

# Most Christians Do Not Love Women

35 upvotes | 1 April, 2020 | by OsmiumZulu

---

Looking at the state of Christianity today one might be tempted to believe that not only do modern Christians love women, but they damn near worship them. From the Mother's Day sermon (you know, the one where we pretend that women are sinless for a day) to the deference to always believing women crying "#metoo", it seems evident that Christians across the theological spectrum are bending over backwards (and bending scripture) to empower and elevate women to the highest status their confessions, conventions, or congregations will allow (and when those don't allow for more women-worship they are amended to provide more latitude).

So where do I get off that Christians do not love women? Simple: Christians, to their shame, don't even know what women are anymore. Christians love what they *\*think\** women *\*should be\**, not what women actually are.

Conservative Christians are tempted to snicker at this point, but fare little better. Despite loudly protesting that marriage is between "a man and a woman" and firmly stating that "there are only two genders" they are utterly ignorant as to the true nature of one of those two genders.

Women are functionally [solipsistic](#). They are [hypergamous](#). They [re-write history](#) based on their emotional state; feels is reals. [Female leaders are a curse](#) on God's people. Women are [the most responsible teenagers](#) in the house.

The list goes on. Now, one might object that this is all because of secular influence.

Is it?

Why then does the Bible warn against females being the sexual tempters in proverbs? Why do we see [Potiphar's wife](#) acting out beta-bux alpha f\*\*\*s? Why do we have [biblical law](#) given regarding the practice of acquiring [war brides](#)?

Female nature predates modernity. Our forefathers in the faith knew far better the reality of what women truly are. You may be thinking I hate women at this point. Far from it. Unlike most Christians today we here in RPC actually love women *\*knowing what they actually are\** and invite you to do so, knowingly, as well.

Imagine two men who each claim to love sports cars. One says, "I love sports cars because they can tow my boat, haul a load of wood, and fit all my dogs in the bed." The other says, "I love sports cars because of how fast they go, how quick they accelerate, and they were built to handle a windy road."

Which man actually loves sports cars? The one who actually knows what a sports car is and doesn't mistake it for a truck.

Modern Christians mistake women for men. Think about it. What do women frequently get praised for? Their ability to assume leadership roles (male attribute). Their service in the military (male attribute). Their loyalty (male attribute). Their ability to preach a sermon or organize a congregation (male roles). Modern churches do not love women for being female, but for being mediocre males.

What if women are hypergamous, solipsistic, emotively driven, and flexible in loyalty because they were designed by God to be that way because they are *\*fundamentally different\** in their role and function? Let me suggest that women are not meant to mirror the male design and are primarily intended as a vessel to seduce men, produce offspring, and nurture them. If this is what women really are, can anyone claim that the church at large loves them anymore than secular society does?

The historical church had a rather different understanding of women than we find taught in pulpits today:

"Woman does not possess the image of God in herself but only when taken together with the male who is her head, so that the whole substance is one image. But when she is assigned the role as helpmate, a function that pertains to her alone, then she is not the image of God. But as far as the man is concerned, he is by himself alone the image of God just as fully and completely as when he and the woman are joined together into one." –Saint Augustine, Bishop of Hippo Regius (354-430) On the Trinity

The word and works of God is quite clear, that women were made either to be wives or prostitutes. –Martin Luther, Reformer (1483-1546), Works 12.94

Thus the woman, who had perversely exceeded her proper bounds, is forced back to her own position. She had, indeed, previously been subject to her husband, but that was a liberal and gentle subjection; now, however, she is cast into servitude. \*\*–\*\*John Calvin, Reformer (1509-1564): Commentary on Genesis, p. 172.

Even as the church must fear Christ Jesus, so must the wives also fear their husbands. And this inward fear must be shewed by an outward meekness and lowliness in her speeches and carriage to her husband. . . . For if there be not fear and reverence in the inferior, there can be no sound nor constant honor yielded to the superior. –John Dod: A Plaine and Familiar Exposition of the Ten Commandments, Puritan guidebook first published in 1603

Men have broad and large chests, and small narrow hips, and more understanding than women, who have but small and narrow breasts, and broad hips, to the end they should remain at home, sit still, keep house, and bear and bring up children. –Martin Luther, Reformer (1483-1546), Table Talk

Women are amazingly forthcoming if you listen closely. Most strong-independent-career women I know would love nothing more than to stay home, breed, and raise their children. They low-key loath their husbands because they have to shoulder part of his responsibility to provide instead of getting to focus on being homemakers and moms.

Could you imagine Sarah telling Abraham, "Abraham, could you please, for the love of Yahweh, pick up after yourself and help take care of the kids so I can go to yoga class? I am just so overwhelmed at work and need a night off to myself"? Or Rachel telling Jacob, "Jake, think about how much my daddy has done to provide opportunity to our family. Do you really think it is a good idea to run away and leave him?" No. These women clearly understood and respected the concept of male headship.

