

"It's hard to imagine a theme more timely for the global church today, nor a message more necessary."

Pete Greig, 24-7 Prayer International

EQUAL

What the Bible
Says about
Women, Men,
and Authority

KATIA ADAMS

EQUAL

What the Bible
Says about
Women, Men,
and Authority

KATIA ADAMS

DAVID  COOK™

transforming lives together

© 2019 Katia Adams. Published by David C Cook. All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	19
Introduction	23
1. From Eden to Eternity	27
2. Jesus and Women	47
3. 1 Corinthians 11: Hierarchy by Design?	65
4. 1 Corinthians 14: Women, Be Silent	89
5. 1 Timothy 2: Teaching and Authority	111
6. 1 Timothy 3: A Question of Eldership	145
7. Ephesians 5: Marriage	165
8. Women in the New Testament	187
9. Gender Equality and the Trinity	209
10. Egalitarianism in Practice	235
Conclusion	255
Notes	261
Bibliography	277
Bible Credits	283

FROM EDEN TO ETERNITY

Not long ago, I was driving my car when this ‘random’ thought dropped into my mind: ‘Christians are abdicating their mandate, and it’s time for that to stop.’ I wasn’t completely sure what the thought meant, but I knew that God was stirring something up in me. The following chapter came out of my trying to figure out what He was speaking about that day.

The Mandate

Right at the start of history, God had a world-shaping destiny in mind for humanity. The book of Genesis tells us that, having created human beings (both male and female), God commanded them to ‘subdue and rule’ (Gen. 1:28 NIV). Their role in creation was to take the lead, to influence, and to transform. It was not a suggestion, but a mandate. A mandate that was given to them both with no question as to whether they had what was needed to carry it out. They were

made in the very image of God and carried His stamp of authority—of course they had what was required for the task.

This was God's mandate for humans at the beginning of time, and remarkably, it's His mandate for humans still. Even with all that's happened in history, God's purpose for His people hasn't changed. His intention is the same: that the whole earth would be covered with the reality of His kingdom. For those who are in Christ, the words that God spoke over Adam and Eve rest on us now, and the provision of all that we need for the task has been put in us by His grace (2 Pet. 1:3).

Some, however, have unwittingly abdicated this call to lead and have veered away from the mandate that was over humanity right from its conception.

For some of us, this is motivated by feelings of insecurity and inadequacy to bring transformation. We have not fully recognised who God has made us to be and just how much power is coursing through us now that we are in Jesus. As a result, we have shrunk back rather than stood tall, knowing who we are and who we belong to.

For others, there has been a misunderstanding of what the church exists for, and a hesitancy to participate too much in a world that we are not from. It is as if we have got so preoccupied in keeping ourselves separate from the world that we have given up a core purpose of our existence: to engage with the world so that we can transform it with His kingdom. Hence, at times, our churches have served as bunkers, protecting us from the outside, rather than as springboards, propelling us to impart the life of heaven's family on the earth.

But, regardless of our reticence, you and I have been put on this planet to dispense kingdom life wherever we go. For this to become our reality, a radical renewing of our minds is needed. A

transformation of how we see ourselves and the world He placed us in and a re-education about how kingdom and church work together. Once we align ourselves with His understanding around our identity and authority on the earth, then we will be ready to start taking up the full mantle of what we were created for.

There is another reason for abdication that needs to be addressed. One that on the surface would seem to impact only women, however, on closer inspection, affects the entire body with devastating effect. It is the question of whether God really created *women* to rule and what that looks like in practice.

The reality is that, in many church circles today, we have become so confused on gender roles and what the Bible is trying to tell us about women in leadership that we have encouraged our women to abdicate their purpose as revealed in Genesis 1:28. We have instructed generations of Eves to abdicate their God-given mandate to rule, in favour of an alternate church-given mandate to follow and serve Adam as *he* rules. And the results of this are catastrophic.

Not only does this significantly impact the women in the church, but if it is true that God saw that it was ‘not good’ for Adam to be alone and that he would need a suitable counterpart to achieve all that he was made for, then undermining women’s roles in the body of Christ has severe repercussions for our men too. In that case, renewing our minds around God’s intention when He made Eve is neither a women’s issue nor following a feminist agenda. It is crucial to the destiny of men for women to understand who they really are (and vice versa).

When we see through this lens in the discussion on gender roles, the reality of why there is such a spiritual dynamic around this

becomes apparent. The enemy knows that undermining women is an efficient way of incapacitating the whole body of Christ. No wonder this is such a war-ridden issue.

