

CATHERINE BOOTH

WOMEN IN THE MINISTRY

One objection urged against the public exercises of women is that it is unnatural and unfeminine. Many make the mistake of confusing nature with custom. Custom can make things appear to us natural which, in reality, are very unnatural. On the other hand, novelty and rarity make very natural things appear strange and contrary to nature. 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. The trammels of custom, the force of prejudice and one-sided interpretations of scripture, have in some places almost excluded her from this sphere. Before such a sphere is pronounced to be unnatural, it must be proved either that woman has not the ability to teach or to preach, or that the possession and exercise of this ability unnaturalizes her in respect to the delicacy and grace belonging to the female character.

We believe rather that those that have been called by the divine Master into the exercise of the ministry will be generally distinguished for modesty, gentleness, order and right submission to their brethren.

Why should woman be confined exclusively to the kitchen and the distaff, any more than man to the field and workshop? Did not God and has not nature, assigned to man his sphere of labour, "to till the ground and to dress it?" If exemption is claimed from this kind of toil for a portion of the men, we must be allowed to claim the same privilege for women. Nor can we see the exception more unnatural in the one case than in the other, or why God in this solitary instance has endowed a being with powers which He never intended her to employ.

Perhaps some fear of women occupying any position which involves publicity, lest she should be rendered unfeminine by the indulgence of ambition or vanity. Why should woman any more than man be charged with ambition when impelled to use her talents for the good of souls?

Well, say our objecting friends, how is it that women should venture to preach when female ministry is forbidden in the Word of God? This is by far the most serious objection which we have to consider. By a fair and consistent interpretation we shall show that not only is the public ministry of woman unforbidden, but absolutely enjoined by both precept and example in the Word of God. First we will select the most prominent and explicit passages of the New Testament referring to the subject, beginning with I Cor. 11:4, 5: "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 even all one as if she were shaven." "The character," says

one writer, “of the prophesying here referred to by the apostle is defined in I Cor. 14:3, 4, and 31. 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, for this 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.” Adam Clarke, on this verse, says “Whatever may be the meaning of praying and prophesying in respect to the man, they have precisely the same 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 (2:28) and referred to by Peter in Acts 2:17. Had there not been such gifts bestowed on women, the prophecy could not have had its fulfilment. The only difference marked by the apostle was that the man had his head uncovered and the woman had hers covered, as it was the custom both among Greeks and Romans, and among the Jews an express law that no woman should be seen abroad without a veil. This was the custom in all the East and none but public prostitutes went without veils. If a woman should appear in public without a veil, she would dishonour her head—her husband. She would appear as

those women who have their hair shaven off as the punishment of adultery.”

We think that the view above given is the only fair and common-sense interpretation of this passage. If Paul does not here recognize the fact that women did actually pray and prophesy in the primitive Church, 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, we leave to objectors the task of reducing any sense whatever from his language. The question with the Corinthians was not whether or not the woman should pray or prophesy at all, but whether, as a matter of convenience, they might do so without their veils. The apostle clearly explains that by the law of society it would be improper to uncover her head while engaged in acts of public worship.

Concerning the above passage one writes, “Paul here takes for granted that women were in the habit of praying and prophesying. He expresses no surprise nor utters a syllable of censure. He was only anxious that they should not provoke unnecessary reproach by laying aside their customary head-dress or departing from the dress which was indicative of modesty in the country in which they lived. This passage seems to prove beyond the possibility of dispute that in the early times women were permitted to speak to the edification and comfort of Christians and that the Lord graciously endowed them with grace and gifts for this service. What He did then, may He not be doing now? It seems truly astonishing that Bible students, with the second chapter of the Acts before them,

should not see that an imperative decree has gone forth from God, the execution of which women cannot escape, whether they like it or not, they shall prophesy throughout the whole course of this dispensation.”

Well, say some objectors, hear what Paul says in another place: “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn [preaching and teaching is not learning!] anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.” I Cor. 14:34, 35. Now let it be borne in mind this is the same apostle, writing to the same congregation as in I Cor. 11. Will any one 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 contradiction and absurdity. Taking the simple and common-sense view of the two passages, namely, that one refers to the devotional and religious exercises in the Church and the other to inconvenient asking of questions and imprudent or ignorant talking, 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 directions how a thing shall be performed, which further on, and writing to the same congregation, 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 based on

these words can be deemed of any worth, objectors must prove that the “speaking” here is synonymous with that concerning the manner of which the apostle legislates in I Cor. 11. Adam Clarke, on this passage, says, “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 what the apostle says (I Cor. 11), where he lays down rules to regulate this part of their conduct while ministering in the church.” All that the apostle opposes here is their questioning, finding fault, disputing, etc., in the Christian church, as the Jewish men were permitted to do in their synagogues (see Luke 2:46); 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.

