



Pink

Blue

Purple

Which Gender Is Stronger?

Daniel Oyanna

This is a free book.

Published by Daniel O. Oyanna (January 2022)

Unless otherwise stated, quotations of the Bible are from the King James Version. It may also be denoted by KJV

Cover design by Daniel O. Oyanna

*It is God who was at work in me to conceive and
execute this good work.*

Thank you, Lord.

Linda Itokan Oyanna

You are in a class of your own; ruby rare among women.
I am blessed to be your husband.

Michael, Gabriel, Joseph

My boys, I wait to see the glory of God packaged in you
manifest for all to see. You are going to be wonderful men. I
am proud of you.



Pink

Blue

Purple

Pink, blue, purple

Which gender is stronger? Men, or women?

I hear all the time, as I'm sure that you have, how people compare the strengths of the two genders.

Traditionally, men have been described as the stronger gender but, like everything else in our days where we challenge traditional views, we are beginning to describe women as the stronger gender. And for those who are Christians, we begin to challenge verses of scripture like 1 Peter 3:7 because we now think that the meaning has implications that are NO LONGER applicable or correct. And if one verse of the Bible is no longer true, would we stop at that one verse or would we keep digging till we erode the whole thing?

I've heard of people who have made comments about the Bible or God, being anti-woman or so simply because of this verse and because men are mentioned more than women in the Bible.

We begin to think that in our bid to fight for women's rights, we have to alter the way the Bible is interpreted, written, or even its relevance to our world. We are on the edge of throwing it out altogether, just because we want everything to fit the contemporary maxim that women are stronger than men or that men are not stronger than women. (They sound the same but to those who understand, there is a world of difference).

Aaaaanyway ... I don't think that's my point right now.

So, which side is stronger?

Anyone who has studied the English language to any reasonable extent would quickly realise that when you mention an adjective, it means you are comparing multiple things that may not be similar based on that parameter that they have in common which the adjective specifies. What this means is that when you bring up strength as a factor for comparison, you would need to standardise the parameter for comparing strength. Otherwise, the comparison would be compromised by the uniqueness of the subjects being compared.

For example, if someone were to attempt to compare the speed of a 100m sprint track athlete with a 100m swimming athlete, you would immediately put holes in the analysis because the parameters do not match even though you are comparing speed – the difference in the playing fields makes it difficult to swallow the comparison.

It is the same with comparing the strength of our genders. If we look open heartedly at the basis of our comparison of strength, when we compare them head to head we will find that our analysis has been full of holes. To be able to rationally compare strengths, we will need a level playing field.

But the thing is that the playing field has never been level. Matter of fact, it has always been shifting ... more so recently.

Traditionally, men were viewed as being stronger than women. But that traditional belief was a product of a time when

strength was measured by one's capacity in the face of manual labour, hunting wild animals, and fending off skirmishes with primitive tools or weapons or with just sheer force. But as technology has advanced and the requirement for sheer force has been replaced by a requirement for skill with modern tools and weapons, that basis of measurement of strength lost its grip. So, in comes the marching chant "What a man can do, a woman can do" ... and some add "even better" ... and it seems to make sense.

The world today documents situations where women have become successful at many things considered traditionally masculine, and in many cases, even more successful than the men around them. Single parenthood seems to be largely associated with women and the more children came out well, the more it was thought that the fathers were not really needed in the first place and that men were the weakest link in the chain holding the family together. Add that to scenarios where women are coming out as star military personnel and other very high risk, potentially fatal professions, the story seems like women can generally do better than men, can generally do without men, and should generally do without men.

There are a few things off base about such a philosophy.

