

A

# Woman in the Pulpit!!!

DID PAUL FORBID IT?

OR THE IMPORT OF

EXEQUID.

[From the Congregational Quarterly.]

By H. LOOMIS,

AUTHOR OF "THE LAND OF SHADOWING WINGS; OR, EMPIRE OF THE SEA."

Price, 15 Cents. Sent by mail to any address in the United States.

## MAY A WOMAN SPEAK

IN A

### PROMISCUOUS RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLY?<sup>1</sup>

---

THE discussion of this subject in the Brooklyn Presbytery, the action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and of the Methodist Episcopal General Conference, has led the writer to a somewhat earnest and careful examination of the question.

Let him premise that, notwithstanding his high appreciation of woman, he must go with Paul, the inspired apostle, if need be, against the whole sex; but he must know precisely what Paul said, and what he meant.

Here, in the very outset, he is met with a difficulty. If Paul said precisely what our English version makes him say, and what many of the commentators affirm that he did say, then Paul is against Peter and the prophet Joel and some rather stubborn facts relative to the pious women in the days of the Acts of the apostles. Peter says (Acts ii: 16-17), "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, And it shall

<sup>1</sup> This article was prepared for the press within a month after the celebrated discussion in the Brooklyn Presbytery, relative to the admission to the pulpit of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Miss Sarah F. Smiley.

But the author soon found that the freedom of the press in this country consists in the liberty of any man to print what he can pay for, or the furnishing of such articles as will increase the subscription list, or such as chime in with the views and long-established sentiments of the conductors and supervisors of the press. Hence the delay of its publication till it found a place in Free Congregational New England.

He commenced the examination merely to satisfy his own mind, hitherto somewhat dubious on the subject. Having very satisfactorily accomplished that with the results to which he was led, it occurred to him, that if his investigation were thrown into type, it might help to remove similar doubts from other minds laboring in the same way. For this purpose it is given to the public. If it is true, it will stand; if erroneous, let sincere inquirers after truth and critical scholars point out the error; and he will rejoice in the truth, though he stands convicted of error.

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 (*-presbuteroi*) shall dream dreams."

Does Paul say they should not do what Joel, as interpreted by Peter, says they would do under a spiritual baptism, in the Christian dispensation? But what makes the matter still worse, Paul is against Paul. For in 1 Corinthians, xi: 4-5, he says, "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every *woman* PRAYING OR PROPHESYING with her head uncovered, dishonoreth her head." Now, if neither the men nor the women did pray or prophesy, the sentence is absurd,—a word spoken into the air. The fact is implied that the women, as well as the men, did pray and prophesy; and the direction to do it in a modest and womanly manner involves an approval of the praying and prophesying. There is no evading or escaping this conclusion.

If he had sent this direction to Corinth, and found afterwards that it was best to stop the women's talk altogether, and sent another Epistle to that effect, there might have been a consistency in it; but here these things are in the same Epistle, written at the same time, not three chapters apart,—Paul against Paul, as he is interpreted. I have too profound a respect for Paul as a logician—not to speak of his inspiration—to admit that.

There is still another difficulty. Did the Holy Ghost contradict, through Paul, what he had declared through Joel and Peter? Did he forbid the women to do what he declares they would do through his own inspiration?

The word of God cannot be inconsistent with itself. Have not the translators made Paul say in English what he never did say in Greek? Let us examine, and go to the root of the matter.

Paul was a "Hebrew of the Hebrews, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, thoroughly learned in the Jews' religion." Not only so, but thoroughly versed in the Jewish literature. His thoughts and ideas were Hebrew, but in the circumstances of his nation he was obliged to communicate his Hebrew thoughts through the Greek language. He was learned in that lan-

guage also, far above the rest of the apostles and disciples, unless it was the beloved physician Luke. It may not then be "travelling out of the record" to go back of the Greek, even to the Hebrew, for a fair interpretation of the New Testament writers.

