

THE HOLY BIBLE: A MASCULINE BOOK

Note: I use the words "man" and "men" in the original pre-feminism sense, meaning both gender-specific and generic; the context of the word reveals which is the case. All scripture verses quoted in this essay are from A Conservative Version (ACV) unless otherwise stated. Also there are times when I add underlining to words in scripture for emphasis. And all of the Greek words I mention are transliterated.

Some Statistics

In order to help reveal to you the masculine nature of the Bible I compared a few simple statistics in the New Testament from seven different Bible versions: The King James Version (KJV), the Revised Standard version (RSV), the New International Version (NIV), the New King James Version (NKJV), the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), the New English Translation (NET), and my own A Conservative Version (ACV). Depending upon the version, there are about 4200 to 6000 uses of the following gender specific pronouns: he, him, she, and her. In all seven versions the masculine words outrank the feminine ones more than 9 to 1.

In the KJV, the RSV, the NIV, and the NKJV there are from about 1100 to over 1400 uses of the words, "man," "men," "woman," and "women," depending upon the version. Their respective male/female percentage ratios are 90/10, 87/13, 85/15, and 86/14. There are 667 and 868 of those words, respectively, in the pro-feminist NRSV and NET, with their percentage ratios being 75/25 and 80/20. The ACV has almost 2100 of those words with a percentage ratio of 91/9.

For all seven of the versions there are about 500 uses of the words, "son," "sons," "daughter," "daughters." In all of them 93 to 94 percent of them are "son" or "sons."

There are roughly between 350 and 450 uses of the gender specific nouns "brother" and "sister" (singular and plural), including the archaic word "brethren" (which means brothers). In the ACV, the KJV, the RSV, the NIV, and the

NKJV the masculine words comprise 93 to 94 percent of the total. For both of the pro-feminist versions (NRSV and NET) the percentages are 70/30. The large difference in their percentages compared with the other five versions was caused primarily by their translators inserting the phrase “brothers and sisters” where the original Greek text has only “brothers.”

The figures for gender specific words with the smallest differences are those for parents. There are commonly about 500 uses of the words, “father,” “fathers,” “mother,” “mothers.” In all seven versions 81 to 84 percent of those words are “father” or “fathers.” Although the gender difference with these words is less than any of the other comparisons I made, yet the use of the paternal words still outranks the use of maternal ones by four to one.

There are situations recorded in the Bible when statistical comparisons cannot be made because women simply were not counted. For example, we read of two occasions in the New Testament when Jesus fed thousands of men from only a handful of food; one group consisted of five thousand, and another of four thousand:

And those who ate were about five thousand men, besides women and children (Mat 14:21).

And those who ate were four thousand men, besides women and children (Mat 15:38).

Notice that only the men were counted; the women and children were excluded from the count. This practice is typical of the Holy Spirit who guided the hearts of the righteous men whose lives are recorded in the Bible, and of the prophets who wrote the words in it. In the Old Testament book Numbers its first four chapters give a detailed numbering of the tribes and families of Israel as they were after they left Egypt. In every case the men were counted, but women were never counted. Also in the lengthy genealogy of the families of Israel contained in the Old Testament book First Chronicles, the words “son” and “sons” are mentioned 428 times. The words “daughter” and “daughters” are mentioned 16 times. The words “father”

and “fathers” are mentioned 86 times. The words “mother” and “mothers” are mentioned twice. All of these things are just further evidence that both the New and Old Testaments were written to be masculine oriented at God’s direction. And the above facts are but a few of all of the supporting evidence.

Indeed, the statistics in favor of the masculine could be much greater. For often Greek adjectives in the New Testament are given without an associated noun. And as William D. Mounce wrote in his book, *Basics of Biblical Greek*, “In this case you must use your common sense to translate properly.” Consider, for example, the English word “saint” which is translated from a Greek adjective meaning, holy. When a New Testament writer left out the associated noun, it seems clear that he knew the context of the word would make obvious what the noun should be. If he was writing about women, and the word “holy” is feminine, then it is clear he meant, holy women. But in most cases the English word “saint” is more correctly translated “holy men” because it is almost always masculine plural. Nevertheless, every other English translation I know about uses words to conceal the masculine character of the Bible.