Necessity is the mother of invention but that does not mean we need to reinvent everything. Single parenthood started as a very real necessity. At a time when the world's armies were all men, quite naturally husbands and fathers were lost. Some of the affected women remarried but others had to learn to cope without a man in their lives. On the tail of that was the rise in incidence of runaway fathers. For reasons I cannot go

into here, some men started just walking away from home and never returning. Again, out of necessity, the affected women reinvented themselves to deal with the new normal. On the tail of that, divorce. With the rise in divorce rates, there was also a rise in the number of affected women choosing to remain unmarried. And on the tail of that is our generation where people choose not to marry at all, and we are settling into a belief that women don't need to be married to be parents if they so choose to be.

We look at the world today and we think this is huge. We think everyone is walking this path and living by such ideologies. But we are largely misled. What we have is a situation where the smaller subset, in a bid to be heard and recognised, makes so much noise and draws so much attention that it saturates the news and discussions which ends up spreading the ideology even further. Our world has always been impacted by the loud minority. And with this Internet driven age, news travels far and fast, sometimes in real-time, and has massive sometimes costly effects.

A very sad example is that of a young man who died by suicide in Lagos, Nigeria, some years back. Some part of the story was streamed on social media. The nation was united in grief by his painful demise through the Internet. Unfortunately, the aftermath proved to be woeful as an unprecedented wave of suicides and suicide attempts rocked the nation. Watching one event sowed a seed that made soooo many people think of what they would not have otherwise thought of. Hearing and seeing it made it seem like a real option they had not previously considered. And the fact that we kept hearing and seeing of more and more people falling victim, we felt it was an epidemic of sorts.

Another example is divorce. People have been getting divorced for thousands of years but it did not reach the status it has today because the news wasn't travelling as far or as fast as it is today. The way we hear about it today, it would seem that almost everyone is getting divorced. The rates are certainly rising but there are more people today staying married than there are those in divorce situations. The loud minority has simply got our attention making us think otherwise.

Take a look at this data from around the world.

- Official statistics suggest that divorce is exceedingly uncommon in Nigeria. Just 0.2% of men and 0.3% of women have legally untied the knot, according to the National Bureau of Statistics. And well under 1% of couples admit to being separated.
<https://www.economist.com/middle-east-and-africa/2016/07/07/rings-fall-apart> 7 July 2016
- The crude divorce rate (divorces per 1,000 Australian residents) rose in the 1960s and 1970s and peaked at 4.6 per 1,000 resident population after the introduction of the *Family Law Act 1975*, which came into operation in January 1976 and allowed no-fault divorce.
<https://aifs.gov.au/facts-and-figures/divorce-rates-australia>
- 42% of married couples (in the USA) are expected to get divorced. <https://worldpopulationreview.com/state-rankings/divorce-rate-by-state> 29 June 2021
- Divorce Statistics 2021: How Many UK Marriages End in Divorce? 84% of people who are married in the UK

describe themselves as being 'happily married'. 8.2% say their marriage is 'neither happy nor unhappy'. And a further 8% say they're 'unhappily married'. Of this 8%, only a third are thinking of divorce.

<https://www.scribbler.com/Blog/Divorce-Statistics/>

There are more people staying married than there are getting a divorce but the way we hear about it, we think it is everywhere. Thousands of planes take off and land daily but only the very few ones that crash make the news. This is the power of the loud minority.

It is the same with the men-are-not-needed philosophy. It is the mantra of a loud minority. The quiet majority of the world recognises the invaluable and irreplaceable role of men in marriages, homes, workplaces, and so on.

But the truth is that some things are just exclusive to a particular gender. We have bottle feeding options sourced from various things around us, but we still know that the best milk for a baby is that of its mother. We have sperm banks, and some of the personnel trained to carry out the artificial insemination are women, but there is still no other source of sperm cells other than a man. Some things are easier for a particular gender because they were designed with the resources for it. There is nothing we can do about it. No matter how much we talk back and forth, it's just what it is.

We recognise this such that in spite of the advancements we've made as a race, we still have sports events separating men from women. As an example, even though some women are faster than some men, the fastest person in the world is still male.