We find two Hebrew words, דָּבַר (*dabār*) and אָמַר (*amār*), generally translated in English *speak* or *say*, seldom *tell*,—terms so nearly synonymous that few minds ordinarily recognize a difference. The shades of thought, however, expressed by the two Hebrew words are very different. To get at the use or precise meaning of these words, I have traced them through the whole book of Genesis. *Dabar* occurs as a verb *sixty-two*, and *amar* *six hundred and eleven*, times in this book. *Dabar* is used generally on important or unusual occasions, in solemn contracts, in grave consultations, or earnest discussions or pleadings.

1st. It means a mere use of voice, conveying no definite thought to the hearer, but only awakening attention.

As Gen. viii: 15. "And God spake (*dabār*) to Noah, saying" (*hamor*, the present participle of *amār*).

2d. To consult or discuss in an assembly, or between individuals, when the result or decision of the question under discussion is dubious or uncertain.

As Gen. xxiii: 8. "And he *communed* (*dabār*) with them, saying, If it be your mind," etc. Also Gen. xxxiv: 6, 8, 20. Hamor *communed* with Jacob, and *communed* with the men of the city (*dabār*).

3d. Deceptive speech, when there is an implied design to conceal the real thought or purpose from the hearer, or others.

As Gen. xxxiv: 13. "And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father deceitfully," *who* they said (*veyedabaru*), or as rendered in our version, "because he had defiled Dinah, their sister." There seems to be an implied excuse for the deception, anger for the injury, and a concealed purpose of revenge, in the word *dabār*, in the form in which we find it here. Also as in Gen. xxxix: 10. "And it came to pass, as she spake (*dabarah*) to Joseph day by day." In verse 7: "And she *said*" (*amār* is the word), followed by the explicit words uttered; but here it is *dabār*, without the words spoken, but an implied, insinuating, half-concealed, guilty wish against the opposing will and arguments of Joseph, all in secret, to be concealed from all others.

4th. To wrangle or dispute, or a quarrelsome use of voice.

As Gen. xxxvii: 4. "They hated him, and could not speak (*dabārō*) peaceably to him."

5th. To denote what had been before uttered as command or promise, without the repetition of the utterance.

As Gen. xii: 4. "So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken" (*dabār*).

*Dabār* is almost uniformly translated by the Seventy in the Septuagint by the Greek word *λάλεω* (*Lalleo*) in some of its forms.

*Amar*, on the contrary, is used generally in common conversation. Even when applied to God, it is in his most familiar intercourse with the patriarchs, or in his work of creation, as if that were an easier and less important matter than some of his other works. "God said (*amār*), let there be light, and light was." What he said was immediately apparent and clear to the beholder or hearer. It is generally followed by what is said,—a clear, plain conveyance of edifying thought to the mind of the hearer, an awakening of truth or thought in his mind. The one brings into view the startling apparition of the speaker, the other awakens calm, clear vision in the mind of the hearer. The very common use of these Hebrew words in connection is as in Exodus xx: 1:—

וַיִּדְבָּר אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם  
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֶיךָ הָאָדָם

(*Väyēdābār Alōhīm āth kāl ha dābārim hāālāh lāmōr*). And, God "worded" (spake) all these words, saying: then comes the specific commands under the term *amar*. The Seventy, with very few exceptions, have translated *amar* by the Greek word *εἶπω* (*eipō*), and the present participle *lāmōr* by *λεγων* (*legōn*). The New Testament writers have very generally followed this translation, using *λάλεω* where the Hebrews would *dabar*, and *εἶπω* or *λεγω* instead of *amar*.

From this base or starting-point we proceed.

The classic use of *λάλεω*, as given by Donnegan, is to speak, to talk, to prate, to prattle, to babble, to chatter, to twitter. The very root of the word *λαλ*, like the unmeaning *lal*, *lal*, *lal*, or first sounds from the tongue of a child, would seem to indicate its origin and meaning.

