

WOMEN IN MINISTRY

Compilation of articles

10 Lies the Church Tells Women

Lee Grady

Ten Lies The Church Tells Women

FOR CENTURIES, A PATRIARCHAL SYSTEM OF CONTROL HAS KEPT WOMEN IN SPIRITUAL CAPTIVITY THROUGH DISTORTION OF THE SCRIPTURES. IT'S TIME TO DEBUNK THE MYTHS.

By J. Lee Grady

We live in the 21st century, but if we're honest we have to admit that in some ways the church is still in the Dark Ages--especially when we look at the way we treat women.

Even though the Scriptures never portray women as secondary to men, our male-dominated religious system still promotes a warped view of female inferiority. Women are tired of this, and as a man, so am I--because such demeaning attitudes don't reflect God's heart.

Jesus challenged gender prejudice at its core when He directed so much of His ministry toward women. In a Middle Eastern culture that considered women mere property, He healed women, disciplined them and commissioned them to minister. Yet today we spend much of our energy denying them opportunities--and using the Bible to defend our prohibitions.

I've identified 10 erroneous views about women that for too long have been circulated in the church, preached from pulpits and written in the study notes of popular Bible translations. I believe we must debunk these lies if we want to see the church fully released to fulfill the Great Commission.

LIE #1. GOD'S ULTIMATE PLAN FOR WOMEN IS THAT THEY SERVE THEIR HUSBANDS.

How sad that so many Christian men view women from a selfish perspective. This view is often promoted by misreading the account of Eve's creation in Genesis 2:18-25, in which Adam is provided a "helpmate." The Hebrew word used here often is translated "companion," denoting intimacy and partnership. But through the centuries it has been used to imply that Eve was some type of domestic appendage.

We men have assumed that God gave Eve to fulfill Adam's sexual needs as well as to serve as his cook, laundress and maid. But the Genesis account does not say this.

After Eve's creation, God did not tell her: "You are Adam's helper; I command you to serve him well." She was not created for servitude; she was fashioned to be a co-laborer with Adam so that they might rule together over creation as God commissioned them to do (see Gen. 1:28).

LIE #2. WOMEN CAN'T BE FULFILLED OR SPIRITUALLY EFFECTIVE WITHOUT A HUSBAND.

From the time she was released from a German death camp in 1944 until her death in 1983, Corrie Ten Boom taught the world about a Savior who could forgive the cruelest Nazi. Yet she never married. Did the fact that she did not have a husband make her less "complete"? Some Christians would say yes.

We have spent so much energy defending the concept of the biblical family that we are guilty of idolizing it. We've preached that a woman's primary responsibility is to find a godly husband, have lots of babies and stay home to raise them for Christ.

But marital status is not a qualifier for ministry. The Bible does not even state whether certain key followers of Jesus, such as the 12 disciples, were married or not.

The highest calling of all believers--married or unmarried--is to develop a relationship with Jesus. Any other earthly relationship is secondary, and Christ Himself warned us never to allow people we love to become idols that distract us from Him.

LIE #3. WOMEN SHOULDN'T WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME.

Many evangelical churches have preached that women who work outside the home are breaking a scriptural commandment, but this conclusion can be reached only by distorting the biblical record. The woman described in Proverbs 31 is often used to bolster a traditional view of the June Cleaver-style matron who spends her day baking casseroles while her husband is at the office. But a careful reading reveals that the Proverbs 31 woman, in her ancient Middle Eastern context, functioned as a real estate agent and ran a textile business.

Titus 2:5 instructs women to "take care of their homes" (New Living Translation). But most scholars would agree that this passage simply exhorts married women not to forsake their children.

It is true that, because of ambition or materialism, some Christian women neglect their children even though the Holy Spirit has urged them to put their career objectives on hold. But rather than placing a legalistic burden on women by telling them that having a career is ungodly, we should tell both men and women to submit their career plans to the Holy Spirit's direction.

LIE #4. WOMEN MUST OBEDIENTLY SUBMIT TO THEIR HUSBANDS IN ALL SITUATIONS.

A distraught Christian woman who was regularly beaten by her husband finally gained the courage to seek counsel from her pastor. After she told him about her husband's

fits of rage, the pastor responded, "If your husband kills you, it will be to the glory of God."

The pastor reached this irresponsible conclusion because of a distorted view of "male headship." We often portray marriage as a hierarchy, with husbands on the throne and wives at the footstool, and we use Scripture to justify this view: "Wives...submit to your husbands as you do to the Lord" (Eph. 5:22).

We assume this verse means women have no say in family matters or that their opinion is second-rate. In extreme cases, women have been told to submit to abuse in order to honor male headship. But this is not a Christian view.

Paul also told the Ephesians, "submit to one another" (5:21, emphasis added). I have heard teachings by male clergy on the subject of male headship, but I've never heard a pastor encourage men to submit to their wives! Yet in a loving marriage, a man and woman will defer to one another as they make decisions.

In my 16 years of marriage, my wife and I have had plenty of disagreements. But when we reach an impasse, I don't announce, "I am the head of this house, so what I say goes." Rather, Deborah and I either agree to pray about the matter, or we choose to defer to one another.

The point is never who is in charge. I view my wife as an equal. I am not "over her." We function as one.

LIE #5. A MAN NEEDS TO "COVER" A WOMAN IN HER MINISTRY ACTIVITIES.

This idea came from a distorted interpretation of the apostle Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 11:3, "the head of woman is man" (NKJV). People have used these words to bolster the idea that women are subservient to men or that they cannot approach God without a male authority figure in their lives.

Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 11 about head coverings is a difficult passage, and Bible scholars don't agree on its meaning. However, most teach that Paul is addressing specific cultural concerns in first-century Corinth and that he is calling for propriety and order in a society where immorality and paganism had blurred gender distinctions.

Paul was not placing men in a position of generic rulership over women. Because there is "no male or female in Christ" (see Gal. 3:28), women can pray, worship, study the Bible or minister without a man present. How silly to think that a man, because of his gender, could add credibility to prayer or Spirit-empowered ministry! To believe this would be to trust in the flesh.

LIE #6. A WOMAN SHOULD VIEW HER HUSBAND AS THE "PRIEST OF THE HOME."

Search your concordance. Scripture never describes men as "priests of the home." This man-made concept was popularized in evangelical churches in the last century. We

have one priest, Jesus Christ, whose blood atoned for our sins. It is a mockery of the gospel to suggest that any human being needs an additional priest apart from the Son of God.

The Bible says all believers are priests (see 1 Pet. 2:9, Rev. 1:6); there is no gender restriction. Husbands function as priests when they pray for their families or when they minister the Word of God to them, and wives also function in this role.

My experience in marriage has been that God speaks both to me and to my wife. He doesn't say to me, "Since you are the head of this house, I'll tell you my plans for your family, and you can tell the others what I said." Often God has revealed His plans to my wife before I heard anything!

Christian men need to stop being defensive and recognize that God has called us to function in unity with our wives. We need to listen to their counsel, consider their opinions, and pray together for the mind of the Lord rather than putting our foot down and shouting, "I am the leader of this family, and what I say goes!"

LIE #7. WOMEN ARE NOT EQUIPPED TO ASSUME LEADERSHIP ROLES.

The most common mistake we make in biblical interpretation occurs when we take one isolated verse and build a doctrine around it--even if the verse seems to contradict other passages. This is often what we do with 1 Tim. 2:12, "I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man" (NASB).

Most theologians believe that this passage was addressing an isolated situation in Ephesus. They came to this conclusion after studying the myriad of references in the Bible to women in spiritual authority. The Old Testament records that Deborah was a judge over Israel--and God blessed her leadership in battle (see Judg. 4-5). Other women who held authority over men include Miriam, Huldah and Noadiah.

Jesus issued His first gospel commission to women (see Matt. 28:1-10), and both men and women were empowered to preach on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). Priscilla, Chloe and Phoebe were leaders in the early church, and one woman, Junia, is called an apostle by Paul (Rom. 16:7).

The promise of the prophet Joel was that "sons and daughters" would prophesy after the Holy Spirit was given to the church (Joel 2:28, emphasis added). Yet we have taken one misunderstood verse from Paul's writings and used it to negate hundreds of other passages that support the full release of women into ministry.

LIE #8: WOMEN MUST NOT TEACH OR PREACH TO MEN IN A CHURCH SETTING.

Since 1 Timothy 2:12 obviously contradicts the overall biblical endorsement of women in authority, how are we to understand it? What is Paul actually saying in this passage?

In their book *I Suffer Not a Woman*, Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger explain that certain cultic worship practices involving female priestesses of Diana had invaded the first-century church. These priestesses promoted blasphemous ideas about sex and spirituality, and they sometimes performed rituals in which they pronounced curses on men and declared female superiority.

What Paul was most likely saying to the Ephesians was this: "I do not allow a woman to teach these cultic heresies, nor do I allow them to usurp authority from men by performing pagan rituals." He was not saying, as some Christians have assumed, "I do not allow godly Christian women to teach the Bible." In his day, Paul would have been thrilled to have had more skilled women who could teach the truth!

LIE #9. WOMEN ARE MORE EASILY DECEIVED THAN MEN.

This idea has been taught by twisting the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:14, which says, "It was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into transgression" (NLT). Some have suggested that because Eve was tricked by the devil, women have a stronger propensity toward deception. Others have gone so far as to insist that women are to blame for all the evil in the world and are therefore under a greater curse than men.

No respectable Bible scholar in the church today would promote such a view. The Bible clearly states that Adam and Eve were both held guilty by God for their disobedience, and they were both punished. In 1 Timothy, Paul cited the creation account not to place extra blame on Eve but to refute a bizarre teaching that was circulating in Asia Minor.

In the first century, Gnostic heretics were mixing Christianity with paganism. One of their teachings stated that Eve actually liberated the world when she disobeyed God and gained secret knowledge from the devil.

Paul was not teaching that women are more prone to deception. He was explaining that what Eve did was not right, and that the Christian view of the creation was that Adam and Eve sinned when they listened to the serpent.

Women are certainly capable of spreading deception because they have a fallen nature as men do, but there is no evidence that they have greater gullibility. That view is rooted in demeaning stereotypes and prejudice.

LIE #10: WOMEN WHO EXHIBIT STRONG LEADERSHIP QUALITIES HAVE A "SPIRIT OF JEZEBEL."

Once I was listening to Bible teacher Cindy Jacobs speak at a prayer conference in Colorado. When she approached the pulpit, two men who were sitting in front of me turned to each other and began to pray softly.

"Lord, we bind the power of the devil from bewitching this audience," one man said, adding, "We bind the power of Jezebel in the name of Jesus." These men believed

that the crowd would automatically come under a spirit of deception when Jacobs taught them--simply because she was a woman.

How absurd! Was Barak "deceived" when he took orders from Deborah? (See Judg. 4:14.) Did baby Jesus come under a harmful influence when Anna prophesied over Him? (See Luke 2:36-38.) Was Apollos spiritually emasculated when he submitted to the teaching of Priscilla? (See Acts 18:26.) Of course not!

To associate godly women with Jezebel, a wicked Old Testament despot, is unfair and offensive, yet men in the church today often pin Jezebel's label on strong, anointed women because they feel threatened by them.

Let's stop the insults. If a woman is using manipulation to usurp authority or if she is spreading heresies, then she certainly deserves the Jezebel label--as do men who do such things. But women who walk in spiritual integrity and preach the Word of God with power deserve our respect.

J. Lee Grady, editor of Charisma magazine, has enlarged on this topic in his book, *Ten Lies the Church Tells Women*, to order click here <http://www.spiritedwoman.com/10lies.html> It is excellent!

A BRIEF HISTORY OF SOME WOMEN IN MINISTRY

By Richard M. Riss

During the first century, many women were active in Christian ministry. Acts 21:9 mentions the four virgin daughters of Philip the evangelist as prophetesses who lived in his home at Caesarea, where Paul and his associates visited during his third missionary journey. Priscilla, or Prisca, and her husband Aquilla, were known as fellow-laborers in Christ with the apostle Paul. Their expertise as teachers enabled them to explain the way of God more accurately to Apollos of Alexandria, another important leader of the early church (Acts 18:25-26).

Another associate of Paul's, Lydia, a seller of purple dye, opened her home for ministry (Acts 16:40), as did many other Christian women in the Roman empire, including the "elect lady" to whom John addressed his second epistle. Close examination of II John would suggest that she was functioning in a pastoral capacity, as would also have been the case for Lydia (Acts 16:40), Nympha (Col. 4:15), and Chloe (I Cor. 1:11). Phoebe was a leader of the Church at Cencrea. In Romans 16:1,2, Paul commanded the members of the church at Rome to receive her as such, and to help her in whatever manner she requested. Paul also mentions that Andronicus and Junia were outstanding among the apostles (Romans 16:7), and there is little doubt that Junia was a feminine name. Both John Chrysostom and Jerome made reference to her as a woman apostle, and no commentator referred to her as a man until the late thirteenth century.

In the early fourth century, Catherine of Alexandria defended the faith at Alexandria before philosophers and courtiers, before she was tortured to death by Maxentius, the son of the Roman Emperor Maximian. At about the same time, Dorothy of Caesarea in Cappadocia was martyred (A.D. 313). As she was being led to her execution, Theophilus, a lawyer, taunted her, asking her for a basket of flowers and fruit. Soon afterward, a child came to her with a basket laden with roses and apples. She sent this to Theophilus, who as a result of this incident became a Christian and later gave his own life as a Martyr.

Macrina the Younger (328-380) was founder of a religious community for women in the eastern church. With her brothers, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa, she was a pioneer in the monastic life. She healed, prophesied, and actively spread the faith. John Chrysostom wrote of her that "she was a great organizer, and independent thinker, and as well educated as Basil himself." After the death of her mother, she reared and educated her younger brother Peter, who became Bishop of Sebaste.

Marcella (325-410) was an important teacher in the early church who was highly esteemed by Jerome. She was in the front lines in interacting with heretics and bringing them to a better understanding of Christian truth. Her palace on the Aventine Hill became a center of Christian influence. At one point, when a dispute arose in Rome concerning the meaning of the Scriptures, Jerome asked Marcella to settle it. Her Church of the Household was not only a house of study and prayer, but a center for deeds of Christian charity and sacrifice. It was here that another woman, Fabiola, received inspiration to establish the first hospitals in Rome. Marcella later established on the outskirts of Rome the first religious retreat for women. It was also at Marcella's Church of the Household that Paula (347-404) and her daughter Eustochium first made their decision to assist Jerome in his Latin translation of the Bible. They went to Bethlehem in order to aid him in this work, revising and correcting his translations and making new Latin translations from the Hebrew and Greek texts. In turn, Jerome dedicated some of his books to them. Paula founded three convents and a monastery in Bethlehem, where Biblical manuscripts were copied. This became a model for what soon became the universal practice at monasteries for many centuries.

Genevieve (422-500) lived in Paris when Attila and his Huns invaded France in 451. She assured the inhabitants of Paris that God would protect them if they would pray. While the men prepared for battle, she persuaded the women to pray for hours in the church. Then, after Attila destroyed Orleans, he decided not to touch Paris. At a later time, she was said to have averted a famine in Paris and the surrounding cities by distributing miraculous gifts of bread.

Bridget, also known as Bride (455-523), inspired the convent system that made an indelible impact upon life in Ireland. After settling in Kildare, she built for herself and her female friends a house for refuge and devotion. As other houses were

founded through her missionary efforts, she became known as the "mother abess" of all of Ireland.

Theodora I (500-548), wife of the emperor Justinian, was an important and influential Christian. A woman of outstanding intellect and learning, she was a moral reformer. Justinian, as Christian Emperor, was, for all practical purposes, head of the Church of his generation, and his wife, as Empress, shared his power to select church leaders. The inscription "Theodora Episcopa" or "Theodora, Bishop (fem.)" in a mosaic at the Basilica of Sts. Prudentia and Praeexedis in Rome, may have been a reference to the Empress.

Hilda (614-680) was appointed by Aidan as abess of the convent at Hartlepool in County Durham in 649. Ten years later, she founded a double monastery for men and women at Whitby in Yorkshire, which became world famous as a school of theology and literature. Five of her disciples became bishops and a sixth, Caedmon, became the earliest known English poet.

Hildegard of Bingen (1098-1179) was a German abbess, mystic, and writer known throughout all of Europe. Skilled in subjects as diverse as theology, medicine and politics, she did not hesitate to rebuke the sins of the greatest men of her time in both Church and state. She exerted a wide influence among many people, including the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and various kings, prelates, and saints. Many miracles were attributed to her during her lifetime.

Clare (1193-1253) was co-founder, with Francis of Assisi, of the Poor Clares, a mendicant order which spread rapidly through Italy and into France, Germany, and Spain. In 1249, when she was lame, her convent was attacked by a group of Saracens. She told the sisters to carry her to the door of the monastery, then addressed the Saracens and prayed aloud that God would "deliver the defenseless children whom I have nourished with Thy love." She heard a voice answer "I will always have them in my keeping," and turning to the sisters, she said, "Fear not." At this moment, the Saracens scrambled down the walls of the cloister, recoiling from her valiant words. Clare's care for the poor was a tremendous inspiration to Elizabeth of Hungary (1207-1231), a princess who, in the last years of her short life, led a life of rigorous self-sacrifice and service to the poor and sick.

Some other significant women of the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries included Hechthild of Magdeburg, Gertrude the Great, Angela of Foligno, Bridget of Sweden, Catherine of Sienna, Catherine of Sweden, Margery Kempe, Julian of Norwich, Joan of Arc, Catherine of Genoa, Isabella of Castile, and Maragaret Beaufort.

During the Reformation, a member of the Bavarian nobility, Argula von Grumbach (1492-1563), challenged the Rector and all of the faculty of the University of Ingolstadt to a debate in which she would defend the principles of the Protestant Reformation. She offered to base this debate upon a translation of the Bible published prior to the outbreak of the Reformation. She was permitted to present her position

in 1523 in Nuremberg before the diet of the Empire. Martin Luther wrote of her, "that most noble woman, Argula von Stauffer, is there making a valiant fight with great spirit, boldness of speech and knowledge of Christ." Her extensive education and fine critical abilities enabled her to become a force to be reckoned with. She conducted church meetings in her home and officiated at funerals.

Two other important leaders of the Protestant Reformation were Margaret of Navarre (1492-1549) and her daughter, Jeanne d'Albret (1528-1572), the grandmother and mother of King Henry IV of France, who issued the Edict of Nantes, granting religious toleration to the French Protestants for almost a century. Jeanne d'Albret held services of the new Reformed faith in her palace apartment. A friend of John Calvin, she also used her palace as an institute for Reformation study.

During the Puritan era, Anne Hutchinson (1591-1643), became influential in that as many as eighty overflowed to the doorsteps of her house, at a time when Boston had a population of roughly 1,000 people. These meetings grew rapidly, and soon men, also, began to attend. Among her loyal followers was Henry Vane, who served for a short time as governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Within two years of her arrival from England, she had the strongest consistency of any leader in the entire colony. Her large following, coupled with her strong exegetical and homiletical skills, deep Christian commitment and insightful understanding of spiritual truths, may have incurred the jealousy of several New England ministers, who became uncomfortable enough with her successes that she was accused of heresy and banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1638.

Margaret Fell (1614-1702), the mother of Quakerism, was an English peeress and wife of Judge Thomas Fell, member of the Long Parliament and Vice-Chancellor of Lancaster. Her home became a place of refuge and renewal for the persecuted Quakers for almost fifty years. She was arrested for holding Quaker meetings in her home, Swarthmoor Hall, and imprisoned for four years. After her release from prison, she visited Quakers in jails and travelled on horseback with her daughters and servants to remote farms and villages as an itinerant preacher. Many people sought wisdom and advice from her, including Thomas Salthouse, and, of course, George Fox, who married her a number of years after the death of her husband. Because she had his blessing in her preaching ministry, she wrote many tracts and letters on the subject of women in ministry.

Madame Guyon (1648-1717) was a French mystic who was imprisoned on several occasions for long periods of time because of her beliefs, but she was never known to complain about this. An author of forty books, including a twenty-volume commentary of the Bible, she had a wide following, particularly in France and Switzerland. Among those profoundly influenced by her ministry was Archbishop Francois Fenelon.

The founder of the first Methodist congregation in America was Barbara Heck (1734-1804). In England, Lady Selina Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon (1707-1791), founder of the Calvinistic Methodist denomination during the Evangelical Awakening,

functioned as a bishop by virtue of her right as a peeress to appoint Anglican clergymen as household chaplains and assign their duties, and to purchase presentation rights to chapels, enabling her to decide who would conduct services and preach. Among the many chaplains whom she appointed and continued to finance for many decades was George Whitefield. In 1779, after sixty chapels were already functioning under her auspices, this practice was disallowed by a consistory court of London. Therefore, in order to continue to function, she was able, under the Toleration Act, to register her chapels as dissenting places of worship, known as "The Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion." Lady Selina frequently invited members of the aristocracy to her home to hear the preaching of the Wesleys, Whitefield, Isaac Watts, Philip Doddridge, Benjamin Ingham, John Fletcher, John Berridge, William Romaine, Henry Venn, and others. She founded Trevecca House on property adjoining the home of Howel Harris. A seminary for the training of ministers for all denominations, its first president was John Fletcher. Joseph Benson eventually became headmaster on John Wesley's recommendation. George Whitefield preached the inaugural sermon when it opened in 1768.

In America, two important preachers during the first years of the Second Awakening (1800-1808) were Deborah Peirce of Paris, N.Y. and Martha Howell of Utica. Phoebe Palmer (1807-1874), "The Mother of the Holiness Movement" began her ministry in 1835 with her Tuesday Meetings for the Promotion of Holiness, which continued for 39 years in New York City, where she lived with her husband, who was a physician. Hundreds of Methodist preachers, including at least five bishops, were profoundly affected by her ministry. The success of Phoebe Palmer's informal meetings encouraged other women to conduct the same type of ministry, and dozens of them sprang up throughout North America. These meetings brought together Christians of many denominations under the leadership of women, particularly among Methodists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Baptists, and Quakers.

In 1858, Walter Palmer, Phoebe's husband, purchased the periodical *GUIDE TO HOLINESS*, which under her able editorship, grew in circulation from 13,000 to 30,000 subscribers. She travelled widely with her husband, conducting evangelistic meetings during the summer months. In the fall of 1857, she and her husband travelled to Hamilton, Ontario, where they attracted crowds of several thousand people when an afternoon prayer meeting became a ten-day revival meeting during which four hundred people were converted to Christ. They experienced similar successes in New York City and in England, where they preached for four years to packed houses at Leeds, Sheffield, Manchester, Birmingham, and dozens of other places. It is estimated that within her lifetime, Phoebe Palmer brought over 25,000 people to faith in Christ.

Catherine Booth (1829-1890), with her husband, William Booth, founded the Christian Revival Association in 1865 and the Salvation Army in 1878. The Booths regarded the active participation of women to be vital to Christianity. Before 1865, when they were still Methodists, Catherine began preaching. Soon after her pulpit debut, her husband became ill, and his slow recovery paved the way for her own preaching ministry. For a

time, he was so ill that she had to take over his entire preaching circuit. She eventually became one of the most famous female preachers of England, and her last sermon was delivered to an audience of 50,000 people.

Hannah Whitall Smith, author of *THE CHRISTIAN'S SECRET OF A HAPPY LIFE* (1875) catalyzed the development of the Holiness movement in Britain and throughout Europe. Her activities in England led to the Keswick Convention in 1874.

Carrie Judd Montgomery was a healing evangelist of considerable prominence beginning in 1879, and became a founding member, along with A. B. Simpson, of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in 1887. She later became a part of the Pentecostal revival and was ordained a minister by the Assemblies of God in 1917, continuing in ministry until 1946.

Maria B. Woodworth-Etter was also involved in the Holiness movement before she rose to prominence as an early Pentecostal leader. In 1884, she was licensed to preach by the Churches of God general conference, founded by John Winebrenner in 1825.

Within a few months of this time her meetings were already beginning to receive national press coverage, and in the late 1880s she started twelve churches, added 1,000 members, erected six church buildings, and started several Sunday Schools. Her work at this time resulted in the licensing of twelve preachers. The revivals that she held at this time were accompanied with unusual manifestations of God's power, many healings, and mass conversions. During the early Pentecostal movement, Woodworth-Etter was in continual demand, becoming a featured speaker at the Worldwide Pentecostal Camp Meeting at Arroyo Seco, California, in April 1913. She founded the Woodworth-Etter Tabernacle in western Indianapolis in 1918, which she pastored until her death in 1924.

