

THE TWAIN ONE

A BIBLE STUDY OF A VITAL SUBJECT

THIS GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.
A CUP OF COLD WATER FOR A THIRSTY SOUL.
BY
MARIA FRANCES RUSSELL

Copyrighted 1906 BY MARIA FRANCES RUSSELL

To The valued Christian Friends
whose faith and courage
have been a bulwark of strength,
this volume is dedicated.

PREFACE

If any apology is needed for the publication of this small work, it is the very general misconception of the teaching of the Word of God as to the social standing of one half of the human race, involving also, to a very large degree, the best interests of the other half. For so united are the interests of the twain that God made one, that if one suffers injustice and oppression the other will suffer also, either directly or indirectly. If the wives and mothers are enslaved and degraded, the husbands and sons will miss the tender ministries of that refinement and culture which can never flourish in any other atmosphere than that of the freedom and happiness which God designed, and posterity must inevitably feel the blight.

Since the Word of God is thought by many to be on the ignoble side of this question, and is often apologetically explained, or explained away, by some such, who feel the reproach, while by others many of its expressions are repeatedly quoted in support of a great error, we have endeavored to present in these pages the whole Bible testimony on the subject, believing that "God is his own interpreter, and he will make it plain."

In the light which one scripture throws upon another, truth is made clear. Therefore, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." God gives "line upon line" and "precept upon precept, here a little and there a little," and when thought and patient investigation, guided by the holy spirit of truth and righteousness, bring these littles together, we have the harmonious whole of God's truth upon any given subject; and upon none more clearly than the one under present consideration.

At the request of many friends who desire to see these thoughts before the public, and specially before Christians in general, the writer consents to their publication, although such was not the original intention. The subject grew to its present proportions from a simple effort, with Bible and pencil in hand, to gain personal instruction from the highest source.

In the hope that these pages will aid others in such investigation, and establish some of God's children more firmly in truth and righteousness respecting the most important of all human relationships, we submit them to the reading public.

MARIA FRANCES RUSSELL.
Allegheny, Pa., U. S. A.

A RAVELED rainbow overhead
Lets down to earth its varying thread:
Love s blue, joy s gold, and fair between
Hope s shifting light of emerald green.

On either side, in deep relief,
A crimson pain, a violet grief.
Wouldst thou, amid their gleaming hues,
Snatch after those, and these refuse?

Believe, could thine anointed eyes
Follow their lines, and sound the skies,
There where the fadeless glories shine,
Thine unseen Savior twists the twine

And be thou sure what tint soe'er
The broken ray beneath may wear,
It needs them all that, fair and white,
His love may weave the perfect light.

Mrs. Whitney.

The Twain One

TRUE happiness, in any human relationship, is incompatible with the ignoble ideas both of tyranny and of servility; for beings created in the likeness of God must retain that likeness. The dignity and nobility of God's handiwork may not be sacrificed to any mean ambition that thrusts itself athwart the divine purpose. Therefore, while God has, in various human relationships, enjoined the duty of submission, it can never be properly regarded as a servile submission, or as giving any countenance to the exercise of tyranny.

Whatever stands in the way of the accomplishment of God's original designs for his intelligent creation stands in the way also of their true happiness and lasting welfare; for God's purpose in creation was and is the eternal happiness and welfare of his creatures, and that in a manner consistent with the original dignity and nobility of their creation. He did not bring them into life to degrade them and make them miserable, but to advance them and make them happy.

While he foresaw and has permitted sin temporarily to interfere with his original purpose, it is a part of his plan, in due time, to obliterate all sin and eventually to establish the willing and obedient in everlasting life and happiness--a true and lasting happiness based upon nobility of character.

He therefore, who is truly wise will desire to know the purpose of God in any case, and in no case more than in that which affects that most important of all human relationships, the domestic relation. And since this subject is closely allied to the still broader one of woman's sphere of activity in the church and in the world, it assumes a still greater magnitude of importance. To seek for happiness outside of the range of God's original purpose is but to seek it in vain; for although sin may yield a temporary gratification or pleasure, yet eventually it will inevitably yield its legitimate fruitage of misery and degradation.

To the worldly mind, bent on its own course regardless of the divine purposes, this subject will be of little interest; its appeal, therefore, is only to those who have the spirit of Christ--to Christians. It is true, as the apostle Peter suggest (2 Pet. 3:15,16), that on this subject, as well as on some others, our beloved brother Paul speaks in his epistles of some things which are hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned in the things of God, and unstable in their purpose to follow Christ, "wrest unto their own destruction."

Professing godliness, yet lacking its vital power, they claim to find in the writings of the beloved apostle to the Gentiles, as they do also in the other scriptures, justification and endorsement of the unrighteousness which they prefer to the right ways of the Lord. But, though isolated expressions of the apostle, misconstrued, may seem to such to give support to unrighteousness, and to be hard to be understood by them in any other light, they are not beyond the possibility of right understanding. On the noble side of every question all the scriptures agree; and in the testimony derived from a careful comparison of all that is stated by the inspired writers on any subject, the mind of the Lord is revealed.

Much stress has been laid by some on the apostolic counsel to wives to be subject to their own husbands, and in this, it is claimed, the ideas of domestic slavery and tyranny find ample support. The attention of all true and thoughtful Christians is therefore invited, in these pages, to the consideration of the subject of submission as it concerns our relation both to God and to our fellow men; for it is enjoined in several important relationships, and with a reasonableness and righteousness which is clearly manifest when carefully considered.

REASONABLENESS OF THE REQUIREMENT OF OBEDIENCE TO GOD

Obedience is set forth in the Scriptures as the first duty of the creature to the Creator. It is a most reasonable and just requirement, and one necessary for the well-being of the creature. God, who created man, created him for his own pleasure--that he might have a Father's

benevolent delight in his intelligent creation, all of whom should gloriously reflect his own image of righteousness and true holiness. Rev. 4:11; Heb. 12:10.

In order to the delightful communion of the Creator and the creature contemplated in the creation, paternal and filial love must respond to each other. The creature must gratefully recognize the benevolent design of the Creator in bringing him into existence, and must own his dependence, as a child, upon the love and bountiful providence of his Heavenly Father. God did not bring his human children into existence unprovided for, nor did he leave them to struggle with adverse circumstances alone and unaided; for every child of God is an *heir* of his bounty, both present and future:--"If children, then heirs." Rom. 8:17. The Heavenly Father has planned and provided for their highest good-- for their eternal life and happiness in his love and favor and in communion with himself. Even foreseeing man's fall into sin and consequently into death, his loving heart provided redemption and salvation for all through Christ: "for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16.

God's love, wisdom and power being infinite, and pledged to the eternal welfare of the willing and obedient, how necessary is the full, loyal and loving submission of the finite creature to his righteous and benevolent authority. How necessary to our protection, our development in his character-likeness, our peace and our happiness, as well as to our eternal life.

In view of such necessity, it is therefore evident that it is no disposition of selfishness or pride of power or vain glory on the part of the Creator that commands the obedience of his creatures, but that it is the broadest and wisest benevolence and the deepest love. His commandments should, therefore, awaken in the heart of man emotions of grateful appreciation, and should be responded to with that filial, loving reverence that gladly says, "I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart."

ANY SUBSERVIENCY TO FELLOW MEN A SECONDARY CONSIDERATION.

While recognizing the duty of obedience to God as the first duty of man, we must, of necessity, regard all rightful subserviency to our fellow men, enjoined in the Scriptures, as *secondary* to this *primary obligation to God*. So the apostle Peter rightly reasoned, and incidentally stated, saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29), although he also wrote to the church, "submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." 1 Pet. 2:13. And Paul also wrote, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers; for there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." Rom. 13:1.

To Titus Paul also wrote. "Put them [the church] in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, and to obey magistrates." Titus 3:1. But when these human authorities set themselves in defiance of God, and so commanded God's people, these same apostles did not hesitate to oppose them, and to obey God rather than men. Such a course was manifestly right, God being the supreme authority. It is one of the things, like that of 1 Cor. 15:27,* which reason and common sense would make manifest, even if there were no revelation on the subject.

*1 Cor. 15:27, 28—"For he [Jehovah] hath put all things under his [Christ's] feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, *it is manifest* that he [himself--Jehovah] *is excepted* which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

So acting upon this principle, when Peter and the other apostles who were with him were brought before the council for preaching Christ, and the High Priest addressed them, saying, "Did not we straitly command you that you should not teach in this name? and behold you have

filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us," they unhesitatingly answered, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:27-29.

Upon this principle of the supremacy of the divine authority over all human authorities and powers, even though divinely ordained for a time, and of the consequent obligation of submission to the divine, in preference to the human, whenever the two are in conflict, our Lord also acted, when, in opposition to both Jewish and Gentile powers, he declared himself the King of the Jews, and taught the people that his kingdom would, by and by, be established in the earth. Yet he was careful to render unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's, as well as unto God the things that are God's, and to teach the same. See Matt. 22: 15-21; 17:24-27.

It was also in pursuance of this same principle that Stephen and Paul and all the reformers from their day to this labored, many of them suffering martyrdom at the hands of the powers that be, rather than yield this principle of *the supremacy of divine authority*.

SUBMISSION OF THE CHURCH.

In this light we must therefore view all of the above-quoted exhortations to the church to submission to the powers that be. In like manner, Christians must, of necessity, exercise a degree of common sense in interpreting other similar exhortations to submission to their fellow men.

Thus, when we read the exhortation to the church--Heb. 13:17—"Obey them that have the rule over you [*i.e.*, who preside over you as elders, pastors and teachers], and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account"--we must bear in mind the teaching of the Lord and of Peter, that none of these elders, pastors, teachers or others may aspire to be greatest, or to lord it over the church, which is God's heritage, not theirs (Luke 22:24-26; 1 Pet. 5:1-3), and that any attempt on the part of any to do so should not be yielded to by the church, but, in the spirit of love and of loyalty to Christ, should be resisted; for the apostle Paul says, "*Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not again entangled with the yoke of bondage.*" Gal. 5:1.

Our Lord said, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them [That is, instead of rightly using their office to preserve the natural rights and liberties of the people, they rule, and often tyrannize, in selfishness and pride of power]; and they that [thus] exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. [They are even flattered thus for their tyranny by a servile people, many of whom descend to the most ignoble deeds to gain their favor and some small present advantage.

Thus pride, selfishness, love of power and tyranny are fostered and cultivated in the one class, and a more or less groveling servility in the other, both of which dispositions are beneath the dignity of noble manhood and womanhood, and are displeasing to the Lord, who says further:] But ye [my disciples] *shall not be so* [ye shall not be either tyrannical, proud and lovers of power, nor servile, sycophantic slaves to any aspirants to such power]: but he that is [truly] greatest among you, let him be as the younger [modest and unassuming]; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? But I am among you as he that serveth." Luke 22:25-27.

How plainly our Lord thus tells us that both *tyranny*, which trespasses on the rights of others, and *servility*, which cowardly sacrifices the principles of righteousness, and consequently self-respect also, for some mean temporal advantage, are *alike* dishonorable and reprehensible in his sight

"BUT YE SHALL NOT BE SO."

Peter also counsels those in leading positions in the church to imitate Christ in this respect of being ensamples to the flock (1 Pet. 5:3); as Paul expresses it, "ensamples in word, in

conversation, in charity, in spirit [the spirit of meekness and holiness], in faith, in purity." 1 Tim. 4:12.

The duty of submission to those in leading positions in the church we must therefore regard not in the light of unquestioning, childish or servile obedience, but simply as a matter of respectful deference and cooperation with such as answer Peter's description of a true shepherd, and who, as Paul describes, "watch for your souls as they that must give account."