Some things are easier for a particular gender because they were raised and trained that way. So, this is a matter of skill acquisition and the specific resource is the will to submit to the training. This is something anyone can do. So, the strengths here are not related to gender but to personal development. This is where professions fall into. Same with things like cooking, child minding, house chores, and many more. Although the basic strengths of each gender might help them have or add a masculine or feminine touch as the case may be, the core of the required task is tied more to skill sets rather than the gender. A female doctor might have a more soothing presence by a patient's bedside but essentially, the real task accomplished are not tied to her gender but to her training and skills.

My point is this, each gender in our world has unique strengths and weaknesses. The strengths indicate why that gender is needed and the weaknesses indicate why this gender group needs the other gender group. But if they both come together to form a team of any sort, be it intimate, business, family or whatever else, we have more strength in the unit and that much less weakness.

You know, I reflect back to my primary school days and I see that this ideology that both genders are somehow anti-each-other has been unconsciously, perhaps unknowingly, planted in us. The opposite of up is down, that of fast is slow, and that of man is woman. How did we come about that? I don't know, but what I am saying here is that rather than see one gender as opposite and counter the other, we should see them as complementary and our lives, indeed the world would be all the better for it.

Because, for one thing, rather than seeking to chase one particular group out of a space because we think that is the way to make the other group more comfortable, we would begin to include them recognising and utilising the unique strengths that make them valuable in that space.

In the past, where the raw strength of men was the basic parameter by which the world was run, women were like lesser men or defective men because try as we might have been able to, we could not make women be like men even though some tried to act like men. Today, we have done a complete 180 as women have gained more and more prominence in the world. We now treat men like defective women and no matter how we try, men cannot be women. Someone said, I don't know who, but he or she said not in these exact words that rather than women trying to do what men can do, they should focus on doing what men cannot do.

I think combining forces is better for our world. In the setting of marriage, it takes the form of love plus submission. In the workplace, it would take the form of teamwork leveraging on the strengths of the individual team members, and so on depending on the particular circumstance. Collaboration, not competition, is the way.

Now, for those of us who consider the Bible as the basis of our lives, let us consider a few things I had mentioned previously and it would be in response to some commonly held, perhaps popular, beliefs.

- 1. The Bible is against women because it mentions men more often than it does women.**

In making this assertion, reference is often made to the genealogies which are built on the male bloodlines. Of course, by looking at the genealogies, one would see that it is dominated by the names of the men with very few women mentioned, one could come to such a conclusion.

One thing we need to correct as our impression of the Bible is that it is a book of the history of the world. It is not. Some of the contents show that it was intended to be applied and useful to the whole world, but it is in no way a documentation of all that happened in the earth since creation. In that light, it is not even a documentation of all that has happened to the nation of Israel since its origins.

The Bible is not a book of redundancies but of necessities. It contains only what God decided was enough to communicate his thoughts to us, nothing more.

The Bible says concerning the works of Jesus ...

John 21:24-25 This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.

So, even the life of Jesus was not exhaustively documented. If it had been, I reckon that almost no one would attempt to read the whole Bible; as it is, most people already think that it is too much and to read the Bible from cover to cover is truly a feat in commitment.

The scarcity of records regarding the lives of women in the Bible is not because God did not want to mention them but

because the Bible stories reflect the relationship and interactions between God and humanity. And in the “Bible times”, the world was largely focused on the men as they worked to shape history, therefore the stories that made it into the Bible reflected that by default. However, at any point that any woman was involved in any remarkable way in the turn of events, her name showed up right next to the men of her time. Thus, we have the names of people like Sarah, Leah, Rachel, Rebecca, Hannah, Deborah, Esther, Mary, Elizabeth, Salome, Priscilla, Rhoda, and on and on ... even Delilah, Jezebel, Herodias and Salome, her daughter.

