

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

WOMEN KEEPING SILENCE IN CHURCHES.

BY REV. WILLIAM DELOSS LOVE, D.D., ANDOVER, MASS.

ON Sunday, Oct. 13, 1845, died Mrs. Elizabeth Gurney Fry, in the sixty-sixth year of her age. Her excellent natural endowments were remarkably graced with culture and refinement. She became an earnest Christian in early womanhood, and soon entered upon a career of philanthropy unusual for that period, continuing in it thirty-five years, to the end of her life. She became a preacher of the Society of Friends, and as such had a lengthened experience in addressing public audiences. She travelled much on the British Isles and through continental Europe, and was often admitted to kings' palaces. Much interest centred about her prison-reforms, of which she often spoke in public; but her most effective discourses were upon the spiritual truths of the gospel. Often addressing women alone, she still did not scruple to speak in the presence of men when she thought herself constrained to do so by the Holy Spirit. Her larger audiences are reported as numbering fifteen hundred, and sometimes three thousand, persons. Kings, courtiers, and their families, with many of the most intelligent and refined men and women of cities and realms, assembled to hear her. Yet was she the mother of eleven children, whose training and development she by no means neglected; two of her

VOL. XXXV. No. 137. — JANUARY, 1878. 1

daughters giving to the world the memoirs of their mother in a set of very interesting volumes.

These facts in the life of Elizabeth Fry suggest some inquiries concerning the Pauline direction that women keep silence in the churches. — Was that command binding on her? Was there anything indelicate in her appearing before men, as well as women, to speak and to teach? In so doing did she lack in proper subjection to her husband? Was hers a case of exception? If in these days we are not in all respects bound to the inspired letter of eighteen centuries ago, what relieves us, and how far does our wider privilege extend?

It is obvious that the leading questions on this subject are not yet settled. The two extreme views advocated are these: First, that silence at this day, and in all ages, is enjoined upon all women in all religious assemblies where men are present; second, that the command of silence was binding *only* upon Grecian women who had just been converted from idolatry, but not yet from all ignorance and its degradation. Is there not a golden mean between these two opinions which will reconcile all Scripture on this subject, and at the same time satisfy a conscientious regard for the divine word and all rational demands of the most active and also of the most cultivated modern society?

The two passages which enjoin the silence of women are from the inspired pen of the apostle Paul. As rendered by Alford, they stand thus:

“Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but to be in subjection, as the law also saith. And if they wish to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home: for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church. What! did the word of God come forth from you? Or came it unto you alone?” (1 Cor. xiv. 34–36).

“Let the women learn in silence in all subjection. But I suffer not the woman to teach, nor yet to rule over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being taken by the deceit hath become a transgressor. Notwithstanding she shall be saved through her child-bearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sober-mindedness" (1 Tim. ii. 11-15).

The opinions advocated in this Article will be grouped under five different heads.

I. Some prominent views respecting woman's silence in the churches are inconsistent with Scripture facts.

1. Elaborate attempts have been made to show that the word translated *to speak* in 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35 means, in that instance, simply *to babble*; and that the apostle did not intend to forbid woman's intelligent speech in promiscuous or mixed religious assemblies, but to forbid the disorderly and unprofitable speech of those Corinthian women, and of others like them, at that day.

We reply: (1) The usual meaning of the verb *λαλεῖν* is not *to babble*, but *to speak*. In this same epistle it is used when one speaks the "wisdom of God" (1 Cor. ii. 7) and the wisdom of the Spirit (ii. 13; xii. 3); while in another epistle it is used for the speaking of God (Heb. i. 1, 2; ii. 3), and for that of angels (ii. 2). In the classics this word is sometimes used to express the inarticulate sounds of human beings, the natural cries of animals, and also their attempts to imitate speech. But Archbishop Trench says that all those contemptuous uses of *λαλεῖν*, as to talk at random or to chatter, are foreign to the New Testament.¹ Neither do we find in the lexicographers Robinson, Bloomfield, Loch, Grimm, Harting, Schirlitz, Wahl, Wilke, any recognition of this bad sense of the word when it is used in the New Testament. Bretschneider, however, recognizes it in 1 Cor. xiii. 11 and 1 Tim. v. 13; yet in both those passages that shade of meaning lies not in the word, but in the context.

(2) If it were shown — which it is not — that the women at Corinth, and also those at Ephesus (where doubtless Timothy was when Paul addressed his first Epistle to him),

¹ New Test. Syn., p. 275.

were incompetent or disinclined to say anything rational or of profit in religious assemblies, then this claim that they only babbled would have weight. On the contrary, Strabo speaks of the strong influence exerted by the women of Western Asia in forming the religious opinions of the men. In this same country was Ephesus, where Paul also enjoined "silence" upon women. Why should it be different across the Archipelago in Corinth? Aristotle credits the Spartan women with great influence over the men.¹ Such influence was not elsewhere unknown. The noted Phoebe, "succorer of many," lived in Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, and must have had a leading influence over her Christian sisters in that city. Priscilla for a time worshipped with the church in Corinth, and also must have exerted a social power over its women. "The good service which women contributed towards the early progress of Christianity is abundantly known, both from the Acts and the Epistles."² It must be that there were women in the Corinthian church who were far above *babbling*.