In summary, most Christians love an imaginary ideal of women that does not exist. What they claim to love is a femininity that is nothing more than a poor imitation of masculinity.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

perplexedm • 13 points • 1 April, 2020 01:23 PM

Happens when too many Liliths and Jazebels enforce their view points on everyone in the name of equity than equality.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 04:56 PM

The problem is that this isn't just being pushed the "equality" crowd, but is being pushed from within so-called conservative circles as well. They also have a fundamental misunderstanding of the female nature.

OrlandoTheAxe • 6 points • 1 April, 2020 05:02 PM

Modern conservatives aren't conserving anything.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 6 points • 1 April, 2020 05:08 PM

Indeed. Conservatism at best is a tactical retreat meant to stall the inevitable. We need to be looking forward more than looking backward.

IsAllThisReal • 2 points • 1 April, 2020 06:28 PM

Conservatives are slightly less degenerate than liberals and twice as stupid and blind.

absolutelythewootley • 19 points • 1 April, 2020 09:55 AM

In today's times, women are trying to intellectualize "being like a man" and men are being forced to "feel the feelings of a woman," all wrapped in the package of "equality."

OsmiumZulu[S] • 6 points • 1 April, 2020 04:54 PM

Worse is that it's being wrapped up in the package of "complimentarianism" as well.

Conservative "traditionalists" are running with the same faulty programming stemming from a particular reading of Ephesians 5. "See men? You are called to love your wife like Christ loves the church! Christ sacrificed *everything* to serve his bride, and that is what you are called to do as well as Christian husbands."

Heard that one before?

IsAllThisReal • 4 points • 1 April, 2020 06:21 PM

No one can force you to be feminine. No matter how hard they push it, every guy knows its complete foolishness. Similarly even girl knows she is not a man, which is why women who try to be men are so unhappy the second they are not receiving attention for it.

absolutelythewootley • 2 points • 2 April, 2020 12:50 PM

I disagree. Bad parents can certainly force a little boy to be feminine, and create such a deep rooted condition in him that he may never decide to question it. If he does decide to question it, then it's on him to continue moving forward with it, any setbacks you most certainly can place on him.

I also want to point out endocrine disruptors. Parents should know what to avoid when feeding themselves and their children, but there are many who are not aware, and feed their children food containing chemicals such as soy, pesticides, heavy metals, and especially sugar. This stuff not only damages the liver, and secondarily effects other organs in the body, but the cognitive effects can be very

detrimental and long lasting. Couple decreased male cognitive functions (increased emotion, decreased rationale) with an environment where masculinity is deemed “toxic” and constant reinforcement of the narrative, and you’re developing a Hegelian dialectic for them and not really giving a child a good head start to reject feminized forces. That’s on the parent.

If we didn’t have such a deep rooted feminist ideology flourishing in our times, in my opinion, damage from endocrine disruptors wouldn’t be so bad on a child. Our bodies are miraculous and can heal from many different maladies. But cognitively, when a belief system is thwarted, and an individual finally takes the responsibility to move away from the victim hood, if they are not supported in the community or strong enough within themselves, they most certainly can fall again and revert to their old ways. These are the boys I pray for, who never overcame the feminine spirit and had a strong father figure in their lives to mitigate this.

Responsibility doesn’t have to be this painful, but boys who haven’t truly embraced this make it seem more painful than what it is because of their feminized emotions. You can also apply this to your statement on girls who try to be men and are unhappy when the attention isn’t placed on them; Frustration and anger is their response to having their emotional narrative challenged. This doesn’t apply to all, because some children are born with a great spirit and overcome this easily, but this can be applied to most boys and girls in our time.

IsAllThisReal • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 05:21 PM

You're probably right about that. I have a bit of a cultural divide with many americans I meet.

EDCs are among the most concerning emerging contaminants in our water supply. Our understanding of their provenance, reactivity in the environment, and the resulting fate and transport is severely lacking. We need unit operations in our water treatment facilities to address them, but its difficult to target very small concentrations of a wide range of different compounds.

Red-Curious • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 02:12 AM

They can't force you, but they can punish you for not feminizing yourself. Yes, this is happening. The impact of the APA study finding "traditional masculinity" to be "harmful" is already reaching the courts.

Rifleshoot • 7 points • 1 April, 2020 02:41 PM

I agree that women’s first priority must be God, then her husband and then his household. That doesn’t mean that stay at home mom is the only way that she can do that. If we look at the book of Ruth, one of her best qualities was that she worked extremely hard. So stay at home mom is not the only way. I like it personally, but there is nothing sinful about a woman working. Where it becomes sinful is where it conflicts with her duties as a wife and mother. Those must always come first.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 3 points • 1 April, 2020 05:06 PM

That doesn’t mean that stay at home mom is the only way that she can do that. If we look at the book of Ruth, one of her best qualities was that she worked extremely hard.

