

WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY

THE ROLES OF MEN AND WOMEN: EQUIPPING GOD'S PEOPLE TO KEEP
COMMUNICATING SCRIPTURAL TRUTHS ABOUT MALE HEADSHIP

SUBMITTED TO PROF. BRAD WORDELL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE MASTER OF DIVINITY PROGRAM

BY
NATHAN R. LASKA
FEBRUARY 24, 2018

ABSTRACT

The Role of Men and Women has been a fiercely discussed topic since God populated the world with one married couple. Many Christians might respond by saying that it is a discussion they would just as soon avoid. Many conservative Christians fear the retaliation of the world. Granted, the role of men and women would not be a topic a Christian canvasser would initiate on a prospect's doorstep. However, the discussion is not one a Christian should try to avoid.

If and when these conversations concerning roles do arise, what can a conservative biblical Christian say to end the discussion? Here lies the crux of this thesis. The goal is not for the conversation to cease; instead, the goal is to keep the conversation going. God's principle of different roles between men and woman and his principle of male headship are beautiful teachings from Scripture. These teachings do not suppress one sex; they lift both sexes up within marriage, within the church and the world at large.

This thesis is organized by the different words, phrases and ideas which historically catalyze discussions with strong emotions on the topic of the role of men and women. It intends to encourage men to serve the women in their lives, and to see their wives as Christ sees the Church. Also, its purpose is to reassure Christian women who struggle with the head-helper principle in a world hostile to it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
ORDER OF CREATION.....	3
EQUALITY OF STATUS	19
DIFFERENT ROLES	28
SUBMISSION	38
I DO NOT HAVE A VOICE IN MY CHURCH.....	46
CONCLUSION.....	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52

INTRODUCTION

A secular high school social studies teacher poses the question to his classroom, “Did you know there is still a Lutheran denomination that does not allow its women to vote?” A member of that church body in question says nothing as he sits in that classroom. When the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America decided to allow homosexuals to serve as pastors, a man who desired to leave the ELCA church body expressed, “I would switch to the Wisconsin Synod if they did not treat their women so poorly.” A young man in the room who belonged to the Wisconsin Synod did not know what to say.

As the world focuses more and more on equality, papers within our own church body are written challenging the concept of the *order of creation* (meaning that God has structured his creatures to function a certain way) leaving many congregations in a cloud of confusion. What do the scriptures say about male headship and the roles of men and women? If Scripture teaches the order of creation, how then can we best positively talk about the roles of men and women and male headship? There are many words and phrases which spark robust emotional discussion. How can we equip our men and women not to shrink back when the topic of men and women roles arise? The worst thing biblical adherents could do would be to say nothing and hope that these words and conversations about roles go away.

The purpose of this paper is to encourage our men and women to share what the Bible says in a society which struggles to see the beauty of God’s prescription concerning men and women Roles. The relationship between men and women is the heartbeat of human interaction. The roles of men and women is a topic as timely as it is controversial. The writer has organized

this paper by using different words and phrases known to be used as discussion enders in conversations about the roles of men and women: *Order of Creation*, *Equality of Status*, *Difference of Roles*, *Submission*, and “*I do not have a voice in my church.*” The goal is not for the dialogue to stop. These words and phrases do not end discussions about roles; instead, they begin conversations. Social movements and a wage gap between the sexes will not be covered. The idea of male headship being the more forward-thinking, benevolent, humanitarian way of life will be unfolded. Let God’s people refer to Scripture in all matters; to God be the glory.

ORDER OF CREATION

Even within conservative church bodies, there is confusion as to what ‘*order of creation*’ means and to what realm it applies. Some see the roles of men and women as roles which only apply within marriage, or only with marriage and church. Many see a measuring line alongside the roles of men and women indicating “This biblical teaching only goes so far. It does not apply to society at large.” Wherever a person might fall along this conceptual measuring line, Christians who adhere to the principle of man and woman roles in marriage, church and society, need not be discouraged as they converse with their fellow Christians on this topic.

“Doctrine should be based on explicit teaching and not an inferred assumption. Do the first three chapters of Genesis clearly establish a moral law called the ‘order of creation’ governing male/female relationships apart from marriage? The evidence seems weak.”¹ It is safe to say that all conservative church bodies would agree with the first sentence of such a quotation. However, the second half of this statement reveals these Christians, who pose the question, to be disciples who struggle to see differing roles for men and women as a universal principle. To say the evidence of the order of creation as moral law is lacking from the pages of the Genesis creation account collides with the teachings of our church body claimed to be taken from these very same Genesis chapters. The only remedy for such an impasse is to read and reread Gen 1-3.

“Scripture leads the subordination of woman back to creation, and therefore it is part of the order of creation and thus also the moral law. It is God’s creation of woman as man’s helper,

¹ Bruce Becker and Paul Kelm, “Women in the WELS,” May 2018, 3.

not God's statement at the Fall which ordained that the woman subordinate herself to man."² To say it another way, "the supplementary revelation of Gen 2 informs us that for the exercise of joint human dominion, God at creation at the same time established a specific relationship between the two sexes (in paradise)."³ A definition of terms is in order.

This is the posed question. "Do the first three chapters of Genesis clearly establish a *moral law* called *order of creation*?" Since moral law is depicted as the broader concept, it shall be defined first. "The essence of [the] moral law is love."⁴ The apostle Paul says this (Gal 5:14) "The entire law is summed up in a single command: Love your neighbor as yourself." Many Christians see the moral law and the Ten Commandments as synonymous; it is easy to teach and easy to categorize. The imperatives found in Exod 20 express and give words to God's will for all people. However, the same gray area remains in which people ask, "What about this real-life situation, and what about that one?"

In his moral law, God lets the tension stand in a sinful world. Sometimes the answer to the question, "What is *the* right thing to do?" is not given. Asking how to "apply what St. Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy to what women can and cannot do in the life and worship of the church"⁵ betrays confusion about what the moral law is. It also conveys a legalistic attitude, an addiction to the law.

2 David P. Kuske, "The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman," in *Our Great Heritage*, vol. III of (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991), 554.

3 Carl Lawrenz, "Selections from a Genesis Commentary," *Wis. Lutheran Q.* 78.4 (1981): 279.

4 Kuske, "The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman," 550.

5 Becker and Kelm, "Women in the WELS," 1.

Egalitarians, those who believe that men and women are equal in an unquantifiable sense in all things, may argue that Jesus did not address male headship or men and women having different roles. They would say female submission came from the mind of Paul.

Paul had to teach many things Jesus did not teach, not because Paul was developing a different approach, but because he could not presuppose that his converts would always accept what the early followers of Jesus took as a matter of course. Had Jesus preached and taught in the same environment as Paul, he undoubtedly would say many of the same things. The fact that the New Testament teaching on roles is Pauline and not explicitly from Jesus is no reason to call into question its authentic Christianity.⁶

For the believer, “The moral law of God sets forth eternal principles which rest in the very nature of God and with which his new man is in perfect harmony.”⁷ The moral law did not start at Mount Sinai. It was present at Eden both before the Fall into sin and after. The essence of moral law was love then too. There will never be a time when God’s people do not live by the moral law. Once God restores his own image to the human race in heaven, God’s people will not have any tension.

Calling male headship and female submission “moral law” expresses that they are timeless principles. There were decisions to be made in a perfect Eden. Opportunities to lead and to submit existed. The ambiguity with the moral law does not eliminate a principle. The moral law is more akin to a magnet for God’s people, drawing them closer to the principle, than a checklist, where someone could stand and document, “Yes, this observable concrete behavior happened.” “While the principle is clear that the husband is to be the servant-leader and have ultimate responsibility and authority in the family, the Bible gives almost no details about how

⁶ Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences* (Ann Arbor, Mich: Servant Books, 1980), 254.

⁷ Kuske, “The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman,” 546.

that is expressed in concrete behavior.”⁸ Some might say the teaching of the roles of men and women pricks and burdens consciences. “If only the Bible gave rigid rules then we would be more comfortable.” However, when taking the diversity of personalities between the couples of the world, could the silence also comfort? “Both men and women are called to do science and art, to build families and human communities.”⁹

The term “the order of creation” also requires definition. Kuske concedes this term might lead us to think of the order (in time) in which God created man and woman, i.e. first the man, then the woman. This chronology is not what the term “order” in the expression “order of creation” is referring to. “It is rather referring to the relationship God established between man and woman.”¹⁰ With this understanding, a reader then goes back to the creation account in Genesis and sees the words inspired there to describe this relationship between men and women.

God speaks the first relational word to describe the woman. “I will make a *helper* (עֲזָרָה) suitable for him.” (Gen 2:18) Much ink has been used to describe this relational word among those who claim evidence in Genesis for an order of creation is weak and also among those who claim the evidence is apparent. The dictionary meaning of this noun according to the Enhanced Brown-Driver Briggs-Hebrew and English Lexicon is: *help, one who helps, succor* (synonyms include: relief, aid, support, assistance). Some have said, “The meaning of the Hebrew word translated ‘helper’ contains no thought of either inferiority or submissiveness.”¹¹

8 Timothy Keller, *Meaning of Marriage* (Penguin Group US, 2011), 209.

9 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 194.

