

A woman with long, dark, wavy hair is shown from the chest up. Her eyes are closed, and she has a serene expression. She is wearing a white, long-sleeved top. The background is a soft, out-of-focus light green and yellow. Overlaid on the image is the text "Should Women Preach?" in a stylized, cursive font. The text is white with a thin black outline and a rainbow gradient fill. The word "Should" is in white, "Women" is in yellow, "Preach" is in pink, and the question mark is in white with a rainbow gradient.

*Should Women  
Preach*

?

---

# Should Women Preach?

*Dr. Kyle M. Matthews*

**1 Timothy 2:1-15** - *I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, [and] giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all holiness and honesty. 3 For this [is] good and acceptable in the sight of Elohim our Saviour; 4 Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. 5 For there is one Elohim, and one mediator between Elohim and men, the man Messiah Yeshua; 6 Who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. 7 Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an emissary, (I speak the truth in Messiah, and lie not;) a teacher of the pagans in faith and verity. 8 I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. 9 In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; 10 But (which becomes women professing holiness) with good works. 11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. 12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. 13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve. 14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. 15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.*

---

## Jewish Sha'ul

We must be careful with Shaul. We must, but most people are not.... Either ignoring him entirely as unintelligible, dismissing him as a fraud, or otherwise encountering his complicated works and interpreting them quickly and carelessly. Shaul is extremely loquacious in his letters and we can't afford to let ourselves take his words too lightly; neither can we treat them too literally nor too laterally.

The emissary of Yeshua is often addressing specific issues pertaining only to one assembly and applying to no one else. Other times he is confronting a problem we don't fully grasp not being privy to the issues of that assembly nor the troubles leading up to the events addressed in his letters

of which we get but a glimpse. Of these conversations we are only getting one end and can not always safely and reasonably determine what is the situation whether universal or local. Other times our own traditional replacement terminology and reinvented theology has gotten in the way and thrown us off. And we have been interpreting these things all too often through our own milieu aswell.

Sha'ul is an attested emissary of the King Messiah. We have no reason to doubt anything he said or did. And he is testified by Kepha (Peter) as being one of the ambassadors aswell. Therefore his epistles should not be dismissed. And as all his words are often complex, we should not overlook his letters as over our heads, but instead attempt to understand them. But equally so we cannot afford to assume that he is saying something very simple even if it seems so. We have to understand who he was in order to understand what he said. And we have to understand that he was always weaving a complicated narrative throughout each discourse.

So we can't ignore him, we can't act like he is not important, and we can't act like he is easy to understand. These are three different mistakes that different people make to their detriment. And moreover, to the destruction of many.

When we study the writings of Sha'ul we must do so, knowing that he to the end of his days was a Jew and a Pharisee. Contrary to the church narrative, we have no reason to believe that this man ever converted from being a Jew to being a Christian. We have no reason to believe that he ever ceased to be a Pharisee. We know for sure and certain that he found something more valuable than he had previously found these things to be, but we don't have cause to think he cast them aside entirely. And moreover, we have every reason to believe, based on his own record of his own deeds and his own recorded words that at the end of his days, he still said that he was a Jew and a Pharisee. Not that he claimed to be one once upon a time, but that he still was one at the end of his ministry, and that he had never at any time taught anything contrary to the Torah.

Therefore, contrary to the church doctrine and Christian Tradition, we cannot read the letters of this emissary in the understanding that he converted to a new religion, that he cast aside all the tenets of the Torah or the traditions of his people, nor can we act as if he was teaching something new. And we cannot behave as if he was an authority unto himself. Sha'ul was but an emissary of the Messiah. That makes him a mighty man, but does not make him the Almighty, nor even on a level with Moses or the Messiah. His authority is as a good student of the Messiah and a good servant of the Messiah. Which means he brings the message of the Messiah and speaks with the authority of the Messiah and not his own.

So for all those who embrace Paul and do whatever he said in the light of church doctrine, they are making a god of Paul. But Paul, really Sha'ul, was a Jew, was a Pharisee, was a student of the Jewish Messiah, and faithfully taught the teachings of the Jewish Messiah, who faithfully taught

everything Moses already said to do and prophesied to come to pass. So when we read Sha'ul we must set his writings in this category of one who is not sharing anything new but explaining everything old.

