

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXIV.

JANUARY, 1920.

No. 1.

The Ministerial Office a Divine Office:

The highest order or state of a man is that of a Christian. Christians, though, like other men, by nature sinners, are saints in the sight of God, being sanctified through the blood of Jesus Christ. They are children of God, kings and priests, as they are one with Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, His King and Priest. There is within this state of Christianity no higher order, no higher or lower grade of holiness and sanctity, no Christian more a child of God, more a saint, a king, or a priest than others, but all alike participants of these divine privileges. As we read Gal. 3, 26. 28: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." And as to our relation to one another, the Lord says: "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." This being so, it must be maintained that pastors, or ministers, who are intrusted with the ministerial office, are of no higher order in the Church than the other members, called laymen. Their office does not invest them with such a priority. To grant it to them would be a violation of the words of the Master: "All ye are brethren." It would lead to the pernicious practise of the Roman Church to consider priests and bishops as having dominion over the faith of the Christians, and being mediators between God and the people.

All this, however, does not justify any one in thinking mean of, or disregarding, the *work* of the servants of the Church. It would be wrong indeed to overestimate the persons

The Woman in the Church.

The woman in the Church, her rights and privileges, the restrictions which limit her activity, -etc., are questions about which there has been much discussion, and about which the widest divergence of opinion prevails. It is a question, the settlement of which has, at least in our circles, been taken for granted, and in Lutheran literature, especially that of the Missouri Synod, we find only scattering paragraphs, and all of them, without exception, take the stand of absolute silence of the woman, not only in the divine service, but also in all the business relations of the Church. Our congregations have for the most part remained pretty well untouched by the modern suffragette movement; but with the wide-spread agitation of this question the related question of the standing of the woman in the Church may here and there become a burning one, and a free discussion of it in conference circles does not seem at all untimely.) The essayist has been unable to find very much material relating to the question. Suffragettes have written on it; but usually in such a rabid, unreasoning, and sometimes unchristian manner that their effusions were of little practical value for use in a conference paper. Let us bear in mind from the outset that the scope of this paper is not to enter upon the merits or demerits of the women's suffrage question in its wider and popular sense, but is merely to treat of the standing of woman in the Church, in the light of Scripture, with particular reference to the passages relating to the question from the pen of St. Paul.

Closely related to the question of the position of the woman in the Church, as defined by St. Paul, is the question of the status of woman in the world at large, particularly over against man. In order to define the position of woman in world affairs and family life, it is best to let the inspired writers speak. The first passage relating to her is Gen. 2, 18, where we read: "And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept.

And he took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made He a woman and brought her unto man. And Adam said," etc. The priority of man is here already plainly announced. After the Fall, God said unto the woman: "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Gen. 3, 16. Esther 1, 20—22 we read: "And when the king's decree which he shall make shall be published throughout all his empire, (for it is great,) all the wives shall give to their husbands honor, both to great and small. And the king did according to the word of Memucan. For he sent letters unto all the king's provinces, into every province, according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their language, that every man should bear rule in his own house." St. Paul writes, 1 Cor. 11, 3: "But I would have you know that . . . the head of the woman is the man; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman is of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." Again, Eph. 5, 22—24: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church, and He is the Savior of the body. Therefore, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let wives be to their own husbands in everything." God in His wisdom has established plainly the relationship of man to woman and woman to man in the realm of the family, a relationship perfectly natural, and which would be ideal if it were not for the corrupting influence of sin. The subjection of wife to husband, a subjection not of compulsion and brute force, but of love, a position called for not only by the direct ordinance of God, but by the physical, mental, temperamental make-up of woman, is plainly established in the Bible. That the rule of man in his household should be gentle and kindly, the rule of love, Scripture plainly states. The model wife is described in Prov. 31, 21—31, and St. Paul admonishes: "Husbands, love

your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself for it. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband." Eph. 5, 22—33. The same apostle writes Col. 3, 18: "Husbands, love your wives and be not bitter against them." We read 1 Pet. 3 that the Apostle, after admonishing wives to obedience, as Sarah was obedient unto Abraham, continues: "Likewise ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life, that your prayers be not hindered." That the domestic relationship is not, as it should and might be, a fore-taste of paradise, but often an antechamber of hell, is not God's, but man's own fault. The relation of woman to her husband determined her position in the Church in Paul's time and must determine it to-day, as we shall see later.