J.H. Robinson, writing on this passage remarks: “The silence imposed here must be explained by the verb, *to speak*, 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 any 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.” In Robinson’s Lexicon 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* 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." 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.

"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 from the context. Now, the context shows that it was not silence which was imposed upon women in the congregation, but only a refraining from such speaking as was inconsistent with the words, they are commanded to be under obedience. That is, they were to refrain from such questionings, dogmatical assertions and disputations as would bring them into collision with the men. This kind of speaking and this alone was forbidden by the apostle in the passage before us. This kind of speaking was the only supposable antagonist to, and violation of obedience. My studies 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 congregation 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.”

Parkhurst in his lexicon, tells us that the Greek word *lalein*, which our translation renders *speak*, is not the word used in Greek to signify to speak with premeditation and prudence, but is the word used to signify to speak imprudently and without consideration, and is that applied to one who lets his tongue run but does not speak to the purpose, but says nothing.” Paul’s fulmination is not launched against speech with premeditation and prudence, but against speech devoid of these qualities. It would be well if all speakers of the male as well as the female sex were obedient to this rule.

We think that with the light cast on this text by the eminent Greek scholars above quoted, there can be no doubt in any unprejudiced mind as to the true meaning of *lalein* in this connection. We find from Church history that the primitive Christians thus understood it, for that women did actually speak and preach amongst them we have indisputable proof.

Some may still insist on a literal application of I Cor. 14:34, and deem it a prohibition of women speaking at all in the assembly. Let us realize that the apostle was addressing a problem here with the Corinthian women only. “Let your women keep silence.” These directions were given because these particular women had been speaking in an imprudent manner. This was for the women of the Corinthian congregation.

God had promised in the last days to pour out His Spirit upon all flesh and that the daughters, as well as the sons, should prophesy. Peter says most emphatically, respecting the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel." Acts 2:16-18. Words more explicit and an application of prophesy more direct than this, does not occur within the range of the New Testament.

Though some say if women have the gift of prophesy they must not use that gift in public, God says, by His prophet Joel, they shall use it, just in the same sense as the sons use it. When the dictation of men so flatly opposes the express declaration of the "sure word of prophesy," we make no apology for its utter and indignant rejection.

Presbuteros, in his reply to a priest of Rome, says: "Habituated for ages, as men had been, to the diabolical teaching and delusions practiced upon them by the papal priesthood, it was difficult for them when they did get possession of the scriptures to discern therein the plain fact, that among the primitive Christians preaching was not confined to men, but that women also, gifted with power by the Holy Spirit, preached the gospel. Hence the slowness with which, even at the present time, this truth has been admitted by those giving heed to the Word of God and especially those setting themselves up as a priesthood or a clergy. God had, according to His promise, on the day of Pentecost poured out His Holy Spirit upon believers—men and women, old and young—that they should prophesy, and they did so. The prophesying

spoken of was not the foretelling of events, but the preaching to the world at large the glad tidings of salvation by Jesus Christ. For this purpose it pleased God to make use of women as well as men. It is plainly the duty of every Christian to insist upon the fulfilment of the will of God and the abrogation of every single thing inconsistent therewith. I would draw attention to the fact that Phebe, a Christian woman whom we find in our version of the scripture (Rom. 16:1), spoken of only as any common servant attached to a congregation, was nothing less than one of those gifted by the Holy Spirit for publishing the glad tidings, or preaching the gospel. The manner in which the apostle (whose only care was the propagation of evangelical truth) speaks of her, shows that she was what he in Greek styled her, a deacon (*diaconon*) or preacher of the Word. Other translators speak of her (because she was a woman) only as a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea. The men *diaconia* they styled ministers, but a woman on the same level as themselves would be an anomaly and therefore she was to be only the servant of men ministers, who, in the popish sense, constituted the church!"