Beginning in 1906 and 1907, Florence L. Crawford, Mabel Smith, Ivey Campbell, and Rachel A. Sizelove were some of the first women to spread the blessings of the early Pentecostal revival through their separate itinerant ministries. Florence Crawford planted and pastored several churches in the Pacific Northwest, founding and becoming general overseer of the Apostolic Faith Church based in Portland, Oregon, which later became part of the Open Bible Standard Denomination.

Other pioneers of the Pentecostal movement in the U.S. included Mrs. Scott Ladd, who opened a Pentecostal mission in Des Moines in 1907, the Duncan sisters, who had opened the Rochester Bible Training School at Elim Faith Home, "Mother" Barnes of St. Louis, Missouri, who, with her son-in-law, B. F. Lawrence, held tent meetings in southern Illinois in the spring of 1908, and Marie Burgess, who preached in Chicago, Toledo, Detroit, and New York City, where she founded Glad Tidings Hall, which soon became an important center for the spread of the Pentecostal revival. Another early Pentecostal pioneer in New York was Miss Maud Williams (Haycroft).

In Canada, some early pioneers of the Pentecostal movement included Ellen Hebden in Toronto, Ella M. Goff in Winnipeg, Alice B. Garrigus in Newfoundland, the Davis

sisters in the Maritime provinces, Mrs. C. E. Baker in Montreal, and Zelma Argue throughout all of the Canadian provinces. Aimee Semple McPherson of Ingersoll, Ontario, began a preaching ministry in 1915 which began in Toronto and took her along the U.S. Eastern Seaboard, and across the United States in 1918. She eventually founded Angelus Temple in 1923, where she continued as senior pastor until her death in 1944.

Kathryn Kuhlman's ministry began in the summer of 1923. After her ordination by the Evangelical Church Alliance in Joliet, Illinois, she established the Denver Revival Tabernacle in 1935, which she pastored for three years. In the mid-1940s, she went to Franklin, Pennsylvania, where she began to thrive as a preacher and radio evangelist. Many people were healed at her meetings beginning in 1947, and she gained a reputation as one of the world's outstanding healing evangelists, carrying on as a leading figure during the charismatic movement until her death in 1976.

A few of the women working as Pentecostal pastors during the charismatic movement of the 1960s and 1970s included Charlotte Baker, Myrtle D. Beall, Helen Beard, Aimee Cortese, Sue Curran, B. Maureen Gaglardi, Anne Giminez, Ione Glaeser, Hattie Hammond, Alpha A. Henson, Marilyn Hickey, Violet Kitely, Janet Kreis, Freda Lindsay, Fuchsia T. Pickett, Iverna Tompkins, and Rachel Titus. A sampling of a few of the other women who were vital during the time of the charismatic movement as speakers, authors, or evangelists, would include Eleanor and Roberta Armstrong, Rita Bennett, Edith Blumhofer, Hazel Bonawitz, Roxanne Brant, Mary Ann Brown, Shirley Carpenter, Jean Darnall, Josephine Massynberde Ford, Katie Fortune, Shirlee Green, Nina Harris, Sue Malachuk, Daisy Osborn, Dorothy Ranaghan, Agnes Sanford, Gwen Shaw, Bernice Smith, Ruth Carter Stapleton, Jean Stone, Joni Eareckson Tada, and Corrie Ten Boom.

Women in Ministry ?

Vera Csada

csada.dv@accesscomm.ca

Oct 1, 2004

Every time I read about the debate of whether women should be in the same ministries as men, I have an urge in me to write about what I have been thinking about in this area of spiritual and scriptural thought.

I know with real assurance that men would benefit greatly if they would only set some of the women in a position where they could be heard... Where their teachings could be esteemed as just as valuable as those of a man's. Women are not called into the ministry of Christ to 'show men up' or to 'put them down', but have a calling to unite the body of Christ. I believe that until the men in the church have a correct relationship with the women in the church, spiritual unity of mind, and unity of purpose, will not be as it should be.

Here are some thoughts to consider: - It is true that there are far more passages of the bible that don't limit women within the church, and these greatly out-number the

few that do. All that is written in the bible is not written for the exclusion of women.
It is written for all of us.

- There is nothing that Jesus ever said or did that would suggest that women should not speak or teach in the church, or fulfill fully their ministry gifts wherever, or however, the Lord may lead them.

I have heard the argument that Jesus never picked any women for disciples, and when He sent them out two by two that they were men. My thought is... That was then, and now, is now... And also that the Father, Jesus, and the workings of His Spirit are never confined, and cannot be confined, to what He did then, in the past. The scribes and Pharisees tried to confine Jesus into how they viewed the scriptures to be written. Could we possibly be hindering the Holy Spirit from bringing about some very good things forth from God by disregarding, or degrading, the ministry of women?

The chief priests, and scribes of the temple at Jerusalem had totally convinced themselves that they were following the scriptures in a very truthful and diligent fashion, but refused to accept what the truth really was. Jesus was the truth. Why did they do this? Was it because they had within them a spirit of fear? It seems that they did not know the 'God of Love', but only the 'God of Control'. - Jesus, our Lord, may have been the only one who knew that the bible was going to be written and preserved till the end of time. Paul (and many of the others who contributed the New Testament may not have had any clue to this fact at all).

- Also, neither Peter, nor Paul, should be considered as completely flawless, or as ones of pure 100% perfection when it comes to every little aspect of their lives, and ministries. Remember that they were just humans, like us, picked for a special time, and a special job, (also just like us). One pastor told me that he was taught in bible school that a preacher should never preach out of the four gospels alone, without it being backed up by scriptures from other places. I was totally amazed at this reversed sense of direction, as clearly the ministry of Jesus should be our first standard of reference.

- Concerning the scripture of how women are not to speak in church but only to ask their husbands at home, I have not been able to find any written proof of my belief that the female children in that day did not have to be very learned in the scriptures as the boys were all required to be. I believe that they were much more required to learn homemaking skills such as cooking, cleaning, and looking after the little ones, rather than the book of the law and all of the scriptures.

It makes sense then that the women should not speak up in the churches if they don't know the basics of the scriptural things that the men were talking about. It makes sense then that they should not interrupt the men who are discussing them, but rather they should wait until they get home and then ask their husbands.

In today's world there are many women who are very studied in the word, and gifted in the Spirit. The reason I think that this is so is because they have often been more

free than many men in these days that we live in. Many men must work a full time job to keep a supply coming in for their families to survive. They are not as free as the husbands of old who looked after the animals with their servants, while the women did all of the work in the home. (Consider the work of the Proverbs 31 woman, while her man sat in the gate with the other men and tried to keep all things in the state of peace and security). She was one busy lady!

- Now on the subject of authority, I believe that the husband has the final say and is the protector, and leader, whether visibly so, or not. He may let his wife take control as he watches, and takes over only when he sees a necessity to do so. He trusts her. because he has learned and knows, that she does only those things that are good for all, including himself.

The husband has natural tendencies that are strong towards protection, and also provision as well, ...and doesn't have to be taken away from this job at any time while the wife often has her mind and body taken captive because of pregnancy, birth, and the nurture of helpless little ones. It makes sense then that he has the final say as to the good of his household, so that they are cared for, and protected. Even though he may work hard to be a supplier he still can usually free himself in an emergency, when his wife and children may need him in some way.

We must all see that spiritual authority belongs to the Lord. The wife (and perhaps women) were made subservient to their husbands (and perhaps men) only after the sin of Adam and Eve. Before this they were both given the same command: to subdue the earth, and to have dominion over it. They were to work together as one.

Discernment and desire for all the precious things of God should include recognizing the authority of the Holy Spirit. If we can be more serious about a word of God coming through a man and much less serious about a word of God coming through a woman, ...then we must see that we may have a prejudice, and a partiality within us and that is not good! We need to discern the prophecy, or the teaching, etc. ...rather than the outward appearance of the person. The problem here perhaps is recognizing what truly is being governed by the authority of the Holy Spirit, and what is not.

- Women have been told and taught submissiveness, and this is good, because this helps us when it comes to being submissive to the Holy Spirit as well. Many men need to learn more about how to submit to the workings of the Holy Spirit, ...and this of course, includes knowing when to be submissive when the Holy Spirit is working through a woman.

- In the story of Adam and Eve when they had sinned, and went astray, you can see that it was the woman that pointed out the way. She said to her man, "Look and taste!" This he did. Now, since this time, we are always looking at women as the ones that will lead everyone, including men, astray! I believe that if many people would look at their marriages, they would see that the wife has often gently redirected their husbands back to a proper focus in times when they have needed it, rather than the

other way around! I believe that godly women are very good at seeing when men have lost the proper focus, and when there is a need to be brought back into it, for the good of all.

It has been scientifically studied and found that while men are more target orientated than women it is the woman that can more easily see how all the ingredients must work together to make one cake, or pie, etc. So, I believe that true spiritual unity within the body of Christ will only happen when women are given their rightful place, and the focus shifts from the 'who's who' to an overall picture of the whole body working mightily together.

I believe that women are more likely to be concerned with lifting up others, rather than entering into some kind of competition, or heirarchy, or having the need to be 'the one in control'. They are more likely to see everyone as thirsty, or hungry, and have a strong desire to give them what they need in order for them to grow spiritually. Right now the church is generally seen as uncaring and unloving, and only concerned with it's own preservation. This needs to change, and it will take the ministry of women to birth out a new perspective in this area.

Another thought about Eve: Even though she was a woman, she was a woman that didn't have a mother, and also at the time of her sin, didn't have any children either. I add these two things on here just to spark your thinking about the whole situation that existed at the time of her sin. She may have had no real perspective of 'family', at the time of her sin.

So, while women are often looked at only as objects of sin, (or pleasure, and possession), we may be overlooking some of the great spiritual blessings that we could be receiving if we changed our thinking about it.

I believe that the men that God will choose to be the end-time leaders will have their lives in order and this will include having a right relationship with women. Pure and undefiled religion for a man is to remain unspotted by all fleshly thoughts and desires in each and every encounter with women.

I believe that many men would accomplish much more in their personal ministries if they would allow a woman to impart some wisdom to them. The love of God, (or the judgement of God), will break down the many walls of self preservation that exists in the church today, and give it the end-time perspective that it needs. I believe that many women have already been sent with some messages to men in leadership and that many of them have not taken heed to it. Now God is not going to come to some of these with the gentleness of a woman any longer, but rather with the roar of the Lion of the tribe of Judah!

Let us all learn how to be under the control of the Holy Spirit. Written with love for all of God's dear children,

from Vera Csada

Equal in Creation

By Fuchsia Pickett

<http://www.godswordtowomen.org/equalcreation.htm>

MALE AND FEMALE CREATED TO CO-LABOR WITH GOD

THE CHURCH HAS LONG MISUNDERSTOOD GOD'S DIVINE PLAN FOR THE GENDERS. HE NEVER INTENDED FOR MAN TO RULE OVER WOMAN.

In my more than 50 years of ministry, I have discovered that because people often study their Bibles through the eyes of their own prejudices, customs and traditions, they tend to read into the Scriptures what they have been taught instead of reading out of them what the Holy Spirit meant when He inspired His servants to write them. This practice leads to much deception in the church. Nowhere is the deception more apparent than in the misunderstanding about God's divine order for the genders.

Many Christians believe that God created man to rule over woman. They cite as proof God's words to Eve after she ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: "Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you" (Gen. 3:16, NKJV). But in making this statement, God was not revealing His divine order for the woman. He was imposing on her the consequences of her fall. He was telling us how a fallen man and woman were going to relate to each other.

Results of the fall of man can never be construed as God's divine order for him. God told Adam he was going to eat by the sweat of his brow (see Gen. 3:19), but that was a consequence of sin rather than God's divine intention for him. God had purposed that Adam and Eve eat of the vegetation in the beautiful garden He had prepared for them and that they have dominion over every living thing.

PRIEST OF THE HOME? Another misconception prevalent in the church is that the man is the priest of the home. But this is not a scriptural concept either. The Scriptures declare **that we--male and female--are all priests: "You at a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, holy nation" (I Pet. 2:9).**

The New Living translation of the Bible translates royal priesthood as "a kingdom of priests." There is no distinction here between male and female.

Although the Scriptures do not single out the man as priest of the home, **they do teach that the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church (see Eph. 5:23).** The wife's relationship to her husband parallels her husband's relationship to Christ. He is the head of the home as Christ is the head of the church. **The husband is commanded to love his wife as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her.**

To say the husband is the "head" and not the "priest" is not simply a matter of semantics. It is a matter of assignment, of delegated authority. The realm of authority that God delegated is marvelous. But we must not give the man authority God didn't give him or take away the authority God did give him. God did not intend for one gender of mankind to be over another. He meant for them to walk together as one, submitting themselves to one another as Paul admonishes believers to do (see Eph. 5:21).

This understanding does not destroy the order of the home. It does not touch delegated authority. It does not make women higher than men, or make them aggressive or domineering. It puts man and woman back together again in Jesus.

The divine responsibility a man has in his home encompasses much more than what we normally think of as "being in charge." **Being the head of the home involves developing the character of God. A godly leader will have abandoned the macho, domineering image that is a reflection of his carnal nature and adopted the attitudes and behavior of Christ-modeling sacrifice, giving and caring.**

It takes time and effort for a man to become the head of his wife, home and family in more than name only. He must become a true man of God.

REVEALED FAITH: Some of us have difficulty accepting the truth about God's design for the genders because we have not "come to faith." When we read the Scriptures, we don't come in faith with an open heart and mind to hear what the Holy Spirit is saying. Paul explains, Before faith [comes], we [are] kept under the law up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed" (Gal. 3:23, emphasis added).

We can't understand the Word until we have "revealed faith" because tradition, prejudice, culture, denominationalism, pseudo-masculinity and other bondages of the carnal mind hinder us. After revealed faith comes, we are no longer under the law but walk in the grace Jesus brought to us through redemption. Paul tells us, "After that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For [we] are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (vv. 25-26, KJV).

He declares that when we come to faith we will see "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for [we] are all one in Christ Jesus" (v. 28). Faith comprehends God's intentions in creating mankind. But the fall of man has so damaged us that we are unaware of the purpose for which God created man. We the are oblivious to the divine order He intended for man and woman to enjoy.

Until faith comes to our hearts we cannot expect an illumination o the Word of God that gives us understanding of the purposes of God. The Scriptures teach that the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14, NKJV). No wonder the church, which has not yet come into a proper relationship with the Holy Spirit, is living without a true understanding of God's divine order for mankind!

A basic misunderstanding arises from our definition of "man." The word we translate from the Hebrew as "man" actually has no gender; it is more accurately translated mankind." In mankind--in Adam--was both "male" and "female." Thus when God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18, KJV), He was announcing His plans to do "surgery" to separate mankind into two sexes.

After God made the woman, He brought her "unto the man" (Gen. 2:22); He didn't put her under him. His purpose was for them to be one.

God ordained that the woman should be a "help meet" for the man. One of the definitions of the Hebrew word for "help meet" is "reflection." That is a beautiful picture of God's divine intention in creating mankind to walk together as one in fellowship with God.

IN ADAM'S IMAGE: Unfortunately, it is not the picture we normally see--because of our fallen nature. When God was about to create Adam, He said, "Let Us make man in Our image according to Our likeness" (Gen. 1:26, NKJV). Then He created him; male and female He created them" (v. 27). So Adam was created in God's image.

But the Bible tells us that after the fall of man, Adam "begot a son in his own likeness, after his image" (Gen. 5:3, emphasis added). This means that Adam's descendants--including us--were born not in the image of God, their heavenly Father, but rather in the image of Adam. We were born with his nature, not God's.

God's eternal plan for us was not thwarted, however, for He had anticipated Adam's failure before the foundation of the world and had prepared a Savior for mankind. John assures us: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:8). That word "destroy" is the Greek word *louso*, which means "to loose, to undo, outdo and overdo." So Jesus came to undo, outdo and overdo everything the devil has ever done.

When we accept Christ, who is called the "last Adam," as our Savior, we are restored to the image of God. Restoration is a wonderful reality that promises we will become all God ordained for us to become in His eternal purpose and will experience what mankind would have known if the first pair had walked on with Him and not fallen.

God knew we couldn't change ourselves back into His image, so He designed the costly plan of redemption through the blood of his own Son, Jesus. Jesus was the express image of the Father, sent to live in us by the power of the Holy Spirit until that image takes over our inner natures--our spirits and souls. He begins to change us from glory to glory. When He fills our beings, as He wanted to do before man ever fell, we are going to go home in His image, complete and mature;

By the action of Calvary, we are being changed into Christ's image so male and female can walk together in their own realms of authority. God puts both genders back into Christ, not as male and female, but as mankind, walking with God. Husband and wife, male and female preacher, man and woman leader will walk in the cool of the day with Jesus, who is talking to

us, fellowshiping with us, giving us authority and changing us into His image. In the "last Adam," God is restoring what we would have had if Adam had not fallen in the beginning.

RETURNING TO DIVINE ORDER: God ordained that man and woman should walk with Him and be as one, and He would meet the innermost needs of both of them. Divine order is higher than the plight of fallen man. It is far more liberating to men and women than having to live under the doctrine of the curse of a fallen Adam and a fallen Eve.

As God delivers His church from the bondages of tradition and culture--and from fallen man's doctrine of divine order--we will see men and women function together to build godly homes and to fulfill God's purpose for the building of His church. When redemption cleanses us from the desire to rule, man and woman will not be threatened by each other, but will welcome each other's godly counsel.

The Bible gives many examples of women who provided godly leadership. Deborah was appointed by God as a judge, prophetess and general in the army. She was able to tell Barak what God had said to her, and Barak then declared he would not go to battle without her (see Judges. 4:4-8).

I believe in these last days of God's outpouring of His Spirit, many Baraks will say to their Deborahs that they will not go to battle without them. I believe it is the timing of God to restore man and woman back to divine order both in the home and in the kingdom of God. It is the hour for man and woman to come to faith, to stop living under fallen doctrine and to start living according to divine order--male and female walking together as one in Christ, each with his or her own delegated authority.

FUCHSIA PICKETT is the author of numerous books, including *How to Search the Scriptures* (Creation House). She has earned doctorates in both theology and divinity and teaches at churches and conferences throughout the United States. *How to Search the Scriptures* (Creation House). She has earned doctorates in both theology and divinity and teaches at churches and conferences throughout the United States. Note: Fuchsia Pickett passed away on January 30, 2004.

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY ABOUT...WOMEN IN MINISTRY?

By Betty Miller

Do women have a place in ministry? If so, to what extent? Is there scriptural basis for a woman to be in any position of authority in the church? What does the Bible really say about this issue? To understand God's intentions, we must go back to the very beginning of creation to see His original purpose for both man and woman.

MALE AND FEMALE CREATED HE THEM

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Genesis 1:27).

"Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created" (Genesis 5:2).

It is interesting to note that God called both male and female, "Adam" in the day they were created. Adam means "man." Adam and Eve were created with God-ordained differences from each other, but together they made a full "man," or a complete picture of God Himself. There was perfection in their union. Their differences were not a source of discord or inequality, but a beautiful compliment to each other. Together, God gave them the task of overseeing and ruling His creation

"And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Genesis 1:28).

Notice that God gave the above commission to them both. There is no hint that there was anything but equal authority between man and woman as they existed in a sinless state. What changed things? In the next few chapters of Genesis, we find that sin entered the heart of Adam and Eve. The result was a temporary curse placed upon both man and woman, which would affect the whole earth.

Genesis 3:14-19: "And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Unto the woman he said, 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. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

This curse has affected all aspects of creation, from the ground itself (infested with weeds and thorns) to human relationships. (I say temporary, because in Christ this curse is removed, as we shall see later on).

When Eve ate the forbidden fruit and enticed Adam to sin with her, one of the consequences for women was the loss of equality with men, as men were to rule over women, instead of men and women ruling together. She would now be "ruled by her husband." However, when Jesus came as sinless Man and died as the Messiah on the cross for us, all things were restored positionally. In actuality, the restoration of man (men and women) began to take place at that very moment.

Though the complete cleansing of the curse has not yet been manifested on the earth, the day is coming when it will be so. Or to put it another way, all those who receive Jesus as Savior receive restoration as Sons of God, but not all of us walk in that restoration--yet. Through Jesus, the curse upon women has been lifted. Women no longer have to receive pain in childbirth nor are they inferior to man with him ruling over them. Women can now be restored to their original place and plan that God had for all His "sons." Although we do not see all things restored at this time, "legally" in the spiritual realm, they already have been.

Adam was the head of the first race of mankind; and Jesus is the head of the last race, the adopted children of God. God only sees two races--the Adamic race (all natural-born mankind) and His children through Jesus (all those born of the spirit).

"For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Corinthians 15:21-22).

Once we are born into the kingdom of God, we become new creatures in Christ. In the Spirit, we find there is "neither male nor female," just as there are no race distinctions nor class separations. The Lord looks on the hearts of His new creatures and therefore does not discriminate when He offers His love and privileges. Women are not excluded from any of God's promises nor callings merely because of their sex.

Galatians 3:28: "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."

GOD'S MASCULINE AND FEMININE TRAITS

As we stated above, the command to have dominion over and subdue the earth was given to both Adam and Eve. They were both to rule and reign over the Lord's creation. The very act of subduing something requires authority, aggressiveness and leadership, as well as humility, tenderness, patience, and the ability to respect the intrinsic value of what we are ruling. Most of all, it requires love.

Within God's own nature we find these same qualities. Both men and women are to become like Him as we are conformed to His image. Since this is true, there are times that under the unction of the Holy Spirit a woman should assert herself boldly. (This assertion, however, should not necessarily be toward others, but rather toward the enemy, Satan!) For men and women to become overcomers they must have this boldness and authority over the devil. God still desires that His people rule and reign with Him. His intention is to qualify us for that position, whether we be male or female. "And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen" (Revelation 1:6).

Even though "kings" is a masculine term, this is the ultimate destination He desires for all of His people. The Lord often uses both male and female terms to refer to both

sexes. Women are to live in the "hidden man of the heart" (1 Peter 3:4). Both men and women in the church are referred to as "the bride of Christ." God has both a masculine and feminine nature. The mother heart of Jesus was evident as he prayed over Jerusalem.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matthew 23:37).

Submission is considered to be a feminine trait. However, Jesus submitted to the cross under the direction of the Father. If we walk in the Spirit, we too will possess both the masculine aggressiveness and feminine submissiveness of God.

Both submissiveness and aggressiveness are God-given strengths. Yet, both can be perverted, so that we become submissive and aggressive in the wrong ways, with the wrong attitudes. Because these qualities are so misused and misunderstood by the world, they have become distasteful and despised. If aggression is frowned upon, submission is viewed in an even more negative light in western culture. We equate submission with weakness and lack of spirit. Nothing could be further from the truth. There was never a human being more submitted to God than Jesus Christ-- yet never was there one as completely resistant to the system of the world! It took extraordinary submissiveness and aggression for Jesus to overcome the world. For the Christian, whether we are male or female, He is our model. We are to possess His qualities and use them according to the needs around us.

WOMEN AS MINISTERS

How does all of this lead up to women ministers? Perhaps you are thinking that although we have laid a biblical foundation for "neither male nor female" in Christ, certain verses in the New Testament still seem to ban women from ministry positions in the church. Let's examine these verses for the true interpretation.

"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" (1 Corinthians 14:34).

"Let the woman 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" (1 Timothy 2:11-12).

In these verses, Paul cannot be addressing women who were in the ministry, but rather those in the congregation who were out of order. How do we know this? We have many such proofs, many from Paul himself. Here is a partial list of women who were all in influential positions of leadership in the early church.

Pheobe (Romans 16:1-2): This woman was a deaconess of the church in Cenchrea, who was beloved of Paul and many other Christians for the help she gave to them. She

filled an important position of leadership. It would be a difficult stretch of the imagination to say that this woman fulfilled her duties without ever speaking in the church!

