

Abandoning their first estate: An argument from analogy, Against women in leadership in the family and in the church

8 upvotes | 6 August, 2020 | by Proverbs_31_2-3

One of the arguments I often read in feminist or egalitarian blogs and publications is something like the following:

- Assertion: Leadership and teaching are two necessary and important functions in the life of a family and the life of a church.
- Assertion: Women are capable of being excellent leaders and teachers.
- Assertion: God would not give women the ability to lead and teach if He didn't intend them to use those gifts!
- Conclusion: Therefore, women should lead and teach their husbands in their homes; and they should lead and teach their fellow Christians in their churches. To restrict them from doing so is to thwart God's purpose, to deny the spiritual gifts God has granted, and is just plain mean. Let the women lead and teach whenever, wherever, and however they want.

Now, there are plenty of biblical reasons for short-circuiting the conclusion above, such as by citing Scriptures which directly contradict the assertions or the conclusion, or by looking at the biblical texts on the creation of man and woman and their intended roles, etc.

But I would like to bring up a biblical narrative example that, by analogy, contradicts the third assertion: "God would not give [someone] the ability to [do something good] if He didn't intend them to use those gifts!"

Our texts for today are:

- Genesis 6:1-9 (The sons of God had children by the sons of men - these were the Nephilim, fallen ones, giants, men of renown; wickedness increased; only Noah was of pure lineage)
- Genesis 14:1-7 (King Kederlaomer and his ally kings (representing Babylonia, Ellasar, Elam, and Goiim) fought against an alliance of kings from Nephilim origin (Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim, and Bela) and partially destroyed their peoples: Rephaites, Zuzites, Emmites, Horites, Amalekites, and Amorites).
- Genesis 15:16 (The sin of the Amorites in Canaan was not yet full)
- Genesis 18:20; 19:1-29 (The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah because of their great wickedness; note that in the narrative, the men of Sodom tried to have sex with angels)
- Numbers 13:30-33 (The Hebrew spies were afraid of the Nephilim giants in the land; they feared the Nephilim (referred to here as the descendants of Anak) more than God and so their generation did not enter the Promised Land)
- Deuteronomy 2:10-12; 20-23 (A recounting of some of the offspring races of the Nephilim: Emmites, Anakites, Rephaites, Zamzummites; it seems that the Horites, Canaanites, and Avvites may also be linked to the Nephilim.)
- Deuteronomy 3:8-11 (Israel utterly destroyed all the people of the Amorite kings Sihon and Og (see Gen 15:16 above). And King Og was a Rephaite (descendant of Nephilim, see Deut. 2:11 above)).
- Joshua 11:21 "During this period, Joshua destroyed all the descendants of Anak (see Numbers 13:33), who lived in the hill country of Hebron, Debir, Anab, and the entire hill country of Judah and Israel. He killed them all and completely destroyed their towns. Not one was left in all the land of

Israel, though some still remained in Gaza, Gath, and Ashdod."

- 1 Samuel 17; 2 Samuel 21; 1 Chronicles 20 (David kills Goliath, a descendant of Anak; David and his men kill off other giant descendants of the Anakim and Rephaim)
- Amos 2:9-10 (The Amorites may also have been giants: they were tall like the height of the cedars)
- 2 Peter 2:4-8 (Three instances of God's judgment that are conceptually linked: God's judgment on angels when they sinned; God's judgment of the ancient world except for Noah; God's judgment of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. These may all be instances or results of sinful angels defiling the human bloodline with their angelic seed.)
- Jude 1:6-7 "And I remind you of the angels who did not stay within the limits of authority God gave them but left the place where they belonged. God has kept them chained in prisons of darkness, waiting for the day of judgment. And don't forget the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah and their neighboring towns, which were filled with sexual immorality and every kind of sexual perversion. Those cities were destroyed by fire and are a warning of the eternal fire that will punish all who are evil."