So, we're going to take some time to look at the first few chapters of Genesis together and come to grips with what happened both in creation and in the fall. Understanding God's intention in the beginning will set us up well to think through God's intention in redeeming the earth.

Genesis 1: Creation through a Wide-Angle Lens

The creation account of mankind in Genesis comes in two forms. First, there is the overarching story found in chapter 1 and then a zooming in and slowing down over details in chapter 2. Both have much to teach us about God's intention for men and women.

In Genesis 1, we see a culminating moment in creation when God, having created all living creatures according to *their* kinds, begins to create humanity according to *His* kind, according to His image, and filled with His breath. He created humanity—both male and female—in His likeness and commanded them both to be fruitful and multiply, to fill the earth and subdue it. And He gave them rulership over (very specifically, nothing was left to misinterpretation here) fish of the sea, birds of the air, and every living thing that moves over the earth—including livestock and creeping things (Gen. 1:26–28). He gave them *both* the instructions. Notice how it would have been impossible for Adam to walk out this mandate on his own? Given the inclusion of 'fruitfulness and multiplication' in this

mandate, there is no doubt that God was addressing the command to both male and female (how else was Adam to achieve multiplication exactly?). This was in no way a one-man mandate, but right from the beginning a male and female job. Not just the multiplication bit but all of it, a job that required both male and female at the helm.

At the beginning of history, God created a man and a woman and told them both why they had been put on the planet. For both of them the job description was the same: fruitfulness, multiplication, subduing, ruling. No role was reserved for one over the other. Both were created with equal value in the image of God, both were created with equal authority given by God (rulership), and both were created with equal opportunities to fulfil the purposes of God (no role in the mandate was off-limits for either gender).

Notice that their equality didn't mean uniformity—they had been created male and female, and hence there was an inherent diversity in *expression* as they fulfilled their roles. Eve was to rule as the female image bearer. Adam was to rule as the male image bearer. Not one with greater authority over the other (for then they would not both in fact be ruling) but as two equal, wonderful sides of the same coin—ruling together but radiating the multifaceted nature of the Godhead in their different expressions. What a beautiful start to human history.

What we see in Genesis 1 makes the fact that God created Adam and Eve in two separate stages all the more intriguing. Given that the very purpose God had in mind for humanity required for there to be both male and female, we know that God must have always planned to make both Adam and Eve. Far from being an afterthought, Eve was a necessary part of reflecting the image of God and carrying out

His plan for humanity right from the beginning. The pertinent question for us, then, is why did God choose to create humanity in two different moments? Why create Eve after creating Adam? What was He trying to show Adam about Eve, and Eve about Adam? What was He wanting to show us about men and women? We can categorically say from chapter 1 (especially with verse 26 revealing forethought and planning) that Eve was not part of a spontaneously evolving plan after Adam's creation, but an inherent part of the original plan alongside His creation. So why take the time to do it as God did? This is an important question to address, and we'll look at it in some depth in a moment as we look at Genesis 2.

But let's pause just for a moment before we head there to notice something right here in the Genesis 1 narrative: there is no suggestion of male superiority. No suggestion that only the being fruitful and multiplying roles were for both male and female but that the subduing and ruling roles were specifically with the male Adam in mind. You would think that, if there was such a crucial caveat to this mandate in the heart of God, it would have been communicated clearly, especially as He is taking great pains to be so specific about the nature of the rulership remit that is given to mankind (to the point of including creepy crawlies!). Gilbert Bilezikian highlights this point beautifully:

Because of his creator rights, God allocates spheres of authority. He assigns limits to the firmament, to the water, to the earth ... He prescribes in detail human rulership over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, over every living thing that moves over the earth

including cattle and creeping things, and over all the earth (vv. 26, 28). The whole created universe—from the stars in space to the fish in the sea—is carefully organized in a hierarchy meticulously defined in Genesis 1. And yet there is not the slightest indication that such a hierarchy existed between Adam and Eve. It is inconceivable that the very statement that delineates the organizational structure of creation would omit a reference to lines of authority between man and woman had such a thing existed. Man and woman are not negligible or incidental happenings in the story of creation. They constitute the climactic creative achievement of God. Consequently, the definition of authority structures between man and woman would have been at least as important as the mention of their authority over ‘every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth’ (v. 26). This is all the more so since the Biblical text describes hierarchical organization as an element intrinsic to creation. But nowhere is it stated that man was intended to rule over woman within God’s creation design. The fact that not a single reference, not a hint, not a whisper is made regarding authority roles between man and woman in a text otherwise permeated with hierarchical organization indicates that their relationship was one of nonhierarchical mutuality. Considerations of supremacy or leadership of one over the other were alien to the text and may not be imposed on it

without violating God's original design for human relations.¹

The thrust of Genesis 1 is thoroughly egalitarian. But is that true of the whole creation narrative? Let's look at Genesis 2 to see whether there is any difference there.