Furthermore, we have the mention of a few women whose names were not documented but their actions were. There was the little girl who started the chain of events that led to Naaman, the Syrian General, being healed of leprosy. There was another little girl with a spirit of divination who was set free by Apostle Paul who then landed in prison, and then there were the nameless “girls” who fasted with Queen Esther for a chance to effect the deliverance of Israel. This is no different from the many men whose actions place them on the pages of the Bible but did not include their names. So, it is their impact that brought people into the pages of the Bible, not their gender.

When it comes to family trees, I believe we still employ the same basic rule of naming families by the names of the men. And the genealogies in the Bible are no different. They trace the line via sonship. However, again, when occasion required it, a mention is made of a striking woman in these genealogies just as we do today.

Numbers 27:1-11 The daughters of Zelophehad son of Hopher, the son of Gilead, the son of Makir, the son of Manasseh, belonged to the clans of Manasseh son of Joseph. The names of the daughters were Mahlah, Noah, Hoglah, Milkah and Tirzah. They came forward and stood before Moses, Eleazar the priest, the leaders and the whole assembly at the entrance to the tent of meeting and said, “Our father died in the wilderness. He was not among Korah’s followers, who banded together against the LORD, but he died for his own sin and left no sons. Why should our father’s name disappear from his clan because he had no son? Give us property among our father’s relatives.” So Moses brought their case before the LORD, and the LORD said to him, “What Zelophehad’s daughters are saying is right. You must certainly give them property as an inheritance among their father’s relatives and give their father’s inheritance to them. “Say to the Israelites, ‘If a man dies and leaves no son, give his inheritance to his daughter. If he has no daughter, give his inheritance to his brothers. If he has no brothers, give his inheritance to his father’s brothers. If his father had no brothers, give his inheritance to the nearest relative in his clan, that he may possess it. This is to have the force of law for the Israelites, as the LORD commanded Moses.’ ”

See here how these ladies made their mark? They made a case with the leadership of their day and gave God an opportunity to interact with humanity in on a new level.

Remember that in the beginning, God gave dominion to Mankind, the male and female man together.

Genesis 1: 26-28 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and

over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he **them**. And God blessed them, and God said unto **them**, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

As I said in some other writing, “Man’s purpose involved dominion, not just over the garden but over the whole planet. One physical man could not have done it by himself and God said it is not good for the man to be all by himself. He cannot multiply. 1 x 1 is still 1.” What the woman was created to make happen is critical to God’s plan for the earth and for humanity as a whole. The male man would not have been able to accomplish it by himself.

This leads to the next common statement or belief.

2. The Bible says women are weaker than men.

The scripture usually quoted to make this point is **1 Peter 3: 7**.

Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

From my understanding of the English language, I do not think that this verse means that the woman is being referred to as the weaker vessel.

Let’s re-read the verse and point out what it does not say.

Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife *because she is* the weaker vessel ...

If it was written this way, it would mean that the reason the husband is to live a certain way with his wife is on the basis of physical strength. It would mean then that if the wife is not weak, she should not be treated the way this prescribes, whatever that is (we'll get to that later). It would also mean that if a woman was stronger than her husband, as we know is true in some cases, then the wife should be the one treating her husband according to the prescription of this verse of scripture.

Another thing it does not say ...

Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them carefully, giving honour unto the wife because she is weaker ...

Again, this would mean that the basis of who treats who a certain scriptural way would be a matter of who is stronger.

Next ...

Likewise, ye men, dwell with them according to knowledge ... because women are weaker than men.

Written this way, it would mean a general statement has been made that women are weaker than men. Since the argument today is aimed at making people see that women are not weaker than men or even that they are stronger than men, it seems to me that this last version is closer to what many people understand when they read this verse. But, no. It says "husbands", not men, and then "wife" meaning that "them" in this verse refers to "wives" not women. So, this verse cannot be applied on the basis of our genders but on the basis of our roles in a marriage relationship.