---

## **I Do Not Permit**

One of the mistakes of reading, Shaul isn't just oversimplifying his words but clipping them. The common practice is to cut his words up into smaller segments and to quote them in absence of their surroundings. But this is almost always going to destroy the narrative. And especially when addressing the works of this particular emissary, it is always going to destroy the narrative. Why? Because Shaul is constantly weaving a long narrative, connecting one to another and one to another and working it all back again to the beginning. And the meaning of any given word or phrase must be understood in the context of the entire narrative that is being played out.

Though we are extremely used to and find it hard to live without chapter breaks and verse markings, these are late additions to the text. They are not natural breaks made by the author. These are medieval traditions which are designed to aid in memorization and ease of reading. However, they also end up as tricky truncations of a point the author was trying to get across - artificial divides within a larger explanation.

For example, it is very easy for us to take 1 Timothy 2:12 and run with it. Men so often address this issue in isolation and yet end up erring as abusive and authoritarian. But any verse meant to be understood in light of a larger conversation will appear in the exact same fashion. In order for us to properly understand what the author is trying to tell us in verse 12 of chapter 2, we have to go back to the beginning of the chapter and read versus 1 through 11 first. And we cannot stop at 12. We have to read on to the end of the chapter. And since the author did not add that break, we cannot automatically end our investigation at that point. We must go on to the next chapter and even the following chapter in order to establish the entire narrative that is being addressed. Otherwise, verse 12 of chapter 2 will become its own narrative rather than one talking point in a larger narrative. When we isolate a single verse and study it in absentia, we make a doctrine of it when it was a passing point. We also destroy the entire point of its ever having been spoken. And we remove all the reasonable explanation for why it was said which, if placed in its original setting in the structure that is being established, it will not only make sense but will be most acceptable.

Was Sha'ul at odds with woman speaking? We would think that if we selected only verse 12 of chapter 2 in his first letter to Timothy and read it in isolation. But if we take into account that he was a Torah teacher, but he was addressing a particular problem that Timothy was having to face, that



he himself had female students who were leaders in the community and he was not teaching them just so they could know and teach no one else, and that he did not simply state this one verse and walk away, then we will not be able to simply say that he was being a bigot and that's that.

Sha'ul was almost certainly not using the rigid Greek language to say what he was trying to to Timothy. We have his translated words left to us in Greek and then extrapolated from there into English. And much is lost in the translation. The emissary of the Messiah is not telling us anything different than he told his disciples, many of which were women. So once again, we have to be careful not just with chapter brakes and verse markings, but also taking the recorded words with the cautionary possibility that the ones given are a translation, and not the original since Greek is difficult to use in expressing Hebrew thought, impossible to divorce from pagan religion, philosophy, and culture, and functions in the opposite manner as Hebrew.

With these cautions in mind, let us begin in the beginning of chapter 2, and work our way up to the sentence in question with this question in mind, "should women preach?"

*1 Timothy 2:1-4 I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all holiness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of Elohim our Saviour; Who will have all men to be helped, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.*

Shaul asks first for prayers and petitions that be made for all men. In this instance men is referring to mankind not just males. But then he narrows it down to Kings and all who are in authority. For those who are kings, *and all* who are in authority. Are there no queens who have authority? Of course there were queens who have authority, but it was a rarity that a queen would have authority independent of the authority of her husband, the king. And even though the author is speaking generally of mankind, when asking for intercession on behalf of all men, there is an element that is, addressing the authority of men - males. And what we are praying for is twofold. We are praying for all those in authority over us, kings, or otherwise, in order that we may have a quiet and peaceful life in holiness and honesty. In other words, we are praying that our authorities will be good and just which will result in our ability to live a quiet and peaceful life pursuing holiness and honesty. Moreover, the double meaning is that because he is asking for prayers for all men in that instance, he is addressing this in the sense of the males who have the authority, that we pray for our ability to have a quiet and peaceful life in all holiness and honesty. And indeed, as he writes, so it is true - whether prayers for kings and all those in authority to be good, which will enable us all to live quiet and peaceful lives in all holiness and honesty, as well as prayers that we who are men who are in authority, have the ability to live quietly and peaceably in all holiness and honesty - both of these

meanings are good and acceptable in the sight of our Elohim. And Sha'ul says at the end of verse 4 that this Elohim, Who is our only Saviour wishes to save or more likely help (restore) all men and would have them come to a knowledge of the truth.

This is once again a dual meaning. Not only is he saying that the Most High wants to help all human mankind and for all humankind to come to a knowledge of the truth, but moreover He literally wants to help the men who are in authority and wishes them in particular to come to a knowledge of the truth. The latter understanding aiding in the establishment of the former understanding.

