

Biblical Gender Roles – Part 6

James Smyda

June 18, 2016

Over the last several months, we've been working our way through a multiple-part sermon series on the subject of biblical gender roles. Today is the final installment of this series, so if you'd like a title for this sermon, it's

Biblical Gender Roles – Part 6

As I've mentioned previously in this series, today in the Western culture we find ourselves in a situation where gender roles are basically in the state of confusion. We have men who don't know how to be men, women who don't know how to be women and a society that, quite frankly, just denies the very fact that there are fundamental differences between the roles of men and women and tries to make it all exactly interchangeable.

This has primarily come about as a result of the feminist movement that has dominated our culture for probably the last 50 years. What they've done is basically completely remove biblical gender roles from our culture using a two-pronged approach. One has been teaching the idea that masculinity is inherently pathological and that men have to be feminized, basically for the safety of mankind.

They've also taught that for women, being in a feminine role is inherently oppressive; that it basically just leads to victimization, so naturally women should be more masculine and should compete with men for a masculine role. And this has created an absolute disaster in terms of the structure of the family in our culture in Western society.

As I mentioned in part 3, one of the things that this has resulted in in terms of the role of men is that rather than taking young boys and developing them into Godly men, it essentially often results in producing boys who can shave. In other words, young men grow chronologically into men but never really mature and take on a masculine role; the role that God intended for men to play.

A similar thing has happened with the role of women. We have a culture that tries to erase the entire concept that there are fundamental differences between men and women and it tries to make us exactly interchangeable. So instead of having a culture that teaches young girls how to grow up into Godly women, essentially what it tries to develop them to be is men who are biologically capable of bearing children. And the reason I mention that is because our culture very much tries to treat men and women as being exactly the same and completely interchangeable.

But there is one fundamental difference that you just can't deny between men and women. Women have babies and men don't. You just can't deny that one, regardless of how much indoctrination you try to give people, that's just a fundamental fact that

does not go away. So essentially, when they try to teach girls to grow up to be exactly like men, what they try to produce is men who are biologically capable of bearing children.

What I'd like to do today is finish up our series by covering the rest of the role of women and let's look at more fundamentally what God intended the distinct differences of the role for a woman to be as opposed to a man. We're going to see the word of God basically directly says that this is blaspheming the word of God for women to completely reject the role that God has intended for them.

To go through this in detail, let's start off first of all by turning over to Titus 2:4-5. But just to get the full context here, I'm going to start off in verse 1.

Titus 2:1. *But as for you, speak the things which are proper for sound doctrine: 2) that the older men be sober, reverent, temperate, sound in faith, in love, in patience; 3) the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things— (NKJV)*

Now before we go on to verses 4 and 5, I'd just like to point out one thing. Notice here in verse 3, it ended with *teachers of good things*. The reason I point that out is that previously in this series we talked about 1 Timothy 2 where Paul goes into the instructions regarding it is not appropriate for a woman to be teaching or having authority over a man. And as I mentioned what Paul is specifically addressing in that section of scripture is more roles of leadership within the church because if you read the next couple of verses beyond where he discusses that, the next thing he's talking about is the roles of the ministry and the roles of spiritual leadership within the church. And it talks about that that's a male role because even one of the qualifications is being the husband of one wife. So obviously that's not a role for women. And as we talked about that, I mentioned that this obviously doesn't mean that women aren't intelligent or have valuable experience that they can pass on and teach others because they certainly do. It was explaining that it was not their role to be in the ministry and teaching in services.

In verse 3 he specifically mentions that he wants the older women to be teachers of good things. So he wants them to be teachers. He wants them to pass on their wisdom and their experience. There's just appropriate context for that.

Now we're going to see here in verses 4 and 5, he's going through and basically telling the older women that they should be instructing the younger women and gives them a number of criteria of things he wants them to be teaching and to understand the significance of what's being addressed here in these next two verses.

I'm going to give you an analogy so you can understand really what he's addressing here. Picture this in an employment environment. Say you've got a department that focuses on a particular profession and you got some new hires that you're bringing into your department. And they're fresh out of school, they don't really have much

experience in this field and you want to teach them how to be successful in this particular role. So one of the things you typically do in a case like that is you get some of your older, more experienced employees who have shown from their performance that they're top performers and you assign them to work with the newbies that you just hired to teach them and mentor them how to be successful in this role. Well, if you're going to do that, what is the experienced employee going to focus on teaching the new hire in this role. They're typically going to cover the core fundamental elements, the things that you've got to master to be good at this profession because they want them to develop a good foundation in how to fulfill this role.

That's what's happening here in this verse. Paul is basically saying here's what the older ladies should be teaching the younger ladies because here's the fundamental elements that they've got to master to be good at this role. So this tells us a great deal about what God's role for women is focused upon and as we go through this, we'll see not only this in detail but also think of this in contrast to what the male role is and you can see how they're distinctly different. With that in mind, let's start in verse 4:

4) that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, (NKJV)

Oftentimes when we think about love in a biblical context, what immediately comes to mind is the concept of agape love. The Christian instruction to love our fellow man, to love others as Christ loved us. And those are certainly valid universal commands that the Bible gives to Christians. That's not really the concept of what this verse is getting at because as we're going to see here, the meaning of the words here of what Paul is referring to get more at the fundamental focus of the role of women and what he's really trying to express here. There's two different Greek words here that are translated into the phrases "love their husbands" and "love their children." They're unique terms. In fact it's two separate Greek words and both of them are only used once in the entire Bible and it's in this scripture. So they are unique terms, not the agape term that we're use to in 1 Corinthians 13 and various places throughout the Bible. These are unique terms.