In the religion of the Greeks, their gods and goddesses might quaff their nectar, and prate and babble, as well as men and women, over their wine; but the Hebrew's religion would never permit him to predicate *prate* or *babble* of the utterances of his God, or Messiah, or his angels, or even of his inspired prophets, even though these utterances might be as incomprehensible and meaningless to him as the babble of gods or men.

This fact, together with the fact, which we may make apparent, that the term *λάλεω* is used in the New Testament, both in its Hebrew and classic senses, accounts for its very wide and seemingly almost contradictory use by the New Testament writers. It is well known by scholars that the Greek of Matthew, Mark, and John was Hebrew-Greek, — Greek words, with Hebrew meanings, and their phrases often Hebraisms.

Matthew has used the word *λάλεω* in his Gospel twenty-five times, Mark seventeen times, John, in his Gospel and the Revelation, sixty-four times, Luke, in his Gospel and the Acts, seventy-six times.

*λάλεω* is used by these writers with wonderful uniformity, in the Hebrew sense. It takes the place of *dabar*, and means, —

1st. A mere use of the voice, as in Matt. ix: 33, and xii: 22, and the parallel passages in the other Gospels. "And the dumb spake" (*ἐλάλησεν*). It is not related what he said, but simply that by the miracle he got the use of his voice. Matt. xii: 36. "Every idle word that men shall speak (*λαλήσωσιν*)," etc., — meaningless or profitless babble.

2d. It is used in the sense of counselling or communing together. Acts xxvi: 31. "And when they were gone aside, they talked (*ἐλάλουν*) between themselves." Luke xxiv: 32. "Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked (communed) (*ἐλάλει*) with us by the way?"

3d. It is used where there is an expressed or implied design in the speaker not to convey plain and clear thought or truth to the mind of the hearer. See Matt. xiii: 3, 10, 13, 33, and 34; also parallel passages in the other Gospels. "And he spake (*ἐλάλησεν*) many things in parables." The disciples inquire, "Why speakest (*λάλεις*) thou to them in parables?" He answers, "Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. . . . Therefore speak (*λάλω*) I to them in parables." They are not in a state of mind to know the truth, therefore I purpose so to speak as not to convey it to them.

4th. It means to wrangle or discuss in a confused and bitter manner, without much development of truth to enlighten and edify. Mark ii: 7. "Why doth this man thus speak (*λάλει*) blasphemies," — babble out his impious talk. In those

sharp discussions — and, on the part of his opponents, bitter retorts — recorded in chapters seventh to twelfth inclusive, of John's Gospel, the word occurs *twenty-seven* times.

5th. It is often used in allusion to what had before been uttered, without a repetition of it, or giving any clear idea of its import. As Luke xxiv : 6. "Remember how he spake (ελαλησε) unto you when he was yet in Galilee." John xviii : 21. "Ask them that heard me, what I said (ελαλησα)." ix : 29. "We know that God spake (ελαλησεν) unto Moses." xii : 41. "When he saw his glory and spake (ελαλησε)."

Now, what was Paul's use of the term? What did λαλεω mean in his Epistles?

A writer in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," some two years since, whose article was the foundation of nearly all the arguments in the Brooklyn Presbytery really pertinent to the question, after giving the number of times it is used in the New Testament, says, "It can never be translated *babble* but once, and even then it is doubtful." The author of that very scholarly article certainly could not have examined very critically the passages in which it occurs, or he would not have made so sweeping and so erroneous an assertion.

To find, if possible, Paul's meaning beyond all mistake, I have jotted down chapter, verse, and sentence, where the words *speak*, *say*, and *tell*, in any of their forms, occur in all his Epistles, from the first word of Romans to the last of Hebrews, and the Greek words of Paul thus translated. I find he used five Greek words, λαλεω, λεγω, ειπω, ειρω, and φημι. *Laleo* occurs *sixty-four* times, almost uniformly translated *speak*; *legow*, *eighty-seven* times, generally translated *say*, sometimes *speak*; *eiro*, *twenty-three* times, generally translated *say*; *eipo*, *eight* times, *say*; *phemi*, *five* times, *say*. Paul seems generally to have used λεγω where the Septuagint translators would have used ειπω, instead of the Hebrew word *amar*. These five Greek words, quite different in their shades of meaning, are virtually covered in our translation by one English word, *speak* or *say*. To this infelicity — almost a necessity in translating from one language to another — this covering so many words with one, is doubtless owing the obscurity, confusion, and controversy on this subject. As λαλεω and λεγω are the only two words really pertinent to the main