Genesis 2: Creation Zoomed In

Genesis 2 reveals some details that bring fascinating insight into how God brought His creative plan about. On His foundational purpose laid out in Genesis 1:26, God chose to create mankind in two separate stages.

First, He made Adam from the ground (Adam—which in the Hebrew means 'man'—is wordplay on the Hebrew word 'ground', *adamah*). And then God made this proclamation that it was 'not good' for Adam to be alone (Gen. 2:18)—the only time this declaration was made over His creation.

We then read that God brought the animals to Adam to see what he would name them. Initially, we may assume that this was simply God giving Adam an opportunity to steward and rule creation as he had been designed to. But, on closer inspection, we find the true purpose of this exercise revealed at the end of Genesis 2:20 where we are told, 'But for Adam there was not found a helper fit for him.' This was not about Adam flexing his muscles of authority but rather a 'helper-finding' mission. 'In naming the animals, that is, in the process of determining their definition and their function in relation to himself, Adam discovered his own uniqueness as a human

being.²² The reality is that the premise of searching out a companion was somewhat of a charade considering God knew all along that no suitable helper would be found. But it was a crucial process intended to open Adam's eyes to that fact.

Thus, naming the animals wasn't just a random occurrence at this point in creation. Nor was it done alone with Adam as a means of reserving an authoritative action just for him (the text never mentions authority at all); rather, it was the process by which Adam was to experience a searching-out of his perfect counterpart and to come to the realisation that creation, as good as it was, was insufficient to meet this need. God knew right from the beginning that the search would never come up with a suitable helper. The result wasn't a surprise to God, but it was an essential education for Adam. Adam's realisation of his uniqueness—and his need for someone just like him—is highlighted after Eve's creation, when he exclaims, 'This *at last* is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh' (Gen. 2:23).

Adam's experience as he operated alone in naming all the animals made him recognise that nothing in creation was suitable to come alongside him in community. At no stage in the narrative is there any mention that the purpose for this was to communicate to him (and us) that there was greater authority, leadership, or rulership reserved for him. These words, or anything that would infer as such, are notably absent from the Genesis text in referring to Adam's experience from being made first. Hence, Richard Hess concludes, 'The man and the woman were created sequentially in Genesis 2 in order to demonstrate the need they have for each other, not to justify an implicit hierarchy.'²³

Despite the absence of hierarchical words in the story, there are some (Hurley, Grudem, Piper amongst others) who assert that

Adam being created before Eve *is* nevertheless proof of Adam having authoritative supremacy over Eve. The argument tends to centre on a few ideas from elsewhere in Scripture:

1. Primogeniture: This describes the legal right of the firstborn son to receive a double inheritance in property. The logic here is that this birthright, formally instated in Mosaic law (Deut. 21:15–17), shows that the one who comes first is elevated to a superior position. But there are a few significant problems with appealing to primogeniture to argue Adam's supremacy over Eve. First, the issue of the birthright was about children, not spouses. Second, it was a system that is not about male/female relations as it only noted sons in their sequence. Third, it was not a system that bestowed greater authority but more property. Finally, it was a system that was regularly ignored, particularly at God's urging (see Jacob and Esau, Jacob's twelve sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, Solomon and Adonijah). To appeal to this loosely observed, male-sibling-only, Mosaic law to interpret the creation story is certainly an uncomfortable stretch.

2. 1 Timothy 2:13: The argument posited is that Paul refers to the sequence of creation in order to justify why women should not teach or have authority. Therefore, it is said, we can see that the sequence of creation gives men greater authority. The problem with this argument is it states as fact that which is only one possibility. It is only one interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11–14 that shows that Paul's appeal to creation sequence was about inherent authority. The Timothy text never states that, and so 'to read it this way is to import an idea alien to Paul's thinking.'⁴ In fact, as we will go on to see in this book, there are other ways to interpret 1 Timothy 2 that are true to the text and context but do not implant hierarchy of authority into the verses. It is

not good logic to feed one possible interpretation of 1 Timothy 2 with one possible interpretation of Genesis (and vice versa) and to state that these scriptures thus prove that our view is correct.

