heart better than my article apparently did.

In His grip,

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# **“You’ve Got Feminism All Wrong!”**

Dear Sue Bohlin,

I’m writing about your response to “[Probe Answers our E-Mail: Should a Woman Work or Stay Home with the Children?](#)” I would like to express my extreme disappointment in your answer.

First off, I should say that I am young Catholic and a strong feminist. I believe that you have feminism’s mission all wrong. You stated that the “feminist viewpoint values materials above people.” I find this highly contradictory to feminism! Feminism is about equality. Plain and simple. It is difficult to debate the fact that men and women are equal. If so, what does it matter if the father stays home with the children? Why should the female sacrifice her goals in life and be “submissive” to her husband? What makes it okay for the male to follow his goals and watch his wife’s be thrown away? Parenting is a two person thing. The idea that the man is the mightly breadwinner to whom the wife obeys without question passed in the 1950’s. It disgusts me to think that other young women like myself are reading your response. We’re living in the year 2001—the world has changed quite a bit since the time of the bible! Maybe Titus instructs women to stay at home, but we’re far from that. When the bible was written, women were treated badly. Virtually the only thing a woman was good for was cooking, cleaning, and childbearing. In case you haven’t noticed, women do quite a bit more than that today. The contributions women have made to society are immeasurable. If you ask me, Jesus would never say to a female with aspiring hopes and dream the same as her husband, “You stay home because you are a woman, thus the only thing that should do it

take care of the children and the household.” I think Jesus would see the importance of strong parental roles in a child’s life—but equally, both mother AND father. Raising a child where the mother is the only active parent in their life is as bad or worse then sticking the child in daycare their whole life!

There are two things that I would really like the reader to get out of this letter: first, feminism is about equality, not material things. Second, we are not living in the time of Jesus! We should try to be Christlike, not mimic the lifestyle of 33 AD!

Thanks for writing! I am anxious to reply to your letter, but I would like to know one thing first: Are you married? Secondly (I guess that’s two things <grin>), how old are you?

Thanks so much,

Sue

Dear Sue,

Thanks you for your interest in my letter. After rereading it, I want to apologize for seeming...harsh. I’m just opinionated. I think your site is truly wonderful—I’ve had countless questions answered there.

As for your questions, no, I’m not married. I’m 14. I’ve never even had a boyfriend. (Actually, I spend most of my time at the library reading *Ms.* magazine! LOL)

Thanks again for your time—and your part in probe.org.

Thank you SO MUCH for your sweet message and apology and your honesty with me! I am truly delighted to hear that you like our web site and have benefitted from it, especially since you’re 14 and there’s so much to learn. It’s great that you’re reading things from a Christian perspective to help you form your opinions and your worldview!

OK, to answer your thoughts about feminism. . .

*First off, I should say that I am young Catholic and a strong feminist.*

Not surprising, actually. Feminist philosophy has so permeated our culture that it's unusual to find people who haven't been brainwashed by its values and perspectives. Yes, "brainwashed" is a strong word to use, but it's just as true as the way Communists indoctrinated their students in the last century.

Of course, if you spend your free time in the library reading *Ms* magazine, you are doubly steeped in feminism!

*I believe that you have feminism's mission all wrong.*

Is it possible that there might be more to feminism than the "public face" that it presents? Is it possible that someone who has spent time investigating the underlying philosophies and values of feminism might have a perspective different from what the rest of the culture accepts without question? And finally, ::::said in a low but respectful voice:::: is it possible that someone who's 48 might know more about this subject than someone who's 14?