The apostle says of her— "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a minister (*diaconon*) of the church which is at Cenchrea: that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you." To the common-sense of disinterested minds it will be evident that the apostle could not have requested more for any one of the most zealous of men preachers than he did for Phebe! They

were to assist “her in whatever business she” might require their aid. Hence we discern that she had no such trifling position in the primitive church as at the present time episcopal dignitaries attach to deacons and deaconesses! Observe, the same Greek word is used to designate her that was applied to all the apostles and to Jesus Himself. For example: “Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister (*diaconon*) of the circumcision” (Rom. 15:8). “Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers (*diaconoi*) by whom ye believed” (I Cor. 3:5). “Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers (*diaconous*) of the new testament” (II Cor. 3:6). “In all things approving ourselves as the ministers (*diaconoi*) of God” (II Cor. 6:4). The idea of a woman deacon—it was intolerable, 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.

“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. 16:7. 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 translator it was out of all character to have

a woman of note amongst the apostles and a fellow-prisoner with Paul for the gospel. Therefore let them be kinsmen!

Justin Martyr, who lived till about A.D. 165 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, by which he endeavoured to convince the Jews that the latter days were come.”

Dodwell, in his dissertations of Irenaeus says, “that the gift of the spirit of prophesy 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.”

Another passage frequently cited as prohibitory of female labour in the Church, is I Tim. 2:12, 13. Though we have never met with the slightest proof that this text has any reference to the public exercises of women, nevertheless, as it is often quoted, we will give it a fair and thorough examination. It is primarily an injunction respecting her personal behaviour at home. It stands in connection with precepts respecting her apparel and her domestic position, especially her relation to her husband. [Women are to be in subjection to their OWN husband, not to all men. Eph. 5:22, I Pet. 3:1, Col. 3:18, Titus 2:5.] 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, but is such teaching as is domineering and as involves the usurpation of authority over the man [her husband]. This is the only teaching forbidden by Paul in the passage under consideration. "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 *didaskēin* stands associated. Her teaching may be public, reiterated, urgent and may comprehend a variety of subjects, provided it be not dictatorial, domineering, for then and then only, would it be incompatible with her obedience."

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." "This prohibition," says one writer, "refers exclusively to the private life and domestic character of woman and simply means that an ignorant or unruly woman is not to force her opinions on the man. It has no reference whatever to good women living in obedience to God and their husbands, or to women sent out to preach the gospel by the call of the Holy Spirit." If the context is allowed to fix the

meaning of *didaskein* in this text, as it would be in any other, there can be no doubt in any honest mind that the above is the only consistent interpretation and if it be, then this prohibition has no bearing whatever on the religious exercises of women led and taught by the Spirit of God.

Let God's Word take the place of man's traditions. The man who shall teach that Paul commands woman to be silent when God's Spirit urges her to speak, we fear must answer to God.

Another argument urged against female preaching is that it is unnecessary; that there is plenty of scope for her efforts in private; in visiting the sick and poor and working for the temporalities of the Church. Doubtless woman ought to be thankful for any sphere for benefiting her race and glorifying 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 title of the honour which He has attached to the ministration of His gospel. Here, again, man's theory and God's order 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 exultation 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 many of His professed people appear to entertain in these days. We have no intimation of His reproving the

Samaritan woman for her public proclamation of Him to her countrymen, nor of His rebuking the women who followed Him amidst a taunting mob on His way to the cross.

As to the obligation devolving on woman to labour for her Master, I presume there will be no controversy. The particular sphere in which each individual shall do this must be dictated by the teachings of the Holy Spirit and the gifts with which God has endowed her. If she have the necessary gifts and feels herself called by the Spirit to preach, there is not a single word in the whole book of God to restrain her, but many to urge and encourage her. God says she shall do so and Paul prescribed the manner in which she shall do it. Phebe, Junia, Philip's four daughters and many other women, actually did preach and speak in the primitive Church. If this had not been the case, there would have been less freedom under the new than under the old dispensation, a greater paucity of gifts and agencies under the Spirit than under the law, fewer labourers when more work to be done. We are told again and again in effect, that in "Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free, male nor female, but ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

We commend a few passages bearing on the ministrations of women under the old dispensation to the careful considerations of our readers. "And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time." Judges 4:4-10. 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 II Kings 22:12-20, we have an account of the king sending the high-priest and the scribe 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 abject servility which some persons seem to think should characterize 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." Ps. 68:11. 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." How comes it that the feminine word is actually excluded in this text? That it is there as plainly as any other word no Hebrew scholar will deny. It is too much to assume that as our translators could not alter it, as they did *Diaconon* when applied to Phebe, they preferred to leave it out altogether rather than give a prophesy so unpalatable to their prejudice.

