

# Women in the Churches

## *Their Rights and Restrictions*

-----or-----

PAUL HARMONIZED THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

With

---

SECOND EDITION

---

PRICES ( (Cloth Bound, prepaid, 50c.  
(Paper Bound, prepaid, 25c.

Revised and Enlarged by  
J. B. MOODY, Dean  
Hall-Moody Institute  
Martin, Tenn  
1910

## INDEX

Preface to the First Edition.....	2
Introduction to the First Edition.....	3
Preface to the second Edition.....	4-9
Changeable Customs vs. Unchangeable Principles.....	11-25
Heathen Customs.....	25-29
Heathen Testimony.....	29-31
These Universal Customs have Influenced Translations And Interpretations.....	32-37
Not Women prohibited, but Wives.....	38-43
What Sort of Silence and Subjection Enjoined.....	43-49
Equalities of Husband and Wife.....	49-53
Women's Privileges in the Old Scriptures.....	53-64
Examples Under the Ministry of Christ.....	64-68
Examples Found in the Acts.....	68-81
The Teaching of the Epistles.....	81-88
1Cor. 14:34.....	88-92
Directions and Restrictions in 1. Tim. 2, and 1 Peter 3.....	92-100
Female Deacons.....	100-107
A Right Revision Rightly Read.....	107-126

### PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

**I** the public worship and service of God from the writings of three noted received my early education on the subject of Women's Restrictions in men, viz: Drs. John A. Broadus, T. T. Eaton and W. P. Harvey, than whom there are no men I delight more to honor and none I more confidently follow. These tracts I first read with great relish, and with only a little misgiving. In trying to quiet what doubt I had by re-readings, the doubts

increased, so that now I feel compelled to dissent in several things from these good brethren. I could not reconcile these Restrictions with what I plainly saw in other parts of God's Word.

In one of these tracts, page 22, the writer says: "This question is to be decided by scholarship, and that scholarship is unanimous, and who is he that denies their correctness?" This makes it very discouraging for a man who is not a scholar to offer objections. But the author says on same page that "scholars are fallible men and may be mistaken, and on some questions their opinions may be worth no more than others." I take issue with this noted scholar about the subject of Paul's Restrictions of Women being an exception to the general rule. In the following pages I have ventured to say my say.

## **INTRODUCTION TO FIRST EDITION.**

**T**he importance of this subject is acknowledged by all Bible students, and its many difficulties have troubled the wisest and best in our Lord's churches. Any discussion of the question that will help to the fuller and clearer understanding of the relative duties and the God-given privileges of the noble Christian women should be received with eagerness and read without prejudice. The author is well prepared by his varied experiences as pastor, editor, author and lecturer in varied and various fields for the task so ably performed, and we feel sure that every candid, unprejudiced reader will be greatly benefited by a prayerful study of this clear, scholarly, comprehensive and scriptural discussion of this highly important issued. Much of the consecrated talent and spiritual power of our sisters is lost because the women have been discouraged and suppressed, or they have been urged on beyond the divine limits of her queenly sphere. Just where does the Lord want her and just what He would have her do is the great question so ably discussed in the following pages.

Fully believing this book will do great good, we beg the blessings of God on both the men and women in our Lords' churches.

I.N. PENICK.

Martin, Tenn.

## **PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.**

**T**his substance of the following pages were first delivered in a series of sermons in several places, and then to the Bible Class in Hall-Moody Institute. They next appeared in the Baptist Banner (now Builder) and sent to forty picked critics outside of its circulation, with the request that they assist the author by way of correction or suggestion, before the articles went into permanent form. No one gave an adverse criticism. He afterward sent the booklet to scores of thinking men, as well as the press, and to this day it has not received a public word of adverse criticism, but on the contrary, by word and pen, many of our best students of the Word have given it the warmest words of commendation. Only a few can be given here. Two or three have shot into the air, and struck back handedly at the conclusions reached, but no criticism of the argument. The little book was first introduced to the Baptist Ministers' Conference in Louisville, about as follows:

The author said he might be wrong in his interpretation of these Restrictions on Women, and might have failed to harmonize these restrictions with the Law and the Gospel, but both together would not invalidate his argument. To illustrate: On John 3:5 there are many interpretations held by the ministers of this Conference, and that we all might fail to satisfy others with the harmony of our interpretations with the Scriptures, but that we were all agreed on the Scripture argument that baptism is not a *sine qua non*<sup>1</sup> to entrance into the Kingdom of God. This author inherited the notion that "born of water" meant baptism, and it was woe to the man who would dare call it in question. And so, with many other inherited notions, "supported by concurrent scholarship." Honest investigation is safer than both.

The many Scriptures on any subject cannot be overthrown by any interpretation of a difficult passage. That we also had as many

---

<sup>1</sup> *Sine qua non* is a latin legal term meaning 'condition.' It refers to an indispensable and essential action, condition, or ingredient. (Editor – LK, 2-10-09)

interpretations of Acts 2:38, and as many ways of harmonizing our interpretations with the general teachings of the Scripture, but that we were all agreed that baptism is not necessary to the forgiveness of sins, because of the many plain Scriptures to the contrary. The same of Acts 22:16, and Heb. 6:4. We were all agreed that no interpretation of those Scriptures could overthrow their general teaching on the subjects involved. John 6:37. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. Many such Scriptures on the Divine side are unanswerable, unless the many on the human side, showing the appointed means, are considered with them. And so of these restrictions. Paul sent us to the Old Scriptures in justification of his restrictions, and we know that the Law and Gospel say nothing about women keeping silence in the churches. So it was not church government, but family government that was being violated in the churches. Family government is taught in the law, but not church government.

This book attempts to show how God used and honored women, and even married women, all down the ages. That is where the argument is. So it is a waste of time and energy to cavil over a difficult Scripture that is made to contrary all the Scriptures. I dare not interpret Paul so as to contradict the Scriptures he sent us to for proof of his position. Paul made no attempt to change the relations between women and God, women and men, or wife and husband. He did not aim at an innovation. It was not a relation of women to the churches, but he was trying to maintain the married relation in the churches. The married heathen women made free by the Gospel were transgressing the family rules in the "confusions and contentions," brought about by the use of their supernatural gifts in the churches. This seems to be the key to the unusual and exciting occasions that made it necessary for Paul to remind them of the family government so plainly taught "in the law."

### **SOME GOOD LETTERS.**

Dr. G. C. Skillman, Augusta, Ky.:

"I have read with an absorbing interest, 'After Death: Where and What?' and 'Women in the Churches.' I am glad to see at least one Baptist preacher who knows how to rightly divide the Word of Truth. In both your books I find

just what I have believed and taught for years. The book, 'Women in the Churches,' will do much good. It will deliver many pious women from the bondage into which they have been forced by false interpretation of the Scriptures. The life of many of our churches depend on their being liberated."

Dr. S. E. Jones, the great theological teacher in Carson-Newman College, wrote:

"I think you have made out a strong plea for your contention. . . . Your position seems to harmonize with the Scriptures when interpreted 'according to the analogy of faith.' . . . I regard it as a very thorough, painstaking, fair and able discussion of a very important subject."

Dr. E. Y. Mullins dissents from some of the conclusions, but congratulates the author on making the strongest argument that has been made on that side of the subject.

Dr. A. T. Robertson said that his father-in-law, Dr. J. A. Broadus, modified his position on the subject before he died, and his own views on the subject were broader than those of Dr. Broadus.

More than one association in the Blue Grass region recommended it in their report on Religious Literature. The Sulphur Fork, in Eminence, in minutes, page 6, says: "Than which nothing more conclusive on this subject has ever appeared."

FROM DR. J. B. GAMBRELL.

"It is not the custom of The Missionary Worker to notice books, but a publication has come to our desk that we would really love for many of our people to read, and we therefore call attention to it.

"'Women in the Churches—Their Rights and Restrictions; or Paul Harmonized With the Law and Gospel,' by J. B. Moody, dean Hall- Moody Chair of Theology, Martin, Tenn. This is an exceedingly practical publication. It is practical because many of our people have been bothered by two

passages written by Paul. We have never taken the view held by many of our brethren, notably by Dr. Broadus, but we are glad to know that even Dr. Broadus modified his views before his death, and the very narrow view held by some does not represent the views of the Seminary. Dr. Moody is an exigete [sic - lk] of rare ability, and this publication ought to help many of our people. The churches have been greatly hurt by what we consider unScriptural limitations put upon the liberties of women. Dr. Moody deals with the question broadly, as any one must, who would arrive at the whole truth of the matter. If you have any trouble on this subject, write to Dr. Moody for his booklet."

Pages of the strongest commendation could be given. These are given only for the encouragement of those who might think it heresy to advocate the liberty of Christian women in Christian lands from those galling and degrading chains of heathenism. Baptists must support State churches in some countries, but not in this. Here we have no such "custom," because no such law.

In the Bible Institute just closed in Martin, all who spoke on the subject were favorable to it. "The authorities that be" may rob woman of her property rights, but woe to the man who robs her of her religious rights and of her eternal rewards. To "rob widows' houses" is innocence personified compared to this.

II. Cor. 6:18—And "I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." Will the sons rob the daughters of the Almighty Father of their rights? Shame on them!

J. B. M.

**RIGHTS AND RESTRICTIONS  
of  
WOMEN IN THE CHURCHES.**

*"We have no such custom, neither the churches of God."*—I. Cor. 11:16.

# W

Whether "custom" refers to the veiling and unveiling, or to "contentions" about veiling and unveiling, I will leave to two of our best Baptist Commentaries. The American Commentary says: "This is generally referred by commentators to the habit of contentiousness, but also by some to the habit of women praying with uncovered heads. The former (contentiousness) is the immediate subject, and the latter the general subject. One difficulty in making it refer to the unveiling of women in prayer, is to explain the pronoun 'we' in the statement in such a way as to fit this. When he says, 'We have, or have not, a custom,' it must refer to something practiced by themselves, i. e., in this case the women must be included in the 'we.' Alford sees this and explains the pronoun as referring to 'the Apostles and their immediate company, including the women who assembled in prayer and supplications with them at their various stations.' But in Acts 16:13, which he refers to, the women do not belong to their company.' . . . 'This solemn discussion of the question whether women shall pray in public, veiled or unveiled, is a good indication of the way in which all directions about mere customs, even when they are based on general principles, as in this case, are to be treated. Customs, as indications of principles continually change, while the principles remain."

George W. Clark, *in loco*, says: "Some refer to contentions. . . . It naturally refers to that, and thus gives the best sense. It will be noticed in this discussion that Paul's argument is partly from the Divine law and order, and partly from symbolic reasons, the sense of propriety, and from the practice of society and the custom of the churches. That which is of Divine direction is permanent; but the rest is more or less temporary, as modified by circumstances and customs of different nations and ages."

Then Paul meant that "we" (Apostles) or Churches of God, were not accustomed to such contentions about women praying, or prophesying with heads covered or uncovered. There was nothing of it in the Old Scriptures, the Gospels, the Acts, or in any of the Epistles, except in those cities where these heathen customs prevailed, and where the customs indicated character. The Apostles and other churches had no contentions about how



women should dress or act in praying and prophesying in public. This will be made clear.

Let us now exhaust Scripture teaching on customs. As already wisely quoted, "customs change, but principles and doctrines change not." For the use of customs, see in Old Scriptures the following: Gen. 31:35; Judges 11:30-39 `As it was a custom in Israel." Jer. 32:11: "Sealed according to the law *and* custom."...I. Sam. 2:13: "The priest's custom with the... people was." This custom changed. Ezra 3:4: "According to the custom, as the duty—of the day requires." That custom has ceased. Lev. 18:30, speaks of "abominable customs," and Jer. 10:3, of "vain customs." Customs are not universally binding, but only binding on certain classes in particular countries, and that only for a time.

The following exhausts the matter of customs in the New Scriptures: Matt. 27:15: "The Governor was wont (accustomed) to release." The custom was limited in many things and without authority. Mark 10:1: "As he was wont (accustomed,) he taught them again." It only expresses a habit. Luke 4:16: "As his custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day." This custom He changed for us, to the church, on the next day. Acts 17:2: "Paul, as his manner (custom) was, went in to them and three Sabbath days disputed with them out of the Scriptures."

It was Paul's habit to go to the Jewish gatherings to speak to them, but the custom was not so iron-clad that he could go nowhere else, at other times and places, to speak to the other people. This, like many customs, was not binding.

In Luke 1:9 we read of the priest's custom.

Not now observed, even by Jews. In Luke 2:42, that "Jesus with His parents went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feasts." In Luke 22:29: "As He was wont (custom,) He went to the Mount of Olives." An individual habit, called custom.

In John 19:40, we read of the manner or custom of the Jews in burying the dead. Not now observed. Acts 6:14, tells of the accusation against Jesus of Nazareth to change the customs of Moses. This charge was true. It was what He did, and the Jews were about as jealous and zealous for certain customs as some people are to-day, though the custom be purely and only heathen—good for certain times and places and people, but sadly needing change.

All our Christmas and Easter customs need abolishing. They are heathenish.

In Acts 15:1, we find some Baptist preachers contending fervently for circumcision after the manner (custom) of Moses. A good custom, but not binding, always, everywhere, on all people. In Acts 16:21, Paul was falsely accused of teaching customs not lawful for Romans to receive. The customs referred to were good in their places, but no further. In 21:21, he is again accused of not walking after the customs.

Hurrah for Paul! 25:16, speaks of manner (custom) of the Romans. This was a good custom, based on a good principle, of hearing a man before condemning him, which some of our people need to learn. In 26:3, Agrippa was credited as being an expert on all customs and questions of the Jews.

In 28:17, Paul said he had done nothing against the people or customs of the fathers. He taught circumcision in its place, but fought it out of its place. Heb. 10:25: "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the custom of some is." A bad custom, and, like all bad customs, ought to be broken, and even all good customs will come to an end, as ordained of God.

These are all the places, except where custom is used in the sense of tariff or duty, and these are as changeable as the other customs, and ought to be.

As pastor, I was once asked in a church meeting what Baptist custom was on a certain question. I answered that I was not there to teach Baptist customs, but Baptist doctrine. That was a case where Baptist custom was contrary to Baptist doctrine, and there are many such Baptist customs I am

ashamed to confess. Of course, the customs of other people are still worse. Let us get custom to accord with doctrine and principle. Customs may change, but not doctrines.

"We have no such customs, neither the churches of God," was written in peculiar circumstances. The heathen custom prevailed of requiring women to veil, or cover, with a mantle or cloak, the head, so the face could not be seen. Another heathen custom was that women should not speak in the presence of men. These two customs the Jews had been forced to adopt, in a measure, by association with the heathen. This had gone to such a length, that to violate the custom would indicate a loose character, as loose women violated the customs, even to the extent of cutting their hair like men. As the public recognized all such as loose in morals, so it was important, then, and even now, in such countries for Christian women to conform to the custom.

God gave women long hair to express a certain principle. When Rebecca met Isaac as his betrothed, she took her mantle and covered herself—Gen. 24:65. See also Gen. 38:14, 19, and Ruth 3:15; Cant. 5:7; Isa. 3:23. These are all the references to the veil in the Old Scriptures where women are included. There are many places where it refers to men.

I. Cor. 11:4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 15, contain all the references to this covering and uncovering of men and women in the New Scriptures. The entire covering of the face and head was a heathen custom, and was proper for Christian women because of what it signified in those places. If I were in those countries to-day, I would insist on their conforming to the custom; but I should do what I could to change the custom. Most of the Jewish customs are not binding on us, and many customs taught by Christ and His Apostles are not now binding, though the principle expressed by such customs is now expressed by other customs.

Take John 13:14-17:

14. If I then, *your* Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet.

15. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.

16. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.

17. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.

This was a conformity to a social custom that expressed a good principle. The same principle is now expressed a different way—and a better way—as people do not now go with feet so much exposed to the dust and dirt of travel.

To prove that it was a social and not a church custom, read I. Tim. 5:9, 10:

9. Let not a widow be taken into the number under three-score years old, having been the wife of one man.

10. Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work.

This was a test of her social qualities. It is not said, if she had been baptized or eaten the Lord's Supper, for those being church customs to be continued to the end, it was taken as a matter of course. Nor does this passage make this a church custom, but only gives directions when such a thing is to be done.

We have directions given us by James that are not now observed. "Send for the elders of the church, and let them pray over the sick, anointing them with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick." Here is the perpetual principle of praying for the sick in conjunction with the use of means. This custom of treating the sick is changed, but not the prayer of faith. That is what saves, and not the custom of administering

remedies. Our customs are doubtless a great improvement, and God will as surely bless our remedies as the others.

Christ said to the moral, rich, young ruler: "If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come follow Me."

This is not of universal obligation, because not every one's wealth is in the way of his salvation. This one was so loaded with money and morals, that he could not leave all to follow Christ. But it is not so with all—even of all those having money and morals.

In verse 12, we read about those who were born eunuchs, and those made so by men, and those who made themselves so for the kingdom of heaven's sake. But the latter is not of universal obligation, but is a means only to such, as it may be necessary.

"Seek not a wife"—I. Cor. 7:27—must be taken in a restricted sense. A bishop and deacon must be the husband of one wife, explained either way: must have a wife, or only one wife, is not now observed except in the sense of having one wife at a time.