It's all pretty esoteric. But in summary:

1. Angels were *capable* of having sex with women and reproducing demi-human offspring, the Nephilim, the heroes of renown, the giants
2. God saw this as pollution and wickedness and wiped out the first batch with the Flood
3. Peter and Jude, both inspired by the Holy Spirit, point to this angelic act as a great sin that was punished by throwing the angels into everlasting darkness and chains
4. The tainted human line had to be wiped out with the Flood and also afterwards, at various times, as God helped the descendants of Abraham to wipe out Amorites, Anakites, Rephaim, Horites, Canaanites, etc., all of whom were polluted with this mixed, adulterous lineage
5. Sodom and Gomorrah were implicated in the defilement as well: both Peter and Jude mention them in the same breath as the fallen angels (and Peter includes the flood). The biblical text even shows how the Sodomites tried to rape the angels who came to rescue Lot before God's wrath destroyed those cities.
6. God later used the Israelites after the Exodus to wipe out most of the rest of these descendants of the Nephilim; both during the conquest by Joshua, and during the time of King David.

OK, so here's my takeaway from this and the relation to women in leadership and teaching in the home and in the church:

- God commanded mankind to be fruitful and multiply. Having offspring is a good thing!
- Angels were *capable* of having sex with women and producing offspring. (Surely God would not have given them that gift if he had not wanted them to use it! /s)
- Angels did indeed have sex with women and produce offspring. But from God's point of view, those offspring were evil and a defilement. Jude states that "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."
- Those offspring, the results of angels using their God-given ability in a way that was against God's instruction, actually resulted in endless torment for themselves, and great tribulation for humanity and God's people: Tartarus for the angels; the Flood for the Nephilim descendants and corrupted humanity; then all these wars and "genocides" to kill off the remnants or re-emergences of Nephilim after the Flood.

So this should be a warning also to women when they "reject authority" (Jude 1:8):

- God *does* give beings that he creates *powers* that He also commands them to keep in check under the authority, rules, order, and roles that He has established.
- The narrative thread of the angels who abandoned their station and co-mingled with human women shows the long-lasting evil that can result from defying God's order.
- In the same way, women who abandon their station as helpers, submissive to their husband and submissive to church leaders will also bring about torment for themselves and long-lasting evil, corruption, twisting, and defilement if they take up the authority to lead and teach that was not assigned to them by God.
- One actual interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11:3 ("For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, **because of the angels**") is actually that the 1 Corinthians passage is in parallel to 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 1:6. A woman should be in submission and not exceed her authority, because otherwise what happened to the angels could happen to her! She could bring torment on herself and destruction to her progeny and many faithful believers after her.

Well, RPChristians, what do you think? Is this analogy helpful? Of course there are plenty of other arguments, like "Because God said so" as to why women should be submissive and not teach or lead their husband or their church. But what do you think of this analogy as a warning of the devastation that can occur when we go outside God's bounds and use our "gifts" for something God has not authorized us to do?

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 4 points • 6 August, 2020 07:40 PM

I have often encountered people who believe that women should not take on leadership roles in the church. While they usually say their reasoning is due to what is written in scripture, I have never seen such a well organized citation of various scriptures to support their reasoning. Thank you for taking the time to compile this! However, something I'm unclear on are what would you consider the ramifications of women fulfilling leadership roles to be? Would you say it's not supported by the Bible, or would you go as far to say that she is sinning for putting herself in authority of a man? Personally, I think it's fine for women to assume leadership roles in a church if she is in authority over other women (for example a women's bible study). She would still be under the authority of the pastor and elders, but could help guide young women and relate to them in a way that men cannot. Additionally, women in leadership roles in Sunday school for example I think is actually really beneficial since women tend to be more gentle and nurturing.

What do you think about women in leadership outside of the church? For example, I had a man tell me once he'd never work for a female boss and that women shouldn't have leadership positions anywhere. Personally, I disagreed with that sentiment but I am curious what others think.

Proverbs_31_2-3[S] • 3 points • 7 August, 2020 09:01 AM

Regarding women being in authority over other women in church, here are some passages from the Bible:

Titus 2:3-4

3 Older women likewise are to be reverent in behavior, not slanderers or slaves to much wine. They are to teach what is good, **4** and so train the young women to love their husbands and children, **5** to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be reviled.