(3) The Pauline direction in some places is general, and not specific, applying to all women, and not to those only of Corinth and Ephesus. In Timothy (1 Tim. ii. 11, 12) it is not "your women," but "the woman," who is charged to learn in silence. In Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 35) the direction is first to "your women," but afterwards to "women," or, as the earlier manuscripts read, "a woman." This change from the definite to the indefinite shows that the command was binding on women in general at that time, and not merely on those of two or more particular cities.

(4) The *reason* assigned by the apostle for silence is applicable to *all* in Christian communities at that day, and not alone to the women of Corinth and Ephesus. That reason is, that there should be due honor to husbands and men. In First Corinthians the apostle writes, "As the law also saith." That law is, "Thy desire shall be to thy hus-

¹ Grote's Hist. of Greece, Vol. ii. p. 383.

² Conybeare and Howson, Vol. i. p. 181.

band, and he shall rule over thee" (Gen. iii. 16). In First Timothy the apostle makes specific reference to Adam's being formed first, and not being first deceived, as the reason why authority was given to man. And from this he infers the duty of silence on the part of *woman*. Hence to limit the injunction of silence to the women of Corinth and Ephesus must be wrong.

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

2. Professor Calvin E. Stowe has argued¹ that the apostle's injunction of silence was laid upon women in the churches of Greece and Asia Minor, because of peculiar customs there requiring reticence and retirement; and that in Rome and other parts westward from Greece, more freedom being allowed to woman, no such silence was enjoined. Such exception is not made or intimated in Scripture, and the inference is that it did not exist. At that time the condition of woman was nearly the same in all pagan nations. Earlier it was better, especially in Rome, and women still had a few more *legal* rights there than in Greece. They could give evidence in courts of law, and could accompany their husbands to public banquets. Professor Stowe cites Cornelius Nepos to show the superiority of the condition of Roman over that of Grecian women. But this author lived nearly a century earlier than the date of Paul's Epistles; and all he claims is that a Roman was not ashamed to take his wife to

¹ *Hearth and Home*, Vol. i. pp. 600, 601.

a feast, and that he allowed her to occupy the better part of the house, even in the presence of company—*all* which was more than the Grecians did, and *a part* more than many Romans did when Paul gave his command. Becker shows that Roman women were in general restrained by custom from exercising even their legal rights.¹ And history shows that the silence made imperative on one side of the Adriatic was not changed to practical liberty of speech on the other. Besides, we have seen that Paul's direction to be silent was based on the difference between man and woman, and therefore must have been applicable in *all* churches, unless there were special reasons to the contrary,—which there were not, so similar were the manners, customs, and intelligence of all well-known nations of that period. Yet Professor Stowe recognizes the important fact that the apostle would not undertake to change *all* evil customs of his age, but would await the sure work of truth and time for some.

3. The theory that the meetings where Paul enjoined silence upon women were merely of a business character seems clearly untenable. The passages show that they were religious meetings. In the Corinthian instance, the "word of God," "psalm," "doctrine," "revelation," and "interpretation" are under consideration (1 Cor. xiv. 26, 36). In the case of the Ephesian church, "Faith and love and sanctification with sober-mindedness" are the theme (1 Tim. ii. 15). These are not business concerns, but religious topics.

4. There is no ground for the opinion that the silence enjoined was to be observed only in synagogues or other church buildings. For the "church," the *Ἐκκλησία*, means "assembly" of any religious kind in any place, and does not mean the building where the assembly meets.

5. Another view is, that the apostle required only so much silence of women in the churches as was needful for good order and womanly "subjection." The passages are interpreted to mean that women should keep quiet and orderly as "under obedience." But against this stand positive injunctions: "Let

¹ Gallus, p. 153.

your women keep silence in the churches"; it is not permitted unto them to speak"; "Let them ask their own husbands at home"; "It is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." Silence itself was requisite to good order and womanly subjection, except in special circumstances.

6. The view most prevalent, which seems to us inconsistent with Scripture relative to our obligations, is this: Woman's silence in religious assemblies of the two sexes is as obligatory now as in the apostolic day. One of the ablest discussions in favor of this view is contained in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1870. The writer, Rev. A. Hastings Ross, maintains: "A positive limitation of some sort is put by the Scriptures upon women."¹ He cites the limitation requiring 'woman's subordination to man,' which, as he rightly says, is as "permanent as the relation of the two sexes."² He cites, also, the limitation requiring woman's "silence," as though it were equally permanent; whereas the latter depends on the varying law of custom, and does not demand the same strict enforcement in modern civilization that it did in primitive times. Once "silence" was a synonyme of "subjection"; but it is not so now.

II. The same permanent principles are often embodied in changeable customs, quite unlike each other, in different countries and ages. As an idea may be expressed in various languages, so it may be by various customs. With the early Greek Christians men expressed reverence in places of worship by uncovering their heads (1 Cor. xi. 4, 7). So with us. But in the Orient, then and now, the same sentiment has always kept the head covered. In China gentlemen calling upon their friends express respect for them by keeping their hats on; we do the same by taking them off. Here we express cordiality by shaking each others' hands; the Chinese do it by shaking their own. English and American ladies wear white at weddings and black at funerals; Chinese ladies reverse that order. An American student, reciting a lesson, expresses respect for his teacher by turning

¹ Vol. xxvii. p. 337.