If that is the meaning, then unofficial members in those heathen places might have had the liberty, for the time being, of having more than one; and that is the general understanding of the teaching. But the custom of having polygamy in the churches has passed away— and we all rejoice in it. If people believed that they might have more than one wife, and had them, and afterward converted—and no doubt there were many such—it might have proved a radical revolution in society and families to have required all such to put away their wives. This was wisely left to enlightenment and improvement in knowledge.

There are many texts that must be explained by other Scriptures.

"Swear not at all," Matt. 5:34, must be restricted to private and profane swearing, and not to civic oaths, as is now the custom.

So of "Resist not evil." We all must resist evil. The injunction needs explaining, and must mean that we must not revengefully do so.

Paul and Peter both direct that the saints salute or greet each other with a holy kiss—Romans 16:16; I. Cor. 16:20; II. Cor. 13:12; I. Thess. 5:26; I. Peter 5:14. It was the custom in those days for men to kiss men, but it is not needful now, as we can express affection in other and better ways. If that custom were insisted on now, it would hinder the cause of Christ. It was right then, because it was the custom, and would be wrong now, because the custom has changed. This custom is as positive and binding as the Restrictions on Women. They belong together.

Christ said: "Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide until ye depart thence." Mark 6:10 It might have been proper then, but not now, and no one insists upon its observance. So of women veiling or hiding their faces with their shawl, or cloak, or mantle. It was proper then, in some places, because of custom, but not now. So of her silence.

If I were a missionary in heathen countries, where these customs prevail and where they had such significance, I would insist on their observance by Christian women, as did Paul.

There is a reason for every law, and every rule and custom should be founded on right, and, as long as the reason and the right remain, the law and custom should remain, and no longer. Such, for instance, as vaccination. The law of enforcement must be confined to the reason for it. Take no purse or extra clothing on a journey is not now binding, the reason for it having passed. And so of women covering their faces and keeping silent.

In those times and places—and now in many heathen countries—not to do so, would imply immorality and insubordination, and especially to husbands. But women can now go anywhere with open face, and talk freely with men and their husbands, and no one thinks of immorality or insubordination. The Gospel invites her to many liberties in private affairs

equal to those of the men. The only limitation in church work is in official preaching, and authoritative proclamation, as shown in another place.

These heathen customs were not commanded by God, nor observed by the ancient Hebrews. It was only as they were dominated by heathen influence that their women became partakers of the customs. The Persian sway from Solomon to Christ fastened these galling chains on them. But the Gospel gave deliverance to Jewish women in Jewish lands; yet Paul urged these heathen converts to conform to the custom for the sake of propriety, as non-conformance would have ruined their reputation in the public mind of those living in those countries.

In the middle ages, after the destruction of the temple and the dispersion of the Jews among all nations, these customs so prevailed again, that Jewish women were excluded from the vocal praises of God, as taught in Ex. 15:20, 25; I. Sam. 18:6, 7; Eph. 5:19-22; Col. 3:16-18. So these customs prevail as religion retrogrades.

Paul conformed to a custom when he circumcised Timothy, but wrote to the Galatians about the same time that if they be circumcised, they were bound to keep the whole law, and that Christ could profit them nothing. He followed the custom when it expressed a right principle, but when the principle changed, the custom should cease.

If I were a Seventh Day Baptist, I would observe the day I believed to have been sanctified by the Lord; but, for the sake of custom, I would cease from labor on the Christian and civil Sabbath. The Jews ought, and generally do the same.

Jesus conformed to a custom when he paid the poll-tax for himself and Peter. "Render to all their dues; custom to whom custom; tribute to whom tribute; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."—Romans 13:7. This is wise. So that, in changing countries and centuries, these things vary, and we should vary with them when no religious principle is sacrificed.

It is of the utmost importance, in discussing this question, to know the nature and binding force of customs, not only religious, but civil and social, as we are members of society and civil government, as well as the church. Our Lord dressed according to the custom of his time and country, and I am sure that if he had been born in our time and country, He would have conformed in the main to our customs. When these heathen come into our country with their customary dress, we feel disgusted. If nude Africans would not conform to our customs, they would be put out of our country. And as nudeness does not express a good principle, I would not conform to theirs if in their country.

The principle of politeness in meeting, or courteous greeting is universal, but how differently expressed. With some it is hat off, and with some, hat on; with some, the right hand; some, the left; while others shake the hand at you. With some standing is the posture of dignity, with others sitting. Men go with bare feet, or bare-head, according to custom. They dress according to custom. So I repeat with emphasis, that Paul's and Peter's instructions about dress and fashions were for conformity to existing conditions, whereinsoever those customs were made to express moral character or social propriety.

Should women cover their heads now when praying privately or publicly? Certainly the instruction was not about secret prayer. Then it was for public prayer and it could be only on the ground that custom required it. And as this was only a heathen custom, it could be appropriate only in heathen countries, unless, indeed, it can be shown that God enjoined it in "the Law," to which Paul sent us for his authority in those cases. Peter also referred us to the Old Scriptures for the proper conduct of women; but in the cases referred to, there was no such custom as Paul found at Corinth and other heathen cities. Sarah could obey Abraham and call him lord, but she neither covered her head, nor did she keep silent, as we will see. Read the 14th Chapter of Romans, and also the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th Chapters of I. Cor. to learn further of customs, whether binding or nor binding.

Now it is the same with silence. Custom said it was immodest and immoral for women to talk with men, or before men, and, on that ground, as



on the matter of dress, Paul urged it. But when did God originally command either? And did not Paul refer to the law for his authority?

Christ, the great Reformer (Heb. 9:10), while conforming mainly to outward customs, yet He violated their very spirit continually. He was perfectly accessible to women. He privately broke the spirit of customs with the woman at the well, because they were wrong. He addressed her not only as man and woman— not only as Jew and Samaritan; but also as pure and impure. "They marveled that He spoke to the woman."—Verse 27. There were three customs thundering at such a transaction, but as they were not of God, He took private pleasure in violating their bad spirit.

So of the literal law of the Sabbath. See Mark 2:23-28. There was a silence ordained of God, but the heathen silence was a transgression. Paul took pleasure in violating the evil spirit of such customs, as we will see.

I wish to give a few quotations, to show the degradation of women by brutal men; and this has been and is universal among heathen nations and shows that the custom is theirs. It makes my blood boil with indignation when I think of preachers—Baptist preachers—trying to hold on to the relics of this barbarism, practiced on wives and women, even when and where civil and social customs do not demand or even tolerate them; and, what is worse, in the face of the plain liberties given her in God's Word.

I have charged that these customs influenced both our translations and interpretations, and will let the reader decide whether I prove the charge.

From a book, "The Women of the Orient," written by an eye-witness, I make the following extracts:

"Except among the very poor, I never saw a Chinese family, males and females, eating together, nor, excepting in a few cases, enjoying a social chat together (p. 274).

Our colored slaves were treated better than that. It was not our social custom to sit down at table together, yet we often ate together in the fields,

and social chat was in order most any time. These Chinese laws may have been necessary, not because the women were bad, but because the men were bad; and, as men were lords and women brutes, they had to be protected by law and custom from the lustful eyes of men.

From the same authority, p. 250:

"A married woman becomes the servant under the mother-in-law, and is compelled to yield her implicit obedience. She may be scolded misrepresented to her husband, or ill-treated in any way; still she must bear it all with patience. There is positively no redress, no relief. The supreme duty of the wife is to obey the mandates of her husband. Let the wife who wishes to perform sacred ablutions wash the feet of her lord, and drink the water, for the husband is greater to the wife than Vishnoo (the god). When in the presence of her husband the woman must keep her eyes upon her master and be ready to receive his commands."

Should a Christian woman marry into such a heathen custom, she would be compelled to conform, not because it is right, but because it is a custom, and it would be her duty, and all others, so far as she could, to get the custom changed. She could be more devoted and obedient to her husband under our custom than under those. One is the fearful obedience of a slave; the other, the free obedience of a wife. Yet these abominable customs must be submitted to as long as the customs mean what they are made to mean.

In this country we have laws against cruelty to animals, but read the following about cruelty to wives.

"Where there is no fear of interference or of discovery, by near relatives, the blows and kicks are often applied in the most merciless and barbarous manner. Women are quite frequently killed in this way, and no outsider knows the cause. One of my Moslem neighbors once beat one of his wives to death. I heard her screams day after day, and finally one night, when all was still, I heard a dreadful shriek, and blow after blow falling upon her back and head. I could hear the brute cursing her as he beat her. The next day there was a funeral from that house." (Ib. p. 256.)

I have heard it said by a few fool Southerners—and I may have said it myself—that you cannot hit a negro amiss, unless you hit at him and miss; and the man in some localities who did not consent, was suspicioned. But it was worse than this with women. In India, two fine young men fell in love with two fine girls, well educated in mission schools. The teacher of the girls tried to extort a promise from the boys that they would not beat the girls. But the reply was: "Of course we must beat them; everybody has to do it, and of course we must." (P. 258.)

Here is another custom:

"If a man goes on a journey, his wife shall not divert herself by play, nor shall see any public show, nor shall laugh, nor dress herself in jewels of fine clothes, nor shall hear music, nor shall sit at the window, nor shall behold anything choice or rare, but shall fasten well the house door and remain private, and shall not eat any dainty food, and shall not blacken her eyes with powder, and shall not view herself in a mirror. She shall never amuse herself in any such agreeable employment during the absence of her husband." (P. 274.)

A Christian wife with such a husband, living in such a country, would be compelled to follow the custom. This would be my advice.

A church sends a female missionary or "ambassador" to China to preach to women. God saves by the foolishness of preaching, and if any are saved, it will be from her presenting "Christ crucified" to their guilty consciences. This the Bible calls preaching. But suppose a converted wife should desire this lady to speak to her husband about his soul. Suppose, through the newly converted wife, the husband, under conviction, should desire the missionary lady to show him the way of life. Must she answer that her church and pastor think that Christ would rather his seeking soul be lost than have a woman tell him of the Saviour? If she should lead him to Christ, it would be the fruit of a woman preaching to a man. She ought publicly to conform to the customs, but, like her master at the well, she should

privately break the spirit of them if at all safe to do so. She should "by all lawful means save some;" yea, all she could.

The papers report a strange "Hold Up." A missionary lady was passing from one city to another in India. She was met by men who demanded her to tell them her story. She did it with fine effect. Did she do right? All say Yes. I would hate to believe a doctrine that its advocates don't want practiced.

Where is the pastor that wants to have that Restriction literally observed: "Let the women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted them to speak." No one practices it, or wants it practiced, because the translation is wrong, and the interpretation outside of the context and tenor of Scripture would keep her from telling her experience, singing, teaching in the Sunday School, or uttering a word in the prayer-meeting, or any other social or religious meeting, large or small, as they have thus defined the places; and, moreover, it would require them to cover their heads and faces, which was the heathen token of their silent subjection.

I don't care to believe what the advocates don't practice. It would shock a heathen to see our male and female members giving the hand of fellowship to new members, or to see them talking in the aisles, or on the way home. Customs, like habits, hold with a savage grip, and men yet are as contentious for them as the Pharisees were for the traditions of the fathers. Christ fought these customs faithfully.

**CUSTOMS, LIKE FLOWERS AND FASHIONS AND  
HUMAN LIFE, ARE ORDAINED OF GOD TO  
PASS AWAY. THEY MAY BE BINDING  
FOR A TIME, BUT NEVER UNIVERSAL  
OR PERMANENT IN THEIR  
OBLIGATIONS.**

The before mentioned and the following Heathen customs have so influenced translations, interpretations, and also public sentiment, that in spite of Bible teaching, women are not yet accorded their rightful privileges in the world or in the churches of God. Only of late the States begun to give

women their property rights. These universal customs have made interpreters too rigid and strict in their interpretations of Paul's Restrictions. The privileges accorded woman in the Bible lifts her far above the degraded depths of Pagan and Mohammedan degradation. Her right relation to man, and especially that of husband and wife, and her rights and privileges in the kingdom and churches of God, demand a thorough investigation.

On the principle that "might makes right," the stronger sex has debased and degraded the weaker sex to the lowest depths of slavery known to men. Her perpetual condition under the rule of false religions may be seen by a few extracts from heathen writers themselves.

The penal code of Asher says: "If a husband say to his wife, thou art not my wife, he shall pay her half a mina (seven dollars) and be free; but if a woman repudiate her husband, she shall be drowned." In the Greek period of art and literature the highest type of woman was the courtesan Aspasia, whom Socrates invited to talk on the question of how she might ply her occupation with most profit. From the earliest period of Roman history the wife was regarded as a piece of property, destitute of legal rights and under absolute control. Ovid, Horace, Propertius, agree that female virtue was not to be found at Rome. Seneca says that ladies count their years not by consuls, but by the number of their husbands. Tertullian says: "The women marry in order to be divorced, and are divorced in order to marry."

The men were of course responsible for this immoral sentiment and custom. Even among the Teutonic tribes, wives were articles of purchase and sale. To this day the condition of women in heathen nations is not improved. The Indian tribes of America make their wives do the slavish work. The princes of the Fiji Islanders lay the four corners of their residences on four women buried alive. The East Indies burn the wives on the funeral pyres of the husbands. Mohammedanism has no higher honor for women than the harem. Any autocrat<sup>2</sup> has the self-assumed right to take any woman in his realm and either debase her or decapitate her. I quote a few lines from Dr. Eaton's tract, pp. 31-32:

---

<sup>2</sup> Autocrat – A person having or acting with unlimited power (Leon King, Editor, 2-10-2009)

"Plato's Republic represents women as grossly inferior to men. The Roman had the legal right to kill his wife. Confucius said: 'Women are as different from men, as earth is from heaven. Women, indeed, are human beings, but they are of lower estate than men, and can never attain to full equality with them. The aim of female education, therefore, is perfect submission, not cultivation and development of mind.' In the sacred books of the Hindoos it is said: 'The graces of womanhood are four: ignorance, fear, pureness, and modesty.'" The 4th chapter of the Koran allows wife beating. Voltaire voiced the sentiment of infidelity toward women when he said: 'Ideas are like beards: men have none until they grow up, and women none at all.' Even in Europe, where they have a form of Christianity, but where they have not had an open Bible, women are degraded as we do not find them in this country. I myself saw on the continent of Europe in many instances, women and dogs harnessed together drawing wagons. In one case, in Leipsic, I saw a woman and a dog drawing a wagon in which sat an able-bodied man. I came nearer falling from grace on that man than I had come for a long time before, or than I ever expect to come again."

## **TRANSLATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS INFLUENCED BY HEATHEN CUSTOMS.**

**E**ven where the Bible is most read, Christian sentiment is yet affected and afflicted with this unrighteous might. These translations, especially the oldest versions, and also interpretations, have felt the baneful influence of these damnable customs. Then come the habits of error, which have done more than to restrain and discourage investigation. This is also true of other errors. The next error has been the failure to interpret in the light of the context. Paul's restrictions of women, or rather of wives, must be interpreted in the light of all his instructions on the subject, also in the light of all Scripture, since he qualifies them by saying: "*As also saith the law.*" This, it seems to me, has been overlooked by writers on this subject. Paul intended no change in the original relation of the sexes, or of husband and wife, but to teach the heathen women, made free by the gospel, not to violate family government in the churches. Not having learned God's word

on family government, they were perhaps using their Christian liberties to that end. Marriage is an ordinance of God, and intended for the family as long as the family exists. God may abolish ordinances, but he changes them never, nor allows them to be changed. As long as the family and the church exist, their governments must remain unchanged. When Christ or apostle was asked about these things, the reply was: "What saith the Scriptures?" Christ mentioned, without approval, the exception Moses made, and then directed them to the institution of the family "In the beginning." So I insist that Paul's restrictions must be interpreted in the light of ALL SCRIPTURE. This I will attempt to do.

Paul's strongest restriction is found in I. Cor. 14:33, and he refers to Gen. 3:16 as his authority for doing so: "As also saith the Law." So also in I. Tim. 2 and I. Pet. 3. Paul was giving no new law for the regulation of women either in the family or the church. This has been overlooked. Then, why the restriction?

But before we consider the restrictions, I ask why the translations? These are criminal, and have misled the interpretations which are saturated with the influence of these heathen customs. Let me say with masculine vigor that Paul never said that "the man is the head of the woman." Nor did he say, "Let the women keep silence in the churches." He was not talking about women as women, but women as wives. No one will deny this. If the man is the head of the woman, then any man is the head of any woman; then any man is the head of all women; then all men are the heads of any woman; then each woman has all men for her heads; then she has no use for her own head, and less for a figure-headed husband. Paul says "nature" teaches about these things. Then let a man who thinks he is the head of any and all women try his hand on a few he may meet on the street. They may not hurt his hand, but see if they don't take a little of that bigness out of his head. Nature will teach him what God's word teaches, and what he ought to have known and would have known but for these miserable translations and interpretations. The Hebrew nor the Greek has any word for husband or wife, and the pretended aim of the translators was to translate the words for men and women by the words husband and wife, when such were married. But how did they do it? Look at a few facts and figures.

As all these questions were referred back to Genesis by both Christ and the apostles, let us get the three main passages before us to start with. These are Gen. 1:26-29, 2:18-25, and 3:16, 17, 20, 21. On these three hang all the law and the prophets, and the psalms, the gospels and epistles on this subject of Restriction on Women. I say again that Paul was not making any new chains for women, nor any new restrictions, but he was trying to teach these heathen women not to violate the family government in the church. They were no doubt speaking against their husbands in the church disputations, as will be seen. Family and church governments must not conflict, for they were both from heaven, and to continue through the ages assigned to them.