The Importance of the Masculine

My beloved brothers, maintaining the primacy of men over women is the will of God. It has nothing to do with male pride, or any other base motive. It is vital for our spiritual health. When God gave all of the commands about cleanliness to Moses at Mount Sinai (see Leviticus 13-15 for a few examples), he did not explain about germs. Hence, for centuries men belittled this Biblical “extremism” with very tragic results. Only when germs were finally discovered, and proven to be a source of disease, has this “fanaticism” about cleanliness become recognized as absolutely essential to preserve the health of the body, and prevent life threatening disease. Faithless men now scoff at masculine primacy, and call it “extremism.”

Men and women are myopic about many things. Nearsighted animals are often killed because they cannot see danger until it is upon them. This is the main reason our streets and highways are littered with the corpses of free roaming animals. In spiritual things men are often similarly handicapped, very nearsighted, unable to see danger until it is too late. Fornication and homosexuality are deadly spiritual diseases. Yet their threat is not immediately apparent. Men cannot easily see the spiritual poison of them. Feminism is equally deadly. It is another kind of sexual perversion. Even its name is a perversion of what it means to be feminine, for what is called “feminism” is actually anti-feminine. Many great nations have fallen because of these kinds of perversity. Yet their citizens were blind to why it was happening; they were like the citizens of a village slowly dying because of diseases caused by drinking germ-laden water.

My brothers, what would happen to an army if its officers had all of the authority over their soldiers taken away in the same way that men have had all of their authority over women taken away? If the allied armies of World War II operated like that, the Nazi’s would now rule the world. Modern America has become rich and powerful in material things, but is now racked with spiritual disease. And the unrelenting attack in recent years against manhood is one cause.

Americans have wandered away from God into the alluring, but vicious jungle of sin. And now it is only a matter of time before our country, too, is torn apart by forces of evil—unless there is a spiritual reawakening, including restoring the primacy of men. For the primacy of men over women is absolutely essential in order to maintain the spiritual health of any social system, whether it is a humble family or a mighty nation. By trusting the great foresight of God, and obeying his will for us, we can preserve and enhance our social systems, whether they are humble families or mighty nations.

The Failure of Other Versions

The more I have studied the Bible the more clearly I can see. And the more clearly I can see, the more my life has improved, and I thank God every day because of it. And now, as part of my gratitude to him, I am trying to help others see more clearly. But the task is more difficult because of the failure of English Bibles (except the ACV) to bring out many important aspects of the Word of God that are contained in the original languages. From the statistics I described above it can be seen that the Bible is a very masculine-centered book.

Yet every other English translation I know about, including the KJV has seriously understated this characteristic of the Word of God. One contributing cause is a comparative shortcoming of the English language relative to the Greek. For example, the gender of most Greek nouns and pronouns is revealed in the spelling. An English word like “they” provides no gender information. However, Greek words usually reveal the gender of the subject simply by variations in spelling (its inflection). The Greek, therefore, often omits a word where English would require it, because the inflection of the Greek word reveals what is needed.

For example, consider a statement from Matthew 9:3. The Greek words (translated) are as follows: “**This blasphemes.**” The KJV says, “***This man* blasphemes,”** italicizing the word “man” to show that it is not in the original Greek (yet the KJV is not consistent about this). You see, the word “man” is not needed in the Greek wording, for the inflection of the word “this,” plus its context, reveals who they are accusing of blaspheming. The gender of the Greek “this” is masculine. If it were neuter, it would mean something like, “This thing blasphemes” or “This little child blasphemes” depending upon the context. If it were feminine, the translation would read, “This woman blasphemes.” But being masculine, the correct translation is “This man blasphemes,” or the equally correct, “This man is blaspheming.”