We are also taught that this sort of submission should be general throughout the church—in every member of it, without any exception of leaders and teachers. As Paul states it, it is "submitting yourselves *one to another* in the fear of God." Eph. 5:21. And Peter says (1 Pet. 5:5) "Likewise [that is, like as the elders, whom he was exhorting to be ensamples to the flock, and not lords over it, set the example of humble submission, so also], ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder: yea, *all of you* [young and old] be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble."

Thus the divine authority of the Word and Spirit of God is shown to be the supreme and only authority in the church; and the duty of every member of the church is manifestly to recognize and obey that authority, all submission to one another being only that which humility and loving cooperation in the divine service dictate.

CHARACTER OF THE SUBMISSION OF CHRISTIAN SERVANTS TO THEIR MASTERS.

We further observe that Christian servants are taught to be obedient to their masters. Here the same degree of common sense is necessary as in interpreting the above similar exhortations to the church in general: otherwise, a large proportion of mankind might consider themselves in duty bound in a most abject slavery to their fellow men; for the great majority of men and women are servants in some capacity to others. Some are household servants; others serve in shops, stores, factories, political offices, etc.

Let us observe some of these exhortations to servants. Paul says: "Servants, obey *in all things* your masters according to the flesh, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of your heart, fearing God. And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ." Col. 3:22-24.

Again he says, "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ: not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart: with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men, knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free." Eph 6:5-8.

That these servants are not of necessity slaves, but servants in general, bond or free, see also and compare Matt. 20:27. "Whosoever shall be chief among you shall be your servant" (Greek, *doulos*, same word as in above texts); and Col. 4:1, "Give unto your servants that which is right"—same word, *doulos*, here paid servants, not slaves. To Titus Paul further says, "Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and *to please them well in all things*; not answering again; not purloining, but showing all good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things." Titus 2:9, 10. Peter also says, "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." 1 Pet. 2:18.

The ounce of common sense in the interpretation of these exhortations to servants to "*obedience in all things*" to their masters must, of necessity, limit such obedience *to the terms of their contract*. They by no means give to the master unlimited power over his servant. Nor is the servant in duty bound to please his master in all things except within that same limit, the limit of his contract. Beyond the time and conditions of his contract, he is at liberty to please himself, and his master has no jurisdiction whatever.

And when the apostle further exhorts to obedience to masters—"in singleness of your hearts as unto Christ"—the idea is not that the master takes the place of Christ, and that the servant is to serve him as though he were Christ; but the idea is that the servant is to do this work for his master remembering that Christ is taking cognizance of his faithfulness, and that in striving to please his earthly master, according to the terms of his contract, his course, in thus honestly doing his duty, is pleasing to Christ, whose approval, above that of his earthly master, should be his chief desire.

This supreme devotion to Christ should be the constant incentive to faithfulness with the Christian servant, that thus, with singleness of heart, as unto Christ, he may serve and please the earthly master, in whose approval, if received, he may also find a secondary pleasure. But the interpretation which would put the earthly master instead of Christ would be wrong, a wresting of the Scriptures to our entanglement in sin.

The counsel of Peter, of subjection even to the forward master, must, of course, be understood to apply only in cases where the necessities of circumstance or of contract require a continuance of the relationship of master and servant. In case of disagreement which cannot be adjusted, if a servant may have his liberty he should, as Paul suggests--1 Cor. 7:21--choose that, rather than remain under the unfavorable conditions. He would do better to find, if possible, some other situation with a more agreeable master.

SUBMISSION OF CHILDREN TO PARENTS.

We next observe the exhortations to children to honor and obey their parents:--"Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. Honor thy father and thy mother, which is the first commandment with promise, that it may be well with thee and thou mayest live long upon the earth." Exod. 20:12; Eph. 6:1-3.

This obedience to parents required on the part of children, like the similar requirement on the part of all God's children to their Heavenly Father, is not a mere arbitrary matter to gratify a pride of power in the dominant parties, but it is a most necessary requirement for the protection and well-being of the children as long as they are children. But any tyrannical use of this parental authority, that is, any use of it which does not aim to secure the highest good of the child, is a misuse of it, for which God will hold such parents accountable.

But when children come to years of maturity, and are no longer children, the command of obedience to parents no longer applies to them, although it is obligatory that they should *honor* their parents to the end of their days; and if they have been faithful and wise parents, children may safely give very careful heed to their counsel and experience long after they have passed from under parental control. Wise parents will also not fail to mark the transition from childhood to manhood and womanhood, and, recognizing the new responsibilities of the maturer years of their sons and daughters, they will treat them accordingly, and not presume to extend their authority beyond the divinely appointed limit. Attempts in this direction are always more or less hazardous of the well-being of all concerned.

The conduct of Jesus, as a child, was that of loving and respectful obedience, both to his Heavenly Father and to his earthly parents (Luke 2:48-51); and, as a man, it was that of loving honor and respect to his surviving earthly parent. He bore his mother company to the wedding at Cana, and he tenderly commended her to the care of John in the hour of his last agonies. When he would express his love for his disciples he compared them to his mother and brethren, his own nearest kind, saying, "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples 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." Matt. 12:48-50.

DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH DOMESTIC SLAVERY?

We next come to a much more disputed question along this line than any of those already mentioned, viz., as to whether husbands and wives stand related to each other as master and slave, or as companions. We have no hesitation in affirming that between husband and wife the relationship of companions, and not of master and slave, is plainly taught in the Bible.

In the account of the creation, woman is referred to as a suitable help for man: "I will make him a help suitable for him." Gen. 2:18—Leeser's Translation; "a help meet for him"--Common Version: "a help like unto himself"—Douay Bible.

Some seem to gather from this word, "help," the idea of inferiority, as though the man were the great and capable one, and the woman were merely privileged and honored in doing some insignificant turns in his service. But it should be observed that this same word "help" (Hebrew, *ezer*) is used in reference to God and Christ; as, for instance, in Psalms 121:2 and 89:19—"My *help* cometh from Jehovah which made heaven and earth," "I have laid *help* upon one that is mighty"--Christ.

Consequently, there can be no inferiority implied in the term; but, on the contrary, capability to help is implied. And the very facts that God said that it was "not good that the man should be alone," and that, on this account, he made the woman and brought her to him, imply that the man needed a help; not, however, because of any imperfection in him, but because he was so constituted as to need and desire the companionship of just such a one as God intended to create. This no more implies imperfection on the part of Adam than does the similar desire on the part of our Lord Jesus for a companion so adapted to him, and which he will by and by have in the glorified church, his bride and joint heir, imply his imperfection. The further fact that the woman was declared by God to be just such a help as Adam needed—"a help suitable for him"-indicates that she was the exact complement of the man. When Adam saw this intelligent counterpart of himself, not an inferior creature therefore, but of his own human nature, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, he recognized in her the suitable help, the companion, he had not found in the inferior creatures of God. Gen. 2:20

True, the lower creatures pleased him well, and they were all in perfect subjection to him and obediently rendered him all the service he required. Many of them were strong to bear his burdens; some were fleet to run his errands, many of them gratified his love of the beautiful in form and proportions, and some in plumage; some charmed his ear with strains of music; and all manifested more or less of intelligence and affection; yet, in all, there was the lack of those higher qualities necessary to human companionship. The higher instincts of the perfect man for companionship were not satisfied with the burden-bearer, nor the errandrunner, nor the gay butterfly, nor the tuneful birds of Paradise: what he craved was an intelligent, sympathetic companion; and this lack the "suitable help," which God subsequently provided, exactly supplied.

When God had created the woman and brought her to the man, Adam said, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman [Hebrew, *ishshah*] because she was taken out of man [*ish*]." Gen. 2:23. That the name was not given as designating her office of motherhood is manifest from the fact that, when God said that she should become a mother, Adam changed her name to Eve, "because she was to be the mother of all living." Gen. 3:20.

We thus see that what the man found in the woman was an intelligent companion, one capable of sharing and appreciating all his joys (for he had no sorrows) and of participating with him in all his interests, as an heir together with himself of the grace of life, so bountifully bestowed by the Creator. Thus, as counterparts, suited to each other, these two constituted *one*: not one individual, but *one specimen of humanity*, including the two individuals, the male and the female.

These twain were "one flesh" (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5)--*i.e.*, one kind of flesh; not the beast or bird or fish kind, but the human kind. The two, constituting one specimen of humanity, were made in the image of their Creator: "So God created man [or Adam--the same Hebrew word,

which is here used in the generic sense, including both sexes] in his own image: in the image of God created he him: male and female created he them." Gen. 1:27. "In the day that God created man [Adam--same word] in the likeness of God made he him. Male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called *their name* Adam in the day when they were created." Gen. 5:1, 2.

Thus the generic term "Adam," or "man," is applied to the pair--to this one specimen of humanity which the man and the woman together constituted. On the same principle, if we exhibit a full specimen of any animal, whether of beast or bird or fish or insect or creeping thing, we present both the male and the female. So also God presented them when he gathered them into Noah's ark: "Every beast after his kind, and all cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, every bird of every sort. And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is the breath of life. And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh." Gen. 7:14-16.

With this same thought, that the twain--male and female--of any kind constitute "one flesh," one specimen of that kind, Paul also says, "All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes and another of birds." 1 Cor. 15:39.

Of course the terms "man" and "Adam" are not always used in the generic sense, as in Gen. 5: 1, 2: they are used also in the specific sense in reference to the male only. Thus, while in Gen. 5:2—"And he called *their name* Adam"--the term is plainly used in its generic sense, in Gen. 2:7, the same term, being applied to the male before the female was created, is evidently used in the specific sense:--"God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

The sense in which the human being is a likeness of God we can see to be in his mental and moral construction. As we observe God in his works and ways and in his revelation of himself, we perceive in him the same faculties, though of infinitely wider scope and greater power, which we find in ourselves, viz.: perception, memory, reason, judgment, original suggestion, free-will, etc.; also the moral qualities of conscience, perception of right and wrong, and character, the outgrowth of free choice and the exercise of the moral faculties, In these respects we thus recognize the human likeness, mental and moral, to the Divine Being.

It is because of our constitutional mental and moral likeness to God that we can apprehend him, though, because of the limited scope and strength of our faculties, we cannot comprehend him. It is because of this, our mental and moral likeness to God, that God can say to us, "Come, let us *reason together*," and that we can respond to the invitation. He gives no such invitation to the lower orders of creation, which are not in his likeness. Nor is it possible for them to know the great Creator, whose kind providence is over all his works; for, although they have some semblance of mental likeness, it is insufficient to apprehend, even in the smallest degree, the invisible God, and they have no moral likeness whatever.

While, thus viewed, each individual of the human race, whether male or female, is in the likeness of God, except as it is impaired in all by sin, yet both the masculine and feminine graces (as they are usually regarded) of strength and tenderness are necessary to the fullest likeness of God, for "strong is the Lord God of hosts" and "his tender mercies are over all his works." Thus, both individually and unitedly, the twain being one, they were created in the image of God.

There is nothing in this account of creation to indicate that the woman was in the least inferior to the man. Nor does the fact of her subsequent creation bear any such testimony; but to the contrary. Adam was left alone long enough to realize what God afterward declared, that it was not good for him to be alone; that, although he was perfect in all his powers and surrounded with blessings in his Eden home, yet there was still a desire for something not yet possessed, for companionship and fellowship with one who could intelligently enter into and sympathize with all his experiences. And so the woman, created for the man, and fully answering to his needs, came just in time to be appreciated because the need was realized.