Priscilla (Acts 18:26): Priscilla and her husband Aquila are often mentioned with great respect by Paul. Together they were pastors of a church in Ephesus, and were responsible for teaching the full gospel to Apollos. We are informed that they both taught Apollos, and pastored the church together. In fact, Priscilla is sometimes listed ahead of Aquila when their names come up. This has led some to speculate that of the two, she was the primary teacher and her husband oversaw the ministry. At any rate, we see here a woman in a very prominent position of teaching and pastoring. (Other references to Priscilla and Aquila are Acts 18:2, 18; Romans 16:3, and I Corinthians 16:19).

Euodia and Syntyche (Philippians 4:2-3): Here we see reference to two women who were "true yokefellow" and who labored with Paul in the advancement of the gospel.

Junia (Romans 16:7): In this verse we see Paul sending greetings to Andronicus and Junia, his "fellow-prisoners" who are of note among the apostles. Junia is a woman's name. In some modern translations, an "s" has been added (Junias) because the translators were so sure a woman could not be an apostle, that they assumed a copyist has accidentally dropped the "s." However the proper male ending would have been "ius," not "ias." No church commentator earlier than the Middle Ages questioned that Junia was both a woman and an apostle.

Though there were other women throughout the Bible in positions of leadership, such as prophetesses, evangelists, judges, leaders, etc., the above references should be enough to establish that women were indeed a vital and normal part of church leadership. Paul expected women to speak in the church, or else why would he have given the following directive? It would have been useless to give directions for women who were speaking in the church, if they were never allowed to do so.

1 Corinthians 11:5, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven."

Furthermore, if Paul believed that all women should never teach or speak in church, why does he commend many women who did just that?

With all this in mind, what then do we make of the troubling verses that command women to be silent in the churches? First of all, we must interpret those verses in light of what we have just established--that there were women in leadership positions of the church. Obviously, Paul is not writing to them. He is must be addressing another issue entirely--the women who were loud and unruly during the service, causing disorder and confusion..

When he wrote the Corinthians, he was dealing with a church that was very disorderly in their services. Much of the letter was spent correcting excesses and abuses. Some of these pertained to women in particular and some were to the entire church. Paul is not being prejudiced against women when he instructs the Corinthian women to keep silence. In the early church the seating arrangement was quite different from our modern day churches. Men were seated on one side of the church while the women and children were seated on the opposite side. This is still practiced in many cultures today.

The women of Christ's day were generally uneducated and usually only the men were privileged with an education. Due to this situation, when the church met the women were tempted to shout across the room and ask their husbands the meaning of whatever was being taught. This disturbed the service. Paul was simply saying during the service, "Women, keep your children quiet and you be quiet, and if you have anything to ask your husbands, wait until you get home." Because of the new equality that Christianity brought to women, it could be that some of them were taking their freedom too far, to the point of being obnoxious.

When Paul wrote to Timothy, he gave him a similar directive. Again, it is important to understand the context in which the letter was written. In I Timothy, a careful reader becomes aware that many severe heresies and false teachings that were being dealt with. We can draw a conclusion here that many of the proponents and victims of the false teachings were women. Timothy pastored in Ephesus, and it has been suggested that goddess worship might have played a large part in Paul dealing so severely with the women. Ephesus was a primary center of the worship of Diana or Artemis. The heresies being taught might have suggested that women were authoritative over men and had higher access to spiritual knowledge than men did.

Regardless of the particulars, in both cases we can see that Paul is dealing with specific incidents in specific churches for very particular reasons.

We must understand that many of Paul's epistles dealt with local problems and his commandments are not meant to be taken as "commandments" across the board for all situations. Rather, we are to seek the Lord for the basic principle that needs to be incorporated in our churches. Because of Old Testament precedents that had already been set, apparently it never occurred to Paul to re-establish the case for women in ministry. Why would he need to? The early church took it as a matter of course that Jesus would call and ordain anyone He chose--and that settled it! As a matter of fact, the Bible mentions a prophetess who was in the Temple when Jesus was brought there as a baby. Her name was Anna (Luke 2:25-35), and she was one of two people who recognized Jesus as the Messiah because of her sensitivity to the Holy Spirit.

Paul's writings are sometimes misunderstood today because we do not know all the details that led him to write as he did. We must rely on the Holy Spirit, and the rest of the testimony of Scripture to interpret how we are to apply these things to our everyday lives. Scripture should always be compared with other Scripture and the

context taken into consideration. Even in Paul's day, there were those who tried to twist the meaning his words.

"...His (Paul's) letters contain some things that are hard to understand, which ignorant and unstable people distort, as they do other Scriptures, to their own destruction" (2 Peter 3:16).

It is a fair conclusion that the testimony of the bulk of Scripture, church history and God's anointing upon them, all speak plainly for women being able to fulfill all positions of the five-fold offices of apostle, prophet, pastor, evangelist and teacher.

MINISTERING TODAY

It has always been a strange doctrine that will allow women to go to foreign mission fields and teach heathen men, but will not allow the "heathen" men at home to be taught by the same women! It makes absolutely no sense to think that a female who is learned in the Scriptures cannot teach a male who is unlearned. Additionally, it is acceptable for many women to teach Sunday School to children, and for mothers to teach their sons. Where do we draw the line and say to the women that can no longer teach a male once they reach a certain age? This may seem like a ridiculous scenario, yet there are those in the church who teach along these lines.

Those that are dogmatic in excluding women from the ministries of God usually are not walking in the Spirit, as they see women after the flesh (viewing her sex), not after the Spirit (seeing her heart and calling). The Lord admonishes us in His Word that we are not to look at one another with regard to our sex, race, class or culture, but rather we are to see one another through spiritual eyes.

"Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation: To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Corinthians 5:16-20).

God wants to use any person who will yield to His Spirit, regardless of that person's sex or capabilities. Those who are a new creature in Christ have His capabilities.

Our problem is that we must see there are rules for the fleshly, or earthly man, and there are rules for the spiritual man. Then, we must discern when to apply the appropriate Scripture. We are admonished in 2 Timothy 2:15 to "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

THE FIVE-FOLD MINISTRY

The Lord gave the church gifts of His choosing in the form of men and women who would lead the church into perfection (Ephesians 4:8-12).

It is the Lord who calls men and women to His ministry. He does not call special people, but the call goes out to "whosoever will." First, we are called to salvation; then as we walk in obedience to Him, He calls for us to be baptized in His Holy Spirit. As we continue to obey and follow Him, He then may choose us to serve Him in a full-time ministry. He chooses people for the ministry out of those who have walked in obedience to His other calls. He desires that all follow, but can only choose those who are obedient. These men and women who have answered the call are set in the ministry by Jesus Himself. Man's ordination does not qualify them, but the ordination of God does. Men will recognize those who are truly called by Him. They will even recognize women who are called of God as God empowers them with His anointing and power which cannot be denied.

God has used many modern day women in His service as well as women spoken of in the Bible. Madame Guyon, Catherine Booth, Jessie Penn-Lewis, Aimee Semple McPherson, Corrie Ten Boom and Kathryn Kuhlman are only a few of the women on the list of great five-fold ministry gifts to the church. What are those gifts and that ministry? "And His gifts were (varied; He Himself appointed and gave men to us,) some to be apostles (special messengers), some prophets (inspired preachers and expounders), some evangelists (preachers of the Gospel, traveling missionaries), some pastors (shepherds of His flock) and teachers'' (Ephesians 4:11, Amplified Bible.).

When this Scripture says, "appointed and gave men to us," it does not mean just the male sex. The same man whom God created in the beginning which included male and female is the one referred to here. These "men" are both male and female and they have a responsibility to bring others into the maturity that they possess.

Ephesians 4 continues, "His intention was the perfecting and the full equipping of the saints (His consecrated people), [that they should do] the work of ministering toward building up Christ's body (the church), [That it might develop] until we all attain oneness in the faith and in the comprehension of the full and accurate knowledge of the Son of God; that [we might arrive] at really mature manhood...the completeness of personality which is nothing less than the standard height of Christ's own perfection -- the measure of the stature of the fullness of the Christ, and the completeness found in Him'' (Ephesians 4:12-13, Amplified Bible.).

The Lord has lofty intentions for His men and women and desires that they come into perfection and maturity even as Christ walked in that perfection. The Lord sends those whom He chooses to bring about this maturing and perfecting. If we have been raised in a traditional church, the idea of coming into perfection may sound impossible--even heretical! However, it is clearly a Biblical precedent and until we understand it we will

not be able to understand God's full intention for His body. The separation of laity and clergy is not God's plan for His people. All that are called to salvation are called to a full-time ministry in the Lord. This does not mean that all should leave their secular occupations, but all should devote their lives to the Lord and be as committed and active in witnessing, learning and growing in God as the leadership.

The leadership that God raises up is those men and women whom He trains for His work in the kingdom. Women have been limited in traditional churches to certain positions that men would give them, but the Lord is restoring His full five-fold ministry in these last days to prepare the body of Christ for His return.

FURTHER QUESTIONS

If Jesus wanted women to minister, how come all His disciples were men? This question is actually raised from a misunderstanding of the word "disciple." Jesus had many women disciples. These include, Mary and Martha (John 11:1-4, and many other references as well. Mary and Martha, along with their brother Lazarus were among Jesus' closest friends). In addition, Jesus had many other women followers as well.

Luke 8:1-3, "And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve were with him And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, And Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance."

For the sake of brevity, I will not include other lists of names of women who followed Him. However the Scripture makes it clear there were many of them.

In another incident, Jesus motions to the crowds that followed him and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matthew 12:49-50).

In John 4:1-42, we see that it is a Samaritan woman who leads a large population of her community to Jesus.

Why didn't Jesus choose any women to be among His twelve original apostles? Jesus could not choose women to be among the twelve because it would not be wisdom for men and women to be travelling about together when many of them were single. Also, the twelve apostles fulfilled the "type and shadow" of the twelve patriarchs, so they had to be equal to men (Revelation 21:12, 14). However, this doesn't mean that he does not anoint women to fill an apostolic role today, as we already established in the case of Junia.

Jesus showed a great deal of respect for women--and children as well. In the culture of Jesus' day, these were often deemed "lower class" so to speak, and not worth

paying serious attention to. However, Jesus repeatedly broke this unspoken rule. Because His actions were so unusual, those closest to Him were often surprised and annoyed.

WOMAN, THOU ART LOOSED!

We pray that this teaching will encourage many women, who might otherwise relegate themselves to the "back burner" to instead step forward into the full calling of God upon their lives. Likewise, we pray that men who have been taught against letting women minister will see the truth of the fullness of God's plan. No matter who we are in the Lord, we will be held responsible for how we treated others and how we either hindered or helped the cause of Christ on Earth. Those in leadership especially need to heed this warning with reverent fear. Just because we have believed something our whole life, or because our denomination or culture teaches us so, doesn't mean it is correct. If you have a problem with seeing women in the pulpit, or in any position of leadership, we pray that you will prayerfully seek the Lord with an open heart on this issue.

In conclusion, let us read the following promise from the prophet Joel. This prophesy was initially fulfilled at Pentecost, and as we draw closer to the End, we can expect to see it fulfilled in even greater measures.

Acts 2:17-21, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy: And I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke: The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come: And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

Personal Note from Betty:

My own personal call to the ministry came as a surprise to me. I was not expecting the Lord to use me because I did not realize God used women in the ministry. At the time of my call I was in the medical profession. I had been filled with the Holy Spirit and because of the tremendous transformation in my own life, I was eager to share with others this beautiful blessing. I had known the Lord since the age of twelve. However, I had not known Him in the power of the Holy Spirit. After my baptism in the Holy Spirit, I found I had a new holy boldness that I had not had before. I found myself witnessing and sharing with all who would listen.

I wanted them to know of my new joy, love, peace and faith. I did not intend to pursue the path of becoming a female preacher. (I really did not know such existed). I

just found myself sharing and preaching. Actually all of us who know Christ should be "preachers." Preaching is simply sharing the good news of Jesus Christ. The clergy should not be the ones who do all the preaching! This is the responsibility of every member of the body of Christ.

When the Lord spoke to me about His plan for my life, I immediately thought of many objections. My first was that I was a woman, so how could He use me? I told Him I didn't have the kind of tremendous testimony that would cause people to listen to me. He said, "Betty, it is not your testimony that will cause people to listen, but it will be My Spirit and My anointing." He then ministered to me in a beautiful way to show me in His Word that it was Scriptural for women to minister. Most of these truths are in this teaching. Our confusion over women ministering comes by misunderstanding the full counsel of God's Word. The verse with which this chapter begins is one of the first He revealed to me, "...there is neither male nor female..." in the Spirit. In heaven there will be no sex; so if we are walking in the Spirit now, we will not be conscious of sex, but only of the Spirit of God.

"For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matthew 22:30).

My husband and I have been privileged to serve the Lord together as evangelists, pastors, teachers and now pioneering this new work on the Internet. It's rewarding to allow the Holy Spirit to minister through us as He sees fit. We only want to be those vessels who stand ready for the Master's use. The Lord uses Bud to relate to many that I could not reach, and He uses me to minister to others that he could not reach. Together we are able to accomplish much more for the Lord than we would if we were ministering by ourselves. We are grateful that the Lord called us into His service together.

God bless you! Betty

Excerpt from the book and workbook Neither Male Nor Female by Betty Miller. To purchase books click here: <http://store.bible.com/>
The Story of God: Women in the Early Church
By Pamela Walford

<http://godstowomen.org/studies/womenhistory/walford2.htm>

Pam has a great site, go check out other articles there !

In less than 400 years following the deaths of the last apostles, the early Christian church yielded to the influence of the Greco-Roman culture in which it was immersed and relinquished the egalitarianism that had been established by Jesus; thereby setting the stage for the subjugation and silencing of women that spanned more than two millennia and continues to detrimentally impact the lives of women today.

While history shows that all social classes were impacted by the influence of Greco-Roman culture on the church, the discussion in this paper will be confined to women and how the first four centuries of the Christian church were pivotal in the consequences they generated for women.

There is ample evidence in Scripture that Jesus had an inclusive attitude toward women in ministry and had initiated their emancipation from the confinement of their culture. He defended the adulterous woman brought to Him by the Pharisees (John 8:1-11) and affirmed the unclean woman who dared to touch Him (Matt. 9:20-22). He validated Mary's abdication of domesticity and encouraged her sister Martha to also make following Him her priority (Luke 10:38-42). He had several women disciples (Mark 15:40-41, Luke 8:1-3). He sent the Samaritan woman as a missionary to her people (John 4:1-42). He appeared first to women at His resurrection and sent them as His first missionaries to His church (John 20:15-18, Luke 24:9, Matt. 28:9-10), and He baptized women with His Holy Spirit at Pentecost at the same time as the men (Acts 1:14, 2:1).

Furthermore, Jesus' emancipating call to women to step out of their culturally gendered roles and into ministry was entirely in keeping with the Old Testament. When God called women in the past, their obedience continually required their having to move beyond the boundaries of their culture's customary roles for women, but it also consistently facilitated Israel's rescue and altered the course of Biblical history.

Jochebed deceived Pharaoh's daughter and preserved Moses' life (Exod. 2:1-10), Rahab sheltered Israelite spies and as a result her Gentile family was brought into the nation of Israel and into the genealogy of Christ (Josh. 2). Jael murdered her husband's ally and saved Israel (Judges 4:17-21). Tamar deceived Judah and preserved Christ's birth line (Gen. 38:1-30). Abigail defied her husband's stupidity and kept David from sin (1 Sam. 25:14-35). And, Mary, the Lord's mother, transgressed the taboos of her culture by her pre-nuptial pregnancy and gave birth to our Savior (Luke 1:26-38).

According to Acts and other New Testament letters, women did fulfill Jesus' mandate to serve in ministry alongside their Christian brothers. The criteria for being considered an apostle was having seen the risen Lord (1 Cor. 9:1), which Joanna certainly had (Luke 24:10), and who Paul considered an apostle who had been significantly helpful to him (Rom. 16:7).¹ Priscilla was not only Paul's colleague but was the teacher of Apollos as well (Rom 16:3-5, Acts 18:24-28). Phoebe was a church leader as were Syntyche, Euodia (Phil. 4:2-3) and Lydia (Acts. 16-14-15, 40). In addition, there is well-argued speculation that the anonymous author of the Book of Hebrews is none other than Paul's beloved friend, Priscilla.²

"What went wrong?" Female students of Christian history inevitably ask themselves, because once we leave Scripture and move on to extra-Biblical reading, Christian history reads in such a way as to imply that women were completely uninvolved in the formation of the church. The last of the apostles would have not lived much beyond

the beginning of the 2nd Century A.D., and women in church leadership seem to have disappeared along with them.³ How did it come to pass that women ceased to function as church leaders, and why so early in the church's development?

Fortunately, with the 20th Century advent of feminist historians and theologians, church history has been revisited, but the answers to these questions are not easily discerned and must be teased out from a historical framework that records the passage of time solely from a male perspective and reports the history of women only as it pertains to men.⁴ Although, there is a scarcity of documents written by women about the lives of members of their own gender, upper class women in the Roman Empire were highly educated and historians surmise that women likely wrote a great many more works than what has survived.⁵ Among the few surviving works believed to have been written by women is the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas, most of which Perpetua is believed to have written herself and the Apocryphal Acts, which is essentially a series of lively stories about women who, upon encountering a male apostle, reject secular life in favor of ascetic Christianity.⁶ And, of course there is the controversial, Gospel of Mary Magdalene, which, despite its much debated historicity and theology, suggests that she had a ministry that was significant enough to warrant a gospel account.⁷

The little else that is known about women in the early church has been gleaned from epitaphs on tombstones, artwork and from what the church "fathers" wrote about them, and the evidence suggests that women held positions of authority in the church and were also exegetes. An ancient mosaic in Rome names a Bishop Theodora. There were women Bishops in Egypt and women presbyters in Sicily and Greece.⁸ A woman named Paula, was the most intimate friend of the church "father", Jerome, with whom he enjoyed challenging debates over Scripture.⁹ Another woman, Melania the Elder, was dubbed a "female man of God" by her Christian brothers on account of her learnedness.¹⁰

While a few select women as mentioned above received accolades from church "fathers", most often when writing about women, they denounced them for performing certain ecclesiastical tasks, or they penned diatribes on woman's intrinsically sinful nature. Feminists deduce from these writings that if the "fathers" deemed it necessary to speak against women functioning in specific ecclesiastical roles, women must have been in fact participating in them. "The fact of laws forbidding women to preach indicates that there were preaching women who needed to be silenced."¹¹ Condemnation of women prophets can only mean that women were prophesying. If the 2nd Century Statutes of the Apostles lambasted women presiding over the Eucharist, the assumption must be that they were presiding over it and likewise regarding women baptizing.¹² If the Didascalia, a manual on church organization, castigated the "order of widows" for evangelizing, discipling believers, hearing confessions and performing baptisms, then it stands to reason that the widows were doing all of these things.¹³

Women apparently also exercised authority and leadership through their influence as patrons. Lucilla of Carthage held considerable sway as a patron of Donatus and was

instrumental in the rise of the Donatist movement that plagued the "orthodox" church for several centuries. Origen was also assisted by a woman patron as was Chrysostom.¹⁴

With a clearly extensive female presence in church leadership and the support of Scripture behind them, it seems inconceivable that the church devolved so rapidly into an institution that viewed itself as an exclusively male domain that eventually came to consider the creation of women as almost a misguided afterthought on God's part.

Egalitarian historians, both male and female, generally attribute it to the pressure applied by the pervasive influence of Greco-Roman culture.¹⁵ However, this explanation does not adequately convey the manner in which this influence was visited on women in the quest to prohibit them from church leadership. What began as the relatively soft-sell of persuasion in the form of written attacks and ecclesiastical legislation eventually transcended the church and escalated into violent acts of force that sought to subdue women across the spectrum of society.

Attitudes toward women in the Roman Empire were inherited from the Greeks. Greek mythology taught that women were created by Zeus as a curse against the human race, which prior to offending the gods, was strictly male.¹⁶ The Greeks defined masculinity, which in their minds equaled humanity, through the male genitalia. They associated honor with sexual prowess to the degree that orgies were rampant and homosexual relations with young boys were highly regarded.¹⁷

On the other hand, women were associated with shame and were viewed strictly as male possessions for usage that had to be endured as the unfortunately necessary means of procreation. Since men were honorable, they could be separated from their sexuality and carry on public business and political activity, whereas women were sexual in any sphere because of their being the curse of men. To be a woman meant to carry shame everywhere, and private life was the only sphere in which her taint could be endured. From this philosophy evolved the assumption that public life was male, and private life was female. Any woman who held a public office was deemed unchaste and was seen as attempting to establish sexual independence. A woman's sexuality was a male possession, and a sexually independent woman was a threat to every man's authority.¹⁸

Prior to the conversion of Emperor Constantine, persecution and the fact that Christians "conceived themselves explicitly as an alternative family or household," meant that the church functioned as a private institution. Christians confined worship primarily to meeting in homes where women in leadership was not an issue.¹⁹

However, due in great part to the rising veneration of celibacy, not all Christians in the pre-Constantinian church embraced female leadership. With the deaths of the apostles, the church lost the authority of its first-hand witnesses to the teachings of Jesus, and as Greco-Roman converts continued to be brought in the church, their secular culture had increasing impact. Celibacy was the combined birth child of Greek

disdain for women and Christianity's desire to distance itself from the appalling sexual promiscuity of the Roman pagans.

In some churches, female virgins were part of the clergy and were greatly revered. They sat in special places during worship, and as a sign of having dedicated their lives to God, they did not wear the veils normally worn by women. Tertullian, a 3rd Century theologian with a robust Greco-Roman contempt for women, opposed all manifestation of female leadership and insisted that virgins should not be bestowed any measure of honor and accordingly, should wear their veils in church despite it being "private" space. 20

Emperor Constantine's conversion and the subsequent legalization of Christianity with the Edict of Milan in 313 A.D. catapulted Christianity into the public realm for which it was unfortunately unprepared.²¹ Many of Constantine's subjects converted to Christianity motivated more by a desire to curry his favor than by religious fervor. Established Christians also desired his goodwill more than they desired God's. This, when coupled with Constantine's own faith being of a questionable degree, made for a situation in which Biblical authority took a back seat to the will of the emperor and the ambitions of undiscerning Christians.²² A natural consequence of a more secular, Greco-Roman influenced and less Spirit-led church was the widespread consensus that women ecclesiastical leaders were absolutely unacceptable.²³

The campaign to eject women from ministry that began with the quills of the church "fathers" in the 3rd Century transitioned into ecclesiastical legislation during the 4th Century when the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. banned women from the clergy.²⁴ Nevertheless, history shows that women did not universally or easily accept their banishment because over the ensuing centuries the church had to repeatedly enact legislation against women leaders and enforce it with their customary disciplinary measures of excommunication and burning at the stake.²⁵

The continued persistence of women in fulfilling their call from God kept the attack on women alive. The pens of the "fathers" marched on relentlessly, but their ranting had one significant difference; rather than being merely unfit for leadership, woman became sin personified. Whereas for the Greeks, woman would not have been created if man had not sinned, the church "fathers" determined that if woman had not sinned, faultless man would still be enjoying himself in the Garden of Eden in perfect harmony with God.

Writing in 375 C.E., Ambrose of Milan's attitude toward woman may have been one of the more affirming ones among the church "fathers" in that he conceded that God had deemed woman good despite her being the very source of sin. Augustine, on the other hand was not so kind. In 401 A.D., he agreed that God had made woman to be man's helper, but the issue was what kind of helper she was supposed to be. Any man could outwork a woman; therefore, it could not have been for the purpose of physical labor. "One could also posit," he argued, "that the reason for her creation as a helper had to do with the companionship she could provide for man, if perhaps he got bored with his

solitude. Yet for company and conversation, how much more agreeable it is for two male friends to dwell together than for a man and a woman, nor could it have been for the purpose of companionship ... I cannot think of any reason for a woman's being made as man's helper, if we dismiss the reason of procreation." His contemporary, John Chrysostom, magnanimously chimed that as a helper to man, woman was far superior to an animal because God had made a clear distinction between woman and beast in the Genesis creation story. 26

Sadly, to make the situation for women worse, the evolving all-male, church leadership came to believe the "fathers" had so thoroughly summarized Christian theology that their writings superseded the authority of Scripture. This negated the necessity of reading Scripture altogether and granted the church the license to do whatever it wanted. In time, the "fathers" authority was conferred on the Pope as infallibility.²⁷

By the end of the 5th Century, the only option for formal ecclesiastical service for women was celibate life as a nun or a masochistic ascetic. Undaunted, women were determined to follow the call to ministry and flocked to monasteries and convents, often defying their families. Unfortunately, becoming a nun was available almost exclusively to wealthy women since life in a monastery required a substantial dowry. The remaining masses of lower class women had to be content with life within the confines of marriage; an institution the church increasingly denounced as an unfortunate necessity for individuals too weak and too sinful to embrace the higher calling of celibacy.²⁸

Without the ascendancy of Scripture, the denigration of woman continued unabated, and of which canonized Peter Damian's following harangue was typically representative.