Including the actual word for “man” in Greek is unnecessary because of this ability of that language. And adding the word “man” in the English translation is not a true addition because it is contained in the Greek word for “this.” It is no more an addition than adding the pronouns “I,” “he,” “she,” etc when they are not given in the Greek, but are revealed by the form of the verb.

There are numerous examples of this characteristic of the Greek language. Consider another one: “...**The blind man said to him...**” (from Mark 10:51). The Greek has only the word for “blind”; the word “man” is not given. But because the Greek word is in the masculine singular form, it is clear that the blind person was a man. And in this case all of the versions translate it that way. Consider one more example: “**Now at Joppa there was a certain disciple named Tabitha, which, being translated, is called Dorcas. This woman was full of good works and charities that she did” (Act 9:36). The word “woman” in that verse is not contained in the Greek text. Yet because the words for “certain disciple” and “this” are both feminine singular, it is proper to use the English word “woman,” and all versions do so. It is not an addition.**

Nevertheless, English translators have often used this difference between Greek and English to diminish the masculinity of the Bible. For they often conceal the gender information provided in the Greek, and use genderless words like “one,” or “person.” Why, I do not know. The roots of feminism appear to go back many centuries in the development of this characteristic of the English way of thinking. Modern feminism is an extreme expression of this mentality.

Consider another example of bias against the masculine orientation of the Bible. Acts 22:1 begins as follows: “**Men, brothers, and fathers, hear now my defense to you.**” Paul is addressing men only, for he said, “Men, brothers, and fathers...” The Greek is very clear. The masculine words “men,” “brothers,” and “fathers” are all there in all the manuscripts. There is no dispute among Bible textual critics

about this. Yet most of the modern versions omit the word “men.” And for “brothers” they use the archaic word “brethren.” Hence they make it read, “...brethren and fathers...” diminishing the masculine emphasis contained in the original.

Ignoring, or mistranslating the Greek word for “man” is a common practice of all English versions, even in the KJV (although not as much). There are many examples. Sometimes, as in the above example from Acts, the failure is blatant. However, in most of the cases it is subtler, as in the following example. In Second Corinthians 10:11 Paul wrote these words: “**Let such a one think this...**” (KJV). There are three Greek words used in that scripture: “This,” “let think,” and “such.” The Greek word for “such” is nominative, masculine, and singular. Yet virtually every English version fails to translate it correctly to say, “such a man.” Instead they say, “such a one,” or “such a person.” Even though the KJV adds the word “one,” they did not italicize it. Even the more literal modern version by Jay Green says, “such a one.” Consequently, they all conceal the true masculine form of the word. The RSV and NIV even says, “such people,” making it plural as well as gender neutral.

Consider this example. Jesus said, “**If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple**” (Luke 14:26; KJV). In the Greek text the word is “any.” The word “man” is not included. But the word “any” is masculine singular, and there can be no doubt that the meaning is “any man” because Jesus including leaving his wife. Yet all of the other 20th century versions I know about say “anyone,” thus concealing the masculine nature of the word.

Every English translation I have ever seen (except the ACV) is filled with such examples of failure to reveal the many gender distinctions contained in the Greek text. By so doing, it not only diminishes the masculine emphasis of the

Bible, but it often conceals some interesting subtleties in the text. Consider this example:

And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance. Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find it? And when she hath found it, she calleth her friends and her neighbours together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost (Luke 15:6-9; KJV).

Both the man and the woman in the above passage called their friends and neighbors. Yet what is commonly not revealed is that both words are masculine plural in verse 6, and feminine plural in verse 9. In other word, the man called his *male* friends and neighbors, and the woman called her *female* friends and neighbors. No version I am aware of reveals this information that is contained in the original Greek text, except the ACV.

There is similar wording in Luke 17:34-35, which reads: **“I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left”** (KJV). The words “men” and “women” are not in the Greek text. Both words are simply “two.” However, since the words “one” and “other” in the first verse are masculine, and in the second verse are feminine, then it can be properly translated “two men” and “two women.”

