

Submit: Reviewing the word use

Have we had Ephesians 5 wrong all along?

Does biblical submission in marriage, as some feminists would like you to believe, really mean something besides what the ordinary reader thinks it means? Could it mean something besides being under the husband's authority, and being obedient to him? Similarly, does it mean what other feminists might say, being under a general headship, one relating to the husband having a final say in big decisions, but not including simple obedience to the husband? Actually, the meaning of submission in marriage is not as complicated as some try to make it sound. That's why a simple reading of the Word of God, when it speaks of submission, won't leave a lot of doubt in our minds that submit means what the ordinary reader takes it to mean – put oneself under an authority in a position which includes obedience. We're going to look at many such scriptures below including the variant uses.

It is true that there are rare specialized meanings of the word which are different from a formally subordinate relationship. Feminists generally try and play these up as much as possible to distort and confuse the issue. It is also true that some of the words translated “submit”, or be “subject to”, have various shades of meaning, and even different meanings entirely. As you would guess, feminists will also try and jump on these to confuse the subject. Nevertheless, an ordinary believer reading major passages such as Ephesians 5 or 1 Peter 3 has no trouble understanding the word in its context. Moreover, the same ordinary soul, taking the time to go through the usage of “submit” throughout the Holy Scriptures won't end up confused by them at all either. That's because between the known meanings of the words, and the usually obvious context, we can understand confidently what the word means.

I don't plan to go through all the scriptures, and will in fact focus mostly on the *Brit Chadasha* (New Testament). That's for the sake of time, as well as to keep things simple. I'll give a brief review of the word use in the *Tanach* (Hebrew Scriptures) at the end, and provide you a couple examples. Let's see how the Bible uses words meaning “submit”, or “subject to”, and see if we've just been wrong all those years and if the feminists have got it right. I think the answer will be clear in fact, quite early on.

Let's start by looking at by far the commonest Greek word translated submit or subject to in the *Brit*. That is **hypotasso**. As you can see here, it speaks of submission to authority and obedience, with a minority meaning of simple yielding.

Hypotasso:

- I. to arrange under, to subordinate
- II. to subject, put in subjection
- III. to subject one's self, obey
- IV. to submit to one's control
- V. to yield to one's admonition or advice
- VI. to obey, be subject

Most of the time we'll see this word is used in a straight forward way, which relates to submitting to authority and obedience. The context usually makes that clear. We'll also see a few verses having to do with overall devotion to others, as well as one verse with great theological implications. Later, we'll go over another word rarely used for submission, the word **enochos**. We'll see it used more for being bound by certain principles, such as justice.

Let's look at the *Brit Chadasha* verses:

Luke 2:51 Then He went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was **subject to** them, but His mother kept all these things in her heart.

Here hypotasso is translated "subject to." The boy Yeshua, after returning to his parents, is subject to them. This means he is under their authority, and as a part of that relationship, naturally obeys them. Remember, if you applied the feminist reinterpretation of submit here, you might have the boy Yeshua merely caring about his parents, or generally listening to their guidance. But that would be absurd in context. Not only do we know children were expected to obey their parents, but the word itself in nearly every instance involved being under authority or obeying. We will see this over and over again.

Luke 10:17 Then the seventy returned with joy, saying, "Lord, even the demons are **subject to** us in Your name."

Here the demons are subject to, hypotasso, the apostles who were casting them out. Now were the demons cast out? Did they have to leave? Or did they, as the feminist interpretation might suggest, just care about the apostles or maybe listen to their gentle guidance. We know very well what it means; because of the authority the apostles had, the demons had to leave.

[Luke 10:20](#) Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are **subject to** you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven.”

This is the same situation. Same word. Same translation of it.

[Mark 3:29](#) but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is **subject to** eternal condemnation”—

I saved this one for the last of the gospels for a reason. In contrast to nearly all the others, this use of the phrase comes from *enochos*, and its usage is somewhat different. The meanings of the word are below.

- I. bound, under obligation, subject to, liable
 - A. used of one who is held by, possessed with love, and zeal for anything
 - B. in a forensic sense, denoting the connection of a person either with his crime, or with the penalty or trial, or with that against whom or which he has offended
- i. guilty, worthy of punishment
- ii. guilty of anything
- iii. of the crime
- iv. of the penalty
- v. liable to this or that tribunal i.e. the punishment to be imposed by this or that tribunal
- vi. of the place where punishment is to be suffered

This example is a little different because it does not involve being subject to in a personal way, but we can still see the same element of control that comes from something greater. It is almost like being subject to a principle. The soul is subject to condemnation.