So what are these terms really getting at? Well, first of all let me share with you the Greek word that's translated as "love their husbands." It's transliterated into English as philandros. It's Strong's 5362 and according to Helps Word Studies, it's defined as the following: *properly the special affection of a woman for her lifetime mate husband embracing him as her calling stewardship from God.* What it's talking about is the emphasis of her role, kind of what her priority is, what her focus is, that's what he's referring to here.

Let me also quote to you a section from Expositor's Bible Commentary by Frank E. Gaebelein. This is a comment on this particular verse, but in addressing this, he talks about these two terms and the idea being expressed here in this verse. He says:

To love their husbands and children renders two separate adjectives devoted to husbands, devoted to children. Such domestic affection stands at the very heart of any Christian home.

Now what he's getting to here is the focus of what the priority is, the emphasis of the role for a woman. What he's getting at is the concept of being nurturers of the family. That's a major priority for the role of a wife and mother.

To understand this a little further, let's look back at Adam and Eve in the garden and how God established these roles going forward and contrast to see some of the fundamental differences between the male role and the female role. We're going to see that there is certainly crossover in some of this but you're going to see the distinctly different emphasis of how He created them. So to do that, let's turn over to Genesis 2:18. This is prior to Eve being created. But this is the first reference where God talks about the need to create Eve.

Genesis 2:18. *And the LORD God said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him." (NKJV)*

This is the role he has in mind for Eve. She is to be the helper to him. Let's also contrast this with comments He makes to Adam about his role and we'll see some fundamental differences in the emphasis of what their roles were for. Look back up to verse 15:

15) Then the LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to tend and keep it. (NKJV)

Now as I explained in part 3 of this series, this is God establishing Adam's profession. His role was to be the gardener. As I mentioned last time, He tried to set Adam up for success here in establishing him in his role before Eve was even introduced into the equation. But my point here is He makes a point of saying "Adam, your role is you're going to be the keeper of the garden, this is your profession, this is your focus." It's not just about tending the garden. This is his profession and his role is to be the provider of the family, what we would call today the breadwinner. That's the primary focus of his role.

The reason I point that out is if you notice in the instructions here in these chapters, never do you see the comment to Eve that her major responsibility is to tend and to keep the garden. That's never stated. Now I'm not saying there weren't times that Eve didn't also assist Adam in doing that. Nor am I saying that Adam didn't also have roles in nurturing the family, of caring for their children and things of that nature. There's obviously some crossover there. But what you can see here is a significant difference in the emphasis of the roles they were supposed to play.

We can also see that when we look at God's conversations with them in terms of the consequences of what happened to them after they rebelled against God. In chapter 3 it explains to us that God gave Adam and Eve basically one major rule. "The tree of the knowledge of good and evil – leave that one alone. Everything else is yours. Just don't

touch that one.” So, of course, Satan goes out to tempt them to break the one rule. And as we know, he was successful in doing so. After all of that happens, we have recorded in chapter 3, three different conversations where God has a conversation with Satan and then with Eve and then with Adam. And the subject of those conversations is the consequences that would come to all three of them as a result of their part of this rebellion.

But to understand the significance of what we’re going to look at here, look at this in a larger context. As we’ve taught in the Church of God (I know my entire life) the two trees in the garden, of course they were two literal trees, but they also symbolized two different ways of life. We have the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. As we’ve always taught, the tree of life basically symbolized looking to God as a source of knowledge, following His way of life, following His instructions. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was more self-determination: “I’ll figure it out on my own, don’t need God,” – really following Satan’s way of life.

So what happens here when Adam and Eve reject the tree of life and they take the knowledge of good and evil when they take from that tree, they are rejecting God as the source of knowledge and rejecting following Him. Instead they follow Satan’s way of self-determination. Think of the consequences that’s going to have on their life. That’s not going to just affect a couple of areas of their life. Rejecting following God and deciding to do things their own way is going to have a universal effect across all of their life. But when God addresses the subject of consequences with them, He only addresses a couple of areas and He’s very specific in what He addresses. But if we look at this, we’re going to see this is consistent of what the primary emphasis of what their roles were.

Let’s notice now in Genesis 3 and we’ll start in verse 16. This is where He starts His conversation with Eve.

Genesis 3:16. *To the woman He said: "I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you." (NKJV)*

In part 4, we went into great detail covering what the latter part of verse 16 here is actually saying and what that means so I’m not going to cover that again. But what I want you to notice here in what He addresses with Eve is basically two things. He has basically addressed how this would affect her relationship with her children and her relationship with her husband. Think about that. That’s completely consistent with ... what’s her role? Devoted to husband, devoted to children. And what is He addressing? This is how this is going to affect your relationship with your children, your relationship with your husband. He is addressing how this is going to be affecting her primary role.

Now let’s read on regarding what He addresses with Adam. Because we’re going to see some interesting things here too.

17) Then to Adam He said, "Because you have heeded the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree of which I commanded you, saying, 'You shall not eat of it': "Cursed is the ground for your sake; In toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life.

18) Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you, and you shall eat the herb of the field.

19) In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for dust you are, and to dust you shall return." (NKJV)

What is He addressing with Adam? "Here is how it's going to affect your profession. Here's how it's going to affect your role as provider of the family. You're going to have to work a lot harder, it's going to be a lot more difficult for you than if you'd stayed in the garden and did what I told you to do." So He's saying this is how it's going to affect the primary part of Adam's role as provider. It is going to be a lot harder.

And He told Eve that her role as nurturer of the family, caring for her husband and children, is going to be a lot harder in both cases.

What's also an interesting observation if you look at these two; if you look at how men and women in general tend to be psychologically wired, it's consistent with these things. Now I realize there are always exceptions. When you make a generality someone can say "Well I know a person that doesn't totally fit that." That's always true. But look at this in general: how men tend to be wired and how women tend to be wired and you'll find an interesting parallel to everything that's been talked about here.

The reason I mention that is because when He talks with Adam, what He is primarily focusing on here, in fact almost exclusively focusing on here, is how it's going to affect his profession, his work. Men in general have a tendency to not only focus in terms of their efforts towards their career, they tend to focus on their identity and their self-worth, their well-being, is oftentimes attached to their career. You'll find men oftentimes define who they are as a human being as a result of that.

What I mean by that is if you look at a man who has been unemployed against his will for an extended period of time, you can find that that can be psychologically very difficult for a man to deal with. And much more beyond the issue of the loss of income. For anybody, if their source of income and support is cut off, that can be difficult. But for a lot of men, that can be psychologically devastating outside of the issue of just the loss of income. You can even see cases where if a man is unemployed for a length of time, especially if his profession, the demand for what he does or what his talent is, for some reason goes away or those jobs get off-shored or he gets injured and he's not able to perform the type of work he's always done before, men can literally get to the point where they're committing suicide as a result of this situation because for them it's not just an issue of the financial support being gone, it's a threat to their very identity and their sense of self-worth and how they have defined themselves.

You oftentimes find women are wired a bit differently in this regard. Women tend to define their identity and their self-worth more often in their relationships than they do necessarily in their career. Not that a job is not important to them and, of course, a source of income is as well. But oftentimes women tend to have to have a broader sense of how they define their self-worth and identity as a human being.

My point here is how we are psychologically wired oftentimes correlates with these roles. As I was going through and studying this subject and noticing a lot of these parallels (I tend at times to have kind of a sarcastic sense of humor) and when I would see some of these corollaries I would sarcastically joke and say, "You know it's almost like somebody planned it that way. It's almost like it was done by design." Because it was. This was done by design. God designed us and created us for different unique roles and that's why He made us inherently different and He made our psychological and emotional makeups consistent with these as well because He designed us for different purposes. Because that's what He had in mind. So it was done by design.

Let me also clarify one other thing here. I'm not saying that there's not a crossover here. Obviously, yes, the role of men is to be the provider for the family. That doesn't mean he doesn't also have responsibility for nurturing his children as well. And caring for them. It's just a primary emphasis. Obviously it doesn't mean that the wife and mother doesn't also contribute to the household, providing for the family. I'm not saying that that's inherently bad for there to be crossover. There naturally is. But what I'm getting at is that there is an inherent difference in the focus of where this is going. We have a culture today that basically tries to teach women everything about the roles that we're going to cover here today is inherently bad and oppressive. And they should reject all of that, they should be totally just like men and reject everything about this focus for women. As we can see here in Titus, that's basically blaspheming the word of God because it also undermines the structure of the family and the roles that God intended for us to play.

Let's turn back over to Titus, chapter 2. We'll pick up here in verse 5. In the beginning of verse 5 it mentions to be discreet and chaste. Now, there's a couple of concepts that we're going to address that are related to this. In my notes, I've titled this as femininity and modesty or morality you might say in terms of the focus. Because what we're getting at here with "chaste" is obviously more of living a pure, moral, and modest-type approach in life. "Discrete" is referred to, as we're going to see here in 1 Peter, as a gentle and quiet spirit. It's very much more of a feminine, gentle nature.

And if you notice our culture today, very much the opposite is what is encouraged. Oftentimes what you see in our culture today is much more encouraging women to be aggressive, to be brash, to be kind of in your face. It's oftentimes focused more in terms of being strong and independent, but what do you oftentimes see when you see those words being thrown around? And I'm not by any means against women being strong if you're looking at it from a Godly perspective of strong character and standing for their principals, but what do you oftentimes see in our popular culture today?

When you talk about strong and independent, oftentimes what I see coming across in our culture is more the picture of the in your face, finger snapping, hand waving, head bobbing, I've got attitude, and I'm loud and brash. It's kind of the whole focus of their idea of strong and independent, and it's exactly the opposite of what God tells us is the feminine role. To see that, turn over to 1 Peter, chapter 3. We're going to pick up here in verse 1.

- 1 Peter 3:1.** *Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives,*
2) *when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear.*
3) *Do not let your [beauty] be out outward [adorning of the] arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—*
4) *rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible [ornament] of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. (NKJV)*

What he's saying here is more of a gentle, feminine nature. That is what he's encouraging. He's saying this is very precious to God. So it's no surprise that our culture despises this and wants to tell women that they should be the exact opposite. They should be brash and aggressive and in your face and full of attitude because obviously they're going to hate everything that God would promote and want to promote the exact opposite.

