

Liberalism in Conservative Circles Regarding Women

16 And it shall be at that day, saith the LORD, that thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali.

Hosea 2:16

I read a passage from a devotional put out by a so-called “evangelical” denomination the other day. The reference verse was Hosea 2:16. The devotional following the reference, summed up that a man is not to take the position of “master” over his wife, but that of “husband.”

It further said that a man ruling over his wife, and her having a desire for him, was wrong and something that resulted from the fall and needed to be fought against. It was referring to the following verse:

16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. Genesis 3:16

I have heard this argument more than once from supposedly conservative churches.

They further said that in the New Testament, Jesus is our husband and not master. We men needed to pray to be husbands and not masters to our wives.



That message, which appears to be spreading in Christian circles, is blasphemous.

Let’s start with a look at the most blasphemous aspect: “The **LORD** Christ Jesus is not a ‘master.’”

Anyone who is a Christian can only have come to that saving position of faith through bowing before Christ as “Lord.” To be ‘lord’ is to be ‘master.’ The terms are synonymous. To say Jesus is not our master, is treason to His “Lordship.”

For these blasphemous teachers, they are stripping His title of “Lord” from Him. To that we should be saying, “*Get thee hence Satan!*”

Secondly, let’s look at this term ‘husband.’ Seeing how it is translated in the King James Bible and the definition found in a very good source – Strong’s, we shall come to understand just what this term means. Take note of the tail-end from the following:

3 But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold, thou art but a dead man, for the woman which thou hast taken; for she is a man’s wife. Genesis 20:3

This was from an incident with Abraham telling a foreign ruler that his wife, Sarah, was his sister. (To understand the whole story read Genesis chapter 20.) It is of note that the final part, “*for she is a man’s wife,*” uses a biblically rarer word for being a husband. It is the word ‘baal.’ The King James Version (KJV) translators translated it as “*man*” in this verse. It’s usage definitely tells of

the place of a man over his wife.

If you look up the definition of that term in the Hebrew of Genesis 20:3, you will find that word translated as “*man’s*” has the following definition:

“A master, hence a husband, or (figuratively) owner...”

Interesting, isn’t it? Strong’s saw both master and husband as synonymous. But let’s not stop here. If you look up the Hebrew word most commonly used in referring to a husband, you will find it is the word, “*ish*.” That is the word for man, and that is the word we saw in our opening verse as “*Ishi*.” *Ishi* is the possessive form of “my man.”

Follow this through, and you will see the King James translators translated “*ish*” as “*husband*” many times and as “*man*” many times. Consider this with Genesis 20:3, and we see these same translators translated “*baal*” likewise as “*man*” in referring to a husband. From looking at this, we see why they translated Hosea 2:16 as “*Ishi*” and “*Baali*” (*Baali* is likewise a possessive form of *Baal* for ‘my master’). If the KJV translators did not give us a ‘transliteration’ at this verse, but continued with their consistent pattern, they would have been forced to translate it as: “*that thou shalt call me my husband; and shalt call me no more my husband.*” It would have made no sense.

So what is God getting at in this Hosea passage? Is He saying that

to be a husband and a master, or lord, at two totally different things? Clearly not. The terms are synonymous.

In this Hosea passage, God was dealing with Israel's unfaithfulness in turning to false gods they called "baal" or plural, "baalim." In Hosea 2:7-8 you will find this same dance with these two words for "ishi," translated "husband" in verse 7 and "Baal" at the end of verse 8.

When we get to Hosea 2:16, and it really goes through verse 17, we find God reacts to the name of "Baal" because they worshipped their false gods under this name. God acknowledged they had also known Him under this name, but because of it's connection in their idolatry, when they turned back to Him, they would not address Him with that term "baal." God did not find the term for "man" being offensive because they did not worship idols under this term.

For further light on this fact, consider the name given to Gideon. He was given the name of "Jerubbaal" Judges 6:32, meaning "Baal will contend." Later we see Joab, in a message to King David make reference to him and we see the name change:

21 Who smote Abimelech the son of Jerubbesheth? did not a woman cast a piece of a millstone upon him from the wall, that he died in Thebez? why went ye nigh the wall? then say thou, Thy servant Uriah the Hittite is dead also. 2 Samuel 11:21

The full context tells us this "Jerubbasheth" is the same as "Jerubbaal" or Gideon. What gives? Scribal error? No. The meaning of "Jerubbasheth" is "Let shame contend." In David's time they had already made the connection of the name of "Baal"

with shame. The meaning had taken the shift, in the circles of those who worshipped Yahweh, from meaning "master" to meaning "shame." Since that term had become so entwined with idolatry, it had defiled that Hebrew term as something profane.

To say the teaching of Hosea 2:16 is that the terms "husband" and "master" are two totally different things, is pure fable. It is also dishonest. The King James translators bore witness to this in their translation of many passages.

Let's take this a step further. In 1 Peter 3:6, Peter was calling for women of godly character to follow the example previously given by Sarah in calling Abraham 'lord' or also translated 'master'.

6 Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. 1 Peter 3:6

Again look at Strong's on the Greek word used in 1 Peter 3:6 translated as "lord":

"kuros - Supreme in authority, that is, (as noun) controller; ..."