examine the passage a little more closely. "Let two or three of the prophets speak in order, one at a time, and let the others judge." There was evidently a doubt in the case whether these prophets were really moved by the Holy Ghost in these utterances, or, self-deceived perhaps, were only giving utterance to their own unedifying imaginations or fancies; of that matter, "the others were to judge." Till that can be decided, therefore, in the Hebrew sense of λαλεω, let him "*word*" his dubious words, or in the Greek sense, let him babble for the time being.

But, as is said in the following verse (30), "If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace." If there is an inspired message more certain and edifying, let this dubious talk, this unedifying babble, cease. If there had been no doubt of the inspiration of the prophet, Paul would probably have used the word, "Let the prophets prophesy (προφητευσαν); but with the doubt he uses λαλειψαν, as the appropriate word; so that this passage, even, confirms the fact of the restricted sense of λαλεω. It does not mean to *speak*, in our large and general sense of that term in English. The men as well as the women are cautioned against that kind of speaking or talk (λαλια) in the assemblies.

We might multiply such examples of Paul's use of these terms. Indeed, quite generally, in his Epistles to the Greek churches, it would be no violation of the sense or the argument, although it might be inelegant, to translate λαλεω as from its classic use, *gabble*, *babble*, *prate*, *wrangle*, or by a somewhat milder term, according to its connection. When the apostle addressed his Greek congregations, by word or epistle, it would be very natural for him to expect them to understand his words in their classic sense, and to so use them himself.

In the noted 1 Cor. xiv, λαλεω, in some of its forms, occurs *twenty-four* times, λεγω only *three* times. There seems to have been a state of things in that Corinthian church that made that word, λαλεω, singularly apposite and appropriate, so that the apostle could think of no other word so adapted to the confusion and disorders. There were sectarian divisions and controversies, "some for Paul, and some for Apollos"; envyings; "law-suits before the ungodly"; discussions about meats used

question before us, we drop the other three. What did Paul mean by these two words?

To examine them in all the passages in Paul's Epistles where they occur would expand this article to a volume. We call attention to a few of these passages. Romans iii: 19, it is written, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith (λεγει), it saith (λαλει) to them who are under the law," etc. The definite and precise use of the two Greek words, with their forcible and opposite shades of meaning, is all lost in our translation, by the use of only one word. To an angel, or Christian conformed to law, its voice is plain, clear, sweet, calm, enlightening the soul; but to the transgressor it has quite another voice. It wrangles, commands, confuses, terrorizes, "till," as Paul says, "sin taking occasion by the *utterance*, works in me all manner of concupiscence,"—bitter opposition. Romans vii: 1. "For I speak (λαλεω) to them that know the law." At first view it would seem that he should have used λεγω or ειπω, the statement is so plain; but he simply asserts that he was using his voice, and that in argument. It is as if he had said, "I am *discussing* or *arguing* these controverted questions, before those not entirely ignorant on this subject." 1 Corinthians, xii: 30. "Do all speak (λαλουνσι) with tongues?" Babble, neither themselves nor others knowing what the utterances are. 1 Cor. xiii: 1. "Though I speak (λαλεω) with the tongues of men and of angels, . . . and have not charity (love), I am nothing." Though I *babble* in all the babbling languages of earth and heaven without love, the ground of sincerity, that gives force and weight to words, with all this learning it is only babble after all. For the want of a "spiritual baptism," how much such babble there is in the prayer-meetings, and even in the pulpit! 1 Cor. xii: 11. "When I was a child, I spake (ελαλουν) as a child,"—*prattled* words with little weight or meaning.