10 Kuske, “The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman,” 552.

11 Becker and Kelm, “Women in the WELS,” 2.

Those taking the opposite position, saying that evidence is strong for the order of creation in Genesis would say the former position is only half correct.

Being made a helper for the man can only be understood as being made for a role subordinate to that of the man...It involves a divine assignment of distinct responsibilities to the women in the interest of marriage and the family, upon which human society in this earthly life is basically structured.¹²

The word עֲזָרָה describes relational submissiveness, not inferiority. Other uses of this word used in Scripture shed light also. עֲזָרָה “is almost always used in the Bible to describe God himself. Other times it is used to describe military help, such as reinforcements, without which a battle would be lost.”¹³ There is nothing conveying someone being weak or unwanted by this word. In relation to the man, the word עֲזָרָה (literally: like in front of, or insight of, or opposite him) is used. The word “suitable” is a standard English translation. This helper and her companionship invoke a different reaction in the man than all of the animals standing in front of him as Adam named them.

The question causing the most heat within church bodies is “To what scale is the woman a suitable helper for man?” “Friend. Helper. That is what a woman is supposed to be first of all, whether she chooses to give up her independence and marry and have children or not.”¹⁴ This point calls for more discussion. Does the woman’s role as helper refer only to the scope of marriage? Church? Society at large? In the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve answer these three

12 Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 280.

13 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 195.

14 Nathan R. Pope, *Feminism: Understanding and Balancing Its Impact on Marriage, Family, and Church*, Impact Series (Milwaukee, Wis: Northwestern Pub. House, 2003), 143.

following questions: What is a family? What is the Church? What is society at large? The world population was two.

There are those who believe that if the order of creation is prescriptive in Genesis at all, it only pertains to the marriage relationship. Some go to the New Testament to make this point. “In Matt 19... Jesus understood that Gen 1 is speaking about Adam and Eve as husband and wife, not simply male and female.”¹⁵ Besides much of the order of creation material being found in Gen 2, not Gen 1, there is another hole in this argument. In Matthew 19 Jesus was asked a question within the scope of marriage; the question of the Pharisees was about divorce. Jesus answers in kind.

On the other hand, there are those who read early Genesis and say the marriage relationship is foundational to men-women relationships in all of society. “The pattern in the broader community is an extension and reflection of the pattern in the marriage.”¹⁶ Marriage is the building block of all society. Civilization goes the direction that its marriages go. Where people devalue marriage, there all human relationships struggle. In his 1959 work, Derrick Sherwin Bailey paints a fascinating picture based on first-century research.

The Jewish respect for marriage and for family was continued in the ideal of the Christian home as in some sense a 'religious institution' - a microcosmic “ekklesia” (church gathering) in which natural relationships were elevated and strengthened by the sharing of a common faith, and charity was practiced through the mutual submission 'in the fear of Christ' which was enjoined upon all followers of the Lord.¹⁷

Marriage is a microcosm, a small world. The marriage relationship is merely a smaller scale ecosystem for humanity. The following agronomy or earth science illustration for the order

¹⁵ Becker and Kelm, “Women in the WELS,” 3.

¹⁶ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 28.

¹⁷ DerrickSherwin Bailey, *The Man-Woman Relationship in Christian Thought* (London: Longman’s, 1959), 5.

of creation explains it well. Within a handful of soil, live uncountable microbes. These living organisms operate a certain way. There is an order to their function. A plot of land is an ecosystem. A county, a state, a country, a planet—these are ecosystems also. For those who teach the order of creation with the broadest scope, this earth science illustration communicates the point well.

“A woman should learn in quietness and full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent” (1 Tim 2:11-12). Some see these instructions about learning and authority from the pen of the apostle Paul as relevant only within marriage. However, consider Paul’s rationale for these directives. In the following verse, Paul writes, “For Adam was formed first, then Eve” (1 Tim 2:13).

Paul’s point in bringing up Adam and Eve...God’s creation plan for Christian men and women as they worship can be clearly seen by the adverb/verb/adverb combination. Paul is telling us that the way God ordered the creation of man and woman, in the beginning, impacts the way Christian men and women serve in his church today. “For Adam was formed first, then Eve,” does not speak to their marriage; it speaks of their creation.¹⁸

There are those who agree that an order of creation exists on the scale of marriage. There are those who will agree that the order of creation and male headship exists within the scope of the church. Some become more hesitant, however, to agree that the order of creation extends to society at large. Note the challenges posed:

If male headship and female submission are [the] biblical *mandate*, should Christian women refuse to accept a role in business or the civic area that places them in a position to which men report, a position that will require them to direct, discipline, and dismiss males? If a woman voting in the church violates this universal headship principle, how does voting in a civil election not violate this principle?¹⁹

18 Daniel Leyrer, “South Eastern Wisconsin Praesidium,” 2018, 4.

19 Becker and Kelm, “Women in the WELS,” 1.

These claims lose track of what the moral law is. The word *mandate* exposes a law-driven attitude continually asking, “What must I do? I want a checklist of rules.” The principles of moral law may look different in different settings and cultures; the principle itself stands unwavering. Poor applications happen when applications are made to interpret principles. The apostle Paul, referring back to Genesis when he speaks about the roles of men and women whether within the family, church, or society, speaks to these Genesis verses being prescriptive, meaning that there are principles for all people of all time to follow. Paul’s allusions speak to the principle of male headship.

That the Genesis creation account establishes an order for man/women relationships beyond marriage is confirmed by Paul’s writing in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy. He draws upon the creation account in 1 Cor 11:8,9; 14:34; 1 Tim 2:13-14 to show the way God ordered the creation of human beings has a decided impact on the way Christian human beings conduct themselves beyond marriage. In other words, God’s New Testament revelation illumines and interprets the full teaching in his Genesis account.²⁰

One of the most substantial pieces of evidence speaking to a societal order of creation is the fact that marriage was instituted in Gen 2. Recall that the world population was two people and that Adam and Eve defined the world at large. “What is the difference between a romance and a marriage? It is the signing of that piece of paper, or the walking through of animal parts, or the stomping on a glass, or jumping the broomstick, or whatever way the culture provides to make a solemn, public vow to which you are held accountable.”²¹ Adam and Eve were the government. They were the public when making their vows. The order of creation had been established; the word “helper” had already been spoken from the mouth of God. A cultural Eden marriage ceremony took place.

²⁰ Leyrer, “South Eastern Wisconsin Praesidium,” 2.

²¹ Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 94.

When the order of creation is seen through the lens of scale for family, church, and society, the focus then shifts to the inner-workings of these microcosms. Submission, a word that receives a chapter to itself in this paper, is essential for creation to function. “Whether on a divine scale or human scale, submission and authority are indispensable elements in God’s order and design.”²² Whether it be in the family, the church, or society, several intersections in life occur where decisions have to be made. These microcosms would cease to be if decisions ceased to be made. Authority and submission are unavoidable.

There are those who perceive submission as a consequence, for women, resulting from the Fall into sin. They say, “Gen 3 also describes the resulting consequences to both relationships. In the case of Eve, the consequences of sin are described in terms of the negative impact on marriage and family life. There were no consequences identified, as a result of the fall, to generic male and female relationships.”²³ However, if there were no consequences identified, as a result of the Fall, to generic male and female relationships, then why do such back and forth discussions on the topic of roles of men and women occur? When volatile discussions take place on the topic of man and woman, this proves the consequence of the Fall to be generic and widescale indeed.

One reason these volatile conversations occur is due to confusion over the word “submission.” This behavior, which is essential to any relationship, means “to line up under.” In the view of many, this word identifies with a party that is less valuable or otherwise known as *the losing party*. “The subordination God demands is not ordained because of inferiority but as a

22 John MacArthur, *Divine Design* (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1994), 40.

23 Becker and Kelm, “Women in the WELS,” 3.

blessing.”²⁴ In his article, Kuske presents several examples. Children do not submit to parents because they, the children, are less valuable. Members of a congregation do not submit to a pastor because the pastor is “more saved” than they. People of a nation do not submit to their government officials because citizens are worth less. Submission is not about inferiority, but about functionality.

Nor is the submission tied to male headship a consequence for sin. “If Eve was subordinated to her husband and bidden to be in submission as punishment for her disobedience, then Adam would be absolved of all guilt in being appointed to rule over her.”²⁵ Scripture does not paint Eve as a sacrificial lamb or co-redemptrix. The words, spoken by God, “Your husband shall rule over you.” did not begin woman’s subordination.”²⁶ “Lining up under” existed on day six of creation, and preservation of it after the Fall was a sign of loving consistency by the Creator. Submission is not a symptom of sin. Instead, in Eden, God preserved this behavior for the crown of his creation.

As old as God’s order of creation might be, attacks against it have nearly as much history. The eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was an attack against God’s principle of the man-woman relationship. In Scripture, the first sin is described this way: “When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it” (Gen 3:6). The first sin was not the picking and consumption of fruit. “In the

²⁴ Kuske, “The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman,” 552–53.