Both men and women are capable of teaching false doctrine and practice, of course. But if women are teaching "under the authority of pastors and elders" as you say, how are they keeping track of what is being taught in secret, when there are no men around? Who will keep them or those who listen to them from being deceived like Eve was (1 Timothy 2:14)? Look what happened at the church in Thyatira in Revelation 2:

19 "I know your works, your love and faith and service and patient endurance, and that your latter works exceed the first. **20** But I have this against you, that you tolerate that woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess and is teaching and seducing my servants to practice sexual immorality and to eat food sacrificed to idols. **21** I gave her time to repent, but she refuses to repent of her sexual immorality. **22** Behold, I will throw her onto a sickbed, and those who commit adultery with her I will throw into great tribulation, unless they repent of her works, **23** and I will strike her children dead. And all the churches will know that I am he who searches mind and heart, and I will give to each of you according to your works. **24** But to the rest of you in Thyatira, who do not hold this teaching, who have not learned what some call the deep things of Satan, to you I say, I do not lay on you any other burden.

I really recommend The Transformed Wife blog as great reinforcement in the message of Titus 2. Lori Alexander does a great job building up women in following a godly model of thought and behavior in her blog and her books.

On the other side of the spectrum you have Beth Moore who teaches all kinds of nonsense and really should

go home, as John MacArthur put it.

Regarding the teaching of children: Men (fathers) are given the responsibility to teach their children God's ways. You see this for example in Ephesians 6:4 "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord."

And in Deuteronomy 6:6-7:

And these words that I command you today shall be on your heart. You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise.

Women also have the responsibility to train their children up, e.g. Proverbs 1:8: "Hear, my son, your father's instruction, and forsake not your mother's teaching." Timothy was taught the Jewish and Christian faith by his mother and grandmother (2 Timothy 1:5, 3:14-15).

But I think it is important for men to be involved in the religious education of children, so that children will not get the impression that women are more spiritual or more authoritative in matters of faith. And women should teach under their husband's authority or under their church leadership's authority, and not vie for power or try to contradict the teachings that are given by those in authority over them.

Proverbs_31_2-3[S] • 3 points • 7 August, 2020 08:37 AM

Here are a few thoughts regarding women in political leadership. Consider God's judgment or curse on Judah and Jerusalem in Isaiah 3. First in verses 1-3 he says he will take away all the males who fill leadership positions:

- 1** For behold, the Lord GOD of hosts
is taking away from Jerusalem and from Judah
support and supply,
all support of bread,
and all support of water;
- 2** the mighty man and the soldier,
the judge and the prophet,
the diviner and the elder,
- 3** the captain of fifty
and the man of rank,
the counselor and the skillful magician
and the expert in charms.

Verse 8 gives the reason for the judgment:

For Jerusalem has stumbled,
and Judah has fallen,
because their speech and their deeds are against the LORD,
defying his glorious presence

Then there's verse 12:

My people—infants are their oppressors,
and women rule over them.
O my people, your guides mislead you

and they have swallowed up the course of your paths.

Part of the curse is that the males, who should be the leaders, are gone. And it is children and women who rule. That's the opposite of what God intended.

Also worth considering is that the only ruling queen of Judah, Queen Athaliah (daughter of Jezebel) used her power to kill off all the male heirs to the throne of Judah (her grandchildren) that she could get her hands on. This was a Satanic plot to destroy the Davidic line and ensure the Messiah could never be born. But God orchestrated one grandchild's rescue: Joash. Athaliah was eventually executed and Joash ascended to the throne.

On the other hand, the non-ruling Queen Esther was a picture of submission: to her cousin who was her spiritual advisor; to the eunuch commander of the harem; and to her husband King Xerxes. She used gracious and submissive behavior, good cooking, hospitality, and deference and even kneeling to her husband as her tools not to destroy but to rescue God's people from destruction.

rocknrollchuck • 5 points • 6 August, 2020 02:56 PM

While it's good, detailed reasoning I doubt it will make an impact on those you share it with, because most who believe that women can lead because they have the ability to don't know Scripture well enough. It may be helpful on occasion, but I'm betting you get shut down more often than not.