It is to these Scripture-passages relegating the woman to a secondary position in the family to which many of the more rabid suffragette leaders so strenuously object, and which make some of them violent enemies of the Christian religion. Matilda Joslyn Gage, in her well-known book, *Woman, Church and State* published 1893, speaks regretfully of the fact that the feminine principle is absent in the Christian conception of the Deity. She looks upon it as a regrettable loss of something which heathen nations had and have, as, for instance, the combined male and female principle as represented in god among the Chinese under the name Fou-Fou, *i. e.*, Father-Mother. So in our day the Shakers hold that the revelation of God is progressive, that in the first, or antediluvian, period of human nature God was known only as Great Spirit; that in the second, or Jewish, period he was revealed as the Jehovah, he, she, or dual being, male or female, the "I am that I am"; that Jesus, in the third cycle, made God known as a father;

that in the last cycle, commencing with 1770 A. D., "God is revealed in the character of Mother, an eternal Mother, the bearing spirit of all the creation of God." (W. A. Parrelle.) Mrs. Gage says: "Jehovah signifies not alone the masculine and the feminine principles, but also the spirit of vivifying intelligence. It is a compound word indicative of the three divine principles. Holy Ghost, although in Hebrew a noun of either gender, masculine, feminine, neuter, is invariably rendered masculine by Christian translators of the Bible. In the Greek, from whence we obtain the New Testament, spirit is of the feminine gender, although invariably translated masculine. The double-sexed word Jehovah, too sacred to be spoken by the Jews, signified the masculine-feminine God. The proof of the double meaning of Jehovah, the masculine and feminine signification, is undeniable. Lanci, one of the great orientalists, says: 'Jehovah should be read from left to right and pronounced Ho-Hi, that is to say, He-She, Ho in Hebrew being the masculine pronoun and Hi the feminine. Ho-Hi therefore denotes the male and female principles, the vis genitrix.' The Hebrew word 'El Shaddai,' translated 'The Almighty,' is still more distinctively feminine than Jah, as it means 'The Breasted God,' and is made use of in the Old Testament whenever the especially feminine characteristics of God are meant to be indicated." (She here quotes Kingsford, *The Perfect Way*.) "The story of the building of the tower of Babel and the subsequent confusion of language possesses deep interior significance; the word (Babel) meaning God the Father as distinct and separate from the feminine principle. The confusion which has come upon humanity because of this separation has been far more lamentable in its results than a mere confounding of tongues. In the earliest religions the recognition of the feminine principle in the divinity is everywhere found. 'I am the Father and the Mother of the Universe,' said Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita. . . . The Holy Spirit, symbolized by a dove, is a distinctively feminine principle, — the Comforter, — and yet has ever been treated by the Christian Church as masculine, alike in dogmas