²⁵ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 304.

²⁶ Kuske, “The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman,” 554.

Fall the woman had sought to act independently of the man. She had taken the initiative and assumed the position of leadership. She sought to control the man by taking control in her own hands.”²⁷ Role reversal is unequivocally attached to the first sin. The first sin was a very particular attempt to emasculate man and to defy God.

As Paul clarifies God’s order of creation in his letters, the reader realizes the apostle is confronting the same attitudes and desires for role reversal. “In Corinth, women demanded the same treatment as men. Similar to many women today, they regarded marriage and the raising of children as unjust restrictions of their rights.”²⁸ Chaos, disorder, and sin consistently arise when both men and women focus more on their rights than on their responsibilities. What results when subordination is removed from the picture is not freedom; it is a society, church, or family that cannot function.

As many commentators have noted, the forbidden tree served as Adam and Eve’s church. It was the place where they went to give thanks to God and to follow his instructions. John MacArthur writes strongly against female pastoral ordination. “The demand for the ordination of women is as rebellious as it is in itself, is a symptom of a much more serious malady. The ordination might disfigure the church, but the disease of which it is a symptom will kill her [the church] unless it is quickly diagnosed and treated. That disease... is the rejection of Biblical inerrancy.”²⁹ A woman in the office of pastor means the recycled prompt of Satan still echoes throughout the sanctuary’s acoustics, “Did God really say?” Yes, he did. The apostle Paul knew what he was writing about, and God knew what he was inspiring to be written.

²⁷ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 303.

²⁸ MacArthur, *Divine Design*, 163.

²⁹ MacArthur, *Divine Design*, 163.

This paper is intended to aid both men and women to speak about God's order of creation. It is time to turn to Adam. "Nowhere does Scripture place the sole or even the prime responsibility for the fall into sin upon the woman."³⁰ Gen 3:6 ends by clarifying to readers that the man was with Eve during the temptation. Adam was not unaware of what was going on. The New Testament brings up this same point several times.

How God addressed humanity after the fall into sin teaches the next exegetical lesson concerning the order of creation and male accountability. While two sinners are hiding, Scripture says, the Lord called out to the man. God's interrogative reveals the principle of male headship:

וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אֵיפֶה "and he said to him, 'Where are you?'" God inspired the Old Testament to be written in Hebrew. In a language that could have used plural suffixes, God inspired Moses to fill this account with the masculine singular. Why doesn't God summon both Adam and Eve together? "Because as the God-appointed head, Adam bore the primary responsibility to lead their partnership in a God-glorifying direction."³¹

Authority always goes hand in hand with accountability. It is clear from these Genesis verses that men are accountable for their families and their women. When the one who wielded ultimate authority was heard walking in the garden to confront fallen humanity, the man could not blame the woman fast enough. "Where relations between men and women break down (be it in marriage or church, or for that matter, the world) Scripture, logic, and interpretation would have us first look at what men are doing, instead of wondering what women are not doing."³²

30 Lawrenz, "Selections from a Genesis Commentary," 304.

31 C. Ortlund Jr. Raymond, "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2006), 108.

32 Pope, *Feminism*, 132.

Men are to command, in the sense of earn, (not demand) respect in the family and church. When skirmishes break out between the sexes, figuring out ‘who is guilty of what’ is a vain exercise.

Men are accountable.

A Christian man is obligated to lead his family to the best of his ability... If his family has purchased too many items on credit, then the financial crunch is ultimately his fault. If the family never reads the Bible or seldom goes to church, God holds the man to blame. If the children are disobedient, the primary responsibility lies with the father... not his wife.³³

This accountability should not lead men to think they can do whatever they wish. It leads men to see male headship as a privilege and a responsibility, not a right. A husband who views male headship as an opportunity to be chauvinistic is guilty of not loving his wife the way Christ loved the Church (Eph 5:25). “If a husband really understands his position, he will know that God has privileged him to function as the head of the household. He holds that position as a matter of trust, divine trust.”³⁴ Male headship is a matter of stewardship. May that moment when the Lord will call men to answer for how they led their family and their church be on the mind of every man.

Again, Adam’s sin in the garden was not the digestion of a piece of fruit. It was the rejection of the stewardship given to him. “All this [the fall into sin] happened when he listened to his wife. As a constant reminder of this sinful default in his God-assigned role, he was to experience insubordination.”³⁵ If there were ever a time for the man to be properly inflexible (to have a firm ‘No dear’ moment) with his wife, it was there before the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. One could argue that the ongoing tension that flares up sometimes between men

³³ John Piper and Wayne A Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006), 39.

³⁴ Pope, *Feminism*, 209.

³⁵ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 308.

and women, concerning men and women, serves as proof that men do indeed suffer the consequences for sin within the family.

Sin does not eliminate a principle of God. Male headship does not allow for domineering (selfish) behavior against wives and women. Due to sin, male headship can (and often does) go awry. Both man and woman disobeyed God. Both man and woman have a sinful nature. “After the fall her husband would continue to rule over her. God’s order of creation would remain in effect. But the husband’s headship, as a sinner, would now likewise be marred with selfishness.”³⁶ Two selfish people now live in a home. Two selfish genders now populate a church body. Both parties desire to be contrary in their own way.

To Gen 3:16 we trace two abiding forces of life: the inclination of men to dominate women and the inclination of women to suffer it. So, the pre-sin principle of male headship combines with the post-sin changed natures to spawn a mixed breed of forces, a miscreation or distortion of the ideal by the warped sinful nature.³⁷

What did a denial of God’s order of creation gain anyone? What was the profit in Eden? What is the profit in churches or societies? “[Eve’s] sinful striving for independence from the man and control over him had not brought her joy and satisfaction. It had brought her sorrow and distress. It was a futile, fateful effort at overthrowing God’s order of creation. The woman was given to hear that God’s order still stood and would continue to stand.”³⁸

God mercifully preserves the order of creation to curb chaos. Paul and Peter, going back to Genesis as they address male and female relations both within family and church, prove the prescriptive value of Genesis chapters two and three. God describes the woman as a glorious helper. We see men-women relations in family, church, and world in terms of scale and

³⁶ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 303.

³⁷ Pope, *Feminism*, 130.

³⁸ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 303.

ecosystem where men are accountable. Submission is a term for functionality, not worth. We have described the order of creation using the language of moral law as it requires. We have left breadcrumbs along the way in order to deal with the other words and phrases that provoke a social reaction. “Scripture grants males the headship in their marriages and their churches. Anyone who does not believe that has to do a lot of magical thinking and tinkering with the Bible to make this doctrine go away.”³⁹ To say one cannot find the teaching of the order of creation within the early chapters of Genesis is a bold statement to make when nearly every word, phrase, and thought in Genesis chapters two and three speak to it.

Patriarchy, seeing the world as one run by men, for men, in order to oppress women, is a problematic word to discuss, impossible to discuss when two people are operating with different definitions and templates. In turn, the word, *feminism* needs to be nuanced as well. “All secular feminism is not radical....and all radical feminism is not precisely secular; there is a religious wing to radical feminism which proposes a spiritual solution to patriarchy.”⁴⁰ When people attribute chauvinistic behavior to Christianity (both to the church and the Bible) as cause and catalyst, clarification is needed.

The conversation is a historical one, addressing sex and science. The accusatory definition of patriarchy as a type of “boys club” making rules vindictively to keep women down has been incorrectly attributed to the Bible. The cure in the minds of many of these accusers is to read Scripture through a matriarchal filter, seeing women as pure heroines or victims in every account. The result is that ideologies are speaking rather than the Bible speaking for itself.

39 Pope, *Feminism*, 129.

40 Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, *Women Caught in the Conflict: The Culture War between Traditionalism and Feminism* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1994), 89.

It is understandable why this hermeneutic denying the order of creation has surfaced in modern times. The western world, most specifically America, is at this time rivetted by concepts of rights and individuality. Many see the modern world as a subjective, existential age. “Modern writers who set out to disengage Christian teaching from culturally determined elements end up canonizing the approach of their modern culture and using that because they cannot find any standard within Scripture that would allow them to accept the elements they want to accept and reject those they want to reject.”⁴¹

Whenever the order of creation as a principle of God for all people of all time is challenged, proponents of male headship can remain confident; the word used by God himself to describe woman is “helper.” God’s people are equipped by Paul’s example to use these words from Genesis prescriptively. The order of creation was restated by God to ensure the crowns of his creation would continue to be blessed. God’s order of creation is just as relevant a teaching today as it was the moment after the Fall into sin.

⁴¹ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 279.

EQUALITY OF STATUS

When a Christian, sensitive to the clear biblical principles of male headship, begins to say, “Men and women have equality of status before God, but different roles...” they may perceive a perplexed audience struggling to harmonize the two phrases. The conclusion, “but different roles,” will be expanded upon in the next section. Many Christians struggle with the concept of equality of status between the sexes. What does it mean? What does it not mean? How can anyone be equal to another, yet different? “How can one defend a sexual hierarchy whereby men are over women—not just some men over some women, but all men over all women, because men are men and women are women—without supposing that the half of the human race which exercises authority is superior in some way to the half that submits?”⁴² These questions based on worldly logic exposes a great deal of teaching that needs to be done within churches as they talk about the roles of men and women.

