

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Is a male of more value than a female? - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/15 19:13**

And the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them, When a man shall make a singular vow, the persons shall be for the LORD, by thy estimation. And thy estimation shall be, of the male from twenty years old even to sixty years old, even thy estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary. And if it shall be a female, then thy estimation shall be thirty shekels. And if it shall be from five years old even to twenty years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels. And if it shall be from a month old even to five years old, then thy estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver, and for the female thy estimation shall be three shekels of silver. And if it shall be from sixty years old and above; if a male, then thy estimation shall be fifteen shekels, and for the female ten shekels. Leviticus 27:1-7

Did the translators of the original Hebrew Scriptures translate these verses wrong? Does anybody think that the male scholars were biased, therefore mistranslated?

It begins with the words, "The LORD spoke to Moses." Does anybody think the scholars added those words and it was merely Moses who spoke and said what followed?

I realize that I have asked more questions than one, so if it be too overwhelming for any just let it pass.

**Re: Is a male of more value than a female? , on: 2016/7/15 21:42**

No mistranslation. Things in the Old Testament Mosaic Law had spiritual application of principles and truth. I have an opinion, but it's a picture that's not one of "value" or worth, but place/position. Similarly to as we are the "bride" of Christ, but the "Bridegroom" of Christ is the preeminent value & position of authority/leadership. That's my opinion. But it's not opinion that it's not mistranslated. This is not "translator bias". The opposite is true in the new NIV "Gender Neutral" version where male and female are removed. The "bias" effects of feminism on translation.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/7/16 0:15**

I think it is purely an estimate of relative strength or potential strength and therefore ability to labor. It's just biology not sexism.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 3:32**

Yes, TMK, it was about biology, and the difficult hard work required during the wilderness period, which was the moving of the Tabernacle and of its service, which was further limited to the Levites.

God already established the equal worth of male and female children in the offerings to be made after birth. And God later said that He is no respecter of persons - all are equal of worth in His sight.

Concerning the whole question of the Mosaic statutes "They were not perfect, other wise there would have been no need for amendment - for Jesus Christ to say as He did in the Sermon on the Mount, 'Ye know that it was said TO (not by) them of old....But I say unto you' (Bushnell).

"The provision of legislative enactments for the control of human conduct" (B) were for a specific time period, and were not meant for all time (though it is a pity concerning some of them which were much more fair to women than those of today) but to act as a brake at a time when the children of Israel were coming out of slavery and women were even more mistreated as they are during times of trouble and disruption to the normal order of things, like during times of war.

Paul said that 'The law is not made for a righteous man but for the lawless and disobedient' 1Tim 1:9-10

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: Is a male of more value than a female? - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2016/7/16 10:21**

There is no doubt that many males back then considered themselves superior to females. This can be reflected in the prayer, "I thank thee God that thou has not made me a female!"

In the scheme of brute strength, emotion, there is no doubt the male far exceeds the female. The female is made weaker in brute strength but has superior strength in her ability to endure pain. She is made weaker, has little brute strength to protect her body so she can bear children. My father-in-law came from a large family - a dozen children, I think. Among them were 4 boys, the rest were girls. But none of them had more than four children, most only one or two. One of these aunts told me the reason for their childlessness was because they did too hard physical work when growing up thus impairing their childbearing ability.

When one reads of a dad who had no sons but only daughters and who gets the inheritance because there are no males to pass it on to, I find it gratifying when God says give it to the daughters.

God loves females. If one studies the OT law, notes the restrictions laid upon females, it is all to protect the female, the female body. Moderns have discarded these restrictions as being outdated and useless. But I maintain if one were to regard them with respect and take lessons, she would be a whole lot healthier. We are NOT men and we need to honor the purpose God has made us for. Only there will one find satisfaction.

And who cares if one is superior... life is too interesting to worry about that.

Sandra

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 11:00**

Oh joy! Now us Christian men know why we can rule over Christian women: we are of more value than them. And now we have a verse for it.

Reminds me of another "religion of peace". Such similarities.

<http://thereligionofpeace.com/pages/quran/women-worth-less.aspx>

Of course I am speaking about a perverted form of Christianity which we have no business participating in.

Men and women both have strengths the other does not have and they need and compliment one another.

Christian men and women should always emphasize the positive about one another. It is when they start looking at what each other lacks that they form a superiority attitude and then find scriptures to back them up.