In the light of such passages as these, who will dare to dispute the fact that God did under the old dispensation endue His handmaidens with the gifts and calling of prophets answering to our present idea of preachers. Strange indeed would it be if under the fullness of the gospel dispensation, there were nothing analogous to this, but “positive and explicit rules,” to prevent any approximation thereto. We are thankful to find, however, abundant evidence that the “spirit of prophesy which is the testimony of Jesus,” was poured out on the female as fully as on the male disciple, and “His daughters and His handmaidens” prophesied. We commend the following texts from the New Testament to the careful consideration of our readers.

“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 at that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of Him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.” Luke 2:37, 38. Can any one 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 who looked for redemption in Jerusalem.”

Jesus said to the two Mary’s, “All hail! And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren that they go before me into Galilee.” Matt. 28:9, 10. There

are two or three points in this beautiful narrative to which we wish to call the attention of our readers.

First, 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. 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!

Surely, if the dignity of our Lord or His message were likely to be imperilled by committing this sacred trust to a woman, He could have commanded another messenger, but as if intent on doing her honour, He reveals Himself first to her and as an evidence of His approval of female service.

Acts 1:14 and 2:1, 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. The Holy Ghost filled them all. They spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. The Spirit was given alike to the female as to the male disciple. This is cited by Peter (16, 18).

“Philip the evangelist had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy.” Acts 21:9.

“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. 4:3.

This is a recognition of female labourers, not concerning the gospel but in the gospel, whom Paul classes with Clement and other his fellow-labourers. Precisely the same terms are applied to Timotheus, whom Paul styles a “minister of God, and his fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ.” I Thess. 3:2.

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. 16:3, 4.

The word rendered helpers means a fellow-labourer, associate, a colleague. In the New Testament spoken ONLY OF A CO-WORKER, helper in a Christian work, that is of Christian teachers. How can these terms, with any show of consistency, be made to apply merely to the exercise of hospitality towards the apostle, or the duty of private visitation? To be a partner, or joint worker WITH a preacher of the gospel, must be something more than to be his waiting-maid.

Again, “Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which laboured much in the Lord.” Rom. 16:12. Adam 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 Paul (I Cor. 14:3), whoever prophesied spoke unto others to edification, exhortation and comfort, and that no preacher can do more every person

must acknowledge. To edify, exhort and comfort are the prime ends of the gospel ministry. If women thus prophesied, then women preached.”

“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Gal. 3:28. If this passage does not teach that in the privileges, duties and responsibilities of Christ’s kingdom, all differences of nation, caste and sex are abolished, we should like to know what it does teach and wherefore it was written. See also I Cor. 7:22. As we have before observed, the text, I Cor. 14:34 and 35, is the only one in the whole Book of God, which even by a false translation can be made prohibitory of female speaking in the church. How comes it then, that by this one isolated passage, which, according to our best Greek authorities, is wrongly rendered and wrongly applied, woman’s lips have been sealed and the “testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophesy,” silenced, when bestowed on her? By this course men have involved themselves in all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions. Worse, they have nullified some of the precious promises of God’s Word. They have set the most explicit predictions of prophesy at variance with apostolic injunctions.

Paul refers to the fruits of his labours as evidence of his divine commission in I Cor. 9:2. “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.” If this criterion be allowed to settle the question respecting woman’s call to preach, we have no fear as to the result. When God’s

blessing attends the ministrations of females, let not man speak against it.

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 connections and insisting on a literal interpretation of the words of our version, what errors and contradictions would have been forced upon 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," etc. The Antinomian, according to this rule of interpretation, has most unquestionable foundation for his dead faith and hollow profession, seeing that Paul declares over and over again that men are "saved by faith and not by works." The Unitarian also, in support of that soul-withering doctrine, triumphantly refers 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, wrested from their proper connections, or the light thrown upon them by other scriptures and applying them to sustain a favourite theory."

According to the Word of God, woman has both the right and the responsibility to teach. This right is to be independent of any man-made restrictions. The Lord gives the Word and He will choose whom He pleases to publish it, notwithstanding the condemnation of unlearned or prejudiced minds.