So from his opener, Sha'ul is showing us that the issue is authority, that authority is complicated and requires prayer, that those in authority are not likely to have a quiet and peaceful life unless in answer to prayer, and that those in authority being honest and holy is what will enable all human mankind to live quietly and peaceably. And those who have the authority will have the help of the Elohim and will have the goal of helping all people and help them come to a knowledge of the truth.

Sha'ul is establishing from the start, the nature of authority, the requirements of authority, the obligations of authority, and the results of authority. He's laying out the seriousness of this subject. It's no small matter. Ego has no rightful place here. The want of power has no proper place here. The desire to escape command has no just place here. For even the One in authority, overall men has an authority over him by the Elohim Himself.

*1 Timothy 2:5-8 - For there is one Elohim, and one Mediator between Elohim and men, the Man Yeshua Messiah; Who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an emissary, (I speak the truth in Messiah, and lie not;) a teacher of the Nations in emuna and emet. I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.*

Why is Sha'ul switching subjects all of a sudden in the next sentence? He's not. As we have seen, he weaves a complicated narrative, and this is an example of the authority he is talking about in the previous few verses. He talks about kings and then those who are under that authority, and then he says that there is one Elohim and one mediator between Elohim and men, and that Man is Yeshua. In the same way that the Most High is in authority and his Anointed One is in authority under Him, so also men are in authority and have others under them. Some men have more authority than other men and men have more authority than women. And women have more authority than children...Well that doesn't seem fair. Sure doesn't. If we are judging by modern doctrine and modern standards. But these are the standards of which the emissary is speaking. The

only question is - is he speaking on his own authority or that of the Messiah of Whom He is the emissary.

Shaul is often giving his own opinion. And at times he is giving general rules rather than rigid restrictions. We should be asking which case this is. It is not a question what he is trying to say about the nature of authority being hierarchical. So many question this, because they don't want it to be true. It is not a matter of question that this is true, that that is what Shaul is referring to. The only question is, whether or not Shaul was speaking his own opinion at this point? Was he giving a rigid doctrine? Or was he giving a general rule? To this Shaul seems to answer right away by now, bringing himself into the scenario to establish his own authority in what he is about to say.

In the scenario in which the Almighty is above all and the Messiah under Him, Shaul, as the emissary of Messiah speaks now in this position to declare what the doctrine is, so at least he himself believes that he is not giving his own opinion, but speaking in the role of the emissary what he is relaying here.

And everything immediately after is supposed to be seen in the context of covenants.

Only the men carry in their flesh the sign of the covenant. Which means only the men are responsible for said covenant, for guarding it, and for teaching it.

If a woman is teaching men, there are men not doing there job. But if the men are not doing their job, should the job not be done anyway? Or should the women do the job to the shame of the lazy or ignorant men?

Moreover Sha'ul is not speaking strictly of our modern idea of teaching in which a person stands up in front of the gathered assembly and explains the covenant in concise words.

He is speaking of the Hebraic nature of teaching which is literally an apprenticeship. If a woman is teaching men in the Hebraic sense, she is leading them around, and they are required to follow her everywhere and learn not just what she *says* but moreover what she *does*. **Everything** she does. Not only would this be an inverse of the established order of creation, but it would fast become a perversion as the students are literally required to learn everything their teacher does. **EVERYTHING**. There would be so so many moral violations for men to be following a woman around watching and learning everything she does no matter how personal or private. And much would also be impossible for them to learn from her, in addition to so many other logistical issues no one thinks of nowadays.

For this reason, a man who is suitably proficient in The Way, is supposed to take up the duty of teaching men in this manner, and those men in turn teach what they have learned to their wives who in turn then teach the same to their children. And propriety is preserved. But simply speaking truth? Anyone can do that. One need not be a man for that task. Should a woman keep silent when a lie is proclaimed just because The Way is principally to be relayed by men? No indeed. And there are far too many men running about teaching lies these days - fantasies, Messy-mythologies, etc. If a woman speaks with humility and in her husband's authority, and isn't trying to run away from him, or run against him, or run over him, then men and woman can learn much from her, if she follows the same logic as he. A man who refuses to unlearn error and learn truth but still sets himself up to teach can destroy many men and women together. And a woman who questions everything, investigates, and studies with an endless goal of discovering truth not labeling her bias as truth, then she can do much to advance the kingdom in her speaking for both men and women.