There are many patriarchal societies, today. Some that come to mind are:

Pakistan  
Saudi Arabia  
Iran

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 14:26**

I never said they were of more value. That's interposing meaning into what I said that I neither thought nor said. Just as "there is neither male nor female, both are equal in Christ", but it tells us later in multiple places in the epistles that "As Christ is the head of the church, so is the husband head of the wife...", "and so a wife must submit to her husband in all things....and a wife must respect her husband.." I know it says a man must love His wife as Christ did the church and lay down His life for her" (as He leads just as Christ laid down His life and is the Head. That's not sexism, that's scripture. & please don't make ridiculous allusions to believing those things clearly laid out in scripture as equal to Islam. That's underhanded & wrong. I am not saying (nor ever was/have) that men are of more value than women, but they were in the OT. It's right there plain as day. To deny this is to deny facts/scriptures. So what was the "spiritual point"? I think it pertains to "whom much is given, much will be required" in a way & men have given the responsibility to lead (in a loving, understanding, & patient life-laying down way) & so much will be required with this responsibility. Twist that around if you want to and remind me why I should post less and share what I see in an overarching reason/principle/theme from the Law that pertains to the New Covenant. I could be wrong, but no reason to make the comments and compare it to Islam. Totally unnecessary.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 14:28**

"Now us Christian men know why we can rule over Christian women: we are of more value than them."

Anyone who really thinks that way has no heart prepared to lead as God would have them. Anyone who makes jokes at the whole notion of male headship/leadership servanthood also is in no right Biblical position to lead IMHO.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 14:51**

Interesting thing to me is that to quote an article on Islam saying "men are more valuable than women" when that's actually a Law God instituted clearly in the OT Text. So, are you implicating the character of God during the OT time period as evil, wrong, & like "Allah"? This whole notion that the God of the OT is different than the God of the NT is so pervasive in people's theology. Or He was in a bad mood in the OT & is in a good one now. It affects so many other hermeneutics where the OT is totally discredited and pitched as "when God was bad" against the NT when "God became nice". There are differences in covenants no doubt, but the same God who sent Jesus to the cross for our sins instituted the Law in the OT, and There is no sin/flaw in him. So bringing up Islam (which shares that OT principle, wrong as that anti-Christian religion is) & making such comments is assigning evil to "the God of the OT who said it first".

**Re: Is a male of more value than a female? - posted by narrowpath, on: 2016/7/16 16:24**

Yes, it is in the bible, but what is your real intention of posting this?

Jesus paid the highest price ever for something completely worthless - sinful men and women.

**Re: Is a male of more value than a female? , on: 2016/7/16 16:25**

savannah, you wrote this question:

"Is a male of more value than a female?"

And brought up a proof regarding monetary value.

Do you think that the monetary value of something is the same as the value of that thing?

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 16:45**

Excellent question Tsuzanna

**Re: Is a male of more value than a female? - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 16:55**

My answer to the question is absolutely and unequivocally, NO! NO! NO!

I hope I have made myself clear.

I found these comments from one commentator to best express my understanding of what we find here in Leviticus 27:

"Moses first treats of persons; and estimates a male at fifty shekels of the sanctuary from twenty-five years of age to sixty; since this is the best time of life in which a man's work is profitable. A woman he estimates at thirty shekels; since for the most part less profit is made by a woman than a man; and although it might occur that some women would be much more valuable than men, since sometimes women are found to be industrious, prudent, discreet, and strong to labor, whilst men are idle, dull, lazy, and weak, still a general law must needs be given, for the examination would have been too difficult if each individual was to be estimated according to their good qualities. God then does not pay exact attention to the merits of each, but is contented with the common calculation."

Thus far I've not found any person here on SI who'd answer yes to the question in the OP!

Thanks for loving the LORD with your mind enough to have an interest in, and to pay attention to, Scriptures like these which many write off and many others take great offense at.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 19:26**

savannah,

There were 2 questions asked.

You said that your answer is no.

I know that I could easily calculate your answer to the other one. But just for the clarity:

And forgive me for being so meticulous.

Question 1:

Is a male of more value than a female?

Question 2:

Do you think that the monetary value of something is the same as the value of that thing?

What is your answer to Question 1 and Question 2?

**Re: value questions - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 19:50**

I've already answered your first question.

Your second question needs a qualifier.

There's no monetary value to a soul.