*You stated that the "feminist viewpoint values materials above people." I find this highly contradictory to feminism! Feminism is about equality. Plain and simple.*

Uh. . . no. It's not that simple, \_\_\_\_\_. Have you ever seen pictures of icebergs? A mountain of ice rises out of the water, but there is another 9/10ths of the iceberg submerged below the water. Feminism is something like that: there are parts of this philosophy that remain hidden until you start digging. For instance, particularly as a Catholic, are you comfortable with feminism's strong insistence on unrestricted access to abortion for all women? Abortion is an essential



part of true feminism. Are you comfortable with the strong link between feminism and a lesbian lifestyle? While there are many many feminists who truly enjoy their femininity and their relationships with men, many of the movers and shakers in feminism have bought into the belief that men are the enemy. Do you plan on marrying and having children? Feminism has an anti-family agenda because it sees children as a drain on women and sees women who stay home to care for children as parasites, choosing a path that has no value because women are not paid for it.

*It is difficult to debate the fact that men and women are equal.*

Equal in value, absolutely. Equal in function and role, no way! Equal does not mean "same." Men and women are not interchangeable. We have different strengths and gifts, and different perspectives. We not only have different bodies, we have different emotional and mental make-ups. The biology of maleness and femaleness is hard-wired into the brain. Feminism's mantra for many years has been that the only differences are those of plumbing and reproduction. (And those differences are despised. There is a contempt for a woman's capacity for carrying and nurturing babies because of the fact that it makes a woman more vulnerable and needful of care and protection. That's one reason feminists are so insistent on the need for across-the-board access to birth control and abortion, because getting pregnant is so distasteful and threatening to so many of them.)

*If so, what does it matter if the father stays home with the children?*

Because mothers and fathers are not interchangeable. They nurture children differently. When children are very young, they need their mothers more intensely than their fathers. (But please hear me: children need BOTH a mother AND a father.

It's like asking, "Which do you need more, air or water?" We need both, but air is more immediately essential. It says no more about us not needing water than the idea that children don't need their fathers.)

Furthermore, God's intention is for men to be providers and protectors, and for women to be caregivers and nurturers. This is only construed as an indictment on women because of the way the culture has de-valued the contribution of women. Since we don't put a dollar amount on caregiving and nurturing, those contributions are dismissed as unimportant. (That's why I made my point about feminism being materialistic. Only those things that have been given monetary value are worth doing.) Feminism's contempt for women who are "only a housewife" or "only a mother" has spread to the rest of the culture, where many people hear "caregivers and nurturers" and snort their disapproval of such a lightweight role.

Maybe we ought to ask the kids who have grown up without the caregiving and nurturing, the kids who have had to raise themselves because their parents were so busy doing things that "mattered," if caregiving and nurturing is so unnecessary. And to go back to your original comment, if a father stays home with the kids and the mom works, *when the kids are very small* they are going to feel abandoned by their mother. That's just the way it works. It might not sound fair, but that's because mothers and fathers are not interchangeable.

*Why should the female sacrifice her goals in life and be "submissive" to her husband?*

OK, two subjects here: goals and submission.

If a woman sets her goals apart from God's values and intent for her life, they are worthless. Once we die and we stand before God, everything will be revealed for what it is. Those who have trusted in themselves and refused to submit to God

and trust in Jesus will go to hell. Of what value will their goals be then? For those who HAVE trusted in Christ, if their goals were self-serving instead of God-serving, then everything they accomplished to meet those goals will burn up in the flames of God's judgment. (You can read about this in 1 Cor. 3:9-15.)

It's like the person who climbed the ladder of success and discovered his ladder was leaning against the wrong wall!

Concerning submission. Why should a wife submit to her husband? Because submission is what we were created to do! We submit first to the Lord and then to those who are in authority over us. I think you have a misunderstanding of submission as "mindless doormat." Biblical submission is a deliberate choice to use one's strengths and gifts to serve another, to fill up what is lacking, to support and respect and yield to another. That is neither mindless nor subservient. (And I think, by the way, that many people hear the word "submissive" and think "subservient." They are not the same thing.)