If we were to take even a shallow study of the Greek words translated here we would find that the word translated *husbands* here is **ἄνδρες** (andres) Strong's Greek 435: a noun meaning A male human being; a man, husband. A primary word; a man. Similarly, the word translated *wives* is **γυναικείω** (gynaikeiō) Strong's Greek 1134: an adjective meaning “Belonging to woman, of woman, female. From **gune**; feminine.” Which means potentially, the words could have been translated into any of the meanings attached to them but the translators had to use *husbands* and *wives* because of this key word, **τreat** **συνοικοῦντες** (synoikountes) Strong's Greek 4924: A verb meaning “To dwell with, live in wedlock with. From **sun** and **oikeo**; to reside together.” So, the characters at play here are not simply genders but men and women who have committed to a marriage relationship i.e. husbands and wives.

It's getting interesting so let's continue with the critical contentious word *weaker*. It is an Adjective **ἀσθενεστέρω** (asthenesterō) that means (lit: not strong), (a) weak (physically, or morally), (b) infirm, sick. Strengthless. However the word is usually used to imply **delicate** and I think that is right because when used in conjunction with *vessel* **σκεύει** (skeuei) which is a noun which means a vessel, implement, equipment or apparatus (specially, a wife as contributing to the usefulness of the husband), and so any translator would go with the impression that it means weakness as in fragile, delicate vessel or equipment.

And why is the husband to treat his own wife as a delicate vessel? What does it mean to the relationship? Is it a matter of him using his strength to do physically demanding stuff

because she might shatter to pieces if she attempts them? This is the impression that people, women and men who advocate for them, are trying to fight. But no, that's not what this implies. The basis of that 'handle with care' disposition is actually *honour*.

The word translated *honour* [τιμήν \(timēn\)](#) is a noun meaning "A price, honor. From [tino](#); a value, i.e. Money paid, or valuables; by analogy, esteem, or the dignity itself." So the implication here is not a matter of the woman's constitution, physical, emotional and definitely not spiritual (as preceding and proceeding verses imply) but one of the value that the husband has for his wife.

It is the same concept of value that is at play in this verse, matter of fact, it's the same word in Greek and in the translated English forms.

2 Timothy 2:20 But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to **honour**, and some to dishonour.

Nobody reads this verse counts the "vessels unto honour" as those that are inferior or even superior on the basis of its constitution and strength. We all know it refers to the value that the master of the house places on it. It is the same thing that 1 Peter 3 is asking that husbands do, treat your wife honourably as you would treat someone you treasure immeasurably. Each time I read this verse, what I get out of it is that I should treat my wife as I would a queen. If you ever hear me say "Happy wife, happy life", this is what I am referring to.

But, what if you didn't have access to all this Greek 😊, would you still be able to see this truth in this scripture? Why, of course you would ... if you took the verse in its context. Let me walk you through it.

First of all, we need to be aware that the books of the Bible are mostly letters, while others are simply chronicles documenting something. It is for ease of reference that they were broken into chapters and verses. So, if we want to get the context of any particular verse, we need to zoom out a bit and find the beginning of the thought and its conclusion so that we can get the message.

So, zooooooooooooooooooooom ... 😊

1 Peter 3:7 begins with "Likewise". This means it is being related to something that was discussed before. So, let's go to the preceding verses. If you look through, you will notice that the thought preceding this one about how men should treat their wives is preceded by a thought on how women should treat their husbands. So, the "Likewise" at the beginning of verse 7 shows that it is being described as something similar to how women are to treat their husbands as documented in verses 1-6.

1 Peter 3:

1Likewise, ye wives, *be* in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; **2**While they behold your chaste conversation *coupled* with fear. **3**Whose adorning let it not be that outward *adorning* of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; **4**But *let it be* the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, *even the ornament* of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. **5**For after this

manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: [6](#)Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. [7](#)Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

It means that men are being taught to honour their wives because of their immeasurable value in like manner as women are being taught to honour their husbands because of his role in the relationship as the head.