I repeat, the women Paul was proscribing were married women, and so translated by many. How could they ask their husbands at home if they had none? Numbers 30th chapter speaks of daughters, wives, widows and divorced women.

Paul gave some instruction to girls (children), some to women, some to wives and some to widows. These instructions suit their classes, and they are to be kept distinct. Now let us prosecute the translators on the charge that heathen customs, unspeakably damnable, have influenced them.

*Adam* is one word for man, and it often includes the woman, as it is used in the sense of mankind. It occurs thus 483 times, and always translated man, except 30 times it is the proper name of the man, and is capitalized—Adam. Eve occurs two times in the Old and two times in the New.

*Ish* occurs 996 times, and 936 times translated man and 60 times husband. Note that. *Enosh* occurs 524 times, and translated man 521 times, and 3 times husband. NOTE THAT. Now add the three terms together, and we have, so to speak, 2003 men and only 63 husbands. Now take the two terms for woman. *Isha* occurs 500 times, translated woman 220 times and wife 280 times. Wife 60 times more than women and man 876 times more than husband!



*Nashim* (plural) occurs 204 times, translated women 120 times, and wives 184. Compare this with 521, and 3 above. Adding, we have 704 women and 364 wives, more than half the women—wives. Now look: 2003 men and 63 husbands, or 1940 men, and 63 husbands; 364 wives with 63 husbands!

God intended there should be as many husbands as wives. Does this imply an unfairness in translators? We will see about that. Now come to the New Scriptures. The Greek *Anthropos* occurs 560 times, and is always translated man, and like the Hebrew word adam is the term for the race, and often includes the woman. Examples: "Man shall not live by bread alone." That includes the woman. "Fishers of men" (and women). "Trodden under feet of men" (and women). "Seen of men." "Glory of men." "Alms before men." "Appear before men." "Forgive not men," etc. The first ten occurrences [sic - lk] of *Anthropos* include woman. Listen! These terms, with "Brethren," "Believers," "Saints," "Disciples," "Church," etc, with the personal pronouns in the masculine gender, are made to so include women, as to exclude them in the public mind. Embraced to death! We will see about this. As these are common terms for both sexes, they cannot be translated husband and wife.

*Tis* occurs 480 times, is translated man 108 times; also "any one," "any man," "any thing," etc. It embraces the woman, but who sees her? "Except a man be born again," or "of water and spirit," is as applicable to the woman as the man, and should have been translated any one. A woman forgets her pain when a man is born into the world, but how is it when a woman is born? In II. Cor. 11:20 *Tis* occurs 5 times; does it include the woman? "For ye suffer, if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself, if a man smite you on the face." Read again and instead of "man" put any one which lets the women in. Then women were suffering or enduring fools gladly. Read II. Thes. 3:14-15 in the same way. In James 5:13-19, *Tis* occurs five times. Is the woman included? Can she get sick, and send for the elders of the church? Can she err from the truth, or convert one who has? But let us now look at the specific terms for man and woman.

*Aneer* occurs 214 times, and is translated man times, and husband 47 times. This term never includes the woman. *Gunee* occurs 204 times, and is translated woman times, and wife 87 times. See the same disproportion. This term never includes the man. *Arseen* occurs four times, and is the word for made. *Theelu* occurs four times, the word for female, and the two are found together only in Matt. 19:4; Mark, 10:6; and Gal. 3:28, and "male and female" must be studied in the first references given above in Genesis.

Now the pretended rule of the translators was, that when *Aneer* referred to a married man, to translate husband; and when *Gunee* referred to a married woman, to translate wife. But did they do it? In Eph. 5:23 they say correctly that the husband is the head of the wife, but in I. Cor. 11:3 they say the man is the head of the woman. The Greek does not justify this change. The apostle had just said that Christ was the head of every Andros,—man, but he did not say that every Andros—man was the head of the woman. In 14:34 the passage in dispute, we have woman, ere all know wives are meant.

## **NOT WOMEN, BUT WIVES.**

**T**he Twentieth Century Translation reads: "Married women should remain silent at the meetings of the church, . . . for it is disgraceful for married women to speak at a meeting of the church."

Rotherham, who aims to be literal, reads: "As for the wives in the assemblies, let them keep silence, . . . for it is a shame for a wife to be speaking in assembly." The Emphatic Diaglott also has wives. So has Worrell and many others.

Dr. George W. Clark, the greatest of all Baptist commentators, says: "Unmarried women are not mentioned."

If any scholar in the world denies the correctness of this, let some Priscilla take him aside and teach him the word of God more perfectly by showing him that the restricted women had husbands that they could ask at home. And if he contends that all wives are women, let her contend that all

women are not wives. I know the great majority will not consent to this and I am sorry for them, for the scales on their eyes which they caught from these heathen customs are a scourge which, till yet, are saturating Christian sentiment. Why did Paul mention only the married women, and why did he mention these restrictions, and why did he restrict these restrictions to a "Thus Saith the Law"? The man who is not willing to go to the law for the interpretation is badly afflicted with these heathen customs.

Now let us go to Gen. 1:20-29, where God proposed to make man, and notice how he viewed the woman in the term man, and also the equality of the man and the woman in the purpose of creation. As man includes the woman, let us so translate. "And God said, let us make man (and woman) in our image, after our likeness, and let "THEM "have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowls of the air and over the cattle, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth," etc. Notice how often "them" occurs. "Male and female created he them," etc. I once thought this was a mistake, as women had no dominion over anything but a man. I thought that man alone could subjugate fierce animals. But the woman is as perfect a master over animals as is man. The most daring feats of authority over wild animals I ever witnessed were by women, and animals have the same instinctive dread of women that they have of men, and women may have as much courage as men. Nature and providence help to interpret God's word. God told both the man and the woman to subdue the earth and have dominion over everything on it.

Now read Gen. 2:18-25 and you see the perfect equality of the sexes, except the "man was made first and the woman was made for the man." This gives man the priority, and that the pre-eminence, in creation in that sense. If priority gives authority then the beasts and birds and fishes of the sea have authority over the man as they certainly had the priority.

The trouble came in chapter 3:16-21. The woman was first in transgression, and for that the restriction was put upon her in matters of FAMILY GOVERNMENT. The man committed the greater sin and brought the greater woe and received the greater punishment, and while there was a

kind of rule given man over his wife, it was not that autocratic<sup>3</sup> rule that presumptuous man has arrogated to-himself. We are to study the kind of authority God gave the man. With this he gave the man the responsibility of caring for and providing for his wife, but which was reversed by the audacious autocrat. The wife was to look to the man for protection and provisions; her desires and needs were towards him, but see him in that "carriage, with a dog and his wife pulling." Dr. Eaton says he came near falling from grace when he saw that sight. I suppose he would have succeeded if it had not been for his inurement<sup>4</sup> to the partial abasement of women. The writers of these tracts rejoice greatly in the elevation of women in social life, through the gospel; but it seems to me that they would reduce women to a like subordinate degradation in ecclesiastical matters. These tracts not only put the restrictions on all women, that Paul put only on wives, but they put the restrictions with a severity that the Scriptures do not justify. Of course this follows from the same principles that led the heathen to restrict her in social matters. On page 18 of one of these tracts the author quotes approvingly from Meyer, who in turn is quoted by Neander, who adds: "After the apostle has forbidden to the woman any activity in church assemblies as unbecoming to her, he now points to the destiny assigned her by God, the fulfillment of which brings salvation to her." What language is this? "Any activity" of women in church matters, preventing or jeopardizing their salvation!

On the next page the same great author quotes approvingly from Godet, as follows: "The saints distributed in churches locally speaking, yet form only one great spiritual whole." Then the women are not to speak in the "universal church." In other places is mentioned "Sunday-schools," "social gatherings," "prayer meetings," "everywhere."

On page 15 Oosterzee is quoted as follows: "Everywhere, that is in every place, . . . not the main house of worship merely, but to other places as well, . . . a precept to be remembered by all wherever they may be." Absolute silence in the "universal church," . . . which includes the parlor and the kitchen. Silence in prophesying, preaching, teaching, praying (lest she

---

<sup>3</sup> Autocratic – Adjective; denoting actual or practiced full authority.

<sup>4</sup> Inurement – the state of becoming advantageous.

usurp authority over the man). Says one: "In silence the women, without uttering a word, are humbly and believingly to hear the instruction, which is given solely by men, in the holy place." Right here I feel like falling from grace, like Dr. Eaton did in Leipsic. This makes women as mum as mummies, if not more and much more so, as it may suppress divine unction in praise and prophesying. These all plead for silence, and then labor to qualify it, some in one way and some in another.

These efforts are to me futile and fanciful, and some fanatical and frantic. All say the prophesying was by inspiration. We know it was for utterance, and that women had the gift. But these brethren who seem to be fearful lest women usurp authority over the men, seem also to protest against women uttering those prophecies, although inspired of God; although five such words are worth more than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. If God were to give to women the gift to speak with tongues as he did on Pentecost, I wonder if they would be allowed by these brethren even to speak thus "to themselves and to God." Would it not spoil women for God to honor them with such gifts as he gives to men, and would it not jeopardize man's authority over her? This is worse than African slavery. The man in some sense is the head of the family, but I deny that the wife is the foot in the family or anywhere. The bone was not taken from the head of authority nor from the foot of subjection, but from the region of affection, for God made woman to love and to be loved. Man is the head, but the wife is the heart. (Now look at me saying man and wife, when I ought to say husband and wife. That shows I have felt the same influence from these heathen customs. But I confess and repent. Whoever heard anybody say husband and woman, or woman and husband? We bind the woman, but leave the man free. A husband means a husbandman, and that means a farmer, a tiller of the ground. Don't insist on the man being a husband, for outside of Bible influence the wife is the husband, or tiller of the ground. Webster felt this heathen influence, for he defined husband as "the master of the family."

I deny that God made the husband the master of the wife. Even husbandman is defined by Webster as, first, "the master of the family;" second, "a farmer, a cultivator, or tiller of the ground, one who labors in tillage." Hence man had rather be man and let the wife be the husband, if

that term means anything but master. Heathen masters have made the women till the ground. The wife is, or should be, a help-meet, or helper; she doing the house work in her own way while the man works the field, and milks the cows.

While God made every woman for a wife and every man for a husband, yet these rules of family government do not apply till they are married. In I. Tim. 2:11 we read: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection." What women? Subjection to whom? Any man? All men? All women in subjection to all men! Again, "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." What man? What woman was it who tried to usurp authority over a man she had nothing to do with?

## **WHAT SORT OF SILENCE AND SUBJECTION?**

**W**hat sort of silence and what sort of subjection is this enjoined on wives? These terms must be greatly modified from tyrannical usage, as we will see. Take *hupotasso*, the word for submit and for subjection—well enough translated, but cruelly applied to women and to wives. Its first use is in Luke 2:51, where the boy Jesus went to Nazareth and was subject to his parents. In I. Cor. 15:28 we see again that the same Jesus is to be again subject unto the Father. This is not the subjection of a slave to his master. In I. Cor. 16:16 we read: "That ye submit yourselves unto such (as the household of Stephanus, which addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints), and to every one that helpeth with us and laboreth." This is the same word, but how chastened by gospel teaching and custom. Let every one submit to those who labor and help in the gospel. Not submit to their authority, but to their service or leadership in the work. In Eph. 5:21 we read: "Submit yourselves one to another in the fear of God," and in the next verse it reads: "Wives submit yourselves to your own husbands (not any man or somebody else's husband), but to your own, as 'unto the Lord.'" Then in verse 24: "Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be unto their husbands in every thing." And I would add in nothing be subject unto him as the slave is to his master. It is the same word, but not the same kind of subjection. This is the subjection of love to the rule of love. Dr. T. T. Eaton says in his *Wives and Husbands*, pp. 5-6: "It is the duty of

the wife to submit to her husband, not as a servant, but as a helpmeet. Outside of questions of conscience, the husband is to be the head. Of course in questions of conscience she must obey God rather than man."

Jeremy Taylor, famous theologian, wrote on Marriage: "The dominion of a man over his wife is no other than as the soul rules the body; for which it takes a mighty care, and uses it with a delicate tenderness, and cares for it in all contingencies, and watches to keep it from all evils, and studies to make for it fair provisions, and its government comes only to this—it furnishes the body with light and understanding, and the body furnishes the soul with hands and feet; the soul governs, because the body cannot else be happy, but the government is no other than provision, as a nurse governs a child when she causes him to eat, and to be warm, and dry, and quiet. And yet even the very government itself is divided; for man and wife in the family, are as the sun and moon in the firmament of heaven; he rules by day and she by night—that is, in the lesser and more proper circles of her affairs, in the conduct of domestic provisions and necessary offices, and shines only by his light, and rules by his authority. And as the moon in opposition to the sun shines brightest; that is, then, when she is in her own circles and separate regions; so is the authority of the wife then most conspicuous, when she is separate and in her proper sphere."

"Husbands, love your wives even as Christ loved the church and gave himself for it." In Titus 2:5 the word is translated obedient, but an obedience of love, and not of fear. In I. Peter, 3:1 it is: "Wives, be in subjection to your own husbands," but in a way to win them to Christ. In verse 5 they are again exhorted to be in subjection unto their own husbands, even as wives were in the olden times, Sarah as an example. Sarah was not afraid of Abraham. They had two quarrels, but God told Abraham to hearken to Sarah. How the next verse softens the matter. "Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor to the wife as unto the weaker vessel and as being heirs together of the grace of life." "Weaker vessel" means weaker body, See II. Cor. 4:75; I. Thes. 4:4. Then in 5:5: "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility." In these places and in these relations the word is chastened, and softened, and sweetened by the

gospel as it has been by God since the creation of the race. Christ was subject to his parents: Luke 2:51; and will be again to the Father; I. Cor. 15:28. The wife must be subject to her husband—as the Church is to Christ. Let the younger be subject to the elder, yea, all be subject to one another is the same word in Greek. How this lifts above the slavish, yea doggish submission of wives that we have inherited from the heathen.

Brothers have no authority over their sisters, but both are under authority to father and mother alike. The husband rules his wife to be sure, but the sun also rules the day. The same word in Hebrew. In Isa. 3:4 we read: "And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them." The rod of authority is one kind, the rod of love quite another. The authority of love is one kind, and the authority of heathen autocracy quite another.

There are other tart and tainted words to be tempered to holy wedlock. In Gen. 24:2 we see that Abraham's eldest servant had rule over all that he had. So Joseph ruled Egypt, but not as an autocrat. His personal character won the hearts of the people, and thus he ruled them in the highest sense, and with the greatest ease. We can see in I. Tim. 2:12 there must have been some demand for the re-utterance of these old restrictions of wives. So in all these cases, there are to be found the occasion for the restriction. More than this, I repeat my charge on translators and interpreters, that they have sought for the severer senses of the terms and not the milder senses required by the Scriptures. "Let women learn in silence with all subjection." What women and what sort of silence and subjection? Not the silence of those who have no right to speak, but improper to speak, under the circumstances. Let wives hold their peace, when speaking would be contrary to peace. See examples of this in Luke 14:4; Acts 11:18; 21:14; 22:2; I. Thes. 4:11; II. Thes. 3:12; I. Tim. 2:2; I. Pet. 3:4 and I. Tim. 1:11-12. Here I have exhausted this family of Greek words found in the New Scriptures. In nearly every case the holding of the peace was a refraining from speaking under the circumstances, lest that liberty be abused, and was mostly applied to men as well as women.



As I see from the circumstances and the context, and which I will try to show, Paul was teaching these wives not to dispute with their husbands in the public meetings of the saints nor with those who were sent as official indoctrinators. A woman nor a wife was to act the didaskales, nor to didaskein, as an official, or ordained officer. This the word requires.

The first word is 46 times translated "Master" and it corresponds to our Doctor, and is so translated in Luke 2:46. See Luke 5:17; Acts 5:17; I. Tim. 1:7. Absolute silence is not enjoined on women or wives, as all concede. She may vote, sing, pray, praise, testify, prophesy, teach, yea preach, in some sense, as I can plainly show and will show. Yea, she may teach her husband, in private or public so as to disciple him to Christ. But to do so as an official, would imply authority as a herald, and this is not for woman and especially for wives in the public meetings. In family affairs the husband had the authority to decide family matters, when there is disagreement. For wives to teach authoritatively in the church on doctrinal matters where there was so much disputation would be inconsistent with family government. So a wife must not so teach as to usurp authority over the husband. This they were doubtless doing or it would not have been needful to mention it. Women and wives were certainly praying and prophesying in I. Cor. 11:8 and Paul told them that it was wrong for them to do so with their heads uncovered. That they did this these tracts concede, but the explanation they give I cannot accept. It is claimed that Paul knew, that in the 14th chapter he was going to forbid women doing either, so here he only tells them in chapter 11 to do wrong, rightly. That is to say, they might go on praying and prophesying if they would only cover their heads, reserving the right instruction for the fourteenth chapter. I don't believe that Paul knew when he was writing the eleventh chapter, what he was going to write in the fourteenth chapter for they "wrote AS they were moved by the Holy Spirit" and it would have been confusing to have "moved" four such chapters at once. I could quote approvingly very much in these three tracts. So I quote from one of them at bottom of p.17. "They may privately instruct as Priscilla did Apollos, Acts 18:26 and as a believing wife may instruct her husband when he requires a reason of her faith, but then she must not challenge any authority to do this, this being to usurp an authority not due unto her." I think she may go

further, even push herself in trying to "win," or "save her husband" by private instruction.