3. Christ as firstborn: This argument centres around how the New Testament shows that Christ as the firstborn of creation has supremacy and, therefore, Adam as firstborn has supremacy over Eve. Quite apart from the difficulty of applying Christological theology to Adam's position, the problem here is that there seems to be some misunderstanding in the proponents of this view about what Christ being firstborn actually means for the church. The New Testament refers to Christ as firstborn *of not over* creation. It is not a hierarchical title denoting His rulership over His people. The point, rather, is that Jesus is the 'firstborn among many' (Rom. 8:29)—Christ has broken the way open for us to become children of God *alongside Him* (and co-heirs with Him no less!) (see Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15, 18–22). Attempting to underline a hierarchy between Jesus and the people of God in order to justify Adam having superior authority over Eve sadly undermines just how radical and lavish what God has done for His people is. The point is that God *could* have made us servants or slaves in a hierarchical framework, but He raised us up and seated us with Him in a place of equality with the Son of God Himself. To sacrifice this profound truth in order to justify male/female hierarchy in a text in Genesis that does not warrant it is a grievous error.⁵

A further problem with insisting that 'first' must mean 'superior in authority' is that complementarians would not follow that logic when we look at the 'firsts' recorded in the New Testament. The first recorded evangelist is a woman (John 4). The first to see Jesus after the resurrection is Mary. 'And "the dead in Christ" should be leaders

of Christ's future kingdom, since they are to be raised "first" when Christ returns, and only "after that" the living (1 Thess. 4:16–17).⁶⁶

On further study, therefore, it becomes evident that those who wish to argue an innate hierarchy in creation's sequence are stretching the Genesis text in order to justify a position held otherwise. On this, Craig Blomberg's admission is telling: 'I concede that these chapters [Genesis 1–2], taken on their own, might not necessarily lead to a complementarian position.'⁶⁷

On a different note, outside of the theological arguments for or against Adam's superior authority based on creation order, there seems to be a much simpler argument based on logic. If creation order is the basis on which authority is given, then surely the animals must have had greater authority than either Adam or Eve, seeing as they preceded them both. Clearly, this line of argument has a major flaw in it in that, if anything, creation gets more authoritative the further on in order, not less. Now whilst I would not use this to advocate a view that Eve was superior to Adam, neither do I think it's justified to use order of creation to argue for the opposite.

Taking all of these thoughts into account, my conclusion on the sequence of creation is that far from being intended to bring some sort of revelation of authoritative hierarchy, the two-stage creation order was intended to bring a revelation of the unique community that men and women have need of in each other.

Genesis 2: Focus on Eve

Having looked in some detail at the question of why God created male and female in sequence, let's now return to the flow of the

story. There are some unique moments in God's creation of Eve that don't happen anywhere else in creation and, therefore, hold great significance.

Firstly, God didn't make Eve from the ground. He'd made 'every beast of the field and every bird of the heavens' (Gen. 2:19) from the ground and had made Adam of 'dust from the ground' (Gen. 2:7). But not Eve. There are great pains taken in the narrative, culminating in Adam's exclamation when he meets Eve, to show that Eve was not simply another creature created from the dust but was made of *exactly the same substance* as Adam. God took from Adam and fashioned Eve. She was his perfect counterpart. For the first time in creation, God chose to create a living being from a different substance than everything else. Why? Why use Adam as material for Eve rather than the dust? Surely there can be no other reason than to ensure that they both carried the same substance. They were two sides of exactly the same coin. Two expressions of one substance carrying together all that was needed to fulfil their two-(hu)man mandate. The significance then of Genesis 2:24 is not simply about sexual union in marriage but of putting the two pieces of male and female back together again in the ultimate expression of oneness. Interestingly, Genesis 2:24 is not quite what we'd expect if the context was one of male superiority, for it is not the woman who leaves her family to join her husband but the man who leaves his family to join his wife.