propounded from the pulpit and in translations of the Scriptures." Again she quotes Mason, *The Lost Name*: "No man seems shaken at hearing of the fatherhood of Jehovah. Is motherhood less divine? Nothing but a male-born theology, evolved from the overheated fires of feeling, would have burned away all recognition of the fact that the presence of the 'Eternal Womanly' in Yod-he-vau's being is necessary to full-sphered perfection; none but those whose degraded estimate of woman has caused them to desecrate her holy office of high priestess of life will see anything more sacrilegious in a recognition of 'Our Mother in Heaven' and offering the prayer, 'Hallowed be thy name, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' than in saying the same things to the Father there." So far Mrs. Gage. Again she says, later in her book: "To the theory of 'God the Father,' shorn of the divine attribute of motherhood, is the world beholden for its most degrading beliefs, its most infamous practises. Dependent upon, and identified with, lost motherhood is the 'Lost Name' of ancient writers and occultists. When the femininity of the divine is once again acknowledged, the 'Lost Name' will be discovered and the holiness (wholeness) of divinity be manifested. 'The Lord's Prayer,' taught His disciples by Jesus, recognized the loss, and demands restoration of the feminine in 'Hallowed [whole] be Thy name.'" Mrs. Gage and her ilk see the only hope for woman to obtain absolute equality with man in the abolition of the Christian religion. She says: "The Church has ever obstructed the progress of humanity, delaying civilization and condemning the world to a moral barbarism from which there is no escape except through repudiation of its teachings." These people have a special grudge against St. Paul, whose writings contain the passages upon which we shall base our later contentions. The above-mentioned suffragette leader writes: "No illiterate, having received instruction at the feet of Gamaliel, Paul was yet intolerant and credulous, nay, more, unscrupulous. He was the first Jesuit in the Christian Church, 'becoming all things to all men.' The Reformed Church, with strange unanimity, has

chosen Paul as its leader and the accepted exponent of its views. He may justly be termed the Protestant Pope. . . . Having been accepted by the Church [Catholic] as the apostolic exponent of its views upon marriage, it was but to be expected that his teachings should be received as divine. That Paul was unmarried has been assumed because of his bitterness against this relation, yet abundant proof of his having a wife exists (p. 55). But tenderness toward women does not appear in his teaching; man is represented as the master, 'the head' of woman. In consonance with his teaching, responsibility has been denied her through the ages; although the Church has practically held her amenable for the ruin of the world, prescribing penance and hurling anathemas against her whom it has characterized as the 'door of hell.'" Of course, such methods of argumentation are to us of little moment, since we consider St. Paul and all other Scriptural writers who touch upon the question of woman as inspired, and their statements as the unalterable decrees of God. We cannot argue the question with any one who does not accept the Bible as the Word of God, and considers the statements of the writers of Holy Writ as mere individual expressions of opinion, without binding force upon us in our day. I have merely quoted these effusions to show to what distorted conclusions women may come in demanding the rights of which they feel themselves deprived in Church and State.

The question is, What are woman's rights and privileges in the Church? What are the limitations which the Word of God places upon her? Before we enter upon this question, which is really the *cruce* of the paper, let me first draw attention to two points: first, very briefly, to the status of woman among the children of Israel in the Old Testament, and secondly, to the gradual degradation of woman's position during the dark centuries, when popery was in the ascendancy.

Note the freedom and importance of woman in private and social life in ancient Israel. The early Hebrew wife and mother held much control over her household (cf. Prov. 14, 1;

31, 10—31), and even invited guests to her dwelling and hospitalities; Joel invited Sisera to her tent (Judg. 4, 18), the Shunamite woman Elisha to her home. Later, when her son sickened and died, this Shunamite woman went to Mount Carmel to intercede with that man of God for divine blessing (2 Kings 4, 8); on another occasion a prophet's widow carried to him her own case of need (2 Kings 4, 1—7), and, much earlier, the troubled Abigail went with gifts to implore assistance from David (1 Sam. 25, 18). In Job's day women attended feasts with their brothers (Job 1, 4); in Christ's, they attended both as assistants (John 12, 2) and as guests (John 2, 3). Undoubtedly it was always customary for Jewish women to take their meals with the men. (*Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, p. 3553.) There is an indication in the story of Rebekah that Hebrew damsels were not given in marriage without their own consent (Gen. 24, 58).—Note the freedom and activity of Hebrew women in public and religious affairs. Miriam led the women of Israel in public rejoicings over the nation's deliverance at the Red Sea (Ex. 15, 20, 21); Jephthah's daughter went out publicly to congratulate her father on his triumphal return from battle (Judg. 11, 34); the daughters of Shiloh engaged, by themselves, but in sight of others, in sacred dancing at a yearly religious feast (Judg. 21, 21); women of Israel came out of their cities with songs and triumphal marches to meet Saul and David as they returned from the defeat of the Philistines (1 Sam. 18, 6, 7); Deborah was a judge, prophetess, and sacred poetess in Israel, and of high distinction in public service (Judg. 4, 6, 14; 5, 7). Hannah offered a remarkable prophetic song in the house of the Lord (1 Sam. 2, 1—10); and the public office of inspired prophetess was held in the earlier day, at least, by the four: Miriam, Deborah, Huldah (2 Kings 22, 14), and Noadiah (Neh. 6, 14). Women took part in the ancient worship (Ex. 15, 20, 21; 48, 8; 1 Sam. 2, 22); also in the choir (1 Chron. 25, 5, 6; Neh. 7, 67). They were required to attend the reading of the Law (Deut. 31, 12; Josh. 8, 35).