Instead, ask questions: "Show me the verses where women are called to lead based on their ability." They will likely point to Deborah and Priscilla as their examples.

Proverbs_31_2-3[S] • 4 points • 6 August, 2020 05:45 PM

It's a good point. This is definitely not the opening argument. Rather it's a deep and profound example of the danger of doing what God says not to, even if you are capable of it. It's probably a more useful warning for those who already believe than for those who don't. Kind of how Peter and Jude were addressing their believing audiences with the warnings about the fallen angels, the ancient world, and Sodom and Gomorrah. You had to know those stories and what they meant for that to have any impact.

I think it could be a helpful thing for Christian women who already believe in God's ordained roles, to help them stand firm against the assault of the Enemy against their submissiveness and their gentle, quiet spirit. In these days, women are surrounded on every side by flaming arrows of doubt against God's order for church and family.

Of course, you probably know as well as I do that Deborah's first act in the narrative was to invest leadership, authority, and a mission into the hands of the man Barak; then to rebuke him for his lack of manly leadership; then to shame him by decreeing that the killing of the enemy commander would be done by a woman since he had shrunk back from his manly duty.

And Priscilla was always operating within the sphere of authority of her husband; neither was she teaching the church with authority, but rather was part of her husband's work of explaining the Gospel more fully to Apollos. Various churches met in their home as they lived in different cities (Corinth, Ephesus). No doubt, with such high praise and frequent mention by Paul and Luke, she was a model of feminine submission, service, and hospitality with a gracious, gentle and quiet spirit. It's a travesty that feminist rebels rally around her name. If she were here today, no doubt she would rebuke them along with Paul (who called her his fellow worker). Paul, Timothy, Aquila and Priscilla were all well acquainted and knew each other. They would have been on the same page. Priscilla would have known of Paul's instruction to Timothy, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet." (1 Timothy 2:12)

That's what I would say.

I'm currently reading a book that I would recommend on the subject: *God's Design for Man and Woman* by Andreas and Margaret Kostenberger. They take you through the text from Genesis to Revelation and show how God's order has always been for male leadership in families and spiritual gatherings.

rocknrollchuck • 1 point • 6 August, 2020 06:14 PM

Amen.

kingbossdj • 5 points • 6 August, 2020 08:28 PM

Women should know their place BECAUSE they naturally excel at submissiveness, and followership, and being the assistant to the Masculine leadership.

Women are HAPPIER when they are submissive to their Masculine Leaders. It's in their biology to be happy when submissive. It's truly beautiful how GOD designed them.

So yes, women are very valuable ONLY when they are in their lane. But if they leave their first estate, that's where all the problems begin.

The Modern Female has made herself WORTHLESS & a LIABILITY to the family unit & society at large.

Unfortunately, there are only a few worthy females left in western society.

But let us take Hope in the LORD, because GOD is all we need in this temporary life anyway.

MEN don't need women. Women need Men. But it's nice having a "helper"

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 August, 2020 08:51 PM

Why do women need men? I'm not intending to be antagonistic at all! But if I recall correctly, there is a verse in the New Testament that advocates men and women (if I'm not mistaken) to pursue singleness. At least it's better to be single, but marriage is permitted. I think women and men need each other for reproduction naturally, but as a woman, if I decide to remain single I don't actually need a man in my life. While I'd like to get married someday, I disagree with your statement that women need men but men don't need women.

RedPillWonder • 5 points • 7 August, 2020 04:37 AM

Why do women need men?

Because God made a woman to be a helper for the man. If she doesn't have a man, she can't fulfill the divine role God literally made her for. There will always be that longing within a woman to be alongside a man.

"And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." - Genesis 2:18

Also 1 Corinthians 11:9 "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man."

Women were made *for* men. By God. It's His design and plan and purpose.

Unless you have the ability to stay single and celibate all of your life, and focus your efforts exclusively on the Lord, then a woman will have that desire to have a man, that need (whether emotional, mental, physical or spiritual), and it won't be fulfilled without a husband.