For some, the word 'helper' (*‘ezer*) in describing Eve has proven to be a bit of a stumbling block to seeing her as Adam's equal. We have read it to mean 'deputy' or 'subordinate' called upon only should Adam choose to call for assistance. This could not be further from the truth. 'Many have pointed to the fatal flaw in this line of

thinking. All of the other occurrences of *‘ezer* in the OT have to do with the assistance that one of strength offers to one in need (i.e., help from God, the king, an ally, or an army). There is no exception. More, fifteen of the nineteen references speak of the help that God alone can provide.⁸ If it is a word most often used of God, *‘ezer* can hardly be read as a word inferring a subordinate! We must reassess how we view the word ‘helper’, for subordination or the idea of being a ‘deputy’ are not inherent components of the text.

When God forms Eve, He brings her to Adam without any instruction to name her. ‘The naming formula used for the animals ([Gen.] 2:20) has a clear literary parallel with Eve—but only after the fall ([Gen.] 3:20), in contrast to the differently worded phrase before-hand ([Gen.] 2:23).⁹ The charade is now over and God simply presents this perfect partner without question. And when Adam meets her, he immediately recognises her. Finally! Here is a helper that fits him perfectly because she is from him and of the same substance as him! The term ‘woman’ (Hebrew word *ishah*) is a further means of highlighting Eve being made from Adam’s substance with its wordplay on the Hebrew word for ‘man’ (*ish*) (the wordplay on ‘Adam’ already having been used with *adamah*, meaning ‘ground’). The beginning of Adam’s poem recognises the woman’s equality, ‘bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh’ (Gen. 2:23), and that reality is further underlined by the careful structuring of Adam’s words: ‘the second part of Genesis 2:23 is a chiasm (concentric structure) in which the words for “woman” and “man” are positioned at the centre, suggesting a corresponding and equal relationship to one another.’¹⁰

And so, the details of the overarching theme of the creation of humanity come into full focus. God completes His two-stage

creation of mankind, and it is as if all of creation celebrates this birth of male and female in the image of God—alongside each another to multiply, fill, subdue, and rule.

So what went wrong? And why are we experiencing male/female relationships that in many ways seem alien to what was outlined in Genesis 1 and 2? Enter, Genesis 3: the fall of humanity and the subsequent curse.

Genesis 3: The Breaking of the World

We know the story tragically well. The serpent came and spoke to Eve. With carefully worded half-truths, suspicions, and promises, he won Eve's heart and ultimately she believed him (Gen. 3:13). Although we don't see Adam taking an active role in the narrative, we find out as the story progresses that he was with Eve throughout (Gen. 3:6). It's interesting that while Eve was deceived by the serpent's words, we are not told that about Adam. The more carefully you read over the story and note Paul's writing in 1 Timothy 2, the more it would seem that Adam was not so much deceived by what the serpent said but wilfully chose Eve's instruction over God's (Gen. 3:17; 1 Tim. 2:14). Regardless of their motivations, there are some points to note here.

Some have used the fact that Eve was deceived as support for the fact that she was inferior to Adam. I'm not sure if this is the most obvious interpretation. Perhaps the fact that Adam had greater experience of God (having been made first) and the fact that the original prohibition had been communicated to Adam when he was alone (Gen. 2:16–17) made Eve more vulnerable? It is noteworthy

that Eve's knowledge of the prohibition is not precise (compare Gen. 2:16–17 with Gen. 3:1–3).

The effect of the deception, as we know so well, is that Eve and then Adam gave in to the temptation before them, and the course of history was forever altered as a result. They tried to hide because they were ashamed of their nakedness (Gen. 3:7, 10), when questioned by God they both shifted blame (Gen. 3:12–13), and there was what is now an all-too-familiar power shift declared in the curse where male and female were no longer on equal footing, but he would rule over her and her desire would be for her husband (a word that not only means desiring to be with him but has the sense of wanting to overcome him—see how the word is used in Genesis 4:7) (Gen. 3:16).

As we read the words of the curse spoken over Adam and Eve, we see something that is much closer to what we experience today. Considering the fact that the cross and resurrection broke the curse and restored us to a place of wholeness, this is a very sad assessment if it is true of the church today. In the fall, harmony, equality, safety, and unity were replaced with shame, blame shifting, division, and power play. This is the first hint we get of male superiority in authority—and it is not good. After the fall, we see Adam naming the woman Eve (Gen. 3:20).