Contrast this comparatively free condition of woman to her condition during the dark years of religious corruption before the Reformation. The general corruption of morals among the clergy, the growth of superstition and ignorance, naturally tended to degrade the sexual relationship and lower the standard of conduct towards the weaker vessel, woman. The more mystical among the priests taught that before woman was separated from man, the Elementals were accepted by man as his children and endowed by him with immortality, but at the separation of the androgynous body (uniting the characteristics of both sexes; hermaphrodite) into two beings, Adam and Eve, the woman, through accident, was also endowed with immortality, which theretofore had solely inhered in the masculine portion of the double-sexed being. These mystics also taught that this endowment of woman with immortality, together with her capability of bringing new beings into the world, also endowed with immortal life, was the cause of intense enmity towards her on the part of the Elementals, especially shown by their bringing suffering and danger upon her at this period.— Still another class, recognizing marriage as a necessity for the continuance of the species, looked upon it with more favor, but maintained that the marriage of Adam and Eve did not take place until after they had been driven from Paradise. This doctrine was taught by Jerome. Marriage was pictured as a tribulation to man, and it was declared that God caused sleep to fall upon Adam at the creation of Eve in order to prevent his opposition. (*Life of Adam*, by Loredano, published at Amsterdam, 1696.) Marriage was treated as the consequence of the fall of Adam. Out of such views gradually grew the idea of celibacy, at first voluntarily practised by many priests. The synods at Nice (325), at Constantinople, at Ephesus, and at Chalcedonia forbade marriage to the ministers at the altar. The Council of Neo-Caesarea (between 314 and 325) decreed that a priest who married after ordination should be degraded to the lay state. That this ordinance opened the doors to almost unbelievable licentiousness on the part of the priests is too well

known to need special emphasis. Woman sank lower and lower in the estimation of man. She was a prolific subject of discussion, a large party classing her among brutes without soul or reason. As early as the sixth century a council at Macon (585), fifty-nine bishops taking part, devoted its time to a discussion of this question, "Does woman possess a soul?" Fortunately the decision allowed Christian women to remain human beings in the eyes of the clergy. Nearly a thousand years after this decision it was still contended that the women of newly discovered America belonged to the brute creation, possessing neither souls nor reason. (*Dictionnaire Feodal*, Paris, 1819.) Naturally ideas like this affected woman's position also in the Church. At an early date woman was forbidden to receive the Eucharist into her naked hand on account of her impurity (decree of the Council of Auxerre, 578) or to sing in church. To such an extent was this opposition carried that the Church of the Middle Ages did not hesitate to provide itself with the eunuchs in order to supply cathedral choirs with the necessary sopranos. One of the charges against the Huguenots was that they permitted the women to sing in church, using their voices in praise of God contrary to the express command of St. Paul, Catherine de Médiçi reproaching them for this great sin. The *History of Music* says that when part-singing was first introduced into the United States, great objection was made to the taking of the soprano or leading part by women, which, by virtue of his superiority, it was declared, belonged to man. Therefore woman was relegated to the bass or tenor. But nature proved too powerful, and man was eventually compelled to take bass or tenor as his part, while woman carried the soprano. — Even as late as 1661, during the reign of James I in England, the Chancellor of Norwich ordered that every woman who came to be churched (after childbirth) should be covered with a white veil. Interesting is St. Chrysostom's estimate of woman. He describes her as "necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic peril, a deadly fascination, and a painted ill."