Ruth didn't go out and spend the primer of her youth building spreadsheets for Globalhomo Corp. Yes, she worked hard, but her efforts were focused on Boaz's farm which was a family business.

Rifleshoot • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 05:22 PM

That was before she was married to Boaz. She was working for someone else to provide for her late husband’s mother and herself. She could have been like her sister-in-law and simply left her mother in

law to fend for herself, but instead, she kept her obligation to that husband and his family and did everything she could to provide for them.

I do agree with the fact that many women are indeed putting career ahead of their family these days, but I do not agree that a woman working outside of the home is a sin in and of itself. If it is for the benefit of her husband's household and he approves of it, then it is good for a woman to work. It's ultimately situational. If the man makes a ton of money and they don't need the extra income, then it's good for her to stay home and run the household. If the family needs that extra income, however, then it is good for her to go work.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 9 points • 1 April, 2020 05:39 PM

That was before she was married to Boaz. She was working for someone else to provide for her late husband's mother and herself.

Re-read Chapter 2.

Now Naomi had a relative of her husband's, a worthy man of the clan of Elimelech, whose name was Boaz. And Ruth the Moabite said to Naomi, "Let me go to the field and glean among the ears of grain after him win whose sight I shall find favor." And she said to her, "Go, my daughter."

Before she was married to Boaz she worked for him in his fields. Boaz was a relative. Hence my statement that Ruth worked for the family business.

I do not agree that a woman working outside of the home is a sin in and of itself

I'm glad you don't agree with that because I never made such a claim. For the record I do think that *many* if not *most* young women today are rebelling against what God created them for.

If the family needs that extra income, however, then it is good for her to go work.

Why is it that it used to be that families seldom if ever needed the extra income of a wife working until after women at large entered the workforce? It's as if doubling the labor supply negatively impacted wages and made it far more difficult to raise a family on a single income...

Red-Curious • 6 points • 2 April, 2020 02:15 AM

I'd add the fact that Ruth's intentions were also not to build a successful career for herself. Rather, she set her eyes on the highest value man there (the owner of the whole place) and seduced him into marrying her.

Props for the last point. Well put.

Willow-girl • 4 points • 2 April, 2020 03:28 AM

For most of history, marrying a wealthy man was a surer bet than almost anything a woman could do on her own to attain financial security.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 3 points • 2 April, 2020 04:30 AM

All\* of history. Literally today the wealthiest woman on earth is the lady who divorced raped Jeff Bezos of Amazon.

Willow-girl • 4 points • 2 April, 2020 11:34 AM

But now women have the option of making our own money.

Willow-girl • 3 points • 2 April, 2020 03:27 AM

Why is it that it used to be that families seldom if ever needed the extra income of a wife working until after women at large entered the workforce?

Only a relatively small number of upper-class women have led lives of leisure. In the working class, most women worked until marriage, and sometimes after marriage as well unless they were too burdened by a large number of children. Even then, traditionally women have had 'cottage industries' like selling eggs or butter to help supplement the family income.

wkndatbernardus • 3 points • 2 April, 2020 04:43 AM

Good point. I would also say that our standard of living expectations are much higher now so we spend ourselves into needing more income than is necessary.

[deleted] • 12 points • 1 April, 2020 12:02 PM

An excellent wife who can find? She is far more precious than jewels. The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will have no lack of gain. She does him good, and not harm, all the days of her life. She seeks wool and flax, and works with willing hands. She is like the ships of the merchant; she brings her food from afar. She rises while it is yet night and provides food for her household and portions for her maidens. She considers a field and buys it; with the fruit of her hands she plants a vineyard. She dresses herself with strength and makes her arms strong. She perceives that her merchandise is profitable. Her lamp does not go out at night. She puts her hands to the distaff, and her hands hold the spindle. She opens her hand to the poor and reaches out her hands to the needy. She is not afraid of snow for her household, for all her household are clothed in scarlet. She makes bed coverings for herself; her clothing is fine linen and purple. Her husband is known in the gates when he sits among the elders of the land. She makes linen garments and sells them; she delivers sashes to the merchant. Strength and dignity are her clothing, and she laughs at the time to come. She opens her mouth with wisdom, and the teaching of kindness is on her tongue. She looks well to the ways of her household and does not eat the bread of idleness. Her children rise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praises her: "Many women have done excellently, but you surpass them all." Charm is deceitful, and beauty is vain, but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised. Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her works praise her in the gates. Proverbs 31:10-31 ESV

Women are not just things sitting around waiting to be fucked and bear children. Instead, we are praised for contributing to the household as evidenced in Proverbs 31. She compliments her husband by working. Although kids are a first priority, and a unique capability given to women, that does not discredit her from being a working member of the household as evidenced by this passage.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 7 points • 1 April, 2020 05:02 PM

Women are not just things sitting around waiting to be fucked and bear children.