It is a sensitive territory. Many recognize that when trying to teach God’s principle of male headship, people are often talking past each other. It should not be a surprise what people might claim to hear during these conversations.

Egalitarian Christians broadly assume that to take differences seriously is to endorse inequality and that having different but complementary roles in family and community life is to employ a kind of ‘ideological/religious’ language whose real intent is to subordinate women to men and to legitimize unequal and oppressive power relations between sexes.⁴³

⁴² Paul King Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 71.

⁴³ Brian T. Trainor, “The Trinity and Male Headship of the Family,” *Heythrop J.* 52.5 (2011): 724.

Many see the motivations of those who teach God's order of creation as duplicitous.

Turning to the Biblical teaching of the Trinity can help us understand equal status and differing roles. Christians confess that God is three persons. They confess that God is one. All three persons of the Trinity are co-equal in glory and majesty. Submission exists within the Godhead also. Jesus speaks most poignantly about this in John 8:28-29. "When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am the one I claim to be and that *I do nothing on my own but speak just what the Father has taught me.*"²⁹ The one who sent me is with me; he has not left me alone, for I always do what pleases him." After Jesus said this, he looked toward heaven and prayed: "Father, the time has come. Glorify your Son, that your Son may glorify you. ² *For you granted him authority over all people that he might give eternal life to all those you have given him*" (John 17:1-2).

"Jesus is not second to the Father in authority, for Jesus is the Word of the Father, is the authority of the Father as original author, is the One who conveys, authors, makes present, bears, crystallizes and expresses in his Person the Father as original Author."⁴⁴ When mortal fathers and sons are both adults, we see this dynamic at work also. One sees the other as an equal, yet submission still exists in their relationship.

The concept of persons being equal but different is not a foreign concept to anyone who confesses the Trinity. "There is an operational order among the divine persons in the sense that divine differentiation is grounded (imminently) in the inner life of the Trinity itself, that is, in the way in which the three Persons of the Trinity are collectively God in their 'being-for-each-

44 Trainor, "The Trinity and Male Headship of the Family," 731.

other.”⁴⁵ Christians who confess the Athanasian Creed betray a high level of inconsistency when claiming the concept of ‘equal yet different’ to be an unrelatable idea to them.

We ought to be sufficiently agile intellectually and emotionally to accept this paradoxical truth. Christians, of all people, have a reason to live with paradox. After all, God exists as one Godhead in three Persons, equal in glory, but unequal in role. The Son submits not because he is God Jr., an inferior deity. Moreover, if our creator exists in this manner, should we be surprised and offended if His creaturely analog on earth exists in paradoxical form?⁴⁶

Confusion over the meaning of the image of God and church bodies who teach egalitarian roles seem to run parallel to each other. Jewett, who has put into words the antagonizing viewpoint of this section, has this to say, “We have affirmed, following Barth, that Man, as created in the divine image, is Man-in-fellowship: we have further affirmed that the primary form of this fellowship is that of male and female.”⁴⁷ However, Genesis implies that the image of God referred to in chapter one, **דְמוּתֵנוּ צִלְמֵנוּ** (our image, our likeness) means something different than ‘man in fellowship.’ The Creator made both man and woman in this image (Gen 1:27). The Fall into sin happened; the role of man was challenged, and humanity’s will contradicted God’s will when the forbidden fruit was seen as pleasing (Gen 3:6). Fallen Adam and Eve had children. Adam fathered a son in *his likeness*, after *his own image* **דְמוּתֵנוּ צִלְמֵנוּ** (Gen 5:33). The words “and then he died” are repeated eight times in Genesis chapter five. There is something different now; something has changed. At the Fall into sin, the image of God was lost, and no amount of human propagation can remedy this. The Apostle Paul comments on this in his letter to the Romans where he writes, “the wages of sin is death” (Rom 6:23). With this

45 Trainor, “The Trinity and Male Headship of the Family,” 728.

46 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 103.

47 Jewett, *Man as Male and Female*, 49.

simple outline of early Genesis and Paul's commentary, we see that Scripture teaches that the image of God must be defined as sinlessness, holiness and righteousness, not fellowship.

The image of God was not gender-specific; both man and woman fell. They had it before the Fall and lost it in the Fall. Only in Jesus, the Son of God, can the image of God be restored. Being in the image of God is an aspect of being a son of God. "Gal 3:26-28 states both men and women are sons of God (or better: sons and daughters)."⁴⁸ A new challenge arises when teaching gender neutrality with the image of God in Christ. Many will say that Christianity, in this world, is then a genderless religion. Granted, Paul writes about the oneness in Christ as he addresses several different demographics and stations found in the church. However, let us think about the Galatian churches seriously. "Their oneness in Christ did not obliterate distinctions between Jews and Gentiles. Nor did it remove the functional differences between slaves and masters. Why, then, would we assume it did so between men and women?"⁴⁹ Paul teaches contentment in the station one is at, before, during, and after Christian conversion.

Paul in 1 Cor 7:17-32 speaks of the relative insignificance of roles through the eyes of God's salvation. To be one with authority means nothing; to be one who submits to authority means nothing. Christ died for all. "The apostle's spirit is echoed by Maggie Gallagher's description of the competitive envy of gender revolutionists toward male leadership. She writes, 'Maleness is threatening only to those who reflexively believe that whatever the men are doing is more significant and satisfying than whatever the women are doing.'⁵⁰ Professional duties

48 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 143.

49 MacArthur, *Divine Design*, 44.

50 Pope, *Feminism*, 68.

outside of the home, preformed by either men or women, should not outshine duties within the home.

“Since homes remained virtually the center of community life, the lot of the Jewish woman was not without either its compensations or its opportunities to influence; under her husband’s roof she was respected, and her seclusion was never so restricted or servile as that of the Greek wife in the gynaeceum.”⁵¹ First century Judaism and first-century Christianity elevated the value and personhood of women compared to their pagan or Gentile neighbors.

The rise of the social gospel in the 20th century America has shaped this discussion greatly. Many church bodies teach that the primary purpose of the Christian Church today should be to promote universal equality among the entire population. What does universal equality even look like? Raymond C. Orthund Jr. writes, “Because God is ultimately the One who shapes our lives, I have to conclude that God is not interested in unlimited equality among us. And because God is wise, I further conclude that unlimited equality is a false ideal.”⁵² When someone exercises their rights, whether in our legal system or the family, there must be another whose rights are infringed. Unlimited equality is impossible.

“Surely God confers upon man and woman equal worth as His image bearers. But does a wife possess under God *all* the rights [and responsibilities] that her husband has *in an unqualified sense*?”⁵³ The answer is, no. Authority is never separate from accountability. Rights are never detached from responsibilities. Men are commanded to love their wives as Christ loved the Church (Eph 5:25). The man was held accountable in Genesis chapter three. “The idea of

51 Bailey, *The Man-Woman Relationship in Christian Thought*, 3.

52 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 100.

53 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 105.

equal rights in an unqualified sense is not Biblical.”⁵⁴ Unbridled equality is a mythical creature, not functional, not possible in the Church or the State.

For what logical reason must equality be defined in terms of position and role? This thinking did not spring up from evangelical soil. It grew up out of worldly soil and has been transplanted into evangelical soil and is sustained there artificially by the potent fertilizers of the worldliness and doctrinal confusion widespread in the evangelical movement.⁵⁵

The denial of the image of God being lost, the desire to divorce rights from responsibility, the dependency on seeing men and women as equal in an unquantifiable sense are all symptoms of original sin and proof that the image of God has been completely lost.

Women stand equal in status, equal in sin, and equal in redemption to their male counterparts. The Bible does not paint wives as second-rate in any capacity.

Concerning Eph 5:19-20; the picture of marriage given here is not of two needy people, unsure of their own value and purpose, finding their significance and meaning in one another’s arms. If you add two vacuums to each other, you only get a bigger and stronger vacuum, a giant sucking sound. Rather, Paul assumes each spouse already has settled the big questions of life—why God made them and who they are in Christ.⁵⁶

Perhaps an illustration from the sports world would be beneficial here. How frustrated would a football team and its fanbase be if every player on the team demanded to play quarterback? The third-string punter demands equality; the team has infringed upon his rights. The sport would die out if this became a reality. Every player on a Super Bowl winning team receives a Super Bowl ring. From the quarterback to the kicker every player is called a Champion. Equal standing does not mean sameness in the positions played. “There are only so

54 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 105.

55 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 104–5.