Now for some things the answer may be yes, for many other things the answer is no. Other factors often weigh in on the things in particular.

Is that a sufficient answer or did I miss something?

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 20:46**

"Now for some things the answer may be yes, for many other things the answer is no. Other factors often weigh in on the things in particular."

So if the monetary value is not always the same as the value, then the answer to the second question is also no.

If you knew this when you started the thread, I have to say that the questions were poorly set.

It is like that:

"Is it true that  $2+2=5$ ?"

I've read in the bible that  $2+3=5$ .

I think it is correctly translated.

Do you think it's not?"

I think this is confusing and I don't see what the point is.

**Re: confusion - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 21:00**

I'm sorry you're so confused!

I'll try to make it more simple next time.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 21:38**

Thank you savannah for bringing up those scriptures, and having us think about the value of humans.

I think the root of feminism lies in the fact that in the world unbelievers often equate the value of a person with the value of material things the person is capable to produce.

Christians are known for their charity towards handicapped or otherwise weak people. Showing clearly that they regard value differently.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 21:42**

One extreme of the Enemy misrepresenting scripture (which is his forte) is radical feminism and the other extreme is the patriarchy movement. The Holy Spirit through the Apostle Paul strikes the right balance.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 21:53**

We have a similar thing today: If a person dies at the job the workers compensation pays a certain amount to the family to compensate them for their material loss. It is easy to see that that amount is not equal to the value of that person.

Edited to add:

However we should never forget that material things sustain our life therefore are very important and that males are more capable of providing those than females.

**Re: compensation - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 22:10**

Tozsu,

The difference here being, which is of no small significance, is that God Himself placed the value upon each one mentioned in this chapter.

Your comparison is far from equal.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 22:13**

while you were writing I edited my post, please read, it brings more balance.

**Re: extremities - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 22:19**

Julia,

What of Abraham, and God's declaration regarding him;

For I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the LORD, to do righteousness and justice; to the end that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him. Genesis 18:19

A movement may be one thing, but what God hath said stands!

The two words you have made to be equally bad. In reality, only one of those words are bad.

Can you guess which one?

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 22:54**

savannah,

Is there a reason why you use the name julia instead of julius?

**Re: reason - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 23:09**

Is there a difference, other than the spelling?

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 23:12**

julia is a female name

julius is a male name

**Re: no difference - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/16 23:41**

But all along I am being told;

Â

In Christ, there is no difference between Jew and Greek, slave and free person, male and female. You are all the same in Christ Jesus. - Galatians 3:28

So again I ask, what's the difference?

Now you have me confused!

Is there a double standard of sorts in this case?

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: , on: 2016/7/16 23:46**

Savannah, I am a simple person, and have difficulty reading hidden messages in your posts. Now I see that you "mispelled" it on purpose. I think it is mean and childish.

**Re: confessional - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 0:08**

OK! Tozsu, I do offer an apology to you. I sincerely do.

I must also offer you this as well;

If my actions are deemed mean and childish, what might be said of one who is turning God's ordained order and authority given us in His Holy Word upside-down?

Thanks for your patience and sincerity, there's a refreshing purity in your simple personhood.

I am glad to have discourse with you.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/17 0:31**

Thanks savannah, but someone else should get your apology. I think I understand your passion about what you believe is right. I am learning from this thread. With your last post you restored my belief in civility:)

"what might be said of one who is turning God's ordained order and authority given us in His Holy Word upside-down"

I had similar thoughts regarding other topics/threads before.

What I don't know is that do they do it fully intentionally or are they blinded to see certain truths. If they are blinded by the devil they just need light.

What I learned that many that I thought were doing it intentionally in fact were only blinded.

**Re: civility - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 1:00**

You expressed that you took offense, therefore an apology was due you.

If any others take offense, they may make it known to me and I'd gladly offer the same to them as I have you.

Re: "What I don't know is that do they do it fully intentionally or are they blinded to see certain truths."

They're intent upon teaching others their per-versions of what God hath said. And Jesus never asked or wondered whether their teachers were teaching false doctrine intentionally or from blindness. He simply said that they're blind, and if the blind lead the blind both will fall in the ditch.

We're not told to first find out why they are doing what they are doing.

As Jesus was, so must we be, about our Father's business.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/17 1:15**

Quote:

-----by Tozsu on 2016/7/17 0:31:25

Thanks savannah, but someone else should get your apology.