[Romans 10:3](#) For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, have not **submitted** to the righteousness of God.

Many people know this passage from Romans 10. It speaks of the unbelieving among the Jews, people who have desired to attain righteousness themselves, but they themselves have not first submitted to the righteousness of God. In a sense they haven’t given their whole being over to God’s righteousness and reliance upon it. It does not mean immediate obedience in this instance, but it certainly has to do with ending self-dependence and becoming dependent on God, more precisely here on His righteousness. This dependence is of the lesser towards the greater. It is also part of an overall submission to God which includes our obedience to Him.

Romans 13:1 Let every soul be **subject to** the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God.

Once more, hypotasso is used to talk about being under the authority of leaders, and in a relationship that naturally includes obedience. It is a state of submission, and just as the marriage relationship does, includes obedience.

As in other verses, can you imagine trying to squeeze in the feminist reinterpretation of the word here? This would have those subject to authorities actually disobeying them. Or, according to their other favorite meaning, it would have them generally caring for the authorities, and listening to their gently-given advice. Or maybe it means what common sense tells us, which is to submit in a way that includes obedience.

1 Corinthians 16:15-16 I urge you, brethren—you know the household of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and *that* they have devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints—¹⁶ that you also **submit** to such, and to everyone who works and labors with *us*.

In this case, the use of hypotasso has some similarities and differences. Here there are several men that *Sha'ul* (Paul) mentions who have given themselves to service of the saints. The word first used is *tasso*, here translated “devote.” According to Matthew Henry, this sounds like a voluntary service arrangement, and one in which they likely served the ministers in various areas. In commending Stephanus and the others of serving the saints, *Sha'ul* encourages others to choose to be servants, or helpers in ministry. The second time he uses hypotasso, translated “submit.”

The kind of subjection in this passage seems to have a unique light, and it may exist outside of a formal authority arrangement. Still like the others uses, it contains the elements of putting oneself under another and serving him.

James 4:7 Therefore **submit** to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you.

Again, here we have hypotasso. In the abstract, it means to put oneself under God's authority, obey God and give oneself over to Him. In context, packaged between verses telling us to humble ourselves, behave righteously, draw close to God, we can see how being under God's authority includes all of these things. This should not be surprising, since the rich relationship of

submission to God, much like the rich relationship of a woman's submission to her husband, includes a beautiful interaction of them. The relevant factor for this essay is that submission to God, much like towards a husband, includes obedience.

If you want a more concise answer, here's what David Guzik has to say: "This means to order yourself under God, to surrender to Him as a conquering King, and start receiving the benefits of His reign."

1 Peter 2:13 Therefore **submit** yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the king as supreme,

One more verse with hypotasso teaching submission to government. This clearly involves formal authority and obedience. If you have been taught to radically reinterpret the wife's submission, why not reinterpret submission here too?

1 Peter 5:5 Likewise you younger people, **submit** yourselves to *your* elders. Yes, all of *you* be submissive to one another, and be clothed with humility, for "God resists the proud, But gives grace to the humble."

This verse uses hypotasso twice. The first time, it is in a relationship we know includes one being beneath the other, that of the young toward the elders. The second time it is the general application of submission, one relating to putting the good of other people first and humility. I think for any reader, our general knowledge and the context can tell us the difference.

However, like in other passages with alternate meanings present, feminists will try to isolate the word from its context, and claim that marital submission is the latter kind appearing here, rather than the first. This line of reasoning is only possible if we ignore all we know about scripture, the culture at the time, and the various contexts in which the words are used. An average reader can tell the first usage, then, from the second.