There's as much evil in telling a good and true woman to sit down and shut up as there is for a presumptuous woman to open her mouth to speak on her own authority and contrary to the Torah. And indeed, much of the fantasy and Messy-mythology being paddled by men these days is the result of silly women sharing their faith through feeling to so many males of a previous generation. It's so important to maintain the balance in all things, especially between extremes.

***1 Timothy 2:9-15** - In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; But (which becomes women professing holiness) with good works. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.*

In our western society, the warrant of authority comes from a desire to command, and to not be subject to commend... Yet what Shaul is attempting to explain is that we are all under command and that the more authority we have the more responsibility... And the more responsibility, the greater penalty for improper command. In our society, we do not think about authority in conjunction with responsibility, but these are two sides of the same coin. With authority comes responsibility, and with responsibility comes authority.

If Shaul had simply said, that women are supposed to learn in silence, and in subjection, and had not prefaced this passage, with all that he has mentioned before, about the authority of the



Elohim over the Messiah and the Messiah, over His emissaries, stating in his authority as an emissary that women are to learn in silence and submission then, perhaps such a statement would be an oppressive and subject to just scrutiny... But Shaul did not forward such a point in isolation. He built up the knowledge of authority with its inherent nature of responsibility, and that the Almighty is the source of authority. He alone has issued authority to the Messiah, and all the emissaries through Him, and in this case, particularly the one who is speaking, acquire their authority from the Most High by Way of His Messiah. And on that authority, the emissary speaking explains the nature of authority and why men are responsible to hold that authority over the congregation. Men in general are in charge of all things in the assembly, but each man is specifically in charge of his own family, and each woman specifically in charge of her own children...and each child in charge of absolutely nothing.

How ironic it is, that children have no authority and have no need of authority, and that men are supposed to hold authority and women supposed to submit to authority, yet men are constantly trying to abandon their authority and women constantly trying to take it up. Why does society suffer so greatly? Because nobody is trying to exercise their own role within the creation, and everybody attempting to assume the role of others. Children are left to be an authority unto themselves to which their parents cater. And women are the predominant authority in most relationships and in the wider world... while men have set themselves subservient to women and children, both... Making life a free-for-all of feeling and frustration instead of the divine order of authority and responsibility established in the creation.

Shaul makes the point here that Adam was made first and then Eve... That she was made to be his helper and not him to be hers. On a practical basis, Shaul's point is a very weak argument since so much has happened since the creation of man and woman in the beginning, and we are so far removed from our first parents and their unique situation. But his point pertains to the nature of creation itself and the subject of authority to establish the proper flow thereof from the Most High to His Messiah, from Messiah to His emissaries and from His emissaries to men. It's top down till it comes to men. Then it becomes an evolutionary cycle - authority received from the emissaries flowing from man to woman and woman to children... and children growing up to become men and women aswell, assuming their proper roles of authority within the world and making more children who will eventually become men and women and so on and so forth ... or elsewise to usurp the authority of others or shirk it entirely - children over mothers, wives over husbands, and husbands abandoning their position becoming as passively, obedient children should be.

Rather than a hierarchy of the Creator over the Messiah and the Messiah over men, and men over women and women over children, though there is some truth to this, most of the nature of authority should be thought of as a cycle... Yes, authority flows top down from the Almighty to the

Messiah, and from the Messiah to mankind... And this includes both men and women. But within humanity authority is not top down in a strict sense. Men are supposed to shoulder the responsibility of the covenant - guarding it, and teaching it faithfully - And women are supposed to shoulder the responsibility of teaching that covenant to the children... Those children, both male and female, who intern will grow up to, if properly accepting their roles in life, repeat that cycle in the future.

A mother trains her son to be wholly dedicated to YHWH, to cleave to the covenant, to deviate in no way from the left or the right and to show him the example of a holy and righteous woman so that when he comes to maturity as a man he will have been shaped by that woman to be ready to assume his place of authority and responsibility, that he will be able to find a wife of comparative noble character who will do likewise for his children aswell, raising them to follow The Way unchanging.

So what should become of such a son if his mother is off teaching other adult men instead of focusing her time and energy into teaching him? What should become of her daughter? Will she not see that her mother is off teaching men instead of teaching her how to be a good woman and teaching that girl's brother, the example of a good woman, so he will grow up to know what quality to look for when he seeks a wife of his own? It is not that a woman has no wisdom to share... It is not that a woman has no right to speak.... It is not that a woman has no authority to address a man on any matter of import... She is not an inferior being in quality, value, or importance... It is that she has a different authority... That is to say a different responsibility... She is not supposed to be concerned principally with the teaching of the men of this generation...but in teaching of the men of the next.