Never said they were. In fact, I'd suggest women looking to get fucked and bear children ought to be active about it.

Instead, we are praised for contributing to the household as evidenced in Proverbs 31. She compliments her husband by working. Although kids are a first priority, and a unique capability given to women, that does not discredit her from being a working member of the household as evidenced by this passage.

Where did you get the idea that I was suggesting women not be working in their household? Perhaps I was unclear when I wrote: "Most strong-independent-career women I know would love nothing more than to **stay**

home, breed, and raise their children." The "stay home" part includes taking care of said home.

mojo-j0j0 • 6 points • 1 April, 2020 02:48 PM

Well this passage describes an impossible woman. But it's also important to notice that what she does makes her husband look good and is in complete submission to him.

It's also important to remember that proverbs is wisdom literature which isn't meant to derive theology but is based on theology.

But you're right. Women can be powerful and respected helpers. Women can earn a name for their husbands as well as themselves.

DrPackage • 10 points • 1 April, 2020 06:31 PM

The entire bible and God saying how we should live is exactly as "impossible" as Proverb 31. These are all goals to be aimed at.

potatorockstar • 2 points • 4 April, 2020 04:14 PM

yes paradise can be lived from this life. or a small scale of it at least.

potatorockstar • 0 points • 4 April, 2020 04:13 PM

so a unicorn in a fewq words. and the biblical fathers KNEW such a woman is just a unicorn.

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 April, 2020 06:19 PM

What does a unicorn mean?

IsAllThisReal • 4 points • 1 April, 2020 06:41 PM

The reason I am not sure I 100% agree with this is because it absolves women of responsibility for their terrible behavior. Disloyal, hypergamous, solipsistic people are by any cogent system of morality terrible people.

Many, or even most men are just as pathetic, but nobody is absolving them of their patheticness. Just like women, they need to look it in the face and conquer their vices.

potatorockstar • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 04:15 PM

yes and no. they don't seem capable to fully introspect. feelings equal reality to them. maybe with the grace of God they can trascend their nature. i really don't know. most women out there live by the momentary sentiment. sentiment=truth to them.

potatorockstar • 3 points • 4 April, 2020 04:09 PM

woke af. church has been breached. the feminism which is just female demonic nihilism, has affected it. why? cause men got weak in faith and masculinity and became emasculated. if they truly loved women, they would stay red pill and biblical af. and wouldnt give in even an inch. which in the longterm proves to damage women and humanity in general.

sywonsmumu • 2 points • 1 April, 2020 06:00 PM

We keep harping on the fallen nature of women to be some sort of innate point of what we're designed to truly be. We're easier to brainwash, especially if we don't truly follow Christ or have some strong moral background. We see the effects of that today.

Women aren't designed to be solipsistic or flexible in loyalty. That's our sinful nature and that's what is praised

today. Why would God design a helper to be focused on herself and flexible in loyalty?

Also mankind was created in God's image. Marriage is suppose to resemble Christ and the church.

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."  
Genesis 1:27 kjv.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 06:30 PM

We keep harping on the fallen nature of women to be some sort of innate point of what we're designed to truly be. We're easier to brainwash, especially if we don't truly follow Christ or have some strong moral background. We see the effects of that today.

In scripture we aren't given much insight into creation from before the fall, so speculation of design intent can only go so far. What we do know is how women are now and must contend with how women are, not how we wish they were.

Women aren't designed to be solipsistic or flexible in loyalty. That's our sinful nature and that's what is praised today. Why would God design a helper to be focused on herself and flexible in loyalty?

How do you know they weren't design features? Men die on the job, in battle, and from accidents, at far greater rates than women. God providing women with flexible loyalty allows them to pair bond again in the event that their husband dies early on. Solipsism is a childish trait, but this may be part of what allows women to be such effective caretakers for children. Hypergamy is arguably one of the engines that drive societal advancement. Knowing that women will be attracted to the top tier men incentives men to compete, which drives innovation and growth.

Men have their own traits that can be positives but become problematic when they are let completely unfettered. The drive to dominion is given by God in Genesis, but if left unchecked it becomes tyrannical and dictatorial.

The point is: I don't think we can so quickly dismiss these female attribute as results of the fall without first considering they might be part of the design.

Also mankind was created in God's image. Marriage is suppose to resemble Christ and the church. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Genesis 1:27 kjv.

...and? Nothing in what I posted precludes this. Are you suggesting that this necessitates perfect equality?

Red-Curious • 2 points • 2 April, 2020 02:33 AM

This is exactly what I was going to say. These things often have negative connotations in society - not because they're inherently evil (they're not: nothing is inherently unclean, per Romans 14:14), but because the feminist influences in the world have decided they don't like associating these historical traits of women with who they want women to be today. It is a cultural conditioning that causes people to see certain traits as negative, not an inherent design by God through creation.

sywonsmumu • 1 point • 1 April, 2020 07:29 PM

I still don't understand how solipsism is a natural or good trait for women to have. We practice self-preservation which can tie into hypergamy but believing that nothing else exists beyond myself sounds like a disorder or some accepted behavior.