-----

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

Tozsu, I too, thought it was childish, so took no offense and require no apology. Someone else on SI does the same on quite a regular basis obviously hoping I take offense. So far I have not and I continue to converse with them. We should not be easily provoked (1 Cor. 13:5).

I would change my screen name to a woman's name but would not receive as much respect, then. Yes, patriarchy is alive and well in some corners of SI.

**Re: patriarchy - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 1:32**

Tell me J...what offense do you take to this;

Patriarchy (from Greek: Patria meaning father and arch meaning rule)

Please keep with its plain meaning without distortion.

Then also these verses without adding any distortion, but as they are written in their purity;

One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (For if a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)... Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children, and their own houses well. 1 Timothy 3

Also Genesis 18:19 from my other post.

**Re: civility, on: 2016/7/17 1:39**

I guess you are right.

I was doing "the Father's business" in an other thread a couple days ago, the only problem was that I forgot to involve the Father in it. It looked like it was the Father's business but in fact it was my business out of frustration and for revenge. The funny thing is that while I was doing it I was not aware of the nature of my efforts. I felt like a warrior for truth. I don't think I propagated falsehood but 100% lacked God's love in it.

**Re: Word of God or word of J - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 1:48**

J you wrote,

"Christian women living in the urban areas should pursue any education and desires that the Lord has given them and gifted them with. We don't just need godly influence from men in the business marketplace but also from Christian women."

"If a woman is not married, living in urban areas, she will need to develop skills and gain education to support herself and others until she meets her future husband if that ever happens. She may also need to take care of her mother and father but with what does she do this if her parents are not well off? There are just as many reasons that a woman should be able to support herself as there is for a man to be able to support himself."

Please furnish us with The Word of God in its context to support such thinking. Or is it that God is neutral or has not spoken clearly or at all concerning the words you say above. Or isn't it even necessary in your opinion that you back what you say with God's Word.



**Re: God's love - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 2:00**

Tozsu, you say...

"I don't think I propagated falsehood but 100% lacked God's love in it."

So after you examined yourself you came to the above conclusion!

Yes, I'd say that is sad indeed. But thank God He, in His faithfulness revealed that lack.

I am reminded of 1 John 5:3

For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not burdensome.

**Re: Word of God or word of J, on: 2016/7/17 2:12**

I don't see anything wrong with that quote.

Acts 15:28-29 King James Version (KJV)

28 For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things;

29 That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.

**Re: I don't see anything wrong - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 2:28**

Tozsu,

Did you not say that you are a simple person!

So, because you see nothing wrong with that quote, then there's nothing wrong with it right!

You quote Acts with no context whatsoever. You may have missed my request for context from the Word of God addressing this subject.

But maybe you'd like to try again.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/17 2:31**

Quote:

-----by savannah on 2016/7/17 1:32:22

Tell me J...what offense do you take to this;

Patriarchy (from Greek: Patria meaning father and archÃ© meaning rule)

Please keep with its plain meaning without distortion.

Then also these verses without adding any distortion, but as they are written in their purity;

One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (For if a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)... Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children, and their own houses well. 1 Timothy 3

Also Genesis 18:19 from my other post.

-----

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

I take no offense to 1 Tim 3.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/17 2:35**

Quote:

-----by savannah on 2016/7/17 1:48:45

J you wrote,

"Christian women living in the urban areas should pursue any education and desires that the Lord has given them and gifted them with. We don't just need godly influence from men in the business marketplace but also from Christian women."

"If a woman is not married, living in urban areas, she will need to develop skills and gain education to support herself and others until she meets her future husband if that ever happens. She may also need to take care of her mother and father but with what does she do this if her parents are not well off? There are just as many reasons that a woman should be able to support herself as there is for a man to be able to support himself."

Please furnish us with The Word of God in its context to support such thinking. Or is it that God is neutral or has not spoken clearly or at all concerning the words you say above. Or isn't it even necessary in your opinion that you back what you say with God's Word.

I see nothing in the Word of God that would deny a Christian woman taking care of herself and her loved ones as the Lord leads her. I see nothing in the Word of God that prevents a Christian woman from pursuing advanced education or skills in order to support herself if she has no one else who can. And I see nothing in God's Word that prevents a Christian woman from pursuing advanced skills and education even if she is being cared for financially.

In Christ, why does pursuing education and skills have to be about gender? I see nothing in the NT that divides along these lines.