"I speak to you, O charmers of the clergy, appetizing flesh of the devil, that castaway from Paradise, poison of minds, death of souls, companions of the very stuff of sin, the cause of our ruin. You, I say, I exhort women of the ancient enemy, you bitches, sows, screech-owls, night-owls, blood-suckers, she-wolves, ... come now, hear me harlots, prostitutes, with your lascivious kisses, you wallowing places for fat pigs, couches for unclean spirits."²⁹

In the face of such spiraling hatred it is no surprise that the church's misogyny eventually culminated in the witch-craze that began in the 12th Century and did not end until the 17th Century. Often, the proof that a woman was a witch was the crime of being an impoverished middle-aged widow, but the real root of the problem was, as always, female sexuality. Impotency, infertility, disease, death and above all, male lust, were all the fault of women who were supposedly sleeping with Satan. Women were tortured until they confessed to night-flying, killing babies, stealing penises, impregnation by the devil and so on. The witch-craze reached its pinnacle in 1492 when the European town of Langendorf declared that only two women in its entire village were not witches.³⁰ It is estimated upwards from one million women were burned at the stake as witches and often after first suffering other public atrocities such having their breasts hacked off.³¹

Another far less gruesome but equally un-biblical by-product of the church's spiteful sexism was the Vatican's 1854 A.D. declaration on the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary.

It was impossible for the Roman church to fathom God having debased himself by birthing his son through a woman, the very source of all sin. They concluded that Mary had to have been a super-woman, born without the taint of her sisters.³²

The plight of women finally began to turn around with the Reformation. Martin Luther and his colleagues dug the Bible out of the cellar and blew off a thousand years of dust. They reinstated salvation by faith and resurrected the blessing of marriage. Unfortunately, Protestant women were still not quite as equal as Protestant men, but they were expected to read the Bible alongside their brothers.³³ And, with the Scriptures once again in their hands, women began the slow process of reclaiming their freedom in Christ, a process which continues to this day.

Naturally, there are detractors who argue that although Greco-Roman culture undeniably held sway, the only women leaders in the early church were those in heretical sects like the Gnostics. They contend these sects endangered the orthodoxy of the church and justify the "fathers" strong stand against women.³⁴

On the surface this evidence would appear to be true, but the argument does not hold up against Scripture, and it must be remembered that only male writings survived the censure of a male-dominated church. We do not know if orthodox women wrote in defense of their leadership. We do know there were orthodox male voices such as Helvidius and Jovinian, who affirmed marriage and gender equality. Furthermore, the ascetism many church "fathers" followed was itself a derivative of the Gnostic view that the body was inherently evil and needed to be deprived of comfort to facilitate holiness.³⁵

More likely, the real issue was not heresies or female sin but male sexuality. As much of their writing suggests, the various "fathers" struggled with their sexuality. This sheds much needed light on their susceptibility to a culturally influenced repugnance of women. Ascetism and celibacy are not natural human states. We are not androgynous. We are sexual beings, male and female, and we were created to care for our bodies and for each other, physically, emotionally and sexually.

In the Gnostic gospels of Mary Magdalene and Phillip, Jesus is fully human and fully male. This was a problem for the Greco-Roman ascetic "fathers."³⁶ Their desire to live fully dedicated to God as celibates was not inherently wrong. The problem was that for them sex was inherently sinful and inherently female. They believed that were it not for women they would not have had to struggle with their lust. They did not know how to reconcile their sexuality with the redemptive plan of Christ without rejecting woman. In their minds, Jesus was holy and as such was not sexual. Scripture affirms Jesus as being fully human and also affirms his sinlessness (Heb. 4:15). If the "fathers" had divorced their culturally informed understanding of sex and sin from their interpretation of Scripture, they would have understood that, because Jesus never sinned and never married, He had been celibate by virtue of

premarital sex being sin. Jesus had rejected sin, not his sexuality. To think otherwise is to believe that sexuality was never redeemed by Christ. Unfortunately, this is exactly what the "fathers" believed, and the repercussions reverberated far into the future.

Since the days of the Reformation much headway has been made in the way of feminist exegesis of Scripture, but there remain many women who mistrust Scripture as the Spirit inspired inerrant Word of God because (with the possible exception of the Book of Hebrews) its human authors were men and because the Canon was compiled by the "fathers." With so much hurt in women's history, they will continue to struggle with their view of God unless the church attempts to answer their demand to know where God was while women were beaten into silence by the church and why he took so long to release them.

An answer might be found if we revisit Christian history once again and this time remember that God's involvement in history did not end with the closing of the canon. History is not the story of humanity; it is the story of God. It is the story of His redemptive work in His creation, male and female, who image Him together as one. It is the only way to make sense of all the sin and hurt we humans have inflicted on each other.

Since creation, God has ceaselessly moved humanity toward eternal redemptive reconciliation with Him and just as ceaselessly, humanity has rejected His offer of mercy and heaped sin upon sin instead. Adam and Eve rejected Him. The early human race of Noah's day rejected Him. Israel, his chosen people rejected Him in the desert, in the Promised Land and when their Messiah came. Would His church be any different than the rest of humanity or His chosen Jewish people? The first humans rejected God and the last humans will reject Him (Rev. 19:11-21)

Mercifully, despite our sin, God remains steadfast in His plan to bring into eternity with Him, those who accept the reconciliation He offers through Jesus Christ. He promised that those who sought Him with all their heart would find Him (Jer. 29:13) and that He would preserve them. He saved Noah and his small family. He preserved Israel through a faithful remnant (Isa. 6:13), and He preserves His church through a faithful remnant like the early monastics, who objected to the church's alliance with the Roman Empire, and the Reformers who restored His Word, and the countless marginalized women who persevered through the centuries, and the millions of ordinary people who strive to know God in a church that persistently rejects Him (Rev. 2, 3, 18:4-5).

The Bible tells us that in the last days the church will be an apostate prostitute that has made an alliance with the world and is drunk with the blood of the saints.

However, as we have seen, the church has already long been an apostate prostitute who befriends the world and murders the saints. Much has been lost through what women were denied to bring to Christianity, but it was not women who were imprisoned for a thousand years; it was God's image that was in bondage to sin. Male and female

were equally made in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), and men lost as much as women when they rejected the very thing God had said it was not good for them to be without (Gen. 3:18). What they were without was not just a "helper" but the female face of God.

Furthermore, while sin has played a significant role in the failures of the church, the grace of God has played an even greater role in its successes. It has never stopped being His church and though humans have perpetually attempted to wrest it from his control, He has remained faithful and has preserved it in one form or another. He has taken his sinful creation and guided them toward an ever increasing awareness of Himself, and by his Spirit, continues to transform the body of Christ, individually and corporately, into the image of His son. "All of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit. Therefore, since it is by God's mercy that we are engaged in this ministry, we do not lose heart" (NRSV 2 Cor. 3:18). One wonderful day in eternity we will see Christ as He is, and we will be free from sin at last and be perfect like He is (1 John 3:2). Sin removed women from the church leadership but the Holy Spirit brings them back to their rightful place beside their brothers.

Why did He allow women to be silenced in the first place? Why did He wait so long to release them? Why the Holocaust of World War II? Why the genocide in Sudan? Why did he wait 400 years to rescue Israel from Egypt? Why did he wait so long before sending His son? Why must we suffer so long before His return?

We cannot answer those questions; we can only look at God and remember that, "for now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. (NRSV 1 Cor. 13:12). The Bible tells us not to be impatient with God's patience with sin and to trust that He is always good and His decisions are always just (2 Peter 3:9, Rom 12:2). Somehow, everything is working out according to His plan and is for the good of those who love Him (Rom. 8:28). Perhaps what women bring to the church now is much better than what we would have brought before because we have been purified by the Refiner's fire (Mal. 3:3-4). The more women are restored, the more the church resembles Christ, and the more the church resembles Him, the closer we are to eternity. This is all we can say.

Even as God was giving Moses the law on Mount Sinai, the Israelites were down below dancing around a golden calf. The Lord struck those who had sinned against him, but he did not remove his promise to dwell with Israel. Instead, He restored their hope and redeemed them. He moved their eyes to the future and commanded them to build His tabernacle. Jesus did likewise with Peter. After Peter denied him, Jesus restored him by asking three times if Peter loved Him, and each time Peter said yes, Jesus commanded Peter to care for His flock (John 21). What has been lost cannot be regained, it can only be redeemed. We are not to look back on history unless it is

to reflect on God's mercy (Isa. 43:18-19) and to remember that for now faith, hope, and love abide, and that "the greatest of these is love" (NRSV 1 Cor. 13:13).

Women do not need to bang down the church doors and demand equality from what is all too often an apostate prostitute. They simply need to follow Jesus by forgiving their brothers and lovingly obeying Him, even it means walking outside the norms of their culture, just as their sisters before them have done. In so doing, they will show their brothers the other side of the face of God that all of humanity lost 1500 years ago.

After the days of purification were completed, Joseph and Mary brought Jesus to the Temple to present Him to the Lord. He was greeted by the prophets Simeon and Anna. Anna was of the tribe of Asher and was representative of the northern tribes while Simeon was representative of the southern tribes.⁴³ In that brief moment when Anna and Simeon prophesied over the infant Jesus, who is both the son of God and the son of his Gentile ancestral grandmothers, Rahab and Ruth (Matt. 1:1-11), all the tribes of Israel, all the nations of the earth, and male and female, were represented in a symbolic reconciliation with their Creator and Redeemer, Immanuel, "God With Us," in His Holy Temple (Luke 2:25-37).

We need to look ahead to our eternal future (Luke 21:28), not behind at our appalling past. Unless we wed our perspectives as male and female and retell the history of God together, not avoiding our sins or piling new ones on top of the old, but confessing them and forgiving each other and rejoicing in His unfailing mercy. We need to ask God to bring about the fullness of the restoration He began with Anna and Simeon and Jesus in the Temple, and then we need to say, "Amen. Come, Lord Jesus!" (NRSV Rev. 22:20).

Notes _____

1. Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002), 166-169. Junia is the Greek equivalent to Joanna. During the Middle Ages, copyists changed the female name to the male name, Junias.

2. Ruth Hoppin, "We are Witnesses to a Mystery" (www.godswordtowomen.org/studies/articles/hoppin.htm, 2005).

3. Mary T. Malone, *Women and Christianity, Volume I: The First Thousand Years* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2000), 101.

4. *Ibid.*, 35.

5. *Ibid.*, 245.

6. Elizabeth A. Clark, *Women in the Early Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1983), 78, 89, 97-98.
7. Jean-Yves Leloup and Joseph Rowe, Translator. *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene: Translation from the Coptic and Commentary* (Rochester: Inner Traditions, 2002), 7.
8. Karen Jo. Torjesen, *When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity*. (San Francisco: Harper, 1993), 9-10.
9. Clark, "Women in the Early Church," 163-168.
10. Malone, "Women and Christianity, Volume I," 148.
11. *Ibid.*, 33.
12. Torjesen, "When Women Were Priests," 42-44, 148.
14. *Ibid.*, 146-149.
14. *Ibid.*, 90-92, 100, 113.
15. Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen, et al., *After Eden: Facing the Challenge of Gender Reconciliation* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993), 22. Contributors to this book from the Calvin Center for Christian Scholarship jointly determined that, "A feminist is a person of either sex who works to restore social, economic, and political justice between women and men in a given society. This work is motivated by the conviction that the devaluation of women and their activities as compared with the valuation of men and their activities is wrong, and that the systematic disempowering of women in relation to men is unjust."
16. Loren Cunningham and David Joel Hamilton, with Janice Rogers, *Why Not Women: A Fresh Look at Scripture on Women in Missions, Ministry, and Leadership* (Seattle: Youth With A Mission, 2000) 72-75.
17. Torjesen, "When Women Were Priests," 180-188.
18. *Ibid.*, 12, 40, 113-115.
19. *Ibid.*, 126-127.
20. *Ibid.*, 158-172.
21. Justo L. Gonzalez, *The Story of Christianity: Volume 1, The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation* (New York: Harper-Collins, 1984) 107-108.

22. Eric de Bruyn, "HI 260 Christian History to the Reformation." Lecture, Alliance University College, 2005.
23. Torjesen, "When Women Were Priests," 155-158.
24. Malone, "Women in Christianity, Volume I," 125.
25. Ibid., 126-127, 149.
- 26 Clark, "Women in the Early Church," 28-34.
27. Malone
28. Ibid., 172, 187.
29. Ibid., 18.
30. Mary T. Malone, *Women and Christianity, Volume II: From 1000 to the Reformation*, (Ottawa: Novalis, 2002), 216-219.
31. Torjesen, "When Women Were Priests," 228-233.
32. Mary T. Malone, *Women and Christianity, Volume III: From the Reformation to the 21st Century*, (Ottawa: Novalis, 2003), 184.
33. Malone, "Women in Christianity, Volume III," 56.
34. Clark, "Women in the Early Church," 20-21.
35. Malone, "Women in Christianity, Volume I," 163-166.
36. Jean-Yves Leloup and Joseph Rowe, Translator, "The Gospel of Mary Magdalene," 9-12.
37. Bauckham, Richard, "Gospel Women," 98-99.

Bibliography

- Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *Women in the Early Church*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1983.
- Cunningham, Loren, and David Joel Hamilton, with Janice Rogers. *Why Not Women: A Fresh Look at Scripture on Women in Missions, Ministry, and Leadership*. Seattle: Youth With A Mission, 2000.

De Bruyn, Eric. "HI 260 Christian History to the Reformation." Lecture. Calgary: Alliance University College, 2005.

Gonzalez, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity: Volume 1, The Early Church to the Dawn of the Reformation*. New York: Harper-Collins, 1984.

Hoppin, Ruth. "We are Witnesses to a Mystery"
www.godswordtowomen.org/studies/articles/hoppin.htm 2005.

Leloup, Jean-Yves, and Rowe, Joseph, Translator. *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene: Translation from the Coptic and Commentary*. Rochester: Inner Traditions, 2002.

Malone, Mary T. *Women and Christianity, Volume I: The First Thousand Years*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2000.

Malone, Mary T. *Women and Christianity, Volume II: From 1000 to the Reformation*. Ottawa: Novalis, 2002.

Malone, Mary T. *Women and Christianity, Volume III: From the Reformation to the 21st Century*. Ottawa: Novalis, 2003.

Torjesen, Karen Jo. *When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity*. San Francisco: Harper, 1993.

Van Leeuwen, Mary Stewart, et al. *After Eden: Facing the Challenge of Gender Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993.

JUNIA, A FEMALE APOSTLE:
Resolving the Interpretive Issues of Romans 16:7
Dennis J. Preato

Also see article on marriage and submission on this site:
<http://godswordtowomen.org/studies/articles/Preato3.htm>

Greet Andronicus and Junia, my relatives who were in prison with me; they are prominent among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was.

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to solve two major interpretive problems in Romans 16.7. The first is concerned with resolving the gender of the person named Iounian. Was this person a woman? The Greek word Iounian has been translated as "Junias" (male) and as "Junia" (female). The second problem is concerned with the meaning of the phrase *episemoi en tois apostolois*. Andronicus and Junia were "either highly regarded

by the early church leaders (the apostles) or they were regarded as apostles themselves."1 Resolution of these issues can have important ramifications for how the church should carry out her continual mandate. Reviewing Romans 16 will contribute to a better realization that both women and men were participants in all areas of ministry in the church. They were ministers, deacons, leaders and even apostles.

II. THE TWO VIEWS: MALE VS. FEMALE

Part of the interpretive problem is that the word Iouinian, translated as Junia(s), appears only once in the Greek New Testament (GNT) and is shown in the accusative case with a certain accent mark. The use or absence of such mark is a significant factor accounting for the textual variations that appear in the GNT. The oldest and most reliable Greek manuscripts contain no accents or punctuation marks. In addition, the GNT includes early support for a female named Ioulian, translated as "Junia." According to Douglas Moo, the problem with identifying this person "arises from the fact that the Greek form used here, Iouinian, depending on how it is accented, could refer either (1) to a man with the name 'Junianus', found here in its contracted form, 'Junias' or (2) to a woman with the name of Junia."2 The use of such accents mark did not occur until the 9th or 10th century.

Additionally, there is limited external data specifically discussing the gender of the person Paul refers to as Iouinian. Why is this? Probably because this issue was not a concern for those who lived in Paul's time. The first century and early Christian community would have certainly known the gender of the person in question. Therefore, a careful review of the evidence offered by manuscripts, writings from church leaders and scholarly research should shed more light on resolving these issues.

Bible translators appear divided on the how they interpret Iouinian. For example, the ASV, NASB, NIV, TEV, NAB prefer "Junias" while the KJV, NRSV, NKJV, NCV, REB prefer "Junia." Some bibles also footnote the name "Julia." This divergence in translations only serves to highlight the problem faced by modern readers of the text. The task is to synthesize the data and reach a conclusion on the basis of objective evidence.

1. Evidence for Male: Manuscripts

Bibles and commentators generally utilize Greek New Testaments in their translation and interpretive pursuit. Both the UBS4 and NA27 Greek New Testaments show Iouinian accented with a circumflex accent over the alpha, which indicates "Junias" as being a contracted form of Junianus, a male name.3 Support for "Junias" is attested to by B2, D2, Yvid., 33 and a number of minuscules dated from the 9th to 14th century. Chrysostom is also listed as lectionary support for this position.

a. Discussion. Some external evidence does exist supporting a reading of "Junias." However, this support is not among the oldest available witnesses. The majority of

support for Junias comes from numerous minuscule manuscripts from mostly the 13th-14th centuries. These later minuscules contain accent marks reflecting the writer's interpretation that Iounian was a masculine name.⁴ Minuscule 33 is listed as support for Junias. However, according to Douglas Moo, this 9th century minuscule actually represents an important exception to the contracted form and supports the feminine form rather than the masculine.⁵ According to many scholars, including Bernadette Brooten, Peter Lampe, Leonard Swidler, Bruce Metzger and Dianne McDonnell, the male name "Junias" is unattested to in ancient writings.⁶ Additionally, the USB4 GNT may have incorrectly listed Chrysostom as support for a male "Junias." According to John Piper and many others, Chrysostom actually bears witness to a female Junia and not to a male Junias.⁷

- b. **Assessment.** The manuscripts and lectionary support cited provide little justification to support a male reading.

2. Evidence for Male: Church Leader and Writings

John Piper and Wayne Grudem state that Epiphanius (315-403) wrote an Index of Disciples, in which he writes: "Iounias, of whom Paul makes mention, became bishop of Apameia of Syria." According to them, Epiphanius wrote "of whom" as a masculine relative pronoun thereby indicating that he thought Iounias was a man.⁸ Piper and Grudem also presented the results of their computer search of ancient Greek writings looking for the name "Junia(s)." Based on their findings, they concluded that "no one should claim that Junia was a common woman's name in the Greek speaking world, since there are only three known examples in all of ancient Greek literature."⁹

- a. **Discussion.** Douglas Moo discusses Epiphanius and calls into question the reliability of this evidence because in the same passage, Epiphanius thought "Prisca" (Priscilla) was a man.¹⁰ This church father also wrote and believed that "the female sex is easily seduced, weak and without much understanding. The Devil seeks to vomit out this disorder through women... We wish to apply masculine reasoning and destroy the folly of these women" (Epiphanius, *Adversus Collyridianos*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Volume 42, Column 740 f).¹¹

The computer search by Piper and Grudem is inconclusive regarding their statement that "Junia" was not a common name in ancient writings. Many scholars including Brooten, Lampe, Metzger, Moo, McDonnell and Osburn claim otherwise, and state that "Junia" was a common name. However, the real significance of Piper and Grudem's search is the fact that they could not cite any example for a male named Junias. James Walters states: "Researchers have been unable to locate a single example of the male name Junias in ancient literature or inscriptions, either Latin or Greek."¹²

- b. **Assessment.** The observation by Moo and the misogynist statements by Epiphanius about women casts strong doubt to the appropriateness of this person providing any objective evidence in support of a male reading. His beliefs toward women may have certainly colored his thinking and writings. Therefore, we cannot

conclude that this church father is an unbiased and credible witness. The computer search performed by Piper and Grudem offers no evidence for a male reading.

3. Evidence for Female: Early Manuscripts

According to Douglas Moo, the UBS4 and NA27 Greek New Testaments cite "Junia" as a variant reading.¹³ This variant reading is attested to by Codexes Sinaiticus (a), A, B*, C, D*, F, G, P. The GNT also cites "Julia" as a variant reading. Support for this female name is evidenced by P46, 6, itar, b, vgmss, copbo, eth, and Church Father, Jerome.

According to many scholars, Junia was a common name that appeared in Greek and Latin inscriptions and literature. Brooten states, "the female Latin name Junia occurs over 250 times among inscriptions from ancient Rome alone."¹⁴ Peter Lampe has also discovered over 250 examples of the female name Junia.¹⁵ Bruce Metzger, editor of the GNT, likewise agrees that Junia is well attested to in ancient literature.

a. Discussion. Support for a female named Julia is evidenced by P46, a papyrus manuscript, dating from around a.d. 200. This papyrus represents the earliest known and most reliable testimony in support of Julia. The 3rd century Coptic, 4th century Vulgate, and fifth century Latin versions provide additional early support for this female name. These early manuscripts clearly support a female named "Julia."

Junia, the other variant reading, is supported by the earliest known manuscripts available. Sinaiticus dates from the fourth century and is earliest surviving complete copy of the Greek New Testament.¹⁶ Codexes A, B, C, D date from the 4th to 5th century and represent a broad spectrum of "text types." These early witnesses, by themselves, do not clearly reveal how an unaccented Iouinian should be translated.

The cumulative evidence provided by other ancient manuscripts, the existence of "Junia" as a common name in ancient times, and the lack of any evidence for "Junias" cannot be ignored. It is not unreasonable to state, as Moo does, that these early witnesses attest to "Junia."

b. Assessment. The quality and age of the above manuscripts provide strong support for a female name whether it be rendered "Julia" or "Junia." The research from many different scholars clearly support that a female named Junia occurred frequently in ancient writings.

4. Evidence for Female: Church Leaders and Writings

In commenting on Romans 16:7, John Chrysostom (347-407) states:

"Greet Andronicus and Junia...who are outstanding among the apostles: To be an apostle is something great! But to be outstanding among the apostles - just think what a wonderful song of praise that is! They were outstanding on the basis of their works and virtuous actions. Indeed, how great the wisdom of this woman must have been that she was even deemed worthy of the title of apostle."¹⁷

Chrysostom was not alone in confirming the gender of Junia as female. Earlier commentator Origen of Alexander (185-253) understood the name to be feminine.¹⁸ Others included Jerome (340-419) who wrote that Junia was a female. (*Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum* 72,15.), Hatto of Vercelli (924-961, *Theophylact* (1050-1108), and Peter Abelar (1079-1142).¹⁹

a. Discussion. External evidence from writings of early church leaders testify that Junias was a woman apostle. Current scholars provide additional insight. Commenting on the gender of Junia, Leonard Swidler states, "To the best of my knowledge, no commentator on the Text until Aegidius of Rome (1245-1316) took the name to be masculine."²⁰ Douglas Moo agrees that commentators before that 13th century were unanimous in favor of a female rendering.²¹ Stanley Grenz maintains that "the gender of Junia was not an issue in the patristic era ... Origen assumed that Paul's friend was a women...Chrysostom, who was no supporter of women bishops, expressed high regard for Junia."²² Ray R. Schulz states the Church Fathers agreed that Junia was a female apostle.²³

From the very earliest times, the attitude of the "church fathers" toward women could be described as negative at best.²⁴ Origen, Chrysostom and others were no exceptions to the prevailing attitudes. Yet despite their negative attitudes towards women they gave testimony that Junia was female.

b. Assessment. The testimony by church various leaders through the 12th century provide convincing support that Iounian was female.