## **EQUALITY OF HUSBAND AND WIFE.**

**I** and wife in several particulars. See verse four in "benevolence;" verse n the seventh chapter of I. Cor. we see the perfect equality of husband and wife in "authority" and in verses 13, 16 there is equality in several matters. A husband has no authority over his wife's faith, religious duty or doctrine. It is her duty if necessary to forsake him, rather than her convictions of religious duty. In Christ Jesus there is neither male or female, bond or free, Jew or Gentile. Gal. 3:28. In I. Cor. 12:12-13 we see they were baptized unto one body, Jew and Gentile, bond and free, and of course male and female, for these are all in one body, and as no member of the human body has authority over any other member, so in the body of Christ. See Mark 10:35-45 and Luke 22:24-27. Any female member has a right to vote for the exclusion of any male member, yea the wife has the right to vote for the exclusion of her husband, and it would be her duty to do so for Christ and the churches' sake if he deserved it. In Gal. 3:27-28 it reads: "For as many of you as have been baptized unto Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

The effort to break down distinctions in Christ, but maintain them in the church, I do not appreciate. The connection in both places forbids it. The one exception is before mentioned and conceded with the reason that in the authoritative proclamation of the word she might be led to violate family government. I concede further that unmarried women should not be ordained to the ministry, since her after-marriage would prove an estoppel<sup>5</sup>, Besides, God did not give women the necessary voice for public speaking.

I quote approvingly from Dr. W. P. Harvey's tract, p. 22: "Women because they are women, are forbidden to do what men may do because

---

<sup>5</sup> Estoppel - a legal doctrine of common law that has many individual rules but that generally means that any person arguing a legal position to the court should not have behaved unfairly in the matter.

they are men, and it is clear that it refers to the public proclamation of the word, i. e. official work." This is very far from making her as dumb as an oyster, and as mum as a mummy. Must a woman learn in silence with all subjection to her pastor? He is a man. If so, then we have an Episcopacy for the women. Must she be in silence and all subjection to the deacons? That makes a Presbytery for her. Must she learn in silence and in all subjection to all male members, boys included? Her own boys also? I do not believe it. The refraining from speaking, teaching and action is to keep her from usurping authority over her husband and thus violate the old family government, "as the law saith." "The usual word for authority, *exousia*, occurs 107 times and is translated power 70 times, and authority 30 times; also jurisdiction, strength, right, each one time. Authority is the right translation. In not a single place of the 107 is authority given to the man over the woman. In church matters authority belongs to both alike, except the preacher has all authority to publicly rebuke sin. Bible church government is congregational and that limits both to the congregation and extends to all alike in the congregation. This will come up later.

When Paul said that he would not have a wife to usurp authority over the man, he did not use this word *exousia*, but a much stronger one. The verb occurs only in that passage. Thayer says in early usage it signified: "One, who with his own hand, kills either others or himself: in later Greek, one who does a thing himself as the author; one who acts on his own authority, an absolute master, to govern one; to exercise dominion over one." The adjective occurs twice, but watch its company. It is translated self-willed Tit. 1:17. "Not self-willed nor soon angry." II. Peter 2:10. "Presumptuous are they, self-willed." It means self-authority, and Paul did not want self-willed wives, in "anger" and "presumption," to usurp authority or autocracy over the husband. There must have been a need for this restriction or it would not have been given. As the author is the original, it would be wrong for women even to claim originality, for Adam was first formed and then Eve. It was this word that led Paul to say: "Man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man." Hence a woman can have no authority of herself, but only a joint participation of authority with the man, as given in Gen. 1:26-29 and 2:18-24. A man has no authority over any woman but his wife, and no authority over her moral, religious or church privileges and obligations. She

has as much right to her convictions, and to the exercise and utterance of them, as any male member, only the wife must be restricted from speaking or teaching so as to usurp authority over her husband and thus violate "the law" under the gospel. "As ALSO SAITH THE LAW." "WHAT SAITH THE (OLD) SCRIPTURES?" Thus was every instruction and restriction given.

As the opposite opinion has been repeated thousands of times, let me repeat, that Paul was not adding to church government, nor changing it, but enforcing the law, which said nothing about church government. There were women, or rather wives, who were violating the law— family government—in the church meetings. The restriction went far enough to correct that and no farther. I think the context clearly shows what the trouble was, but, as I said, I will defer that until we have seen from the law, the prophets, and the Psalms what liberties women and wives exercised with Divine approval.

### **WOMAN'S PRIVILEGES IN THE OLD SCRIPTURES.**

**A**s Paul sent us back to the first of Genesis for the reason of his restrictions, to Genesis let us go. This is a part of the context, the beginning of it. We have seen that both man and woman were to subdue all things on the earth, and in the sea, and to have dominion over all. Here was equality, and the woman was to be the help-meet. Wild animals have the same instinctive dread of the woman that they have of the man. Let Nature teach us the first lesson. The subordination was not put on Eve as a woman, but as a wife, nor was the "rule" given to Adam as a man, but as a husband. Here we are all agreed

Let us next learn what we can from Abraham and Sarah. This is a notable couple, and both are used as examples by Peter on the subject we are discussing. The first quarrel we notice, is found in Gen. 16:5-6. Sarah charged Abraham with wrong treatment of her, and then referred the matter to the Lord: "The Lord judge between me and thee." Abraham, the good husband that he was, yielded and told Sarah to have her own way about the matter. Sarah was right in her quarrel and Abraham was right in submitting to his wife. So let it be always when the wife is right and husband wrong, and this is often the case. They quarreled again. In Gen. 21:10 Sarah asserted her rights and commanded Abraham "to cast out that bondwoman

and her son, for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, Isaac." Here was a property right for the wife and the wife maintained it to the discomfort of her husband. "And the thing was very grievous to Abraham," but God said: "Let it not be grievous in thy sight, but in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice." Thus Sarah ruled her husband, and it was pleasing to the Lord. And so it always is when the wife is right and the husband wrong. Abraham was not Sarah's master and heathen customs cannot make it so now. Neither did Sarah keep silent, but freely spoke her mind, as she had a right to do. "As ALSO SAITH THE LAW." If these venerable people had lived under the Gospel, it would have been wrong for the wife to press her case on her husband before the church, but she should have waited till they got home. Sarah no doubt popped many questions to her husband about the matter, which would have been improper before a congregation. I have no doubt but that at Corinth there were just such improprieties in the church, wives contending and debating with their husbands about their rights to the floor, and may be about the superiority of their gifts, and may be about doctrine. But this later.

In I. Sam. 1:22-23, we find that Hannah had her way about a matter that she and her husband differed on. Her husband nobly said: "Do what seemeth thee good." It all resulted in Hannah offering a public prayer that the Holy Spirit had written for the whole world. Hannah not only prayed in public, but her prayer is for the public. Why not? She exulted.

Passing many noted women that we might get lessons from, such as Rahab, Rebekah, Rachel and Ruth, let us make a note of Abigail. She had a "son of Belial" for her husband and she despised him, as she ought, and she took matters in her own hand, and went out to meet David and she overcame that mighty man of war. (I. Sam. 25). And David said to Abigail, "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, which sent thee this day to meet me, and blessed be thy wisdom," etc. So Abigail did not submit to her beastly husband in that that was wrong. Neither ought any wife, and all these things were written for our instruction, and for our example. What God approved there he approves here. And in this connection let me say: Hurrah for Vashti for disobeying her husband, the king. "Wives, obey your husbands in the Lord," means when they are right. Every time a husband tells a wife

to do a wrong thing, let her disobey him. Ahasuerus had no right, either as king or husband, to subject his modest and beautiful wife to the indignity of a gazing revel. A wife has her rights, and she should maintain them even when the husband is a king. And why? Because God did not thus subject her to the foolish whims of a foolish husband. Not only did Vashti disobey the king, but Esther ruled the same king and made him do her way. That was right, because her way was right and his wrong.

We have so far spoken of women as wives. Let us also learn from "the law" that women were sometimes more than wives. God gave some gifts, and offices. (II. Chron. 34:19-23). Here is where the king got in great trouble, and he wanted to know the will of the Lord; so he appointed a committee To visit Huldah, the prophetess, the wife of Shallum; the God of Israel told her what to teach the king, and also her husband, and all the other men of the nation. But she did not teach so as to usurp authority for herself over any man. God made her a prophet, to speak for him. He did not choose Shallum, the husband, but Huldah, the wife. A committee of five men went to her for instruction and she gave it to them as a mouth piece for God. And this is for our learning and for our instruction.

In Mic. 6:4 we find that God sent Moses, Aaron and Miriam before the people to lead them out of Egypt to the promised land. Moses was the leader, Aaron the high priest and Miriam the prophetess. Aaron and his sister Miriam rebuked their brother Moses, the lawgiver. But Moses had a right to marry Zipporah, the daughter of the priest of Midian. There was no law against it. She was perhaps a descendant of Abraham, and they had been long married. Then why this fuss? God was against this high priest and this prophetess because they were wrong in that "they spoke against the ruler of the people," and not because a woman spoke against a man or a sister against her brother. Paul made the same mistake in Acts 23:5, and confessed it. So God smote Miriam with leprosy, not, I repeat, because she rebuked a man or even her younger brother, but because she spoke against the "ruler of the people," a rule or law as binding on Paul, the great apostle, as on a woman, or prophetess. So when we find a woman the ruler of the people, the same law is binding on all. Note also that Miriam was not only a prophetess, but a leader of the choir. (Ex. 15:20-21). She and the women

"Answered" to the men, quoting the first verse of their song. She was far from keeping silence. I do not put this against what Paul said about keeping silence, but against the wrong interpretation of it. We are trying to learn what Paul meant, as he sent us to the law, or Old Scriptures, to find out.

One more case out of the law. Turn to Judges 4:5, and we get a wonderful lesson from "the law" on women's privileges and prerogatives. Deborah had a husband; she was a prophetess, a judge of Israel, and besides this, she was perhaps the greatest general the world ever saw. Never was such a victory won. "The river Kishon, the ancient river Kishon, fought for her;" yea, the elements and the stars in their courses fought for her, and the angel of the Lord bitterly cursed the inhabitants of Meroz, because they came not up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. After that battle Israel had rest for forty years. The children of Israel all went to Deborah to be judged, and I suppose Lapidoth, her husband, did the same. The Lord sold Sisera into the hand of a woman. But Deborah was also a poet and a singer. What a song was that she composed! Probably exhausted from the great battle, with a four-fold call to wakefulness, she wrote it and set it to music for all Israel to sing to the glory of God for using a woman in such an emergency.

While the husband is the head of the wife, yet Deborah was the head of all Israel. They brought all their questions to her for settlement. She decided the number of men she wanted and from what tribes. She ordered the place of encampment. She ordered Gen. Barak to go down into the plain and meet Sisera, with his 900 chariots of iron, in open field fight. Josephus says that Barak's heart failed when he saw Sisera's great army, and was about to seek a safe retreat when Deborah gave the order to go down and pitch the battle. Josephus says again the elements that fought here was a violent hail storm that beat in the faces of Jabin's army so they could not fight, and may be the river of Kishon rose so they could not retreat across it; or, being deceived in the ford, they attempted to cross, and the floods took them away. May be the lightning and the thunder frightened Sisera's horses so that they "broke their hoofs in their prancing" and in their runaways with the chariots. The stars that are supposed to influence the elements formed their conjunctions, or God fore-seeing the time for such conjunction, had the

battle to come off at the right time. The storm that beat in the faces of one army, so as to impede their sight and progress, was rather a help to the other. A great battle had to be fought, and God chose the time, place, the agencies, and a woman to head and rule it all. We see from Deborah's song that the Canaanites had so over-run the country that the robbers held the highways, and the people had to sneak through the byways to avoid the robbers; that the villages were deserted because the inhabitants had to flee to fenced cities for protection; that the inhabitants were even afraid to go to their wells for water. The fields were untilled; there was no traffic, no law, no order, so that God decided to make an end of it, and to make the Canaanites as dung for the earth. (See Ps. 83:9-10). All the surrounding kings voluntarily gave their help to Jabin against Israel.

A great battle is to be fought in the providence of God, and a great honor is to be put upon a human instrument in such a victory, and God chose Deborah, a woman, and this was done, and written for our instruction on whom the ends of ages have come. Paul's restrictions must be interpreted to harmonize with this, or "the law" was not the place to send us for the justification of the restrictions. God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. With him there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning. God is still putting the greatest honor upon women, but he has not modified in the least the family government at first ordained. God did not make woman to be a sleeping or crying doll for man to play with. Deborah's case throws much light on the interpretation we seek for.

What of Judith and Holofernes? Apocryphal, you say? Yet it is an Israelitish roance [sic, lk] of the times. God delivered his people by giving the head of Gen. Holofernes into the hands of a beautiful widow. Like Deborah, she was a God-fearing and God serving woman. Like Joan of Arc, they all were used of God in feats of daring and wisdom and courage and usefulness that should open our eyes to the rights, privileges, and prerogatives of women. Man is given to subduing and subordinating women, so that God must vindicate their rights now and then. I would be afraid to add to or take from the word of God on this subject. I would not have her transgress the law of God, nor should man transgress on the rights of women.



As Paul gave us the whole Bible for the context, limiting his restrictions to the law, the prophets and the Psalms, I am sure as I can be of anything that I am pursuing the right course in this investigation. But before leaving the Old Scriptures, let us make a draw on the Psalms for instructions. Chap. 68:9 reads: "The Lord gave the word; great was the company of those that publish it." Company here is feminine, so the Revision reads: "The women that publish it are a great host." Conant has it: "The women that publish the glad tidings are a mighty host." Others translate "to a mighty host."

Scott says on this: "It is remarkable that the whole of these verses is in the future, and therefore, though properly applied, as the language of poetry to past events, may well be considered as prophetic likewise." I think we will come upon its fulfillment in the Acts of the Apostles.

In passing from the Old to the New Scriptures, I make this last remark: If God gives the nations their kings, princes, presidents, judges, etc., then he gives the queens also. He may curse a people with a bloody Mary, or bless them with a pious Elizabeth. If God gives queens as well as kings, then we learn from providence, that it is pleasing to him for a woman to rule a nation. I copy the following from a noted author: "There are times when God seems to have ordained woman to be in the lead. Look at Joan of Arc. I have so often compared her with Deborah. At the time her career began the French government was split into fragments. The armies of England, a part of France and Burgundy were concentrated around Orleans. Destruction and bloodshed were everywhere seen. At this perilous time the cry of the poor French peasant girl was heard. She claimed to have been given a vision from God setting her for the rescue of her people from chaos. Her talk sounded like the twaddle of a babe to the mighty warriors and statesmen who had fought and failed. But she continued to agitate until finally she headed an army of ten thousand men, which she purged of all immorality and fired with such frenzy that no power on earth could resist, and practically wiped the combined armies from the face of the earth. On she went from city to city, conquering everywhere. She then conceived the idea of crowning Charles. She saw it was an immediate possibility, though he was afraid. Still, he consented, and while this "God-inspired woman," as she was called, and her great army stood guard, the dream of her early peasant life—the crowning

of Charles VII—was an accomplished fact. Wonderful feat! There is nothing like it in the annals of profane history. Shame, shame be upon Charles whom she crowned and the people for whom she fought, that they allowed her to be burned at the stake without even a protest. How much like the base ingratitude of many for whom we labor to-day."

God raised up Deborah and Joan of Arc to lay all male generals into a shameful shade. Queen Vashti rebelled against the King in honor of her modesty. Queen Esther ruled the same King and won the victory of the ages. Queen Elizabeth was the greatest ruler England ever had. Here is what Christ said about a queen who had all the authority of a nation in her hand. Luke 11:31. The Queen of the south shall rise up in judgment with the men of this generation, and Condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. If God raises up the rulers of nations as he says, then he has given a good proportion of Queens who like the Kings, either curse or bless a people. Let us see God in the Queens as well as in the Kings. This must be kept in mind when we interpret Paul's Restrictions. Is it not true that bees are always ruled by a female? In all nature we see that the male and female about equal, with perhaps the male the stronger vessel or body. I think we ought to learn of God both in creation and providence. When Christ preached his first sermon in Nazareth, he told his audience how that God in the days of Elijah passed by all the widows of Israel, and sent his prophet to a Gentile widow in a far off city. And that in the days of Elisha, he passed by all the lepers in Israel, and healed Naaman, the Gentile general. It filled them with wrath, and they tried to kill him, but it was true nevertheless. Here Christ taught the Jews a lesson from providence. They thought that God owed all to the Jews and nothing to the Gentiles but wrath and indignation. If there should be those who think likewise about men and women, I trust they will treat me better than that. For verily, verily I say unto all, that God has taught us in nature, providence and revelation about the usefulness of women, and these lessons teach that the interpretation generally given of Paul's language is not right. Christ, Peter and Paul referred us to the creation, nature, providence and to the Old Scriptures to learn the right relation of the sexes and especially of husband and wife.

## EXAMPLES UNDER THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

**N** ministry of Christ, then from the Acts, and thus equipped with now let us go to the New. We will first get some lessons from the

lessons of instruction we will venture on those epistles and passages which cannot be interpreted apart from the context. And there are many other such Scriptures wrongly interpreted that have gotten world-wide credence and done world-wide damage.