Yes, there may very well come a time (and there has many times throughout history) in which a woman is required to step up and lead the people, both men and women... Not just to deliver the message in the assembly on any given Sabbath. Not passing on some sage advice. And not sharing wisdom with the congregation... but stepping into the vacancy left by vapid men to assume the role of a man in leading the entirety of the people - *because* no man of quality could be found to do the job. And in such a situation, where no man is available who is worthy of the position of authority to exercise his responsibility as a man, to serve the congregation, and to bear the burden, and to make the hard decisions, it is necessary, and indeed, mandatory for a woman of worth to step forward, to see that the task which *needs* to be done *is* done.

It is not her natural duty to be responsible for the entirety of the people. It is not her obligation to have to answer for the whole congregation... It is not her burden to bear... It is not her hardship to endure. Yet in such a situation, in which no man is qualified to serve in his natural calling, why should not a woman assume the solemn responsibility to see that the task gets done... until such

time as a worthy man may be found (or trained) to do the work... The work still needs to be done whether a man is ready, willing, and able to do it or not... If a woman is able, and no man is, then in such a situation, indeed, she should serve... But Shaul is not speaking of such a situation in this passage...

The emissary of the Messiah is speaking about the natural order of things and the universal Way the assemblies ought to be running, so that they can function properly and perpetually without falling into chaos and falling apart. Whenever a people is being led by a woman, it should be to the shame of every man of that community...why? Is it an issue of pride? Are men too vain to follow a woman of worth? It may be the case for many men, and if so that's yet another issue, but in general, if the men of an assembly are so weak and unworthy that either a worthy woman has to step into their shoes to serve the needs of the people or that they would allow for an unworthy woman to bully them into submission, then it should be too their shame. Not to their shame because such a "lowly creature" has taken their job away but because men whose function it is to take responsibility, to sacrifice themselves, to carry the burdens and suffer the hardships and accept the consequences - these men were either too weak and cowardly to do their duty or simply betrayed their obligation to all the people by leaving the humble women to have to do the hard labor or elsewise to let the prideful women run amok and overrun the community, running it into the ground.

Being the leader in the assemblies is never supposed to be a position to be coveted, but rather a requirement of men who would rather live carefree lives. Yet as men it is their duty to forego their own desires and serve, if they have the character quality to do so and the wisdom to know when to step down aswell. Being a leader in the assemblies is not supposed to be an acquisition of power and lordship. It's not supposed to be permission to command or be free from command. As the Master said, "The rulers of the pagans lord it over them...but it is not so with you. The greatest among you will be last and the servant of all." In The Way, the man who leads wears no crown and holds no absolute rule, but rather he serves in all aspects high and low and suffers and strives and works and slaves for the assembly.

Among the assemblies there should be at least one man of that manner of make up who is capable of carrying the needs of the people and caring for them in every capacity. Yet if not, then the need of such a people should still be met. If not by a man then by a woman. *Someone* much lead, or chaos will reign. But how should a woman lead the people in place of a man? As Shaul explained in the rest of the passage, she is to be adorned in modesty and sobriety, not occupied with being all dolled up and decorated with finery. In quietness and peace she leads, humbly and in all holiness. Yes, Shaul said he didn't permit a woman to teach nor to usurp the authority of a man. But we are not talking about a situation in which there is a man worthy of serving as a workman in

the community. We are addressing the kind of assembly in which no man may rightly take up the position of authority, being himself unqualified.

Shaul is often misquoted here in translation, saying “authority *over* a man“ as if it is in all cases inappropriate for a woman to hold authority over a man. But that is not what Shaul said. He said “the authority *of* a man.” The emissary of the Messiah has not changed his subject here. This is still about authority and the nature of it. And that is when he starts to go into the topic of Adam and Eve, our first parents. Adam was made first and then Eve. He says this to talk about the nature of authority - that Adam was the one who was responsible and charged to do the work... And because of this, a man is responsible and charged to do the work now. Charged but not just to be in charge. He bears a *charge*... A solemn obligation to protect, to teach, to guide, to guard, and to answer to his Authority for his every misstep. That is why a man is *supposed* to lead... And *this* is why it is to the shame of men when women *have* to lead.