That the two stood on a par in God's estimation of his handiwork is indicated by the fact that the same divine law was placed upon both, which implied their equal ability, both to understand it and to measure up to its requirements. And when, in Christ, men and women are

justified and thus reckonedly restored to the original perfection, God, through his inspired apostle, distinctly declares that, in his estimation, there is neither male nor female, there is no distinction of sex. Gal. 3:28. They stand before him on a par, as intelligent individuals under the same requirements of his righteous law, and equally the subjects of his love and grace.

And further, it is manifest that God created them with equal *rights* when he gave the dominion of the earth to them both jointly: "And God blessed *them* and said *unto them*, Be fruitful and multiply and fill 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." Gen. 1:27, 28.

There was no such doctrine taught there as that the man should own everything and that the wife should be a mere pensioner on his bounty. God did not give the whole earth to Adam alone, and that with a mere suggestion that he should see that Eve would have enough to eat and a shelter from the heat of day and the dews of night, and then tell Eve not to be discontented with her lot, but that as long as she kept on the right side of Adam he would not allow her to suffer, and that if at any time she would suffer she might know that in some way she must have offended Adam, and to be sure to inquire how, and to apologize and rectify her mistakes, etc., etc.: but he made them, as Peter declares, "*heirs together* of the grace of life." 1 Pet. 3:7. The earth, and all that was in it, was given to them as their *jointpossession*. Only the lower creatures were thus subject to man.

Thus they were each equally endowed by the Creator. And when, after the fall, God clothed them, he did not make an ample robe for Adam only, and then tell him to show his benevolence and generosity to Eve by taking some of the abundant surplus of his own robe to make a little narrow one for her that she might also be clothed; but God himself provided amply for them both. Gen. 3:21.

And here let not the fact be overlooked that, in this typical robe which God provided for each of them, was prefigured the salvation provided in Christ for each. But, in order to receive its benefits, each, irrespective of the other, must put it on and wear it: each must have an individual understanding of the divine purpose of salvation, an individual faith to appropriate the righteousness of Christ, and an individual obedience in accepting of and complying with the terms of salvation.

Thus the husband and the wife are recognized of God as distinct personalities, individually accountable to him, and each instructed to work out his or her own salvation by faith, in obedience to the divine requirements; yet, as divinely created counterparts, the twain are one: they constitute one specimen of humanity.

Observe further that, when the law of God was promulgated from Mount Sinai, the command to children was, "Honor thy father and thy mother." If the mother were a mere slave to their father, having no rights or claims of her own, wherein would be the honor? Taught by their father's example to regard her as inferior to him, would they not also--at least the sons--so regard her, and thus violate the law of God?

True, the provisional* law of the Jewish nation did not fully maintain this high standard of the moral code; for "the times of that ignorance God winked at [tolerated, overlooked] *because* he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:30, 31.

*Generally, though less appropriately, termed "the ceremonial law," in contradistinction to "the moral law" contained in the ten commandments.

God did not then attempt a complete reconstruction of the Jewish nation on the basis of the moral code, because, as Paul here states, the appointed time for that work—"the times of restitution of all things" (Acts 3:19-21)--had not yet come. God merely regulated the affairs of that time and nation to favor the ends to be accomplished then.

This accounts for the facts that slavery, polygamy and divorcement, which are great evils, were not only tolerated, but were also to some extent regulated in Israel (see Lev. 25:39-49;

Deut. 21: 15-17; 24:1, and compare Matt. 19:3-8; 5:31, 32), although contrary to the divine purpose for man as intimated even by that very same provisional law. See Lev. 25:42; 18:18, margin; Deut. 17:17; Matt. 5:31, 32. Here we might further remark that when Paul said the law was holy and just and good (Rom. 7:12) his special reference was to the moral code, and not to that accommodated provisional law to which our Lord himself took exceptions, saying, The law saith unto you thus and so, but I say unto you something different. See Matt. 5:31, 32; 19:8.

HOW SIN INTERFERED WITH GOD'S ORIGINAL PURPOSE IN THE DOMESTIC RELATION.

The first intimation we have of any subjection of woman to man is in the terms of the penalty pronounced after the fall into sin: "Unto the woman God 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 [or 'thou shalt be under thy husband's power' --Douay Translation], and he shall rule over thee." Gen. 3:16.

Observe, it is not the bringing forth of children that is the curse; for it was God's original purpose before sin entered that the race should propagate itself, and the command to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth was coupled with the divine blessing: "And God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply," etc. Gen. 1:28. But it was the sorrow and suffering that would attend the increase of the race that constituted the penalty, while her subjection to *sinful* man, instead of the noble companionship of the *perfect* man, was the natural consequence of sin, which God would permit her to realize as long as sin holds its dominion, though such permission would be no justification of the sin in the man.

It should also be noticed that, when God called Adam to account for his sin, there was no intimation of any jurisdiction on his part over Eve: he was not held responsible for her sin, but for his own. God dealt with them as individuals separately responsible to him. In the terms of the penalty we must not expect to find an expression of God's original purpose for his creatures; but rather, we should expect what we do find, viz., the foretelling of the natural course of sin, and therefore its natural penalty.

God, as we have seen, did not originally place Eve under the power of Adam: the earth and the fulness thereof belonged as fully to her as to him: everlasting life and happiness and every blessing were just as fully vouchsafed by the Creator to her as to Adam, and on the very same conditions:-- of obedience to Adam? No: of obedience to God. Eve's reply to the tempter's suggestion to sin was not, "Adam does not allow me to do it," but, "God hath said, Ye shall not eat of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die."

It is sin, then, that has interfered with God's original purpose and spoiled the beautiful domestic relationship which he ordained; and it has operated in this way:-- Woman's natural office of motherhood and the home duties connected with it, the training of children, etc., which, under perfect conditions, as originally designed, could have brought only happiness and joy, instead, under the conditions induced by sin, brought sorrow and a gradual physical weakening or decline. The too frequent maternity, often imposed upon her regardless of proper conditions, has undermined the health of women generation after generation, while man, whose natural occupation has been more in the fields and in subduing the elements of nature, has gathered from nature more of its invigorating force, and thus woman has become, by far, the weaker vessel.

Likewise, the advantages man has had of sharpening his wits by contact with others in business, etc., over woman, whose duties generally restrict her more, has given to him the advantage of a generally superior mental development. But a superior mental development, mark, is not a superior mental construction. The mental construction of woman is as noble as that of man.

On this point we quote the following item from *The Literary Digest* of March 27, 1897, in reply to the query—"Is woman's brain inferior to man's?"

"This question has been answered in various ways and there has been a good deal of acrimonious discussion on the subject. In a recent issue of '*Self Culture*,' Dr. H. S. Drayton tells us that while woman's brain is smaller than man's, it is larger in proportion to the total weight of the body, and is more finely organized, so that, in his opinion, honors are about even.

"Says Dr. Drayton:-- 'At the outset it can be said that, so far as the constitution of the brain elements in themselves is concerned, there is nothing that warrants opinion regarding any defect as such to be set to the account of woman. Using the language of Prof. Ludwig Buchner-- Neither the chemical nor the physical examination of the brain by means of the microscope has yet shown any real difference between the two species of brains by which any distinction of functional capacity can be discovered.

"There are some authorities who claim that on the score of quality, on the fineness and delicacy of her general constitution, woman may assert a comparative superiority. Prof. G. B. Bruhl of Vienna, for instance, in his paper on Woman's Brain, Woman's Mind, appears to think that the absence of difference in their tissue elements implies the absolute intellectual equality of the sexes. These writers do not throw out of view the fact of the smaller size of the feminine head and brain, but argue on the basis of comparative relations.

"There has been much weighing and measuring of crania to determine the ratio of sex-difference, but, as should be expected, no precise standard has been obtained.

"If we were to limit ourselves to the question of weight or size alone in the attempt to determine mental capacity, great injustice would be done. Yet there are many physiologists, or writers on brain-capacity, who stickle for the four or five ounces of over-weight in the male brain as a positive determination of its superiority, and apparently forget that in all examinations of nerve property, its structure as to quality and health should be taken into consideration.

"In typical womanhood the general physiology is smaller and finer, the nervous system especially being more delicate and symmetrical. In proportion to her weight, however, the brain of woman is somewhat heavier, so that, putting the two things together, it may be claimed as a reasonable conclusion, and not a concession of gallantry, that woman, so far as the brain and nervous system are concerned, is very nearly, if not absolutely, upon the same plane with her masculine counterpart."

It is plain, then, both from a Scriptural and from a scientific point of view, that the sexes do not differ in nobility of constitution. Let those therefore take heed how they charge the Creator, who claim that one half of his glorious image is inferior to the other. The proof that God does not so consider it is found in the fact that, in the communion and fellowship of his human children with himself, which he has established, and which this mental and moral likeness makes possible, he ignores any distinction of sex and declares that he is "no respecter of persons."

But, as God foretold, sin, working in the man, soon discovered in the differing circumstances of the sexes man's opportunity to take advantage, which, following the inclination of his fallen nature, he was generally not slow to act upon. So, ignoring the fact that the earth and the fulness thereof belong, by God-given right, as much to his wife as to himself, and that her service in the home is of equal value with his in the field, although, in the nature of the case, it could not coin into money in the markets of the world; and that, being of equal value, he should, in justice, share with her the products of his toil in the fields, as she shares with him the products of her toil in the home-- ignoring all of these claims of justice, to say nothing of love, the masses of men (to which we gladly own there are many noble exceptions, both in the church and in the world), seeing their opportunity in the circumstances of woman, have taken advantage of it, and very generally claim that the income from their own labor is, by right, entirely at their disposal irrespective of the wife, she being regarded as a mere pensioner on her husband's bounty, instead of a worthy joint-heir with himself of the blessings, as well as of the ills of life. In accepting her share of life's burdens in the home, she is as truly entitled to share the profits as is the husband who does his part of service outside: she has earned it. The matter of support is mutual, and not onesided, as generally represented in common parlance.

King David clearly emphasized this principle of justice in rewarding with an equal share of the spoil his soldiers who went out with him to battle and those who remained to take care of the stuff; and those who suggested otherwise are called "wicked men and men of Belial"—"Then answered all the wicked men and men of Belial, of those that went with David, and said, Because they went not with us, we will not give them ought of the spoil that we have recovered, save to every man his wife and his children, that they may lead them away and depart. Then said David, Ye shall not do so, my brethren, with that which the Lord hath given us, who hath preserved us, . . . but as his part is that goeth down to the battle, so shall his part be that tarrieth by the stuff: they shall part *alike*. And it was so from that day forward, that he made it a statute and an ordinance for Israel." See 1 Sam. 30:10, 21-25. Where this principle of justice is ignored in the domestic relation, and the money-power is rigidly held in the hands of the husband, it becomes, as it does in other social relations, an exceedingly oppressive power.

Thus the natural tendency of *sin* has been, not only to render woman a "weaker vessel," but also to bring her under the power of her husband; and he often, selfishly taking advantage of the situation, rules over her, instead of treating her as an heir together with himself of the grace--the favors and blessings--of life. To this disposition induced by sin are due, as God foretold, not only many of the common injustices toward wives by their own husbands, but also all of those unjust laws upon the statute books of the nations, which discriminate against women in favor of the selfishness and sins of their husbands and of men in general, often enabling them to seize her property, to make merchandise of the virtue of her daughters, even in those tender years before they have come to know themselves; and even to will her babes away from her on the unfounded claim that they belong to the father irrespective of the mother.

In speaking thus, we speak of the ways of the sinful world (which really includes also many who profess to be Christians), where both husbands and wives often bind upon each other more and more closely the curse of sin—he unjustly tyrannizing over her, and she, by extravagance, etc., exacting from him more than is meet of labor and sweat of face only to consume it upon pride and selfish ambition. It is, alas only too true that many who profess the name of Christ, both men and women, are far from examples of his spirit in these, as well as in other respects, while some who make no such profession often put the conduct of such professed Christians to shame.