He also mentions here not using beauty, basically physical appearance beauty, to attract attention to themselves. He's not trying to say that it's inherently bad for a woman to dress nicely, but he's saying don't let your physical appearance, your beauty, be your self-worth and that to be the focus of how you present yourself. Because look at what our culture encourages today. Typically it's the very opposite of a gentle and quiet spirit.

It's also typically the exact opposite of being chaste (there in Titus). When I was doing research for this sermon, one particular speaker said that it's basically a culture that encourages women that they should dress and behave like strippers and hookers and they should expect to receive the respect of a lady at the same time, which is inherently a contradiction. But they're constantly encouraged to behave in that way and then if they don't receive the respect of a lady, it's like they've been victimized that they are not able to have their cake and eat it too. Which is a very delusional idea.

Think about the whole concept of what our culture puts across as the idea. Again, it's the loud, brash, very immodest, very overtly immoral-type of behavior. It's basically the very characterization of what we see in the proverbs as the immoral woman.

In Proverbs 5, 6 and 7, the primary emphasis is a warning to young men not to be taken in by immoral women. Basically warning them when they see this, run in the other direction because this would destroy their life. She could turn them into a crust of bread (it actually says "reduce you to a crust of bread"), run for your life, run in the other

direction, just don't have anything to do with this. That is the warning through all this. But it's interesting if you notice in chapter 7, starting in verse 10, the characterization is given of what an immoral woman looks like.

Proverbs 7:10. *And there a woman met him, with the attire of a harlot, and a crafty heart. (NKJV)*

In other words, she's the exact opposite of chaste. She's not modest at all and she has a very evil heart. Now notice verse 11:

11) She was loud and rebellious, her feet would not stay at home. (NKJV)

She was the exact opposite of a quiet and gentle spirit. She's the in your face, brash, aggressive individual who again is very immodest and behaves very immorally. You know, as I mentioned before, I heard one speaker say it and I thought it just summed up a lot of what our culture teaches women to be. It puts across the idea that women should dress and behave like strippers and hookers and at the same time expect to receive the respect of a lady. Like there shouldn't be any consequences to this behavior.

It's somewhat like what I talked about last time in part 5. When I mentioned that our culture puts across the idea that as long as there's a benefit or an upside being addressed, what we hear is strong, powerful, independent, empowered women and, of course, they should have all of that. And as soon as we talk about something where's there is a consequence or accountability for bad behavior, suddenly it's helpless victim.

Let me give you a classic example of this that ties into the subject we've been addressing here. In the last year or so, I saw an interview on one of these morning news shows, a lady named Emily Ratajkowski. You might be familiar with that name. She's a young lady in her 20's, primarily famous for being a model. She's been in magazines and music videos and things of that nature and had small parts in movies, but the vast majority of her career is modeling related. To politely describe the type of modeling that she does, let's just put it this way: She's not modeling dresses for the J.C. Penny catalog. The type of modeling she is more famous for doing is where she's basically flaunting her body with little or no clothing on. But she had a small part in a movie that was being released around that time and, of course, she was being interviewed about that. The reporter started asking her some questions about a particular photo shoot she had done recently in some magazine that was very overtly sexual in the nature of how it had been put across. And the reporter was asking her, and I forget the exact question, but the theme of it was: Isn't this over the top? Isn't this too extreme – what you're doing? And Emily starts quickly defending this and she starts going down the road of that it's just art, and it's artistic and it's empowering and it should be treated that way. And the reporter starts asking more questions, asking if it's immoral and inappropriate. Not those exact words, but that's the concept of where she was going.

And then what's interesting to me is, Emily, right after that, starts going down the road of "that's just men that do that, and if those patriarchal men would just stop sexualizing women and looking at them like this, they should just stop doing this." So basically she's putting across the idea that as soon as there's any judgment or negativity of this, that she's being victimized. And she's expressing the desire that men should just stop doing this, stop looking at it like that because that oppresses women. And honestly when I heard this, I busted out laughing. And let me explain why.

Imagine a world where she gets her wish. Because just suspend reality for a moment and imagine a world where God's up there listening to this interview and He hears her express the desire that men should just stop thinking like this, stop having that visual attraction sexually toward women and He decides He's going to grant her wish. God flips the switch and basically changes the whole nature of men and that goes away. Guess what disappears at the exact same moment. Her career. Her wealth, the attention, the fame, the desire for anybody to be interviewing her on television. That would all instantaneously stop because the reason that she is famous is because there is a market for what she does. Again, I'm not defending her behavior or the lust that created the attraction to that, but the reason that she is able to manipulate this, to be famous, to have some wealth and such is because men are wired like that. So what she wants is this delusional world where she can have her cake and eat it too where she can exploit this to her advantage but face no negative consequences as a result of it. And this is what our culture constantly tells women is a realistic idea.

It's absolutely delusional. It's bought into this idea that you can have it all and that is absolutely delusional, nobody gets to have it all. In fact that is an absolute setup for an unhappy life.

Think of it like this: Happiness equals reality minus expectations. If your expectations are you're going to have it all, reality is never going to live up to that and you're going to be perpetually unhappy. And that is just a reality of life. That is what our culture in many ways has set women up to be. They're very much encouraging them to be the opposite of everything that God has said and then to expect that they can do that with no consequences which is just crazy.