*What makes it okay for the male to follow his goals and watch his wife's be thrown away?*

Nothing. God's plan for husbands is that they love their wives the same way that Christ loves the church. That means serving her, supporting her, being her #1 fan, and, as one writer put it, stewarding his wife's gifts so that she becomes everything God wants her to be.

But some women think they ought to be able to pursue their own goals with no regard to what it will cost their family. Children grow up fast, and there is time for women to pursue all kinds of goals after the children are no longer so needy and dependent on her. Are you familiar with Maria Shriver's book *Ten Things I Wish I'd Known Before I Went Out into the Real World*? She says, "You CAN have it all. . . just not at

the same time.” Try to find a kid who will say to his or her mother, “I’m so glad you went out there and pursued your goals, Mom—even though you weren’t there for me and I was left alone to fend for myself so often, but that’s OK, you’re the only one who matters.” Obviously, I’m being facetious, but the message of feminism is, “You’re the only one who matters.” It’s tremendously selfish.

*Parenting is a two person thing.*

Yes, I agree.

*The idea that the man is the mighty breadwinner to whom the wife obeys without question passed in the 1950’s.*

I will agree that the concept of the obedient wife who obeys without question was a fallacious concept that needed to be corrected. There is a difference between submission and obedience, although it’s not a huge one. Wives are never commanded in scripture to obey their husbands, and there’s a good reason for that. Obedience belongs in a relationship between non-equals because it’s a power mis-match. I obey God and the governing authorities, my children obeyed me (...though not always. I gave birth to sinners <grin>). Those relationships are not between equals. If a husband-wife relationship, which Scripture explicitly says is one of spiritual equals, is one where the husband is authoritarian and the wife obeys him like a robot, there cannot be the emotional and spiritual intimacy that is God’s plan for marriage.

*It disgusts me to think that other young women like myself are reading your response. We’re living in the year 2001—the world has changed quite a bit since the time of the Bible!*

We use a clock to tell time, not to tell truth.

The world may have changed, but people haven't. God's created order and His plan for human relationships hasn't changed. The Bible's relevance to our lives is just as vibrant as it was the day each word was originally written, because when God inspired the authors of each book He knew what would unfold in human history in the years to come, and His book has timeless concepts that are just as valid today as when they were written.

*Maybe Titus instructs women to stay at home, but we're far from that.*

\_\_\_\_\_, are you in a public school? Are there metal detectors at the doors of your school? Does your school have a lockdown plan for what happens if someone starts shooting a gun like at Columbine? Does your school have a problem with drugs? How many girls are pregnant? Are there any who bring their babies to school?

This is the world we live in—the world that is so far from the place of safety that it used to be. Yes, you're right, moms don't stay home much anymore. . .and the kids are paying for it. Families don't stay together much anymore. . . and the kids are paying for that, too. The amount of respect between family members has dropped dramatically as women demanded to be treated like men, so they are no longer respected the way they used to be, and kids don't respect their parents, and parents are afraid of their kids. . .who are paying for that, as well.

*When the bible was written, women were treated badly. Virtually the only thing a woman was good for was cooking, cleaning, and childbearing. In case you haven't noticed, women do quite a bit more than that today.*

Yes, I have noticed. The Probe web site you tell me is "truly wonderful" is a woman's creation and responsibility—mine.

Among my women friends are published authors, speakers, company owners, entrepreneurs, engineers, marketers, trainers, teachers, real estate investors, and doctors. And the Bible's pattern for wise living is just as relevant and life-giving to these women as it ever was.

*The contributions women have made to society are immeasurable. If you ask me, Jesus would never say to a female with aspiring hopes and dream the same as her husband, "You stay home because you are a woman, thus the only thing that should do is take care of the children and the household."*

I agree. The Bible doesn't limit women to only caring for children and homes. There are many ministry opportunities that women are called to give themselves to regardless of family status. There are ways to have a home-based business that does not sacrifice the best interests of a family and smoothly running home. You might want to read Proverbs 31.