It is the duty of Christians in every relation in life to study and to act upon the principles of the divine law, and to take heed that they do not ignore those principles and imbibe instead the selfish principles of the world, even though the world may consider them "sound business principles." To the true Christian no business principles are sound save those which are founded in the righteousness of God--the justice of the golden rule. In the long run, simple honesty will always be found to be the best policy. All other business principles will surely work out their own retribution eventually.

BIBLE TESTIMONY ON THE DOCTRINE OF SUBMISSION.

Having considered God's original purpose in the domestic relation and how sin has interfered with it, let us now consider what the Scriptures have to say about the submission of wives to their own husbands. Here we observe that whatever is written on this subject is addressed, not to the husbands, but to the wives. In the terms of the penalty, when the woman was forewarned of the wreck of domestic happiness through the conditions which sin would induce, the sad revelation was to her, not to the man.

God did not say to the man, "Now, Adam, hereafter see to it that you bear rule over this woman, and see also that she does subject herself to you. Your will henceforth is to be her law in every thing. She is now, in duty, bound to gratify, and even to anticipate, all of your desires and even your whims, to the extent of her ability and opportunity, no matter at what sacrifice of

comfort or pleasure of her own. The promptings of her own mind and heart she must ignore, to please you, even though the fruit of her efforts be accepted with selfish ingratitude on your part.

How strange would such an address to Adam have sounded in view of his equal share in the transgression and how singularly out of harmony with the penalty pronounced upon him. Viewed from the standpoint of that selfishness which is induced by sin, it would indeed have seemed more like a reward than a penalty.

There is, however, no such injunction to husbands, but while such a lamentable condition of things was foreseen and foretold by the Lord to the woman, as the natural consequence of sin working in the man, the Bible, addressing godly husbands who are endeavoring to overcome sin and to return to the original perfection represented in Adam before the fall, counsels them to the very opposite of such a course, saying, "Husbands, dwell with your wives according to knowledge [*i.e.*, according to a knowledge, derived from the Word of God, of the spirit and teaching of Christ, and of the original purpose of God in making of the twain one flesh to be cooperative companions in life], giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel [instead of taking any selfish advantage of her], and as being heirs together of the grace of life." 1 Pet. 3:7.

And again, "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them," or, as rendered in the *Emphatic Diaglott*, "and do not behave harshly to them." Col. 3:19. And the same apostle in his letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 13:4-6) very clearly defines the course of true love, particularly on its negative side, showing how kindly and generously it will act, even under unfavorable circumstances, saying, "Love suffereth long and is kind; love envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things," etc. And if under unfavorable circumstances love so conducts itself, then how sweet and amiable and unselfish and generous and kind will it be under the favorable conditions of peace and reciprocal love.

The same apostle also exhorts husbands further, saying, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself; for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth it and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: for we are members of his body.* For this cause [of having taken a wife] shall a man leave his father and mother and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh," *i. e.*, according to the original purpose of God as previously considered, where the two as counterparts and companions together constitute one specimen of humanity. Eph. 5:25-31.

*The Sinaitic, Vatican and Alexandrian MSS. omit the words "of his flesh and of his bones."

Thus the Christian husband, so far from being instructed to bind the curse of sin upon his wife and be sure to keep her under it in subjection to him, is, on the contrary, pointed back to God's original design as illustrated in Eden before the fall: "Dwell with them according to [that] knowledge," etc.

With that illustration to which husbands are thus referred, the example of Christ in his conduct toward the church is also cited. This latter illustration, while it is beneficial to all who heed it, is specially suggestive to those husbands who feel, whether it be real or imaginary, that in character development and attainments they are greatly in advance of their wives. If such be the case, how shall these superior husbands conduct themselves toward the wives who are either really or presumably inferior to them? Are they prompted by the spirit or the word of God to vaunt themselves, or to boast of their superiority?

Surely not: mark how differently the example of Christ toward the church counsels. The church in its present condition is actually far inferior to Christ, not yet being fit to be the bride, the complement or counterpart of Christ in his glorious divine nature. Before she can be the bride

of Christ she must be made like Christ; and that, not only in spirit or disposition, but also in nature and glory. She must be “a help meet” or “suitable for him,” as Eve was for Adam.

At present the church is only in preparation for this high office. She is now the chaste virgin espoused to Christ (2 Cor. 11:2), and as such, she must diligently make ready to become the bride of Christ, thus making her calling and election sure. In speaking thus of the church, we have in mind, not the great multitudes of worldly-minded professors of Christianity, but those true-hearted ones whom the Lord’s discriminating eye recognizes, and of whom it is written, “The Lord knoweth them that are his.” 2 Tim. 2:19.

Having accepted the invitation to become the bride of Christ, these are not only willing, but they are anxious, to be prepared for that position through whatsoever process may be necessary. And this work of preparing the church for her “high calling” is committed by God to her already exalted and glorious Head, who waits for the joys of that wedded bliss until she is brought up to his own exalted plane of nature and glory and honor. 2 Pet. 1:4. It is not therefore the purpose of Christ to seize upon this opportunity of contrast with the church’s present imperfection for self-glorification: he loves the church too much for that; but his purpose is, by the gradual processes of instruction and discipline, to which she willingly submits, to transform her, first to his own character-likeness, and then God will clothe her with his own divine nature, and she shall be like her glorious Head. 1 John 3:2; John 17:24; Heb. 1:3.

What is the means by which Christ will prepare the Church for her future place?—not a place of humiliation, mark you, but of exaltation—at his side, at his own right hand of power and glory as his bride and joint-heir. It is his own loving, cheerful, humble *self-sacrifice*. “Christ *loved the church and gave himself for it*. . . . So ought men to love their wives.”

This spirit of Christ—the spirit of loving self-sacrifice—in the husband will, therefore, not say in effect to the wife, “Your chief duty as a wife is to please me: now see that you do it.” That would be directly contrary to the spirit of Christ, for “even Christ pleased not himself,” and no manifestations of selfishness in the husband have in them any sanctifying power, either for the wife or for himself. But the truly Christian husband will, by the manifestation of the spirit of the truth in his own daily life of self-sacrifice, commend its testimony and its sanctifying power to his wife, and thus send her to the divine Word, that she too may be blessed and elevated by its washing, cleansing, sanctifying power.

And when they twain come under the sanctifying influence of the Word and Spirit of God, it will be a question as to which will outstrip the other in Christian progress; for whichever most fully and faithfully applies his or her heart to the instruction of the word will make the most rapid advancement toward the mark of perfect holiness.

In considering the example of Christ and the church, there is this difference to be observed by husbands in general between themselves and Christ, viz.: that while Christ is perfect and divine, and thus far above the betrothed virgin now being made ready to become his bride, they are both imperfect and human, as are also the wives; and probably in many cases only divine discrimination can determine which of the twain is the superior; for only the grace of God and zeal in overcoming sin place one on a higher footing than the other in God’s estimation. It certainly is in very bad taste, to say the least, for either man or woman to raise the question or contention, “Which is the greater?” It was this spirit of rivalry that Christ reproved in his disciples, saying, “Except ye be converted [converted from this sinful, vain glorying spirit], ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Matt. 18:3. The apostle Paul also counsels against this spirit, saying, Let each esteem the other better than himself. Phil. 2:3.

It is plain, therefore, that husbands are not to assume, from this illustration of Christ and the church, that they are in the position of ability and of authority from God to cleanse their wives from all imperfections and sanctify them, and so, in the course of years of domestic discipline, to bring the wives to their ideal of wifely perfection. Ah, no: it is not the husband’s ideal that is to be wrought out in the wife; but it is God’s ideal that is to be wrought out in both the husband and the wife, and to this end they should study to be helpful to each other by both example and precept.

Neither of them is in condition or authority to do this cleansing, sanctifying work for the other, except as each, in humility and self-sacrificing love, may commend to the other the

sanctifying power for both in the spirit and word of truth; for to this end, if faithfully heeded, “the Word of God is quick and powerful.” It would indeed be a great mistake for either the husband or the wife to assume a superiority in character-development, and upon such assumption, to attempt to discipline the other. It behooves him who thinketh he standeth to take heed lest he fall. 1 Cor. 10:12.

The exhortation of Eph. 5:33, “Let the wife see that she reverence her husband,” is translated in the *Emphatic Diaglott* as a continuation of the exhortation to husbands. The passage reads thus: “But indeed, let each one of you, individually, so love his own wife as himself, that even the wife may reverence her husband.” Thus the fact of worthiness is implied where reverence is expected; for it is impossible, yes, sinful, to reverence that which is unworthy of respect, esteem or confidence; while, on the other hand, true nobility of character and manly worth and dignity call it forth spontaneously.

Such reverence, Peter tells us, Abraham’s faithfulness commanded and received from his wife Sarah. She had confidence in his goodness and in his faithfulness in obeying the commands of God. Therefore she hesitated not to accompany him through the wilderness in his journeys toward and also in his migrations through the land which the Lord had promised, but of which he never permitted him to own a foot during his past lifetime, the fulfilment being yet future. Acts 7:5; Gen. 13:14-17. But on other occasions, when Sarah thought Abraham was wrong, as for instance in permitting a spirit of rivalry to grow and manifest itself in her servant Hagar, she did not hesitate to tell him so, saying, “The Lord judge between me and thee.” Gen. 16:5, 6.

Again, Sarah remonstrated when the same spirit became manifest in the mockings of Ishmael: “Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son; for [she said, citing the promise of Gen. 17:15-21] the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.” Thus it is clear that in Sarah there was no blind reverence or childish or servile subjection; but while she honored her husband, cooperated with him, and walked with him in all the ways of God’s appointment, she was not willing to submit to the evils which were marring the harmony and peace of their home, and which her husband had thus far weakly tolerated.

“And the thing was very grievous in Abraham’s sight because of his son.” Doubtless it was so in Sarah’s sight also, for she had long endured the increasing discord (Gen. 16:4, 5, 16; 21:5, 8, 9-- about fifteen years) and now felt that strong measures alone could secure that righteous peace which should reign in every home. In their perplexity, doubtless both these godly people sought the divine direction: “And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad and because of thy bondwoman: in all that Sarah hath said unto thee hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed.”

Thus commanded of God to send Hagar and Ishmael away, and thus also assured of God that his divine protection and care would be amply sufficient for them, the characteristic faith of Abraham was not now slow to act; and so “Abraham rose up *early* in the morning” and sent them away. And after the erring ones had felt this rod of correction, God sent his angel to minister to them and to direct and encourage them; and his faithfulness did not depart from them. See Gen. 21:10-21.

In this reasonable view of Sarah’s conduct we must understand Peter’s reference to her and his counsel to others to follow her example. 1 Pet. 3:5, 6.

With this same common-sense consideration, which admits of no servility on the part of the wife, nor tyranny on the part of the husband, and which is compatible with the original design of the Creator, we must view all of those scriptures which counsel submission on the part of the wife.

Thus, for instance, when we read the exhortation to Christian wives, Col. 3:18, “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands *as it is fit in the Lord*, we must bear in mind *this limitation of fitness*, and also the fact that this advice is given to those “*in the Lord*,” and not to people of the world, who are not advised at all, these epistles all being addressed to the church. Therefore it is not for the bar-room lounge, nor any other evil-doer, to quote this text to his wife to persuade her to submit to every indignity that he may choose to heap upon her. The “*fitness*”

of the thing should, in every case, suggest to her conscience how far her submission to her husband will not conflict with the righteousness of God and the supreme reverence and allegiance due to him.