Turn back over to Titus chapter 2 and we'll pick up here on the rest of verse 5. After being chaste, the next thing he mentions is being homemakers. Now the Greek word here for homemakers is basically exactly what the English word implies. The Greek word here is transliterated as "oikouros," it's Strong's 3626 and according to The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the New Testament by Spiro Zodhiates, it is defined as *a keeper at home, one who looks after domestic affairs with prudence and care*. So it's basically what the terms implies.

I know even discussing this particular subject in today's culture is just asking for an argument but this is directly what the Bible is mentioning here. If you'll turn over to 1 Timothy chapter 5, we'll see Paul mention another scripture that gets at this exact same idea.

1 Timothy 5:14. *Therefore I desire that the younger widows marry, bear children, manage the house, give no opportunity to the adversary to speak reproachfully. (NKJV)*

The phrase here, “manage the house,” if you look at the Greek word, it has the exact same meaning of what the English is saying here. It’s transliterated into English as “oikodespoteho.” It’s Strong’s 3616 and according to The Complete Word Study Dictionary of the New Testament by Spiro Zodhiates, it is defined as *to govern or manage a household or the domestic affairs of a family*. So you see it means exactly what the English words say. Again, we’re getting at this concept of the nurturer of the family or the keeper of the home.

As you can see here, there’s a distinct difference here because if you look at the role of men, never do you see these terms used specifically towards the role of men. So you can see an obvious difference of emphasis of what God intended here.

There’s also another interesting lesson we can glean from this. As I mentioned before, God created us in terms of our wiring with these kinds of roles in mind. So it’s not an accident in terms of our natural proclivities as human beings when we look at these particular roles because it was done by design.

The reason I mention that is because today’s society has done everything it can to completely blur and make the roles of men and women exactly interchangeable. Lots of couples approach it in that way. Oftentimes there is crossover and I’m not trying to say one is always on one side or always on the other, that’s not the case. But if you watch where the emphasis of our roles are, God created us with this in mind.

The reason I mention that is oftentimes one of the things that can create conflicts in marriage (if they’re approaching this as if those roles are exactly the same and interchangeable) is oftentimes a wife having the expectations that her husband is going to be just as good and have just as much emphasis on the domestic issues in terms of caring for the home, having the same level of care, being as diligent and as detailed about it as she is. And that’s normally not going to happen. Now I’m not saying that men shouldn’t do their part in taking care of things at home. But what I’m getting at is oftentimes this expectation is put across like it’s realistic that he’s going to be just as attentive and just as good at it and as diligent in the household duties as she is, and that’s generally not the case.

That’s the logical equivalent of the husband expecting that his wife is going to be just as good at the car repairs and the home repairs and all the mechanical stuff as he is. That’s generally not the case. There’s obviously exceptions to that because there are some wives that are very mechanical and there are some husbands who are great at home stuff, but you should know that as a general rule, one tends to be better than the other.

One of the things that you'll see put across in our TV and movies quite often, especially in sitcoms, is that the husband is constantly being belittled in the show because he is not as good at these things as the wife is. There's a reason for that. It's because we're designed that way. Obviously if you're God and you intended for husbands to have certain responsibilities and wives to have certain responsibilities, you would create them more likely to have proclivities in those areas, to be better at it, because that's just consistent with what your plan was.

I'm not saying this is an excuse for men to always be taking the trash out or that he has to be asked a hundred times to do it; I'm not giving you an excuse for everything. But I'm just saying look at this realistically. Because to expect that that's going to be exactly the same way is the logical equivalent of the husband expecting that the wife is going to be as good at repairing the car as the typical husband is, which is generally not the case. And the reason that that is the case is again, it's by design. It is because somebody planned it that way. God planned us with these differences because he had different roles for us in mind.

This doesn't mean that there's not crossover because husbands have a responsibility of helping to nurture children, to help out at home and it doesn't mean that the wife can't also be helping to provide for the family. But the focus is that He created us with different emphases in mind and better at different things so we would complement one another. That was what the objective was about here.

Now, am I saying that that's inherently bad for the wife to work outside the home? I know that can be a hot topic at times. No, I'm not saying that and if you'll turn to Proverbs 31, we can see clearly that that's not the case. As you know, Proverbs 31 is oftentimes considered our go-to chapter to see the example of a Godly woman. We often refer to the "Proverbs 31 woman" as the quintessential example of what a Godly woman is. We're not going to read through this entire section. But you're going to see the same emphasis of devoted to husband, devoted to children, the domestic-related responsibilities. But that's not the only thing you're going to see and that's what I want you to realize, and there's definitely some crossover here. So start in verse 10:

Proverbs 31:10. *Who can find a virtuous wife? For her worth is far above rubies.*

11) The heart of her husband safely trusts her; so he will have no lack of gain.

12) She does him good and not evil all the days of her life.

13) She seeks wool and flax, and willingly works with her hands.

14) She is like the merchant ships, she brings her food from afar.