56 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 49.

many positions for a team to fill up, whether it be football or marriage. The positions are different, *but* different does not mean inferior when it comes to team sports.”⁵⁷

Someone who teaches others how to harmonize *equal but different* is the Second person of the Trinity, the God-man Jesus Christ “In Phil 2:5-11 we have one of the earliest hymns to Jesus sung by the church, that celebrates that although Jesus was Equal with God, he emptied himself of his glory and took on the role of a servant. Jesus shed his divine privileges without becoming any less divine.”⁵⁸ Jesus provides guidance and motivation for every human called helper. Timothy Keller’s wife and co-writer Kathy provides such refreshing insight on this point: “If it [was] not [an] assault on the dignity and divinity (but rather led to the greater glory) of the Second person of the Godhead to submit himself, and assume the role of a servant, then how can it possibly injure me to be asked to play the “Jesus role” in my marriage?”⁵⁹

By demanding equality, one imagines that a center exists between genders, that both men and women can be drawn to a center. A loss of femininity is nothing to rejoice over. “Dominant, swaggering (and sinful) male behavior is assumed to be the default mode if one wishes to get ahead or be taken seriously in the world. Women are asked to shed their feminine qualities and become faux men in order to be ‘one of the boys.’”⁶⁰ The Bible teaches that Christ died for the sins of the world—for the most feminine female, the most masculine male and every individual in-between.

⁵⁷ Pope, *Feminism*, 134.

⁵⁸ Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 196.

⁵⁹ Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 198.

⁶⁰ Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 204.

Just as Christ illustrates servanthood, so also he defines authority. Servanthood happens for functionality and harmony within the home and church. In the same way, authority exists to serve others. Jesus defined all authority as servant-authority. Any exercise of power can only be done in the service to the other, not to please oneself. Any man who must say “respect me, the Bible says so” is no respectable man. Those who often speak of their authority communicate more self-consciousness than authoritativeness.

Sexist objectification of the female demographic otherwise known as *chauvinism* remains a constant fear with a topic like this. Chauvinism is not God-pleasing nor promoted by this paper. May all men repeat the words of their first ancestor as he spoke about the opposite gender: “Adam gave testimony of the unity of the human race and paid joyful tribute to the dignity of the women as being like him. He acknowledged that she was not inferior, yet also not identical, but fashioned from his bones and flesh to be a fitting complement and helper.”⁶¹ Christians may not be able to control how people perceive the equal but different topic, but what Christian men can do is thank God for the women in their lives by serving them, listening to them, and making decisions with them in mind, and for their best interest.

Adam and Eve were created in the image of God, yet they were not the same. The concept of equal but different should not bother the Christian confessor. God the Father and God the Son are co-equal in glory and majesty, two persons of the Godhead. However, they are different. Both men and women are co-equal in sinfulness, but both are saved to the same level in Christ. God’s people can have this conversation.

61 Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 286.

To be a woman is not to be a second-class citizen, not in the eyes of God, nor the eyes of godly men. In Gen 3 Satan tempted Eve with something she already had. The serpent said to her whom God created in his image or likeness, “you will be like God.”

Women should not feel disenfranchised in the household of God when they already have what it takes to see things done... Women need to be reminded that they possess one of the truly great powers of the universe—the force of personality. It is a force created in the most wonderful and enchanting ways by God—where applying their ideas through voting or resolution often becomes a formality in the wake of truth and love.⁶²

In a sinful world, the influence of one person over another will never be perfectly sent, taken, or completely motivated by selflessness. Perhaps Gen 3 plays on a loop to this very day; is Satan recycling his lie? This researcher is inclined to say, Yes. Are the Eves of today being tempted to reach for something they already have, namely influence over men?

⁶² Pope, *Feminism*, 203.

DIFFERENT ROLES

“The antithesis to male headship is male domination, the assertion of man’s will over woman’s will, heedless of her spiritual equality, her rights, and her value.”⁶³ True male headship opposes chauvinism in every way. The first half of the expression, “equality of status,” addressed this exact issue. Now the second half of the expression, “but, different in roles,” will be addressed. In the current era, it may be this phrase which invites the most reaction.

Appreciation of women defines a man. Although the first woman owed her existence to the man from whom God took her, all other men owe their existence to the woman who conceived them and brought them into the world. “The man, then, should not think only of his priority over woman, but also his dependence upon her in the divine order.”⁶⁴ The apostle Paul makes this point in 1 Cor 11:8-9. The role of man, especially the man understanding male headship, is to treat the women in his life well. Mistreating women is not masculine in any way.

Man and woman relationships are the heartbeat of humanity. Roles must be understood correctly in addition to being recognized as real. “Stable social relationships are more important for human life than most people realize. If we cannot reconstruct stable personal relationships, and if human values continue to be consistently sacrificed to functional values, then the human race will be greatly impoverished. It will have lost some of the most valuable elements of its

⁶³ Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 95.

⁶⁴ Jewett, *Man as Male and Female*, 57.

social existence.”⁶⁵ Man-woman relations are depicted as central to humanity. Denial of the different roles of the sexes is nothing short of potential societal upheaval.

Somewhere in this discussion of roles, masculinity and femininity must be defined in a way for people to talk about them. “What is masculine? David’s fearlessness against bears and bullies (1 Sam 17:35,36), Jehu’s aggressive driving style (2 Kgs 9:20), Tubal Cain’s inventive fascination with things (Gen 4:22), Sampson’s strength of muscles (Judg 14:6), Solomon’s physical drive for sexual relations (1 Kgs 11:2,3).”⁶⁶ All of these characteristics: fearlessness, aggressiveness, inventiveness, physical strength, and sexual drive—sin taints all of them, and sin uses them for immoral purposes. Also, all of these characteristics have been called evil in their essence by those focused on equality. “What is Feminine? Mary Magdalene’s loyalty toward Jesus (John 20:15), Ruth’s passivity in capturing Boaz’s heart (Ruth 3), the Virgin Mary’s sensitivity to spiritual matters (Luke 2:19), Hannah’s tenderness toward her son (1 Sam 2:19), Dorcas’ compassion for the poor (Acts 9: 36-39).”⁶⁷ Loyalty, passivity, sensitivity, tenderness, and compassion are not always the characteristics needed in every life situation either. Satan can manipulate these traits also. In no way are these lists intended to put men and women in a box. “All traits mentioned can be observed in both men and women.”⁶⁸

Those who misunderstand the men and women who hold to the principle of male headship will claim that men are decision makers, while women are indecisive. Female submission is not a mark of one gender being indecisive. Kathy Keller brings these thoughts

65 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 540.

66 Pope, *Feminism*, 73.

67 Pope, *Feminism*, 73.

68 Pope, *Feminism*, 73.

together: “Why did Christ become the one to give up authority to the Father? We do not know, but it is a mark of his greatness, not his indecisiveness! Women are called to follow him here. But remember taking authority properly is just as hard as granting it.”⁶⁹

Biological evidence must also be taken into consideration when defining masculinity and femininity. Science disagrees with individual males who feel they are a woman in an incorrect body, or individual females who feel they are a man in an incorrect body. Tim Keller writes about biology, saying, “Every cell in our body is stamped as XX or XY. This means I cannot understand myself if I try to ignore the way God has designed me or if I despise the gifts he may have given to me to help me fulfill my calling.”⁷⁰ Ignoring visible biology seems to be running in tandem with spikes in depression and violence in our current age.

Tim Keller is equally as cautious and respectful in defining masculinity and femininity.

Using all the qualifiers in the world, in general, as a whole, and across the spectrum, men have a gift of independence, a “sending” gift. They look outward. They initiate. Under sin, these traits can become either an alpha male individualism if this capacity is turned into an idol, or dependence if the calling is utterly rejected and the opposite embraced in rebellion.⁷¹

One of the dangerous results of such attacks against male headship is a man might be inclined to disengage, move on, or suffer from disenfranchisement when rejected.

Using all the qualifiers in the world, in general, as a whole, and across the spectrum, women have the gift of interdependence, a “receiving” gift. They are inwardly perceptive (sensitive to how others think of them). They nurture. Under sin, these traits can become either a clinging dependence, if attachments are turned into an idol, or individualism if the calling is utterly rejected and the opposite embraced in rebellion.⁷²

69 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 281.

70 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 194.

71 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 203.

72 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 203–4.

Masculinity needs femininity, and femininity needs masculinity to exist in an ultimately healthy way. The positive use of these polar characteristics stimulates the positive use of the other. The adverse use of these polar characteristics brings the other down in a marriage, in a church, and a society. Appreciation for the opposite sex defines a man; it also defines a woman.

The differences between men and women, first of all, exist. Second of all, these differences are not minor details or able to change with simple personality tweaks. “The data shows that men and women differ emotionally, intellectually, and in their typical approaches to social relationships...the social scientific data indicates clearly and decisively that men and woman are not identical and interchangeable units.”⁷³ “Anything one gender can do the other gender can do also.” This appealing phrase is false. Men cannot do everything a woman can do. A man who desires to have a child knows he cannot bring one into the world on his own. Reproduction requires two people, two sexes. Moreover, the man incapable of bringing life into the world, on his own, then also overruled at directorial intersections by women, this man may spiral down into depression. The alarming rise of male despair and suicide rates in our society requires research.

Keller quotes the philosopher, Soren Kierkegaard and brings up an interesting point concerning those who petition equality because it looks fair. How free are those individuals? “The person dominated by aesthetic sensibility is controlled by circumstances.”⁷⁴ Those who are intent on a marriage, a church, or a society looking equal regarding authority between its members, fail to see that they are the ones controlled by this earthy idea.