This limitation of fitness would exclude submission to every thing that is out of harmony with the divine will, which those in the Lord must ever regard as of paramount importance. The Christian wife, irrespective of the husband, is a "branch" in the "Vine" which is Christ (John 15), and, as a branch, she must abide in the vine, and draw her spiritual vitality from that source direct. Consequently, her first and supreme allegiance must be to Christ, the anointed of Jehovah: "We ought to obey God rather than men." Nor dare she transfer the supreme devotion of her heart from the heavenly to the earthly bridegroom; for to do so would be to sever her vital union with Christ, in which case, her spiritual life must, of necessity, wither and die. "If a man [man or woman] abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them and cast them into the fire and they are burned." John 15:6.

This supreme devotion and loyalty to Christ requires, on the part of every Christian, in whatever human relationship he or she may be, a strict adherence to every principle of righteousness and truth set forth in the divine Word. And any one who would attempt to weaken the force of that divine authority, in the case of a wife or any one else, is to that extent putting himself in the place of God and "lording it over God's heritage." It therefore becomes the duty of every rightly informed Christian, whether male or female, to decline to submit to any such assumption of human authority. In this very connection (Col. 3:25) we are distinctly told that, with God, "there is no respect of persons," and again, "There is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:28.

This element of *fitness*, therefore, limits the obligation of the Christian wife's submission to her husband, just as we have found the enjoined submission of the various members of the church to their elders, pastors and teachers, simply to a respectful deference toward and cooperation with him in so far as her conscience will permit in view of her supreme obligation to God. It would also limit it, as in the case of Christian servants, to the conditions of contract: here the marriage contract, rightly understood from the Bible standpoint, which, as we have seen, is not to bind upon each other the curse of sin, but, as far as possible, to return to the purity and perfection of Edenic bliss before the fall.

It should be remembered also that the *rights* of one cannot conflict with the *rights* of the other; for God has adjusted both, and it is the duty of each to study the divine adjustment and to apply the heart unto this instruction. Thus viewed, the marriage contract becomes the pledge of happy homes, where loyal and loving hearts can safely confide in each other, and where children may grow up to honorable manhood and womanhood under the blessed influences of peace and harmony.

In Eph. 5:22-24 we have another very similar exhortation by the same apostle, which reads: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the savior [preserver, care-taker] of the body. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything."

Here also the above-mentioned matter of *fitness* must be taken into consideration, for the apostle does not ignore in one passage what he teaches in another. It is not fit that those in the Lord should submit themselves to anything contrary to the divine will: "We ought to obey God rather than men."

This consideration of fitness would therefore remind the wife that "as unto the Lord" does not signify that the husband is to take the place of Christ to her; but that, in lovingly fulfilling her righteous obligations to her husband, her supreme motive should be, as in the case of Christian servants (Eph. 6:5-8; Col. 3:22-24) just considered, to please Christ.

This consideration of fitness would also limit the expression, "in every thing," to every thing fit and proper for the Christian wife--to such things as are in harmony with the divine will; and it would exclude everything that is wrong. The submitting here must also be interpreted with the same degree of common sense as already suggested in its application to the whole church and to Christian servants, as signifying, neither childishness nor servility, but simply a proper

loving and dignified deference to the husband as the divinely appointed head of the family, endeavoring to fulfill his righteous obligations as “the head,” “the savior”--caretaker, preserver--of all the rights and interest of the family.

While the husband seeks thus to fulfill his obligations as the head of the family, endeavoring to the best of his ability to protect, conserve and advance their highest interests, the Christian wife should gladly cooperate with him in everything; that is, of course, unless a case should arise in which their judgments might differ to such an extent that she could not conscientiously do so. Thus, for instance, if she should feel that her husband’s judgment, even at its best, is bad in some particular case, and that to follow it would be seriously harmful, it would be her duty to refrain from cooperating with it.

In the subjection of the church to Christ there can be no such contingency as this, since Christ cannot err, and, in this confidence, the church can fully submit to and cooperate with him. But in the case of husbands and wives, and in all other human relationships, where no such infallibility exists, the submission and cooperation cannot be perfect. We dare not permit them to transcend the limits of righteousness, of conscience guided by our best judgment, enlightened by the word of God. The Christian wife may not do it; nor may the husband demand it: the limitations of fitness are imperative—“as it is fit in the Lord.

In view of these considerations, when we read Paul’s exhortation—“Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything”--we must not forget to observe just how the church is subject unto Christ. We must remember that while the church is subject unto Christ, even Christ is not pursuing an independent course, following his own will and judgment, but he is doing the will of the Father, the great Creator and Sovereign Lord of all--his God and our God. John 5:30; 4:34; 20:17. And it is because he does the will of the Father, and would lead us also to do the same, that it is proper for the church to be subject unto him, God also having appointed him as our Redeemer and our Leader.

But if the will of Christ even were contrary to the will of God (though this is only a supposition, such a thing being a moral impossibility), and he still were to insist on our doing his will, ignoring the will of God, even he would thus prove to be an adversary of God, in which case it would be wrong to follow his leading. But Christ is, and always was and will be, in perfect accord with the Father, as God himself has abundantly testified, so that to submit ourselves to him is also to submit ourselves to God—a submission in righteousness, in purity, in holiness; and that for the highest end, viz., of perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.

This exhortation, therefore, of necessity, carries with it the thought that the husband also is, like Christ, in line with the divine will. But if the husband steps out of that line, or diverges from it, it becomes impossible, from the Christian standpoint, which is undoubtedly Paul’s standpoint, to be subject unto him as unto Christ in everything; for it would not be a submission in righteousness, in purity, in holiness. The limitations of fitness suggested by the apostle decide the matter, and no power in heaven or in earth should tempt us away from unswerving loyalty to God.

The significance of this exhortation, coupled, as it is, with a corresponding exhortation to Christian husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the church, and rather than selfishly seek their own pleasure at the expense of the happiness and comfort of the wife, to imitate the example of Christ, who “pleased not himself,” but gave himself for the church, seems to be that true Christians united in marriage should endeavor to make this relationship in their case a striking illustration of the heavenly union of Christ and the church. This is implied in the reason given by the apostle—“For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the savior [preserver, caretaker] of the body.” Eph. 5:23.

WHAT IS IMPLIED IN HEADSHIP.

The question as to what is implied in the headship of the husband is a matter of interest. That it bears some resemblance to the headship of Christ over the church which is his body, in the figure, is clear from the above scriptures; but that it supersedes the headship of Christ in any

degree is by no means admissible; for the church is God's heritage, and is given to Christ (1 Pet. 5:3; John 17:6-10), and the Christian wife is a part of it. Consequently, the husband may no more lord it over his wife than over any other portion of "God's heritage."

Nor does this office give to the husband any right *selfishly* to seek his own pleasure; "for even Christ pleased not himself," but gave himself, sacrificed himself, for the church, thus marking the office as one of noble responsibility, and not of ignoble self-seeking.

It is plain, therefore, that the headship in any case was not ordained in the interests of pride, selfishness or tyranny in the one constituted head, with privilege to ignore the rights of and to oppress such as constitute the body, but, on the contrary, its establishment was to the end that, in the spirit of noble, loving self-abnegation on the part of the head, the rights and interests of the body may be conserved and advanced, as implied in the words "And he is the savior of the body." The proper filling of this office in the family is, therefore, to the highest interests of the family, and it is entirely compatible with all the rights and liberties of wife and children in the activities and blessings of life.

It is thus that the headship is exercised in the case of Christ over the church; and so it should be exercised in all cases--in headship over nations, over business enterprises, over families, etc. The selfish or oppressive use of such an office is, in any case, a misuse of it. Submission to the misuse where principles of righteousness are at stake, which must be ignored by the one submitting, would be wrong, making such a one a participant in wrong-doing. But in other cases, where no such questions are involved, submission in the spirit of self-sacrifice may be rendered in the interests of peace and good-will in the hope of overcoming evil with good.

In view of these considerations, servants are advised (of course, with the understood limitations of fitness, in the Lord) to submit themselves, not only to the good and gentle masters, but also to the froward, being willing even to "endure grief" and to "suffer wrongfully;" not, however, for wrong-doing, but unjustly for righteousness sake: "for," says the apostle, "even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps." 1 Pet 2:18-21.

Then, after addressing these words to servants specially, Peter adds, "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands [of course, with the same limitations of fitness], that, if any obey not the word [being froward], they also may, without the word, be won by the conduct of the wives." 1 Pet. 3:1.

The word "likewise" here refers back both to this advice to servants and also to the example of Christ, to which servants are also referred for an example of suffering wrongfully in the interests of peace and in the hope of doing good. And those who do thus suffer wrongfully and self-sacrificingly for the good of others may find their comfort and even joy in this fellowship with Christ of his sufferings, and, like him, they also may confidently look to God for the promised reward of faithfulness.

There is, however, no encouragement here for the forward husband to be froward; and surely no fair-minded husband would urge his wife's submission to him on the strength of this text, thus demanding that she should sacrifice herself because of his selfishness or frowardness. And any young man who has such ideas, and is contemplating marriage, should clearly define them and make them distinctly understood by the young lady whose hand he seeks before hearing her reply to his proposition. Let him tell her plainly that he would lead her into domestic slavery, that thenceforth he would be the digit and she a mere cipher, a tool subject to his whims and deprived of her own rightful liberty; and let her not be beguiled by fair speeches and flattering attention, with the idea that by and by it will be a little foretaste of heaven in his society, only to awaken from this happy dream to the bitterness of disappointment.

The wife's self-sacrifice for Christ's sake under adverse domestic relations must be her own voluntary act, and neither the husband nor any one else has any right to exact it of her. The claims of justice *may be exacted*, but self-sacrifice *never*. Nor, on the other hand, may the wife demand of the husband any thing more than simple justice: otherwise self-sacrificing love would lose all its sweetness to both parties, being accepted by the one with ingratitude, and rendered by the other under a measure of constraint.

And further, no wife should be so blind to the principles of truth and righteousness that she could not recognize frowardness in her husband, and thus be prepared, wisely, and in the spirit of truth and love, to help him to overcome it; especially if he be an erring fellow member of the church of Christ, who should be so living as to make his calling and election sure. So also the husband should with the same loving solicitude watch over his wife.

In the case of Ananias and Sapphira we have an example of the improper submission of a wife to her husband, and of the Lord's manifest displeasure, and his warning to others on account of it.

"How is it," said Peter, "that ye have *agreed together* to tempt the spirit of the Lord? Behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door and shall carry thee out." Acts 5:7-10. Sapphira did not regard the limitations of fitness which Paul enjoins, and, being a partaker in her husband's sin, she became a partaker also of the penalty.

THE IDEAL DOMESTIC HAPPINESS.

In the Scriptural view of the marriage relation, which recognizes the equal rights and liberties of both the husband and the wife, and their equally noble endowment, physical, mental and moral, as well as their separate individual accountability to God and Christ, we have an intimation of that ideal happiness in the domestic relation which must naturally flow from the loving fellowship of kindred minds and hearts actuated by a single purpose to glorify God. It is not in the stunting of our growth, but in the development and use of all our powers, that we both glorify God and increase our own and each other's happiness.

On this point we quote the following extract from the writing of John Stuart Mill,* the well known political economist and advocate of woman's equal rights with man.

*"On Liberty--The submission of Women," published by Henry Holt & Co., New York.

He says: "What marriage may be in the case of two persons of cultivated faculties, identical in opinions and purposes, between whom there exists that best kind of equality, similarity of powers and capacities with reciprocal superiority in them, so that each can enjoy the pleasure of looking up to the other and can have alternately the pleasure of leading and being led in the path of development, I will not attempt to describe. To those who can conceive it there is no need: to those who cannot it would appear the dream of an enthusiast.