As Matthew Henry describes the verse: "He calls them *the younger*, as being generally younger than their grave pastors, and to put them in mind of their inferiority, the term younger being used by our Saviour to signify an inferior, Lu. 22:26. He exhorts those that are younger and inferior to *submit themselves to the elder*, to give due respect and reverence to their persons, and to yield to their admonitions, reproof, and authority, enjoining and commanding what the word of God

requires, [Heb. 13:17](#). As to one another, the rule is that they should all *be subject one to another*, so far as to receive the reproofs and counsels one of another, and be ready to *bear one another's burdens*, and perform all the offices of friendship and charity one to another; and particular persons should submit to the directions of the whole society, [Eph. 5:21](#).; [Jam. 5:16](#)”

[Romans 8:7](#) Because the carnal mind *is* enmity against God; for it is not **subject to** the law of God, nor indeed can be.

Here again is a use about being subject to the law of God, and by extension to God. This involves being subordinated to God in a relationship, one which involves obedience. The carnal mind cannot be submitted and obedient to God. Once more, if you have been taught to reinterpret the Christian wife’s submission to her husband, why not reinterpret our submission to God as well?

[Romans 8:20](#) For the creation was **subjected to** futility, not willingly, but because of Him who *subjected it* in hope;

This is a tricky reading for some people. The word hypotasso is used twice here. In the first example, creation is subject to a principle, meaning it was bound by that principle. This does not have to do with a personal authority’s control, but does relate to the control that a principle has. In the latter example we can see that God’s hand was behind creation being so subject. God is shown to be in control in the second example. Kind of difficult, but please notice, it involves one thing controlling and another thing bound.

[Romans 13:1](#) Let every soul be **subject to** the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God.

Here hypotasso refers to subjection to earthly ruling authorities. This naturally includes obedience. Notice the similarity between subjection to government being bolstered with God’s authority and subjection to husbands elsewhere being bolstered with God’s authority.

However, if we accept the feminist view of the word, Romans 13:1 should instead read: “Let every soul care about the governing authorities.” Or possibly: “Let every soul listen to the gentle guidance of the governing authorities.”

But that would be gobbledegook.

1 Corinthians 14:32 And the spirits of the prophets are **subject to** the prophets.

This verse says that the prophets, in using the gift of tongues, are the ones in control. They are not being controlled forcefully, as might be the case with a demon. They are the ones in authority here. This may not be the same thing as a personal authority relationship, but the vertical pillar involving authority is here, just as it is in other uses of the word.

But let's just try and see if the feminists interpretation of "submit" fits in this verse. Could it mean that the spirits of the prophets care about the prophets? I don't think so. Could it mean the spirits of the prophets generally take advice from them? Nope. I don't see that either. We're going to see this again and again: Submit means submit, and where it really has little to do with authority, the context clearly tells us that.

1 Corinthians 15:28 Now when all things are made **subject to** Him, then the Son Himself will also be **subject to** Him who put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.

The second appearance of "subject to" here is a theologically tricky one. Let's look at the first to begin with since it's very clear. In context it speaks of all things being subject to God the Son, and then at the completion of His kingdom, being delivered to God the Father. Well, from what we know about God and His relationship with us, subjection means being under His dominion, and will include obedience by all in His kingdom. In fact the previous verse speaks of putting all things "under His feet."

The second use of "subject to" refers to the Son being subject to the Father, something which opens a lot of questions up about the Trinity. However, it's not as difficult as it sometimes seems, since we already know that while the Son is equal in nature to the Father, he is subordinate by position (John 14:31, John 12:49, Philippians 2:8, Hebrews 10:7). Therefore, perhaps this represents a finalizing of the Son's dominion on earth, through which the Son will glorify the Father, being subject to Him now on a different level since the kingdom is complete.

Do feminist words like "care about" fit in this passage above? Do feminist words like "listen to the guidance of" fit there? I trust you can make the call.

Titus 3:1 Remind them to be **subject to** rulers and authorities, to obey, to be ready for every good work,

Here we see hypotasso speaking of being submissive to rulers, this time right next to the word *peitharcheo*, meaning only “obey.” We don’t really need it to discern the meaning, but that extra word in the context locks us in pretty tightly as to meaning. It does not mean to “care about” the authorities.

Hebrews 2:5 For He has not put the world to come, of which we speak, **in subjection to** angels.

Here hypotasso refers to the rulership of the world to come. As we know from other passages, that rulership is actually by the Son of God. Secondarily to Him, His children will have secondary rulership as well. This clearly is speaking of real authority, in a relationship including obedience. Unless of course you don’t think anyone will be obeying the Son of God. Unless of course you think He will be listened to only in a general sort of way. These would be the feminist renditions of the verse. But the ordinary reading is the only one that makes sense.