Peter was bringing forward what Sarah did in the Old Testament. That being the case, Peter was showing that the woman, seeing her man in this light, is what the godly women did and what New Testament godly women should be doing.

Since Peter is quoting from the Old Testament, we can see the Hebrew word Sarah used and Strong's definition of that word. First look at the verse:

12 Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?

Genesis 18:12

The word translated at "lord"

here was "adon." Strong's definition is:

"From an unused root (meaning to rule); sovereign, that is, controller (human or divine): - lord, master, owner."

What we are seeing here, in 1 Peter 3:6, destroys the other aspect of that apostate devotional. It said that a man would rule over a woman because of sin at work. It called for the men to not take that position over their wives. Peter's words destroy such false teaching. He shows that is exactly the way it is supposed to be for New Testament women. It is not the result of 'sinful nature' that will need to be overcome.

One message said, "*and thy desire shall be to thy husband*" was part of that corrupted nature. It taught that women "needed to overcome" that desire for their husbands. It equated it to mean, "the fallen woman would now be wrongfully wanting her husband more than God." It made the plea for the woman to put that desire for her husband away and start seeking God again.

Let me tell you, that passage did not say she would want man more than God and it did not speak of the future He was speaking of for Eve as some kind of 'unfortunate' tendencies a sinful woman would have.

Take note of the whole episode in the Garden of Eden. God created the woman as the helpmeet for the man. God saw it was not good for the man to be alone, and he needed a companion to give him support for his journey in life. If Eve had followed that purpose, her desire would have been rightly said to have been, "*thy desire shall be to thy husband.*" Since she did not take that place, as should have been done as Adam's helpmeet,

she strayed after the serpent's temptation. She was seeking her own desire and worked to motivate her husband to follow.

When God mentioned that her *"desire shall be to thy husband,"* God was placing Eve back where He had created her to be all along. She stepped out from that position when she went into sin.

It is also helpful to think of the reversal of Adam and Eve. If Eve were created first and God had said, "It is not good for the woman to be alone," then we were told He made Adam to be her helpmeet, we would easily see a certain significance. We would see that the woman was given the man to help her fulfil her mission in life. We would not see it as her mission to stand behind him as his support. Such would be totally contradictory to the purpose for the creation of a helpmeet.

The word for "help" in *helpmeet*, is the Hebrew word clearly for "help." Think about it folks. What does it mean to "help?"

■ It doesn't mean to be the 'lord, master' of the one you have come to help. (Not that a boss might not help an employee, but the difference is clearly seen in that help. That employee is still doing it for the boss.)

■ To be the helper is not to be the one who sets the plans for the course to be taken, though helping might include recommendations for a wise course of action.

Look at Eve with the serpent again. When being tempted, she had her desires stirred up. She wanted to be wise. She was not saying, "Hmm, Adam

would be very interested to see this opportunity." She wasn't seeking his desires, she was seeking her own and followed through with that. Carefully read the following:

6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. Genesis 3:6

We are told she took action, and also gave to Adam. She ate first because she was fulfilling her own desire. She wanted Adam to follow her lead, which he did. She took of that fruit for the sole purpose of fulfilling her desire. She failed because she did not rightly follow God's path for her of seeking to be Adam's *help*, and rightly place herself in the place of *"thy desire shall be to thy husband."* God reproved her for that. He corrected her and set her on the path He created her for in the first place as Adam's *helpmeet*.

This has been a bit of a whirlwind journey over quite a bit of scriptural territory. I hope these words have helped dispel some of the darkness that is rising in conservative Christian circles.

I have no doubt you will be seeing more of such false teachings that twist from God's ordained authority of the man as the head of his household. Women's liberation has made substantial inroads into the church. We need to be strong and faithfully hold

to God's Word, reproving the apostasies being taught.

Standing strong is not only for the men, it falls to the women to stand up and reprove the hissing of the serpent. Godly women need to correct women's libers who try and seduce them from the truth. When a women's liber hears a man, who points out what I have pointed out, they may write it off as, "MEN!" When a godly woman joyfully tells of her position and stand, they can't help but feel the darts of correction, for they are reproved by someone who is calling them to do exactly what they are doing. That's a powerful witness.

I'd like to finish this with an illustration. In Orthodox Jewish circles, the women have a lot of restrictions, which the men do not. During the high holy days of Yom Kippur and Succoth, the women are kept very busy and there are many things they cannot do in the synagogue. I was looking at a Jewish web site. One woman left a comment of her bitterness of the limitations and work she had to "endure" during those holidays. Another spoke of her joy during that time, and made reference to the amount of work such times demanded. The second person spoke of that time with rejoicing, the first with bitterness. They were speaking of the exact same time and actions. The issue wasn't ultimately the place of the woman, the issue was the state of the heart. The difference was like night and day. How interesting, the one saw it as oppression, the other as glory. Wow!

 Free to copy under CC-BY-NC-ND3.0 Copyright 2013 by Darrell Farkas

The English version used is from the King James Bible.

To find this article on-line go to www.basedintheword.org entitled "Liberalism Regarding Women"