And moreover, Shaul is not forbidding in his own opinion or official position as an emissary that women have the authority of a man all or in any situation. His forbiddance is in his official status as emissary of Messiah and it is a command against *usurpation*.

There are other reasons why this is a problem for women to be the leaders and authority figures in the community, not at all, but *in-place-of* men. Shaul briefly touches on this to say that the man, Adam, was not deceived by the serpent in the garden, but the woman, Eve, was deceived. Unfortunately, he does not elaborate further, but we can. The minds of men and the minds of women do not function in the same fashion. It is easier to fool the average woman than to fool the average man. And when deception is taught by a woman, it will more readily be received by both sexes, than if the lie is brought by men. But that is not to the credit of men. Because, whereas a woman may be more easily deceived than a man, the man will more often walk open-eyed into error, and will quite often do so *for* a woman.

In other words, either men will have authority over women, or women will have authority over men. There is no such thing as equal authority. Someone must have the deciding position, and if not given it, they will take it. When men have the authority, they may be wrong, but it is less likely to be the error of deception. And when women have the authority, their errors are more likely to be errors of deception...and the men, more likely than not, will follow the women anyway, *not* because they have likewise been deceived, but because the women are *women*...and the men are *men*.

There is also the trouble of the rest of the mental differences between men and women. The average man is more logical, and matter of fact, more narrowly focused, and practical... contrariwise, the average woman is more emotional and function primarily by feeling, more broadly focused, and concerned with ideas. In an ideal situation, the man should be the one to be leading, but not *against* his wife. She is his helper and that doesn't mean doing chores. She is his

other half, the companion of his soul. She doesn't just think differently, but she thinks in a way that he cannot, and he can think in a way that she cannot. In order to address issues properly, he must consult with his wife and converse with her. He requires her mind on matters that must be addressed. The man who leads the community, must hear her advice And indeed seek it out, and encourage it. He will have the ultimate decision and be the one to present the teaching, but he is no island. He is simply the half that does the work in the community, and the one responsible for the consequences of accepting bad advice, and implementing folly if he does.

As a general rule, men are supposed to be responsible for teaching the present generation, and women are supposed to be responsible for teaching the future generation both male and female. If a woman is in a position of authority, which is supposed to be belonging to a man, then one of two things has happened: either she is trying to take the authority that belongs to a man to the neglect of her authority as a woman or otherwise she is being required of necessity to perform both functions, holding the authority of a man, because there is none qualified and holding the authority as a woman. And hopefully she is overqualified... Otherwise, both the community and her own children will suffer lack.

This is what the terrible translation "she will be saved in childbearing" was trying to say when Shaul said it. The term "saved" has been relegated to eternal life in most interpretations, but that is most narrow-minded and foolish. The interpretation should often be "made whole", or "restored" or "helped", especially in this case. Many have tried to interpret this as a social salvation, as in a matter of reputation but that is still off the mark; because the translation of childbearing is again too narrowly focused. Women are not socially saved or saved in reputation by bearing children, but in this case, the interpretation should be "made whole" or "complete" rather than "saved", and it is not in simply giving birth to children that makes women whole and complete, but in the complete raising of these children is there training from infancy to adulthood to be able to then assume their proper functions within the community...

Again this is not to say that motherhood is the only purpose women have in this world... But it is their greatest purpose that only they can do and that because it not only *makes* all the people that have been or ever will be besides Adam and Eve of course, but because it *shapes* who they will be both men and women. What Shaul is trying to say is that it is a man's duty, what makes him whole and complete, to step into his role as a leader and serve the people in whatever is required of him, even if it is suffering and personal sacrifice. And it is a woman's duty, what makes her whole and complete, to step into her role as a teacher of the children to give them their foundation and training in TheWay, so that they can grow up to be correct, whole, and complete, and ready to serve, in the capacity of which they are best capable.



When men lead women, women grow strong and confident. But when women lead men, the men grow weak and effeminate. It is to the betterment of women when they are led by men, and it is to the detriment of men when they are led by women. And the whole community will suffer. And it will likely will be destroyed aswell. Such was the case with the assemblies of the first century and such is the case with modern society in the 21st century. Women led the men, and the men grew weak and effeminate... And the women who were put in charge desired power rather than service. The women who usurped the authority of the man, feminized the men, so that neither were prepared to withstand the torment from the Roman Empire. The men neglected their duty to lead, and the women neglected their duty to teach the children and their fellow women, leaving the next generation, ill-prepared for persecution and ripe to be ruined by it.