Hebrews 2:15 and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime **subject to** bondage.

Here is one rarer example of enochos. We see it as being bound by a principle or a penalty. It is not a personal relational obedience, but it does relate to being bound by something greater.

Hebrews 5:2 He can have compassion on those who are ignorant and going astray, since he himself is also **subject to** weakness.

This use of subject to is unique, coming from the word *perikeimai*, which literally means “compassed by.” A literal translation would sound odd to most ears, so the phrase “subject to” tries to catch the sense. Similar to enochos, it speaks of one being moved or bound by a principle, in this case weakness, or in other translations, infirmities. The literal translation would emphasize His being surrounded by these things. In context, it tells us that Yeshua, being in flesh and blood as we are, is also subject to the same temptations and sufferings we are. While fully God, He being fully man, is subject to the same things we are. This is a part of His compassion for us as High Priest, and a part of His being made perfect in the realm of time.

Notice that even in rare uses of the English words “subject to” like this one, we have no problem telling that it is different from the common ones. It is not as difficult to understand as the feminists would have you believe.

[Hebrews 12:9](#) Furthermore, we have had human fathers who corrected *us*, and we paid *them* respect. Shall we not much more readily be **in subjection to** the Father of spirits and live?

This verse compares our subjection to our earthly fathers, who have real authority and even correct us, to our subjection to Elohim, which is even greater. This again expresses two relationship involving submission and obedience to authorities. Now if there are no significant ambiguities in these kinds of submission, why try to paint ambiguities into wifely submission? There really are none.

[1 Peter 3:22](#) who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers having been made **subject to** Him.

Here the angels and authorities are subject to the Son of God. Unless you think that the Son of God does not actually rule, then we have another of many examples of real authority and obedience. The Son of God rules, governments rule, parents rule, husbands rule. They are all unique, that is true. Yet they all rule.

Brothers, I know that’s taken some time, but I’m glad we did it and I hope you take the time at home to go through word searches like this too. One thing I believe is obvious is that these words, mostly coming from one single Greek word, are not as difficult to understand as those who wish to grossly reinterpret scripture make it. I believe it’s clear that in the majority of uses **hypotasso** clearly involves submission and obedience to an authority. It may also have a general use in humbling oneself towards anyone, but this usage is very easy to spot by context. Moreover, the other Greek words rarely used speak of a kind of subjection to a force or principle, keeping the subjection element of the word, but not including the personal element of a relationship. These too, are easy to spot.

Now let’s go straight to the main scriptures about a godly wife’s submission to her husband:

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

Here we see hypotasso, as in all like scriptures. It is compared in the verse to submission to Yeshua, leaving little doubt as to whether there is a vertical pillar there. The following verses really fill that out and make it undeniable.

[Ephesians 5:24](#) Therefore, just as the church is **subject** to Christ, so *let* the wives *be* to their own husbands in everything.

Same Greek word. Just two verses later. This compares the Church being subject to Yeshua to the wife being subject to her husband. Notice, it added “in all things” for those who believe the husband only has some final decision authority he might use in a meeting occasionally, but in other respects can be disobeyed. The word “everything” is from the Greek *pas*, meaning each, every, any, all, the whole, everyone, all things or everything. Not too subtle here. The wife submits to her husband in all things.

[Colossians 3:18](#) Wives, **submit** to your own husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.

Same Greek word. Wifely submission is once more compared to our relationship with the King of the Universe.

[1 Peter 3:1](#) 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,

Same Greek word. This verse alone gives us some details of what wifely submission looks like, showing us a quiet attitude, which can win over her husband by her behavior. The following verses add to this account, calling it the “incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit.”

Since we’re on the subject of beauty, how many wives do you know who have that kind of beauty? Actually I know one, and that’s my own wife, whom I never cease to honor for it. However, it seems the Body of Messiah as a whole is not even trying to shoot for this mark, and that for many it is rare to meet such an amazing woman. Let us submit to God and try harder.

[1 Peter 3:5](#) For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands,

This is just a few verses later. It continues using the same Greek word to speak of the wife’s holy submission to her husband. Later it goes on to parallel it to Sarah’s submission to *Avraham*, whom she obeyed and addressed as “lord.”