In the first chapter of Luke we find that Elizabeth and Mary uttered words that were recorded to "teach men." So Paul did not mean that a woman should not teach a man. In the 2nd chapter 36-39 we find "Anna a prophetess, coming in at that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord." That is, publicly, as old Simeon had done. She also spake of him to all who looked for redemption in Jerusalem. Not only did she pray in public, but she spoke in public, "to all," and that included the men. Paul must be interpreted to harmonize with this. She was a very old widow, and nothing said about her head being covered or uncovered, as there was no occasion for it in her case. She publicly gave thanks and spoke to all. This word is translated preach in the following places: (Mark 2:2; Acts 8:25; 2:29; 13:42; 14:25; 16:6). It occurs twenty-three times in that noted 14<sup>th</sup> chapter of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians, and is one of the words in dispute. When Paul said it was a shame for a woman to speak, etc., he was not contradicting this privilege of Anna. The circumstances were different, that is the secret. Paul did not reflect on the praying and preaching of this woman. What Anna did was right and any woman can exercise herself in a like manner.

Geo. W. Clark says: "She was one of whom the Holy Spirit moved to utter God's truth and will. This was evidently not the only time when she spake under the moving of the Spirit. . . . And she coming up to the place where Simeon and the others were. . . . At that very time, when Simeon was speaking to Mary. . . . She, too, gave thanks, and publicly returned grateful praises to the Lord, as Simeon had done. . . . And spake of him to all there. . . . More probably some of those devoutly pious Jews were like herself, much in the temple, and she at once spoke to them, and afterward told

others as they came in. She spoke of him as the Messiah and the Redeemer. She was first to become the publisher of the good news—not, indeed, to all, but to those who were prepared to receive the announcement. . . . In Simeon and Anna we have the representatives of the old dispensation and types of Old Testament piety."

Next let us see how women acted under the ministry of Christ. Matt. 15:22-28 gives an instructive example. A woman of Canaan came out of the coasts and cried (prayed), saying: "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed of a devil." "Christ answered her not a word." Was that to rebuke her praying in public or to invite more of it? Then the disciples proposed to send her away. Then the Lord tried her with a rebuff, not to drive her away, but to make her pray the more and draw the nigher. The woman prevailed and Jesus did not correct her for praying before men, but commended her and granted her request. This was no violation of Paul's restrictions. A woman may pray and prophesy in public, yea, preach in some sense which we are soon to consider.

We can get further light on this subject from Mark 14:3-9. Here a woman brought upon herself criticism and censure for her great devotion to her Lord. But Jesus said. "Let her alone. Why trouble ye her? She hath wrought a good work on me. Verily I say unto you, Where soever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of as a memorial of her."

Thousands of women are now doing a good work for the Lord, and they are still receiving criticism and censure because of what Paul is supposed to have said, but Paul said nothing out of harmony with this example of woman's devotion to the Lord. One quotation in one of these tracts not only silences her, but forbids "any activity in a public way."

Luke 8:43-48 is another case of woman's forwardness in public utterance and prayer. She declared unto him before all the people for what cause she had touched him, and how she was healed. "She declared before all the people what she had done and how she had been healed." And he said unto her, daughter, be of good comfort: thy faith hath made thee whole; go in

peace. So ought every woman, whether healed in body or soul. Christ commended her forwardness and public testimony as to what the Lord had done for her body. And shall they not, I repeat, testify as to what the Lord has done for their souls? Paul certainly said nothing to the contrary.

Another example of forwardness is found in Luke 23:55-56, and chapter 24. I don't know about "last at the cross," but they were "first at the grave," and first to receive the good news from the angels, and first to preach Christ and the resurrection, and that to the apostles, who were appointed for that very purpose. They knew the stone was there, and that they could not roll it away, but undaunted, as woman are yet, they pressed on by the break of day. More than three women got out early, and what they learned they told the sleepy-headed apostles (men like), and their words seemed to them as idle tales. "Yea, and certain women also of our company (church) made us astonished." Then the men moved out and found it even as the women had said, "but Him they saw not." The women, the early workers, saw him early in the morning, but the apostles, the slow-goers, saw him not till night, when Christ forced himself on them where they were hid away for fear of the Jews. So I believe today, that when women show their earnestness and forwardness in his service, that Jesus gives them revelations of himself that they should be allowed to tell to men. These women took the lead, and spoke to, and taught the men, but they did not violate Paul's restrictions, and any interpretation that makes Paul reflect on these women, I reject. They were in line with Women's Privileges and Prerogatives. Enforce these misinterpretations on women today, and half of our churches would die. I don't believe that women have yet come to the full measure of liberty given them in the gospel.

## **EXAMPLES IN THE ACTS**

**L**et us go to the Acts, and see how they acted, and prayed, and voted, and preached, and traveled, and suffered, and died. In Acts 1:14 we find men and women assembled together and "they all continued in prayer and supplication" with the women. This continued ten days. This gave the women a time and turn for prayer. The number of names together was about 120. Between prayers Peter addressed all

of them about a matter of business. An apostle must be elected. And they, the 120, nominated two; and they, the 120, prayed; and they, the 120, voted; and Matthias was elected. All of this is conceded even by those who do not practice congregationalism. Note: the men and women without distinction [sic - lk] did these things. I would hate to take a position that would compel me to say that all did not mean all, and that these personal pronouns did not have the 120 disciples for their antecedent noun. My grammar and theology harmonize here. I repeat, the men and women prayed, nominated, prayed again and voted, without distinction of sexes. Hence Paul never said that women must not pray and vote in the church.

But let us go on to know the truth. In chapter 2 we find they were all with one accord in one place. The "they" of the second verse included the women. "And there appeared unto them (the 120) cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them (the 120). And they (the 120) were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." If there be the shadow of a doubt as to whether the women did any speaking, read Peter's explanation in verses 16, 18, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh: and your daughters shall prophesy; . . . and on my servants, and on my handmaidens will I pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy." This was but the earnest of what is yet to come, as the context clearly shows. All of these nationalities heard in their own tongue the wonderful works of God. Only a part of Peter's sermon is given, but they all preached, that is, the 120. There was no debating with their husbands, and no effort to usurp authority over their husbands, hence no violation of Paul's Restrictions. Any interpretation of Paul that reflects on these women, filled with the Holy Spirit, speaking as the Spirit gave them utterance, must be wrong, in my judgment. Both men and women were converted, baptized and added to the church. You must recognize the women in those pronouns. Then read verse 42: "And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine, and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers." Then the women continued steadfastly in prayers. If no distinction in others, then none in this. With this in mind, read 4:23-35: "And being let go they went to

their own company," including the women, and hearing their report, they lifted up their voices to God with one accord. The prayer closes thus: "And now, Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants (women, too) that with all boldness they may speak thy word. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they spake the word with boldness. And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul;" and they all sold their property and had things in common. Among these were a man and wife. Both sold the property, both agreed to lie, and both were killed for it.

In the sixth chapter we find the Grecians complaining because their widows were neglected in the daily distribution. The twelve called the "multitude of disciples," and submitted the proposition, which pleased the whole multitude; and they chose, etc. Can the women be gotten out of the whole multitude? Are they to be counted for nothing anywhere or in any thing? Just as sure as two and two make four, just that sure were the women pleased, and helped to choose the proposed seven, and this was done by voting. If any woman voted to please any man; if any wife consulted her husband as to how she should vote, they were unworthy of the liberty of the gospel. They were figureheads, and unworthy the franchise of a free people. Did Paul say that women must not vote? Some have tried to make her silence include this. "Yea any activity in church assemblies as unbecoming to her." Now read Acts 8:1-4. With this read chapter 11:19-21. The women also were scattered.

Chaps. 9:2 and 22:4 mention the women who were to be brought to Jerusalem in chains. The women were dragged to prison and put to death just as the men were. And why, if they did not make themselves offensive as the men did, in filling Jerusalem with their doctrines? And how could they do this if they neither taught nor preached? With both tongue and hands tied, what could they do "to turn the world upside down?" As "they were all scattered abroad except the apostles," then the women were scattered abroad; and "all that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned to the Lord." Then the hand of the Lord was with the women, and Psalms 68:11 was fulfilled. "The Lord gave the word; and the women that

published the glad tidings were a great host." Dr. Adam Clark gives the Hebrew and then translates: "Of the female preachers there was a great host;" and adds "Such is the literal translation of the passage." Spurgeon in Treasury of David says: "O for the like zeal in the church today, that when the gospel is published, both men and women may eagerly spread the glad tidings of great joy." The New Translation reads: "The women that publish the glad tidings are a great host." So Conant, and etc.

Since preaching is publishing, and glad tidings means the gospel, it may read: "The women that preach the gospel are a great host." This is what they ought to do, provided they do it in a private way, and not officially, and that means as an officer, and that implies "setting apart," to that special work. Paul must be so interpreted as to allow this, since he sent us to the Old Scriptures, called "the law," for his authority for the restrictions he reiterated—"as also saith the law." Just what they were allowed to do in the Old and New Scriptures, must first be learned before we can interpret his restrictions. All the restrictions God put on women are in Gen. 3:16, and Paul added nothing to them in I. Cor. 14:34, but only reiterated them.

This brings us right up facing the most delicate and difficult point at issue. The women did teach and preach, and Paul said they must do neither. These statements must be reconciled, and there must be no dodging or apologizing for either statement. For more than twenty years many have been urging me to write what I am now trying to write. No one thinks that the brethren on the other side wish to rob women of their proper latitude, and let no one think that I would have them transgress, for I know well enough that if I influence them to transgress their sins would be required of me, and God knows I have enough of my own.

I here call attention to a word with its usual forms, and as defined by the great lexicon (Thayer's). *Keerugma* is defined: "That which is promulgated by a herald or public crier, a proclamation by herald." This word occurs eight times. Keerux, "a messenger, vested with public authority, who conveyed the official message of kings, magistrates, princes, military commanders." This word occurs three times, *Keerusso*, "to officiate as herald, to proclaim after the manner of a herald; always with a suggestion of formality, gravity



and authority which must be listened to and obeyed." This word occurs sixtyone times. Women are never to be allowed to preach in this sense. This is the "ordained" preacher. Not only is his message authoritative (didaskalia), but the messenger has authority committed to him. Both these words exclude women. Then do not rob her of the private and unofficial preaching which is allowed. I think this official preaching needs emphasizing. I will illustrate: John Smith was raised in a county town, and he was a "hale fellow well met." The equal of all and the superior of none. He was finally elected to the judgeship [sic - lk] of one of the courts. On taking his seat he said: "Fellow-citizens: You all have known me as John Smith, and so I will continue to be when in the social circle; but on the bench I am not John Smith, but Judge Smith. Here I will know no one after the flesh. I am an officer of the State, and if I cannot forget myself and my interest on the bench, then I am unworthy of this honor and of this office. When I send the sheriff with a message or on a mission, it is not his, nor yet mine, but the sovereign commonwealth's whose we are and whom we serve. Disobey that message or resist that mission and you fight against the State." So I think a preacher may be a John Smith in the social circle, but when he ascends the "rostrum" he should be regarded in his official sense; not only an officer in the church, but an officer of Christ, with authority as an officer to deliver an authoritative message. When the preacher cries, "God commands men everywhere to repent," and "repent ye," it is not the voice of an unofficial, but an official. It is the same as if God himself were uttering it; that is, when God's message is uttered. The official that utters any other message must give account to God, and the hearer who refuses the true message officially sent of God is a thousand times more guilty than the citizen that refuses the message or resists the mandates of the court. This official preaching the world has lost sight of.

These many nice distinctions we must interpret so as to harmonize the one with the other. A like difficulty confronts us on other subjects. There are certain passages of themselves isolated from the general teaching of Scripture, which seem to some to teach baptismal remission and salvation. The error is in taking the passages out of the context and general teaching and insisting on a meaning that contradicts the truth as plainly revealed on the same subject in many Scriptures. I think that those on the other side

have done that way on this subject. John 20:23. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained; and "except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God" need explaining, and unless you go to other Scriptures on these subjects and interpret all so as to harmonize, you will miss the meaning. And so of many other doctrines.

Now hear me on this part of God's word, and when I get to the other I must interpret so as to harmonize. In the passages before quoted the women preached. But how and in what sense? There are five distinct words for preach, with their several compounds. Only two of these words are used in the passages referred to, and one has before been considered and will come up again. The word we are now to notice occurs in Acts 8:4, 12, 25, 40; 10:36; 11:20, and each time translated preach. The noun occurs seventy-seven times, and every time translated gospel. Hence the literal translation of the verb would be gospelize. The special officer is the evangelist, so rendered in the three places where the word is found. The evangelist is sent to sinners to disciple them to Christ. Paul said he was sent, not to baptize, but to gospelize. And I. Cor. 4:15 says I have begotten you through the gospel, that is by gospelizing, and he thanked God that he baptized so few of them. In my Seminary address I said, as I have always said, and no one called it in question, that sinners are to be disciplined before they are baptized, and that it is the duty of every disciple to disciple others, and of course that includes the women. Now since disciples are to be made by gospelizing, or preaching the gospel, then women ought to do it; that the officers fish with a net and the private members with a hook, that is, one at a time, or personal effort, face to face and from house to house. This all may do, even the babes in Christ. The social restrictions that the heathen put upon women may be necessary for heathen women, and the Jews may have been compelled from associations with the heathen to put extra restrictions on their women, but the gospel sends men to women and women to men, not only to evangelize them, but also to teach them, as Priscilla did Apollos. This we all believe and practice. In this book I contend for nothing more than is practiced by majority of Southern Baptists; perhaps by all the rest in the world. In revivals the women are exhorted to go out among sinners, male and female, and persuade them to be reconciled to God. Let us not

exaggerate our differences. Now this, the Scriptures call "preaching," "preaching the gospel," "bringing glad tidings," "showing the glad tidings," "declare the glad tidings," "brought us glad tidings," "hath declared." In all these ways the word is translated. That was what these scattered disciples did, men and women. Everywhere they went they tried to win all to Christ. I am not responsible for the action nor the translation.

It is the preacher's duty to make public proclamation of the word and to preach privately also. *The others, men and women, do the last, but not the first.* I would not help ordain a woman to the official proclamation of the word, nor would I be present in any Arch where she so exercises herself. I have heard them make temperance and other kinds of addresses, but I never felt comfortable in such a place, but that may be the natural result of my training. I will not encumber this writing with that question, nor women voting in civil affairs. I aim now to help fix the bounds of her latitude and longitude in church work and in the general service of the Master, if there be such service outside the church. Possibly at times, but generally church work covers the ground. Let us stick to the word, the infallible word.

One brother wrote: "Most of us know nothing about official and unofficial preaching— it all goes the same with us." Then I will try to make it plainer. There were four offices in the church at first. The twelve were ordained of Christ to testify on the resurrection. All could do so in their private, personal way, but so important was the fact, that these twelve were set apart for that work, and that gave their testimony the greater weight. Any citizen may tell another that he is wanted in court, but when the sheriff officially summons him, he had better not refuse. The Ministry is also an office in the church, and select men after being proved were solemnly ordained to that particular work, to give themselves wholly to it. There are times when they can speak as other men, but also times when they speak for Christ as His officers. That makes it more solemn. There are other interests of such importance, that certain select men, also first proved, are to be solemnly ordained to do that work. Now any member can say what ministers and deacons say, but the Lord wanted those things said in the most solemn and authoritative manner. Hence these officers must speak officially. It is generally believed that Evangelists were ordained to their work of preaching to sinners. This does

not mean that the others must not do so, but that it is of too much importance to leave to all, lest everybody's business should be no body's business. Some persons of certain gifts must be obligated to look after these great interests of the kingdom. They become leaders, the others helpers. Not all who walk are walkers; not all who run are runners; not all who paint are painters; not all who testify of the resurrection are apostles; not all who preach are preachers; not all who serve are deacons; not all who evangelize are evangelists. The word must be spoken officially by those specially appointed, and also by others as they may have opportunity and inclination. It is thus in all the kingdoms of the world. All have their official and unofficial servants, and all should serve officially or unofficially. Women may do any service becoming her unofficially.

In order to get the two passages together we skipped the 10th chapter of Acts. I would make a passing remark on the household of Cornelius and "the kinsmen and near friends which he called together" to hear. Peter. It is reasonable to suppose that this company included some women. "They were all present to hear all things commanded of God." They all believed as Peter spoke, and all were filled with the Holy Spirit, and they all magnified God so as to be heard, and were all baptized who were heard magnifying God. This may be hard for one to believe who thinks a woman ought to keep silent, so as not to speak at all in public. But it is easy for those who think that the restrictions are not so severe and are made to think so by "the law," the gospel, the Acts of the Apostles and also the Epistles, as we will see. In Acts 12:1, 5, 12, it is easy for me to see a mixed prayer meeting. The whole church was persecuted; "prayer was made without ceasing of the church," which was gathered together at the house of Mary, the mother of Mark. I don't see how to separate the women from prayer either in this place or in chapter I. The helpful women in the last chapter of Romans help our argument. See Female Deacons.

Acts 21:8, 9. Philip, the deacon, was also an evangelist; that is, he preached in that ordinary way that we have claimed for women, but perhaps had been set apart to that particular work, and so became an official evangelist. This I would not claim for women. Apostle, deacon, preacher, etc., are used in a general sense, and also in a particular or official sense.