*I think Jesus would see the importance of strong parental roles in a child's life—but equally, both mother AND father. Raising a child where the mother is the only active parent in their life is as bad or worse than sticking the child in daycare their whole life!*

I think perhaps you're either engaging in hyperbole or you really haven't thought through what you're saying. There is no way that a mother's input and love is more harmful to children than the stress of daycare. (Assuming the mother is not evil or mentally ill. It's too bad I have to mention exceptions like this.) You might not know what daycare centers are like. They cannot come close to the power of a mother's love and just "being there" with and for her child. Talk to me about this 15 years from now!

I'm glad you wrote, and I hope you think about these things. I

invite you to read another article I wrote, "[Ten Lies of Feminism](#)," and see what you think. God bless you, \_\_\_\_\_!

Warmly,

Sue

---

## **"You Are Too Harsh on Women Who Are Gender-Sensitive"**

Dear Sue Bohlin,

In your article "[Probe Answers Our E-Mail: What's Your Position on Gender Neutral Bibles?](#)" you write,

*"I am also bothered by the unspoken assumption that women are too self-centered and hyper-sensitive not to be able to figure out that when the Bible—the very words of God Himself—uses the word "man" or "mankind" to refer to all humans, we can't figure that out without getting upset. Just about every language on the face of the planet uses the generic male pronoun to represent all people, but apparently our sensibilities are too finely-tuned to allow for readers of these newer translations to make the mental jump. . .! "*

**I think it sounds a bit harsh. As a Christian woman, I have struggled for years to see that women have as much value to God as men because it seems to me that the Bible is mostly for men and about men. Women were created for men, must submit to men, and to be the help mate to men. I know that most people claim that women are not inferior to men but when I read the Scriptures, I see the inferiority very clearly. However – I find it helpful to read a Bible that uses pronouns and nouns**

that clearly show which verses refer to males only and which refer to all mankind. I don't appreciate the comment about not being able to make the mental jump to understand the idea that male pronouns are often inclusive. I don't think I am being self-centered, since I truly believe that women are inferior to men in God's eyes, but I am learning to accept that God has a right to make us for what ever purpose He chooses, even if this hurts very deeply and doesn't make sense to me. Was there really a need for you to be so hard on those of us who struggle with these issues?

Dear friend,

I regret that my article caused you pain. I'm not sure that it was me being harsh as much as your unfortunate (albeit understandable) tenderness and sensitivity at having been lied to about the inferiority of women. I think the high value of women starts in the very beginning of the Bible when God deliberately makes Adam incomplete without Eve, and says it is not good for man to be alone. . . and then Paul fine-tunes that truth in 1 Cor. 11:7 when he says that man is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. If woman is the glory of the image and glory of God, then we are the best and most beautiful aspect of His creation! I love what John Eldredge writes in *Wild at Heart*: "Eve is the crown of creation, remember? She embodies the exquisite beauty and the exotic mystery of God in a way that nothing else in all creation even comes close to." Please also note the poignancy of his next sentence: "And so she is the special target of the Evil One; he turns his most vicious malice against her." I would respectfully suggest that your sensitivity may have been triggered by the arrows of the Evil One's "vicious malice" against you.

There is a strength and glory to men that is different from the strength and glory of women. When we look at the way the Lord Jesus treated women with such tenderness and respect and dignity, attributes totally unknown in the world at that time,



we see what God REALLY thinks of women. He likes us; He loves us; He delights in us! He does not think we are, nor did He make us, inferior to men. We are different from men. He put the most beautiful and tender parts of Himself in US, to reflect His image in a way men cannot—just as there are wonderful parts of the Fatherhood of God that men reflect in ways we cannot. That is not a difference of value, but of function.

I truly ache that you struggle with the issue of women's value in the sight of God. My guess is that the way you've been treated by misogynistic men who do not protect and cherish women as God tells them to, has given you the wrong impression of what God thinks of us. I pray He shows you how very much He esteems you as a wonderful creation of His hand and heart.