The word for “lord” here is *kyrios*. That’s how she addressed her husband. Now if you’ve done a little reading, or even heard a few sermons, you probably know that *kyrios* is one of the Greek titles for God or Messiah. Here is a list of its meanings below:

- I. he to whom a person or thing belongs, about which he has power of deciding; master, lord
 - A. the possessor and disposer of a thing
- i. the owner; one who has control of the person, the master
- ii. in the state: the sovereign, prince, chief, the Roman emperor
- B. is a title of honour expressive of respect and reverence, with which servants greet their master
- C. this title is given to: God, the Messiah

Could this possibly be some OTHER kind of submission, besides the kind you show to someone over you? Besides the kind which includes obedience? To suggest so would be patently absurd and require ignoring all that we know. The wife’s submission to her husband is just what the average reader understands it to be when they pick up their Bible.

Now I told you I was going to review the scriptures from the *Tanach*, which I will do here in far less detail. These scriptures also consistently show that the main uses of the words translated “submit” have to do with a vertical pillar of authority. They have to do with one person being under the authority of another, in a relationship that naturally includes obedience. In *Tanach* we see the subjects of kings being submissive to the kings. We see defeated and captive peoples being submissive to the king. We see man being submissive to God. Some of these uses are even paralleled with the word obey, leaving little wiggle room for alternate meanings.

It is true that the Hebrew words used have their own unique shades of meanings. It is also true that some have multiple meanings, which the translators choose to apply according to their knowledge and the context. However, even taking that into account, there is little doubt that most of the times we see “submit” or “subject to” in the Hebrew Scriptures it describes submission to authority and obedience.

The main words we see used are **kachash**, **nathan**, **anah** and **kabash** and with the word obey being **shamah**.

Let's just look at a few:

Genesis 16:9 The Angel of the LORD said to her, "Return to your mistress, and **submit** yourself under her hand."

Uses anah

Deuteronomy 33:29 Happy *are* you, O Israel! Who *is* like you, a people saved by the LORD, The shield of your help And the sword of your majesty! Your enemies shall **submit** to you, And you shall tread down their high places."

Uses word kachash

2 Samuel 22:45 The foreigners **submit** to me; As soon as they hear, they obey me.

Uses kachash, Both "hear" and "obey" are the word shama, which can mean both.

1 Chronicles 29:24 All the leaders and the mighty men, and also all the sons of King David, **submitted** themselves to King Solomon.

Uses word nathan

Psalms 18:44 As soon as they hear of me they obey me; The foreigners **submit** to me.

Uses shama, shama and kachash

Psalms 66:3 Say to God, "How awesome are Your works! Through the greatness of Your power Your enemies shall **submit** themselves to You.

Uses kachash

Jeremiah 34:16 Then you turned around and profaned My name, and every one of you brought back his male and female slaves, whom you had set at liberty, at their pleasure, and **brought them back into subjection**, to be your male and female slaves.'

Uses kabash

This is only a portion of the uses in *Tanach*, but it gives us a fair picture of all of them. That picture is of submission to a lord who has authority over us. There really isn't much ambiguity about that, despite minority uses throughout the Hebrew Scriptures which are defined by their context.

One important point, and I need to take a moment on this, is that many will note that the submission often portrayed in the *Tanach* is that of a conquered people or an enemy being subject to the conqueror. These are people like the Canaanites, or the Philistines. They include outright sinners in open rebellion against God. This surely isn't true of the wife toward her husband is it? The husband surely shouldn't view his wife as such, right?

That's a good point, but we must recognize a few things in making it. Number one, the fact that it is often a harsher kind of subjection, does nothing to take away from the fact that the submission we see is the kind on a vertical pillar – one is above, the other below. That is the core similarity that is relevant here. I am also confident that the relationship between husband and wife is not to be viewed precisely the same. His wife is the man's consensual helpmate. Not a Canaanite. His wife is doing her best as a born again believer. She is presumably not an open and rebellious sinner. Nevertheless, the element of conquest we see in the *Tanach* carries over to man and wife. So does the element of surrender to the conquering king, or surrender to God.