**Re: I don't see anything wrong, on: 2016/7/17 2:46**

No. I see nothing wrong with it means I need someone to explain what's wrong with it. Is that simple?

The context is: should we require gentile Christians to keep any requirement that was given to the Jews before?

We do things not because they are required, but because we want to do them. Why do we want to do them? Because the law of God is written on our hearts.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/17 7:12**

Lol so can i get some tatoos

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2016/7/17 7:31**

Savannah, Why do you call Julius J??

Julius graciously expressed that he does not take offense, but I am offended that you deny a brother the basic dignity of being addressed with his proper name. Even a criminal in court is called by his proper name.

You started a post about the estimated value of various persons. Are there persons in your view that are not worth being called by their proper name?

May the other brother who deliberately misspells Julius name take note of this, too.

2 Corinthians 11:29

Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?

Re: why - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 8:04

narrowpath,

You ask,

"Savannah, Why do you call Julius J??"

For the simple reason that if you take note of his posts, he ends with J.

If you take offense I extend my apology to you.

Re: , on: 2016/7/17 9:39

Julius,

If per chance the "playing the victim" & "veiled accusation" bit is directed at me - I wanted to address it directly not deceitfully: I gave (some of) my thoughts on the OP & maybe "why" or what is some of the "principle" or theme intent in the OP verse from the Law from what we see in the NT Clear and spoken plain as day. That the woman is "the weaker vessel". That's NT Scripture. In the full context there And the meaning of the original Greek, that isn't "just" talking about "physical strength" ONLY either I don't believe. And when it says to "live with your wife in an understanding way" in such context, and "I do not permit a woman to have authority (in the assembly - "synagogae" in the original) or to teach, but to be in submission" and "it was not Adam who was deceived, but Eve" (as one person already pointed out. And "but let a wife submit to her husband in all things...and a wife must respect her husband". I am just quoting the Word of God (NT Epistle clear instructive doctrine for the ekklesia no less).

That brought on a "sideways" set of comments of immediately posting comparing such Biblical evaluations to the abuse on women in Islam. That is not right, nor accurate, nor honest. So rather than skirt around and not address it directly, I did. That's how "speaking the truth in love"

is pursued. I didn't attack you, malign you, or attempt to goad you on. Those things were never in my heart. I just thought comparing what God said IN HIS WORD (& even His Law in the OT) to Allah & the anti-Christ system of Islam was wrong. Dead wrong.

And FYI, I don't respect "the weaker vessel" less, but more. If you took on a woman's name to act like one on the forums, my first question would be "why?" Lol. Seems strange you even say that you would do that? I treat my wife with respect. And love her for the special place God gave her as a woman. And my children as children. And other women and children also. I never said (nor did anyone else?) anything about not being able to get an education or pursue a job (although I have NO problem stating that once a woman is married and has children Titus 2 & elsewhere are CRYSTAL CLEAR that her priority is in the home itself to her husband and children, before God. You may call that "Sexism" or "Patriarchy" or whatever. I call it clear Biblical NT Epistle Doctrine. I call the scoffing of that Feminism. And in certain cases it "may" be necessary (certainly single moms is one example) or whatever for a season, but in many cases in our society it is just from buying into the cultural philosophy, not being willing to make sacrifices, and not trusting the Lord by faith to provide (which we never SAW before provision was made as we have gone along, but have trusted God at His Word & He has made the way progressively as the years have gone by - and we have 7 kids on one fairly humble income & I am "an ex-convict who will never be able to find a job" as one prominent attorney told my mother in law many years ago. The Lord showed Himself to be true and every man a liar! (Matthew 23:16-23)).

Anyways, if your comments were (in a veiled way) directed at me, they weren't accurate to my heart or intent. I just didn't take kindly to comparing the Lord and His Word to Allah & the doctrines of demons that make up Islam, sorry.

God Bless,

Jeff

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is a male of more value than a female?**

**Re: , on: 2016/7/17 9:56**

Quote:

-----by jeffmar1130 on 2016/7/17 9:39:41

Julius,

If per chance the "playing the victim" & "veiled accusation" bit is directed at me

-----

No, you have never changed my name to a female gender. But, you should know this, already. I am not playing the victim because I have taken no offense and never brought this up. It was brought up by someone else in this thread. Not so mething I dwell on.

I have tried to make is easier for people so you can just address me as J.