Philip had four unmarried daughters, "which did prophesy." They were not prophetic ornaments, with sealed lips; nor did Paul seal them. They not only had the gift of prophecy, but they prophesied. They spoke to the edification of all, as God moved them to speak. This they did, "as also saith the law." This they did according to Luke, and according to Acts 2:17 and I. Cor. 11:5. In this last case the apostle directed, and corrected, but did not forbid. A prophet is moved by God to speak for Him, for the comfort and edification of all, and He used women for this purpose, and they exercised themselves thus. So that any interpretation of any scripture that sets this aside is incorrect. Women preached, prayed and prophesied in public. This is certain. Those on the other side concede this. Barnes says on I. Cor. 11:5: "That they prayed is clear; and that they publicly expounded the will of God is apparent also." Jameson, Faucett and Brown explain thus: "Praying—in public: Prophesying—preaching in the Spirit." I know of no one who denies it, but the explanation of some is exceedingly foolish. See elsewhere in this book.

## TEACHING OF THE EPISTLES.

**I** article on Church Reputations, by Wm. Morrison. I quote the following: have just read in the *Western Recorder* of February 28, an excellent

"The Corinthian church also had a reputation, but a bad one. 'I hear,' says Paul, 'that there are divisions among you, envying and strife.' 'It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you,' and 'ye are puffed up.' Well does he say to this church, 'examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith.' "

"To understand how the church at Rome got its reputation and who were responsible for it, is very easy to do when we have learned something of the characteristics of certain of its members. These we learn in Paul's salutations to some of the brethren. Nor do we then wonder that faith was the virtue for which it was distinguished. 'Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus, who have for my life laid down their own necks.' Salute my well beloved Epenetus.' 'Salute Mary, who bestowed much labor on us.' 'Salute Andronicus and Junia, who are of note among the apostles.' 'Greet Amplias, my beloved in the Lord.' 'Salute Apelles, approved in Christ.' 'Salute the beloved Persis, who labored much in the Lord.' 'Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord.' There were other members in the church at Rome, but these were among the leaders. With leaders who are such 'helpers in Christ Jesus,' who 'labor much in the Lord,' who are 'approved in Christ,' who are 'chosen in the Lord,' and are marked by such devotion and labor and love, the church could not but have a good reputation and be widely known."

Some of those were women, and women in absolute silence could add nothing to the reputation of a church. Shame on a church that robs women of all utterance.

To this let me add Phil. 4:2: "I beseech Euodia, and I beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind." This shows the respect the apostle had for women, and for these women who had minds, that were mines of power for good or evil. These were perhaps referred to in the next verse as the women that labored with Paul in the gospel, and who needed help in their important work. Paul calls them his co-athletes, a very strong expression, and denoted

great activity. So in the letter to the Romans, there were some who gave the church reputation, and whom Paul calls his helpers. Many of these were women, and note the honor paid them. Phebe we will consider with the deaconesses of I. Tim. 3:11. Then came Priscilla, named before her husband, as also in Acts 18:1. She laid down her neck for Paul, and all the churches of the Gentiles gave thanks for what she did. Don't forget that she taught Apollos the word of God more perfectly. And yet it is said that a woman should not teach a man. If Priscilla should teach Apollos, then any woman should teach any man, if she is competent. In all churches of repute, there must be women worthy of honorable mention; and they become so by their being helpers; yea, athletes; yea, 'sun,' or co-athletes, with such an athlete as Paul. But with shackles on their feet, and chains on their hands, and bits in their mouths, and reined back into rigid inactivity, how can they help or become athletes?

Let all hold their peace, or be silent in the churches, when otherwise to speak would cause confusion; and especially the wives, when to speak would confuse the family relation in the church. Why? Because the law decides the family government, and the law must not be violated in the church. There is no other rational interpretation of the text, but this seems both rational and scriptural.

Having studied the subjects of these Restrictions in "the law," as the Old Scriptures are sometimes called, and also in the Gospels, Acts, and Romans, we come now to the epistle containing the Restrictions. We must take into account the condition of things at Corinth, and perhaps some other places, that made it necessary for Paul to instruct on the subject of man and wife. In chapter 1:10-11 we get a beginning of the situation. Don't forget that the church in verse 2 includes the women. Also the pronouns have church for their antecedent noun. Also the term "brethren" includes the women. No one will deny this, I am sure, though it is often forgotten. Then read: "Now I beseech you, brethren (and sisters), by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you (brethren and sisters), but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared of you, my brethren (and sisters), that there are contentions among you." Some of

these contentions are mentioned here and some further on. Here, as is often the case, the quarrel was about the favorite preacher, and women have always taken a full hand in such fights. Put this with chapter 3:3-9. There were "envyings," "strife" and "divisions" among them, the women included. "They were carnal." In 4:6 we find they were "puffed up, one against another," women included. And so divided were they, and so puffed up against each other, and so envious and full of strife, that they could not take notice of the incestuous member. In chap. 6 we find they were going to law one against the other, so as to wrong and defraud each other, and that in the heathen courts and before the unbelievers. Paul said it was a shame. And so divided were husbands and wives that in the seventh chapter such are urged to "due benevolence one to the other," and they must not part and break the bonds of wedlock on account of these differences. The wife had the same authority over the husband's body that the husband had over the wife's body. It was as much the duty of the wife to "save the husband" as it was for "the husband to save the wife." Paul wrote that to the Church at Corinth.

In chap. 8 we find them mixed too much with idols and idolatry, and were sinning against the brethren and wounding their weak consciences and causing them to stumble. In chap. 9 we find they had been complaining of the traveling expenses of Paul, and some denying his apostleship. Paul belabored these questions. In chap. 10 Paul thought it necessary to refer them to Num. 14:29, and Ps. 106 as warnings, and that they were liable to the same punishment. The women were in all of these musses and fusses, as they have been till now.

In chap. 11 we find them divided over the women praying and prophesying with their heads shaven and uncovered. Lewd women converted to Christianity were not ashamed of some of their lewd customs, and thus showed their disregard of husbands, whom God in marriage made the head of the wife. This leadership of the man is confined to his wife, his "own wife," and not some one else's wife, who of course is a woman. God never made every man the head of every woman. That these women prayed and prophesied no one denies. Paul did not forbid them doing either, but corrected the wrong manner of so doing. I cannot believe that Paul said in



his heart, you may go on doing wrong if you will cover your heads, but when I get to the 14th chapter I will take your heads and covering all off. He seemed to have done so if we cut off the context, but this we must not do. The Pulpit Commentary is in more than 50 large volumes, and several of the greatest scholars were employed to go over the same ground.

Here are some quotations on chapter 11:5

"Prophesying, that is preaching . . .

Although Paul thinks of one thing at a time, and is not here touching on the question whether women ought to teach in public, it appears from the expression that the rule which he lays down in chap. 14, 34, 35 and I. Tim. 2:12 was not meant to be absolute. See the case of Philip's daughters Acts 21:9 and 2:17. With her head uncovered. For a woman to do this in a public assembly was against the national custom of all ancient communities, and might lead to the gravest misconceptions Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head. It is here implied that both the man and the woman are to prophesy, teach and pray; not one instead of the other, but each independently. However closely related the man and the wife may be; however dependent the one is on the other, neither can perform the spiritual and religious obligations of the other.

In brief, they were customs that had a moral meaning. If a woman appeared in public unveiled, she was deemed immodest. To wear a veil was a sign of womanly delicacy, and hence, if she went to a public assembly without her veil, she acted shamelessly. To be consistent, argues Paul, "let her also be shorn," and so assume the work of a disreputable woman. A woman acting in this way sets public opinion at defiance; and as public opinion in many things is public conscience, and as such the aggregated moral feeling of a community, no woman could do this thing and not shock all right sensibilities. . . . The separation of the sexes, which sacerdotalism<sup>6</sup> desires, was to be ignored in this service; alike during the time of praying

---

<sup>6</sup> Sacerdotalism (from Latin *sacerdos*, priest, literally one who presents sacred offerings, *sacer*, sacred, and *dare*, to give) is a term applied to the system, method, and spirit of a priestly order or class, under which the functions, dignity, and influence of the members of the priesthood are exalted in the ministry of religion, and in the church.

and prophesying, and during the Eucharistic Supper, men and women were to mingle together because in Jesus Christ "there is neither male nor female," . . . . It appears that the Christian women at Corinth claimed for themselves equality with the male sex, to which the doctrine of Christian freedom and the removal of the distinction of sex in Christ (Gal. 3:28) gave occasion. Christianity had indisputably done much for the emancipation of women, who in the East and among the Ionic Greeks (it was otherwise among the Dorians and the Romans) were in a position of unworthy dependence. But this was done in a quiet, not an over hasty manner. In Corinth, on the contrary, they had apparently taken up the matter in a fashion somewhat too animated. The women overstepped due bounds by coming forward to pray and prophecy in the assemblies with uncovered heads. . . . Order must be adapted to existing customs. No stiff forms can be allowed in Christian assemblies. Social and National customs and sentiments have to be duly considered."

After reproving them for being so divided that they could not eat the Lord's Supper, eating to their own condemnation, and for which many were weak and sickly and many had died, he closed the chapter with: "And the rest will I set in order when I come." How much more disorder there was, who can tell.

Now comes chap. 12 on Spiritual Gifts. He first mentions their ignorance of spiritual gifts. They were coveting tongues and envying those that had them, and despising prophecy, which was greatly to be preferred. This we learn further on. These different gifts, shared of course by the women also, who of course were members of the body, were intended to fit them for a greater variety of work. Instead of dividing over them, Paul refers to the human body, where there are a variety of gifts, but one body. Every member has its place and importance, the weak as important as the strong members, so there should be no divisions or schism in the body. Then he presents the greatest of gifts—Faith, Hope, Love. Here was the spirit of fellowship and unity, and these were the gifts they should have coveted, the women as well as the men.

Then comes the chapter containing the noted Restrictions—the mark we have kept our eyes on and have been pressing on to. But let us not in this case forget the things that are behind.

He first mentioned Prophecy as next to Love, and shows its superiority to the gift of tongues. That women had both these gifts is not denied. Then they are included in the "ye" and the "all." Verse 5: "I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye all prophesied." If women are to be cut out of "the church" and the pronouns and the "alls" and the "all of you" and the "every one of you" and "the whole church," then it is good-bye women. Hitch them to a wagon with a dog and let the man ride. Are women to be recognized in verses 12 and 19? Then she may speak in the church and edify the church.

Now for verse 23: "If therefore the whole church come together into one place and all speak with tongues," or "if all prophesy." Any women in the whole church? Then they take part in the "convictions" and conversions that result. The trouble was that "when all came together every one had a psalm, a doctrine, a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation," and they were all clamoring for the floor. Each thought his the best gift and the others ought to yield the floor, and no doubt in my mind but that wives were also contending against and debating with their husbands, who were also filled with "wrath and disputings" (I. Tim. 2:8).

In verse 28 the men as well as the women were commanded "to keep silence in the church. Of course that means silence under certain restrictions and not absolute silence. Verse 31: "For ye all may prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all be comforted." Any women in that verse? Verse 32: "And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." They were not compelled to speak in disorder. And now comes the key, 33, "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." There was "confusion, debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults." II. Cor. 12:20. They were also disputing over the resurrection, as we see in chap. 15:12, some saying there was no resurrection of the dead. That the injunction in the next verse, the noted 34th, is on the wives, can't be intelligently denied. Instead of throwing

questions at their husbands in the public meeting, let them do that at home. Now let me fill in the full meaning according "to the law," and all the scriptures beside. Let your wives keep silence in the churches, and not violate the law of marriage which puts the wife under subjection to the husband, in that sacred relation. In these confusing controversies, don't forget the relation of husband and wife; but if the wives differ from their husbands on a question in dispute, don't try to settle it in the church. It is bad enough for men, and unmarried women, to do the like of that, and too bad for a man's wife to do it. They may pray, and prophesy, and speak with tongues, "to the edifying of the church," but don't ask your husband your sharp questions in order to down him in the church, but wait till you get home and get cool. It is a shame for a wife to speak in such circumstances in the church, for there, all things must be done decently and in order. If differ you must, differ at home and in private. Such strifes and confusions as here described are too exciting perhaps for women, and specially for wives when differing from their husbands. Difference in doctrine has often caused husbands and wives to violate the marriage law. They do it, even in public, till yet.

Both are free to believe, and speak what they believe, and that in church, when all things are done to edification; but when there are strifes, confusions and every evil work (Jas. 3:16), let the wives keep silence in the churches. As I said before, the keeping silent is the same as holding their peace, or refraining from utterance, because circumstances seem to require it. It is not a perpetual dumbness, but a voluntary mumness. That is what the word uniformly means, as before shown.

Dr. Geo. W. Clark, the great Baptist commentator, says on 34 and 35, "That in chap. 11:35, where Paul is not speaking specially of spiritual gifts, but rather of religious exercises in general, he assumes that on certain occasions, and under certain circumstances, a woman might pray or speak in meeting." Unmarried women, he says, are not mentioned here. That is, in 14:34. Further on he says: "But unofficial preaching is not to be restricted to ministers of the word. It is the function of all christians. All as they have opportunity should tell the glad tidings. Both men and women should in suitable ways testify of the grace of God." The American Commentary (Baptist) says: "The apostle must be speaking of two things in these

passages, so that there is a speaking of women in the church meetings that is allowed. But how shall we decide what is allowed, and what not allowed, so as to make any practicable application of the teaching? "He gives Meyer's suggestion, "that women were not permitted to speak when the whole church was assembled, but only in the smaller gatherings." This is very strange to me, in the face of the 23rd verse, "If the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues," etc. "But if all prophesy," etc., then the good results. The difficulty is recognized. I don't know that I have solved it, but it seems to me the only one that will fit all bible teaching on the subject of woman's liberties in service. I shall try to interpret the other restrictions, not in the light of the isolated passages, for that would make the Scriptures contradictory, but if interpreted in the light of all scripture, then we get the matter right. A flood of light is thrown on this 34th verse when the whole chapter is rightly read. We will attempt to do this further on. Let us go now to the next restriction.

## I. TIM. CHAP. 2.

**N** supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for ow we go to I. Tim. 2:1-2, 8-14. "I exhort therefore first of all, that all men." Ought women to do these things?

Yes; but in the places of public prayer, both men and women need certain directions. Paul instructs about the men first: "I will therefore that the men pray everywhere (the rule applying in private as well as in public places), lifting up holy hands without wrath and disputations." In those too common disputes and strifes, that showed carnality (I. Cor. 3:3-4), the men not only got excited, but they got mad. In old Bethel church in Kentucky, where I was raised, Dr. W. W. Gardner and others got into a hot dispute with R. A. Massey at an association, about missions. The discussion waxed so warm, yea, so hot, that a brother called for a halt and a prayer. Dr. Gardner was called on to pray, as he was the most powerful man in prayer among them. It was at the close of his speech, while his face was red with anger, as he acknowledged, but he promptly refused to pray, saying he could not pray in the face of this text we are now considering. If a man is angry from his wrathful disputations, let him cool off before going into the presence of God.

If guilty, let him cleanse his hands. Such instruction was needed, or it would not have been given. Then, "in like manner," he would instruct the women also along the line of prayer as set forth in verse 1. A woman who prays in public should not gaudily array herself, because she is to be seen. No doubt they were doing that very thing. When Dr. Lorimer was pastor of Fourth and Walnut church, Louisville, Ky., a servant girl, with whom he had labored faithfully to show the way of life, came up at last to make a public profession of her faith. As a preparation for this public appearance, she had borrowed the gaudiest apparel. The pastor whispered to her that he could not receive her in that apparel or state of mind. He wanted the evidence of the true adornment, and not that of the outward. So women must not adorn themselves thus for public prayer. American Commentary says: "Modesty in apparel when appearing before God." Now this interpretation of this "likewise" or "like manner" is natural and easy for one who recognizes the right and privilege of women to public prayer. But when one settles it in his or her mind that a woman should not pray in public, then they must labor to break the force of this "likewise." It seems to such, that Paul, after instructing the men about praying, that likewise he would instruct women about dress. But the subject is in verse 1—beseeching all to pray for all. So after instructing the men about prayer, he would instruct the women also, that is, "likewise" on prayer. The Greek word occurs 17 times, and it seems in every case to show a similarity of saying or doing. As so much is at stake here, I will give the references. It is translated "likewise" 13 times, "in like manner" 2 times, "even so" 1 time, and "after the same manner" 1 time. See Matt. 20:5; 21:30 and 36; 25:17; Mark 12:21; 14:31; Luke 13:3; 20:31; 22:20; Rom. 8:26; I. Cor. 11:25 ; I. Tim. 2:9; 3:8 and 11; 5:25; Titus 2:3, 6. It is two like-sayings, or two like-doings. In the next chapter he gives certain qualifications for bishops then "likewise" certain qualifications of female deacons. If he were giving qualifications of one class, and dress of another, he would not have joined them with this "likewise." Take the next two in Titus 2:3, 6. He gives the right behavior of aged men, "likewise" the right behavior of young women, and "likewise" the right behavior of young men. So it is behavior in every place. But in I. Tim. 2:9 the effort is made to join the prayers of men with the dress of women. These are two different things, and

"likewise" would not be the word to connect them. The effort to make it connect the two wills of Paul, one supplied, would intimate that Paul sometimes had two wills, but here only one. Did Paul direct men how to pray, and the women how to do nothing? Or how not to be too ornamental? Or directing one about function, and the other about fashion? I don't see the similarity. If Paul wanted to give the women instruction on another subject he would probably have used *te*, or *te kai*, and which would have been translated also, or and, as in Heb. 6:2, 4, 5, and also laying on of hands, and also of resurrection, and also tasted the heavenly gift, and also the powers of the age to come. Here are dissimilarities that could not have been joined by "likewise," which joins similarities. I would make I. Tim. 2:8 refer to men as such, the next two verses to women as such, and verses 11:15 to wives. All of these should pray for all men. After the wives and women have been instructed in prayer, he in eleventh verse gives the wives instruction about another matter, but he does not connect with "likewise:" "Let the wives learn in silence with all subjection." A wife is not in subjection to all men because she marries, but only to her own husband. And then it is not subjection as to an autocrat, indeed not subjection at all, but voluntary submission. Do husbands subject their wives in Bible lands? Is she the subject, or slave, and he the king, or master? God never commanded a man to subject his wife, but he commands the wife to submit herself to her husband. Eph. 5:22; Col. 3:18. See I. Cor. 16:16, submitting yourselves unto such;" and I. Peter 5:5, "Ye younger submit to the elder, yea, all of you be subject one to the other." This I have spoken of before.