15) She also rises while it is yet night, and provides food for her household, and a portion for her maidservants. (NKJV)

Now notice verse 16:

16) She considers a field and buys it; from her profits she plants a vineyard. (NKJV)

Notice what's being addressed here. Of course, this is in the context of an agrarian society, but if she's buying a field and planting a vineyard, that's significantly more of an undertaking than if she has a garden patch out in the back yard and growing a few vegetables. If she's buying a field and planting a vineyard, this is significant work. Today we would call this working outside the home. Because if she's buying a field and planting a vineyard, that's a significant undertaking. So notice here I'm not saying it's inherently bad for a wife to work outside the home because obviously this is our poster child for the perfect Godly woman and she's doing some of this too. So that's not inherently bad.

Also notice that if you read through what else is discussed in this chapter, it doesn't become the situation where the whole concept of the nurture of the family and being devoted to the husband and children gets lost just to climb the corporate ladder. Because you see lots of emphasis on caring for the family as well. And it's not this issue where that all gets pushed aside because she has to climb the corporate ladder. That emphasis for caring for the family role is still very much there but she's also doing other things.

Also look at verse 24 to cover this same concept again here. It says:

24) She makes linen garments and sells them, and supplies sashes for the merchants. (NKJV)

She's got a sewing business here. She's doing a lot more than just doing the dishes and taking care of the kids. And this is all a matter of emphasis. And it can also be timing as well because just like if a mother has several young children, that's much more labor intensive in demanding what the needs are there. This is a fluctuating role in terms of what are the needs at the time and also what real life circumstances are. Circumstances and the reality of life can sometimes force you into the roles of what you have to do. They're not always ideal but that's just reality. We all have to bend and to deal with that.

What I wanted you to see in all of this is that I'm not at all saying that it's inherently bad for a wife to work outside the home because we can clearly see in the Bible this aspect as well.

Turn back over to Titus chapter 2. We can finish up here in verse 5.

Titus 2:5b. ...obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed. (NKJV)

As I mentioned here before, our culture tries to basically teach young women to be men who are biologically capable of bearing children; to basically reject everything God says about a feminine role and take on the masculine role. As we can see here from the Bible, first of all, that's directly blaspheming the word of God because it covers all the

basic fundamental elements of the female role. It says you want to emphasize this and fulfill these roles so that you're not blaspheming the word of God. God does not buy into this feminist idea at all.

Notice our last concept here. It says *obedient to their own husband*. Now this is getting at the concept of submission and we talked quite a bit about this in the fifth part of this series. So I'm not going to cover all that ground again. One of the things I mentioned last time is that this whole concept of submission in marriage, the wife submitting to the leadership of their husbands in marriage, is just considered absolutely anathema in our culture today. If you want to start an argument and get people wanting to fight, just bring up that concept.

As I also mentioned, what is probably more common in the church in addressing this is not necessarily rejecting the whole idea, it's treating it like a liberal's view of tolerance. If you're familiar with our current culture today, oftentimes you'll see people who have a liberal, leftist point of view in terms of politics. They talk about the concept of tolerance. But what you find is that oftentimes if you disagree with them, you're going to see no tolerance whatsoever because very quickly you're going to find if you disagree with them, they have absolutely no tolerance for your point of view. They look at it like essentially if you disagree with them, that's hate speech and they don't have to tolerate hate speech. So really what it comes down to is it's really just words that they talk about because in their mind they tolerate people – those that exactly agree with them. You don't have to tolerate somebody who completely agrees with you. You only have to tolerate someone who significantly disagrees with you and you're respecting their right to disagree.

Sometimes submission gets looked at the same way. It's sometimes like this: "I submit to my husband as long as I agree 100% with his decisions." Well, you don't have to submit to someone you 100% agree with; you're just both doing what you completely agree with. You only have to submit to someone when you don't totally see everything eye to eye and someone has to make the final call and that's where submission plays into it.

What oftentimes happens, and I see it in Church of God circles, they place so many qualifiers on this concept of submission that it almost becomes meaningless. It's like as long as the husband is doing 100% his role, and he's doing everything perfect in his role, then the wife will submit to him. But if he's not, then she doesn't have to.

This concept of submission is not an excuse for husbands to be abusive and to be authoritarian jerks. We've covered that concept. Just to dispel this idea of it has to be the husband just being perfect in order for the wife to submit, turn back over to 1 Peter chapter 3, verse 1.

1 Peter 3:1. *Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, ... (NKJV)*

Notice this next phrase:

- 1b) *that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives,*
- 2) *when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. (NKJV)*

Now if the husband is not obeying the word, is he perfectly fulfilling the Godly role? Of course not. He's not doing everything perfect. My point here is if you want to understand this concept, reverse it all and I think that makes it pretty clear. In other words, picture a situation where husbands look at it and say, "I don't have to fulfill the command to love and dwell with understanding with my wife unless she is perfectly submitting and doing everything perfect as a wife, then I'm exempt from showing love and understanding." Would anybody buy that argument? Of course not. You look at it and say, "No, no, no. You have to show love and understanding because that's what you agreed to when you got married." When you give a marriage vow, you agree that you are going to love your wife as Christ loved the church. That's how it works. And that's right.

Well, submission is the same way. The responsibility is on both sides. We talked a lot about this last time but I just wanted to address that because that's probably the more common ditch in the Church of God circles.