Yet in this case none of the translators say, “two persons are in one bed” and “two persons will be grinding” Is it because in this case Jesus states that persons from both sexes will be resurrected? This we all accept and rejoice about, but men today cannot accept the masculine emphasis of the Bible. Therefore, they manipulate their translations in an effort to

conceal it. How much is deliberate, and how much is unintentional, I do not know. God knows, and he will judge us all.

The Greek words for Pharisee, Sadducee, priest, scholar (commonly translated, scribe), teacher, lord, master, ruler, shepherd are all masculine words. Typically words that refer to persons are masculine unless otherwise indicated. For example, the word “prophet” is masculine, and is used about 160 times in the New Testament. The word “prophetess” is a special female variant, and is used twice. The word “virgin” is like “prophet,” only it is normally feminine, and is used 13 times that way. Its masculine form is used only once, in Revelation 14:4.

There are no separate gender specific words in English for “virgin” as there are for “prophet.” Words for nationals like Romans, Athenians, Judeans are masculine, but words for places like nations and cities are feminine. One example is found in John 4:45. It says, **“So when he came into Galilee, the Galileans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem at the feast, for they also went to the feast.”** The Greek word for Galilee is in the feminine gender, but the word for Galileans is masculine.

Words for organizations (like synagogue and church) are typically in the feminine gender, but the words for their members are masculine. For example, the word for “church” is feminine, but the word for “Christians” is masculine. Words for crowds of people are masculine. For example, the Greek word LAOS is commonly defined as people, and the Greek word OCHLOS is commonly defined as a crowd or multitude. In the New Testament laos is used 138 times, and ochlos is used 83 times. Yet English has no comparable words for groups which focus on the masculine, but which can be gender inclusive. It is providential that Greek has this ability to better reveal the masculine centeredness of the New Testament. Its lack in English is a major shortcoming of our language.

I should mention that every Greek noun is grouped into one of three gender classes: masculine, feminine, or neuter. This

is true of both concrete and abstract nouns, as well as of both animate and inanimate things. It is far beyond the scope of this brief essay to elaborate about this characteristic of the Greek language.

However, I do need to point out that, in this respect, not every word that can refer to something about a man is masculine. Most body parts are classified as feminine. Indeed, the Greek word for a man's foreskin is classified as a feminine word, but of course, men themselves are not feminine. Indeed, God condemns effeminate men: **“Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God”** (1 Corinthians 6:9b-10; KJV).

I need to mention that the Greek word translated “effeminate” is one of the most mis-translated in the Bible. How it is translated is a good test of how sympathetic the translators are to the false ideology called feminism. The literal meaning of the word is “soft” or “delicate,” hence “effeminate,” and the KJV and the ASV translate it that way. Of the modern versions, only the NASV translates it that way. Yet none of these versions translate it fully, because the word in the above scripture is in the masculine gender, not feminine. Hence, the full literal meaning is “soft men,” or “delicate men,” or the more meaningful, “effeminate men.” Therefore I translated it as such in the Conservative Version.

Some modern versions translate it as “passive homosexual partner” as if such detail as who is active and who is passive in that sinful behavior makes a difference to God. And what Green calls his “Literal Version” is not even close; he translates it “abusers.” The NIV is also very erroneous, saying, “male prostitutes.” It is astonishing how much worldly error can distort men's thinking.

I will give one final illustration of the importance of the gender of many words. When Paul was discussing marriage, he made this statement, **“Nevertheless, to avoid**

fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband” (1 Corinthians 7:2; KJV). Using just the given Greek words, the passage says, **“But because of fornications, let every have a woman of own. And let every have own man.”** It would read that way because the words “man” and “woman” associated with the two words “every” in that passage are not in the Greek text, nor are the words “his” and “her.” Moreover, there are no special words for “husband” and “wife” in the Greek language. These words are always inferred from how “man” and “woman” are used in the context.