So yes, she needs him.

As to your comments about singleness. Yes, if one can remain single, God says that is best and gives His reason for it, which is that a single person can focus all of their efforts on the Lord, while if one is

married, they will be focusing on how to please their spouse.

God also says that you do well to marry.

God says "marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled" Hebrews 13:4

God (through Paul) tells younger women to get married. "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house" in 1 Timothy 5:14

God gets onto those who teach it is wrong to marry in 1 Timothy 4:3 when He says they were "forbidding to marry."

Marriage is very good and encouraged in God's eyes. Not just "permitted."

God also knows that if one can stay single, then their relationship and actions in serving Him can be or are going to be even greater.

Proverbs_31_2-3[S] • 2 points • 7 August, 2020 08:19 AM

Given what I read in a different post about what you have been through lately, it's fair to say that you do not *need* a man *right now* as a romantic partner. I recommend getting a little distance, healing, and perspective before you make any life-long decisions in that regard though.

From a creation perspective, it is absurd for either men or women to say, "We don't need the other sex." God created Man male and female, and he's the one who says what is needed or not to fulfill his design and his purposes in creation.

He created male and female to image his relationship with creation, his relationship with Israel, and his relationship with the Church. (See Ephesians 5:22-33 for example.)

1 Corinthians 11:11-12 also says:

11 Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; 12 for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.

Then in 1 Corinthians 12, Paul speaks of the body of Christ as having many members or parts, each with different roles, activities, and functions. Verse 21 of that chapter says, "The eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of you," nor again the head to the feet, "I have no need of you."

He's not speaking directly about men and women here, but as a continuation of chapter 11 where he does talk about male and female, we can extend the concept and understand that what God has established and ordained is good, be it our male or female sex, or the spiritual gifts God has dispensed. What God has created, we as the creatures must see as good and necessary. We can't say men don't need women or women don't need men any more than an evangelist can say we don't need prophets or a healer that we don't need administrators.

If you don't have a man *somewhere* in your life, where are you going to get authoritative, biblical teaching? That is a role that God has ordained for men to fill.

Lastly, for men, women are not only romantic partners. And vice versa. Most women, for men, are supposed to be treated like sisters or mothers in Christ. And most men, for women, are supposed to be treated like brothers or fathers in Christ. And there are so many functions of society that would be inadequately cared for if either men *or* women disappeared, notwithstanding the population crash that would result.

[deleted] • 0 points • 6 August, 2020 10:13 PM

This comment is truly fantastic and really innovative! I was unaware that scientists had discovered a genetic link towards submissive behavior and then also linked to happiness and fulfillment. My PhD is in

biochemistry, so unfortunately I haven't really kept up with new studies in genetics or psychology. I'm assuming they had to compile both psychologists as well as geneticists to really determine that biologically women are happier when they're submissive. Does that mean that men who have an inherited and extra X chromosome (they are XXY instead of XY) also demonstrate the same link between happiness and submission? I'm assuming it's an Xlinked trait, though perhaps the Y chromosome inhibits it's expression. It's guess that men with a double X chromosome would likely have a decreased amount of submissive behaviors compared to women, but still more than unaffected men. Would you be able to provide me with the DOI? I'd love to give it a read it sounds absolutely fascinating :)

Proverbs_31_2-3[S] • 4 points • 7 August, 2020 07:57 AM

Actually, it was a sociologist who discovered it. Read Steven Goldberg's unrefuted hypothesis in *Why Men Rule: A Theory of Male Dominance*. In it, he shows that across all know cultures in all time periods, men have overwhelmingly ruled both at a societal level and in male-female dyads. The mechanism he proposes to explain this is the *in utero* formation of the male brain, which predisposes males to value social hierarchy, prestige, and authority, and the work it takes to get those, more than their female counterparts. He even goes through a list of all the societies proposed by feminists or social activists as "egalitarian" or "matriarchal" and shows that they are all still societally patriarchal, and with the male partner seen as the dominant one in a married couple.