"But I maintain, with the profoundest conviction, that this, and this only, is the ideal marriage, and that all opinions, customs and institutions which favor any other notion of it, or turn the conceptions and aspirations connected with it into any other direction, by whatever pretenses they may be colored, are the relics of primitive barbarism. The moral regeneration of mankind will only really commence when the most fundamental of the social relations is placed under the rule of equal justice, and when human beings learn to cultivate their strongest sympathy with an equal in rights and in cultivation."

Let Christians ever remember, in the domestic relation, as well as in the assemblies of the church, that "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." 2 Cor. 3:17. Let them also bear in mind that the Christian marriage should be on the basis of the Edenic perfection, the original design of the Creator, and, as far as possible, a foreshadowing of the coming blessedness of Christ and the church; and that the duty of Christians in this relation is to mitigate, as far as possible, the results of the fall, and not selfishly to bind upon each other the curse of sin and so bring about domestic discord and all its train of evils.

The perversion of any portion of the Scriptures in the interest of selfishness and tyranny, and the consequent impairment of domestic love, peace and happiness, can only be regarded properly as a wresting of them. It is this wresting of the Scriptures on the part of many that has brought upon them the reproach of teaching domestic slavery, which they do not; and which has caused many professed Christians to appear in very sharp and unfavorable contrast with many

non professors whose intuitive perceptions of right exceeded their understanding of the Word of God.

A careful comparison of all related scriptures gives a full view of this subject and makes manifest the righteousness of God and the integrity of his Word. Yet these scriptures, misinterpreted, are very generally quoted in the support of selfishness and tyranny.

WOMAN S STEWARDSHIP IN THE CHURCH.

Closely identified with the subject of woman's position in the home is that of woman's stewardship in the divine service. Here also there are widely divergent views, some claiming that, according to the Scriptures, women are relegated to silence and comparative inactivity, while others believe they justify her full liberty in the use of whatever talents she may possess.

On this, as on other subjects calling for the testimony of the Word of God, the advocates of each side generally appropriate certain texts to their own use and ignore others which are claimed by those of the opposite view, instead of seeking the truth in the harmony of all. Only when we view the scriptures on any subject in the light which they shed upon one another can we clearly discern the truth to which they all give harmonious testimony. Thus "God is his own interpreter, And he will make it plain."

To this end, let us observe first those scriptures which show that

THE WHOLE CHURCH, WITHOUT REGARD TO SEX, IS EXHORTED TO FAITHFUL STEWARDSHIP

in the use of whatever talents they may individually possess.

These are as follows:-- (1) 1 Pet. 2:9. "Ye [the church, male and female] are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye [both sexes] should *show forth* the praises [in every way possible--in your characters and in your words and works] of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light."

There is nothing in this text to restrict the use of woman's powers, nor to excuse her from the duty of showing forth the praises of God. (2) Compare Isaiah 61:1-3 with Luke 4:18-20 and 1 John 2:27, and see that all the members of the body of Christ, the church, without any exception of sex, as well as the head, Christ Jesus, are *sanointed* to preach."

That is their business; and just as surely as they have the anointing-- the holy spirit of loving, loyal, self-sacrificing zeal for God--so surely will they, whether male or female, be impelled by it to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ, and the blessings to come through him. And they will do it to the extent of their ability in the faithful use of whatever talents God has intrusted to them. It will be observed that our Lord, in quoting his commission to preach from the prophecy of Isaiah 61:1-3, closed the book and sat down before he finished reading it, the portion which he read being the only portion which was due to be preached in his day; and further, that John claims this anointing for the whole church, which implies also a share in the commission to preach the gospel, giving the meat in due season to the household of faith.

(3) Heb. 5:12. Paul, addressing believers, including both men and women, and upbraiding some who were not making good use of their stewardship, said, "When for the time [by this time--*Diaglott*] ye [both sexes] ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again . . . first principles," etc.

(4) 1 Pet. 4:10. "As each one [male or female] has received a free gift, so minister it among yourselves, as good stewards of the manifold favor of God."—*Emphatic Diaglott*.

(5) 1 Cor. 4:2. "It is required in stewards [irrespective of sex] that every one be found faithful."

(6) Matt. 25:14-30; Luke 19:12-27. In the parable of the talents each servant received one or more talents, and was held accountable, not only for their safe-keeping, but also for a

reasonable increase, as the result of the proper investment and use of them according to his best judgment.

Likewise, also, in the parable of the pounds the same personal accountability to God for faithful stewardship is taught; and, as in the former instances, without any exceptions of sex.

It is clear, then, that none of these scriptures debar women from active service, or excuse in her any unfaithfulness in the use of her talents. Women, as well as men, must be faithful stewards.

We next observe certain

BIBLE PRECEDENTS ESTABLISHING THE PROPRIETY OF THE USE OF TALENTS POSSESSED BY WOMEN.

(1) Women, being first at the sepulcher of Christ, were sent by the risen Lord and by the angels at the sepulcher, to bear the first tidings of the resurrection; and that *to men*, the apostles. Matt. 28:1-10; Mark 16:1-7, 10, 11; Luke 23: 55, 56; 24:1-11; John 20:1, 11-18.

(2) The woman of Samaria, instructed by the Lord, went at once and declared the truth, and many believed. John 4:28-30, 39.

(3) Women shared the gift of prophecy: that is, as defined by Paul (1 Cor. 14:3, 4), speaking to the edification, exhortation and comfort of the church. And all, irrespective of sex, were exhorted to covet earnestly the best gifts, among which was the gift of teaching. 1 Cor. 12:28-31.

As examples of women prophesying, we call to mind Anna, Luke 2:36-38; Philip's four daughters, Acts 21:8, 9; Miriam, Exod. 15:20, 21; Micah 6:4; Huldah, 2 Chron. 34:21-28; Deborah, Judges 4:4, 5. Peter also, on the day of Pentecost, immediately after the baptism of the holy spirit upon the assembled believers, declared that the remarkable manifestations of power from on high there witnessed were in fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, "Your sons *and your daughters* shall prophesy, . . . and on my servants and *on my handmaidens* I will pour out in those days of my spirit."

(4) Paul recognizes the propriety of women praying and prophesying in the church. 1 Cor. 11: 1-16. His enjoining in this connection the covering of the head is a matter which can be properly understood only when the circumstances which called it forth are borne in mind. We read of no such injunction, either from Paul or from any other of the apostles, to any church except the church of Corinth. Nor did our Lord, in all his teachings, give any intimation of such requirement to any of his disciples; and that its expression here to the Corinthians was not intended to apply to all the churches down to the present day, nor even to all the churches of that day, is manifest from the statement of verse 16—"But if any one seem to be contentious, we [Hebrews, as a nation organized under the divine law] have no such custom; neither the churches of God" [founded and established by Jesus Christ]. The custom referred to, therefore, was a purely heathen custom, which neither the divine law nor the teachings of Christ required.

Paul's advice here was given only to Greek Christians, Corinth being a Grecian city; and it was based upon certain ideas of propriety among the Greeks regarding the veiling and seclusion of women, which it would have been unwise to disregard suddenly and entirely, as some seemed disposed to do when they began to comprehend the liberty of the gospel. To have done so would doubtless have brought unnecessary reproach upon the cause of Christ.

Some idea of the unnatural and humiliating restrictions placed upon Grecian women in those times may be gathered from the following extracts from noted writers on the subject.

In the *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 34, March, 1879, page 700, in an article on "The Position and Influence of Women in Ancient Athens," Professor Donaldson, of St. Andrews University, Scotland, says:-- "In Athens we find two classes of women who were not slaves. There was one class who could scarcely move one step from their own rooms and who were watched and restricted in every possible way. There was another class on whom no restrictions whatever were laid, and who could move about and do whatever seemed good in their own eyes. The citizen women [the wives] had apartments assigned to them, generally in the upper story.

They were forbidden to be present at any banquet. The men preferred to dine with themselves rather than expose their wives to their neighbors gaze.

“Seemingly the education of girls was confined to the merest elements. It is scarcely possible to conceive that such a marvelous crop of remarkable men, renowned in literature and art, could have arisen if all the Athenian mothers were ordinary housewives. But though there never was in the history of the world such a numerous race of great thinkers, poets, sculptors, painters and architects in one city at one time as in Athens, not one virtuous Athenian woman ever attained the slightest distinction in any one department of literature, art or science.

“We pass from the citizen women of Athens to the other class of free women--the strangers or courtesans. These stranger women could not marry: they might do any thing else they liked. The citizen women were confined to the house and did not dine with the men; but the men refused to limit their associations with women to the house. Accordingly, they selected these stranger women as their companions; and *'hetairai'*, or companions was the name by which the whole class was designated. The citizen women had to be mothers and wives, nothing more. The stranger women had to discharge the duties of companions, but to remain outside the pale of the marriageable class. They were the only educated women in Athens. Almost every one of the great men in Athens had such a companion, and these women seem to have sympathized with them in their high imaginations and profound meditations.

“But the Athenian women, even the citizens, had no political standing. They were always minors. Such, however, was the force of character of these *'hetairai'*, or such their hold on powerful men, that not infrequently their sons were recognized (by special decree) as citizens. The names of virtuous wives are not to be found in history; but the influence of the *'hetairai'* comes more and more into play. They cultivated all the graces of life; they dressed with exquisite taste; they were witty. But it must not be forgotten that hundreds and thousands of these unprotected women were employed as the tools of the basest passions, seeking only, under the form of affection, to ruin men and send them in misery to an early grave.”

These statements from Professor Donaldson are all supported by citations from Greek authors in the writings of Professor Becker of Germany, who is considered an authority upon ancient Greek and Roman life. In his “Charicles,” page 463, he says:--“At this time, and in the very focus of civilization, the women were regarded as a lower order of beings, naturally prone to evil and fitted only for propagating the species and gratifying the sensual appetites of man. There were no educational institutions for girls, nor any private teachers at home. They were excluded from intercourse, not only with strangers, but also with their own nearest relations, and they saw but little even of their fathers and husbands. The maidens especially lived in the greatest seclusion until their marriage, and, so to speak, regularly under lock and key.” Page 287—“At Athens it was a thing unheard of for any free woman to make purchases in the market.”

In his work on “Old Greek Education,” Prof. J. P. Mahaffy, of Trinity College, Dublin, mentions the frequency with which children were exposed or left to die of starvation and neglect, and says (page 11)—“We cannot really doubt that the exposing of new-born infants was not only sanctioned by the public feeling, but actually practiced throughout Greece. Plato practiced infanticide under certain circumstances in his ideal state. Nowhere does the agony of the mother's heart reach us through their literature save when Socrates compares the anger of his pupils, when first confuted out of their opinions, to the fury of a young mother deprived of her first infant. There is something horrible in the allusion, as if in after life Attic mothers became hardened to this kind of treatment. The exposing of female infants was not uncommon.”

The bearing of this general condition of women under the Greek civilization upon the language of the apostle Paul to some of them is still more clearly seen when we consider that Corinth was one of the worst of the Grecian cities.

Professor Becker says: “Corinth seems to have surpassed all other cities in the number of its *'hetairai'*, to whom the wealth and splendor of the place, as well as the crowd of wealthy merchants, held out the prospect of a rich harvest.”

In view of these customs among the Greeks and of the fact that the veil became a mark to distinguish the virtuous class, it was necessary for Christian women, for this reason,

measurably to adhere to the old custom in order to protect both their own honor and the honor of the Christian name.