I'm not suggesting perfect equality. I don't believe that between the sexes and I don't think men and women are equal. I was suggesting that women were created along with men in Gods image in response

to your quotation of Saint Augustine.

Willow-girl • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 03:23 AM

but believing that nothing else exists beyond myself

Umm, how many people do you know who actually think this way?

sywonsmumu • 2 points • 2 April, 2020 03:35 AM

A lot. I just don't agree that it's a natural trait for women to have.

Willow-girl • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 03:56 AM

I think if women were as solipsistic as some men believe them to be, a lot of small children would be in trouble, lol.

sywonsmumu • 2 points • 2 April, 2020 04:07 AM

I work with small children. These small children are in trouble lol. I see a lot of solipsistic mothers but I don't think it's just our nature. I think it's selfishness, accepted behavior. It hurts their children and if the bare minimum is taken care of, they don't care or don't start to until it's too late.

Willow-girl • 2 points • 2 April, 2020 11:44 AM

I'm not sure kids need constant parental attention aka "helicoptering." In my day, kids and parents existed in separate spheres, only interacting when the kid needed something it couldn't provide for itself, like transportation. Otherwise, parents were largely off in their own world, doing adult things, and we were expected to entertain ourselves and negotiate our own disagreements. The average parent of the '70's would probably be regarded as negligent in today's kid-centered culture. JMO.

potatorockstar • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 04:28 PM

yeah agreed. even those defects women have seem to serve some purposes in society if they dont get too demonic and self destructive.

potatorockstar • 2 points • 4 April, 2020 04:26 PM

i agree. the jezebel woman is mostly a product of the fall. sure her emotional nature seems to have made the fall happen. as the cunning devil approached her first, cause he saw vulnerability in her. but the full fledged jezebel solipsistic nature seems to be a product of the fall from Grace and not God's endgoal design.

sywonsmumu • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 04:52 PM

Yep. It's easier to sell a women on validation than it is for a man. The fall spreads like wildfire because a woman can get a flood of validation over night. No validation comes from anything of value though, it's just a lot.

The serpent did go through the woman. It is so important to stay diligent and remember that to not become another victim.

RedPillWonder • 1 point • 1 April, 2020 07:04 PM

I hear what you're saying, but take a closer look at the verse you quoted:

God created **man** in his own image

He created man in his own image. This is the word *'adam* and while it is sometimes used to mean mankind, I think in this context it's referring to a male, Adam.

Then we get:

in the image of God created **he him**

This is the word *zakar* and it means exclusively male, as an adjective describing a (male) human, or as a masculine noun.

Again we see the phrase "in the image of God" associated with the male.

Lastly, we have:

male and female created he them.

There is no phrase "created in his own image" or "in the image of God" listed when referring to the female, even when listed alongside the male.

What to make of this?

While scholars disagree, it seems to suggest man is created in God's image, while the woman does not bear that particular title.

And for some, before we break out the smelling salts or anyone is in need of a fainting couch, don't have an emotional, knee jerk reaction. Women's worth and value in God's eyes are not diminished.

This does speak to God's hierarchy, design and roles for each. We know that it is God > Christ > Man > Woman as the New Testament tells us.

If man is in God's place toward the woman (husband/wife), as God is to us (Christ/church), then it makes sense that the man would bear the image of God, while the woman responds as we do toward Christ.

Tagging: u/Red-Curious u/OsmiumZulu u/RocknRollChuck

As I'd like to get your thoughts on this.

Deep\_Strength, definitely you too, but I remember RC saying you can only tag 3 at a time.

sywonsmumu • 2 points • 1 April, 2020 08:04 PM\*

If man is in God's place toward the woman (husband/wife), as God is to us (Christ/church), then it makes sense that the man would bear the image of God, while the woman responds as we do toward Christ.

I see where you're getting at but if Christ and God are one wouldn't we still be in the image of God? Or is, what I'm understanding, that women have to be married to do so?

Red-Curious • 3 points • 1 April, 2020 09:57 PM

I agree with /u/RedPillWonder, but in light of your comment let me take things a step further.

Your interpretation that women are most in God's image when they are married is also the way I would take what I think you're asking. A woman without a husband is like a man without Christ, or Christ without the Father. She is as incomplete as a person as Adam was without God.

But as RPW is saying, the reverse doesn't play out quite the same. Christ without mankind is still perfectly fine. There is no circumstance to imagine God without Christ, but this is the exact point of the parallel God is establishing: that we are fallen and trying to return to our ability to reflect God's image - triune as it may be. So, while God is triune, he gave men, women, and children to represent

triune structures as well - and Jesus, in the way he interacts with humanity is a mediator, bridging the gap between God's triune being and our triune structures here on earth, linking the two through his own relationship with the Church.