1 Cor. xiv: 29. "Let the prophets speak (λαλειτωσαν) two or three, and let the others judge." This is really the strongest passage against the women that has come to my notice; therefore I quote it. Only five verses after this (34), it is said of the women, "It is not permitted unto them to speak (λαλειν)." It would seem at first view to settle the question. The prophets (the men) are permitted to λαλειν, the women not. Let us

in an idol's temple; contentions about the relative merits of spiritual gifts; at the very communion-table, some drunken and some thirsty; and the boldest of the Corinthian women, with uncovered heads, sadly mixed up in these discussions and disorders.

But the women were not the only members of the church reprov'd by the apostle, and commanded to keep silence. In the 28th verse it is written, "If there be no interpreter (of the unknown tongue), let *him* keep silence (σιγατω)"; again, in verse 30, "Let the first hold his peace (σιγατω)," the same word that is applied to the women in verse 34. Did that mean perpetual silence, as some affirm it does of the women? The context shows it to be only temporary, and from a certain kind of talk not edifying to the church (λαλια), the babble of foreign tongues. By what rule of logic is it partial and temporary in one case, and general and perpetual in the other? The confusion had been made principally by the men, and the apostle's rebukes were chiefly to them, with the reason for it, in the 33d verse, which is connected with the preceding verse by a "γὰρ (for) God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." I know some scholars and some Greek editions of the Testament punctuate the passage so as to make it read, "As in all the churches, let your women of the saints keep silence in the churches"; but that seems to me to make a bungling sentence, both in the Greek and the English, and to savor a little of special pleading against the women. The drift of thought seems more natural and easy with the punctuation of our common version.

Then comes the paragraph introducing the new subject relative to the women, verse 34. "Let your women keep silence (σιγατωσαν), for it is not permitted unto them to speak (λαλειν) in the assemblies, but to be in subjection (αλλυποτασσεσθαι); the interpolation, "they are *commanded*," thrown in by the translators, only lumps the sentence and obscures the sense, and is rendered unnecessary by the phrase, "as saith the law,"—the law in Eden, "Thy desire shall be to him, and he shall rule over thee,"—the law of nature. There is great expository force in the antithesis in the passage, "But to be in subjection." It implies that the λαλια was a kind of insubordinate talk. Had

a modest, loving woman only poured out her soul in prayer, or told what Jesus had done for her, or spoken of his wonderful love and salvation to all, male and female, "waiting for the redemption of Israel" in the assembly, as Anna did in the temple, there could have been no insubordination in that; and if Paul had wished to prohibit that kind of speaking he would not have written *ἀλλὰ* (*but*), making the antithesis, but *γὰρ* (*for*) she is a woman; but if it was insubordinate wrangle, or profitless discussion with the men, the antithesis is pat and wonderfully appropriate, and shows very clearly what *λαλέειν* meant.

The sophism at the foundation of this whole controversy is a literary curiosity. It consists in translating a Greek word, — (*λαλέειν*) restricted in its use to certain kinds of speaking, excluding certain other kinds, such as plain, edifying discourse in a religious meeting, such as to pray (*προσευχασθαι*), to prophesy (*προφητεῖν*) (exhort), to preach (*κηρύσσειν*) (or, herald the gospel), — by an English word that includes them all, thus lugging into the conclusion what was not named in the major premise, — a sophism so insidious and occult as not to have been noticed by translators or commentators till it has been wrought into a law, under the endorsement of great names; till, in the eye of the strictest of the sect of followers, it has become sacrilegious and presumptuous to doubt it. Our Protestantism allows us not to believe in the divine inspiration of the translators or commentators of our English Bible, or in the infallibility of the pope, or in a pope at all in the Protestant Church, but to use our liberty of private interpretation, and to go behind the great and authoritative interpreters in the church and inquire of Paul himself what he meant.