⁷³ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 410.

⁷⁴ Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 103.

Luther writes most gently as he speaks about patriarchy and roles, noting those same ideas of microcosm and scale. “Woman was created for the benefit (*usum*) of man, that is, for the prudent and sensible training of children. Everyone does best when he does that for which he was created. A woman handles a child better with her smallest fingers than a man with both hands.”⁷⁵

A denial of different roles for men and women is nothing new to the twenty-first century, nor did it arise within the last one hundred years. “Androgyny [eliminating any sense of difference between sexes by means of fashion and behavior] has been around for a long time; the modern feminism did not invent it. Some ancients embraced female-style androgyny as a pagan ideal. Others were horrified by it even as they fancied other ways to blur gender.”⁷⁶ The argument, “It is 2018; let us not be so old-fashioned” loses its purpose when we read history and allow facts about gender roles to come to light.

In the modern day, we see the germination of androgyny on our playgrounds and even in our preschool playrooms. “Androgynists mistakenly consider boys’ traditional rough-and-tumble play (like laughing, running, smiling, jumping...wrestling, play fighting, chasing and fleeing) as a form of aggression.”⁷⁷ This researcher can attest that rough-and-tumble-play serves a vital role as it teaches a young man where the boundaries are for him. Without rough-and-tumble-play young boys struggle more to understand what is humorous and what is dangerous. They also struggle with social cues where others communicate sarcasm or “please leave me alone right

⁷⁵ Martin Luther, *What Luther Says*, ed. Ewald M. Plass (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n.d.), 3:1458.

⁷⁶ Pope, *Feminism*, 65.

⁷⁷ Pope, *Feminism*, 71.

now.” The elimination of rough-and-tumble-play is another manifestation of vilifying those characteristics of masculinity.

How was androgyny most recently introduced? How has such an unproven ideology gained such traction? Feminist social scientists also advance a political position by employing direct polemical techniques. They often present scientific data about theories of men’s and women’s differences in a way calculated to produce a particular emotional response (like sympathy or indignation) in the reader. They strive for a response which would not occur if they presented the data in a more neutral, objective fashion.⁷⁸ Unqualified equality is romanticized and spoken about as if possible.

Androgyny seems to go primarily in one direction. “When radical feminists talk about androgynous people or regendered people, they really mean people who are more feminine than masculine.”⁷⁹ As we see children raised within the confines of a genderless environment, many take note of fashion, hairstyle, and other mannerisms. An element of deception exists where children are raised with the goal to blur gender. When positive male role models are chased away from our children, psychological side effects like identity confusion happen to our young ones.

Androgyny in adults is on the rise also. We are seeing young people who were raised in this genderless way now having children of their own. “Androgynous Dad is not an android in concept, but he might as well be. Anatomically, he still comes equipped with recognizable male parts, but [in] the androgynous model, he is supposed to be more like a Ken doll than G.I. Joe. Jettisoned is that offensive male aggressiveness in favor of a uniform, plastic, passiveness.”⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 462.

⁷⁹ Pope, *Feminism*, 62.

⁸⁰ Pope, *Feminism*, 154.

When men are not taught to appreciate the differences between men and women, it is a disadvantage for them when they must work and live with those who are biologically different. Gender blending leads to a generation of people with no experience with appreciating the other sex and an inability to deal with those who are different or with any semblance of diversity. “As men and women lose or deny their ‘particular honors,’ knowledge of how to relate and to relish the Other is also lost.”⁸¹

There should be no pressure for men and women to resemble each other in appearance, behavior or approach to disappointment or conflict.

Husbands and wives are partners with complementary roles who are one flesh. The husband should be the head of the family. He should care for and protect his wife. He should provide for her clarity in what is expected of her, and he should provide a steadying influence on her emotional life. He ought not try to have the same reactions to situations as she does, nor should she try to share his. When their companionship leads them to share each other’s emotional reactions, the effect is to feminize the man.⁸²

Remember, independence is a characteristic of healthy masculinity. God holds the man accountable for his wife, family, church, and society. Let this be the biblical motivation for men to act independently of other people. With the *you singulars* spoken to Adam in Eden, God did not vilify masculinity. He reinvigorated it.

Kathy Keller brings the different roles of men and women to life as she describes a real-life conversation with her husband. She writes,

It was clear that Tim wanted to take the call (job), but I had serious doubts that it was the right choice. I expressed my strong doubts to Tim, who responded, “Well if you don’t want to go then we won’t go.” However, I replied, “Oh no you don’t! You are not putting this decision on me. That’s abdication. If you think it is the right thing to do, then

81 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 205.

82 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 649.

exercise your leadership and make the choice. It is your job to break this logjam. It is my job to wrestle with God until I can joyfully support.”⁸³

Those earlier definitions of masculinity and femininity come back into play when someone considers the different roles needed in a church or community. Masculinity, being generally more independent, lends itself organically to leadership positions. “A governor must be able to take a disciplinary perspective, to be detached, to order a situation, to move a group forward and advance its interests, to be ready to sacrifice individual needs and feelings to the common good. Thus, it can be seen that the data clusters in a coherent pattern around the male governing role.”⁸⁴ To demand “equality of outcome,” saying the number of men and women *must* be equal in these forums that organically lend themselves to males is uninformed, perhaps even oppressive.

This is not to say that women cannot lead or pursue specific careers. To refuse equality of opportunity is just as foolish. A society (our society) wants the most qualified people for every task. In his lectures, renowned clinical psychologist Jordan Peterson asserts that even in the most egalitarian society (where men and women have exactly the same opportunity to pursue any career and schooling) men still gravitate toward managerial careers, and women still gravitate toward vocations known for compassion such as nursing and child care.⁸⁵

The most helpful way to define the difference in roles between men and women in community service is not by listing activities forbidden to women or by stating that women did not hold positions of leadership in the community. A key feature of that role difference lay in the fact that the positions of government authority were held by men,

83 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 280.

84 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 438.

85 Clip Hunter, *Jordan Peterson Gender Roles In Society*.

and when women exercised authority, they do so subordinate to a man and normally over other women, or in the home.⁸⁶

Some will claim that Miriam is called a leader, (Mic 6:4). She certainly is. What Exodus makes clear is that her brother Moses was responsible and accountable. Leadership and authority are not synonymous.

Women are not asked to live in a vacuum, isolated from their society. Nor is their role described as being barefoot and pregnant, working as the sole chef and child care provider of the house (although what a privilege these tasks are). “Both sexes are invited and charged to teach God’s Word to their children. (The Ten Commandments are given to both men and women). Deut 6:6-7 and Prov 6:20 indicate both [man and woman] are responsible for teaching the law to their children, which means both must first know it.”⁸⁷

Assume no role nor gender as more glorious than the other. God created both men and women in the image of God. The blood of Christ redeemed the sins of both men and women. Both roles, the head and the submitter, serve their counterpart. At those intersections in life where decisions need to be made, both roles put the other first and consider their needs. “Since both the headship role of a husband and the submission role as a wife are servant roles, one can always begin to serve without waiting for permission.”⁸⁸

The differences between men and women as well as the differing roles intended for men and women are under attack at this present time. The conversation is one of the most valuable conversations to have. These are not random isolated points which God’s people can take or leave. “The teaching about men’s and women’s roles is no addendum to basic Christian teaching

⁸⁶ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 123.

⁸⁷ MacArthur, *Divine Design*, 171.

⁸⁸ Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 216.

that sticks out like an ill-constructed addition to a house. Instead, it is an integral part of an important teaching about the unity of the body of Christ and the good order that makes unity possible.”⁸⁹ Since humanity continues being born male or female, and God’s church (family or congregation) continues to make decisions about *disputable matters*—matters where God has not spoken—the topic about the roles of men and women is not going away. It continues to be a necessary conversation, one from which neither man nor woman needs to shy away.

Men and women have different roles. God’s people are welcomed to speak this way. Science agrees with the difference of the sexes. The result of denying these different roles is unknown and potentially detrimental to society. The Bible does not paint one role as better than the other; people do. Male headship adherents do not need to apologize for speaking about different roles concerning men and women. Nor do they need to be silent.

⁸⁹ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 220.

SUBMISSION

Submit. For many it is such a problematic word. Combat sports in America have been perpetually popular, sports such as professional wrestling, and Mixed Martial Arts, where one way to be declared the victor is to make the opponent “tap out” to a submission maneuver. Perhaps this is partially the reason, in the modern day, that to submit to someone means to lose a title; perhaps this is the reason the word submission is associated with pain, seeing the counterpart as the enemy. After discussing the concept of submission in various ways in this paper, now we address the word on the scale of: couple, family, church, workplace, and secular government. The word submission has to do with function, not the worth of two people. “No institution—including the church—can function without a system of authority and submission.”⁹⁰ A world without submission is not a utopia; it is anarchy and chaos.