But it is easy to see, that this thought also begins with “Likewise”. So, a man’s treatment of his wife, is similar to a woman’s treatment of her husband, which is similar to a thought presented in the preceding section of text. Some Bible translations help you, with their type setting, to notice the beginning of the previous section as beginning in verse 21 of Chapter 2.

zooooooooooooooooooom ... ☺

1 Peter 2:

[21](#)For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: [22](#)Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: [23](#)Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed *himself* to him that judgeth righteously: [24](#)Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. [25](#)For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

The thought here is that a sinless, faultless Christ trusted God enough to give up his rights and himself as an act of willing service for our utmost benefit.

So ... so far, men are to highly esteem, value, cherish, and honour their wives, just as women are to revere, submit to, and honour their husbands, just as Christ willingly let go of his rights of divinity to serve humanity as an expression of trust in the Father.

But you will notice that the thought presented in 2:21-25 begins with “For” or “Because”. This means the discussion did not start here either. So, let’s zoom out again. What was the sacrifice of Christ being related to in this discussion? Why was it brought up as an example, so to speak?

zooooooooooooooooooom ... 😊

1 Peter 2: 18 Servants, *be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. 19* For this *is* thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. **20** For what glory *is it*, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer *for it*, ye take it patiently, this *is* acceptable with God.

This section of scripture seems to be the beginning of the discourse and it obvious that the point of the whole discussion was about each individual’s personal and unconditional loyalty demonstrated in the place of service to others as part of his relationship with God. Servants are to serve their masters whole-heartedly, as Christ served The Father sacrificially, as

women are expected to serve their husbands with humility, and men are to serve their wives with high esteem.

The point is that we are more like God wants us to be when we actively seek to serve, honour, value, and submit to one another in whatever station we find ourselves, and in whatever kind of relationship we might be in.

So, even without going into word studies as I did previously, 1 Peter 3:7 is in no way saying what a lot of people have used it to say for a long time. The Bible, and certainly this verse, does not say women are in any way less than men. I have often said that when God said that a woman should submit to her husband, it is because she is just as potent as he is, but because they must exist as one, He has to establish a chain of command ... just as there is a chain of command in the God-head.

1 Corinthians 11: 3 But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God ... the woman is the glory of the man. **8**For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.

What am I saying here? It is this: men and women are equal before God. And in the setting of marriage, that equality of power and access does not disappear, no. The woman surrenders so that she can be a wife, and in the process make it possible for the man she has chosen to be able to serve as her husband. I mentioned in my book, *Instruction in Submission*, that submission is a gift that a woman gives to a particular man which enables him to be a husband to her.

The fact that she submits does not make her less potent. Why do I say this?

1 Peter 3:7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being **heirs together** of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

The word translated “heirs together” is [συνκληρονόμοις](#) (synklēronomōis) Strong's Greek 4789: A joint heir, participant. a co-heir, i.e. participant in common.

Let’s bring up another verse that quickly comes to mind when we mention the words “joint heirs.”

Romans 8:17 And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with [him], that we may be also glorified together.

Joint heirs. It’s the same Greek word in both instances. When we say we are joint-heirs with Christ, we do so in the context of having equal access to everything that Christ has. It is the same implication here. The wife is as much a full-fledged kingdom citizen. That is why it is possible for her to agree with her husband in prayer and it stands before God; if they were not equal, it would not be an agreement. So, if a man treats his wife dishonourably, as though she is less than himself, even when she stands with him, it does not amount to an agreement before God and so, whatever prayer the man is praying, that requires an agreement, suffers a hindrance.

And before you start to think that a man could decide to bypass a prayer of agreement rather than respect his wife for what she truly is, understand that in the realm of the spirit, things do not happen anyhow – there are principles that must be engaged. Therefore, those things that require a prayer of agreement with your wife cannot be bypassed no matter how much “faith”

you think you can muster. Remember that the dominion of the world was given to the man and his wife, so if you truly want to dominate your world as God intended, you cannot do so without her.