The man is indeed a conqueror. He is also indeed a king. It is true that his subject feels remarkably more willing than the Canaanite felt toward Joshua, but the husband conquers her nonetheless. Despite her consent, he shows his strength. Despite her general willingness, he still must put down pockets of rebellion. He still grinds down hard spots and makes them smooth. Turns obstacles from being rock to gravel, from being gravel to dust. He still reigns and governs over her, guiding, dictating and correcting her. In many ways this is what *Adonai* does with us. We may be willing toward Him, but we know full well we still need His guidance, and we are often reluctant and resisting. Therefore, like *Adonai*, the husband conquers. He subdues. He rules. It may get put the wrong way at times, but the husband has his way completely with his wife.

So while the examples in the Hebrew Scriptures are not exact parallels to the man and wife, the core principle of subduing and ruling are applicable. There is a great masculinity and femininity to marriage. It's not a level playing field. It is one with a standing pillar. It doesn't seem surprising in this day when submission in marriage is swept under that rug, that countless millions of people want to flock to see a movie like *50 Shades of Grey*, or read the book. I realize most believers attack this movie, but it's not surprising to see its popularity, including among Christians and especially Christian women. You see a story like this might present a warped view of the man and woman relationship, but the general public rarely if ever gets the real view. So it goes for the artificial.

The fact is, as warped as it is, *50 Shades of Grey* is merely a bent version of something good, true and from God. It presents the fake thing. What is the real thing? The real thing is called marriage. It really has a clear leader and it really has a true submissive, deeply giving of herself to her lord. When does the general public get to see that real godly marriage? What they typically get instead is a milquetoast marriage, one which ignores male strength and leadership, and they are persuaded that being milquetoast is the alternative to having a brutal thuggish husband. They even hear this nonsense from ministers who are themselves deceived. No wonder they would flock to this movie. I have heard (and I never watched it by the way) that the movie involves a contract between master and servant which binds them together. Well, if the fake thing involves a kind of agreement, the real thing surely does too. Once again, that real thing is marriage. It is the marriage vows, rooted in the truths of the Word of God, and then the presence of Yeshua filling it and holding it together. That is the bond between man and wife, making them one flesh.

If Sarah the honored matriarch of my people called her husband master, then how much more should our matriarchs do the same. Not surprisingly, this godly subordination helps make them into beautiful daughters of God. It helps to fully reveal that godliness, holiness and light the Lord above has placed in them. You know in hiding and spitefully denying submission, the Body of Messiah hasn't just lost some of its faithfulness. It hasn't just lost some of its ordinances. It has also lost some of its beauty. Incredibly beauty lit by the light of the Son. That is the woman in submission to her man. Fully being revealed as the bride, just as the Church, the Bride of Messiah is fully being revealed, made holy and led in submission to our Savior.

We've come to our close, brothers. I hope I haven't scared you with that section on *50 Shades*, but it is the truth. Moreover, if you have been taught that marriage is a flat field and an egalitarian experience, I am sorry but you have been deceived. It's that simple. I realize that some of those people who deceived you might be ministers. I realize they might in other respects be faithful people. But they deceived you. Between the many scriptures we have gone over above, as well as the overarching truths in the Word alongside our common wisdom understanding of man and woman, we can know confidently that the man is the king in marriage, and the wife in subordination under him. We in fact can know that from Ephesians 5 alone. Please pass it along. Pass it along to your pastor as well. As I've said before, by all means go and do the same searches through the Bible that I have.

As to those who openly deny the truth we can all clearly know, they have one overarching motivation – that is simple disobedience. To claim scripture teaches something other than real submission is complete lunacy. It is in itself an act of disobedience. The people who promote this are simply choosing to become post-modernist when they find scripture unlikable. Instead of

openly saying – let’s disobey – they ridiculously claim that words mean something other than what we know they mean. They deny the ability of language to communicate at all. Now they will not deny language in all instances. In the instances when they are the ones speaking and they are the ones making the rules, they will cease being post-modernists and quickly become believers in truth. Because they want their own words to be understood, to be communicated, to be obeyed. They are only denying the meaning of words when it suits them. In other instances they respect language. The denial of submission, and I hope you see this as plainly as I do, is little more than a sham. If you are involved in this corrupt denial, please accept the review of the Word of God above, and make a choice about where you stand. I realize if you want to do whatever you want you’re going to believe whatever you want too. Yet I pray you have the grace to accept this message. Then the grace to submit to God.

Peace unto you.