² *Ibid.*, p. 339.

his face towards him ; while a Chinese student does the same by turning his back. In China the left hand is the place of honor ; here, the right. In Eastern Turkey a gentleman precedes a lady in entering a room ; but in America the reverse is the order. In Europe a young lady may not go out at evening unattended by a gentleman or lady guardian or protector ; in America she may go with any proper company. Standards of propriety and the language of manners change.

It has long been understood that some commands of Scripture pertaining to customs are not binding upon us, if other current customs involve the same sentiments and principles. There is the definite affirmation of the Saviour, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet" (John xiii. 14). And the apostle Paul puts 'washing the saints' feet' (1 Tim. v. 10) along with other "good works" as an index of noble character in woman. It was a significant and symbolical act. Some have made foot-washing a sacrament, and a few still so observe it. But Christendom generally perceives that Christ did not institute it as a perpetual ordinance. Yet he himself exemplified it with his apostles, and enjoined it as at that time a proper and expressive symbolic custom. The Christian principles signified by it — humility and love for the brethren — are now manifested by other acts. Climatic change often changes foot-washing to foot-clothing or foot-warming. Luther recommended in place of it a bath for the poor. Christianity makes us willing to do even menial service for one another, when that subserves the higher temporal or spiritual good. The principle of humble love remains ; the custom has passed away.

The apostle James enjoins prayer for the sick by the elders, "anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord" (James v. 14). The ancients used unguents for the promotion of health. Orientals now in warm countries do the same. Many Christians after the apostolic age continued the custom of anointing the sick. As a curative, in cool climates, its use now is generally displaced by other remedies. Though

once a symbolic sacrament with some, with us it seems not to be binding as such. The duty of prayer for the sick and of the use of means for their recovery continues; the custom of anointing with oil is superseded.

III. The customs of the early Christian era which then required the silence of women in churches had changed since the more primitive and better Hebrew life, and have again changed since the apostolic period.

1. Customs among the Hebrews in the early Christian era. The condition of Hebrew women then was far better than in surrounding countries at that time,¹ or than in the Orient now. Hebrew law gave them some advantages denied even by the European or American law.² The former was founded on the Pentateuch, while the latter is partly based on Roman jurisprudence. But the general seclusion of woman from the other sex prevailed in all Eastern countries in the time of Christ and his apostles, and during hundreds of years before. 'It was the custom prevalent from the earliest period of the East to seclude women in apartments removed from those of the men.'³ Among the Hebrews women had their own apartments, especially when in captivity among the Persians, as is evident from the case of Esther (Esther ii. 8, 11). Daughters seldom left those apartments for secular purposes, except among the humbler classes, and then chiefly or wholly for drawing and bringing water, or tending the flocks.⁴ Daughters who by their wealth were elevated to high stations in life spent nearly their whole time within the walls of their palaces.⁵ In Solomon's palace there was a woman's apartment separate from the rest (1 Kings vii. 8). In journeys women had their separate tent (Gen. xxxi. 38). At the eastern gate of Solomon's Temple virtuous men could take their wives with them as they entered; but women were excluded from the two inner

¹ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3552.

² Smith and Barnum, p. 1194.

³ Layard's Nineveh, Vol. ii. p. 193.

⁴ Jahn's Archaeology, p. 175; Kitto's Cyclopaedia, Vol. ii. p. 966.

⁵ Jahn's Arch., p. 176.

courts.¹ In the same locality, in Herod's Temple, was the inclosure known as the "court of the women,"² though not exclusively devoted to them.³ Worship in synagogues was practised at least five or six hundred years before Christ. In them each congregation was divided by a partition five or six feet high; the men being on one side and the women on the other. A speaker on either side of the partition could not be seen by the whole audience. To avoid confusion, he must go to the platform in full view of all, where for a woman to go, unless she were a prophetess, would have been very indecorous and immodest. These arrangements and customs of themselves nearly compelled the silence of ordinary women in the larger religious assemblies, especially in the synagogues, where the primitive Christians often met. But those buildings were ill constructed for their or our prayer-and-conference meeting. Such smaller meetings were held in private dwellings or rooms, where they partook of the nature of family gatherings.

The head-dress of women also nearly compelled their silence in the larger assemblies. In two particulars women were to be scrupulously different from men—they were to wear long hair, and not to be shorn as men were (1 Cor. xi. 6, 15), and they were to be veiled in the religious assembly (1 Cor. xi. 5, 10, 13). The word "uncovered" in 1 Cor. xi. 5, 13 is literally "unveiled." The word "covered," occurring twice in 1 Cor. xi. 6, is literally "veiled."⁴ It is certain that the apostle enjoined upon the Corinthian Christian women the wearing of the veil in the churches. It is equally certain that in their conceptions of their new liberty some at times wished to throw off the veil (1 Cor. xi. 5, 6, 13). That act was doubtless necessary for unimpeded speech to an assembly of considerable size, and was probably prompted by the desire to speak. The Hebrews used several kinds of veils, but all chiefly for covering the face. They had, besides,

¹ Josephus's *Antiq.*, Bk. xv., chap. 11, sect. 5.

² Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, p. 3205.

³ Kitto, Vol. ii. p. 839.

⁴ Robinson's *Lex.*, on *Ἀκατακάλυπτος* and *Κατακάλυπτος*.

several kinds of mantles or shawls, which could be drawn over the face at pleasure. Both shawls and veils were doubtless of so thick material as to impede speech, except as addressed to those near at hand. Thin veils would have been as indecorous as no veils. Only a few months since, the authorities in Constantinople reprimanded certain Turkish women there for displacing thick veils with those of light gauze. The veil which Moses put on when he came down from the mount was probably a large garment, which could be drawn over the face at pleasure.¹ The common assumption and the English translation imply that Moses addressed the people with the veil drawn over his face. But the Hebrew and the LXX indicate that he did not put the veil over his face until after his discourse was finished. Alford and Murphy sustain this view.² One kind of veil covered the lower part of the face to the nose; another, called "mufflers" in the English version, hung down from the eyes over the face; another covered the head and nearly the whole person; still another hung from the top of the head over the face, and an equal distance down behind.³ It was possible for a woman to be veiled, and still have one or both eyes exposed, but not and have her mouth uncovered. All veiling was a hinderance to speech addressed to more than a few persons.

Besides, the veil was especially emblematic of that "authority" (1 Tim. ii. 12) given the man over the woman, which he was to exercise not more as her leader than as her protector.⁴ Without the veil she dishonored her head (1 Cor. xi. 5), and her head was the man (1 Cor. xi. 3). The love enjoined on husbands for their wives (Eph. v. 25; Col. iii. 19) would inspire them with the desire to "provide" for (1 Tim. v. 8) and protect their "own."

Though women in the synagogues were excluded by a partition from the sight of men in the audience, they were in full view of those that conducted the services,⁵ who prob-

¹ Rev. W. L. Bevan, *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, p. 3370.

² Alford, 2 Cor. iii. 7-13; Murphy, Ex. xxxiv. 33-35.

³ Jahn's Arch., pp. 141, 142.

⁴ Thompson's Land and Book, Vol. i. p. 35.

⁵ *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, Art. "Philo," p. 3135; Kitto, Vol. ii. p. 806.

ably were the messengers, the "angels," of the churches in the New Testament period. With their customs both modesty and "reverence" (Eph. v. 33) for men required the women to wear the veil in the presence of the synagogue officials. There was the public sentiment that they should have on their heads the token of "power" (1 Cor. xi. 10)—authority—which was doubtless the veil. The leaders of the services, unaccustomed to look upon the countenance of women beyond their own homes, would be in danger of embarrassment or diversion if a company of them sat unveiled in the assembly. The requirement of female modesty and "reverence" probably explains the text, "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels."¹ Even now in Oriental lands, as Dr. Thompson says, the missionary is generally obliged, for the sake of the native preacher and of the people, to have women veiled and seated behind screens, separate from men.² Their immemorial custom cannot suddenly be set aside. Among the early Hebrew Christians, therefore, in their state of society, the silence of women in the larger assemblies naturally followed. But the churches of Corinth and Ephesus, though composed in part of Hebrew members, were in Grecian society. Did that make an essential difference?

2. Customs relative to woman's silence in assemblies among the Greeks. Virtuous Grecian women during the apostolic age, and long before, were seldom or never in public assemblies, except as converts to Judaism or Christianity. The condition of pagan Grecian women was far inferior to that of their Hebrew sisters.³ When converted and introduced to Christian assemblies it materially exalted their concep-

¹ If the angels referred to were those of heaven, the good order of wearing the veil was needed for their sight. If as Tertullian (*Ant. Nic. Lib.*, Vol. xviii. p. 165) supposed, they were evil angels, stirring up concupisence, the veil on the head would tend to defeat their purpose by shielding woman's face from man's sight. If Bengel's view be correct, that as angels are to God so in a far lower sense woman is to man, and as angels veil their faces before God so woman ought before man; still the good order of wearing the veil was imperative.

² Land and Book, Vol. i. p. 36.

³ Rothschild, *Littell's Living Age*, Vol. cxxix. p. 133.

tions and desires, and female vanity might easily creep in under the name of Christian freedom.¹ Pagan Grecian men had but little respect for the character of woman, and regarded her capacities as much inferior to their own.² Aristotle put her relation to man as that of subject to governor; and asserted that "if she have a will it is a will without rights, and if she have virtues they are kindred to those of slaves."³ Though Plato's ideal education extended equally to both sexes,⁴ his ideal community of wives⁵ and ideal nudity of woman in the palestra⁶ were degrading to the popular estimate of her character. The Grecian high poetical ideals of woman "had no counterpart in actual life. The Athenian woman was in no respect the equal of her husband; she was not the entertainer of his guests or the mistress of his house, but only his housekeeper and the mother of his children. She took no part in military or political matters."⁷

Virtuous Grecian women, previous to marriage, were chiefly kept confined at home. After marriage they were not allowed to leave their dwellings except on special permission of their husbands. At marriage-feasts, contrary to the custom on other public occasions, women as well as men were invited, though they sat with the bride at a table separate from those occupied by the men.⁸ In Sparta, Olympia, and Crete married women did not attend gymnastic contests, though the unmarried did, and often engaged in them.⁹ In Sparta some women appeared in public games and dances in a kind of undress or half-dress which shocked the refinement of Athenian society.¹⁰

"The life of a Greek woman of good repute was one of strict seclusion. She lived with her children and servants in what was called the *gynaecoon*, always in the rear of

¹ Lange, 1 Cor. xi. 5, 6.