III. One of the Apostles VS. Highly Regarded

The second issue under consideration is whether Andronicus and Junia where "among" as "one of" the apostles or were simply highly regarded "by" the apostles. Grammatically, some say both meanings are possible. It is interesting, however, to observe that while the ten Bible translations, mentioned earlier, are evenly divided on how they translated Iounian, they are unanimous on the meaning of *episemoi en tois apostolois*. For example, they are "outstanding apostles" (NAB), "outstanding among" (NASB, NIV), "prominent among" (NRSV), "eminent among" (REB), "of note among" (KJV, ASV, NJKV) and the NCV states "they are very important apostles." All these bibles translated *episemoi en tois apostolois* as meaning they were "one of" the apostles. James Walthers states "virtually all" English bibles interpret the phrase as meaning they were among the apostles.²⁵

1. Evidence They Were Apostles: Natural Meaning

a. Discussion. Greek scholar, A.T. Robertson states that the phrase *en tois apostolois* "naturally means that they are counted among the apostles in the general sense of Barnabas, James, the brother of Christ, Silas, and others. But it can mean simply that they were famous in the circle of the apostles in the technical sense."²⁶

Moo also concludes that it is more natural to translate the phrase *episemoi en tois apostolois* as "esteemed among the apostles" and not "esteemed by the apostles." He also states that earlier interpreters would argue against Paul meaning a woman because they had difficulty in "imagining that a woman could hold such authority in the early church.²⁷ In this sense, such a translation would also represent the harder or more difficult one. J.B. Lightfoot agrees that the only natural way to translate *episemoi en tois apostolois* is "regarded as apostles."²⁸ Cranfield states it is "virtually certain" that the phrase means "outstanding among the apostles." Walkers, commenting on Cranfield's remarks said, "this is the way the phrase was understood by all of the patristic writers and by most all modern commentators.²⁹ Bauer provides the normal meaning of *episemoi en tois apostolois* as "outstanding among the apostles."³⁰

Aida Besancon Spencer, makes the grammatical point that "the Greek preposition *en* which is used here always has the idea of 'within.'"³¹ Greek text books point out that *en* followed by the dative normally means "in, on or among." For example, *en tois* is translated as "among those" (1 Cor 2:6), and *en tois ethnesin* as "among the Gentiles" (Acts 15:12, 1 Cor 5:1, Gal 2:2, Col 1:27, 1 Pet 2:12). Where *en tois* is followed by a plural noun referring to a group of people, the word *en* is translated as "among." F.F. Bruce adds that not only were they "well known to the apostles" but they were "notable members of the apostolic circle."³² Liddel-Scott defines the Greek word *episemoi* as "having a mark on" it.³³ James A. Witmer, explains that *episemoi*, literally means "having a mark [*sema*] on them," therefore they are "illustrious, notable, or outstanding" among the apostles.³⁴ These definitions seem to describe them as one who "bears the mark" of an apostle.

b. Assessment. Numerous contemporary and past scholarship, lexical definitions, and grammatical construction provide conclusive support that they were "regarded as apostles."

2. Evidence for a Women Apostle: Church Bishop

Fourth century bishop of Constantinople, John Chrysostom wrote a series of homilies.

On Romans 16.7 he "noted: 'Oh how great is the devotion of this woman that she should be counted worthy of the appellation of apostle!' (The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series I, 11:555; Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956)."³⁵ Chrysostom praised Junia as an apostle. He also praised other women. It is significant to reflect on his following comment in reference to Paul's greeting of Mary in Romans 16:6:

How is this? A woman again is honored and proclaimed victorious! Again are we men put to shame. Or rather, we are not put to shame only, but have even an honor conferred upon us. For an honor we have, in that there are such women among us, but we are put to shame, in that we men are left so far behind by them . . . For the women of those days were more spirited than lions. (Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 51, cols. 668f.)³⁶

- a. Discussion. Chrysostom's writings provide us with important insight into the ministry of women in the early church. Junia was an apostle and was not the only woman so honored by the early church. Chrysostom's statements about these women are particularly convincing especially in light of his misogynist views toward women.³⁷
- b. Assessment. Chrysostom provides credible objective evidence that Junia was an apostle.

3. Evidence for Highly Regarded

Some interpreters, have taken the phrase *episemoi en tois apostolois* to mean that they were "held in high esteem" by those who were apostles. John Piper and Wayne Grudem simply say they may have been held in high regard or that they were "of note among the apostles" meaning they were well known before Paul was converted. Thomas Schreiner states that if Junias was a woman apostle, then tension would be created because "apostles were the most authoritative messenger of God." He implies that women could not serve God in this manner. He states Roman 16.7 is unclear, but does not attempt to explain why he says this.

- a. Discussion. Piper and Grudem offer no exegetical evidence to support their opinions and conclude "we cannot be certain."³⁸ Their remarks are only opinions and are not based on any objective evidence. Schreiner provides no objective evidence to support the claim that Junia(s) was only highly regarded other than his own subjective opinion.³⁹ James Walters states: "It is highly unlikely that Paul would have recommended this pair to the Roman Christians by saying they were "outstanding in the eyes of the apostles." Paul's comments on one's reputation in Galatians 2:6-9 would seem to argue against him trying to bolster the Roman Christians' opinion of the couple.⁴⁰ Craig Keener casts serious doubt upon any such interpretation, saying, "Since they were imprisoned with him, Paul knows them well enough to recommend them without appealing to the other apostles, whose judgment he never cites on such matters, and the Greek is most naturally read as claiming that they were *apostles*."⁴¹
- b. Assessment. There is no exegetical evidence offered or available that could substantially justify that "highly regarded" is the most probable and natural reading of this passage.

IV. PREFERRED VIEW

Junia was a female apostle. This is the preferred view. The evidence is authoritative, compelling, diverse, and objective. Junia has been demonstrated to be a woman based on the testimony of early manuscripts, recorded statements of various church leaders through the 12th century, and research performed by many other scholars attesting to the name Junia or Julia existing in ancient times.

The evidence for a male reading was based on later manuscripts subject to the interpretations of scribes who thought Iouinian was a male and to the statement by one

early church leader who was also mistaken as to the correct gender of Prisca. Computer-generated searches could find no example of a male Junias in ancient times nor is there any evidence proving that Junias was ever a contracted form of a longer name.

Junia and Andronicus were apostles. Numerous contemporary and past scholarship, lexical definitions, grammatical construction, and scriptural examples all provide the strongest support that *episemoi en tois apostolois*, naturally meant they were "outstanding among the apostles," just as Chrysostom so elegantly declared.

1. Meaning of Apostle

Andronicus and Junia were apostles. The only unresolved question is what did Paul mean by "apostles." James Walters offers four distinct ways "apostle" was used in the New Testament: 1) the Twelve original followers of Jesus, 2) persons who had seen the risen Lord and been commissioned by Him (1 Cor 9.1; 15:1-11); 3) a missionary successful in church planting, labor and suffering (which underlie Paul's arguments in 2 Cor); and 4) an emissary or missionary sent out by a particular church to perform specific tasks (2 Cor 8.23 and Phil 2.25).⁴² The first and fourth choice can be ruled out because they were not among the "twelve" nor was their apostleship specifically associated with a particular church or specific task. Selecting between the remaining choices 2 and 3 is more problematic. They certainly could have been among either or both of the remaining groups. We simply do not know. They may have ministered together as a married couple. An interesting parallel would then exist with Prisca and Aquila mentioned by Paul in Romans 16.3-5a. We do know, however, that Paul did not assign any gender-specific roles in his greeting to Andronicus and Junia, nor should the church today. They were both equally deemed outstanding apostles.

2. Concluding Comments

Andronicus and Junias were outstanding among the apostles probably by virtue of their apostolic sufferings, the numbers of years they had been in Christ, their labor, and their humble service for Christ. May the eyes of all those in the Church be opened to see this important truth and its significant implication in allowing women to minister equally as they are called by God. To do otherwise is to deny the full redemptive work of Christ.

NOTES _____

1 Stanley Grenz, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry*, (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1995), 93. 2 Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans, The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 921; James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)-Rom. 16:1-2,7," in *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity: Volume I*, ed. Carroll Osburn (Joplin, Missouri: College Press, 1995), 186. 3 Douglas Moo, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, 922. 4 Ibid. 5 Ibid. 6 James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)-Rom. 16:1-2,7" in *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity: Volume I*, ed. Carroll D.

Osburn (Joplin, Missouri: College Press, 1995), 186. 7 John Piper and Wayne Grudem, "An Overview of Central Concerns: Questions and Answers," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, eds. J. Piper and W. Grudem (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1991), 80.

8 Ibid, 79. 9 Ibid, 80. 10 Moo, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, 922. 11 Ronald L. Dart, "The Christian Woman" [on-line article], available from <http://www.abccog.org/woman.htm>; accessed 9 October 2001. 12 James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)," 186. 13 Moo, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, 922. 14 Bernadette Brooten, "Junia," *Women in Scripture* (2000):109; quoted by Dianne D. McDonnell, "Junia, A Woman Apostle" [on-line article]; available from <http://www.churchofgoddfw.com./monthly/junia.html> ; accessed 8 February 2002. 15 James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)," 186.

16 David Alan Black, *New Testament Textual Criticism, A Concise Guide*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 19. 17 Bernadette Brooten, "Junia ... Outsanding among the Apostles (Romans 16.7)"[on-line article], available from <http://www.womenpriests.org/classic/brooten.htm>; accessed 2 February 2002. 18 Ibid. 19 Dianne D. McDonnell, "Junia, A Woman Apostle" [on-line article]; available from <http://www.churchofgoddfw.com/monthly/junia.shtml>; accessed 8 February 2002. This article includes discussion of how Junia become known as a male during the papal reign of Boniface VIII. 20 Ibid. 21 Moo, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, 922.

22 Stanley Grenz, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology*, 95. 23 Ibid. 24 Dart, "The Christian Woman", accessed 9 October 2001. 25 James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)," 186. 26 Archibald Thomas Roberston, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, Vol. 4: *Epistles of Paul*, (Hiawatha, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1997), electronic edition. 27 Moo, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, 923. 28 Walter Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle In the Early Church*, trans. John E. Steely, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1969), 62. 29 James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)," 186.

30 Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed., trans. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 298. 31 Aida Besancon Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985), 104. 32 F.F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 298, 388. 33 Liddel-Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, 7th ed. (Hiawatha, Iowa: Parsons Technology, Inc., 1997), electronic edition. 34 John A. Witmer, *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, An Exposition of the Scriptures by Dallas Seminary Faculty: New Testatment*, (Hiawatha, Iowa: Parson Technolgy, Inc., 1997), electronic editon.

35 Leonard Swidler, *Biblical Affirmations of Woman*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979), 299. 36 Ibid, 295. 37 Ibid, 343. 38 John Piper and Wayne Grudem, "An Overview of Central Concerns: Questions and Answers," in *Recovering Biblical*

Manhood and Womanhood, 80. 39 Thomas R. Schreiner, "The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership: A survey of Old and New Testament Examples and Teaching," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, eds. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton: Crossway, 1991), 221. 40 James Walters, "Phoebe and Junia(s)," 187-188. 41 Craig S. Keener, Paul, *Women and Wives*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992), 242. 42 James Walters, 188.

Dennis J. Preato, Master of Divinity, magna cum laude is a graduate of Bethel Seminary, San Diego (June 2004). A condensed version of this paper was published in "Priscilla Papers" Volume 17, Issue 2, Spring 2003.

<http://godstowomen.org/studies/articles/juniapreato.htm>

Journey's End: Removing "Biblical" Barriers Between Women and Their Destiny
by Kathryn J. Riss, ThM

More than a narrow focus on a few verses, *Journey's End* applies the entire sweep of Scripture to illuminate passages that have puzzled Christians for generations, and have too often been misused to hurt women. God never intended for his Word to be misused to hurt women! Let *Journey's End* answer your questions and settle your heart!

- Reclaims Scripture as woman's Magna Charta
- Brings out St. Paul's true meaning and intent
- Sheds light on Genesis, Eph. 5, and I Cor. 11-14
- Provides a fresh translation of I Timothy 2:12-15 based on Greek grammar
 - Spotlights the cultural concerns Paul addressed
- Corrects errors of translation, interpretation, and Bible doctrine
 - Liberates Christian marriage
- Sets women free to be all God intends!

The "serpent's seed" has attacked God's daughters long enough. It's time for the truth to set them free! You will be refreshed, challenged and inspired by this thought-provoking book.

Dive into Chapter One
Read the Compelling Conclusion!
To Order *Journey's End* Online
Journey's End Conclusion
by Kathryn J. Riss, ThM
For a short bio of Kathryn click [here](#)

Over the quarter-century during which I have researched and studied the questions surrounding the role and status of Christian women, I have spent much time in prayer.

Acknowledging that the exegetical questions are difficult and perhaps impossible to resolve with complete satisfaction, I have turned to the Lord for an answer that would settle my heart. For it would be unthinkable for me either to lose faith in God's Word as inspired or in His Holy Spirit as doing all things well in the lives of the many women

He has called into and gifted for leadership. Both are true works of God and therefore must be in agreement; but how can this be reconciled with Scriptures that seem to restrict women?

What keeps coming back to me during such times is the Lord's answer to the Jews' question as to whether or not it was lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any reason. The rabbis allowed this, citing the Law of Moses, which allowed such men to grant their wives a writ of divorce so they could remarry.[1] Jesus told them, "because of the hardness of your hearts God gave you this commandment, but from the beginning it was not so."

This statement by Jesus shows that not all Scriptural directives convey God's ideal, but that some were given as concessions to human sinfulness. Jesus applied this specifically to the relations between husbands and wives.

I believe that the passages of Scripture which seem to restrict women fall into this category. They reflect, not God's original design for gender relationships as outlined in the Creation narratives, but the division and male domination that began at the Fall. Such Scriptures regulate the fallen state of hardened hearts, but Jesus died to change our hearts! That is an ongoing process, both in us as individuals and in our society.

Jesus wants us to soften our attitudes towards the women He sends to preach His Good News. Mark 16:14 tells us, "Afterward, He appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them for their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe those who had seen him after He was risen." Those who had seen Him after He was risen were Mary Magdalene, Mary Clopas, Mary Salome, Joanna and the other women who had obeyed His command to "Go and tell my brothers that I am risen from the dead." But the male disciples were so prejudiced against women that "all their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they did not believe them." (Luke 24:11) Jesus had to appear to them in person to reprimand them for not believing the message He gave them through women. Will He have to do the same with us?

Jesus led the Pharisees who wanted to take advantage of women away from their second-best law written for a fallen people back to Genesis, to the story of the perfect love and unity of man and woman before the Fall. I believe He would have us do the same.

Our Lord's admonition is a simple one, yet difficult to follow. We must return to Eden if we would truly learn and follow God's will for man and woman. Yet how can we go there without first being transformed from sinfulness to innocence? A sword of fire surrounds that place! We have inherited all the consequences of the Fall: self-will,

guilt, blame, deception, division and pride, to name just a few, and so are shut out by a holy God.

We are so saturated with sin and selfishness that we don't realize how alien our thinking is from that of Jesus Christ. That is why the greatest saints have fallen at Christ's feet, begging for mercy. Ordinarily, such people appear holy, but Jesus' presence shines perfect love upon human sin, revealing its blackness. For sinners saved by grace, trying to imagine sinless Eden is like a fish trying to imagine life as a bird flying in the sky. This is why orthodox Christians have failed so miserably over the millennia, justifying slavery, anti-Semitism, the Inquisition, the Holocaust, witch burnings, and other atrocities. Like us, they failed to realize how utterly deceived we become when we forget the law of love.

In His Great Commandment, the Lord points out for us the way back to Eden It is His way - the way of love. Jesus commands us to love God supremely and to love others as He has loved us. This means to treat others in all things as we would want to be treated. It means withholding judgments and extending mercy, giving others the benefit of the doubt. As St. Paul explains in I Corinthians chapter 13, whatever other gifts, wisdom, education, opportunities or good works we may have, love is supreme. Without it we are nothing.

Those who insist on placing restrictions on women but not men in the home, church and society fail to consider how far this causes them to stray from Christ's Great Commandment. Like the proverbial Pharisees of old, they have strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel. They have made great efforts to enforce peripheral matters of ancient law and custom while forgetting what is truly essential - to love one another.

In this case, that means to treat their sisters with the same consideration they themselves desire.

There are many things in the Bible that God has allowed and regulated because of the hardness of our hearts. Wars, slavery, polygamy, and the subjection of women are among the most difficult to reconcile with the loving, holy God Who has died for us.

Why would God allow such things? I believe it is because He knew that in a fallen world they would occur whether or not He allowed them and wanted to establish limits to their evil. God commanded that when Israel went to war, they were to spare the women and children and not destroy the productiveness of the land. When they married several women, they were not to favor a new wife over the first, nor bring a woman's sister as a rival into the household. Slaves in Israel had some legal rights and were to be set free after a period of years. And women were not to be treated as chattel, but to be loved, honored and respected as joint-heirs of God's kingdom.

God allowed all these practices, not because they were His best, but because the human heart was not sufficiently transformed to eliminate them. Over the centuries of God's self-revelation to His people, He has been working to bring us more and more into His holy standards and to reform society as a result. The Gospel has worked like yeast in bread dough to raise moral and ethical standards so that now, ancient practices such as polygamy and slavery seem unthinkable. And this process is continuing. Ephesians 4:13 and 15 encourage us to grow up in all things into Christ; that is, to become more and more like Him in all that we do.

Can you imagine Jesus marrying several women or owning a slave? Can you imagine Him Who healed the ear of an enemy who came armed to arrest Him picking up a sword to kill someone? Can you imagine Him Who commended Mary of Bethany for abandoning the housework to listen to His teaching putting a woman "in her place?" I cannot, nor do I think He wants us to do such things, but to love one another, as He did. If we are to follow in His footsteps, let us consider "what would Jesus do?" and do the same.

Let's stop teaching as the Lord's will a double standard for the sexes that gives men unfair advantages.

Traditionalists typically uphold the duty of husbands to love their wives in the same way that Christ loved the church in order to balance the obligation they place on wives to submit unilaterally to their husbands. In what ways has Christ limited the church or kept her down? Has He not rather defeated all her enemies, setting her free to be all He has created and redeemed her to be? Does He not encourage and equip her for her highest and noblest efforts, giving her His own power and authority? And did He not take upon Himself complete rejection, disgrace, defeat and even death so that she might live an abundant life that testifies to His power to liberate?

Restrictions placed upon women do not allow them the abundant life promised by Christ and enjoyed by Christian men. Instead, they rob women of their freedom and authority in Christ in favor of antiquated customs embedded in a legalistic view of what should be our most satisfying relationships; our marriages and our fellowship in the Body of Christ. This yoke is neither light nor easy, because it is not given by Christ, but imposed by man. Nor is it natural; it must be enforced with intimidation, oppression and even violence at times.

It saddens me that so many in the church have abandoned the Golden Rule in order to impose a rigid model of marriage and church polity upon those they profess to love. It saddens me even more that they are unwilling to let God be God and accept His sovereignty in granting spiritual and natural gifts to whomever He chooses and allowing them to be used for His glory.

It saddens me that evangelical churches reject the Holy Spirit's precious gifts because He sometimes chooses to give them to and through women rather than men. Some men are so proud and stubborn that they would rather die than be healed by God through a woman like Kathryn Kuhlman! While Christ tells us not to put our light under a bushel but upon a lamp stand for all to see, misguided traditionalists tell women to bury their leadership gifts rather than use them for His glory, no matter how rare and greatly needed. This is a waste and a great pity.

Have you ever had the experience of giving someone you love a gift that did not please them? Have you known the pain of having that person criticize or even return a gift you gave in love and great joy? I have, and it felt like more than a rejection of my gift - it felt like a rejection of me personally for having misjudged and offended my friend's taste. Added to that was a sense of grief - that the one I thought would share my appreciation for something I found beautiful was really not as close to me as

I had supposed, but held a different set of values. This placed a rift in our relationship and an ache in my heart.

The pain I felt at that time must be a tiny reflection of the much greater pain we inflict upon Jesus when we reject His gifts to us, including the women leaders He has called and wishes to raise up to serve the church in His behalf. God has a plan and purpose for these women; He has called them and given them special abilities for our benefit. But like spoiled children, we cast away His gifts in search of something more pleasing to our pride and sense of status.

One thing I have learned in my Christian life is that it is impossible to receive anything from the Lord without humbling oneself. I believe the same is true for the body of Christ. We must humble ourselves if we would receive the best He has for us and draw close to Him.

When people really love each other, any token of love is precious. What grandparent will not replace the mahogany pencil cup on his or her desk with the little can wound with string by the loving, patient fingers of a little child? What young woman in love will not carefully arrange the flowers her sweetheart gave her into her best vase, even if they were picked from beside the road?

If a bride to be should judge the diamond her fiancé offers too small, one doubts whether this marriage will succeed. Similarly, when Christians reject the gifts Jesus presents when they come in humble form, one wonders what happened to our first love for Him?

My prayer for those who retain beliefs in gender hierarchy and female restriction is that you will take a moment to consider prayerfully the effects of your attitudes on Jesus as well as on others before taking action. Put yourself into a woman's position and consider how you would feel as the victim of such views. Then remember the Lord's words: "inasmuch as you did it to the least of these, you did it to Me."

We greatly misjudge and wound the Lord's compassionate heart when we fail to abide by His great law of love in favor of a legalistic approach to human relationships and Christian service.

Please do not hurt Jesus and His children with words and actions that can never be undone but only repented of. To paraphrase Christ, do not load women down with burdens hard to bear while you will not touch one of them with your finger! Christian women do not wish to take anything that belongs to men; we only wish to have and use what God has given us, just as you do. There is no need for envy or rivalry between the sexes if we work together, encouraging and supporting one another.

Instead of defining what others may or may not do, let us encourage one another to do our utmost in serving Christ. Let's stir one another up to love and good works of every kind. If we see a special ability in another, let's pray for its increase and

encourage that person to exercise it that it may grow. Let's not measure our self-worth by our position in a pecking order, but quit pecking one another and look to Jesus! Together, let us "stand fast, then in the freedom with which Christ has set (us) free, and do not be entangled again with a yoke of bondage." (Galatians 5:1).

I thank you for considering these matters. May God bless you and guide you into all His truth.

NOTES_____

[1] Deuteronomy 24:1-3, Matthew 19:3-12

The Truth About Women in Public Ministry

For centuries women have been restrained from fulfilling their God-given leadership roles in the five-fold ministry. It is time for men to liberate and release women to fulfill their callings in God.

By Don Rousu

Women, I have a prophetic word for you:

"The Spirit of the Sovereign Lord is upon me because he has anointed me to preach good news to the oppressed, and to proclaim release to the captives."

It's time to hear the Lord saying, "Release my captive daughters to do my will."

You have been held captive in the Church. You have been restrained and in many ways disqualified from public ministry. I know, because I cooperated in that restraining process thinking it was right to do so. But by His Word and Spirit, God has radically changed my thinking and set me free to embrace my wife, Ruth, as my closest ministry partner. We are a team—equal partners, and a perfect complement. I am the head, she is the heart. Today I know that God has more than doubled my effectiveness and anointing by releasing Ruth to minister with me publicly. I can no longer imagine doing ministry without her.

Why have women in the Church been restrained? In large part, it has happened because men dominated the Church for hundreds of years. We brought a male bias to the translation and interpretation of Scripture. But it also appears that the Sovereign Lord has allowed the enemy a hand in this as well. Could it really be all three? Man, the devil, and God Himself?

This pattern can be found in Scripture. For example, while in their Egyptian captivity, the people of Israel were simultaneously shackled by Pharaoh, held captive by Satan, and restrained by God—all to fulfil the purposes of the Lord at His appointed time. He is the God who brings good out of evil. When the time came, Moses called to Pharaoh,

"Let my people go!" In one night all restraints fell away, and the people of God walked out of the land to their destiny.

Now is the time for a Moses-like proclamation. Right now God is orchestrating something far greater than the Exodus. Prophetic intercessors everywhere bear witness that God is preparing us for a harvest of unprecedented proportions in which we will need every labourer. We sense that God is about to do something so big that it will take a full expression of the Body of Christ to fulfil His purposes. It's time to hear the Lord saying, "Release my captive daughters to do my will." Just as it took both man and woman, Simeon and Anna, to pray and prophesy over the infant Jesus in the temple, so God is raising up both men and women to birth His purposes. We need to embrace His heart.