But again, if the Christ-church relationship is our given model (as we don't see the same imperative for men and women to interact the way God and Jesus do), then a man's need for a woman is as essential as Jesus's need for the Church (i.e. based on desire, not need), whereas a woman's need for a man (i.e. husband) is as essential as the Church's need for Christ (i.e. based on need, and hopefully also desire).

But all of this is still glorious not only for the Father and men, but also for the woman. After all, while it is still evident throughout Scripture that the Holy Spirit is referenced in the masculine as a person (as God, as a whole, while presumably ungendered (Jesus' physical body excepted), chose to identify himself in the masculine) ... we also see many wife/mother-like traits ascribed to the Spirit.

The way I see this triune structure of God is that:

The Father is the head

Jesus is the Son of God whose obligation was to obey his Father

The Spirit is the functional will of God put into action in the world

In this sense, in as much as the Holy Spirit is God's primary means of influencing the world for his glory, so also is the significance and glory of the wife's role with her husband in marriage. And this is made even more obvious when we consider the third relational context of Christ and the Church - that Christ, while not needing the Church, has chosen to glorify the Church by sending it to be his primary vehicle through which his will would be accomplished.

This is a fantastically beautiful thing for women! And it's interesting to me that no one bats an eye when seeing the way the Spirit enacts the will of the Father on earth, or that everyone loves and adores the way the Church is meant to serve Christ on earth to carry on her will - yet because of feminism, as soon as we argue that wives should rejoice at being the primary vehicle through which a husband's will is effected in his world (i.e. sphere of influence), everyone groans instead, rolling their eyes while commenting, "Oh, so she's just supposed to be his work-mule while he sits back and does nothing." How bad does one's theology of the role of Jesus with the Church or the Father with Christ have to be to reach such a backwards conclusion!?

How ego-centric has the Church become (as /u/OsmiumZulu notes is characteristic of women - and the Church by extension) that we over-emphasize our own role in the work Jesus set out for us, ignoring the infinitely more drastic, yet often unseen ways that Jesus is at work in the world alongside and over the Church!

Like I say, all of this should be as beautiful to women as the Spirit is to the Father or as the Church is to Christ. It is not to their shame, but to display her splendor, even while the husband and Christ are glorified by it.

And since RPW couldn't tag him and I have one extra tag left: /u/Deep\_Strength

sywonsmumu • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 01:05 AM

I agree with everything that's being said here but

| She is as incomplete as a person as Adam was without God.

I'm not sure if a woman has to be married to be complete as a person. I think a woman can be

complete as a person in Christ, married or not. Although I don't think or recommend it to be common a path for us, I think its possible.

I say this just based partially on the dating scene and hookup culture and how difficult it is. If it can take a long time to find someone then we might grow more focused on God and what He has for us to do.

Red-Curious • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 02:07 AM

I'd argue that a single woman can be 100% fully satisfied in Christ in this life, but she won't be "complete" as a person until the resurrection when her marriage to Christ is manifest more pragmatically and physical marriage, as we have on earth, will be done away with. To that end, I'd also suggest that the "completeness" any man or woman has on earth is still little more than a shadow of the "heavenly things" - whether they're married or not.

sywonsmumu • 1 point • 2 April, 2020 03:59 AM

I get it. I'll just say I think there can be some outliers, probably very few, as if God may have His will for them to be single, or if they can't have kids or something. I agree on our completeness definitely being more than a shadow of heavenly things though.

potatorockstar • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 04:32 PM

Christ and God are one. thank you sir.

potatorockstar • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 04:31 PM

God bigger than Christ is a heresy and completely antichristian. please dont even identify as a Christian if you really believe that. it nullify's the very purpose of the term. Christ IS God. He is the Logos, the second person of the Holy Trinity. and every person/hypostase of God is undivided and unseperable. Orthodox christian Christology is a mystery, as all theology. if it could be comprehended by humans, it wouldnt be divine.

RedPillWonder • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 05:24 PM

You wrote:

God bigger than Christ is a heresy and completely antichristian. please dont even identify as a Christian if you really believe that.

I didn't say bigger than Christ. Please read more carefully and keep things in context. I'm directly referencing scripture, in 1 Corinthians 11:3 where it reads:

But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God.

That clearly lays out God's hierarchy.

Christ IS God. He is the Logos, the second person of the Holy Trinity.

Yes, and nothing I've written says otherwise. Just as Paul writing in 1 Corinthians isn't saying otherwise. Again, please read more carefully.

Whitified • 2 points • 3 April, 2020 05:30 PM

You admit (most) women are dishonest and will change reality to suit their own needs.

Women are functionally solipsistic. They are hypergamous. **They re-write history** based on their emotional state; feels is reals. Female leaders are a curse on God's people. Women are the most responsible teenagers in the house.

But all that is great because God made them so!