² Smith's Greek and Roman Antiq., p. 621.

³ Barnes Sears, Bib. Sacra, Vol. xx. p. 233.

⁴ Jowett's Plato, Vol. ii. pp. 146, 280.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 130, 282.

⁶ Ibid., p. 276.

⁷ Ibid., 129.

⁸ Smith's Greek and Roman Antiq., p. 620.

⁹ Ibid., p. 622.

¹⁰ Prof. Felton's Ancient and Modern Greece, Vol. i. p. 381.

the dwelling; or, in Homer's time, in the upper story. The men occupied the *andronitis*, the front first story and chief part. Strangers were never admitted to the apartments for women. As a rule the virtuous women were not well educated, except in the duties of a housekeeper. The unvirtuous women were often well educated, like Aspasia, the famous mistress of Pericles."¹ The superior education of some of the hetaerae was owing to their unrestrained social intercourse with men. Virtuous wives were in general shut out from the thoughts and aspirations of intellectual society. They could not mingle with men, nor yet with educated courtesans — enemies of their peace — who associated with their husbands. No women but the hetaerae could listen to the philosophers in the arcades, or to the orators in the Areopagus. None but they could ride through the streets with uncovered face and in richness of apparel. With their society the men became familiar, and instead of loving their own wives often treated them as furniture and chattels.² "If retirement, restraint, ignorance of the world, and legalized respect were the portion of married women, freedom, education, and the homage of men, ending in contempt, fell to the lot of the hetaerae. Young women destined for this pursuit received a careful education, such as was denied daughters intended for the marriage state. Hence the hetaera was connected with the arts, the literature, and even the religion of her country; and this gave her a kind of historical importance."³

In such society it was of great moment that the apostle should guard the Christian women against all dress and behavior that would liken them to the vicious. Addressing religious assemblies would bring suspicion upon them and disgrace upon the church. Appearing in those assemblies at all was for them a marked degree of advancement. One class of Grecians, however, — the Dorians, — allowed com-

¹ Edward North, Professor of Greek Lang. and Lit., Hamilton College.

² Sanger's History of Prostitution, p. 54.

³ Dollinger's Gentile and Jew, Vol. ii. p. 237.

paratively free and unrestrained public intercourse between the sexes, and that actually led to the charge of licentiousness against them.¹

Virtuous Greek women going from home customarily wore a veil or light shawl upon the head, with which they could cover their faces when in the presence of men.² Spartan married women never appeared in public unveiled; though the young unmarried did.³ When, after the battle of Chæronea, some women of Athens were daring enough to stand at the door of their dwellings, and inquire of those that passed after the fate of their husbands and sons, that exposure was deemed a reproach to both the women and their city. In Homer's *Odyssey*, Penelope comes down from her upper room, and appears before her suitors *veiled*:

“ Before her cheek having placed a shining veil.”⁴

In such society and circumstances the Christian Greek women must have felt constrained to wear their veils in the larger religious assemblies. Wearing the veil would of itself nearly compel silence, and throwing it off to speak would invite scandal. If some in their zeal were willing to incur all risks, and, besides appearing in church, to displace their veils and engage in asking and answering questions in public, the apostle thought it not becoming or wise. Especially so, because, unless they were actually inspired, and the Lord should not be hindered from speaking through them, they could as well put their questions to their husbands at home.

3. Customs relative to woman's “silence” among the Romans. With these we have not so much to do, for Paul's restrictions relative to “silence” were especially concerning Grecian women. The chief of what he wrote was to the church at Corinth, and that before he ever went to Rome; and all that he wrote was while he was in Grecian or Asiatic society. The restrictions of law and custom upon women among the Romans, however, were not so many or severe as among the Grecians. A Roman married woman had more

¹ Smith's *Greek and Roman Antiq.*, p. 621.

² *Ibid.*, p. 622.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 1037.