Verse 12. "But I suffer not a wife to teach nor to usurp authority over husband (no article), but to be in silence, for Adam was first formed, then Eve." Here the word for teach means official, or authoritative teaching, so as to usurp authority, which signifies priority; self-willed (Titus 1:7 and II. Peter 2:10). Adam had the priority. I am certainly not in favor of wives treating their poor husbands so. I know some try that now, but who would believe they did it in those days and countries? If this refers to public prayers, then surely it would look ugly for wives to do so at prayer-meeting. Better hold her peace, though she had a thousand rights to speak. But does this mean that she or an unmarried woman must not pray, or prophesy or sing, or testify? Why urge a woman to testify what the Lord has done for her

soul when she joins the church, and then put an embargo on her mouth, saying she is no longer a witness for Christ, but she must be in silence? See American Commentary on verses 11 and 14. There is so much I would like to quote. On verse 9 it says: "In like manner also--as he had before declared his apostolic will respecting the position and function of men in public worship, he now 'in like manner' points out the proper sphere and deportment of women in it. In the case of both, the directions relate to the public assembly of the church." . . . On verse 10 it says: "Godliness (a word not elsewhere used in the New Testament); it denotes reverence toward God, an attitude of mind which should lead to modesty in apparel when appearing before him." . . . On verse 11 it says: "The gospel had elevated the position of woman, and given her a share in the ordinances and a place in the assembled church. The great truth, so new to the ancient world, that in the kingdom of God `there is neither male nor female. . . . but all are one in Christ Jesus,' had lifted the sex to a higher plain; and it might well occur that, in using the liberty thus conferred, some, especially in a city like Ephesus, would seek to exercise functions inconsistent with the original and unchangeable position of subordination that God has appointed, for the sex." . . . On verses 13-14 it says: "This rule, however, requiring the silence of women in public worship of God, can only by a most arbitrary interpretation be applied to her in the informal, social meeting. Plainly it is only in the official position of the public teacher of the church she would usurp authority over the man; and the inhibition therefore has its natural limitation to the functions of the ministerial office."

"In spirit, indeed, it would forbid to woman, in any mixed assemblage, an arrogant, declamatory or didactic mode of address, as unsuited to her nature and relations; but nothing in the language or connection here can properly be constructed as forbidding her, in the informal social gatherings of christians, the utterance of her heart experiences in the communion of saints, and the out-breathing of her spiritual desires in communion with God, provided it be done in a manner befitting the modesty and gentleness of her sex. Indeed, many examples show that public prayer and address were not forbidden to woman on all occasions, as that of Anna in the temple, Luke 2:38, and that of Mary and the women assembled with the one hundred and twenty. Acts 1:14. The apostle elsewhere refers, without



rebuke, to women praying and prophesying in the church, and prescribes the manner in which they should do this. . . . The plain import of the passage here is, therefore, woman being subordinate to man, should fill no office and exercise no function in the church involving authority over man, but neither the language here, nor the analogy of other scripture, allows an interpretation forbidding her participation in public exercise consistent with the subordinate position of her sex, although without doubt her chief sphere as here indicated, is the home life."—Dr. H. Harvey of Hamilton Theological Seminary.

It has been conceded by the strongest opponent of these views that they are held by a majority of Southern Baptists. Add to this the Northern Baptists and all other Baptists who are not practicing these awful restrictions, as well as the practice of those contending for such restrictions, for not even they believe them strong enough to practice them, for they must know that when they enforce their restrictions that it will prove the death of their churches— I say, seeing that so far as practice is concerned, and men are judged by their works rather than their words, may I not with all this good company console myself that my "heresy" on this subject is not very "hurtful."—As so many of these Commentaries are not accessible to so many of my readers, I would like to quote more of them, but my limits forbid. I don't know how much of Paul's seeming austerity was induced by his bachelorhood, if he were a bachelor; or who knows but that he was married to a woman he could not live with? There have always been many such women. The Holy Spirit did not destroy a man's idiosyncrasies when using him, but rather made good use of those peculiarities. Who would have written with Paul's severity against the Judaizing teachers? Paul had experience with them that would qualify him to sternly rebuke, and that was what the Holy Spirit wanted. And some women no doubt needed just such severe language. All women are not angels and no angel is a woman. If Paul had tried to live with such a woman as he was restricting, or was well acquainted with such cases, then that gave him a qualification that the Holy Spirit might recognize, and which none of the other apostles had. I believe the apostle used the right words, but I do not believe those words have been interpreted with proper respect to the context, and with his "also saith." This I have tried to do. As Peter had a wife, who no doubt was a good woman, he

was not chosen to give these severe restrictions. His instructions in chap. 3:1-8 is much milder than this. So I need not make further comment on that, only to say it greatly helps my interpretation. There only remains Rom. 16:1-2, with I. Tim. 3:11. These are also helpful cases. Paul's proscriptions left woman some privileges and prerogatives.

## **FEMALE DEACONS.**

**T**hat Phebe was a female deacon is maintained by the following: Dr. Geo. W. Clark, the great Baptist commentator says: "Phebe was a servant of the church in more than a menial sense; she was a helper, what may be termed a deaconess, as the word was frequently used in the second century. Succorer is an honorable word, and seems to be used with reference to her official work." The American Commentary, a Baptist work, says the original word is the same as that translated deacon in Phil. 1:1 and I. Tim. 3:3, 12. She may have been one of those women set apart in the early church to perform certain needful services to their own sex. We know that such a class existed as early as Trajan and Pliny, less than half a century after the date of this epistle. Pliny wrote to the Emperor Trajan that he "thought it necessary to torture two christian women called deaconesses, that he might find out the truth in regard to the new superstition." Jamieson, Faucett and Brown say, "That in the earliest churches there were deaconesses, there is no good reason to doubt."

Matthew Henry says, "A servant by office, a stated servant, not to preach the word (for that was forbidden women), but in acts of charity and hospitality. So Bloomfield and Jerome refer to her as a woman famous in reputation and who obtained the office of deaconess."

Mosheim, p. 22, says: "Some, particularly the Eastern churches, elected deaconesses who ministered to the poor, and performed several other offices that tended to the maintenance of order and decency in the church."

Wesley says: "The Greek word is deaconess of the church. In the apostolic age, grave and pious women were appointed in every church."

Hodge: "A servant, i. e., deaconess." Adam Clark says: "A deaconess of the church. There were deaconesses in the primitive church. . . It was evident they were ordained to their office by the imposition of hands. . . . The form of prayer used on such occasions is still extant in the apostolic constitutions." I. Cor. 12:28 says he put in the church "helps" and if these were not deacons, then deacons are not in the text. But if "helps" refer to the deacons, then the female deacons may be included, for women are particularly referred to in Rom. 16:3, 9, as helpers. So in Phil. 4:3. And now with regard to Titus 3:11. "Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderous, sober, faithful in all things." It is now evident to the scholarship of the world that this has no reference to the wives of deacons, but to women who were to act as deacons. On this let scholarship speak. The standard Baptist commentary, called the American Commentary, says: "Wives; better, women, . . . filling the deacon's office; deaconesses. . . . Decisive reasons seem here to require its reference to the deaconesses who may have been the wives of deacons, but who are here merely mentioned as the female members of the deaconate. For it is evident that deaconesses existed in some of the apostolic churches, as Phebe and certain other women who at Philippi labored with Paul in the gospel, and seemed to have had an official position. Phil. 4:3. In the post-apostolic churches this office certainly existed. . . . 'In like manner' suggested the introduction of a class separate from the deacons. . . . The qualifications of deaconesses form, as will be seen, a parallel to those of the deacon. . . . Not 'theirs,' but women without article, or pronounced female deacons. It is difficult to see why the qualification of deacons' wives should be specified, and not those also of bishops' wives, but there was a reason for defining the qualifications of the deaconesses, since to them was largely committed the administration of church relief. . . . The great body of commentators, therefore, ancient and modern, have understood this passage as relating to deaconesses."

Joseph Angus, the English Baptist, says, "Rather women, meaning apparently women who acted as deaconesses." Jamieson, Faucett and Brown say: "Rather the women, i. e., deaconesses. For there is no reason that special rules should be laid down as to the wives of deacons, and not also to those of bishops. Moreover, if the wives of deacons were meant, there seems no reason for the omission of 'their,' which is not in the Greek."

Also the Greek for 'even so' or 'like manner' denotes a transition to another class of persons. Further, there were deaconesses doubtless at Ephesus, such as Phebe at Cenchrea, yet no mention is made of them in this epistle if not here. But if meant here, this chapter embraces, in due proportion, all of the persons in the service of the church. The same qualifications are required in the female as in the male deacons, only such modifications as the difference in sex suggested."

Comprehensive Commentary, in a note by the Baptist, Jenks, says: "See note on deaconesses, to which the voice of antiquity refers this." See also Twentieth Century Translation on these verses. Also Living Oracles, Sawyer, Emphatic Diaglott, etc.

The Pulpit Commentary says: "What is meant by these women? Certainly not women in general, which would be quite out of harmony with the context. The male deacons had just been spoken of, and so the apostle goes on to speak of the female deacons. He conceives of the deacon's office as consisting of two branches, (1) the deacons (2) the deaconesses; and gives appropriate directions for each. . . . The return in Verse 12, to the male deacon is in favor of understanding "the women" of the deaconesses as showing that the subject of the diaconate was not done with. Chrysostom (who says, "He is speaking of those who hold the rank of deaconesses") and all the ancient commentators, and De Wette, Wiesinger, Wordsworth, Alford, and Ellicott among the moderns so understand it."

Another writer on the same passage, says: "The allusion is evidently not to the wives of deacons, but to deaconesses. Why should the duties of deacons' wives be set forth when there is no allusion to the duties of minister's wives? The omission of all mention of domestic duties in this case is significant. There was evidently such an order in the primitive church. . . . The order did not cease to exist till the fifth century in the Latin church, and till the twelfth in the Greek church."

Another writer on the same passage in Pulpit Commentary says—"We must therefore think of these women as closely associated with the diaconate. We might think of the wives of the deacons, but, as nothing has

been said of the wives of bishops, and as by the insertion of the phrase 'in like manner' we are led to think of the election of women to office, it is better to think of deaconesses. We have an example of deaconesses in Phebe of Cenchrea mentioned in Romans 16:1."

This is only a sample of the authorities on the subject. If the Bible provides for female deacons, then they are needed, and the cause will suffer without them, yea, it is suffering now.

The form of ordination of female deacons is given in Apostolic Constitutions, B. VIII. Section 20. This document is supposed to date about the fourth century. It is unreliable in many things, but this may be taken as the history of the times. But the words five times translated "deacon," in its noun and verb forms, are also forty-six times translated "minister," and sixteen times "serve" and "servant." In many places women are included by name, and in many others rightly included but unrightly excluded, by exclusive translators and interpreters. Was Phebe a deacon, servant, or minister of her church? Not minister say some; nor deacon say some, nor servant say some, if she is to serve with her tongue, but she must keep silent in the (universal) (?) church of God. It being the same word, who is to decide whether it is to be translated the one way or the other.

In I. Tim. 3:13: "For they that have used the office of a deacon well," comes after verse 11, which gives the qualifications of female deacons. Thus the promise of verse 13 is also hers, and I would not rob her of her eternal reward for faithful service to which she is called of God.

We see providence again in this matter. All over the land women are doing the deacon's work. When a pastor or church needs funds, the women, more than the deacons are looked to, to do the work of collecting. Hundreds of times this writer has been invited to serve churches for a day or more and often nothing is said about his compensation; sometimes his traveling expenses—a little more or less is handed him, and if a few dollars more than expenses, much less than enough to starve on, it is generally accompanied with a word of regret that it is so little, with a wish that it was several times more, and it all grows out of trifling deacons who failed to make the

necessary effort. And when a promise is made to further supplement [sic - lk] it, I count it as wasted bad breath. The demand and necessity for women to help in finances grow out of this travesty on official work in the kingdom of righteousness. Women deacons would have more pride about such matters, and this galling experience of mine, I believe is God's rod driving me to this writing.

For one to say that he does not believe in female deacons and at the same time is using and encouraging women in the work of deacons is a shameful inconsistency. If it is right for women to do such work, then, such work becomes a part of Woman's Rights. When I was opposed to this and other Woman's Rights I was intolerant on the subject and that is proof positive that I was wrong.

When I was opposed to instrumental music in the church I was intolerant. The organ providentially got in; then the cornet; and when the violin and flute got in, I was forced to examine all the scriptures on the subject. That compelled me to favor all instruments in the church. The same with this and other subjects. An honest examination of all scriptures on any subject is a cure-all for all heresy. I recommend this course to all my readers. Why not be right, especially on Woman's Rights?

## **A RIGHT REVISION RIGHTLY READ.**

**I** believe in congregational church government, which means, that do not know what to think of one's inconsistency who professes to authority in church matters is both limited to the church, and also extended alike to all in the church, and who at the same time so teach, that women in their churches, who may be largely in the majority as to numbers, and also more largely in superiority as to intellect, purity, and zeal, yet are not allowed to have any judgment or church privileges, no, not so much as to make a motion, or to second one, or even to vote on any question; or to express an opinion if she is allowed to have any. And if she is allowed to sing aloud, or allowed to pray aloud, or allowed to say any thing aloud in prayermeeting or any other meeting for devotion or business, or to teach in

a Sunday school, then their own interpretation of "let your women keep silence in the church," is violated. They neither believe nor practice the literal interpretation of the text. Read Phil. I. 1:2 and put the women in every pronoun lest God may put you out. Some women are mentioned by name in chap. 4:2-3, and that with more honor than any male members of the church. Paul "besought" them to be of the same mind, which shows not only that they had minds, but that they only had control of their own minds. If that "man" Paul had been the head of those women, he would have commanded them and not "besought" them. They are not only called "fellow laborers," but "sun-athletes in the gospel." These women must have been included in the opening address: "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi." These women in chap. 4:2 are said to be "in the Lord." In chap. 1:7-8 we have not only the pronoun "you" but "you all" in both verses. If women are in the church and in the pronouns, then "woe be to the man who reads them out." Then they are in verses 9, 10, 11, and if so, they should "abound in all judgment," and "approve things that are excellent." If God gives women judgment in church matters who will dare to rob them of any and all expression of it?

Philippi was not the center of all iniquity like Corinth, Ephesus, or even Rome, hence these Restrictions were not on at Philippi. How do I know? Nothing plainer. Turn to Acts 16 where Paul and others made their first visit. There was a gathering at the river side, where as now, the women attended the prayer-meeting. Not one that excluded men, for if so Paul and these gentlemen would not have obtruded<sup>7</sup>. Nor did the women take fright at the approach of men. The women were doubtless glad to see men come to their meeting. Read what follows and say if it is not just like we have it in free America.

13 And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither.

---

<sup>7</sup> Obtrude - To thrust forward forcibly or unduly; to thrust (a matter, a person, his presence, etc.) *upon* any one.

14 And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord, opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.

15 And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, "If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there." And she constrained us.

40 And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed.

Such free intercourse would not have been proper in the other places. Even in Athens it was better than Corinth. Here is a woman who "*clave*" unto Paul.

How be it certain men *clave* unto him, and believed: among the which was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them.

Take II. Cor. 5:14-15 and put women in every "all," and in every pronoun, then take man out of verses 16, 17, and put *tis*—no one, any one—and that lets in the woman. Then you can plainly see in the 18 verse that she is in the "us," and also in "the ministry of reconciliation;" yea in the "ambassadors," and in every pronoun to the end. If you want to feel "enlarged," read it thus, and give women their honor and their rights. Then go on with chap. 6, and put her in the "we then as workers together." Next read verses 3:4, "giving no offense in any thing, that the service be not blamed; but in all things as the servants of God (not ministers as the old Episcopal translations have it). Then let her into every verse to the last, which reads: "And I will be a Father unto you and ye shall be my sons and daughters saith the Almighty." Does that let the women in. Then they are in all the preceding pronouns, and if so then they are fellow workers and may become sun-athletes with the preachers, as they were with the great preacher to the Gentiles. Let us hasten to chap. 14, the battleground and let the women into the nouns and pronouns just as the Holy Spirit did.