You might be thinking, this guys is talking about husbands and wives but the argument is about men versus women. You are right. Although the contemporary argument is about men versus women generally, the stage of the argument has always been in the setting of marriage. We always use examples to clarify and buttress our points, so when talking about this men v women showdown, we almost always pitch it in a context of marriage. The mistake there is that the people in a marriage are more than just men and women and so whatever principle we glean from there if applied to another context, say the work place, has to be applied with great care. If a man fails in his marriage, it is not because he is a man but because he is poor at being a husband. Same applies to the wife.

I am an artist and so I think of colours more frequently than the average person, I think. I want to borrow a concept from here. I think we all know that a rainbow has 7 colours but most of the time, we only see three of these colours, the red, the blue and the purple. Of course if we looked closely enough, we would be able to see the yellow and the green but the three main ones catch our eyes quicker. Based on that, I could say the main colours of the rainbow are the reds, the blues and the purples. The more a colour tends towards the red spectrum of light, the warmer it is said to become and the more it tends to the blue section of the spectrum, the cooler it is said to be. Pink is considered a feminine colour so it is warm, and blue is generally a masculine colour so it is cool. If we poured both

these colours into a container and mixed them, we would get something in the purple section.

Culture and hence language is evolving but classically, desirable women are described as hot, while the trending man is described as cool. Now, it is interesting that our world is losing colour when we pitch women against men. Keeping the pink (basically a red) from the blue, we lose the purple and our rainbow becomes thoroughly incomplete. I hear purple signifies royalty. Most people know that the way to get purple is to mix the reds with the blues. Hot temperatures are okay, and cold temperatures can be fine too, but we would all be comfortable in the mid temperatures where the hot and the cold mix, right? Or at the very least, it gives us one more option.

It is the same thing I am proposing here and that is the point I am making. Rather than fight to kick men out of the space or counter that by kicking women out, why don't we mix it up like God intends? Pink + Blue = Purple. If men treat women as they should be treated, and women treat men as they should be treated, we all get to be royalty.

Life is in the complementary.

On a macroscopic scale, by design, the male body complements the female body in a way that helps us create the life of the next generation of humans. Women cannot keep the population of the human race going by themselves any more than men could by themselves. We need each other.

On a microscopic scale, when sperm meets egg, they don't fight for dominance over each other ... they merge. The egg carries one half of the genes and the sperm cell carries the other half. Each without the other will die off in a matter of days but when

that one sperm cell merges and complements the egg, both units come together to create something that lives for decades and continue the chain reaction known as the human race.

We are complements of each other, not opposites.

Pink + Blue = Purple.

About The Author



Daniel Onimisi Oyanna is a man of many sides. He was Vice President of Gospel Power Assembly, a campus based ministry in the University of Benin. He pastored also in the House of Tehilah Christian Fellowship in Benin City and currently Pastors in Living Faith Church Katsina where he has served as Choir Director, Pastor over the Choir, the Gilead Medical Team and the Technical unit of the church at various times. He is a singer, musician, song writer, sound engineer, fine artist and blogs actively

on life's issues with a biblical perspective on pdlionunlimited.wordpress.com. He is the author of "To Date or Not to Date", "Instructions in Submission", "Crushing the Crushers" and blogs on pdlionunlimited.wordpress.com. As a Doctor, he worked with the Katsina State government, Nigeria and served as head of two hospitals in the State.

He is very happily married to Dr. Linda, who is a dentist and together they have three lovely energetic boys. They counsel and mentor young men, women and young couples from all over the world through their intimate relationships and life as a whole. They have also served as patrons to NCCF.

Dr Daniel is a conference speaker on relationships, health, faith and other subjects, has published several books many of which are available for free, and he is a Pastor and teacher blessed by God with a grace to make things easy to understand.

Feel free to send questions or comments via

e-mail: pd_lionunlimited@yahoo.com

facebook: Pastor Daniel Oyanna

blog: pdlionunlimited.wordpress.com