⁴ *Book i.*, line 334.

control over her own household, and in the earlier centuries of the Republic lived in the better part of the house, instead of being confined to the poorer part. She shared also in the honors of her husband, and might be the educator of her own children, instead of yielding their instruction to the more trusty slaves, as among the Grecians.¹

But Roman pagan women were far from the possession of rights and freedom afterwards enjoyed under the reign of Christianity. The few favors they received did not redeem them from oppression. Equality with men in culture and education was unknown. Profitable social intercourse with them was usually cut off. It was an index of their condition that while men could obtain divorces from women on slight grounds, women could not from men on any ground.² The Roman law affixing *infamia* to a woman for appearing on a public stage as an actress, was in accord with the general custom of excluding women from society, as well as with the sentiment of disgrace attached to that employment.³

Under the Emperors, which was the time of the apostles, woman's lot was far more miserable and degraded than during the Republic.⁴ In early Rome the women were more like those of the ancient Celts, Scythians, and Thracians, who were remarkable for courage, and often accompanied the men in warfare.⁵ But culture under pagan rule begat corruption. The change when it began in the latter part of the Republic, "was rapid and fearful."⁶ Woman was more often taught by slaves and Greek chambermaids than by the Roman mother, or not taught at all. She was regarded as naturally more vicious than man. Even the elder Cato said, "All women are plaguy and proud," and "were men quit of women, their life would probably be less godless."⁷ Metellus, the censor, said, "Nature has so arranged it that we cannot either live comfortably with wives or live at all without

¹ Smith's Greek and Roman Antiq., p. 625. ² Ibid., Art. "Plutarch," p. 624.

³ Ibid., p. 635.

⁴ Rothschild, Littell's Living Age, Vol. cxxix. p. 133.

⁵ Strabo, Lib. 3. c. 4; Womankind in Western Europe, by T. Wright, p. 4.

⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

⁷ Mommsen's Rome, Vol. ii. p. 408.

them." "Marriage was long regarded as an oppressive public burden, necessary for the state."¹ "As soon as the old rigor of family life passed away, everything in morals fell, and marriage was poisoned at its foundation."² The union between husband and wife "on the side of the woman was rigorous and unequal. . . . He exercised the jurisdiction of life and death; and it was allowed that in the cases of adultery or drunkenness, the sentence might be properly inflicted. She acquired and inherited for the sole profit of her lord; and so clearly was woman defined, not as a *person*, but as a *thing*, that, if the original title were deficient, she might be claimed, like other movables, by the *use* and possession of an entire year."³

Even the partial legal emancipation once secured for women was soon found to be inconvenient to men. They passed a law that only a limited amount of property should be left in inheritance to women, and took measures to deprive them of much of the property that fell to them without testament.⁴ "The Romans knew nothing of the relations of modern society in which the sexes mutually encourage each other in the virtues appropriate to each. . . . The women were never associated in their husband's occupations, knew little of their affairs, and were less closely attached to their interests than even their bondmen. They seldom partook of their recreations, which accordingly degenerated for the most part into debauches. Systematically deprived of instruction, the Roman matron was taught indeed to vaunt her ignorance as a virtue."⁵ The Sabine housewives were not to be found in the decline of the Republic, or under the Empire. Education, and even pleasing conversational powers were, in the opinion of Sallust, such seductive fascinations as formed the charm and fixed the price of the courtesan. Virtue was under temptation to apostasy. Man's infidelity to the marriage state had long been nearly universal, and woman's at length

¹ Mommsen's Rome, Vol. iii. p. 419. ² President Woolsey, Divorce, p. 60

³ Gibbon's Rome, Vol. iv. p. 346.

⁴ Mommsen, Vol. ii. p. 408; Liddell's Rome, Vol. ii. p. 62.

⁵ Merivale's Fall of Roman Republic, p. 226.

became so common as to alarm even corrupt emperors for their subjects. Virtuous women did not break through these chains and attempt a social equality with man; they rather pined in solitude. They could not have the companionship of even their brothers or other male relatives for their own improvement. Consequently, when woman was allowed any intercourse with the world, her ambition sought vain and gaudy show; her conduct was generally frivolous, often boisterous and vicious. She was unblushingly bought and sold for marriage; her capacities for even that relation were ridiculed; and marriage was at length avowedly and boastfully renounced by many citizens. She came practically to be without rights, without the ownership of property, and nearly without respect from her own or the other sex. Her status was that of a child. Her life of bondage was first controlled by her father, and then transferred at his option to her husband.¹ Though the law did not forbid her attendance at theatres, banquets, and courts, yet scruple and custom as a rule withheld her from such society, and even from walking abroad with the permission of her husband.²

Roman as well as Grecian and Hebrew women customarily wore the veil in the presence of men. The bride at marriage wore a veil called *flammeum*,³ while the usual veil was named *velum*, or its derivative *velamen*.⁴ "The fact that women covered their head with a veil always remained."⁵ The married women more scrupulously wore it than the unmarried, because it was a symbol of their adherence to their own husbands. On the whole, then, Roman society, in the apostolic age, required woman's silence nearly or fully as much as Grecian. Virtuous women were too little esteemed to be allowed social freedom with men. That freedom was so much granted to vicious women as to drive the virtuous into seclusion. Silence became their protection; and there was no occasion for the apostle to except them

¹ Merivale's History of Rome, Vol. iv. p. 34.

² Becker's Gallus, pp. 153, 154.

³ Smith's Greek and Roman Antiq., p. 625.

⁴ Ibid., p. 1037.

⁵ Becker's Gallus, p. 438.

from the restrictions laid upon Christian women in the churches of Greece and Asia Minor.