What if women are hypergamous, solipsistic, emotively driven, and flexible in loyalty because they were designed by God to be that way because they are *fundamentally different* in their role and function?

**"And God made her dishonest, unloyal and narcissistic. And God said that it was good."** -Genesis 1:31

At long last you show your true colors

OsmiumZulu[S] • 5 points • 3 April, 2020 05:51 PM

Just when I thought you'd finally given up being a pedantic troll around here you go and prove me wrong.

Decimus\_Stark • 3 points • 6 April, 2020 11:27 AM

Dude, Eve wasn't even made yet when that verse was said.☐. Also nice job butchering the quotation.

Whitified • 0 points • 6 April, 2020 11:48 AM

Don't tell that to me, tell that to OP

Willow-girl • 6 points • 1 April, 2020 12:53 PM\*

Let me suggest that women are not meant to mirror the male design and are primarily intended as a vessel to seduce men, produce offspring, and nurture them.

Sorry, but that doesn't sound like a good time to me! (Well, maybe the seduction part, lol.)

I'd advise you to go read Proverbs 31. Does that sound like a woman whose only concerns are having sex and making babies?

I rest my case.

Edited to add: Haha, I guess I was posting at the same time as the person beneath me. Great minds think alike eh? :-)

OsmiumZulu[S] • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 05:09 PM

I'd advise you to go read Proverbs 31

Oh my gosh, Proverbs 31 is in the Bible? I had no idea. I need to rethink my entire worldview in light of this revelation.

Willow-girl • 3 points • 1 April, 2020 05:16 PM

That's probably a good idea. Have at it!

EarthIsNotAGlobe • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 08:36 AM

What a great and informative post! I especially liked your citations, they were very relevant. Thanks for continuously putting in the effort to write these, even if to a rather small audience.

OsmiumZulu[S] • 3 points • 1 April, 2020 05:12 PM

Thanks mate.

Phos\_Halas • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 09:59 AM

This is a very interesting perspective on a subject I feel very passionately about - understanding God's design for us separate from the influence the world has had on genders etc. '

But what does OP think about this in light of the new covenant which states that gender is no longer a distinguishing feature of our identity? (Galatians 3:28)

In my understanding and experience of the Gospel now, we may be called/led by God to perform acts and duties that supercede the original gender boundaries..

Though, I acknowledge my limited understanding of such things and I could be wrong in all of my assumptions and learning...

john\_tree • 9 points • 1 April, 2020 01:51 PM\*

But what does OP think about this in light of the new covenant which states that gender is no longer a distinguishing feature of our identity? (Galatians 3:28)

??

Galatians 3:22-29 King James Version (KJV)

22 But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

23 But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.

24 Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

25 But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

**28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.**

29 And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

Please examine that (crystal clear) context. Nowhere in there are found your "conclusions" ("gender" or "identity").

Is it really talking about "gender"? Is it not clearly speaking about Faith and belief in Jesus Christ as the sole requirement for salvation, and for receiving the promises of Abraham; thus there "is neither Jew nor Greek", *a complete different concept?*

Try to refrain from (single-verse-quoting), and (single-verse-interpreting) in the future. The Bible is not a tool which you use to justify and solidify **your** claims via practices such as those (using single verses as a stamp of approval), it should be the other way around, you learning and deriving your claims and mindset from the Bible, which is the Word of God.

UpTanks • 3 points • 1 April, 2020 01:35 PM

Great thoughts here. The first thing I'd point out is that, God is not inhibited by any culture from performing His work. The culture in China is totally and brutally oppressive towards Christians, yet they have a flourishing underground Church.

The culture of the modern west is feminist, but God isn't going to say "looks like I'm out of options here lol the women are in charge!". No matter how bad or strange the world gets and how far removed we are from

God's ideals, God will work through *anyone* who is willing to deny themselves and follow Him. So of course there are many women pastors in the current age.

That being said, women obsessed churches is **not** ideal, women obsessed culture is also **not** ideal. But you know what, I think it's all apart of God's plan to bring us back towards Him and there's a huge opportunity for Christians to lead the way. God knows how many men, women and children are broken and suffering because of the way things are right now. He's asking us (Godly men) to take on some responsibility not only for our own lives, but for the broader culture we live in. Because as Kingdom-bound men, we are not to be altered by the culture around us - we are meant to *alter the culture* towards God's image, in Jesus' name!

OsmiumZulu[S] • 5 points • 1 April, 2020 05:46 PM

we are meant to alter the culture towards God's image, in Jesus' name!

Yes. We are supposed to alter culture to accurately reflect and follow God's intent. Which is why we oppose women taking positions of authority within the church (1 Timothy 2:11-15). It's why we "urge the younger women to *love their husbands and children*, to be self-controlled and pure, to be *busy at home*, to be kind, and to *be subject to their husbands*" (Titus 2:4-5).