And it was because of these customs and prevalent ideas of propriety that Paul said to them that it was a shame for a woman to have her head uncovered or shorn.

When we note the very different conditions of the Roman and Hebrew women we can account for the absence of any such instruction in the epistles to the Roman and Hebrew Christians. Dr. Smith in his "Greek and Roman Antiquities" says: "The position of a Roman woman after marriage was very different from that of a Greek woman. The Roman wife presided over the whole household and shared the honor and respect shown to her husband." And Professor Becker says: "The Roman housewife always appears as the mistress of the whole household economy, instructress of the children, guardian of the honor of the house and equally esteemed with her husband, both in and out of the house. The women frequented public theatres as well as the men and took their places with them at public banquets."

The freedom of women in Hebrew society is so manifest from the Scriptures as to need no further proof. They freely conversed with the Lord and the apostles and other male disciples, attended the meetings of the church and synagogues and went about with entire freedom.

Consequently, when Christianity took hold of them it found them ready for Christian work and unhampered with the fetters of hereditary custom, which, among the Greeks, must be measurably adhered to until a gradual reconstruction of public sentiment could be brought about.

While doubtless foreseeing that some of those to whom this counsel was given might be inclined to chafe somewhat under this old restraint of heathen custom and its continuance in some degree even after learning that the Christian faith imposed no such regulations, the apostle showed them also another way of looking at it, so that the now despised custom might be clothed with a new significance to them, as follows:-- The man with his head uncovered represents Christ Jesus, the head, the protector, the provident bridegroom of the church; while the woman with her head covered represents the church; "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he [in this typical relationship of husband] is the image and glory of God [that is, he thus typically represents the headship that inheres in God and in Christ for the protection and blessing of his beloved charge]; but the woman is the glory of the man"--thus typically representing the fact that the church in her glorious completeness, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, will be the fit companion, the suitable help meet for Christ, for whose glory and companionship she was created, and who will therefore be received and beloved by him as his bride and as joint-heir with him of all things.

To have disregarded the prevailing customs of those times in this respect would doubtless have brought reproach also upon the angels-- Greek *angelos*, the messengers, agents or ministers of the church, the apostles and others. (For the similar, though exceptional, use of the word "angel" as applied to human beings, see Gal. 4:14; 2 Sam. 19:27; 14:17, 20; also Rev. 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14.) Therefore Paul said, "The woman ought to have a covering on her head because of the angels."

(5) We note also the activity of women in the early church, those especially mentioned by the apostles being Priscilla, Tryphena, Tryphosa the mother of Rufus and Julia the sister of Nereus. Acts 18:26; Rom. 16:1-15; Phil. 4:3. And in every instance except one--1 Cor. 16:19--where Priscilla and her husband are mentioned Priscilla is named first, seeming thus to indicate that she was the more active of the two. See Rom. 16:3; 2 Tim. 4:19; Acts 18:18-26.

(6) In Judges 4:4-24; 5:1-31 we read of Deborah, wife of Lapidoth, a judge in Israel for forty years, and a prophetess; and in 2 Kings 22: 14-20 and 2 Chron. 34:19-33, of Huldah, wife of Shallum, a prophetess of whom the king of Judah inquired and received the word of the Lord.

It is a serious question for those to settle who would debar woman from all public service, both in the church and in the world, why God chose these women for these important offices in preference to their husbands, Lapidoth and Shallum. And with the Lord again they must contend if they will assert that these women would better have kept at home, confining all their energies to husband and children.

Since they were godly women and their public services were acceptable to God, doubtless their private life was equally so, and husband and children, as well as the public, were gainers,

rather than losers, from the activity, enterprise and zeal of these godly women who had some ability to spare beyond what the home required. Nor do the virtues of such women shine the less, as some opposers of woman's public work claim they always do, because of their wider sphere of usefulness than that of the home and family. A developed mind, an enlarged heart, with a correspondingly widened sphere of usefulness, entered and filled with that becoming grace which faithfully performs the humble as well as the larger services, as truly ennobles, dignifies and beautifies woman as man; while vanity, conceit and selfishness are as blameworthy in one as in the other. And to these sins one is as prone as the other, until the grace of God in the heart eliminates self, and the service is done with an eye single to his approval.

Bearing in mind the above noted Scriptural precedents, let us further consider some

BIBLE TEXTS WHICH MANY REGARD AS DEBARRING WOMAN FROM THE EXERCISE OF THE TALENT OF TEACHING.

1 Tim. 2:11-15. "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. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Not with standing, she shall be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."

In considering these words of the apostle Paul we are not justified in the conclusion that he here meant to nullify or ignore all the aforementioned scriptures and the reasonable deductions from them, which show that women, as well as men, are anointed to preach, and are held individually accountable for the faithful use of their stewardship, and the cultivation and use of all the talents which God has given them; and which furnish numerous precedents for their use of the talent of teaching and of prophesying and praying in the assemblies of the saints whenever the spirit of God moves them to do so.

This same apostle writes to some in the Philippian church, "Help those women which labored with me in the gospel;" and again, in his letter to the Romans, "Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus." Nor did he upbraid Priscilla for the part she took in explaining to Apollos the way of God more perfectly, but he strongly commended her and her husband for their ardent zeal, saying, "Who have for my life laid down their own necks; unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles."

It is therefore unreasonable to conclude that, in the above words to Timothy, Paul meant to put a quietus upon all women in the church, forbidding even those who have the talent and opportunity for teaching, and upon whom the spirit of God has set his seal of approval, thenceforth to exercise that talent in the divine services.

The key to the apostle's thought is, we think, in the second clause of his statement—"nor to usurp authority over the man." In other words, woman is not ordinarily to assume the general direction and leadership in the work of the church, which, under the supervision of Christ, the great Head of the church, has been committed to man, on the same principle as indicated in the creation, as Paul intimates, the man being created first (verse 13), and so made the leading and aggressive one.

Our Lord also observed this same principle in appointing his twelve apostles, all males. Women were not adapted for the pioneer work to be done; but, in the subsequent work of the church, there has been ample scope for female activity in every direction, and God has owned and blessed such efforts. In not choosing them for his apostles he indicated no lack of esteem, or failure to appreciate their zeal and devotion; nor did he forbid their telling the good tidings of great joy to as many as would hear, whether men or women.

Nor did he at any time even hint at any intellectual incapacity to do his work. When he chose humble and unlearned fishermen for his apostles, he showed very plainly that it was not by power of intellect that he intended to propagate the Christian faith. On the contrary, the Lord has been glorified in the effectual use of humble and insignificant instruments, which he has filled with his spirit.

Nor did the apostle do, or, rightly interpreted, teach otherwise. He, like our Lord, would simply have the church observe, and, in a general way, conform to the order of nature, which indicates that *ordinarily* man, not woman, should be the foremost and aggressive one. Yet if, in any case, special intellectual and spiritual qualifications mark any woman as particularly fitted for any part in the divine service, and the providential leadings point that way, it becomes the duty of all to observe the Lord's leading in this, as in everything else, and to cooperate with it.

Is there any reason why a woman should fold any of her talents in a napkin, or hide her light under a bushel? Or is she excusable in doing so? Or are men always so highly endowed that they can afford to dispense with the help that God has made meet for them, either in the church or in the world? However others may answer these queries, let Christian women be faithful to their stewardship, knowing that they must give an account thereof; and let Christian men do likewise and rejoice, in every case, to have their own efforts as ably supplemented as possible.

Should a woman of ability and opportunity, in any case, permit the work of the Lord to suffer when it is in her power to advance its interests? Does she do so in the home? Or could she do so and be faithful to her stewardship either in the church or in the home? When, as is sometimes the case, the head of the family fails from any cause, whether disinclination or illhealth, or other reasons, to do the part of a husband and father, should the wife and mother allow the family to suffer while she has power to do beyond what would naturally fall to her lot were the head entirely able and willing fully to measure up to his responsibilities?

Who would condemn the wife of the inebriate, or of the shiftless and improvident, for burdening herself with more than a wife's and mother's cares to provide for the shelter, food and clothing of her household rather than permit them to suffer the consequences of the shortcomings of the one who should be the head of the house? Or who would condemn the godly mother who erects the family altar in her home and herself leads her little ones to God, because the divinely appointed head of the family fails to recognize and fulfill the duties of his priestly office in the little circle?

Surely God does not condemn such heroism; and his choicest blessings have followed such efforts of godly women. And if such a course, when necessary, on the part of the wife in the home-life is praiseworthy, upon what principle could it be condemned in the life of the church, whose spiritual interests are of much greater importance than the temporal things of the family life?

The statement of verse 14, that Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression, was not meant, as some take it, as a compliment to Adam. The point of the statement is that they were alike "in the transgression," sinners and under the same condemnation; and that the fact of the woman's deception did not in the least excuse her sin. She was not deceived into the belief that her disobedience of God would be right: she knew it was wrong to disobey God, and that God had said he would hold them accountable for their actions and would punish any violation of his righteous authority (Gen. 3:2, 3); but she was deceived into the presumptuous sin of disbelief in the threatened penalty of sin, and into the belief of Satan's lying statement, "Ye shall not surely die." Consequently, although thus deceived as to the penalty of sin, she was not deceived as to the fact of sin, but she was as willing to sin as was Adam; and therefore, like him, she was "in the transgression" --a willful sinner, and justly under the same penalty.

Therefore, as individuals, separately accountable to God for their individual actions, and being together in the transgression, the twain being one flesh and the parents of the entire human race, they together, through the operations of the natural laws of heredity, plunged the race into sin and death; for "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Job 14:4.

But the hope of the race for deliverance is in that "new man"—"the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified [to all] in due time." 1 Tim. 2:5, 6. In this new man were all the human possibilities of the first man, Adam--of a bride from his side and of a race yet ungenerated; and with him, therefore, as the great atoning sacrifice for the race of Adam, perished all these human possibilities in him:--"Through oppression and through judicial punishment was he taken away, and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of

the land of the living.” Isa. 53:8. Thus, in the man Christ Jesus, was the exact corresponding price for Adam and Eve and all their posterity.

As the reward for the great sacrifice of his life and all the human possibilities of a bride and of posterity bound up in that perfect life, not only has our Lord been highly exalted to the throne of the majesty in the heavens (Heb. 8:1), but also to him is granted, on the higher plane of the divine life, a bride, a companion, a help meet for him (Phil. 2:8-11; Rev. 19:7); and hereafter he is to be known as “The Everlasting Father” (Isa. 9:6); for to him is to be given a numerous posterity, God having said to him, “Ask of me, and I shall give unto thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.” Psa. 2:8; John 17:24-31.

As to Job’s question, “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?” and its answer, “Not one,” it is manifest that, in the order of nature, the laws of heredity preclude such a possibility; but neither Job nor any believer in the divine testimonies would deny that in this, as in other things, God is able to overrule nature’s ordinary course, as he surely did when he enabled the imperfect woman to bring forth the immaculate Son of God—“a clean thing out of an unclean.”—“That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Luke 1:26-35; 1 John 3:5; 1 Pet. 2:22.

This was the seed of the woman long promised to bruise the serpent’s head.

As to how God accomplished this miracle, we are not prepared to explain. Nor should we expect to be able to explain or to understand this miracle on scientific principles, any more than any other miracle. Who, for instance, would attempt to explain the process by which our Lord turned water into wine, or by which he multiplied the five loaves and the two fishes so as to make them feed five thousand and leave a remnant of twelve basketfuls? or how the lepers were cleansed, the blind received their sight, or the dead were raised? Or how the dumb ass was made to speak, etc..?