The same is happening again in the attempt to restore The Way of old and reestablish the Torah among holy people again. Western society has conditioned men to follow women and women to lead the way... Which will inevitably lead to the same outcome as before, that the men will grow effeminate and weak and ill-prepared for the trouble to come. That said, it is very important in our day, since the feminization of the faith has already taken place, and most men are highly unqualified to hold a position of leadership let alone to teach in the community, that worthy women step up to fill the role left vacant. It is imperative for women in our day, who are wise and humble, and well trained in the Torah to perform the duty that men have forsaken in our day... Not to be the ones to rule and reign over the people... but to serve in the absence of men who have made themselves too weak and ignorant for the work... And it is imperative, that these women who do assume the role, do so to train men who can then step up and start striving manfully in The Way. And then, for such women who humbly stepped up in time of need in the position as servant of all to then step back down to serve in their natural capacity once again.

---

## **The Sign of the Covenant**

There are many arguments as to why men are supposed to be the teachers and the leaders, and the ones to hold the authority over the assembly to bear the responsibility, and to do the work, and for women, to be the helpers of their husbands, and their advisers and the teachers of their fellow women, and the teachers of their children... Most of the arguments, which are best Shaul did not bother to make. And the majority of situations in the world should function in this way, except for emergencies and deficiencies. But within the assemblies and among the followers of The Way, there is a reason why men are supposed to hold the position of authority and be responsible for

teaching and instruction in the community, a reason more important than all, a reason that does not apply to the nature of man in the wider world. That reason is circumcision.

The responsibility of leadership is upon the men of the assembly in a very literal sense! And infact the most literal. The sign of the covenant is physically cut into the flesh of men and not women - The sign or the covenant and therefore the obligation and the dreaded burden aswell as the blessed promises. The covenant of YHWH is what the leader is to be guarding and teaching and that covenant is a sexual covenant. Yes you read that right. This is a sexual covenant. Can we be adults here for a few minutes? Most preachers want to read it like the covenant is between the Creator and Mankind, to PG up the contract, to shift the symbol to water baptism and generalize it, but while water immersion is important it is not a remission of the symbol of the ancient covenant which is specifically between the Creator and Man via this sign of the covenant being phallic not vulvic.

The covenant could have been for all holy people to be dipped in water or to wear a certain type of clothing or cut their hair in a specific style. It could have been a command for everyone male and female to wear a pendant on a necklace or a ring on their finger. It could have been a symbolic tattoo or a gesture made by hand. But none of these were commanded as the sign. The sign was for the flesh of the foreskin of the males of Israel to be surgically removed on the eighth day of their life...and that in every generation to the ending of all time. The Creator could have even commanded a general genital surgery which would have applied for all people male and female but He did not. And to attempt such a sign would therefore be itself a violation of Divine Instruction and a perversion of the order from On High.

YHWH ordered Israel to perform surgery on the sons of Israel on their sex organs on the eighth day of their lives. Not the daughters of Israel. Yes it is a covenant between YHWH and Man. But it is still very much a sexual covenant aswell. Our Heavenly Father ordered Abraham to do this first and to circumcise all the men of his household also. He was ordered to do it not to express monotheism as many have made it out to be. He wasn't ordered to make this the sign of the covenant of Judaism as the later revision interprets it. He was told to make this the sign of the covenant, because YHWH promised Abraham that He would miraculously provide a child born to his aged wife well passed her prime. This is an act we know to be impossible, and yet it was the promise YHWH made; and circumcision is the sign established confessing uttermost trust that YHWH would provide exactly what He promised as He promised...and a commitment of Abraham to doing his part...that part being having sex with his wife.

Circumcision is a sign of absolute devotion to YHWH and a complete and total commitment to doing the will of YHWH, living by the word of YHWH, and doing everything YHWH has said...and doing so all in preparation for the promises YHWH has vowed to fulfill beyond our ability to

perform the parts that are impossible. Abraham could perform the *act* that would make the child but he could not actually *make* the child. All he could do was believe that YHWH would do what He swore to do, do himself the deeds he was commanded, and trust that YHWH would do the rest.

That is the sign YHWH made with Abraham and every man thereafter who belongs to Israel. And that is the most important reason why men are supposed to assume the responsibility of leadership...because though both men and women are bound to the covenant of their Creator, only men bear the burden thereof being the only ones who bear the sign thereof. Men bear the sign and the solemn obligation. It's not a sign that can be changed like clothing or easily removed like a necklace. It can't be altered like a hairstyle or avoided like a hand gesture. It is cut into his very flesh, into his sex organ so that he remembers the seriousness of the symbol.