The story is a devastating one and would be utterly hopeless without the redemptive purposes of God being woven in even in the midst of the brokenness. Even whilst pronouncing the curse, God spoke the solution: 'I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel' (Gen. 3:15), words that gave a glimpse of One who would come against the serpent. Of course, we know these words

speak of Jesus. That He is the One who has brought complete resolution to all that was lost in the garden in the cross and resurrection. We're told that Jesus broke the curse (Gal. 3), took on our sin and brokenness at the cross (Isa. 53), and disarmed the enemy there (Col. 2). The resurrection brings with it a 'new creation' reality—beautifully inaugurated in a garden like Eden but this one with an empty tomb as Jesus brings the first revelation of all that has changed in a conversation with a woman. What was lost in one garden is restored in another. Not only in terms of breaking the curse of sin and death but also in restoring what was intended from the beginning—for male and female to stand *alongside* one another, not *over* one another.

Looking Forward

Of course, there is so much more that could be said on these first three chapters in Genesis. However, I hope what I have done, albeit briefly, is demonstrate the clear mandate to rule that was God's original purpose for both genders and how male authority over women only came into being as a result of utter brokenness. It is tragic that, in the face of this narrative, we would propagate and protect male superiority in authority as if it was God's perfect plan all along.

As those who are in Christ, we don't need to live under the curse anymore. We don't need to follow the pattern of power dynamics at play there. We have been redeemed and restored and have the privilege of living out the harmony and equality (with the full depth of that word—not just a theoretical badge of value) that Adam and Eve were intended for.

We have seen this demonstrated as we've looked back at creation, but we can see glimpses of this further as we look forward to

eternity. In the New Testament, we see again God's desire for men and women standing alongside each other—together in equality to rule and reign. Men and women are co-heirs with Christ (Rom. 8:17), seated with Him (Eph. 2:6), and reigning with Him (Rev. 5:10); our position, inheritance, and authority are not based on our gender but on our union with Christ (Gal. 3:28). Verses that communicate the position men and women have in Christ (inaugurated in the new covenant and continuing on into eternity) are notable for their lack of one thing: gender-based hierarchy.

Concluding Thoughts

I wonder why, when God created men and women to rule together from Eden to eternity, we would think that His intention for our present age is any different? Why would we believe that God would introduce hierarchy as His intention now when hierarchy is not His intention in Eden or in the kingdom fully come? The trouble with this kind of thinking is that it leads to an abdication of God's mandate where women choose to, or are convinced to, give up on why they were put on the earth in order to fall in line with how the church has interpreted a handful of verses. That's a scary thought.

An important part of the gender debate is that we recognise that 'freedom' or 'equality for women' is not a new idea that the world has thought up today. Rather, freedom and equality for women (and men) is God's idea right from the beginning, and in resisting it, we are not coming against external cultural forces, but rather the original design from God Himself.

A few months ago, I felt God speaking to me from some verses in Isaiah 61.

The Spirit of the Sovereign LORD is on me,
because the LORD has anointed me
to proclaim good news to the poor.
He has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted,
to proclaim freedom for the captives
and release from darkness for the prisoners,
to proclaim the year of the LORD's favour
and the day of vengeance of our God,
to comfort all who mourn,
and provide for those who grieve in Zion—
to bestow on them a crown of beauty
instead of ashes,
the oil of joy
instead of mourning,
and a garment of praise
instead of a spirit of despair.
They will be called oaks of righteousness,
a planting of the LORD
for the display of his splendour.

They will rebuild the ancient ruins
and restore the places long devastated;
they will renew the ruined cities
that have been devastated for generations.

(Isa. 61:1–4 NIV)

We see in Luke 4 how Jesus came and fulfilled the first few verses of this prophecy—how He came as the ultimate expression of favour to humanity. But what caught my attention from these verses is where the prophecy changes from ‘He’ to ‘They’. ‘*They* will be called oaks of righteousness ...’ and so on. What Jesus came to do, we as His people continue to do as we are planted as oaks of righteousness to display who He is. The verse that God began to highlight to me as I marvelled at this text is verse 4—a verse that calls every believer to rebuild that which has been broken, even for many, many generations.

In Genesis 1, something beautiful was created. In Genesis 3 that beauty was shattered and stands as an ancient ruin. Clearly, gender roles are only one part of what lies in ruins. But it is a part. In Isaiah we see a picture of a people who will rebuild and restore that which has been broken. The church is not called to stay in Genesis 3 with regards to gender roles. We have been empowered to rebuild the Genesis 1 blueprint (with an even greater eternal trajectory), so that what God had always planned will be restored—men and women ruling alongside one another to see His glory cover the earth.