There is absolutely no single English word that can convey adequately the import of *λαλέω*, in all the circumstances and relations in which it is found in the New Testament, covering, as it does, both the Hebrew and Greek usage of the term. The general or primary idea underlying this term in both these usages, as brought to view in this investigation or discussion, is a simple use of the voice, present or past, without what was uttered, or a use of the voice unintelligibly, — unenlightening, unedifying to hearer or reader. Now, if instead of trying to cover five Greek words with one English word, we are allowed

ten English words, — *talk, prate, babble, prattle, gabble, wrangle, argue, dispute, discuss, teach, or speak authoritatively*, — we may, by translating into one of them, give the force of the term in all its connections in the New Testament.

But what does it mean in this disputed passage, 1 Cor. xiv: 34? To my mind, the case is already made out. It is as if the apostle had said to the Corinthian church, There is discussion and confusion enough among you made by the men, without adding a woman's voice to it. Let your women keep silence from all this babble and wrangling. The responsibility is not placed upon them to discuss in public these disputed questions, but to submit, with more deference and modesty, to the judgment and opinions of the men, and if they will learn anything of these questions, let them inquire it out of their husbands at home, for it is a shame for a woman to prate and gabble to no profit or edification in the assembly. These English terms are not elegant, but expressive; while the Greek terms *λαλέειν*, and the noun *λαλία*, are very soft and musical, and must have sounded so on the Grecian ears of those Corinthian ladies, when the Epistle was first read in the church.

This is just what Paul said, and all he said; and, I believe, just what he meant, and all he meant. Let Paul speak for himself, in his own precise and musical Greek, and it spikes every gun, and silences the whole battery that has so long made so much smoke and noise against the most pious, godly, active Christian women in the church, lest they should open their lips in prayer, or for Christ and his salvation, in a promiscuous Christian assembly.<sup>1</sup>

Still, behind this battery lies the Malakoff, the strong fortress against the women invasion, in 1 Timothy ii: 11-12. "Let the women learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer

<sup>1</sup> A recently returned missionary from the field where Paul once labored, remarked, "If the Brooklyn Presbytery had been in one of our religious meetings, they would have known what Paul meant. The Greek women are now, as of old, very excitable, perpetually asking questions, given to talking often to the disturbance of the meetings. In plain English, Paul told them to stop their gabble." It was somewhat gratifying to find that I had before come to the same conclusion, without reference to this peculiarity of the Grecian women, by the careful study of Paul's Greek. Professor Potwin, of Western Reserve, Ohio, also afterwards called my attention to an article by Mrs. Cowles, in the Boston *Congregationalist*, with a quotation from one of Chrysostom's homilies, showing the same fact.

not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." We do not propose (in military phrase) to try to turn this fortress, but to march up to it in front, and reconnoitre it a little, at all events.

Timothy was probably at Ephesus when this Epistle reached him, — a somewhat uproarious city, under the influence of Demetrius ; and the women, as appears from Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, a little inclined to the same habits of insubordination with their sisters in Corinth. It does not appear, however, that this direction to Timothy had any reference whatever to their speaking in public, but to their general deportment at home, abroad, everywhere.

"I will, therefore (verse 8), that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting" (*διαλογισμου*) (questioning, disputing). "In like manner also (and to the same end) that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety, not with broidered hair or gold, or pearls, or costly array ; but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works." Then follows the passage (verses 11-12), "Let the women learn in silence." It is not *σιγατωσαν* (keep silence) as in Corinthians, but *ησυχια* (quietness, tranquillity). It might have no reference whatever to public speaking, but freedom from all excitement, with subjection. "I suffer not (*επιτρεπω*) turn, or place not upon a woman the responsibility to teach." The word here is not *λαλειν* (so the argument from that word has no pertinency here), but *διδασκειν*, a verb used only *thirteen* times in all Paul's Epistles, and the noun, adjective, or participle derived from it only *twelve* times. The teacher (*διδασκαλος*) was a master, or one in authority, — the president of the assembly, the bishop or overseer of the church, — and his teaching authoritative, as asserting and defending the doctrines of the church. "I suffer not a woman to preside, and to teach authoritatively." That this is the thought, is made more apparent by the next phrase, "nor to usurp authority over the man (*αυθεντειν*), but to be in quietness (*ησυχια*)," — to coin or anglicize a Greek word, to *authoritize* in any manner over the man. The English has it forcibly, "*usurp* authority": to do so is a usurpation.