Tipping a sacred cow

As I embraced a radical shift in my theology regarding the role of women in public ministry, I realized that the captivity of women in the Church resulted primarily from one passage:

The mistranslation hinges on the Greek verb, *authentain*.

"Let a woman learn in silence in full submission. I permit no woman to teach or have authority over a man. She is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness with modesty" (1 Timothy 2:11).

The Church has built a whole doctrine and practice essentially on this one text. In the last few years, however, valuable evidence has accumulated that the original Greek has been misunderstood and mistranslated. A particularly enlightening resource is a book published by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, by a scholarly couple, Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger.

The mistranslation hinges on the Greek verb, *authentain*. The problem is that this verb is found nowhere else in the Bible. From years of studying biblical languages, I know that translators learn the meaning of a word by studying it in other Bible passages. Where there are no other Bible passages, they must look in comparative literature of the same time period. Although most translators of 1 Timothy have interpreted *authentain* to mean "to usurp authority" over a man, or "to have authority" over a man, such a translation violates both the context of Paul's writing and the first-century usage of the word in other literature. Let me explain.

The authentic meaning of *authentain*

Research shows that the meaning of *authentain* changed dramatically over a period of 1,100 years. When we first find it in classical literature of the 6th century B.C., the

word usually meant "to initiate" or "to be responsible for a murder." Jumping ahead to 200 or 300 A.D., this word usually meant "to claim ownership of property" either rightfully or wrongfully through fraud. During the same period it could also mean "to usurp power." However around the time the New Testament was written, the most common meaning of authentein was "to be, or claim to be the author or the originator of something." To underscore the point with a pun, this appears to be the authentic translation of authentein, the crucial verb of 1 Timothy 1:12.

Not only have translators overlooked the prevailing meaning of the word authentein at the time the New Testament was written, but they also seem to have missed the cultural context in which Paul wrote his letter to Timothy.

Perversion of Scripture infiltrates the Church

Timothy was in Ephesus. Ephesus was the world centre of paganism governed spiritually by the female deity Artemis whom the Romans called Diana. The cult of Artemis taught the superiority of the female and advocated female domination of the male. It espoused a doctrine of feminine procreation teaching that this goddess was able to bring forth offspring without male involvement. The cult was characterized by sexual perversion, fertility rites, endless myths, and elaborate genealogies traced through female rather than male bloodlines. Magic, and all manner of demonic activity flourished.

... gnostic teachings infiltrated the Church ...

Also present in Ephesus was a contingent of Jewish gnostics who represented the first century's equivalent of the New Age movement. The Greek word for "gnostic" is gnosis meaning "knowledge." Gnostics acknowledged spirit guides and combined the teachings of Artemis with the teachings of the Old Testament. An example of their distortion of Scripture is evident in their version of the Old Testament story of Adam and Eve.

In the most prevalent gnostic version of the story, Eve was the "illuminator" of mankind because she was the first to receive "true knowledge" from the Serpent, whom gnostics saw as the "saviour" and revealer of truth. Gnostics believed that Eve taught this new revelation to Adam, and being the mother of all, was the progenitor of the human race. Adam, they said, was Eve's son rather than her husband. This belief reflected the gnostic doctrine that a female deity could bring forth children without male involvement.

Gnostics also taught that the Hebrew God was a lesser deity and therefore changed His name from Yahweh to Ialdabaoth. Because they believed that physical matter was evil and the world of the spirit was good, they maintained that God had made a serious mistake in creating the material universe.

These gnostic teachings infiltrated the Church, and in writing to Timothy, Paul encouraged him to confront the problem of false doctrines head on. He told him to

forbid certain people from peddling their false teachings in the Church and to admonish others to turn away from myths and endless genealogies. He told him to oppose those who speak falsely of the living God, warn people about the doctrines of demons, avoid stupid, senseless controversies, and have nothing to do with old wives' tales such as the corrupted story of Adam and Eve. He urged Timothy to use the Scriptures as an antidote "for sound teaching, reproof, correction, and training in righteousness."

What Paul really said

In light of the authentic meaning of the word *authentain* and of the social context within which Paul wrote his letters to Timothy, let me offer what I believe is an appropriate rendering of the text in Timothy. I believe Paul is saying, "I am not allowing (present tense for that situation) a woman to teach or to proclaim herself the originator of man (*authentain*)." Do you see how this translation offsets false doctrine?

I submit that this translation is possibly the most legitimate ...

The word that is frequently translated "silence," *hesuchia*, also means harmony, peace, conformity or agreement. I therefore suggest Paul goes on to say, "she must be in agreement," meaning agreement with the Scriptures and with sound teaching in the Church.

He continues in this vein saying, "Adam was formed first, then Eve." This statement militates against the doctrine of Eve as progenitor. He also says, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman was! And sinned!" This statement directly contradicts the notion that Eve was the "illuminator," and carrier of new revelation.

I submit that this translation is possibly the most legitimate because it fits the social context, is true to the Greek, speaks to the troubled situation, and lines up perfectly with all of Paul's other teachings and practices concerning women.

Women: Paul's co-labourers in the Gospel

There is no indication that Paul restricted women in their callings before God. Throughout his ministry, Paul speaks of women as his co-labourers in the Gospel:

... there is no longer male and female, for all of you are one in Christ Jesus ...

He worked with a wife-husband team in the tentmaking business. He travelled with them planting and pastoring house churches and training the great orator, Apollos, to be more accurate in the Word of God. He usually mentions Priscilla, the woman, first before her husband, Aquila.

Paul also encouraged Timothy to trust the faith he had received from two women, his grandmother and his mother.

In his letter to the Romans, Paul commends a woman leader, Phoebe, to the Church at Rome. He says he is sending her himself as a minister of the Gospel. The Greek word for "minister" here is diakonos, a deacon. It implies that Phoebe had the same status in the early Church as Stephen the martyr and Philip the evangelist. In speaking of Phoebe Paul also uses the word prostatis, which means leader, overseer, or someone with stature, responsibility and authority.

In the same chapter Paul greets his relatives, Andronicus, a man, and Junia, a woman. He says that they both were in Christ before he was, and that they are highly prominent among the apostles.

Paul breaks rabbinic tradition in which he was raised and insists that women should learn the Word of God just like men in humility of heart and in full submission to the truth of Jesus Christ. Paul wants to equip women who will teach the truth of Scripture rather than myths and lies.

Paul tells Timothy which women to add to the church payroll. He counsels him to employ those who can serve a ministerial function in the church—women with good character and a proven track record.

Finally, Paul himself said, "As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female, for all of you are one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:27, 28).

God's purpose for women today

Throughout the centuries, God has raised up remarkable women in the Body of Christ to places of leadership. They have stood in the five-fold ministry of the Church as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. Several women come to mind who have profoundly shaped the character and ministry of numerous men, myself included: Madame Guyon, Hannah Whithall Smith, Jesse Penn Lewis, Mother Teresa, Jackie Pullinger-To. [Heidi Baker I might add - pris]

... this is not about the dominance of men or about the subservience of women.

Dr. Paul Yonggi Cho, pastor of the largest church in the world, said that his ministry would not be what it is today were it not for his mother-in-law and for women who were willing to pastor the many cell groups of which his church consists. He claims that 6,000 women were leading cell groups before he found the first man who was willing to do the task. These are but a small token of what God will do in the near future with women whose lives are yielded to Him.

Paul told Timothy to look for women who, like Jesus, have washed the feet of the saints. We are therefore called to search out those in whom He is incarnate, whether male or female, and release them into freedom to serve according to their callings. We will know them because in their submission to God's discipline they will reflect His

holiness. They will demonstrate His nature and His character, have a servant-heart, walk in humility and obedience. Such people will exhibit the mind of Christ, manifesting His wisdom and His authority. His love, His Word, and His anointing will be in them, and through them, the world will see Jesus.

So, you see, this is not about the dominance of men or about the subservience of women. It's about seeing Jesus fully expressed in all the members of His Body. And today there are many women in the Church who reflect the character, ministry and anointing of Jesus. The time has come to break the yoke of oppression, fear, bitterness, enmity, prejudice and distorted teaching. It is time to recognize the callings God has placed on the lives of His daughters, and release them into their ministries. The hour is late.

In these last days God is setting the stage for the great harvest. When it comes, it will look like Luke 5 all over again. Remember that great catch of fish? Nets breaking! Boats sinking! Overwhelmed disciples calling for help! Now is the time to hear His voice. He is stirring the Church to pray as never before. And as we pray, the Lord of the harvest is calling for every available labourer. Women of God, come forth!

Don Rousu and his wife Ruth pastor the VCF, Edmonton, Alberta.

Originally published in Spread the Fire, October 1997.

SILENCE THAT SHOUTS by Pamela Walford

"Dismembering the concubine's body and sending parts to each of the 12 tribes was intended to awaken Israel from its moral lethargy and to marshal the tribes to face up to their responsibility. It is ironic that the one who issued such a call was himself selfish and insensitive. See also Saul's similar action in 1 Sa 11:7" (Barker 355). For many women, the rape and murder of the Levite's concubine in Judges 19 and her subsequent dismemberment is among the most horrifying of all biblical narratives, particularly since God appears to be blatantly silent about it. Moreover, typical scholarly efforts to explain this passage compound the horror because the atrocity of the rape is usually minimized and the character of God often distorted through attempts to find spiritual meaning in the wicked acts that permeate the book of Judges. Admittedly, Judges is a difficult book to interpret since the Lord appears to eschew commenting on any event beyond the statement, "In those days Israel had no king; everyone did as he saw fit" (NIV Judg. 17:6). This silence has commonly been interpreted as his endorsement of the civil war that the concubine's death provokes. The higher spiritual cause of war obscures the tragic murder of the concubine and implies God's ambivalence toward her and toward women in general.

However, if Judges is read afresh without the androcentric presupposition of a God-ordained inferiority of women, we discover that his silence is not the noncommittal

neutrality it appears to be. We discover that his silence shouts from the pages of Scripture as the sin against women that was set in motion in Genesis (3:12, 16) comes to a point of no return in Judges.

Women saturate Judges like no other book in Scripture, and their sheer number should be enough to send up a signal that their presence is intentional and pregnant with meaning. Caleb's daughter, Acsah, appears in the very first chapter; Deborah and Jael dominate chapters four and five; a nameless woman slays Abimelech in chapter nine; Jephthah's daughter is the focus of chapter eleven; Samson's mother figures prominently in chapter thirteen; chapters fourteen to sixteen pivot around Samson's Philistine women; chapter nineteen details the story of the unfortunate concubine and chapter twenty-one closes the book with the abduction of the Gilead girls and their Shiloh sisters.

A closer look at these Judges women reveals a progressive, or rather regressive, shift in their status in the young nation of Israel. Judges opens with Acsah being bestowed to Othniel as a reward for capturing Kiriath Sepher. Her status is such that she asks for and receives a valuable tract of land from her father (1:11-15).

The next woman is Deborah, a prophetess and judge, who is told by the Lord to command Barak to attack Sisera. Barak consents to do this only if Deborah comes with him. She agrees but tells Barak that because he will not go without her, the Lord will hand Sisera over to a woman and he will be denied the honor of victory. A grisly narration of Sisera's death at the hands of Jael follows and chapter five is devoted to Deborah's song of praise to the Lord, in which she lauds his mighty work through herself, Jael and Barak.

The narratives of Gideon and Abimelech occupy chapters six through nine, and we encounter no women until the death of Abimelech, when a woman drops a rock on his head. It is interesting to note the differing attitudes between Abimelech and Barak. Barak willingly shares the glory of victory with two women, while Abimelech is more afraid of being killed by a woman than he is of death itself. It is also not much of a stretch to claim that this same anonymous woman defeated Abimelech's army because they immediately retreat after she kills him (9:50-55).

Jephthah's nameless daughter appears in chapter eleven. Jephthah is a mighty warrior who receives the Spirit of the Lord to aid him in battle. Nevertheless, Jephthah attempts to manipulate God by making a wicked vow to sacrifice "whatever comes out of my door to meet me" (11:30) if the Lord will give him victory over the Ammonites. Jephthah, who should have known the Law of Moses and the command not to kill, compounds his sin when he murders his daughter to keep his unholy vow. With her death, daughters depreciate in value, going from something to be won in victory to something to be sacrificed to purchase victory.

However, God continues to demonstrate his esteem of women and sends an angel of the Lord to the nameless wife of Manoah. The angel visits Manoah's wife twice before

finally appearing to the unbelieving Manoah. Manoah is terrified that he will die after he realizes he has seen the Lord but his wife chastises him for his foolish fear. It is noteworthy that it is Manoah's wife who receives the Lord's message and who is commanded to keep the Nazarite law (13:1-23).

The son of these two, Samson, brings all manner of destruction upon himself in chapters 14-16 because of his sinful weakness for Philistine women (Exod. 34:16), suggesting that the Lord reveres the women of Israel and does not look favorably on Samson's rejection of them.

Micah and his idols follow in chapters 17-18 and the tribe of Dan falls into idolatry, which Israel seems to tolerate without any sense of outrage, and for which the Lord appears to withhold judgment.

This brings us to one of the most appalling events in Scripture - the gang rape and dismemberment of the Levite's concubine (19). Ignoring the fact that any man who had a concubine was already an adulterer himself, we can only speculate on what motivated the concubine to be unfaithful. The character of her husband as demonstrated by his actions coupled with the fact that he tarries four months before seeking her out at her father's home, implies an abusive environment from which she sought escape or comfort. Any man who can cut his wife to pieces, even if she were unfaithful, has to be a monster, and her death smacks of a thinly disguised "honor killing"[1] The merciless manner in which the Levite hands his concubine over to the savagery of the Benjamite men and then in the morning prepares to continue his journey home without her, exposes a brutal heart that is murderous to the degree that when he trips over his wife lying on the threshold, he commands her to "get up; let's go" (19:28) and then straps onto his donkey when she does not respond.

We can only hope that she is in fact dead when he dismembers her and sends her body parts to the twelve tribes in a disgusting act that still offends society in every culture. Israel is also appalled, "such a thing has never been seen or done" (19:30).

Barker explains this macabre deed as a call to Israel's sense of morality. However, the book of Judges clearly demonstrates that Israel's sense of morality is severely compromised by this point. Why then is all Israel so offended that civil war flares up? Is it that a woman has been raped and murdered, that a man's pride has been insulted by homosexuality or that his property (the concubine) has been destroyed?

What possible explanation can there be for such a great lust for the blood of a brother that in the aftermath, thousands of lives have been lost and a tribe teeters on extinction?

Virtually every response to the rape of the concubine on the part of Israel is steeped in sin, save for the town of Jabesh-Gilead, which seems to be the only instance of common sense and restraint in this incident. Israel demonstrates a measure of morality by demanding the offending Benjamites be turned over to them, but they totally miss the point that the husband was equally, if not more so, at fault. This is

understandable since he conveniently omitted his full involvement in the retelling of his tale. Nevertheless, Israel does not bother to verify his story, and even if they had, it is doubtful anyone would have been offended because Israelite men already had a habit of offering up wives and virgin daughters to save their necks (Judge. 20:24, Gen. 13:10-16, 19:6-8.26:6-9).

Therefore, one wonders anew what Israel was so upset about? The only possible conclusion one can make is that Israel was merely bloodthirsty. Even before they demand the Benjamites to surrender the men of Gibeah, they amass an army, swearing to put to death any tribe that refuses to join them (21:5) and mastermind the genocide of the Benjamite tribe, swearing a curse on anyone who gives their daughter to them in marriage (21:1,18).

Although, the Lord is noticeably silent as Israel's sinfulness escalates, it can be deduced from the law (Deut. 5:6-7) that Dan's idolatry angers him. It can be further deduced from his threat to punish Israel if they mistreat orphans, widows and aliens (Exod. 22:22-24) and for which he eventually sent them into exile (Zec. 7:8-14), that he is angered over the rape concubine and is also angered that the practice of delivering up of women was not uncommon.

If we analyze the civil war with this in mind, we see that God does indeed communicate his wrath and punishes both Israel and Benjamin. When Israel asks God the wrong question, "Who should go first against the Benjamites?" (20:18), he instructs them to send Judah into battle and allows Benjamin to kill twenty-two thousand of them." Perplexed by this defeat, Israel amends their question; "Shall we go up again to battle against the Benjamites, our brothers?" However, this is not a moral questioning about the ethics of killing their relatives. Rather, the question exposes their sinful hearts and is a poorly disguised attempt to manipulate him. They presume God's faithfulness regardless of their sins and expect him to help them murder their brothers.

The Lord tells them to go into battle again and an additional eighteen thousand Israelites are killed. Finally, they recognize that they have offended the Lord in some way. They frantically pray and fast and offer burnt sacrifices. The Lord tells Israel that he will give them victory over Benjamin, but they demonstrate that they still do not have a clue as to the nature of their sin when they butcher so many Benjamites, including the women and children, that tribe is left too small to repopulate itself (21:16). They again turn to God and blame him for this calamity, asking why he could have allowed such a thing.

The civil war ends but Israel learns nothing from it. They regret their foolish vow to keep their daughters from Benjamin but sinfully believe their vow has the power to obligate the Lord to curse on their behalf. They remember their oath to kill anyone who did not join them in the civil war and proceed to massacre Jabesh-Gilead, the only community with enough discernment to stay out of the war. They spare Gilead's virgin daughters and send them to Benjamin as brides. Unfortunately, four hundred Gilead girls are insufficient and two hundred more girls are abducted from Shiloh. The book

closes with everyone returning to his to live on his own inheritance and doing as each sees fit (21:24-25).

But what of the Judges women, who begin the book on equal footing with men in terms of relationship with the Lord and close the book as mere male possessions of no more significance than Saul's oxen (1 Sam. 11:7)? Again, God appears to refrain from voicing his opinion explicitly, but by his character we must surmise that he has an opinion and that he communicates it in some way. Is his silence tacit approval? Are women a substandard species of humanity whom he values so little that he does nothing to oppose their dehumanization? Since women are made in his image (Gen. 1:27), the answer cannot be anything but a resounding no because to despise women would be to despise himself.

The book of Judges closes on four hundred Gilead women who have witnessed the massacre of their families, who fear and possibly even hate their Benjamite husbands and who are rearing the next generation of girls. There are two hundred abducted Shiloh brides rearing the next generation of girls. There is an entire nation of Israelite women rearing the next generation of girls, all of whom have seen or heard what happened to the concubine and the brides of Benjamin. Would any woman in Israel be so foolish as to risk allowing herself an individual identity? What woman would not question God's love for her when he seems to have not cared enough to deliver them from the abuse of men? What did these women teach their daughters? Lastly, what does the relationship between husbands and wives now look like, but more importantly, what does the relationship between men and God look like after their having cast aside the very thing that God said was for their good (Gen. 2:18)? Is it possible to truly know God through only half of his image?

As the story of Judges plays out we witness God silently lift his hand of restraint from Israel and give them over to their depravity. In the aftermath, thousands are dead, but that is not the end of it. The answer to God's silence lies more in the questions Judges raises than in the solution, which does not appear until Jesus' birth, death and resurrection, and we see that the consequence of Israel's ultimate sin in follows them throughout the Old Testament.

The abuse of women that began in Genesis comes full circle in Judges. The husbands of Israel were cut off from a full relationship with their wives simply by virtue of their subjugation of them. While that is a great loss on its own, the greater loss is the fullness of the knowledge of God through the loss of relationship with half of his image - woman.

And so it stood, until Jesus redeemed the events in Judges through his restoration of women. He taught the women; they called him "Rabboni" (John 20:16); he would not condemn the adulteress (John 8:4-11), and he loved the Samaritan woman (John 4:7-26). And, he brought women full circle back to the status they enjoyed at the outset of Judges when he commissioned Mary Magdalene, the first human to see the resurrected Lord, to "go and tell " the men (John 20:17-18) as Deborah had.

Works Cited

Barker, Kenneth, ed. NIV Study Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995.

Sasson, Jean P. Princess. New York: William Morrow, 1992.

NOTES_____

[1] "Honor killing," an act of murder against a woman who has brought dishonor on her family through infidelity or having been raped, is still practiced in some countries (Sasson 199-209).

<http://godstowomen.org/main.htm> is a fantastic site for women

FEMALE TEACHING:

OR, THE REV. A. A. REES versus MRS. PALMER, BEING A REPLY TO A PAMPHLET BY THE ABOVE GENTLEMAN ON THE SUNDERLAND REVIVAL.

By: General Catherine Booth.

"And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy."--JOEL. "Here is a law of eternal justice; man cannot debase woman without becoming himself degraded." "It is in spite of our stupid education that women have thought, and intellect, and a soul; it is in spite of our barbarous prejudices that they are at the present day the glory of Europe and the companions of our lives."--AIME MARTIN.

SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED. G.J. STEVENSON,
54, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

(foreword)

HAVING abundant evidence that this pamphlet has been rendered very useful, the first issue being exhausted, and feeling that there is as great need as ever for light upon the subject, the author has been induced to issue a second edition. In doing so she has taken the opportunity to enlarge and improve it, rendering it, on the whole, she trusts, better worthy of the important subject of which it treats.

ST. IVES, CORNWALL, Nov. 4, 1861.

Female Teaching.

IN dealing with the pamphlet before us, we may premise, that it is not our intention to enter on a personal vindication of Mrs. Palmer. We do not conceive this to be necessary. The high estimation in which that lady is held by the public, will not suffer in the least by the ungentlemanly and unchristian attack Mr. Rees has ventured to make

upon her. Mr. Rees demands "principles, and not phenomena;" we, therefore, purpose to deal exclusively with the **principles** involved in the controversy, which are,
First, Woman's **right** to teach in the Church.
Second, Personal dealing with anxious sinners.

The first objection urged against female teaching in the pamphlet before us is **Unnaturalness**. Mr. Rees seems here to be labouring under a very great but common mistake, viz., that of confounding nature with custom. Use, or custom, makes things appear to us natural which, in reality, are very unnatural; while, on the other hand, novelty and rarity make very natural things appear strange and contrary to nature.

So universally has this power of custom been felt and admitted, that it has given birth to the proverb, "Use is second nature." Making allowance for the novelty of the thing, we cannot discover anything either unnatural or immodest in a Christian woman, becomingly attired, appearing on a platform or in a pulpit. By **nature** she seems fitted to grace either. God has given to woman a graceful form and attitude, winning manners, persuasive speech, and, above all, a finely-toned emotional nature, all of which appear to us eminent **natural** qualifications for public speaking. We admit that want of mental culture, the trammels of custom, the force of prejudice,

Page 4

and the assumptions of the other sex, with their one-sided interpretations of Scripture, have, hitherto, almost excluded her from this sphere; but, before Mr. Rees dogmatically asserts such a sphere to be unnatural, he must prove either that woman has not the **ability** to teach or to preach, or, that the possession and exercise of this ability unnaturalises her in other respects; that, so soon as she presumes to step on the platform or into the pulpit, she loses the delicacy and grace of the female character--in fact, ceases to be a woman. Whereas, we have numerous instances of her retaining all that is most admired in her sex, and faithfully discharging the duties peculiar to her own sphere, and at the same time taking her place with our most popular speakers and writers.

Mrs. Stowe informs us, that much of Uncle Tom's Cabin was written while superintending her cooking-stove; and we have heard of mothers studying sermons, owned of God in the **undeniable** conversion of souls, while nursing an infant. Will Mr. Rees point out the violence done to nature in these instances? Will he explain why a mind like Mrs. Stowe's should shroud itself in obscurity, and hide its light, beauty, and power under a bushel, because it happens to be enshrined in a frailer body than his own? Will he inform us why woman should be confined exclusively to the kitchen and the distaff, any more than man to the field and the workshop?

Did not God, and has not nature, assigned to man **his** sphere of labour, "to till the ground, and to dress it?" And, if Mr. Rees claims exemption from this kind of toil for a portion of his sex, on the ground of their possessing ability for intellectual pursuits, he must allow us the same privilege for woman; and we challenge him to prove the exception more **unnatural** in the one case than the other, or to show why God in this solitary instance has endowed a being with powers he never intended her to employ.

In reply to our author's first quotation from the poets--

"Seek to be good, but aim not to be great,"&c., we must enquire if he intends to insinuate that goodness and greatness are incompatible, or that all women, any more than

Page 5

men, who venture to teach, preach, or write, aim only to be great. And, though "her fairest virtues" do "fly from public sight," must she herself flee publicity when virtue, humanity, or religion, need her as a champion? In reply to our author's quotation from Milton, we presume that even **he** would not endorse such sentiments, and palm them upon this age as our standard of woman's intelligence, and our code for her morality. Neither in nature nor revelation is there the shadow of a foundation for this fantasy of the poet's imagination. Prior to the fall, at least, the human pair were equal in nature, position, and jurisdiction over the inferior animals. **"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."**--Gen. i. 27, 28.

Here is not the semblance of inferiority or subjection. Woman was a help-meet for man, created to be his companion, assistant, and friend; a being in all respects, save for that of sex, like himself. As is beautifully expressed in the original word by which she is designated, ishshak, being the same word (ish) used to signify man, with a feminine termination, and literally means a **she-man**. Most of the ancient versions endeavour to express this idea as literally as possible. A few of these renderings will tend to throw light on this part of our subject, and perhaps serve to explode some of the absurd notions so common respecting woman's inferiority.

The vulgate Latin renders the Hebrew, virago, which is the feminine form of vir, a man. Symmachus uses andris; a female form of aner, a man. Our own phrase is equally expressive--woman, which is a contraction of **wombman**, being the generic term with a feminine prefix. Hence we see the propriety of Adam's exclamation, **"This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man"**--Gen. ii. 23. If woman had been an inferior being, we maintain that these terms would have been totally inapplicable; her nature would have demanded a designation implying some other dissimilarity that the solitary

Page 6

one above referred to. As to subjection there needed none, their wills being harmonized by perfect acquiescence in the will of their Creator, to whom they were each **equally** responsible. If woman had been in a state of subjection from her creation, in consequence of natural inferiority, where is the force of the words, **"he shall rule over thee,"** as a part of her curse?

We challenge Mr. Rees, or any other person, to give us any authority, beyond the imagination of the poet, for the mere non-entity his quotation represents woman to be.

God nowhere deals with her as it would imply. He treats her as an independent, responsible being; amenable to the same law, and subject to the same penalties, as her companion; and, by the terrible sentence passed upon her for her disobedience, Jehovah unmistakably indicates that he held her equally capable of understanding and obeying his law. Even in her present state of subjection as a wife, she is only allowed to submit to

her own husband "as it is fit in the Lord;" her own enlightened conscience being left arbiter of that fitness. We hope Mr. Rees is able to justify his motives as a Christian minister, in thus parading before the public mind views and sentiments so degrading to at least half his race, and so dishonouring to his religion and his God. Before we can appreciate the force of his quotations from Shakespeare and Cowper, Mr. Rees must point out the woman "impudent and mannish grown;" as also the discourse, gesture, or appearance calculated "to shock one's delicacy, truth, or sense." At present, we are unacquainted with anything of the kind in a female teacher or speaker, not have we heard that any among the thousands who have listened to Mrs. Palmer during her visit to the North, have ventured to prefer such a charge against **her**, save the Rev. A.A. Rees, Dr. Jarbo, of Shields, and one or two others of equal renown for **sagacity, courtesy, and humility.**

Thus much for our author's first objection of "**unnaturalness.**" Much more might be said, but his mere assertion is, we think, more than refuted. The rev. gentleman's second objection is by far the most important, and, if capable of substantiation by a fair and consistent interpretation of the Word of God, should receive

Page 7

our immediate acquiescence; but, on the contrary, we think the views he seeks to propagate in support of his objection are both false and exceedingly detrimental to the spread of true religion. Hence, drawing our weapons, mainly, from the Word of God, we shall proceed to combat them.

First, however, we may remark, that here again Mr. Rees starts with a mere assumption. He asserts female prophesy or teaching to be unscriptural, and then, instead of attempting to prove it so, by a candid and critical examination of the passages relating to the subject, he quietly shelves the most prominent, and gives us only the most hackneyed and controverted view of those to which he refers. We purpose adopting a more honourable course; and one which we think more in keeping with the motto Mr. Rees has adopted, that of "speaking the truth in love."

First, then, we will select the most prominent and explicit passages of the New Testament referring to the subject, viz., 1 Cor. xi. 1--15; 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. Let us look at the passage, 1 Cor. xi. 1--15: "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head: for that is all one as if she were shaven," &c. "The character," says a talented writer, "of the prophesying here referred to by the apostle is defined 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 4 and 31st verses. The reader will see that it was directed to the 'edification, exhortation, and comfort of believers,' and the result anticipated was the conviction of unbelievers and unlearned persons.

Such were the public services of women which the apostle allowed, and such was the ministry of females predicted by the prophet Joel, and described as a leading feature in the Gospel dispensation. Women who speak in assemblies for worship, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, assume thereby no personal authority over others; they simply deliver the messages of the Gospel, which imply obedience, subjection, and responsibility, rather than

authority and power." Dr. A. Clarke, on this verse, says, "Whatever may be the meaning of praying and prophesying in respect to the man, they have precisely the same

Page 8

meaning in respect to the woman! So that some women at least, as well as some men, might speak to others to edification, exhortation, and comfort. And this kind of prophesying or teaching was predicted by Joel ii. 28, and referred to by Peter, Acts ii. 17. And, had there not been such gifts bestowed on woman, the prophecy could not have had its fulfilment. The only difference marked by the apostle was, the man had his head uncovered, because he was the representative of Christ; the woman had hers covered, because she was placed by the order of God in subjection to the man; and because it was the custom, both among the Greeks and Romans, and among the Jews an express law,

that no woman should be seen abroad without a veil. This was, and is, a custom through all the East, and none but public prostitutes go without veils; if a woman should appear in public without a veil, she would **dishonour her head--her husband**. And she must appear like to those women who have their hair shaven off, as the punishment of adultery." See also Doddridge, Whitby, and Cobbin.

We maintain, that the view above given is the only fair and common-sense interpretation of this passage. If Paul does not here recognise the **fact**, that women did actually pray and prophesy in the primitive churches, his language has no meaning at all; and if he does not recognize their **right** to do so, by dictating the proprieties of their appearance while so engaged, he talks jargon, and we leave to Mr. Rees the task of educating any sense whatever from his language. If, according to the logic of Dr. Barnes, the apostle here, in arguing against an improper and indecorous mode of performance, forbids the performance itself, the prohibition extends to the **men** as well as to the women; for Paul as expressly reprehends a man praying with **his** head covered, as he does a woman with **hers** uncovered. With as much force might the Doctor assert, that in reproving the same church for their improper and indecent celebration of the Lord's Supper, Paul prohibits all Christians, in every age, celebrating it at all. Alas! what straits and dilemmas are men reduced to, in making their preconceived notions fit on to the sacred text.

Page 9

"The question with the Corinthians was not whether or not the women should pray and prophesy at all, that question had been settled on the day of Pentecost, but whether, as a matter of convenience, they might do so without their veils." The apostle kindly and clearly explains, that by the law of nature and of society it would be improper to uncover her head while engaged in acts of public worship. We venture to say, that the very refined compliments paid to these women by Dr. Barnes and others are quite gratuitous and uncalled for. Here is no intimation that they ever had uncovered their heads while so engaged; the fairest presumption is, that they had not, nor ever would, till they knew the apostle's mind on the subject. We have precisely the same evidence that the men prayed and preached with their hats on, as that women removed their veils, and wore their hair dishevelled, which is simply none at all. We cannot but regard it as a signal evidence of the power of prejudice, that a man of Dr. Barnes's general clearness and acumen should

condescend to treat this passage in the manner he does. The Doctor evidently feels the untenableness of this position, and endeavours, by muddling two passages of distinct and different bearing, to annihilate the argument fairly deducible from the first. We would like to ask the Doctor on what authority he makes such an exception as the following: "But this cannot be interpreted as meaning that it is improper for females to speak or to pray in meetings of their own sex."

Indeed! but according to the most reliable statistics we possess, two-thirds of the whole church is, and always has been, composed of their own sex. If, then, no rule of the New Testament is more positive than this, viz., that women are to keep **silence** in the churches, on whose authority does the Doctor license them to speak to by far the larger portion of the church? Surely it were better for the lords of creation to sacrifice a tittle of their self-assumed prerogative than to run themselves into such inconsistencies in defending it. Our second quotation reads as follows:--"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to

Page 10

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." Now let it be borne in mind this is the same apostle, writing to the same church, as in the above instance. Does Mr. Rees maintain, that Paul here refers to the same kind of speaking as before? If so, we insist on his supplying us with some rule of interpretation, which will harmonize this unparalleled contradiction and absurdity. Taking the simple and common-sense view of the two passages, viz., that one refers to the devotional and religious services of the church, and the other to its political and disciplinary assemblies, there is no contradiction or discrepancy, no straining or twisting of either.

If, on the other hand, we assume that the apostle refers in both instances to the same thing, we make him in one page give the most explicit and full directions how a thing shall be performed, which in a page or two further on, and writing to the same church, he expressly forbids being performed at all. We admit that "it is a shame for women to speak in the church," in the sense here intended by the apostle; but before the argument of Dr. Barnes or Mr. Rees can be deemed of any worth, they have to prove, their ability to do which we utterly deny, that the "speaking" here is synonymous with that concerning the manner of which the apostle legislates in 1 Cor. xi. Dr. A. Clarke, on this passage, says, "This was a Jewish ordinance; women were not permitted to teach in the assemblies, or even to ask questions. This was their condition till the time of the Gospel, when, according to the prediction of Joel, the Spirit of God was to be poured out on the women as well as the men, that **they** might prophesy, **that is teach**. And that they did prophesy or teach is evident from

* "Learning anything by asking their husbands at home," cannot mean preaching. We do not call that learning, but teaching "the way of God." It cannot mean being inspired by the Holy Ghost to foretell future events. No woman, having either taught or

prophesied, would have to ask her husband at home before she know what she had done, or understood what she had said. Such a woman would be only fit to "learn in silence with all subjection." The reference is evidently to subjects under debate.

Page 11

what the apostle says, 1 Cor. xi., where he lays down rules to regulate this part of their conduct while ministering in the church. All that the apostle opposed here is their **questioning, finding fault, disputing, &c.**, in the Christian church, as the Jewish men were permitted to do in their synagogues. See Luke ii. 46, together with attempts to usurp authority over men by setting up their judgment in opposition to them; for the apostle has reference to acts of disobedience and arrogance, of which no woman would be guilty who was under the influence of the Spirit of God."

The Rev. J.H. Robinson, writing on this passage, remarks:--

"The silence imposed here must be explained by the verb to speak, (lalein) used afterwards. Whatever that verb means in this verse, I admit and believe the women were forbidden to do **in the church**. But what does it mean? It is used nearly three hundred times in the New Testament, and scarcely and verb is used with so great a variety of adjuncts. In Schleusner's Lexicon, its meaning is traced under **seventeen** distinct heads and he occupies **two** full pages of the book in explaining it. Among other meanings he gives respondeo, rationem reddo, præcipio, jubeo: I answer, I return a reason, I give rule or precept, I order, decree."

In Robinson's Lexicon, (Bloomfield's edition) two pages nearly are occupied with the explanation of this word; and he gives instances of its meaning, "as modified by the **context**, where the sense lies, not so much in lalein (lalein) as in the adjuncts" The passage under consideration is one of those to which he refers as being so "modified by the context." Greenfield gives, with others, the following meanings of the word: "to prattle--**be loquacious as a child; to speak in answer--to answer**, as in John xix. 10; **to speak, discourse, discuss in a set manner, harangue, plead**, Acts ix. 29--xxi. 93. **To direct, command**, Acts iii. 22." In Liddel and Scott's Lexicon, the following meanings are given: "**to chatter, babble; of birds, to twitter, chirp; strictly, to make an inarticulate sound**, opposed to articulate speech; but also, generally, **to talk, say**."

It is clear then that lalein may mean something different from mere speaking, and that to use this word in a prohibition does not imply that absolute silence or abstinence from speaking is enjoined; but, on the contrary, that the prohibition applies to an improper kind of speaking, which is to be understood, not from the word itself, but, as Dr. Robinson says, from "s the context."

Now, the "context" shows that it was no **silence** which was imposed upon women in the church, but only a refraining from such speaking as was inconsistent with the words, "they are commanded to be under obedience," or, more literally, "to be obedient:" that is, they were to refrain from such questionings, dogmatical assertions, and disputations, as would bring them into collision with the men--as would ruffle their tempers, and occasion an unamiable volubility of speech. This kind of speaking, and this alone, as it appears to

me, was forbidden by the apostle in the passage before us. This kind of speaking was the only supposable antagonist to, and violation of, that "obedience" on which he lays such a **salutary** stress. Absolute silence was not essential to that "obedience." My studies in "Biblical criticism," &c. have not informed me that a woman must cease to speak before she can obey; and I am therefore led to the irresistible conclusion, that it is not **all** speaking in the church which the apostle forbids, and which he pronounces to be shameful; but, on the contrary, a pertinacious, inquisitive, domineering, dogmatical kind of speaking, which, while it is unbecoming in a **man**, is shameful and odious in a woman, and, especially when that woman is in the church, and is speaking on the deep things of religion.

Justin Martyr, who lived till about A.D. 150, says, in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, "that both men and women were seen among them, who had the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit of God, according as the prophet Joel had foretold, but which he endeavored to convince the Jews that the latter days were come."

Dodwell, in his dissertations on Irenæus, says, "that the gift of the spirit of prophecy was given to others besides the apostles; and, that not only in the first and second, but in the third century--even to the time of Constantine--all sorts and ranks of men had these gifts; yea, and women too."

Eusebius speaks of Potomania Ammias, a prophetess, in Philadelphia, and others, "who were equally distinguished for their love and zeal in the cause of Christ."

"We well know," says the late Mr. Gurney, a minister of the Society of Friends, "that there are no women among us more generally distinguished for modesty, gentleness, order, and a right submission to their brethren, than those who have been called by their divine Master into the exercise of the Christian ministry."

"The scriptural idea," says Mrs. Palmer, "of the terms **preach and prophesy, stands so inseparably connected as one and the same thing, that we should find it difficult to get aside from the fact that women did preach, or, in other words, prophesy, in the early ages of Christianity,** and have continued to do so down to the present time to just the degree that the spirit of the Christian dispensation has been recognized. And it is also a significant fact, that to the degree denominations, who have once favoured the practice, lose the freshness of their zeal, and as a consequence, their primitive simplicity; and, as ancient Israel yielded to a desire to be like a surrounding communities, in a corresponding ratio are the labours of females discountenanced."

If Mr. Rees still insists on a literal application of this text, we beg to ask how he disposes of the preceding part of the chapter where it occurs. Surely, if one verse be so authoritative and so binding, the whole chapter is equally so; and, therefore, such a stickler for a literal application of the words of Paul, under all circumstances and through all time, will be sure to observe the apostle's order of worship in his own congregation. Does Mr. Rees then let his whole church prophesy one by one; and does he sit still and listen while they are speaking, so that all things may be done decently and in order? No!

he does not; but why not? Paul as expressly lays down this order as he does the rule for women, and he adds, "The things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord," verse 37. Why then does not Mr. Rees abide by these directions? We anticipate his reply--"Because these directions were given to the Corinthians as temporary arrangements; and, though they were the commandments of

Page 14

the Lord to them at that time, they do not apply to all Christians in all times." True, my good sir; but, unfortunately for your argument, the prohibition of women speaking, even if it meant what you wish, was given amongst those very directions, and to the Corinthians **only**: for it reads, "Let **your** women keep silence," &c.; and, for aught this passage teaches to the contrary, Christian women of all other churches might do what these women were forbidden to do. Until Mr. Rees makes a personal application of the rest of the chapter, he must excuse us declining to do so of the 24th verse; and we defy him to show any greater breach of the divine law in the one case than the other. There are some other directions of St. Paul, which we might with equal propriety insist on being literally applied, which would place Mr. Rees, and many more of these one-sided gentlemen, in a very unenviable fix; but we forbear: we only want fair play.

We are obliged to Mr. Rees for his quotation from Dr. Palmer's letter, and agree in the opinion, that the Dr. will not be ashamed of his own argument; but we think that Mr. Rees has great cause to be ashamed of the manner in which he disposes of it. First, "As to Mary Magdalen's proclamation," says our author, "I don't call a private message, a public proclamation." Nor do we! There are few particulars, however, about this private message, to which we beg to call Mr. R's attention. It was the **first** announcement of the glorious news to a lost world, and a company of forsaking disciples. Second, it was as **public** as the nature of the case demanded; and intended, ultimately, to be published to the ends of the earth. Third, Mary was expressly commissioned to reveal the fact to the apostles; and thus she literally became their teacher on that memorable occasion.

Oh, glorious privilege, to be allowed to herald the glad tidings of a Saviour risen! How could it be that our Lord chose a **woman** to this honour? Perhaps Mr. Rees can throw some light on this mystery. One reason might be that the male disciples were all missing at the time. One was probably contemplating suicide, goaded to madness by a conscience reeking with the blood of his betrayed and crucified Master; another was occupied in

Page 15

reflecting on certain conversations with a servant maid; and the rest were trembling in various holes and corners, having all forsaken their Master, and fled. Had this perfidy been practised by woman, Mr. Rees would doubtless have paraded it with all that satisfaction which he evidently feels in reiterating the sentence, "The woman was deceived;" but no! Woman was there, as she had ever been, ready to minister to her risen; as to her dying, Lord,--

"Not she with traitorous lips, her Saviour stung,
Not she denied him with unholy tongue;
She, whilst apostles shrunk, could danger brave;
Last at the cross, and earliest at the grave." But, surely, if the dignity of our Lord, or the

efficiency of his message, were likely to be imperilled by committing this sacred trust to a woman, he who was guarded by legions of angels could have commanded another messenger; but, as it intent on doing her honour, and rewarding her unwavering fidelity, he reveals himself **first** to her; and, as an evidence that he had taken the curse under which she had so long groaned out of the way, nailing it to his cross, he makes her who had been first in the transgression, first also in the glorious knowledge of complete redemption.

Secondly.--"As to the prophecy of Joel: I don't set prophesy against precept." But Mr. R. does worse; he makes God do so. Surely, the rev. gentleman will not exclude Joel from the list of the prophets, because he utters a prediction so unpalatable to this prejudices. Surely, he does not deny that God promised in the last days to pour out his Spirit upon all flesh, and that the **daughters** as well as the sons of mankind should prophesy. He **does** presume to say, "What if they have the gift of prophecy, they must not use that gift in public." But God says, by his prophet Joel, they **shall** use it, just in the same sense as the sons use it. When the dictation of Mr. Rees so flatly opposes the express declaration of the "sure word of prophecy," we make no apology for its utter and indignant rejection. If there were no evidence that this prophecy had yet been fulfilled we should deem it sufficiently explicit to warrant an expectation of its accomplishment. But Peter says most emphatically, respecting the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, "This **is that** which is spoken, of by the prophet Joel," &c. Acts ii. 16, 18.

Words more explicit,
and an application of prophecy, more direct than this does not occur within the range of the New Testament. Mr. Rees talks of gloss that would explain away his interpretations, we think that it requires something more than gloss to explain away Peter's application of the passage referred to.

Again, says our author, "The very **reason** for imposing silence, demonstrates that female usurpation was in debate." Without being able to comprehend this sentence, we admit that female **usurpation** of certain offices and ascendancies **was** in debate, and not female **teaching**, which is quite another thing. But, says Mr. Rees, "Explain this away if you like, you cannot so easily **get rid of**, 'I suffer not a woman to teach,' &c." We reply that we have no desire to **get rid of** either this or any passage of the Holy Writ. We challenge Mr. Rees, or any other person, to bring forward any proof that the apostle here refers to the conduct of women in the church at all. "It is primarily an injunction," says the Rev. J.H. Robinson, "respecting her personal behaviour at home.

It stands in connexion with precepts respecting her apparel and her domestic position; especially her relation to her husband. No one will suppose that the apostle forbids a woman to 'teach' absolutely and universally. Even objectors would allow her to teach her own sex in private; they would let her teach her servants and children, and, perhaps, her husband too. If he were ignorant of the Saviour, might she not teach him the way to Christ? If she were acquainted with languages, arts or sciences, which he did not know, might she not teach him these things? Certainly, she might! The 'teaching,' therefore, which is forbidden by the apostle, is not every kind of teaching any more than, in the previous instance, his

prohibition of speaking applied to every kind of speaking in the church; but it is such teaching as is domineering, and as involves the usurpation of authority over the man. This is the only teaching forbidden by St. Paul in the passage under consideration."

Page 17

"If this passage be not a prohibition of every kind of teaching, we can only ascertain what kind of teaching is forbidden by the modifying expressions with which *didaskain* stands associated; and, for anything these modifying expressions affirm to the contrary, her teaching may be public, reiterated, urgent, and may comprehend a variety of subjects, provided it be not dictatorial, domineering, nor vociferous; for then, and then only, would it be incompatible with her obedience."

The Rev. Dr. Taft says, "This passage should be rendered, 'I suffer not a woman to teach **by** usurping authority over the man.' This rendering removes all the difficulties and contradictions involved in the ordinary reading, and evidently gives the meaning of the apostle." "If the nature of society," says the same writer, "its good, and prosperity, in which women are jointly and equally concerned with men; if in many cases their fitness and capacity for instructors, being admitted to be equal to the other sex, be not reasons sufficient to convince the candid reader of woman's right to preach and teach because of two texts in Paul's epistles, let him consult the paraphrase of Locke, where he has proved to a demonstration that the apostle, in these texts, never intended to prohibit women from praying and preaching in the church provided they were dressed as became women professing godliness, and were qualified for the sacred office."

"It will be found," says another writer, "by an examination of this text with its connexions, that the teaching here alluded to stands in necessary connexion with usurping authority, as though the apostle had said, the gospel does not alter the relation of women in view of priority, for Adam was first formed, then Eve."

Not upon us, therefore, but upon Mr. Rees, and those who hold his views, devolves the task of getting rid of unpalatable texts. And, judging from the facility with which the rev. gentleman disposes of Joel's prophecy, and, assisted by a learned doctor, loses others in a fog, we presume that he will not find any great difficulty in this department; we, therefore, respectfully commend to his notice such as the following:--

"And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time," &c. Judges iv. 4--10. There are two particulars in this passage worthy of note. First, the authority of Deborah as a prophetess, or revealer of God's will to Israel, was acknowledged and submitted to as implicitly as in the cases of the male judges who succeeded her. Secondly, she is made the military head of ten thousand men, Barak refusing to go to battle without her.

Again, in 2 Kings xxii. 12--20, we have an account of the king sending the high priest, the scribe, &c., to Huldah, the prophetess, the wife of Shallum, who dwelt at Jerusalem, in the college; to enquire at her mouth the will of God in reference to the book of the law which had been found in the house of the Lord. The authority and dignity of Huldah's message to the king does not betray anything of that trembling diffidence or object servility which Mr. Rees seems to think should characterise the religious exercises

of woman. She answers him as the prophetess of the Lord, having the signet of the King of kings attached to her utterances.

"The Lord gave the word, and great was the company of those that published it," Psalm lxxviii. 11. In the original Hebrew it is, "Great was the company of women publishers, or women evangelists." Grotius explains this passage, "The Lord shall give the word, that is plentiful matter of speaking; so that he would call those which follow the great army of preaching women, victories, or female conquerors."

"For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam," Micah vi. 4. God here classes Miriam with Moses and Aaron, and declares that **He** sent her before his people. Had Mr. Rees been a man of Israel at that time, we presume he would have disputed such a leadership.

"And she (Anna) was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day. And she coming in that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem," Luke ii. 37, 38. Will Mr. Rees explain wherein this exercise of Anna's differed from that of Simeon, recorded just before? It was in the same public place, the temple. It was during the same service. It was equally public, for she "**spake** of him to all, present and absent, who looked for redemption in Jerusalem." See Watson on this passage.

"Acts i. 14, and ii. 1, 4. We are in the first of these passages expressly told that the women were assembled with the disciples on the day of Pentecost; and in the second, that the cloven tongues sat upon them **each**, and the Holy Ghost filled them **all**, and they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. It is nothing to the point to argue that the gift of tongues was a miraculous gift, seeing that the Spirit was the primary bestowment. The tongues were only emblematical of the office the Spirit was henceforth to sustain to his people. The Spirit was given alike to the female as to the male disciple, and this is cited by Peter, 16, 18, as the peculiar speciality of the latter dispensation. What a remarkable device of the devil, that he has so long succeeded in hiding this characteristic of the latter day glory! **He** knows, whether the church does or not, how eminently detrimental to the interests of his kingdom have been the religious labours of woman; and while her seed has mortally bruised his head, he ceases not to bruise her heel; but the time of her deliverance draweth nigh."

"And I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers," Phil. iv. 3. How will Mr. Rees get rid of this recognition of **female labourers**, not **concerning** the gospel, but **in** the gospel, whom Paul classes with Clement, and other his fellowlabourers, without at the same time getting rid of the following, where precisely the same terms are applied to Timotheus, whom Paul styles a "minister of God, and his fellowlabourer in the gospel of Christ?" 1 Thess. iii. 2.

Again, "Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus, who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but all the churches of the Gentiles,"

Rom. xvi. 3, 4. **Will Mr. Rees deny that Priscilla is here recognized by the apostle as his helper and benefactor in exactly the same sense and Aquila her husband? She has even the distinction of priority.**

"Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles; who also were in Christ before me," Rom. xvi. 7.

By the word "kinsmen" one would take Junia to have been a man; but **Chrysostom and Theophylact, who were both Greeks, and, consequently, knew their mother tongue better than our translators, say Junia was a woman.** Kinsmen should therefore have been rendered kinsfolk; but with our translators it was out of all character to have a **woman** of note amongst the apostles, and a fellow-prisoner with Paul for the Gospel: **so let them be kinsmen!**

Again, "Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which laboured much in the Lord," Rom. xvi. 12. Dr. Clarke, on this verse, says, "Many have spent much useless labour in endeavouring to prove that these women did not preach. That there were prophetesses as well as prophets in the church we learn, and that a woman might pray or prophesy provided that she had her head covered we know; and, according to St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 3, whoever prophesied spoke unto others to edification, exhortation, and comfort, and that no preacher can do more every person must acknowledge. Because, to edify, exhort, and comfort, are the prime ends of the gospel ministry. If women thus prophesied, then women preached."

Again, "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea," Rom. xvi. 1. The word here rendered "servant" signifies deacon; but, seeing that it is applied to a woman, our translators have rendered it "servant." The idea of a woman deacon in the **"three orders!"**--it was horrible, therefore let her be a "servant." Theodoret, however, says, "The fame of Phebe was spoken of throughout the world. She was known not only to the Greeks and Romans, but also to the Barbarians," which implies that she had travelled much, and propagated the gospel in foreign countries. See Doddridge, Cobbin, and Wesley, on this passage.

We will only remind Mr. Rees of one other text, at least as **celebrated** as his pet passage in Timothy. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," Gal. iii.28.

Our author now seems to gather up his strength for a final deliverance on this subject. And certainly, the astounding information he conveys (page 14), as well as the remarkable confirmation he supplies, is worthy of the effort it appears to cost him. In reply to his first item of information we beg to remind Mr. Rees, that the introduction of evil into our world is a subject, at present involved in so much mystery, that we think a

little diffidence in speaking of the manner of it might become him. And though woman **was** the door by which sin came into the world, by being first in the transgression, she was not **alone** in the transgression; man was an equal sharer in the guilt. If, through her, sin first entered, through her also, without the concurrence of man, came deliverance. "The seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the serpent, and a woman, by bringing Him forth, has been the occasion of our salvation." See Luke i. 35.

Surely, the transcendent honour thus conferred upon her should counterbalance the dishonour of attaching to her priority in the transgression, and shield her from reproach and insult on that account. "Let not the male sex manifest the odious effects of the fall by ungenerously upbraiding the daughters for the mother's fault, at the distance of so many generations; but rather rejoice that, as by woman came transgression, so by her came redemption too."--Doddridge.

"This sex is," says Mr. Rees, "in the present life, and as far as the body is concerned, under a denser cloud of suffering and humiliation than the other. Daily facts prove that the primeval sentence is not cancelled," &c. We have no desire to prove that woman, any more than man, is delivered from the effects of the fall; and we admit that while the peculiarity of the curse pronounced upon man seems to be that of incessant labour and toil, coupled with vexation and disappointment, that of woman entails a larger share of physical suffering.

And, though in Christ we are redeemed from the curse in a moral sense, God has not seen fit to abolish its physical bearings with reference to either sex. As to the humiliation of the female sex, we beg to remind Mr. Rees of a very important fact, which he seems to have overlooked all the way through his argument, viz., that God has not subjected woman to man as a **being**, but as a **wife**, and then only to her own husband so long as he may live; when her husband is dead she is loosed from the law of her husband. We cannot discover that an unmarried woman is subject to man in any sense in which one man is not subject to another; both the law of God and man recognize her as an independent being. Even in her state of subjection as a wife the ameliorating and exalting provisions of Christianity all but restore her to her original position.

While the semblance of the curse remains, Christ has beautifully extracted its sting by making **love** the law of marriage; and by throwing round the institution itself the greatest sanctity and honour. The New Testament abounds with such commands, injunctions, and allusions as the following:--"**For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.**" "**Marriage is honourable in all,**" however high, however holy.

"**Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.**" "**Giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel,**" as having weaker body, not as being a weaker being, morally or intellectually. See Doddridge on this passage, and 1 Thess. iv. 4, where the same word occurs. "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." Is it in such commands and similes as these that Mr. Rees finds evidence of the humiliation or degradation of woman? or is it in the peculiar favour and friendship with which Christ ever regarded her? We trow not.*

* It is worthy of remark that, often as the Apostles speak of women, not a single instance of imposture, "pretended" inspiration, or apostacy, is recorded. **Sapphira is the only instance of female delinquency to which the apostles make reference.** St. Paul speaks of Hymeneus and Alexander, whom he had "delivered unto Satan;" of Phygellus and Hermogenes having turned away from him; of Hymenæus and Philetus, whose "word will eat as doth a canker-worm;" of Alexander, the coppersmith, who did him "much evil." St. John mentioned Diotrephes, who "loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, prating against the apostles with malicious words." If such instances of corruption and apostacy had been mentioned with reference to women, what language would the monarchs of the desk have found in which to have conveyed their glowing ideas of female impropriety?

Amongst the remedial results of Christianity none are more blessed and heartcheering that what it has done, and is destined to do, when its precepts are better understood, for the exaltation of the female sex. All man-made religions neglect or debase woman, but the religion of Christ recognizes her individuality, and raises her to the true dignity of her moral and intellectual nature. This being the case, any attempt to deduce from its historical records or practical precepts, views and dogmas derogatory to the sex, appears to us exceedingly unbecoming the office of a Christian minister; and in the attempt we think Mr. Rees has nearly allied himself with infidelity and heathenism.

"Of course," proceeds our author, "it is not disputed that many individuals of the female sex are, in ever respect, far superior to many individuals of the male sex."

Truly, the ladies of Mr. Rees's congregation must have felt themselves highly complimented by this very gracious admission, which simply amounts to saying that a refined, intelligent, and Christian female is, after all, superior to a coarse, besotted, ignorant vagabond of the opposite sex, notwithstanding that she is a woman! "Nay, I hold," says Mr. R., "that a good woman is the best thing in the world." We do not for a moment doubt the truth of this assertion; a **thing**, and not a **being**, is what Mr. Rees has been labouring to make a woman appear in all the way through his remarks; and if he can only find one **good**, after his own model, we have no doubt he will exalt her above all other good things. Even then, however, she must be in her "right place," which, according to Mr. R., is amongst many other good things--"in the kitchen."

Page 24

If it will be any gratification to Mr. Rees, however, we admit what he seems to anxious to set forth, that, as a rule, woman is intellectually inferior to man; not as a necessity of her nature, but as a consequence of her training and education.

"We are all what education and habit make us, and women are educated, trained to be inferior." Until very recently, female education has consisted of a round of mere mechanical performances, together with the exercise of memory; the more solid exercises of the understanding and reasoning powers have been entirely overlooked. To use the words of Dr. Johnson, "Its aim has been at accomplishments rather than attainments; at gilding rather than gold; at such ornaments as dazzle by their lustre, and consume themselves in a few years, rather than those which radiate a steady light till the lamp of life is extinguished." "Our fathers," says a celebrated writer, "for a long time confounded ignorance with innocence. Women received no sort of instruction. Everything was

against them, science, legislation, theology--theology which was then taken for religion."

"As for women," says a French writer, "no one thinks of developing **their** souls; and there will soon be six thousand years that they have **led the world** without the world's ever having thought whether, in the exercise of such a **power**, truth might not be productive of some good to them." With this inferiority of education, admitted by those who have studied and written upon the subject, who will be surprised that women, as a class, are mentally inferior to men; or who will venture to attribute that inferiority to nature? Any verdict on the intellectual stature of woman must at present be premature and unfounded; because, never yet has she possessed equal advantages with man. The day is but just dawning with respect to this subject; thank God, however, it is dawning.

Women are thinking, studying, writing, aye and speaking too, on all the leading topics of the day. They are making themselves heard in drawing-room soirées, social science congresses, confidential state counsels, and through the press, to an extent little dreamed of by a gentleman of such antiquated notions as Mr. Rees. Whether the church will allow women to speak in **her** assemblies or not can only be a question of time; common sense and public opinion will force her to examine honestly and impartially the texts on which she grounds her prohibitions.

"**But privacy is their proper sphere,**" &c Perhaps we ought to be obliged to Mr. Rees, that he allows to woman any sphere at all for benefitting her race and glorifying her God. But we cannot be blind to the supreme selfishness of making her so welcome to the hidden toil and self-sacrifice, the hewing of wood and the drawing of water, the watching and waiting, the reproach and persecution attaching to her Master's service, without allowing her a tittle of the honour he so arrogantly assumes and so tenaciously guards.

Here, again, our author's theory and the order of God are at variance. God says, "Them that honour me I will honour." Our Lord links the joy with the suffering, the glory with the shame, the exaltation with the humiliation, the crown with the cross, the finding of life with the losing of it. Nor did he manifest any such horror at female publicity in his cause as Mr. Rees appears to entertain. We have no intimation of his reproving the Samaritan woman, for her public proclamations of Him to her countrymen; not of his rebuking the women who followed Him amidst a taunting mob on his way to the cross.

And yet, surely, **privacy** was their proper sphere. On one occasion He **did** say, with reference to a woman, "Verily, I say unto you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her."--Matt. xxvi. 12. See also Luke vii. 37--50.

Mr. Rees sums up this part of his pamphlet by saying, "**For these reasons I cannot approve of the agency in question. Why, then, should any of my fellow-Christians look coldly on me, &c. It is because I fear God, and tremble at his word.** We reply, that if his fellow-Christians had no reason to look coldly upon him before this publication of his views, Mr. R. has furnished them with abundant reason now, by showing that, if he **does** tremble at the word of God at all, it is only at one or two passages that are capable of being made to serve his unworthy purpose; while he

can, without any tremulous diffidence, entirely set aside others of equal importance and authority, and with shameless effrontery, and insufferable egotism, set up his dictation in direct opposition to those of which he cannot otherwise get rid.

The **good**, of which it appears Mr. R. is not ignorant, and which has resulted from what he terms a "forbidden agency," he sets entirely aside, by setting the providence of God, as operating **in his church**, in direct opposition to his word, and by making good phenomena the result of bad principles; thus annihilating what our Saviour seemed to regard as an infallible test of principles, good or bad. "For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit: for of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes."--Luke vi. 43, 44.

The salvation of souls was referred to by St. Paul, as evidence of his divine commission, 1 Cor. ix. 2. "If I am not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." Mrs. Palmer might appropriately adopt this language with reference to many precious souls in Sunderland, some of them not unknown to Mr. Rees. If, then, souls have been converted, it must have been by the agency of the Holy Spirit. But would the Holy Spirit operate through a **forbidden** instrumentality, and thus sanction the violation of his own laws? Certainly not. The Spirit ever operates in strictest harmony with the word of God, rightly understood and interpreted. It is a significant fact, which we commend to the consideration of Mr. Rees and all who hold his views, that the public labours of women have been eminently owned of God in the salvation of souls.

The following are a few out of many examples, selected chiefly from a valuable work on this subject, entitled "The Promise of the Father," by Mrs. Palmer. At a missionary meeting held at Columbo, March 26th, 1824, the name of Mrs. Smith, of the Cape of Good Hope, was brought before the meeting, when Sir Richard Otley, the chairman, said, "The name of Mrs. Smith has been justly celebrated by the religious world and in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope. I heard a talented missionary state, that wherever he went in that colony, at 600 or 1000 miles from the principal seat of government, among the natives of Africa, and wherever he saw persons converted to Christianity, the name of Mrs. Smith was hailed as the person from whom they received their religious impressions; and although no less than ten missionaries, all men of piety and industry, were stationed in that settlement, the exertions of Mrs. Smith alone were more efficacious, and had been attended with greater success than the labours of those missionaries combined."

The Rev. J. Campbell, missionary to Africa, says, "So extensive were the good effects of her pious exhortations, that on my first visit to the colony, wherever I met with persons of evangelical piety, I generally found that their first impressions of religion were ascribed to Mrs. Smith."

Mrs. Mary Taft, the talented lady of the Rev. Dr. Taft, was another eminently successful labourer on the Lord's vineyard. "If," says Mrs. Palmer, "the criterion by which we may judge of a divine call to proclaim salvation be by the proportion of fruit gathered, then to the commission of Mrs. Taft is appended the divine signature, to a degree pre-eminently unmistakable. In reviewing her diary, we are constrained to believe

that not one minister in five hundred could produce so many seals to their ministry. An eminent minister informed us, that of those who had been brought to Christ through her labours, over two hundred entered the ministry. She seldom opened her mouth in public assemblies, either in prayer or speaking, but the Holy Spirit accompanied her words in such a wonderful manner, that sinners were convicted, and, as in apostolic times, were constrained to cry out, 'What must we do to be saved.' She laboured under the sanction and was hailed as a fellow-helper in the gospel by the Revs. Messrs. Mather, Pawson, Hearnshaw, Blackborne, Marsden, Bramwell, Vasey, and many other equally distinguished ministers of her time." The Rev. Mr. Pawson, when President of the Conference, writes as follows to a circuit where Mrs. Taft was stationed with her husband, where she met with some gain

28

sayers:--"It is well known that religion has been for some time at a very low ebb in Dover. I therefore could not help thinking that it was a kind providence that Mrs. Taft was stationed among you, and that, by the blessing of God, she might be the instrument of reviving the work of God among you. I seriously believe Mrs. Taft to be a deeply pious, prudent, modest woman. I believe the Lord hath owned and blessed her labours very much, and many, yea, very many souls have been brought to the saving knowledge of God by her preaching. Many have come to hear her out of curiosity, who would not have come to hear a man, and have been awakened and converted to God. I do assure you there is much fruit of her labours in many parts of our connexion."

Mrs. Fletcher, the wife of the sainted Fletcher, of Madely, was another of the daughters of the Lord on whom was poured the spirit of prophecy. This eminently devoted lady opened an orphan house, and devoted her time, her heart, and her fortune, to the work of the Lord. Mr. Wesley often visited her establishment, and speaks of it as the perfect specimen of a Christian family. The Rev. Mr. Hodson, in referring to her public labours, says, "Mrs. Fletcher was not only luminous but truly eloquent--her discourses displayed much good sense, and were fraught with the riches of the gospel. She excelled in that poetry of an orator which can alone supply the place of all the rest--that eloquence which goes directly to the heart. She was the honoured instrument of doing much good; and the fruit of her labours is now manifest in the lives and tempers of numbers who will be her crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord." The Rev. Henry Moore sums up a fine eulogium on her character and labours by saying, "May not every pious Churchman and Methodist say, Would to God all the Lord's people were such prophets and prophetesses!"

Miss Elizabeth Hurrell was one of those whom Mr. Wesley honoured with his correspondence and personal encouragement. She travelled through many counties in England, preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ; and very many were, through her instrumentality, brought to the knowledge of the truth, not a few of whom were afterwards called to fill very honourable stations in the Methodist connexion. Mr. William Warrener, the first missionary appointed by Mr. Wesley to the West Indies, was brought to God by her instrumentality.

"It is very much to be lamented," says Dr. Taft, "that she ever relaxed or in any

measure buried that extraordinary talent which God had committed to her; but such was the fact. Whether she turned aside from the path of duty to avoid suffering, or through the

power of temptation, she deeply lamented the course she had taken, when death and eternity appeared in view. 'I am going to die,' said she, 'I am entering the eternal world; but all is dark before me: neither sun, moon, nor stars appear. O that I had my time to live again. I would not bury my talents as I have done.' It pleased the Lord, however, to heal her backslidings, and lift upon her the light of his countenance."

Mr. Wesley writes to his friend Miss Briggs:--"Undoubtedly both you and Philothea, and my dear Miss Perronet, are now more particularly called to speak for God. In so doing, you must expect to meet with many things which are not pleasing to flesh and blood. So much more will you be conformed to the death of Christ. Go on in his name, and in the power of his might. Suffer and conquer all things."--Wesley's Works, vol. vii. p. 103.

From the Methodist Conference, held at Manchester, 1787, Mr. Wesley wrote to Miss Sarah Mallett, whose labours, while very acceptable to the people, had been opposed by some of the preachers:--"We give the right hand of fellowship to Sarah Mallett, and have no objection to her being a **preacher in our connexion**, so long as she preaches Methodist doctrine, and attends to our discipline."

Such are a few examples of the success attending the public labours of females in the gospel. We might give many more, but our space only admits of a bare mention of Mrs. Wesley, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. President Edwards, Mrs. Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Hall, Mrs. Gilbert, Miss Lawrence, Miss Newman, Miss Miller, Miss Tooth, and Miss Cutler, whose holy lives and zealous labours were owned of God in the conversion of thousands of souls, and the abundant edification of the Lord's people.

Nor are the instances of the spirit of prophecy bestowed on women confined to bygone generations: the revival of this age, as well as of every other, has been marked by this endowment, and the labours of such pious and talented ladies as Mrs. Palmer, Mrs. Finney, Mrs. Wightman, Miss Marsh,* with numberless other Marys and Phoebes, have contributed in no small degree to its extension and power.

It was our original intention to deal according to our ability with the second part of the pamphlet before us, but having learnt that an abler pen has undertaken this task, we confine ourselves to the question of female teaching, as belonging more exclusively to our sex. Leaving, therefore, the *modus operandi*, which, by the way, has been adopted in principle by the purest and most successful churches of all ages, we have endeavoured in the foregoing pages to establish, what we sincerely believe, that woman has a **right** to teach.

Here the whole question hinges. If she has the **right**, she has it independently of any man-made restrictions, which do not equally refer to the opposite sex, except when, as a wife, silence is imposed upon her by her own husband. If she has the right, and possesses the necessary qualifications, we maintain that, where the law of expediency does not prevent, she is at liberty to exercise it without any further pretensions to inspiration than those put forth by the male sex. If, on the other hand, it can be proved

that she has **not** the right, but that imperative silence is imposed upon her by the word of God, we cannot see who has authority to relax or make exceptions to the law. From the manner in which expositors have dealt with the passages referred to in the preceding pages, some making one exception and some another, to an almost indefinite number, it is evident

The record of this lady's labours has long been before the public. "English Hearts and Hands," in a truly fascinating manner, describes the wonderful success with which those labours have been attended. Well has it been for the spiritual interests of hundreds that no sacerdotal conclave has been able to place the seal of silence upon her lips, and assign her to "privacy as her proper sphere."

Page 31

they have felt the difficulty of reconciling 1 Cor. xiv. 44, and their interpretation, of 1 Tim. ii. 12, with the general tenor of God's word without extending to females the right of public speaking in the religious services of the church. They have, however, with a few noble exceptions, endeavoured to do so by taking these two passages as the key to all the rest, rather than by using the numerous incidental references to female teaching and labouring, together with the evident bearing of the context, as rays of light by which to apply these favourite texts. By this course they have involved themselves in all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions; and worse, they have nullified some of the most precious promises of God's word. They have set the most explicit predictions of prophecy at variance with apostolic injunctions, and the most immediate and wonderful operations of the Holy Ghost in direct opposition "to positive, explicit, and universal rules." In view of such facts, is it too much to assume, that while the love of power is such a prominent characteristic of the human mind, these men, "of like passions with ourselves" may, unintentionally, have violated the strict interpretations of passages where their own supremacy appeared to be at stake?

If commentators had dealt with the Bible on other subjects as they have dealt with it on this, taking isolated passages, separated from their explanatory connexions, and insisting on a literal interpretation of the words of our version, what errors and contradictions would have been forced upon the acceptance of the church, and what terrible results would have accrued to the world. On this principle the Universalist will have all men unconditionally saved, because the Bible says, "Christ is the Saviour of all men," &c. The Antinomian, according to this rule of interpretation, has most unquestionable foundation for his dead faith and hollow profession, seeing that St. Paul declares over and over again that men are "saved by faith and not by works." The Unitarian, also, in support of his soul-withering doctrine, triumphantly refers us to numerous passages which, taken alone, teach only the humanity of Jesus. In short, "there is no end to the errors in faith and practice which have resulted from taking isolated passages,

Page 32

wrested from their proper connexions, or the light thrown upon them by other Scriptures, and applying them to sustain a favourite theory." Judging from the blessed results which have almost invariably followed the ministrations of women in the cause of Christ, we

fear it will be found, in the great day of account, that a mistaken and unjustifiable application of the passage, "Let your women keep silence in the churches," &c., has resulted in more loss to the church, evil to the world, and dishonour to God, than any of the errors we have already referred to.

And feeling, as we have long felt, that this is a subject of vast importance to the interests of Christ's kingdom and the glory of God, we would most earnestly commend its consideration to those who are learned in the original Scriptures, and who possess sufficient power of intellect and nobility of soul to deal efficiently and impartially with the subject. We think it a matter worthy of the consideration of the church, whether God really intended woman to bury her talents and influence as she now does? And whether the circumscribed sphere of woman's religious labours may not have something to do with the comparative non-success of the gospel in these latter days. We fear that it has, and that the Lord of the vineyard will require some more satisfactory excuse for our timidity and backwardness in his service than the one-sided interpretation of detached portions of Holy Writ, and the ipse dixit of such men as the Rev. A. A. Rees.

BIOGRAPHY

General Catherine Booth

1829 - 1890

Catherine Mumford was born in Ashbourne, Derby, on 17 January 1829. From an early age she was a serious and sensitive girl. She had a strong Christian upbringing and by the age of 12 had read her Bible through eight times! But it was not until she was 16, after much struggling, that she was really converted. In her hymn book she read the words, 'My God I am Thine, what a comfort Divine', and realised the truth of this statement for herself.

At 14 she was seriously ill and spent a great deal of time in bed. But she kept herself busy, and was especially concerned about the problems of alcohol. She wrote articles for a magazine, which encouraged people not to drink.

She met William when he came to preach at her church. They soon fell in love and became engaged. During three years of engagement, Catherine was a constant support to William in his tiring work of preaching, through her letters. At last on 16 June 1855, they were married. Unlike most weddings, theirs was very simple with no great expense. They wanted to use all their time and money for God. Even on their honeymoon, William found himself asked to speak at meetings. Together they accepted this challenge of being used by God before even thinking of themselves.

At Brighthouse, Catherine first began to help in the work of the church. She was extremely nervous, but found the courage to speak in children's meetings. She enjoyed working with young people. However it was unheard of for women to speak in adult meetings.

Catherine was convinced that women had an equal right to speak. At Gateshead, when the opportunity was given for public testimony, she went forward to speak! It was the beginning of a tremendous ministry, for people were greatly challenged by her preaching.

Catherine found the courage to speak to people in their homes, and especially to alcoholics whom she helped to make a new start in life. Often she held cottage meetings for converts.

She was also a mother with a growing family of eight children and was dedicated to giving them a firm Christian knowledge. Two of them became *Generals of The Salvation Army*.

In 1865 when the work of *The Christian Mission* began William preached to the poor and ragged, and Catherine spoke to the wealthy, gaining support for their financially demanding work. In time she began to hold her own campaigns. When William Booth became known as the *General*, Catherine was known as the '*Army Mother*'. She was behind many of the changes in the new movement, designing a flag, bonnets for the ladies and contributing to the *Army's* ideas on many important issues and matters of belief.

When she died in 1890 it was a great loss. Her life had been a challenge to thousands who remembered her as an untiring soldier in *God's Army*.