Unless you read it, you can't criticize it. So hop to and get reading.

pandora_box- • 2 points • 6 August, 2020 03:16 AM

What are your thoughts on Acts 18:24-26?

Priscilla & Aquila were obviously teachers there.

emperorchiao • 4 points • 6 August, 2020 05:26 AM

Sure. They also had a house church (1 Cor. 17:19). That's not to say that Priscilla took the lead in the teaching.

rocknrollchuck • 3 points • 6 August, 2020 02:57 PM

Here's a good article that addresses this issue in detail. You may find it insightful.

NoFaithInThisSub • 2 points • 8 August, 2020 02:51 AM

I want to point out something, that God probably only created masculine Angels with penises, but they only realized in Genesis 6 what it could be used for, as they slept with the daughters of men,

You cannot reference any female angels, the Bible only has masculine names of Angels.

This is my plausible comment.

Also, question for you, if God wiped out the giants and hybrids in the flood, why did they exist afterwards also? (i think i know why, but you tell me what you think 1st op).

Proverbs_31_2-3[S] • 1 point • 10 August, 2020 06:49 AM

I don't know if God created angels with penises or not. Are they spiritual beings that incarnate? If so, is the form of their incarnation preordained? Jesus says that in the resurrection people will neither marry or be given in marriage but will be as the angels in heaven. The angels who are servants of God have the decency to show up in blinding white robes, so who knows what they're sporting. Maybe the fallen angels choosing to incarnate with penises at all went beyond their mandate. (I'm reminded a little bit of Ransom in *Perelandra*

for some reason while discussing this. Although he was trying to use his fallen but redeemed reason to avoid polluting a virgin world, contra the fallen angels we're discussing.)

I do not know for sure why hybrids existed afterwards, just that they did.

Did other angels who were not imprisoned in Tartarus try again?

Another option that may have some basis in the text is that something went wrong in the Hamitic line.

Perhaps Ham's wife had recessive Nephilim DNA or something. Noah was described as pure in his lineage, but we don't know about his sons' wives. This may help explain the curse of Ham's son Canaan - maybe he obviously had Nephilim traits. Why didn't Noah curse Ham directly? The table of nations in Genesis 10:16 has the Amorites coming from Canaan, and that was one of the peoples linked with the Nephilim (see earlier in this thread). Also note that Genesis 10:19 includes the clans of Canaan as reaching as far as Sodom and Gomorrah. As discussed above, those cities were destroyed for wickedness akin to the pre-Flood cause of judgment, if we take the testimony of Peter and Jude into account, and the Genesis account of attempted angel rape.

What is your thought on the matter?

NoFaithInThisSub • 1 point • 10 August, 2020 02:04 PM

Jesus says that in the resurrection people will neither marry or be given in marriage but will be as the angels in heaven.

Because marriage is an institute for earth. Do you think you will lose your gender? I don't. I think i will be a male who will no longer need some of those things.

What is your thought on the matter?

I think possibly whilst Noah was righteous (pure in God's eye, like literally fully human also) perhaps his wife was not, or there was some more breeding after the flood.

It's all speculative/plausible.

johngalt1234 • 1 point • 17 September, 2020 03:15 PM

This may be a late comment. But Angels being Spirits have been shown to take on Male Bodies in the Old Testament. So I think this form was abused to married the daughters of Men resulting in the Nephillim

NoFaithInThisSub • 1 point • 17 September, 2020 11:15 PM

But Angels being Spirits have been shown to take on Male Bodies in the Old Testament. So I think this form was abused to married the daughters of Men resulting in the Nephillim

I think actually Angels are made in the likeness of a male type of body, thus having the ability to have sex and give seed. There isn't afaik any female angels mentioned, or names of in the Bible.

Demons on the other hand, could be both genders, afaik,

johngalt1234 • 1 point • 18 September, 2020 12:53 AM

I doubt spirit have gender. Is it not restricted to the flesh. Said distinctions?

That is kinda confusing spirit with matter. Not quite the same.

But then again its relying on limited info from the Bible.