I would like to invite you to listen to a powerful, encouraging and comforting recording of the Lord Jesus speaking to His Bride, based on what He has said in His word and produced by a good friend of ours, Bob Singleton, [here](#). This has been very touching to the people who have heard it, and I pray it will minister to your heart as well.

Warm blessings,

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

**“I’m a Feminist and a  
Christian, and I Didn’t Like**

# Your Article.”

Concerning your article “[The Ten Lies of Feminism](#).”

I believe John Gray has been divorced 3 times. Surely not an expert on women and men’s relationships that you would like the reader to believe.

Remember that before it says women submit to your husbands—it says husbands and wives submit to EACH other.

You said “It’s important for men to experience personal significance by making a mark on the world. But God calls women to trust Him in a different area: in our relationships. A woman’s value is usually not in providing history-changing leadership and making great, bold moves, but in loving and supporting those around us, changing the world by touching hearts. Once in a while, a woman does make her mark on a national or global scale: consider the biblical judge Deborah, Golda Meir, Margaret Thatcher, and Indira Ghandi. But women like these are the exception, not the rule.”

Please be aware that besides women, there are few people of color—men AND women—who have gone on to be exceptional in a publicly recognized way. It is not because they are in the “roles” God ordained them to be, but because of the man made white patriarchal society that has oppressed and dominated them.

In the spirit of the Lord who spent so much time with the downtrodden, and rebuffed the Pharisees for only giving lip service to the word, I am careful to not just “accept” what has been instilled as doctrine, but question and question again as God encourages us to do. God is not about oppression.

I could take on everything you have written, but the great thing about this country is our freedom of speech.

**I'm a feminist—and a christian.**

Just a couple of thoughts in response to your letter. . .

First, citing something John Gray said doesn't mean we endorse everything about the man. Even a broken clock is right twice a day!

Secondly, concerning mutual submission: if you check Ephesians, it does not say that husbands and wives are to submit to each other. The context is that Paul is writing to the entire Ephesian church, and he is telling the Ephesian believers to have an attitude of submission toward each other. The phrase "submit to one another out of reverence for Christ" can mean "Everyone submit to everyone" or "some submit to others." It is not addressing husbands and wives. Some relationships are a one-way sort of submission, and this would include wives submitting to husbands, children submitting to parents, employees submitting to employers, and church members submitting to church elders. If you try to turn Eph. 5:21 into a doctrine of mutual submission within marriage, then you have to extend it to the other relationships as well, and common sense tells you that won't (and doesn't!) work. I don't know if you have children yet, but I assure you, Paul isn't telling me as a mom to submit to my kids! ::::smile:::: And I don't know if you are married yet, but I can assure you that submission to a man who loves, cherishes, respects and supports me, and who leads me as he is led by Christ, is not in the least burdensome but a true joy.

Third, I certainly won't argue that women have been disrespected and oppressed women throughout time. I see this as a horrible consequence of the Fall. But as a Christian, I believe that God defines power and influence and what it means to be exceptional very differently from the way the world does, and I believe that women have been very powerful in ways that the feminist mindset refuses to acknowledge. I respect your identification as both a Christian and a feminist, but

please be aware that it is easy to let the world (read: feminist thought) squeeze you into its mold so that you see things from a worldly perspective instead of a biblical perspective. To use a phrase like “man made white patriarchal society that has oppressed and dominated them” tells me that you have bought into the feminist perspective. May I suggest that the evil is not patriarchy, but the sinful abuse of power within patriarchy?

You are right, “God is not about oppression.” He is about freeing the captives through Jesus Christ, not through man-made political systems and philosophy. Jesus was absolutely radical in [His respect for, treatment of and elevation of women](#), and when people follow the Bible’s actual mandates they move from oppressing others to true freedom and celebration of others’ dignity, abilities, gifts and calling.

Sincerely,

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries