

# WHERE IS YOUR HUSBAND?

**Scriptures:** 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, 1 Timothy 2:11-15, 1 Peter 3:1-6, Titus 2:3-5, 1 Corinthians 7:12-14, John 4

Dear brethren,

Regarding wives, women in ministry, their roles, behaviors and duties. My wife recently felt led to step down from routine worship at First Assembly of God. To keep this message short, just know, I supported her in continuing. It gave her joy to sing and fellowship with other worshippers. I love that my wife's name "Carmen", means "song". I would never shut her mouth from worshipping God, or speaking out on matters of faith, justice, or childbearing. In fact, she has become a role model among many young women, as a wife of noble character—raising children, keeping out of gossip circles, following her husband's lead. Unfortunately, many clever doctrines have invaded the minds of women as a whole, who have come under their teachings. To keep the peace, even the most biblically arranged fellowships have tolerated too much.

## Unpopular Truth about women in church

Regarding 1 Corinthians 14:34-35:

*34 Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says.*

Contemporaries argue that Paul was addressing just Corinth, right? It does say "your women", which is possibly ascribed to only the women in Corinth churches. He continues with "they are" a pronoun for such women residing in Corinth, yes. But if this guideline "was" the case (meaning past tense, not for today), why does it say "shameful for women", when it could say "shameful for your women" (meaning Corinth only)?

*35 And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church.*

If I play the devil's advocate, insisting that 1 Corinthians is unique time and context, then I still have to deal with 1 Timothy. This epistle is addressed to Timothy as a leader in a different city—Ephesus. Paul writes,

*11 "Let a woman learn in quietness and full submission".*

This theme of silence and submission is present in both epistles. It continues,

*12 "And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man".*

This language is as generic as could be. Paul uses "a woman" and "a man", which is so broad, he must be establishing a rule here. Linguistically, "a" means "any". Therefore, "any" woman should not "teach" or "assume authority" over "any" man. Look at our schools, churches and statehouse, right? Regarding "teaching", the man's authority is expressed in both letters. The rule isn't focused on silencing women, rather, instructions on how a women obtains her voice in the church (if anyone was a misogynist in Church history, was it the recently converted Apostle Paul, author of the letters?).

I am saddened to see for years now, hungry, pious, Christian women, coming to church without their husbands; we know and fellowship with many of these women, who do not have spiritual leaders at home. Verse 35 implies that the best teacher for any wife, is the husband, period. The first person who should correct a difficult wife, is a loving husband. If that fails, what comes next? Titus 2:4-6:

*3 the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things— 4 that they admonish the young*

*women to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed.*

It seems scripture is telling us that the secondary person who should correct a difficult wife, is an experienced wife. “Admonish” means to reprimand firmly. What exactly is the fruit of a “women’s bible study”. Today’s women’s group hardly resembles Titus 2. Sometimes, older women are spiritually immature. In this case, let them learn from any and all women who are mature in this regard—pulpits should extol the married women in church who follow Titus 2. 1 Timothy describes “a woman” and “a man” which are finite terms. “A” here, is an indefinite article for both genders, and reveals a truth—in every congregation, there are many unmarried men and unmarried women alike; men, who should be seeking a wife, and women, who “should learn in quietness and full submission”.

Next, look at 1 Peter 3:1-6. This letter was addressed to persecuted Christians in Asia Minor.

*3 Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. 3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel— 4 rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. 5 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.*

Now we have three epistles, all in agreement. What are the common denominators of all three passages? Gender role, conduct and appearance. Who should teach women? Men. Who is the best man for that job? Her husband. Can a single woman benefit from church? Of course, but she should be influenced by married men, at a distance (pulpits and groups), and married women in close circles. Can women learn from other women? Yes? Which gals are the best for that job? Veteran wives, with children. What is the subject matter? How to love and obey husbands, and be homemakers. How should women conduct themselves? “Gentle and quiet”, “teaching good things”, “bearing children, “not slandering.” How should women present themselves? Well, if they are adorned with nice “hair”, “gold or fine apparel”, it must match with inward beauty—clothes should “discreet”, not revealing flesh or complete figures—they must be “chaste”, “gentle and quiet”. If these things are not accepted, then what is the opposite of the spectrum to which females will gravitate towards as the wind of culture blows upon their spirit? Wild, rebellious, licentious, scantily clad (if even dressed) music stars and boss ladies who make their mission to be financially independent; who make songs like “wet ass pussy” that are on your teen’s playlist.

The truth is, women in ministry don’t get their voice listening to another women’s husband (“pastor”), or mimicking the pastor’s wife; rather, by learning from and submitting to their “own husbands”. Good husbands are the backbone of good churches, and all churched men should be praying for and working to bring more husbands into fellowship and under God’s Word. My heart breaks when I hear of recent divorces in our circle. Is it possible that women’s bible studies often attract females who are not under their pastors or husbands? Or, maybe they pretend to be under an elder or pastor, so they can get a role or position in the church? Why are we so quick to accept, embrace, or push a single or divorced person into ministry? When we encounter divorce, problem women or wives in the church, the first question should come straight from the Gospel of John... “Where is your husband”?

## **John 4 – Woman at well, “Where is your husband”**

Is this the pitiful truth that behind all problem wives is an absent husband? Maybe some women just hunger for spiritual leaders at home, and I submit to you, that the best example of this vacancy, would be the cherished, and unceasingly preached, “woman at the well”. I will close this short paper by re-examining this story from John 4, verse by verse, with a sharp mind, and compassionate heart. You might have heard it preached that the three verses above are just

“context”, “history”, or examples of letters misinterpreted by controlling men, or written by a Jews who undervalued women as second class citizens. What come next with this error, is “the missionary at the well” version of John 4.

My wife recently shared with me such view. She said that Jesus first revealed himself as the Messiah to a woman; and, not just any women, but a woman who had experienced the pains of being stuck in a caste system where men could discard them on a whim, disregard their testimony, and divorce them for any reason. First, know this—my wife came to believe this interpretation, because she was “taught” this. I, her husband, never taught her this, nor even thought to teach this. I, her husband, never made her a “woman at the well”, and no, I am not her 5<sup>th</sup> husband. I am her first husband. Let’s look closely at John Chapter 4, the famous chapter that the evangelical sheep have used to exalt women, draw women into ministry, and bring all the aforementioned verses into question regarding silence and submission.

*5 So He came to a city of Samaria which is called Sychar, near the plot of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph. 6 Now Jacob’s well was there. Jesus therefore, being wearied from His journey, sat thus by the well. It was about the sixth hour.*

Did Jesus target her, a woman? Possibly. He sat down because he was tired.

*7 A woman of Samaria came to draw water. Jesus said to her, “Give Me a drink.” 8 For His disciples had gone away into the city to buy food.*

Notice she was not at the well when he arrived. Another thing I’m noticing, is that the incarnate God, in the form of a biological male, just asked a woman to get him a drink. And, he did not say please (only joking!). I’m not an expert, but in the NKJV here, it seems that had his apostles not been out shopping, they would have been tasked with drawing the water. Did the incarnate God, plan for them to be gone, so he could etch in stone this story for generations, and do so in peace, without the men monopolizing the moment? Quite possibly!

*9 Then the woman of Samaria said to Him, “How is it that You, being a Jew, ask a drink from me, a Samaritan woman?” For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.*

The woman here is making a distinction on his heritage, not his gender. She does mention her status of a woman, but the primary emphasis here is that Jews (Jesus in this case) do not deal with Samaritans. The wall was culture, not gender.

*10 Jesus answered and said to her, “If you knew the gift of God, and who it is who says to you, ‘Give Me a drink,’ you would have asked Him, and He would have given you living water.”*

Jesus is describing himself as the greatest gift; not a man, exalting himself as God (like Christian feminists believe men do), but as God, humbling himself to spend time with her and minister to her.

*11 The woman said to Him, “Sir, You have nothing to draw with, and the well is deep. Where then do You get that living water? 12 Are You greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank from it himself, as well as his sons and his livestock?”*

This “pitiful, poor, abandoned” women (as the woke homily depicts her), first acknowledges that Jesus did not bring his own tools to draw water. It must be that men drew their own water at times, and weren’t expecting women to serve them hand and foot. She also acknowledges the Patriarch Jacob, who she describes as “great”. She acknowledges Jacob as the man who dug the well, and nourished his family and livestock. Women need men to dig wells. Women need men to care for the family and the family business. And, without missing the deeper spiritual truth, that men, no matter how “great”, rich, or blessed, need Jesus to fill them—to fill their hearts, so they don’t abandon their Samaritan wife.

*13 Jesus answered and said to her, “Whoever drinks of this water will thirst again, 14 but whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him will never thirst. But the water that I shall give him will become in him a fountain of water springing up into everlasting life.”*

*15 The woman said to Him, “Sir, give me this water, that I may not thirst, nor come here to draw.”*

The woman is tired of the life she is living, and tired of having to come draw her own water. She's tired of bad relationships, and she's tired of working all the time. It is clear, after four husbands, that she has a personal problem. And, just so she doesn't get too fresh with him, Jesus asks her, in almost a delicately sarcastic, rhetorical (rabbinical) way:

*16 Jesus said to her, "Go, call your husband, and come here."*

*17 The woman answered and said, "I have no husband."*

The sad truth, is that many women do not have a husband, because they are not wife material. An equally sad truth, is that many church women who are married, don't have a husband who holds things together at home. The word "husband" means "house" and "bond". The man is called to bond the house together. If a house is falling apart, he has failed in some way.

*Jesus said to her, "You have well said, 'I have no husband,' 18 for you have had five husbands, and the one whom you now have is not your husband; in that you spoke truly."*

And so, we have come full circle from three of Paul's letters, to John's gospel and the woman at the well—"where is your husband?" This is the question we must ask now—where is the problem woman's husband? Where are the men period? In recent years, this chapter has been much more popular than the "quiet women" passages we first explored, but not in a biblical way—in a cultural way. The woke church in America has changed the punchline from John 4 from "Where is your husband", to "you, oh woman, are my chosen vessel to the Gentiles in Sychar". The American church has enabled women and wives to be the woman at the well. First, by not holding men accountable, and second, in failing to confront problem wives. We see the church has accepted divorce. A matriarchal spirit that has not just served the church, but invaded the house of God—a voice, not of Esther, but a different voice—a different gospel, declaring a new truth, or some liberating revelation that would now deal with the husband hurts or male dominance. "We will take it from here" is the unspoken reality. Instead of the missionary wife, the five times divorced, Christ commissioned rogue evangelist

Has it been erroneously preached that Jesus intentionally selected a woman to be the first human to hear that he was the messiah; and, not just any woman, but a disenfranchised, divorced or abandoned, second class citizen who did not belong to the right synagogue—that Christ, in order to shake up the patriarchy, deliberately, with full intention, chose to comfort this unmarried Samaritan, and empower her to be "the first missionary" to the Gentiles and redeemed Ambassador of good news? Friends, let it be so! Wouldn't all of us Christian men, simply love it if our wives caught an evangelical fire, and couldn't refrain from bubbling up with gospel joy wherever they went! Who would be bothered by a wife, or woman, who walked away from a life of sin, promiscuity and a full time job, to be a wife, mother, and gospel-centered keeper of the home? Friends, that is the wife that sleeps in my bed!

I, for one, am grateful to have a traditional wife, who submits to the scriptures as the final authority. Thank goodness I'm reading them too, because if she was left to pastors today, we'd be in big trouble. It is a travesty, however, that many churches are sinking in the sands of broken marriages. Unmarried, divorced and broken homes where men are not leading, or even aware of their responsibilities beyond providing income. But that is how a matriarchy is built—on the backs of the men, and not their mouths—not their vision or instruction—wives who want dad to earn the living, so they can run all things spiritual. Let's finish the text in John 4, to discover what really was said and what really happened. Not one verse will be omitted.

*19 The woman said to Him, "Sir, I perceive that You are a prophet. 20 Our fathers worshiped on this mountain, and you Jews say that in Jerusalem is the place where one ought to worship."*

The woman "perceives" that Jesus is a "prophet". Is this commonplace, that a man would speak to a women in the heat of the day, and know supernaturally her life's struggle? Is she about to receive a breakthrough in her life? After all, a prophet is one who testifies God's own words.

*21 Jesus said to her, "Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father. 22 You worship what you do not know; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. 23 But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and*

*truth; for the Father is seeking such to worship Him. 24 God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.”*

Jesus moves away from small talk and offering her a peculiar magical water that will satisfy. He opens wide with greater mystery; speaks at length about the essence of worship, the true desires of God, and a future temple to come. It was no-holds-barred at this moment. What is her response? Did she revere the words from this “prophet” and perhaps ask questions for clarification?

*25 The woman said to Him, “I know that Messiah is coming” (who is called Christ). “When He comes, He will tell us all things.”*

Maybe she is feeling offended or overwhelmed. Maybe she considers herself an intelligent woman, has a degree, and now she is dismissing him in self-defense in lieu of wounded pride and ego? Yes, she confesses faith in a coming messiah, but isn’t her final statement more of a conversation ending dagger, than a posture of humility? So, when Jesus drops the anvil, how will she respond? Verse twenty-six. The lynchpin. Here, Jesus can either cast his pearls, or remain silent. Nevertheless, he tells her outright.

*26 Jesus said to her, “I who speak to you am He.”*

Throughout the gospel accounts, Jesus does not outright declare his deity. Rather, he speaks in parables to hearts of stone and the religious order. Him telling the Samaritan woman that he is the messiah, was a precious pearl cast here. Does she embrace the truth? Does she pause? As we later read, it almost seems the more Jesus talks, the less she believes. Wait for it.

*27 And at this point His disciples came, and they marveled that He talked with a woman; yet no one said, “What do You seek?” or, “Why are You talking with her?”*

*28 The woman then left her waterpot, went her way into the city, and said to the men, 29 “Come, see a Man who told me all things that I ever did. Could this be the Christ?” 30 Then they went out of the city and came to Him.*

“Could this be the Christ”? She did not say, “this prophet claims to be the Messiah!”. Verse twenty seven reminds us that men did not converse with women in discussion, casually. Yet, this prophet does engage her, reads her private mail, and then some. She abruptly leaves her water pot behind and invites the men in the city to investigate. Perhaps when a prophet is among you, the rule is broken, and women can now speak to men in public about significant events. My question now, is why does she call him a “man” instead of “prophet” this time around? Nevertheless, she must be convincing, because the men leave their business to go see.

*31 In the meantime His disciples urged Him, saying, “Rabbi, eat.”*

*32 But He said to them, “I have food to eat of which you do not know.”*

*33 Therefore the disciples said to one another, “Has anyone brought Him anything to eat?”*

*34 Jesus said to them, “My food is to do the will of Him who sent Me, and to finish His work. 35 Do you not say, ‘There are still four months and then comes the harvest’? Behold, I say to you, lift up your eyes and look at the fields, for they are already white for harvest! 36 And he who reaps receives wages, and gathers fruit for eternal life, that both he who sows and he who reaps may rejoice together. 37 For in this the saying is true: ‘One sows and another reaps.’ 38 I sent you to reap that for which you have not labored; others have labored, and you have entered into their labors.”*

*39 And many of the Samaritans of that city believed in Him because of the word of the woman who testified, “He told me all that I ever did.” 40 So when the Samaritans had come to Him, they urged Him to stay with them; and He stayed there two days. 41 And many more believed because of His own word.*

*42 Then they said to the woman, “Now we believe, not because of what you said, for we ourselves have heard Him and we know that this is indeed the Christ, the Savior of the world.”*

Jesus turns his focus back on the men he has chosen for his apostles. He speaks in rabbinical rhetoric, about harvest, reaping and sowing. He is not going easy on them. Verse 39 states that prophetic insight (what was a Word of knowledge) was the impetus for Samaritans to believe. And in closing this scene, it is recorded that more came to faith because they were able to test her report firsthand. It is well known that the testimony of a woman was not highly regarded by men, but this was not biblical. Scripture is clear in many places that testimony must come from two or three sources for a judgement to be rendered. Whether men were quicker to believe a male or a female is irrelevant here. To be fair, the closing remark in verse 42 sounds like a slight to her status or a woman, or possibly her status as a divorced woman.

And to keep this message short, I will make one more observation. Those who know scripture, know that almost everything Jesus spoke, was either a fuller, more enlightened truth from the Old Testament, or a direct quote. I believe, that when Jesus sat at the well, he was remembering back to Genesis 24, when a timid, lovely, Godly, father honoring young damsel, by the name of Rebekah, approach the well. She was there to draw water, in the evening time, as was customary. She ended up watering hundreds of Camels, and serving their owners. Why? Because it was a way of life for the daughters of Israel. Genesis 24:16-17

*16 Now the young woman was very beautiful to behold, a virgin; no man had known her. And she went down to the well, filled her pitcher, and came up. 17 And the servant ran to meet her and said, "Please let me drink a little water from your pitcher."*

I think that Jesus was saddened, that the woman at the well, was no longer there. That the woman was once the daughter of the Patriarch Isaac—a virgin prize, not putting herself out there like some kind of trollop, but a true wife of noble character.