To sum all this up, as I mentioned in a lot of this series, our current culture has tried to, as much as it can, to erase the concept of biblical gender roles. The sales pitch that has been used to do that is that basically these roles are inherently oppressive, that they lead people into oppression and rejecting them is leading them out of oppression. What I want you to see is that that is the exact opposite of the truth. I'll explain that statement a little bit later as we go forward.

What has happened here in the U.S. and other western nations with this feminist movement is Genesis 3 on a national level. On this whole idea of oppression, if you look at societies that are oppressive in the 20th and 21st centuries, I think it would be easy to argue that some of the most oppressive societies that we have seen throughout our lifetimes have been socialistic, Communist societies. If you're familiar at all with history, especially throughout the 20th century, these are the nations you would typically see people risking their life to try to escape from. They were oftentimes the cultures that would build walls – not the kind of walls where it's trying to keep illegal immigrants from coming in – these were the societies to keep their citizens from escaping and getting out. And in spite of that, their citizens would risk their lives trying to escape from them. That's how severe the oppression was.

Not only that, these were the societies that are famous for murdering millions of their own people, not just in battles with other nations, but murdering their own people, trying to maintain this system. Let me explain because the reason I'm going down this road is because this is intimately connected with the subject of gender roles but this will be a little bit long-winded for me to put all this together. So just follow me here and you'll see the connection.

If you've ever studied Socialism, Russia was kind of the major first nation, developed into the Soviet Union, who implemented this in the 20th century. And if you look at the philosophy of how they went about it, you would understand exactly why I'm discussing why gender roles in this are an important issue. Feminism is very much a socialistic philosophy, and let me show you the connection there. What I want you to see is that this doesn't lead people out of oppression, it leads people into oppression. Because if you're familiar at all with Socialism and the whole Communistic-type philosophy, this is very much an ideology that is based upon the idea of the redistribution of wealth. Again, the sales pitch is very much the same. It's all about equality and equal fairness and in reality it results in massive oppression because this whole idea of the redistribution of wealth requires a very big, controlling, totalitarian government to really bring this about on a national level.

Now governments basically get their wealth through taxing people. Governments don't produce wealth within themselves. They do it through taxation of the people. If you have a society that looks like the U.S. did from the 1960s and prior to that where the norm more or less was the husbands were the breadwinners who were out in the workforce and more often than not the women were wives and mothers primarily taking care of the home and again, making a very meaningful contribution to society, but doing so in such a way that's not so easily taxed. If you're a society that wants to implement this type of socialistic control of people, you need funding for this large government to be able to do this. So one of the things that's to your benefit is to convince the women that the home is inherently oppressive and you need to get them out into the workforce because it accomplishes a couple of things from a state level. It doubles your workforce and if you can get the other half of the adult population out into the workforce in terms of what your nation can produce from a business perspective, it also doubles your tax revenue. Then you have twice as many people that you can pull income from and basically increase the wealth you have to be able to implement this over-powerful state.

Also, because this system always basically implodes upon itself, because again, if you look at history through the 20th and 21st centuries, the Communist and Socialist nations always implode upon themselves at some point.

It requires a lot in indoctrination to get people to buy into this idea. The other thing that you can accomplish is that if you get all the moms out of the home and out working, you're now requiring daycare. If you can get state-run daycares, you can start indoctrinating the children at a very young age and basically start shaping their minds to this whole system. A strong family unit is in opposition to a totalitarian government in this regard. Again, if you study the history of all this, you'll find this type of approach for gender roles was a fundamental element to how Russia went about trying to implement Socialism Communism. Because it's very much this type of philosophy.

If you're familiar with the Soviet Union and other nations like them, what this resulted in was murdering millions of their own people and an oppressive society that people were trying their hardest to risk their lives to flee from and to get away from.

If you look at the whole subject of gender roles, the erasing of gender roles as God described them in the Bible was the fundamental element to this entire system. What I want you to see is that this doesn't lead people out of oppression. It leads them into oppression. God knew exactly what he was talking about when he established these roles. And this is basically how it tears apart the family.

The other thing that you want to do in a socialistic society is encourage single parenthood because single moms are more likely to be dependent upon the state and you want them dependent upon this all and powerful state because that's the totalitarian control idea. And they're more likely to raise their children to be looking towards the state as well. This also gives you this totalitarian control.

I mentioned Genesis 3 on a national level. Think about what happened in the Garden of Eden. Satan's sales pitch to Eve was that God was cheating her out of equality, that He was trying to hold her down and oppress her and if she would eat the fruit, it would empower her. But what he was doing was leading them out of the Garden of Eden. They were in paradise. They weren't being oppressed. He wasn't leading them out of oppression. He was leading them into oppression.

And here's why I call it Genesis 3 on a national level because this is what happened to our culture in the U.S. If you look at the story of what happened in Genesis 3, it reveals the fundamental weaknesses, you might say the most vulnerable areas for men and for women. Satan is evil but he's not stupid. He's very crafty in how he comes to people and he generally comes to people wherever they are most vulnerable. Look at how he played upon Adam and Eve. He went after Eve with a victim argument. He came to her and told her she was being oppressed and held down and offered her empowerment to lead her out of it, and he deceived her and she bought into it.