Submission is essential to the marriage relationship. A spouse who does not submit is no different from a stranger. “According to the order of creation, the man is specifically mentioned as taking the initiative, but the woman’s unconditional consent is just as clearly implied. How otherwise would the man know that she is his woman to whom he is determined to cling?”⁹¹ Bear with the stereotypical example: How is the woman in the grocery store, who refuses to adhere to the family budget (and this has become a pattern of behavior) any different than another woman in the aisle to that husband? One shopper is just as bound to the husband as the other at that particular moment. Submission communicates that two people are in a relationship.

⁹⁰ MacArthur, *Divine Design*, 41.

⁹¹ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 288.

Associating submission with pain is unnecessary. Kathy Keller shares this personal story: “Tim and I have found that in submitting to our own divinely assigned gender roles we discovered one of God’s great gifts for getting in touch with our deepest selves...No wise person rejects a gift from someone who loves them without at least giving it a look.”⁹² The man submits to his gender role as head also. It is not easy nor desirable being the accountable one for the relationship. Ironically, men, in general, are naturally prone to step back and give up the head role. By submitting, people gain more than they perceive they lose. Being one who submits is closer to the image of God than one who enforces his or her way.

God often places opportunities to serve right within our common spheres of life. In many cases these service opportunities are called spouses. “The wife will find true blessedness of God’s gift of the marriage bond to the extent that she submits in love to her husband as her head; similarly, the husband will find true blessedness of God’s gift of the marriage bond to the extent in which he exercises his headship over the wife in Christ-like self-sacrificing love.”⁹³ Male headship and submission are not about which sex exalts themselves over the other. The man submits to the wife according to his role. Between men and women is a burrowing challenge to see who can get lower, who can support the other. It is about putting the other first.

Subordination is another cold sounding word. The relationship between boss and employee comes to the mind of many.

There is a subordination in Gen 2, but it is a very specific kind of subordination—the kind that makes one person out of two. According to Gen 2, woman was created to be a help to man, not to be a servant or a slave. She was created to be a complement to him,

⁹² Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 193.

⁹³ Lawrenz, “Selections from a Genesis Commentary,” 305.

making a household and children possible. He, in turn, protected her, provided for her, and considered her part of himself, a partner in life.⁹⁴

In marriage, two people become one. Two wills must find a way to make one decision. A husband who makes decisions for himself and ignores the needs of his wife and family is guilty of insubordination in his role as head. A husband with no consideration for the needs of his wife harms and hates himself. They are one.

This point agrees with the terms masculinity and femininity as they have been defined so far. “At the heart of mature masculinity is a sense of benevolent responsibility to lead, provide for and protect women in ways appropriate to a man’s differing relationships.”⁹⁵ For the man who complains, “My wife does not submit to me, what can I do?” the answer is, “Love her; put her first.” A man’s desire to be a blessing for the woman most poignantly expresses itself between a husband and wife. However, this desire to protect and be considerate of women is also applied to every man-woman relationship.

“At the heart of mature femininity is a freeing disposition to affirm, receive and nurture strength and leadership from worthy men in ways appropriate to a woman’s differing relationships.”⁹⁶ No encouragement is as uplifting to the male as the encouragement of the woman.

The oneness from two people found in marriage, the submissive nature of both roles, only advances the personal growth of both individuals. “Studies show that spouses hold one another accountable to greater levels of personal responsibility and self-discipline than friends or other

⁹⁴ Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 28.

⁹⁵ Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 35

⁹⁶ Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 36.

family members can.”⁹⁷ Healthy man-woman relationships teach both sexes the art of self-denial, patience, and selfless thought. The well-being (and future well-being) of the other is on the mind of the individual. “The Christian approach to social structure differs from both a traditionalist approach (every man for himself) and a socialist approach (the worship of equality). The body of Christ is intended by God to be a people, a community, based upon personal relationship[s] of committed love, structured as a relational grouping with social roles, and ordering the goods and services according to a principle of equal care.”⁹⁸

Submission and its necessity have been explained. So have the benefits of a submissive relationship. Now, in this age full of caricatures about what submission looks like it is essential to define what submission is not.

The words, submit and submissive do not mean to tell wives [women] ‘Be passive’ or ‘Be a pushover.’ To submit does not mean, ‘Do not have a mind or opinion’ or ‘Never voice your opinion’ or ‘Always agree.’ To submit means that a wife accepts her husband as head of her marriage. (Eph 5:23) Paul also reminds the husband, then, that he should love and sacrifice for his wife the way Jesus gave himself for the church, his bride.⁹⁹

Remember Kathy Keller’s personal story from the “Different Roles” section. Submission does not equal silence, or to follow blindly. Nor does it mean a wife has no input or initiative in the relationship.

Within the domestic scale of man and woman relations, the woman has immense decision making and leadership dexterity.

The wife is the ruler or manager of the household. She is the heart of the household, ordering the life of the household and seeing that the needs of the people in the household are met. She takes active responsibility for the affairs of the house and is expected to

97 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 17.

98 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 595.

99 Pope, *Feminism*, 210.

handle them competently. She rules the household in subordination to her husband, but she rules the household nonetheless.¹⁰⁰

The wise husband does not hinder the path of his wife as she puts the family first, and he is quick to agree as she voices her thoughts about what needs doing in the home.

Recall how the moral law of God applies to that ambiguous area where real men and real women act in real-world situations. God fearing couples are drawn closer to God's principles, not boxed in by a checklist of observable concrete behavior. Men and women do science and art as they work together; the learning about roles is continuous. No couple is a carbon copy of another.

The submission of [a] wife to [a] husband in its degree and manner may vary according to the different conditions of persons, place, and time. If the husband neglects his duty, it falls to the wife to take his place in directing the family. But the structure of the family and its fundamental law, established and confirmed by God, must always and everywhere be maintained intact.¹⁰¹

A man who refuses to take the needs of the family into consideration, a generation of men who refuse to be a blessing to the brides of their youths, all of the sad accounts in history of chauvinism and misogyny, none of these adverse examples eliminates the principle of submission and headship.

Examples of relationships with no submission are seen all over in the modern world. We see it in the poor treatment of governing officials, the increase of the divorce rate, the hesitancy of people to get married. We see it in our sports when officials exercise authority. "The ideal of scripture is not independence. It is community. The independent individuals of today confront God's desire to form one body out of many

100 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 63.

101 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 296.

different selfish individuals. The contemporary world demonstrates rebellion. This is not an accident, because the principles by which so many people live do not allow real community.”¹⁰² A lack of humility is the root cause of the lack of submission. Since Eden, people have desired to see themselves as their own god.

This perspective has not only endured but, has been promoted primarily in the Western world. This perspective carries with it side effects, side effects the world has noticed increasing at an alarming rate.

How is it that in the last twenty years or so, as we have increasingly lost our understanding of male headship and as feminist ideals have been aggressively pursued throughout our society- how is it that under these conditions, sexual exploitation and confusion and perversity have exploded in incidence? Male headship is not to blame. Male domination and feminism are two viruses attacking sexuality today.¹⁰³

Individuals seeing themselves as the god of their sphere does not solve the world’s problems as some determine to believe; the refusal to submit exacerbates sin and promotes anarchy.

God’s people should not expect the world at large to draw the same conclusions or see the same dynamics. A Christian demanding God’s order of creation thrust upon governments and secular institutions is by definition another example of insubordination. Demanding that the hierarchies of the secular world adhere to God’s order of creation is like demanding that an apple tree produce coconuts.

Christians should refrain from trying to make secular society act as if it follows the Lord; at the same time, they should serve society with the wisdom the Lord provides, to the extent that this wisdom can be put to good use...Christians must also live in a secular social system which follows very different principles than a Christian social system, and, at the same time, live in a Christian social system. They must, in other words, be in the world, but not of it (John 17:15-16), obey God and not men (Acts 5:29), and be

102 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 45.

103 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 105.

submissive to rulers and authorities, ready for any honest work, showing perfect courtesy toward all men (Titus 3:1-2).¹⁰⁴

Between these two institutions, the married couple and the world at large, is that community, that Christian social system, the Church. The Church is composed of individual men and women, married and unmarried. It is composed of those who confess to be adherents to the principles of God. Those intersections where decisions must happen exist in churches also. A body of believers' decision-making structure may differ in appearance. It may be more democratic, where voters voice their preferences and majority rules among disputable matters. A body of believers may be more episcopal, where select representatives on a council make all congregation decisions. A body of believers may be structured to have the pastor make all decisions. In all of these templates, there are plenty of opportunities to exercise submission.

Concerning church councils and episcopal structures, "Church leaders are chosen from among the most spiritual men of the congregation, but other men in the church may be even more spiritual. Those who are not in a position of leadership are still called to submit to those who are."¹⁰⁵ There is no reason to perceive church decision making as a gender war. Men submit to other men in the church. Nor is leadership in the Church a matter of who is most qualified or most devout. Headship and submission in the Church is still a matter of function, not worth.

In anticipation of the final section of the paper let us talk about the representation of women in church decision making. Women, keep in mind the oneness of marriage. "Voting your representative into the voters' assembly, in this case, means marrying him... we sometimes forget the marriage relationship and how it promotes God-pleasing representation of women."¹⁰⁶

104 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 666.