Marquette. (Authorities: *Sketches of Feudalism*. "Articles on Relation of Sexes," *Westminster Review*. Dr. Tusler. *Feudal Dictionary*. H. S. Maine.) Grimm says: "The oldest-born of the peasant is accounted the son of his lord; for he, perchance, it was that begat him. When the guests have retired, the newly wedded husband shall permit his lord to enter the bed of his wife, unless he shall have redeemed her for five shillings and fourpence." Called also *jus primæ noctis*. Another authority, August Bebel (p. 159). Money paid to redeem wives known as the "maiden rent." In Scotland this ransom became known as Marquete from "demi-mare," called marquette. *Droit de jambage, i. e.*, leg-right. Priests practised it. — Witchcraft.

But interesting as such data may be to show us the degradation of women in Church and State in the dark ages of popery, they help us not at all in answering the statement that even in our day woman is deprived of her rights and privileges in the Church. The statement has been made, and will be made with more frequency and persistency in the future as the suffragette movement progresses. And the question as to what woman's status really is cannot be answered offhand without careful consideration of the Scripture-passages in question. Judging from the quite extensive literature in our circles, Synodical Reports, etc., and from the fact that in all this literature the question is never exhaustively treated, seems to indicate that it has been considered as definitely settled and, therefore, unworthy of discussion, or as too dangerous and full of controversial possibilities to tackle. Much to the sorrow of the essayist, the great stack of Synodical Reports failed to grant expected illumination. The hornet's nest has been carefully avoided.

What is and ever shall be, according to God's direction, the position of woman in the Church? We cannot escape the plain statements of St. Paul that she shall keep silence. The two passages which enjoin the silence of women are: 1 Cor. 14, 34—36: "Let your women keep silence in the churches,"

for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. What! came the Word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?" 1 Tim. 2, 11—15: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."

SOME VIEWS RESPECTING WOMAN'S SILENCE IN THE CHURCHES.

(1.) Elaborate attempts have been made to show that the word translated "to speak" in 1 Cor. 14 means, in that instance, simply *to babble*, and that the Apostle did not intend to forbid women's intelligent speech in promiscuous or mixed religious assemblies, but to forbid the disorderly and unprofitable speech of these Corinthian women and of others like them at that day. — In opposition to this we may say, 1. that the usual meaning of the word *lalein* is not *to babble*, but *to speak*. In this same epistle it is used when one speaks "the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 2, 7); the wisdom of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2, 13; 12, 3); while in another epistle it is used for the speaking of God (Heb. 1, 1. 2; 2, 3), and for that of angels (Heb. 2, 2). In the classics this word is sometimes used to express the inarticulate sounds of human beings, the natural cries of animals, and also their attempts to imitate speech. But Trench says that all those contemptuous uses of *lalein*, as to talk at random or to chatter, are foreign to the New Testament. Neither do we find in the lexicographers Robinson, Bloomfield, Losh, Grimm, Hartwig, Schirlitz, Wahl, and Wilke any recognition of this bad sense of the word when it is used in the New Testament.

(2.) This interpretation of the word *lalein* would indicate that the women at Corinth and those of Ephesus (where, it

appears, Timothy was when Paul addressed his first epistle to him) were incompetent or disinclined to say anything rational or of profit in religious assemblies. But the contrary seems to have been the case. Strabo speaks of the strong influence exerted by the women of Western Asia in forming the religious opinions of the men. In this same country was Ephesus, where Paul also enjoined "silence" upon women. Why should it be different across the Archipelago, in Corinth? Aristotle credits the Spartan women with great influence over the men. The noted Phoebe, "succorer of many," lived in Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, and must have had a leading influence over her Christian sisters in that city. Priscilla for a time worshiped with the church in Corinth, and also must have exerted a social power over its women. The good service which woman contributed toward the early progress of Christianity is abundantly known, both from the Acts and the epistles. It must be that there were women in the Corinthian church who were far above "babbling."