We also know that Adam wasn't deceived. We are told that in 1 Timothy 2. He wasn't deceived and he knowingly went along with this. Why did he do that? You have to understand what the primary fundamental vulnerability for men is. It's typically women. What I mean by that is that their desire to please women, their desire to impress, sometimes their lust after them, that is oftentimes a man's Achilles' heel. To see that, just look at it like this: the wisest men who ever lived, Solomon; the strongest man who ever lived, Samson; and the man after God's own heart, King David – what was the downfall of every single one of them? They put their desire to please or to impress or lust after women higher than their desire to please God. What did Adam get in trouble for? Because he listened to the words of his wife. And we know from 1 Timothy 2 that he wasn't deceived. He didn't buy Satan's argument. He was trying to please Eve. What happened here was Satan approaches Eve, convinces her that she is being victimized, held down and oppressed. He then utilizes her as a tool to get Adam to go along because that's his weakness. He's playing on both of their fundamental weaknesses and he's very strategic on how he plays this out. Then he marches them both into oppression. He convinces Eve that she's a victim, gets her to lead, he passively follows, and they march into oppression.

This is exactly what has happened to us as a nation. What happened in the 1960s? You have Betty Friedan writing The Feminine Mystique which is widely recognized as the kicking off of second wave feminism in the U.S. and then you get a growing social movement of more and more women standing up and saying that they're being oppressed and held down and it's the patriarchy. Examine that argument versus the Socialist argument and you're going to find they're identical, they just changed who the oppressor is. In Socialism it's Capitalism; and in feminism it's the patriarchy. It's the same argument, we just changed who the bad guy was. What a lot of people don't tell you is that Betty Friedan and a lot of people who supported her in kicking off the feminist movement were Communist sympathizers. They were basically putting across a Socialist agenda and a movement that could kick it off. In the 1960s in the U.S. there wasn't a lot of funding and support for Socialistic movements. Coming right out and saying Capitalism is the great evil and we've got to fight that got a lot of resistance. But saying that the great enemy is the patriarchy packaged it in a way that it would sell. And that's basically what happened.

A lot of the women were saying that they were oppressed and held down and victimized by men and a lot of the men went along, "Ok, we don't want you to be victimized; we'll accommodate you; we want to impress the girls." So the women started leading, the men started passively following and we marched off the cliff. It was Genesis 3 on a national level. That's what has happened to our nation and that's what we bought into and we have gone down this road. Today we find ourselves in this situation. Just turn on your television set. It will constantly tell you how horrible men are. They're incompetent, they're stupid, they're idiots and they're the oppressors of society. And men have bought into that. Lots of men now campaign for it because what is a man's greatest weakness? The reason I say that is because of the examples I've given, but look at society today and even through biblical history. When men allow their desire for women, sometimes their lust for them, sometimes their desire to please and impress them, they will do the stupidest things if they put that before their desire to please God.

Look at Samson. At the end of his life he was imprisoned by the Philistines, he was blinded and his strength is taken away from him. When I read that story and look at what he did with Delilah, I scratch my head and think how could he not see that coming? Because look at what happened. At least three times prior to the time he actually tells her the secret to his strength, she kept asking him the secret and he would give her a fake answer. And she immediately tried to ruin him with it. He goes through this at least three times and she always comes back with, "If you really love me, you'd tell me." And then he finally tells her. Then, surprise, surprise – he winds up being taken captive and being blinded. How could he not see that coming?

Men tend to get tunnel vision. When their hormones and emotions get in charge of their thinking and that dominates their brain, men oftentimes get tunnel vision and don't see anything else. If you've ever asked yourself the question: Why did Adam go along with this when we know he was not deceived? As God said, "Because you listened to the

words of your wife.” And I’m not blaming it all on Eve. Adam made the decision to put his desire to please Eve above his desire to please God.

That’s what has happened to our nation in regards to gender roles. I’m not saying that there’s even been a time in our history where we did it all right and everybody was treated fairly. I’m not suggesting that for a moment. But just compare the major statistics of where we are today, the divorce rate, the single parenthood, illegitimacy, your marriage participation rate; compare that to the 1960s like I did in part 1 of this series. We are dramatically worse off today. How did we get here? Through the feminist movement. Genesis 3 on a national level is what has taken place here.

That’s how we have thrown out everything God has said and marched in this direction. But what I wanted you to see in making this presentation in this regard is that I mentioned all throughout this series, the whole sales pitch in what our culture has tried to sell us on is the idea that gender roles as God teaches in the Bible is inherently evil and oppressive and just leads to bad and we should throw it all out. That is exactly the opposite of the truth.

It is just like Genesis 3 because what happened? When Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Eden, life was pretty good. And what did they do? Satan sold them on the idea that they were being victimized and that they needed to follow him. And he marched them into oppression and not away from oppression. That is what has happened with us.

Again, we’re not going to turn the culture around. We’re not going to change our culture. We know how that story ends. It’s with the day of the Lord and it’s not pretty. All that we can do is recognize how this culture has affected us individually and try to rid this leaven from our own lives and practice God’s principals in our own personal lives. That’s all that we can do as individuals because we can’t change the culture.

I just wanted to give you the overall picture of this so you understand just how badly our culture has brainwashed us and tried to pervert our perceptions on this subject to see things exactly upside down – calling good evil and evil good. That’s essentially what has happened. The culture hasn’t been trying to lead us out of oppression. It’s trying to lead us into oppression.

Brethren, that’s about all I’m going to cover for this series and again, this has been a very huge topic and I honestly only skimmed the surface.