105 MacArthur, *Divine Design*, 46.

106 Pope, *Feminism*, 234–35.

To the unmarried and widows, what a blessing it is that genuinely masculine men look for ways to be a blessing to the female sex. The unmarried are invited and encouraged to speak their mind to a man of the congregation.

Since submission does not convey pain or powerlessness, male headship proponents see this word as the blessed word it was intended to be. People submit so they can function, not to define the worth of a person. This word has provided many teachable moments for people trying to live by God's design, and this word will continue to do so.

I DO NOT HAVE A VOICE IN MY CHURCH

“For women who wish to influence their church, in any way, for any reason, the task at hand challenges them, to understand the nuts and bolts of their congregation’s policy-making process.”¹⁰⁷ Both men and women are encouraged to become familiar with such processes. Seek the answer to the question, “How has this congregation agreed to make decisions upon disputable matters (matters where God remains silent)?” A congregation may be one where the pastor is entrusted to make the bulk of the decisions with the advice and aid of a council. It may be a congregation where the council itself has been entrusted to make decisions from daily church maintenance to the building of a new facility, and every decision in-between. Many congregations are democratic, with the voting population voicing their desires by ballots. Churches, collective church gatherings, and synods all have (or should have) a constitutional document describing how it has been agreed for decisions to be made, the decisions which affect the community at large.

Where men are equivalent to the voting population, they act as representatives for every member: male, female, child of that church body. To a woman who feels voiceless in church, one might say, “A way to get your vote registered is in this context is to encourage your husband to attend and get involved. He may be elected to one or more positions, and your representation will grow.”¹⁰⁸ A representative is to have those whom he represents in mind, with every vote he casts.

107 Pope, *Feminism*, 189.

108 Pope, *Feminism*, 235.

A man whose vote is not what the church body decides can easily *and in frustration* say, “I do not have a voice in this community.” One of the larger fallacies egalitarian churches promote is that more votes equal a higher probability of making the “right” decision. Male headship is not about the number of ballots counted; both large and small quorums have made “right” decisions in hindsight, and “wrong” decisions in hindsight. This pattern will continue. Male headship is about order, and making decisions that are for the good of the whole church, including men, women and children.

In 1 Cor 14:33-35, the apostle Paul says that women should “remain silent in the churches...they are not allowed to speak...it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church.” This statement of Paul has been called oppressive by many. Egalitarians draw attention to who the silenced subjects are, and ignore the setting that Paul emphasizes. Paul is writing about orderly worship practice in the first-century early Christian church. “There is a reason Paul told women to ask their husbands about disputed matters ‘at home.’ At home is the opposite of in public. The point of the apostle is that the controversial matter of debate, argument, or repartee between sexes needs to be discussed away from the worship setting and especially away from the public arena.”¹⁰⁹ How unsettling it would be for a new member, a visitor, or a prospect to see men and women refuse to submit to each other’s needs. Better for the sinful nature to manifest itself in private if it manifests at all. Is this the reason these questions should be asked at home? It is quite likely.

The issue with male headship has very little to do with the vote; it has more to do with the concept of authority. Authority exists at those intersections where decisions need to happen for more than one person. “In marriage, there are only two ‘votes’... what of a case where both

109 Pope, *Feminism*, 232–33.

parties cannot agree, but some decision must be made? Someone must have the right to cast the deciding vote AND THUS the greater responsibility for the decision.”¹¹⁰ To say “voice equals vote” creates a logical fallacy. Men are accountable for the decisions they make at these times on the scale of marriage and of the family unit. אַיִן “Where are you?” (Masculine Singular) We need men at church meetings where decisions for others are being made.

Biblical male headship adherents must take time and explain themselves well. Liberal feminists and egalitarians conclude conservative male headship adherents are cold. This perspective motivated their movement. “This (feminist/egalitarian) movement is in part a response to genuine needs and problems. Though the feminist solutions are often inadequate, any adequate Christian approach to the roles of men and women must squarely face the same needs and problems.”¹¹¹ Both feminists and Biblical male headship adherents call behaviors such as abuse, chauvinism, and misogyny unacceptable.

Neither feminism, nor allowing women to vote in the church, nor denial of the order of creation solves any of the problems between the sexes.

Nothing can change the fact that God created male headship as one aspect of our pre-fall perfection. Therefore, while many women need release from male domination, the liberating alternative is not female rivalry or autonomy, but male headship wedded to female help. Christian redemption does not redefine creation; it restores creation, so wives learn godly submission and husbands learn godly headship.¹¹²

“In the late eighteenth century, Mary Wollstonecraft set a precedent for feminism—yet not by activism. She shaped its spirit and publicized it: What is good for men is good for women. She called on women to imitate men; women should be autonomous; the way to achieve it would

110 Keller, *Meaning of Marriage*, 279. Capitalization added for emphasis.

111 Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 506.

112 Raymond, “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3,” 109.

be through education and legal emancipation.”¹¹³ Men *and* women generally ignored Wollstonecraft; women who imitated men did not appeal to the general population. Her written work remained dormant, perhaps due to her unconventional personal relationships and unorthodox lifestyle. Her philosophy lay dormant until the twentieth century.

This pattern of citing the shortcomings of men as a problem, and then proposing women acting and being treated equally to men as the solution, results in the degeneration of society, not the advancement of it. One can argue confidently that biblical male headship is not only in line with Scripture’s teaching, but also the more forward-thinking way of life. Man and woman relations are at the very heart of a society. When Christians do not promote biblical male headship or carry it out, humanity is harmed.

Both men and women have voices in their churches. They can voice their ideas, encouragements, and displeasures. Both men and women have a voice to speak about God’s blessings given in male headship and male votership.

113 Pope, *Feminism*, 80.

CONCLUSION

Christians who adhere to the biblical principle of male headship in their homes and their churches need not shrink back from conversations where these volatile phrases about the roles of man and women come up. This is God's teaching, not man's. Neither men nor women need to be ashamed of it. May both men and women be a light and a service to others within those world arenas where God's principles are mocked and seen as oppressive or old-fashioned.

It is highly unlikely that in secular classrooms or secular conversations this material is laid out. Why do conservative church bodies not have women as voting members? Because it would eliminate the opportunity for men to take up their God-given role as submitters to an entire community. The church cannot and should not control what society does; Christian women may vote in secular elections with a clear conscience. However, within a church body which claims to adhere to the explicit commands of God from the beginning, such a church body should practice what he commands, despite how unpopular it might be. In a democratic culture, when considering all social factors, I have been led to conclude male headship to be the more open-minded *progressive* (forward-thinking) path in line with God's order of creation.

Since Scripture teaches the order of creation, we can talk positively about the roles of men and women and male headship. There are many words and phrases which spark discussions with strong emotions, and discussion is welcomed. Men and women are well-equipped not to shrink back when the topic of men and women roles arises.

Every trait of men has a dark side because of original sin. However, men, let no one shame you for your forward motion, propensity to debate, nor any other trait you might share

with generic masculinity. To be a man does not mean to be selfish nor evil as some are in the habit of teaching. “Satan has achieved an amazing tactical victory by disseminating the notion that the summons for male leadership is born of pride and fallenness, when in fact pride is precisely what prevents spiritual leadership. The spiritual aimlessness and weakness and lethargy and loss of nerve among men is the major issue, not the upsurge of interest in women’s ministries.”¹¹⁴ Loving headship will help women to see that God’s design is beautiful. Until the Lord returns, loving headship will continue to be an opportunity for personal growth and ongoing discussion.

114 Piper and Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, 53.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becker, Bruce, and Paul Kelm. "Women in the WELS," May 2018.
- Clark, Stephen B. *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences*. Ann Arbor, Mich: Servant Books, 1980.
- Clip Hunter. *Jordan Peterson Gender Roles In Society*. Vol. 17. Personality Lecture. Toronto, 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eS0ye_uX8L0.
- Derrick, Sherwin Bailey. *The Man-Woman Relationship in Christian Thought*. London: Longman's, 1959.
- Groothuis, Rebecca Merrill. *Women Caught in the Conflict: The Culture War between Traditionalism and Feminism*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1994.
- Jewett, Paul King. *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- John Piper, and Wayne Grudem. "Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood." *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*. Edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2006.
- Keller, Timothy. *Meaning of Marriage*. Penguin Group US, 2011.
- Kuske, David P. "The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as It Is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman." *Our Great Heritage*. Vol. III of. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991.
- Lawrenz, Carl. "Selections From a Genesis Commentary." *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78.4 (1981): 279–311.
- Leyrer, Daniel. "South Eastern Wisconsin Praesidium," 2018.
- Luther, Martin. *What Luther Says*. Edited by Ewald M. Plass. Vol. 3. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.
- MacArther, John. *Divine Design*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 1994.
- Pope, Nathan R. *Feminism: Understanding and Balancing Its Impact on Marriage, Family, and Church*. Impact Series. Milwaukee, Wis: Northwestern Pub. House, 2003.

Raymond, C. Ortlund Jr. "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3." Pages 95–112 in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*. Edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2006.

Trainor, Brian T. "The Trinity and Male Headship of the Family." *The Heythrop Journal* 52.5 (2011): 724–38.