Not to do this is worse than robbing widow's houses. But read first, Heb. 6:10, 12 and magnify women in your mind, for they too "minister to the saints."

10 For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.

11 And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end:

12 That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.

If women are in these, then, she is in chap. 5:12. "For when the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat."

Then please turn to I. Peter 4: and let "man" stay in verses 2 and 6 where he belongs, but take him out in every other place. Verse 10 should read: "As every one (not man) who hath received the gift, let him or her minister the same, one to another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." "If any one (not man) speak, let it be as the Oracle of God; if anyone minister (or serve), let it be done as from the ability God gives." Take out in hundreds of other places those masculine pronouns, since the Holy Spirit left them out. As Episcopacy delights in robbing the pew by the too frequent use of the term "minister," so it delights especially in robbing the women in the pew. Hence these Episcopal translations. Give women some rights and not all restrictions. Are not women in "the Church of God at Corinth?" If so, then in chap. 12 they belong to the members of the body, who were to "earnestly covet the best gifts," but which some will not allow them to use. Then "Faith, Hope, and Love" belong to them, but they are not allowed to express them. Now follow a right reading of chap. 14, which is the battle-field on the subject. The translation has so many masculine nouns and pronouns that the Holy Spirit never used. The word that always means man, does not

occur but once, and there (verse 35) it is translated husband. The other word anthropos, occurs twice, but that word includes the women, as—"God commandeth all men everywhere to repent," includes the women. But how many masculine pronouns found in this chapter that the Holy Spirit did not use! Why should a tense sign be always expressed with masculine pronouns? Because they represent both sexes, which some can't see. The persons addressed in this chap. 14 of I. Cor. containing the noted Restrictions, are *both men and women*. The "Ye" in the first verse is no more masculine than feminine. The substantive noun is the "Church of God at Corinth," and the "Ye" takes them all in. Let us so read: Ye Church of God at Corinth—males and females, "follow after love, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." Putting the verses 23 and 24 with this, and then read the women out, is a crime that robs them of their rewards. The second verse has one "man" and three masculine pronouns, the Holy Spirit never used, nor authorized. Instead of "He that speaketh," let it read: "For the one speaking," and instead of "No man understandeth," let it read *no one*, and that gives women recognition. Then drop out the next "him" and the next "he" or make the "he" include the she. Then the verse will read: For the one speaking in an unknown tongue, speaketh not to men (and women), but unto God; for no one understands. "How be it in the spirit he (or she) speaks mysteries." Who will deny that reading? Verse 3, instead of HE that prophesieth, read: "But the one prophesying, speaketh unto men (and women) to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." To rule women out is worse than cruelty to animals as it robs them of their eternal rewards for the service to which they are called. Verse 4, instead of HE that speaketh, read: "For the one speaking in an unknown tongue, edifieth one's self, but the one prophesying edifieth the church." That is the way the Holy Spirit inbreathed it into Paul, and Paul wrote it as he was moved by the Spirit and I believe without protest. Verse 5: "I am willing indeed for *you all* to speak with tongues, but rather that *you all* prophesy; for greater is the one prophesying than the one speaking with tongues, except he (or she) interpret, that the church may receive edification." *Anthropos*--man, and *adelphos*—brother, and the masculine pronouns in the tense signs, include women, unless the context require differently.

The next five verses contain "ye," "you" and "them," which of course include the women. Verse 11, take out "him" and "he," and read, "I will be unto the one speaking a barbarian, and the one speaking a barbarian unto me." Let the women into the three ye's of verse 12, and it will read: "Even so ye, for as much as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church." Who will dare kick the women out of that verse.

In verse 13, take out "him" and "he," and let it read as the Holy Spirit dictated: "Wherefore let the one speaking in an unknown tongue, pray that he (or she) may interpret." It is not necessary to put in both "he and she" if it were not for the tyrannical theologians, who would risk degrading and then robbing women of their rights. On this principle in verse 16, take out the two "he's," and let *tis*—"the one," in their places.

In verse 20, leave out "men," and put in "perfect ones," and that gives poor downtrodden women a chance.

20 Brethren, be not children in understanding: how be it in malice be ye children, but in understanding be perfect ones.

Leave "men" out of verse 21.

21 In the law it is written, "With other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people: and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord."

This brings to the place of battle for woman's rights. "Therefore, if the whole church come together into one place, 'Any women in the whole church?' `And all speak with tongues." Did the women speak with tongues in Acts 2:4? If you doubt it, read Peter's explanation in verses 16 and 18. If that does not settle it then nothing can. Now verse 24: "But if all prophesy." Did women prophesy? "Your sons and daughters shall prophesy"—"my handmaidens shall prophesy." Acts 21:9: "And the same man had four daughters which did prophesy." Paul tarried with those four women "many days," because he loved their company. Now read I. Cor. 11:6, where women are directed about praying and prophesying in public. No one

disputes this. "Prophecy is for edification, and exhortation, and comfort." It is never to be done in private, but always in public for the edification of all. "Now if the whole church come together, and all prophecy, unbelievers will be converted, as the context shows. Verse 26: "Every one of you hath a psalm, a doctrine, a tongue, a revelation, an interpretation." Let all things be done unto edifying. Are there no women in "every one of you?" Now take "man" out of verse 27, and it will read: "If any one speak." Then take the three masculine pronouns out of verse 28? "If there be no interpreter, let the one having a gift be silent in the church, and speak to him or herself, and to God." Who will deny that reading? Verse 31: "For ye all may prophecy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." By not observing this order "confusion" got into the church, that led husbands and wives to violate the family rules taught "in the law."

Look at this word "confusion" in verse 33, which occurs five times. Luke 21:9: "When ye shall hear of wars and commotions be not terrified." See its company between "wars and terrify." It means much out of the ordinary. II. Cor. 6:5 shows its company again—"In much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings." That is out of the ordinary "much every way." II. Cor. 12:20: describes the condition of things at Corinth—"debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults" — all in the plural. Not one of each, but many of all. What an awful condition that church was in! In James 3:16 the word is associated with "bitter envying and strife," "earthly, sensual, devilish"—there is "confusion and every evil work." See again the company the word keeps, and words are known by their company. This was the kind of confusion spoken of in verse 33, that God is not the author of. Husbands and wives were engaged in that kind of confusion which the law forbade, and was unbecoming anywhere, and especially in the church of God. Under such circumstances let the wives keep silent in the churches, for it is not permitted under such circumstances for wives to speak against their husbands, but to be under obedience as also saith the Law. Let them settle their disputes with their husbands at home, for it is a shame for wives to speak against their husbands in the church. The circumstances and context are always to govern the interpretation of the letter, which so often killeth. There are many passages where the letter

in the translation, made so by the concensus of scholarship but under denominational prejudices, which are to be rejected by those who seek to be guided by the real word of God. Take the following examples: "This is my body"—"this is my blood;" and "except ye eat the body and drink the blood ye have no life in you."

Here is the letter that killeth. Thousands of millions have been killed by it, both soul and body for ever and for ever. And yet the letter and concensus of scholarship support it. Heb. 6:4, seems to support Arminianism, and that view is held by the great majority of christian people; but as that interpretation does not harmonize with the general teaching of scripture, and with salvation by grace, it must be otherwise interpreted. This is especially true of many passages concerning baptism. Nine-tenths of the so-called christian world, both Catholic and Protestant, are Pedo-baptist and affusionists. They have had control of manuscripts and translations so that much of the letter is made to conform to their own doctrines. "Baptize with water" is found in most translations, and in many passages, and is supported by what is called the concensus of scholarship, yet a tyro<sup>8</sup> in Greek knows it ought to be baptize in water, and in the Holy Spirit. Like the Restrictions on Women, these translations are made to force the doctrine of the translators. And so "baptize for the remission of sins," comes from the same source, and is supported by the same erroneous concensus of scholarship. It is the letter that kills, and concensus of scholarship can't prevent it.

It is the mission of the few faithful witnesses to show the spirit that giveth life and light. The same of "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Also, of "baptized into Jesus Christ;" and, "baptism doth also now save us." These, like the Woman Restrictions come from that corrupt source, that have controlled translations and interpretations. There is a right translation and interpretation that accords with the true word of God, and with the analogy of faith. Scripture must not be made to contradict scripture, and the faithful witnesses must not allow it to be done. I denounce any interpretation of any scripture that contradicts the plain teaching of God's

---

<sup>8</sup> Tyro - A beginner or learner in anything; one who is learning or who has mastered the rudiments only of any branch of knowledge; a novice.

holy word, on these, and many other subjects, as well as the religious rights of holy women. God's word abounds with teaching on this Woman question, both by precept and example, and it is not safe or sane to take two or three mis-translations, and worse interpretations, and hurl them against the many plain scriptures on the same subject. All of these false teachings are of both heathen and Catholic origin. These newly converted heathen women and wives had not been properly instructed out of the law, and they were abusing their liberties under the Gospel, and they were doing this in the meetings of the church, the last place in all the world for improprieties of any kind. They were allowed to vote, sing, pray, prophesy, teach, yea even preach to their own husbands, but not authoritatively, so as to usurp authority over them, but to always be in subjection in family affairs involving government. Let all hold their peace in the church rather than violate any rules of government.

How often in the sermon on the Mount did Christ quote the law against those who were contending obstinately for the letter, and how he enlarged the meaning beyond the letter—not to destroy the letter, but to fill it full. So some are obstinately contending for what they think is the letter on Women's Restrictions, made necessary by unfortunate surroundings, and, O, how they need to be enlarged, not by destroying the letter of the law of the Lord, but by putting into these Restrictions the original letter that God gave, also the fullness developed by providence, and further precepts and examples all through the Old and New Scriptures. Like the gospel in the words: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head, but the serpent should bruise his heel"—what an amazing fullness was developed by further precepts and examples all through the blessed Book, as well as the developments of providence which help so much to interpret God's word. As sure as the hand of providence showed itself in the abolition of our African slavery, so sure is it showing itself in the liberation of our women from the unjust bondage put upon them by those who ought to have learned how to deal justly with them. In a way we can't account for outside of providence, the shackles are falling off christian women, and wonderful to tell, they are out in the open, with unveiled faces, cautiously and circumspectly advancing into larger liberties in the gospel. They feel they are not transgressing, and they are seeking instruction. The following fits here: Special to the Banner.

Montgomery, Ala., February 23.—That women should have a voice in church affairs, and that the ministry should not arrogate to itself all affairs pertaining to church management nor to an exclusive masculine laity was the opinion of the Women's Home Mission Society, in session here. Mrs. E. G. Adams addressed the society on "Why the Women Ask for the Rights of the Laity," and Rev. W. M. Curtis gave reasons "Why the Rights of the Laity Should be Granted to Women." According to these speakers, women are largely influential in building up the churches, a fact which should entitle them to just representation on the various church boards. It was their contention that the reign of autocracy is over, and that a laity, composed of church workers, men and women, could best advance the churches by working heart and soul with this end in view. "There is no such thing as a male and female Christian," said Mr. Curtis; "hence there should be no such thing as an exclusive male laity." The matter of allowing the women votes in the conduct of the various churches has been a bone of contention with the women of Alabama for some time, and it is probable that steps will soon be taken to allow them these rights.

Let women contend for their rights. They have both rights and restrictions. These can be learned by those seeking to know the truth. Let us not go to the temple of Herod— the heathen, nor to Josephus who wrote of the customs of his time, but let us go back of these to the original Restrictions, and to the tabernacle God had made. There was no "women's court" in that, or is in Solomon's temple, nor in Zerubbabel's, nor in Ezekiel's, nor in the churches of God anywhere, nor is there a women's court in Paradise, nor in Heaven, nor in the New Jerusalem, nor in the churches of Zion today, thanks be to God.

It has been urged that it is dangerous to put women in the lead. That Satan tempted Eve to break over her restrictions, and thus the evil has come upon us. But Eve was then not under present restrictions. That was before the fall and the curse. Eve was deceived and Adam was in the transgression and it was he who brought the world of evil upon us. He sinned willfully, and does that not prove that man is an unsafe leader? It is urged that Spiritism, Theosophy, Christian Science, etc., were originated and

run by women. But every woman leader in evil can be matched by ten to ten thousand men who are as bad or worse. One bloody Mary can be matched by a score or more of bloody kings. The same logic would make men unsafe in the lead. Are there no women leaders in righteousness?

Read the following from Dr. R. T. Hanks, of Texas: how Claudia, a woman introduced the gospel into England and Wales.—"I have been at some pains in recounting this piece of history, to show that it was not through Augustine, the Numidian, that we received the light of the Gospel by way of England."

Here seems to be the historic facts:

The Gospel was first introduced into Wales by Claudia, a native of Wales, one of Caesar's household, who was led to Christ by Paul, who preached in "his own hired house." She was married to a man named Pudence, who was also brought to a knowledge of salvation under Paul's preaching. This was about the year 63.

While Paul preached in Rome the seed sown by Claudia and Pudence, after their return, were bearing an abundant harvest in the Isle of Britain."

This agrees with Acts 8:1-4; 9:1-2, and 11:9-21. A man is to be pitied who would try to get the women out of these missionary forces who went everywhere "preaching the gospel" and with whom the hand of the Lord was revealed, causing a great number to believe and turn unto the Lord. And thus was that prophecy in Joel and in Psalms 68 partially fulfilled.—"The women that preached the glad tidings were a great host;" and yet they did it as the other laymen in a private and personal way. Here I feel constrained to quote from a great author who expressed the views of so many others. With the passage that in "Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female," he is struck with the history of churches in the Acts, where no distinction is made in church membership between males and females. Only in the offices of the church is there seen any distinction. The duties of the laity knows no male or female. Every one is to exercise their gifts and improve their talents and opportunities as God may give to every one. Take the 12th chap. of Romans



as an example and read all the sex out of it. In verse 3 "man" occurs twice, and in verse 8 "he" occurs four times. Blot them all out, and read "the one" instead. In verses 9 and 15 be sure you see the woman. In verse 16 blot out "men" and substitute "those." Instead of "Recompense to no man, evil for evil," read "no one," and may be you can see the woman. Anthropos is found in verses 17 and 18, but that term includes the women. So of the four "hims" in verse 20. The pronoun is as much female as male, even though in many places it may have the masculine termination. These facts will not be denied, but they are forgotten by some, and not known by many. Such translations as force the masculine into such prominence is an unjust discrimination against the women, and the translations are full of it. I do not mean to say that it was intended, but so it is, to the great detriment of woman's work. Now see what those who deny woman such rights and privileges as is herein contended for, are compelled to do, and many are doing. All public expressions of the doings of women in the Bible, some of which are noticed in this book, and which God approved, they disapprove. See preceding pages from Genesis to Acts where God and Christ approved what these opponents are by their theory compelled to disapprove. Then in the first and second chapters of Acts where even Episcopal and Presbyterial writers agree was democratic or congregational government, and which is approved by every unprejudiced mind, they must rule the women out of praying, voting, prophesying, and speaking with tongues, and that with Peter's explanation in verses 17 and 18. Think of women being disfranchised in the house of God! Not allowed to express any judgment in church matters, nor to pray, although it reads so plainly that the apostle continued in prayer with the women and the mother of Jesus. Here is what others say about who voted:

Schaff, p. 501, says: "So soon as there was a community of believers, nothing was done without its active participation. . . . Peter here lays before the whole congregation of about one hundred and twenty souls the necessity of an election to complete the sacred number twelve. Whereupon not only the apostles, but the whole body of disciples nominate Joseph Barsabas, and Matthias as candidates; all pray to be informed of the divine will (v. 24); all cast their lots, and thus Matthias is elected. Much more must we expect the

general rights of Christians to be regarded in the choice of the ordinary congregational officers."

Comp. Comt. says: "The hundred and twenty did so, for to them Peter spoke, and not to the eleven."

J. F. and Brown: "Not the eleven, but the whole company. . . —voted on by general suffrage."

Jacobus: "Not the apostles who did this, but the whole assembly whom Peter addressed. It is clear that the membership were held to be on an equal footing in regard to their vote or lot here. The same and entire body pray and cast their lots."

The anti-female theory compels them in Act 6:1-7 to rule the women out of the "whole multitude of disciples," who were "pleased" to "choose" seven deacons, and to which all testify to a congregational government, which can not be if the women are disfranchised. And so on to the end. I would be afraid to fight against God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and the church, and the cause, and kingdom, even in an honest effort, to keep women under heathen restrictions in Christian lands. But the Jews were honest in crucifying Christ, and so was Paul in persecuting the church.

I say again to rob women of her God-given rights and privileges in. His service is a crime, in comparison with which the robbing of widow's houses is innocence personified, and woe to those who do it! I close with these solemn appeals:

1st. To godly women in heathen lands; Are you bound by heathen customs? Seek not to be loosed.

2nd. To christian women in christian lands: Are you free from heathen customs? Seek not to be bound.

3rd. To holy women in christian lands who are yet bound by heathen customs: Would you be made free? Use it rather.

4th. What I say unto you, I say unto all: "You are not children of a bondwoman but of the free.

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherein Christ hath made you free and be not again entangled with any yoke of bondage." "I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded, but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.

"They talk about a woman's sphere as though it had a limit,

There's not a place on earth or heaven, There's not a task to mankind given, There's not a blessing or a woe, There's not a whisper, yes or no, There's not a life, or death, or birth, That has a feather's weight of worth, Without a woman in it."