③ The Pauline direction is in some places general and not specific, applying to all women, and not only to those of Corinth and Ephesus (1 Tim. 2, 11. 12). It is not "your women," but "a woman," every woman, who is charged to learn in quietness. In 1 Cor. 14, 35 the direction is first to "the women," but afterward to "a woman." This change from the definite to the indefinite shows that the command was binding on women in general, and not merely on those of two or more particular cities.

④ The *reason* assigned by the Apostle for silence is applicable to *all* in Christian communities at that day, and not only to the women of Corinth and Ephesus. That reason is that there should be due honor to husbands and men. In 1 Cor. 14 the Apostle writes: "As also saith the Law." That Law is: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." (Gen. 3, 16.) In 1 Tim. 2 the Apostle makes specific reference to Adam's being first formed and not being first deceived, as the reason why authority was given to man. And

from this he infers the duty of silence on the part of *woman*. Hence to limit the injunction of silence to the women of Corinth and Ephesus must be wrong. The command was to *woman*, not to a class of women.

(5) In 1 Cor. 14, 27, 28 a *man* speaking in an unknown tongue is directed to "keep silence in the church" unless there be an interpreter present. Unintelligible address is forbidden in men, with the *implication* that they may speak in church if they have something to say that can be understood. But if "babbling" — senseless talk — were the only thing prohibited in women, why was there not the implication that they, too, might speak if they would utter sensible thoughts? Why was not exception made for such women as Priscilla, Phoebe, Lydia? They would have spoken better than some men. Such permission is not given, but silence is enjoined upon them on account of their *sex*.

1. Prof. Calvin E. Stowe, in his book *Hearth and Home* (Vol. 1, pp. 600, 601), has argued that the Apostle's injunction of silence was laid upon women in the churches of Greece and Asia Minor because of peculiar customs there requiring reticence and retirement, and that in Rome and other parts westward of Greece, more freedom being allowed to women, no such silence was enjoined. Such exception is not made or intimated in Scripture, and the natural inference is that it did not exist. At that time the condition of women was nearly the same in all pagan nations. Earlier it was better, especially in Rome, and women still had a few more *legal* rights there than in Greece. They could give evidence in courts of law and could accompany their husbands to public banquets. Prof. Stowe cites Cornelius Nepos (of precious memory to us) to show the superiority of the condition of Roman over that of Grecian women. But this author lived nearly a century earlier than the date of Paul's epistles; and all that he claims is that a Roman was not ashamed to take his wife to a feast, and that he allowed her to occupy the better part of the house, even in the presence of company, — *all* of which was more than

the Grecians did, and in *part* more than many Romans did when Paul gave his command. Becker (*Gallus*, p. 153) shows that Roman women were, in general, restrained by custom from exercising even their legal rights. And history shows that the silence made imperative on one side of the Adriatic was not changed to practical liberty of speech on the other. Besides, we have seen that Paul's direction to be silent was based on the difference between man and woman, and, therefore, must have been applicable in *all* churches.

2. Some, especially those who permit women preachers, advance the theory that the meetings where Paul enjoined silence upon women were merely of a business character. This seems clearly untenable. The passages show that they are religious meetings. In Paul's statement to the Corinthians the "Word of God," "psalm," "teaching," "revelation," and "interpretation" are under consideration. 1 Cor. 14, 24—36. In the case of the Ephesian church, "faith and love and sanctification with sobriety" are the theme. 1 Tim. 2, 15. These are not business concerns, but religious topics.

3. Some hold that the silence enjoined was to be observed only in synagogues or other church-buildings. But the "church," the *ekklesia*, means "assembly" of any religious kind, in any place, and does not mean the building where the assembly meets.