This is not to the exclusion of women though. As mentioned, this is a sexual covenant and as they say "it takes two to tango". For a man this covenant is cut into his flesh, but for a woman it is not, lest it become a grotesquery. He is supposed to be given the sign in childhood and raised to understand its meaning and matchless value...but what of the women then? Men know the sign empirically and eventually gain intellectual knowledge thereof. The women of Israel are supposed to be raised knowing the sign intellectually, until they wed their man and can know that sign empirically. A man has the sign put upon him by his parents and the knowledge of its meaning put in mind by them thereafter. But eventually he has to choose to make the sign mean something, or it will simply be a common medical procedure as it is for so many in modern society. A woman does not have the sign put upon her by her parents but does have the knowledge of its meaning put in mind by them afforehand so that eventually she can choose to make the sign mean something more than a common medical procedure in modern society but only for the boys.

A man of Israel born to the covenant does not choose the sign or the covenant. He only chooses in adulthood to give it meaning, to make it matter. A woman born to the covenant (or otherwise) does infact choose the sign of the covenant *and* to give it meaning in the same moment. As mentioned this is a sexual covenant. By choosing a man who bears the sign of the covenant (who has likewise accepted the value of the symbol) and choosing to have sex with that man (meaning the actual biblical wedding as opposed to the pageantry and pomp and promises of the present time or the promiscuity popular in modernity) she chooses the covenant. And together they make children...children born of the covenant - boys who will be circumcised the eighth day and girls who will be raised to choose such a boy one day.

The Covenant is between a man and the Most High...but it is also between a man and his wife. It is a covenant of promise, a covenant of procreation, a covenant of creation. A man therefore bears responsibility for the covenant, for guarding it, living it, and teaching it to others, because he literally bears the covenant symbol cut into his very being. He has to lead, because he is physically

obligated to it. He literally promised to perform that task when he accepted the meaning of his circumcision. So if he is not leading and teaching by word and deed, he is breaking his part of the contract he made not only with the Almighty but with his bride...and by extension the entire community.

Again this is not telling women to sit down and shut up, to stay pregnant and live in the kitchen, though many messy ministers who have moved the focus off the sign of the covenant and away from the created nature have mistakenly made it out to be. This is about embracing the natural order of the world, keeping the covenant of old intact, and acting like it matters how the Most High made His people to be. He made Men to lead The Way, but He made Women to help the Men achieve success. This covenant is between Men and Elohim but it is also between Men and Women. And each must do their part. Shaul's problem wasn't with women preaching sermons or serving in positions of authority of exercising power in the community. As he stated clearly, his problem was with usurpation of covenant position. In that community the women were usurping the leadership position put upon the men in their circumcision. They were taking the obligations of men upon themselves to the overthrow of the men who were authorized to hold those offices.

In proper covenant, a man is meant to lead, principally because he has committed to the position which was committed to him. But also in proper covenant relationship he has not committed to lord over women as his servants, slaves, or sex-toys. Rather both men and women in proper covenant relationship have committed together to the positions which were committed to them...and each role in the covenant is both necessary and complementary. He can not perform her functions, and she can not perform his. Can each preach? Sure. Can each serve? Sure. Can each hold power and authority in the community? Sure. But it must be *according* to the covenant and not in *opposition* to it.

Ultimately, "Should women preach?" - is the wrong question. "*What* should women preach?" is the right question... If they are *not* preaching the covenant, then why are *they* preaching? If they *are* preaching the covenant then why are *they* preaching and *not* their men? *Men* are duty-bound to live, teach, and guard the covenant, so if a man *is* living, teaching, and guarding the covenant why is *he* not preaching? And if he is *not* living and teaching and guarding the covenant, why should *he* be preaching? And contrariwise, if a woman is the one *not* living, teaching, and guarding the covenant why *should* she be preaching? And if she *is* living and teaching and guarding the covenant why should she *not* be preaching? If *she* is living, teaching, and guarding the covenant and her husband is *not* then why should *she* not be preaching since the preaching is still needed? As long as she is well qualified (and a man is not) and she is not usurping the existing authority of a qualified man, or

if she is preaching in the authority of the man already authorized (not opposed to him), then the question should be “*why shouldn’t she preach?*”