A miracle is something not explainable on known scientific principles, but which is above or beyond the known ordinary course of nature; and the miracle of the transformation of the Son of God from his former glory to our human nature is no exception. Indeed, even the ordinary processes of nature are more or less of miracles to us because of our inability clearly to discern them. Even the processes of the natural birth are not fully understood, and what is termed science is in many lines but mere conjecture.

Returning to the passage under consideration (1 Tim. 2:11-15), verse 15 points to the blessed hope of our race through “the seed of the woman.” In the line of woman’s natural office of motherhood, upon which the curse of sin imposed its heavy penalty, came also the great Deliverer, the pledge of God’s redeeming love, the star of hope for our race.

To this the apostle evidently refers in verse 15. “Notwithstanding [notwithstanding the transgression and its just penalty, death] she shall be saved [not saved from the sorrows of childbearing, nor even from dying in the midst of those sorrows, as many godly as well as worldly women do; but saved, delivered, ultimately from sin and death and restored to the favor of God and to life everlasting] through childbearing [through the bearing of that particular child who should redeem the race, and save them] if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety”—the conditions of salvation to all who would receive it.

Coming back to the main point under consideration here, viz., woman’s exercise of the teaching talent, we believe the apostle’s thought to be that, while women, as well as men, may freely exercise their God-given talents in the church, they should never do so to the extent of usurping or seizing the more prominent or leading positions which God has by nature more specially assigned to men.

This, however, would not debar her even from leadership in some cases and under some conditions. If, for instance, as we have already observed, a woman be found in the church preeminently endowed by the spirit of God and by mental qualifications to lead the flock in the study of the Word of God and in worship, if the company recognize such ability and freely accord to it the opportunity to serve them in the name and spirit of the Lord, then such a woman may freely act in such capacity.

While ordinarily God chose male judges and male prophets for his people Israel, there were the exceptions of a female judge and female prophets; and if, in the case of his spiritual Israel, the spirit of God should make some similar exceptions, it would be folly for any to oppose the course of the holy spirit. The Lord has a right to do what he will with his own, and "Who art thou, O man, that resisteth his will?"

But if men in the church, either obtusely or in a spirit of pride or rivalry, decline woman's services, or seek in any way to fetter the free exercise of the spirit of God through her, let her not contentiously strive for or seize the opportunities, and thus introduce discord and strife, which must eventually work only ill and quench the spirit of Christ in their midst. Rather, let her keep silence and make the best possible use of all the opportunities of service that are accorded to her without strife and contention until such time as the spirit of God, in his own way, shall clear her pathway to larger privileges. Let her not usurp any authority, but, carefully maintaining the sweet spirit of Christ, let her do with her might what her hands find to do; and let her do it heartily and diligently as unto the Lord.

Another text often quoted in this connection is 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, 40. "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be submissive, even as the law also says. And if they will learn any thing let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. Let all things be done decently and in order." That the apostle here meant to debar all women, even of the church of Corinth, from taking any active part in the meetings of the church, we cannot conclude in view of his admission in this very same epistle (Chap. 11:5) of her privilege of praying and prophesying—"Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth," etc. He must therefore have referred to the indiscriminate conversation of some, probably many, of the poorer classes who generally composed the church, which disturbed the proper and profitable order of the meetings.

It should be borne in mind also that the meetings of the church at that time were not like the meetings of the church to-day. They lacked those established forms of worship which, however detrimental they may be in some other respects, at least insure decorum. They were generally held from house to house (see Acts 2:46; 20:20; Rom. 16:5; Philemon 2), and were more of a social character than the formal preaching services, or even the occasional Bible classes, of to-day. Having no printed Bibles in hand to study, they were instructed largely by the spirit of prophecy and of interpretation miraculously given, the gifts sometimes coming upon men and sometimes upon women. 1 Cor. 14:23-33; 11:5.

In such meetings the talking and asking of unprofitable questions, to which some of the women seemed prone, would be quite a disturbance; and such questions as they would probably ask would better be talked over at home with their husbands. It was in this sense--of disturbing the order and decorum of the meetings, and especially in view of the customs of those times, which demanded the seclusion of women--that it was a shame for the women to speak or talk in the assemblies, and not in the sense of praying or prophesying as the spirit of God moved them.

Thus it is clear that Paul's object was not to oppose or obstruct the course of the spirit of God, but merely, as he further intimates, to have all things done "decently and in order."

That the apostle's reference here to the law is not to the moral law given by Moses is clear from the fact that that law contained no such injunction to women. The Greek word here rendered "law" is *nomos*, which signifies a law, ordinance or custom, and the reference is plainly to the laws or customs prevailing at that time among the people addressed. Since those laws or customs to a great extent excluded women, it was necessary, in deference to this public sentiment, that care be taken in the exercise even of their liberties in Christ, so as not to bring any reproach upon the truth and cause of Christ, and so cause some to stumble for whom Christ died.

It should also be observed in this connection that, as there was considerable lack of order and decorum in the Corinthian church, Paul spoke thus plainly, not only to the women, but to the men as well. See 1 Cor 14:28, 30, 33; 11:17-22; 6:5-11; 5:1-13; 3:1-3. Observe also 1 Thes. 4:10, 11. "We beseech you, brethren, . . . that you study to be quiet, and to mind your own affairs, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you."

The above text (1 Cor. 14:34), having reference to the women of the church of Corinth and the peculiar conditions and circumstances of that time and place, cannot, therefore, be justly regarded as an obligation on the women of the whole church to silence, so that they may not speak to the edification of the church, nor cultivate one of the best gifts, the gift of teaching, which Paul exhorts all, irrespective of sex, earnestly to covet. As well might we bind upon all, as obligations, the practice of feet-washing, the holy kiss, etc., enjoined in John 13:14; Rom. 16:15, 16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 1 Thes. 5:26; 1 Pet. 5:14, which we instinctively recognize in spirit, but not in letter, as the courtesies of our times differ from those of that day.

We therefore see no objection, in the apostle's language, to the proper use of a woman's stewardship as a teacher, when nature and the spirit of God have so qualified her and the providential leadings are in that direction; nor, as Paul also exhorts (1 Cor. 12:31), to her coveting earnestly, and seeking to cultivate, this, one of the "best gifts" in the service of the Lord. Indeed, God seems to have given to woman an innate tact and adaptability for the very purpose of teaching. And not only so, but, in her office of motherhood, God has committed to her specially the instruction and training of the race, and that in the formative and most receptive period of life. Shall the son, then, say to his mother, I suffer not a woman to teach, and go his way despising her counsel, thus misrepresenting Paul's teaching and wresting his words to the dishonoring of his mother and the violation of God's law, which says, "Honor thy father and thy mother"? Or at what period in his life may he despise her counsel?

Woman's natural tact and adaptability, together with the educational facilities of the present day, are making it manifest that she has some talent in the direction of teaching where educational facilities are afforded her; talent which the world recognizes and utilizes in her schools and colleges and enrolls on her lists of authors, journalists, etc. And if the world can profit by her intelligent services, why should not the church? Is it only in lines of Christian endeavor that woman must hold her peace, while her energies may have full play in secular and temporal things? Surely not; and any interpretation of the Scriptures which leads to such conclusions is evidently at fault.

There is also abundant precedent for the use of woman's talents in the church in the fact that God has used and blessed her efforts in teaching his truth, both to men and women. If Paul could say to the Corinthian Christians, "The seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord" (1 Cor. 9:2), certainly many zealous women in the church can point to some, both men and women, whom they have led to the Lord and instructed in his way more perfectly, and say, "The seal of my authority to teach are ye in the Lord," and when the providence of God as well as the harmony of his Word thus sets his seal of approval upon the teaching of women, who can dispute their right to do it? We certainly do not understand the apostles or the prophets or the Lord to do so. Here we may reason as did Peter when the providence of God, contrary to Jewish expectation, poured out the holy spirit upon the Gentiles. He did not presume to array himself in opposition to that providence, but meekly said, "What was I, that I could withstand God?" Acts 11:17.

Having now canvassed from the Bible standpoint the various proprieties in regard to the activities of Christian women, we return to gather together the threads of our investigation of the whole subject of obedience and submission from the same standpoint. In view of all the teaching of the Scriptures on this subject, we must conclude that the spirit of submission is the spirit of meekness which must characterize every true Christian: it is the spirit of Christ, who was meek and lowly in heart. It must characterize the women; it must characterize the men; it must characterize the servants; it must characterize the masters; it must characterize the wives; it must characterize the husbands; it must characterize all of God's people, in all their relationships, both in the church and in the world. "*Yea, all of you, be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.*" 1 Pet. 5:5.

Yet, as we have seen in the light which the various scriptures relating to the subject shed upon each other, this spirit of submission or humility is compatible always with the purest virtue, the largest possible development and use of mind and heart and physical powers, with the most scrupulous loyalty to God and the freest exercise of the spirit of a sound mind, which can neither be enslaved nor can it play the tyrant.

Submission within the lines of these righteous limitations is the only submission that is honorable, and that is commended in the word of God. A submission which trails the principles of righteousness in the dust is merely that *culpable cowardice* which always declines to suffer for righteousness sake.

In this view of the subject we should ever bear in mind that “we ought to obey God, rather than men,” and to remember his word—“Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams; for rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft [because it is resisting God and cooperating with Satan], and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry”--being a persistent service of the wicked one. 1 Sam. 15:22, 23.

Therefore, no works or sacrifices can be acceptable to God when presented to him *instead of* that obedience which he requires to the principles of righteousness set forth in his Word. It is the duty of every Christian both to know righteousness for himself and to pursue it. Standing, each individually, upon the foundations of the divine Word, and being individually united to Christ as branches in the vine, and drawing spiritual vitality from him, we shall not only grow up into Christ ourselves, but we may also be helpful to one another.

Therefore, we need ever to bear in mind the admonitions of the Word to *supreme* devotion and loyalty to God and to his Christ, and to adjust all human relationships accordingly. To this end, we are carefully counseled against any who might presume to supplant the place and authority of Christ with any member or members of the church, the heritage of God.

Paul says, “Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels [servants or ministers of the church, or those claiming to be such while really walking and teaching contrary to the spirit and teachings of Christ] intruding into those things which he hath not seen [those spiritual things which he, being carnal, and not spiritual, hath not understood], vainly puffed up by his *fleshly mind*, and not holding the Head [Christ, in that proper reverence and esteem which supremely honors his spirit and teachings], from which all the body, by joints and bands having nourishment ministered [through that spiritual, vital union with him] and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.” Col. 2:18, 19.

If any one in the church becomes thus heady, the church needs to beware. Or if the Christian or the unchristian husband, led away by the adversary through pride, or selfishness, or love of power, assumes thus to lord it over his wife and to interfere with her supreme allegiance to God, then the Christian wife must beware, and not be beguiled into a “voluntary humility” which would bring under a yoke of bondage to sin a soul whom Christ has made free. “The fear of man bringeth a snare, but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe.” Prov. 29:25.

“Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.” Isa. 8:13.

And if any be reproached or persecuted for this supreme allegiance to God, let such remember Paul's words again: “Let every one prove his own work [Take your instructions from the Word of God direct, praying for the promised divine illumination and guidance, and see that your course in all things conforms to this rule], and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another.” Gal. 6:4. See also 1 Pet 3:14-16; 4:14. Such a one will have the witness of God's spirit within himself of a conscience void of offence, and therefore can stand alone, if need be, with God, calmly and courageously saying to himself:--

“Yet nerve thy spirit to the proof,
And blanch not at thy chosen lot.
The timid good may stand aloof,
The sage may frown; yet faint thou not.
Nor heed the shaft so surely cast,
The foul and hissing bolt of scorn;
For with thy side shall dwell *at last*
The victory, of endurance born.”