4. The present Oriental customs relative to the silence and seclusion of women. They are more rigorous than in the primitive age. Women must be carefully excluded from all familiar association with men, except of their near relatives. If an Oriental woman's veil were to fall from her face in the presence of a strange man she would be overwhelmed with confusion.¹ Western Asiatic women are much confined to their own dwellings, and never see men who visit their husbands and fathers. In cities they never go abroad without having their faces completely shrouded; and even at home they generally take their meals apart from the male portion of the family. In rural districts they have somewhat more freedom.² Among the Druzes of Syria, a person visiting at an aristocratic house never sees the lady of it. If she ever goes abroad it is only at night, and with attendants on every side to keep off the profane gaze of strangers. Such a woman is often suffered to die rather than have her face seen by a physician. The birth of a daughter is considered a misfortune; and that is true among all sects and peoples of Syria.³ In Egypt it is more requisite for women to conceal the face and head than other parts of the person. They refrain, if possible, from exposing their head and face to physicians in receiving medical treatment.⁴ Among all Mohammedans the seclusion of women is a prevailing custom. They are never allowed to pray with men in public. It is thought that their presence inspires a different spirit from that of worship.⁵

When Oriental women are converted to Christianity, and are assigned a place in the religious assembly, the veil is still deemed necessary for their own modesty, as well as for the calmness, thoughtfulness, and devotion of the Oriental preacher. A whole half audience of female faces would dis-

¹ Land and Book, Vol. i. p. 37. ² Kitto's Cyclopaedia, Vol. ii. p. 966.

³ Women of the Arabs, Jessup, pp. 28, 29. ⁴ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3370.

⁵ Women of the Arabs, pp. 11, 12.

concert and distract him. Woman's veiling and silence in audiences could be neglected only at the risk of misapprehension and reproach.¹ Both observances are also requisite for symbolic acknowledgment of man's headship.

5. The influence of the ancient Persians in causing female seclusion and silence. The *modern* stringency of these customs among the Orientals took its rise about twelve hundred and fifty years ago, at the promulgation of the Koran, which forbade women appearing unveiled except in the presence of their nearest relatives.² Previous to that event, among the Assyrians women were often admitted to public banquets, and sometimes received strangers to their own apartments;³ but not afterwards under Moslemism.

In like manner, the customs relative to female seclusion which prevailed in Jewish, Grecian, and Roman society during the primitive Christian era received their origin or special intensity from a new propulsive power in Cyrus's conquest of Babylon, five hundred and thirty-eight years before Christ. That Persian conqueror speedily obtained mastery over nearly all nations between the Aegæan on the west and the Indus on the east, and between the Amoo river on the north and the Red Sea on the south.⁴ At Babylon he found the captive Jewish people, and a friendly interest at once sprang up between the Persians and the Hebrews, the latter especially coming under the influence of the former (Isa. xlv. 28; xiv. 1-4). The Persian woman's life had been one of much undue seclusion and restraint, and of oppression and corruption.⁵ As is usually the case, the customs of the dominant began to be infused into the weaker people — the Hebrews copying from the Persians this greater seclusion of woman.⁶ The latter kept their women in apartments separate from those of the men,⁷ and did not allow them communication with persons outside (Esther ii. 3, 14, 15).

¹ Land and Book, Vol. i. pp. 35-37.

² Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3370.

³ Layard's Nineveh, Vol. ii. p. 193.

⁴ American Cyc. (1st ed.), Vol. vi. p. 195.

⁵ Rollin's Hist., Vol. ii. p. 220.

⁶ Lange on Gen. xii. 11.

⁷ Rollin, Vol. ii. p. 220.

Josephus says the laws of the Persians forbade their wives being seen by strangers,¹ and that Vashti, the Persian queen, refused to appear before king Ahasuerus's company because Persian decorum would not allow it. We see, further, that she made a separate feast for the women in the palace (Esth. i. 9-11). These facts indicate a greater degree of female isolation than up to that date had existed among the Jews.

The head-dress, including the veil for women when in the presence of men,² was an important article of apparel among the Persians.³ Botta and Layard show that the head-dress received much attention among the Assyrians and Babylonians. But veiling among the Jews in the Mosaic age was not customary, though occasional.⁴ Afterwards it became universal, undoubtedly through the influence of Persian custom and power.⁵

Lord Hervey quotes Plutarch and Herodotus, as he supposes, in opposition to Josephus, showing that Persian kings had their legitimate wives sit with them at their banquet tables.⁶ But that testimony, at least in respect to Herodotus, pertained to affairs at a later date.⁷ Besides, Josephus may have spoken of the general rule, and the others of exceptional cases. Hervey also says that Josephus is contradicted by the Book of Esther (v. 4, 8, 12; vii. 1). But the instances he cites pertain simply to Esther's receiving the king and Haman at her table, in which acts, as would be natural, she doubtless adhered to her Jewish instead of adopting the Persian custom. The Jews, though then in the Persian capital, were really in a Babylonian city, and retained many of their Hebrew manners and practices. Moreover, the Persian customs, in the third of a century that had nearly passed, had probably been modified by the manners of both Jews and Babylonians; and those of the latter are indicated by the fact, that when Baby-

¹ Antiq., Bk. xi. chap. 6. sect. 1.