OsmiumZulu[S] • 2 points • 1 April, 2020 06:15 PM

But what does OP think about this in light of the new covenant which states that gender is no longer a distinguishing feature of our identity? (Galatians 3:28)

u/john\_tree's response to this is solid. In context, Paul is addressing the conditions of covenant membership. He explains that the covenant was promised to Abraham and his seed (singular), not seeds (plural). Who is that singular seed that inherited the covenant of faith? Christ. Christ *alone* receives this covenant. How then are men saved? By unity with Christ. How are men united to Christ? Faith.

He says, "in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith, for all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. If belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

The meaning is plain. With respect to those who have become "children of God through faith" and "clothed [themselves] with Chris" when God looks upon them he does not see a Jew, or a Gentile, or a man or a woman, but rather he looks at them and sees that they belong to Christ.

This doesn't mean that gender, race, or nationality are done away, but rather they are not what God sees when he looks at people in terms of salvation, rather he sees their being united with Christ.

In my understanding and experience of the Gospel now, we may be called/led by God to perform acts and duties that supersede the original gender boundaries..

Think about it. Paul wrote Galatians 3:28. He also wrote that Cretens are lazy beasts and liars. He wrote that women shouldn't be allowed to teach in the church and that men alone are to be elders. He writes about Jews apart from gentiles. Does that sound like a guy who doesn't believe nationality, gender, or race matter anymore? Far from it.

Red-Curious • 5 points • 2 April, 2020 02:29 AM

Spot on. But when you ask how men are saved, you neglected to ask how women are saved. Through child-bearing (1 Timothy 2:15). While in one sense, this bolsters a pragmatic aspect of your entire post,

in another - the more theological sense - it explains something much deeper that I have been getting on for some time about.

Child-bearing and raising is inherently paralleled throughout all of Scripture to the discipleship process - especially in the New Testament. Jesus references the fruit of a person's seed as the thing by which we would know the saved from the unsaved - their disciples. In discussing the unforgivable sin, Jesus once again takes it back to the concept of spiritual reproduction - specifically rebuking the pharisees for trying to lead people away from Christ (i.e. reproducing their death among those who were moving toward life) as the bad fruit, which is unforgivable. Yet the good fruit that vouches for the authenticity for our faith is known through the disciples we produce.

In this way, women are a parallel for the mission of the church. The way they, as a man's bride, bear children and raise them is symbolic of the way the Church, Christ's bride, is meant to bear spiritual offspring (evangelism) and raise them through discipling them. And this is the evidence of our salvation. It's quite plain, then, that women's salvation - even their highest honor - is to be the vessels of birth, establishing the practical example of the way the Church should forever understand its mission.

It amazes me, then, that the spiritual parentage concept is so plainly obvious in Scripture, yet the church attempts to "parent" hundreds or even thousands of kids at a time from a singular leader. What father actually parents that many children this way? Actual parenting strategies are abandoned and instead we call classrooms and sermons the "modern" approach to "spiritual parenting." Total hogwash.

potatorockstar • 1 point • 4 April, 2020 04:21 PM

imo God means that the divinely apathetic soul, doesnt have those earthly passions inside. like if you put a hot woman near a saint he is unaffected. so for him there are no men and women. you give him a throne, he doesn't want it. you open a vault full of gold and money his heart doesnt move. so i guess for him there arent rich and poor people, locals and foreigners, losers and champions, awkward and alluring people. for him only God exists and everyone is blessed as he is His creation. he is in a constant trance of peace and love towards all creation, seeing the bigger picture. God is in all for him. thus secular distinctions blur and vanish.

Decimus\_Stark • 3 points • 1 April, 2020 08:39 AM

Amen!!! I couldn't have said it better myself.

truguy • 0 points • 1 April, 2020 02:45 PM

You do know that about half of all Christians are women don't you?

OsmiumZulu[S] • 7 points • 1 April, 2020 05:13 PM

More than half, they make up the majority of churchgoing Christians (in the west least).

Guess who is the driving force behind this misunderstanding of gender roles then?

CourageousLight • 0 points • 8 April, 2020 12:54 PM

You realized God has appointed women to places of power himself in the Bible, right? Don't you know of the judge and prophetess Deborah? Or the leader Esther? Or the leader of worship, Miriam? There are many others as well. You are so ignorant it is unbelievable.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -14 points • 1 April, 2020 08:22 AM

□□□□□□□□

OsmiumZulu[S] • 10 points • 1 April, 2020 08:30 AM

Screenshot-20200401-012524-Reddit.jpg

[deleted] • 7 points • 1 April, 2020 11:56 AM

Woah...

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -13 points • 1 April, 2020 08:34 AM

I bet you like big dicks

OsmiumZulu[S] • 10 points • 1 April, 2020 08:34 AM

I am rather fond of my dick, guilty.

Red-Curious • 4 points • 1 April, 2020 06:07 PM

I was just going to remove the troll's comment in the first place, but it's worth keeping it up just for this comment.