4. Another view is that the Apostle required only so much silence of women in the churches as was needful for good order and womanly "subjection." The passages are interpreted to mean that women should keep quiet and orderly as "under obedience." But against this stand positive injunctions: "Let the women keep silence in the churches"; "It is not permitted unto them to speak"; "Let them ask their husbands at home"; "It is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." Silence *itself* was requisite to good order and womanly subjection, except in special circumstances.

5. A certain woman writer of London, Mrs. Josephine Butler, claims that Paul's directions were "given for the correction of the conduct of silly and ignorant *Greek* women of

the day," and complains that that direction "men have elected to apply to all women in all times." The good woman seems to overlook the fact that when Timothy received Paul's direction, he was undoubtedly in Ephesus, an Asiatic, and not a Grecian city. Hence the command was for a wider class than merely "Greek women," and, as we have seen, was for women in general.

6. Others, again, contend that the requirement for silence was for women of Corinth only, where the "Christians were having a quarrel over the question of buying from heathen dealers the meat which had been used, but not injured, in idol worship." But the women of Ephesus, and all other women besides those of Corinth, were enjoined to be silent, and to be silent on *all* subjects, and not merely on that of meat offered to idols.

7. Bishop John H. Vincent of the Methodist Episcopal Church says: "Paul cannot mean to exclude woman from activity in Christian work. He does not say that she shall not, in the domestic meetings of the church, prayer-meetings, class-meetings, fellowship-meetings, and in the sanctuary of her own home, teach as did Lois and Eunice and Priscilla and other saints of the church. He is simply, in these letters, defining the character of the Christian ministry and laying down laws for its regulation, and he provides that women shall not be officially recognized, appointed, and installed as ministers." And yet Paul does not make any such distinction as to indicate that he speaks of the ministry. His direction is that women, *without exception*, refrain from speaking in the assembly of Christians. He was a bold enough man to say just what he meant, without taking any circuitous method to exclude women from the sacred calling. Hence, such exclusion was not his particular aim.

8. Some upholders of "higher criticism" say: "We must first get rid of the old idea of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, or take the Pauline idea that woman must keep silent in the churches." But for us, of course, the Bible stands as

unchangeable authority in this and all other matters. We cannot be justified in rejecting the divine Word on the ground that the spirit of the age demands it. Of course, the "higher critics" claim that Paul's *inspiration* was defective, and hence his mistake concerning woman's *silence*.

All things considered, there can be for us no doubt as to the positiveness, clearness, and generality of the apostolic injunction. The severity of it is explained when we consider the station of women and the customs concerning women at that time.

HEBREW WOMEN.

The condition of Hebrew women in the early Christian era was far better than in surrounding countries at that time (cf. Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, p. 3552) or than in the Orient now. Hebrew law gave them some advantages denied even by the European or American law (cf. Smith and Barnum, p. 1194). The former was founded on the Pentateuch, while the latter is partly based on Roman jurisprudence. But the general seclusion of woman from the other sex prevailed in all Eastern countries in the time of Christ and His apostles and during hundreds of years before. "It was the custom, prevalent from the earliest period of the East, to seclude women in apartments removed from those of the men." (Layard's *Nineveh*, Vol. 2, p. 193.) Among the Hebrews, women had their own apartments, especially when in captivity among the Persians, as is evident from the case of Esther (Esther 2, 8. 11). Daughters seldom left those apartments for secular purposes, except among the humbler classes, and then chiefly or wholly for drawing and bringing water or tending the flocks (John's *Archaeology*, p. 175; Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, Vol. 2, p. 966). Daughters who by their wealth were elevated to high stations in life spent nearly the whole time within the walls of their palaces (John's *Archaeology*). In Solomon's palace there was a woman's apartment, separate from the rest (1 Kings 7, 8). In journeys women had their separate tent (Gen. 31, 33). At the eastern gate of Solomon's temple virtuous men could take

their wives with them as they entered; but women were excluded from the two inner courts (Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book 12, chap. 2, sec. 5). In the same locality, in Herod's temple, was the inclosure known as the Court of Women, though not exclusively devoted to them (Kitto, vol. 2, p. 839). Worship in synagogues was practised at least five or six hundred years before Christ. In them each congregation was divided by a partition five or six feet high, the men being on one side and the women on the other. A speaker on either side of the partition could not be seen by the whole audience. To avoid confusion, he must go to the platform in full view of all, where for a woman to go, unless she were a prophetess, would have been very indecorous and immodest. These arrangements and customs of themselves nearly compelled the silence of ordinary women in the larger religious assemblies, especially in the synagogues, where the primitive Christians often met.