To the Corinthian women the injunction is, silence from

wrangling, and subjection : here it is freedom from teaching and "*authoritizing*," — quietness, a kind of positive and negative form of asserting the same thing. Paul does not found the injunction in either case, as some affirm, on the peculiar degradation of the Grecian women, but on the nature and relation of the sexes from the beginning.

"For Adam was first formed, then Eve" (verse 13); she was the depending side-branch of the one dual man. "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" (14). It was very unwisely and unwomanly to hold that parley with Satan, and to do so momentous a thing without consulting her husband ; had she consulted him, the affair might have resulted quite differently. In his manly indignation he might have hurled the lying, sneaking deceiver out of Paradise, and saved his Eve from her sad fall ; but the confiding womanly mind was deceived. She had gone down. Now, with all his former experience of loneliness, must he stand alone again ? The yearning of his manly heart was too much for his spiritual will ; with his eyes open he went down for companionship. "He forsook father," even his Father in the heavens, "and clave to his wife." None of the race probably would have stood the test any better. Then came that paternal reproof, along with the promised restoration. It is as if God had said, You see the sad consequences of your rash act, not having consulted your husband in this ; hereafter "thy desire shall be to *him*, and he shall rule over thee": "This is the law for thee and thy daughters in all their generations." On this *law*, on this radical difference by nature in the mental endowments of the two sexes, the apostle, in both instances, founds his injunction. Paul was a profound metaphysician. He knew the feminine mind was not, as a rule, adapted to teach either theology or science ; that it required the masculine intellect to discipline and educate. To illustrate the difference, the learner comes with his unsolved difficulties, with no clear perception of what they are, to his MALE teacher, who, by questions and hints, only guides him to solve the problem himself: then he knows it, with the advantage of self-discipline and education in finding it out. He comes to his FEMALE teacher with his difficulties and discouragements. With a

womanly heart, she pours into his ear all she knows about it. He thinks he has learned it, but he has not, and has gained no intellectual strength by the process, only a kindly heart towards his amiable teacher. Exceptions there doubtless are to the general rule. We do sometimes find a man's head on a woman's shoulders, but it is a great misfortune to her.

The church in all its history has had didactic theology, ecclesiastical order, government, intellectual training enough, often too much. She has always failed, and just at the point where woman's mission comes in: in *heart*-religion, in simple trust, — "a faith that works by love." Woman has not hitherto performed her part in the edification of the church, deterred perhaps, to some extent, by the "lords of creation," or by those who "lord it over God's heritage." Under a more powerful spiritual baptism, the church may be brought back to her primitive Christian simplicity, when her sons and her DAUGHTERS shall prophesy.

From what Paul has really written and said, we conclude, first, that Paul was not a "woman's rights man," in the modern acceptation of that term. He would not have appointed a woman adjunct professor with Gamaliel, or president or professor of a college or theological seminary, or bishop of one of his churches, or ruling elder, if he had any such in his day, or attorney to wrangle in a judicial court, or member of Congress or Parliament to discuss questions of legislation, or general to lead armies in the field, or soldier to serve a cannon or handle a musket in battle. He plainly considered her of too delicate a mould mentally and physically for such drudgeries and perils. If her inquisitive intellect should lead her to desire knowledge on any or all these subjects, his direction is, or would have been, "Let her ask her husband at home," or read the papers, "in quietness."