Now, a man who belittles the importance of the gender of the Greek words (by following the popular strategy of using gender inclusive words) might translate that passage to say, **“But because of fornications, let every person have a woman of their own. And let every person have their own man.”** Such wording would suggest justification for homosexual marriage (which perverse practice is becoming ever more widely accepted in this adulterous generation). But the gender of the two words for “each” is different. The first is masculine and the second is feminine. Likewise the words for “own” are gender different, so that a correct translation is the first one given in this paragraph. Obviously, the gender of those words is crucial for correct translation.

The Temporary Gender

What I say next is probably an even harder lesson for modern Americans than what I have already said. And most of you who read this may do what the Jews did when Jesus told them that they could not be his disciples unless they ate his flesh and drank his blood. **“From this,”** the scripture says, **“many of his disciples went back at these things, and walked no more with him”** (John 6:66). Notwithstanding, to help enlighten you, I will go back in history. Please hear me through.

In the beginning when God created the world, the record says, **“And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the**

ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul” (Genesis 2:7). Eighty times in the words of the New Testament, Jesus referred to himself as, “the Son of man.” Yet God was his father, and Mary was his mother, so how could he be the son of man? Jesus was the son of man because every human being is a descendent of “Man,” that is, Adam (for the Hebrew word Adam means man). The first woman (wo-man—a man with a womb) was named Eve. In this sense every human being is a man, being the offspring of Man (Adam). Now after Jehovah God created Adam, he said, **“It is not good that the man should be alone, I will make a help meet for him”** (Genesis 2:18). But after creating every beast and every bird, the scriptures say, **“...for man there was not found a help meet for him”** (Genesis 2:20). And so God created the first woman from out of Adam’s body. Hence, Eve was an offspring of Man.

But woman is not fully man. She is a variant of man, an offspring who was designed from the beginning to be secondary, or subsidiary to man, a help meet for him. For God intended from the beginning for women to be in a supportive or secondary role, for Paul said, **“For man is not from woman, but woman from man. For also man was not created for the woman, but woman for the man”** (1 Corinthians 11:8-9). And as such, God intends for woman to be subservient to man, as Paul also said, **“But I want you to know that the head of every man is the Christ, and the head of a woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God”** (1 Corinthians 11:3). There are numerous similar scriptures. Thus God intends for woman to be subsidiary, or secondary to man. And, of course, he intends for children to be subservient to both, for even Jesus was subject to his parents when he was a child: **“And he [Jesus] went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was being subordinate to them”** (Luke 2:51).

Since it is the will of God for woman to be subsidiary to man, his book—the Bible—was written by men for men. And being in a secondary role, women must first learn about

God from men. Women are allowed to teach other women and children, but never men, for Paul said,

But I do not allow a woman to teach, nor to act autonomously from a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, having been deceived, became in transgression. But she will be saved through childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety (1 Timothy 2:12-15).

Thus, the Bible was intended by God to be masculine-centered.

God is masculine. And his heavenly world is masculine. Few men are aware that no women are ever mentioned in the Bible as having been, or ever will be in God's heavenly world. On earth God has sons and daughters (1 Corinthians 6:16-18), but in his heavenly realm he has only sons; for the feminine gender is only a temporary earthly form. When faithful Christian women are resurrected to live in God's heavenly kingdom, they will be transformed into a masculine form. (For a brief description of how we will be transformed, see First Corinthians 15:35-53). When Jesus was asked about marriage in heaven, he said there would be no such thing, for all will be like the heavenly agents (AGGELOI, which is transliterated, *angels*). And the Bible never mentions such a thing as female AGGELOI (angels). As Jesus said to the Jews,

The sons of this age marry, and are given in marriage, but those who are considered worthy to attain to that age, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. For neither can they die any more, for they are like the heavenly agents, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection (Luke 20:34-36).

The point I am trying to make is not that women have no hope of eternal salvation—God forbid that I should ever do this—but that the female form is natural only to this earthly world, and is temporary. It is by nature a lower or secondary model of the higher masculine form. Even feminists confess

that fact (although not in words but in actions) because they belittle femininity, and strive to imitate men. And even modern psychologists are forsaking the androgyny/unisex role they promoted for a long time, and are now admitting that masculinity is superior (in the same way that adults are superior to children)—but I doubt they will admit that men are, at least not in the foreseeable future.

Now as the female form is a lesser model of the male form, so also is the human form a lesser model of the heavenly form. On earth women can never rise to the higher form of becoming men (although many have tried hard, with grotesque results, which the world glorifies), yet God has given us all, men and women alike, the opportunity to rise to the higher heavenly form to become sons of God, even becoming like Jesus himself (although never anywhere near being equal to him). For John wrote to his Christian brothers, saying, **“Beloved, now we are children of God, and it is not yet made known what we will be. But we know that whenever he is made known we will be like him, because we will see him as he is”** (1 John 3:2).

To Whom the New Testament is Addressed

I previously stated that the Bible is a book written by men, for men. I will now present some evidence to support that statement. Consider the following passage from John’s first epistle:

I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning. I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one. I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father. I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one (1 John 2:12-14; KJV).

Notice that John addresses fathers and young men, but not mothers or women. Indeed, he never even mentions women in any part of the letter. The nearest he comes to including females is when he uses the Greek word for little children, which is neuter, and hence, gender inclusive. (Incidentally, addressing the reader as “little children” was not meant to demean, but to honor; it was a way of showing his deep affection for his fellow Christians. Is any man so evil as not to love little children?)

John’s letter is not unusual in this regard. He is conforming to the Biblical pattern by not addressing women. Women were rarely addressed directly; 22 times in the entire New Testament, versus about 400 for men (not even counting those to Jesus, the central figure of the New Testament). Consider the following passage from Acts:

Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mountain called Olivet, which is near Jerusalem having a Sabbath day journey. And when they came in, they went up into the upper floor where they were lodging, including, Peter and James and John and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas son of James.

All these men were continuing with one accord in prayer and supplication, with women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers. And in those days, Peter, having stood up in the midst of the disciples (and there was a multitude of names at the same place, about a hundred twenty), he said Men, brothers...(Acts 1:12-16a).

Notice that the scripture says there were both men and women present when Peter spoke to them. Yet how did he address them? It was not with the modern American expression, “Ladies and gentlemen,” which not only mentions women, but also puts them before men. It was with the common Biblical expression, “Men, brothers.” Women were considered secondary to men, hence, they were commonly not even addressed in a mixed group. Yet the pro-feminist NRSV changes “Men, brothers,” to say,

“Friends.” Only in a small-print footnote do they tell the truth—as if that excuses them.

There are many other examples in the Bible where only men are addressed directly. Consider another example. When Stephen made his defense before the Jewish council, he began by saying, **“Men, brothers, and fathers, listen!”** (Acts 7:2a). He then went on to give a brief review of the history of their race beginning with Abraham. In his speech he mentions the word “father” or “fathers” 15 times, but he never mentions the word mother. Stephen’s speech is the longest public address recorded in the New Testament, and in it he mentions many men, but only one woman, Pharaoh’s daughter, and her name was not stated. Women may not have been present during Stephen’s address, but there were many situations recorded in both Testaments where women were present, and yet they were very rarely addressed collectively as were the men. In fact, there is only a single case recorded, and that was when Jesus said, **“Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, instead weep for yourselves and for your children”** (Luke 23:28).

Throughout the New Testament Christians are referred to as “brothers,” never “brothers and sisters.” And although the word for “church” is in the feminine gender, Peter refers to it as a brotherhood (1 Peter 2:17; 5:9). Of the 27 books of the New Testament, only one, and that the very smallest—Second John—could perhaps be addressed to a woman. I say “could perhaps” because the letter is addressed to **“the chosen lady and her children,”** and some Bible scholars believe the “chosen lady” refers to the Church, not an actual woman, because no name is given. Excluding the books of history (Matthew through Acts), women are addressed directly only 5 times, while men are addressed over 200 times; a ratio of men to women of 40 to 1. Two of those five are in Second John, the other three are addressed to wives commanding them to be submissive to their husbands:

Wives, submit to your own husbands as to the Lord
(Ephesians 5:22).

Wives, be ye submissive to your own husbands as is proper in Lord (Colossians 3:18).

Likewise the wives, being subordinate to their own husbands, so that even if any are disobedient to the word, they will be gained without a word by the behavior of the wives, observing, in fear, your pure behavior (1 Peter 3:1).

The elder to the chosen lady and her children, whom I love in truth... (2 John 1:1).

And now I beseech thee, lady, not as writing a new commandment to thee, but what we had from the beginning, that we would love each other (2 John 1:5).

Listed below are some examples of how the books of the Bible were written to men, not from the entire New Testament, but from a single book. And this book—Romans—does not contain the most numerous list of instances. There are several other books that contain more; Acts alone has several dozen cases, while Romans has only 14. There just is not enough space in this essay that is practical to give them all. Here are those in Romans:

But I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, that I often intended to come to you (and was prevented until now), so that I might have some fruit also among you, even as among the other Gentiles (Romans 1:13).

Therefore, O man, thou are without excuse, every man who judges, for in what thou judge the other man, thou condemn thyself, for the man who judges is doing the same things (Romans 2:1).

And think thou this, O man who judge those who do such things and do the same, that thou will escape the judgment of God? (Romans 2:3).

Or are ye ignorant, brothers (for I speak to men who know the law), that the law has dominion over the man for as long a time as he lives? (Romans 7:1).

Therefore, my brothers, ye also became dead to the law through the body of Christ in order for ye to

become to another, to him who was raised from the dead, so that we would bear fruit to God (Romans 7:4).

So then, **brothers**, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live according to flesh (Romans 8:12).

Rather, **O man**, who are thou answering back to God? No, will the thing formed say to him who formed it, Why did thou make me this way? (Romans 9:20).

Brothers, truly my heart's desire and my supplication to God for Israel is for salvation (Romans 10:1).

For I do not want you, **brothers**, to be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise according to yourselves, that a callousness in part has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles come in (Romans 11:25).

I beseech you therefore, **brothers**, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, your reasonable service (Romans 12:1).

And I also myself am persuaded about you, my **brothers**, that ye yourselves are also full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish others (Romans 15:14).

But I wrote more boldly to you, **brothers**, in part, as reminding you because of the grace that was given to me by God (Romans 15:15).

Now I beseech you, **brothers**, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit, to strive with me in prayers to God for me (Romans 15:30).

Now I beseech you, **brothers**, watch out for those who make the divisions and the stumbling blocks, contrary to the doctrine that ye learned, and turn away from them (Romans 16:17).

As you can see, Romans is clearly addressed to men, and so are all of the epistles except possibly the tiny letter Second John. Now, certainly most of the things taught in the Bible apply to women and children as well, because they too are men in the broadest sense of the word, being descendants of

Man, or Adam. But in the vast majority of cases the commands and teachings come to them indirectly, being first addressed to men (in the gender specific sense). Here is one final example. When Paul was in Caesarea, on his way to Jerusalem, the Holy Spirit wanted to tell him something. Here is how he did it:

And on the morrow, after going forth, those around Paul came to Caesarea. And having entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, being of the seven, we dwelt with him. Now four virgin daughters who prophesied were with this man. And as we remained more days, a certain prophet named Agabus came down from Judea. And having come to us, and having taken Paul's belt, having bound both his feet and hands, he said, The Holy Spirit says these things...(Acts 21:8-11a).

Notice that although there were four women prophets in the house with Paul, the Holy Spirit would not use them to speak to Paul, but sent a male prophet instead, even though the prophet had to travel from Judaea. God never intended for women to serve equally with men on earth, nor to be considered equal in any other way except in their hope of eternal salvation. For regarding this supreme hope, Paul said, **“There is no Jew nor Greek, there is no bondman nor freeman, there is no male and female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus”** (Gal 3:28).

“Now to the King of the ages, immortal, invisible, alone wise, to God is honor and glory into the ages of the ages. Truly” (1 Timothy 1:17).

Copyright © 2001. Walter L. Porter. All rights reserved