The head-dress of women also nearly compelled their silence in the larger assemblies. In two particulars women were to be scrupulously different from men—they were to wear long hair and not be shorn as men were (1 Cor. 11, 6. 15), and they were to be veiled in the religious assembly (1 Cor. 11, 5. 13). The word "uncovered" (A. V.) in 1 Cor. 11, 5. 13 is literally "unveiled" (R. V.). (Cf. Robinson's *Lexicon* on *akatakalyptos* and *katakalypto*. It is certain that the Apostle enjoined upon the Corinthian Christian women the wearing of the veil in the churches. It is equally certain that in their conception of their new liberty some at times wished to throw off the veil (1 Cor. 11, 5. 6. 13). That act was doubtless necessary for unimpeded speech to an assembly of considerable size, and was probably prompted by the *desire* to speak. The Hebrews used several kinds of veils, but all chiefly for covering the face. They had, besides, several kinds of mantles, or shawls, which could be drawn over the face at pleasure. Both shawls and veils were probably of so thick a material as to impede speech, except to those addressed near at hand. Thin veils would have been as indecorous as no veils. Not so very long

ago the authorities in Constantinople reprimanded certain Turkish women there for displacing thick veils with those of light gauze. One kind of veil covered the lower part of the face to the nose; another, called "muffler" in the English version, hung down from the eyes over the face; another covered the head and nearly the whole person; still another hung from the top of the head over the face and an equal distance down behind (John's *Archaeology*, pp. 141, 142). It was possible for a woman to be veiled and still have one or both eyes exposed, but not to have her mouth uncovered. All veiling was a hindrance to speech addressed to more than a few persons.

Besides, the veil was especially emblematic of that "authority" — "dominion" (R. V.) —, 1 Tim. 2, 12, given the man over the woman, which he was to exercise not more as her leader than as her protector (Thompson's *Land and Book*, Vol. 1, p. 35). Without the veil she dishonored her head (1 Cor. 11, 5), and her head was the man (1 Cor. 11, 3). The love enjoined on husbands for their wives (Eph. 5, 25; Col. 3, 19) would inspire them with the desire to "provide" for (1 Tim. 5, 8) and protect their "own."

Though women in the synagogues were excluded by a partition from the sight of men in the audience, they were in full view of those that conducted the services (Smith's *D. of B.*, Art. "Philo," p. 3135; Kitto, Vol. 2, p. 806). With their customs both modesty and "reverence" (Eph. 5, 33) for men required the women to wear veils in the presence of synagog officials; there was the public sentiment that they should have on their heads the token of "power" (1 Cor. 11, 10), authority, which, doubtless, was the veil. The leaders of the services, unaccustomed to look upon the countenance of women beyond their own homes, would be in danger of embarrassment or diversion if a company of them sat unveiled in the assembly. The requirement of female modesty and "reverence" probably explains the text: "For this cause ought the woman to have power" — a sign of authority, R. V. — "on her head, because of the angels." (Bengel's view, that, as angels are to God,

so in a far lower sense woman is to man; and as angels veil their faces before God, so woman ought before man.) Even now in Oriental lands, as Dr. Thompson says (*Land and Book*), the missionary is generally obliged, for the sake of the native preacher and of the people, to have women veiled and seated behind screens, separate from men. Among the early Hebrew Christians, therefore, in their state of society, the silence of women in the larger assemblies naturally followed: But the churches of Corinth and Ephesus, though composed, in part, of Hebrew members, were in Grecian society.

Jersey City, N. J.

PAUL LINDEMANN.

(To be concluded.) P 103