We conclude, secondly, that Paul has never uttered one syllable, in epistle or by word, so far as the record shows, to prohibit a woman *προσευχᾶσαι* (to pray), *προφητεῖν* (to utter God's messages), *κηρύσσειν τὸν εὐαγγέλιον* (to herald the news of salvation) to a promiscuous Christian assembly, small or large, when constrained by the love of Jesus and of souls, under divine influence so to pray and exhort and preach, only she is to do it in a modest, womanly manner; nor has Peter, nor James, nor John,

nor Matthew, nor Mark, nor Luke, nor Moses, nor the Prophets. Even if the cases are exceptional to a general rule, it is a sufficient reason for the non-prohibition by the Holy Ghost through any of these writers. The whole Bible is in perfect harmony on this point; and thereto agreeth the whole Christian world, except a few, constrained by an erroneous interpretation of Paul's utterances, rather against their better judgment; and thereto agreeth, also, all of the outside world who treat woman as the companion of man.

We conclude, thirdly, that the fears of some, lest the modern "woman's rights" spirit and insubordination should overwhelm the church, as the result of the admission of woman's right to speak, are entirely groundless. The class of women for whom we plead are not those who take the stump at political meetings. These do not, any more than "pot-house" politicians, originate in our most devotional prayer-meetings.

We conclude, fourthly, that the orders or dignities of the ordained ministry are in no great peril of invasion by lay or female evangelism. It was a high sense of official dignity, under divine appointment too, that crucified our Lord. Let us beware how "we offend one of his little ones."

The officers, or rather *servants*, of the church, have come into position as her exigencies required. Under the New Dispensation, first came apostles as witnesses of the resurrection, and to complete the canon of the Scriptures; that commission accomplished, this order followed the Levitical priesthood; then leaders or moderators in the Christian assemblies for prayer and mutual edification, and the proclamation of the Gospel, resulting in more permanent pastors or bishops; then for the care of the poor, deacons. (At Corinth ruling elders were evidently needed.) With all these, there were "some evangelists (travelling preachers, missionaries) and some teachers." "The great commission" was to every member of the whole church for all time. If now gifted laymen or women are called by the Holy Ghost to speak of the love of Jesus, and endowed with natural gifts and graces of the Spirit to win souls, by what authority does any man, or any body of men, forbid their heeding the Divine call?

Brooklyn, N. Y.

H. LOOMIS.

## TO THE READER.

As stated in a note on the first page of this pamphlet, first published in the "Congregational Quarterly" for April, 1874, the article was offered to the press two years ago. In the recent developments of Divine Providence, however, we have become not only reconciled, but glad of the delay.

In the present wonderful revival of religion, taking form against the great, crying, destructive sin of the land—"rum selling and rum drinking"—the Holy Ghost seems to have selected his own instrumentalities, and brought a new power to the front, the godly women of the Church; and by his own baptism sent them, in the very spirit and power of the Gospel, to those neglected ones who seldom if ever hear those messages of Divine love in our Churches from the men. It may therefore be a little encouragement, a little relief, to some minds, at this time, to find that the inspired Paul's injunctions are in no manner against these movements of the women, although they may come somewhat athwart the following action of the Brooklyn Presbytery, taking refuge as it did under the almost obsolete action of the General Assembly of 1837:

The Presbytery having been informed that a woman has preached in one of our Churches, on Sabbath, at a regular service; therefore

*Resolved*, That the Presbytery feel constrained to enjoin upon our Churches strict regard to the following deliverance of the General Assembly: "Meetings of pious women by themselves for conversation and prayer we entirely approve. But let not the inspired prohibition of the great Apostle as found in his epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy be violated. To teach and to exhort, or to lead in prayer in public and promiscuous assemblies, is clearly forbidden to women in the Holy Oracles."

It remains for the Presbytery or General Assembly to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that their assertions are in accord with the injunction of the inspired Apostle, or failing in that, to modify their action against the godly women, "Lest haply they be found to fight against God."

H. LOOMIS,

April, 1874.

70 Hanson Place, Brooklyn.



MISS S. F. SMILEY, (from Harper's Weekly.)