² Kitto's Cyc., Vol. ii. p. 903; Herzog's Cyc., Vol. ii. p. 227.

³ McClintock and Strong, Vol. i. p. 321.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. iv. p. 111.

⁵ Hawks's Egypt and Remains, p. 146.

⁶ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3369.

⁷ Layard's Nineveh and Remains, Vol. ii. p. 312, nota.

lon was taken by Cyrus, Belshazzar was at a feast surrounded by his wives and concubines (Dan. v. 1, 2).¹ Other authorities agree with Josephus in attributing Vashti's refusal to go into the presence of the king's company to her unwillingness to violate Persian modesty by appearing in public unveiled.² Queens Esther and Vashti, by their dissimilar actions relative to eating with men, seem to indicate a difference of custom in the two nations they represent. It has been suggested that queen Vashti was summoned to the presence of only men of her acquaintance, belonging to the king's palace. Even then, why did she refuse to sit with them at the table, except because Persian decorum forbade it. But Layard supposes that all the people of the city of Susa were there in the gardens of the palace (Esth. i. 5),³ and doubtless many strangers to the queen were at the king's feast. Further still, Rawlinson, referring to the supposed contradiction of Josephus by Herodotus, says that the latter in the passage quoted was not making his own statement, but that of certain Persians who wished it believed that wives in their nation had greater liberty than they really possessed. Rawlinson also says of the ancient Persians, "Wives lived in strict seclusion within the walls of the Gynaeceum, or went abroad in litters, seeing no males except their sons, their husbands, and their husbands' eunuchs. Concubines had somewhat more freedom, appearing at banquets, when they danced, sang, and played to amuse the guests of their master."⁴

The influence of Persian rule and custom over the Grecians while under their power, and through them over the Romans, and among the Egyptians and all Oriental nations, was natural and probable. Grecian morals retrograded under Persian subjection,⁵ and particularly after the Peloponnesian war.⁶ The social position of woman in Greece was lower during the Attic age than in the preceding Homeric or

¹ Layard's *Nineveh*, Vol. ii. pp. 312, 313.

² Dr. Cotton, in *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, p. 47.

³ *Nineveh and Remains*, Vol. ii. p. 312.

⁴ *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. iv. p. 196.

⁵ *Mahaffy's Social Life in Greece*, p. 151.

⁶ *Dollinger's Gentile and Jew*, Vol. ii. p. 247.

Lyric;¹ and in Rome was lower during the decline of the Republic and the first of the Empire than in any former period.² The paintings and sculptures of the early Egyptians and Assyrians nowhere show the use of the veil.³ Yet in both those nations it clearly came into use long before the reign of Moslemism, doubtless through Persian example.

6. The original freedom and power of woman in the Jewish nation. Early in their history there was far less use and significance of the veil than in later times. And its more frequent use certainly arose before Moslemism. Betrothed maidens put on the veil on coming into the presence of their future husbands; as Rebekah on meeting Isaac (Gen. xxiv. 65; xxix. 25). The veil was then probably used by fallen women for concealment (Gen. xxxviii. 14, 15). Yet, in the case of Tamar, she may have put it on merely to conceal herself from her father-in-law, Judah. In the apostolic age, however, being veiless produced suspicion of harlotry. But when Abram went into Egypt, the beauty of his wife Sarah was visible to all they passed (Gen. xii. 14). Rebekah was veiless when Abraham's servant first saw her in Mesopotamia (Gen. xxiv. 16), as also Rachel when Jacob first saw her at her father's well (Gen. xxix. 10). The pious Hannah wore no veil while praying in the temple, for Eli the priest saw the movement of her lips (1 Sam. i. 12, 13).⁴ Women were wont also to go abroad through the fields unprotected (Deut. xxii. 25-27).

Note their freedom and importance in private and social life. The early Hebrew wife and mother held much control over her household (Prov. xiv. 1; xxxi. 10-31), and even invited guests to her dwelling and hospitalities; Jael invited Sisera to her tent (Judges iv. 18); the Shunammite woman, Elisha to her home. Later, when her son sickened and died, this Shunammite woman went to Mount Carmel to intercede with that man of God for his and the divine bless-

¹ Mahaffy's Greece, pp. 45, 100, 104, 174, 211, 293, 384.

² Religions before Christ, by De Pressensé, pp. 160, 161.

³ Hawks's Egypt and Remains, p. 146.

⁴ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3370.

ing (2 Kings iv. 8); on another occasion a prophet's widow carried to him her own case of need (2 Kings iv. 1-7); and much earlier the troubled Abigail went with gifts to implore assistance from David (1 Sam. xxv. 18). In Job's day women attended feasts with their brothers (Job i. 4); in Christ's, they attended both as assistants (John xii. 2), and guests (John ii. 3). Undoubtedly it was always customary for Jewish women to take their meals with the men.¹ In the earlier history, at least, Hebrew damsels were not given in marriage without their own consent. To Rebekah the question was put, "Wilt thou go with this man?" (Gen. xxiv. 58). After marriage the husband was not to leave his wife for a year, but stay and cheer her (Deut. xxiv. 5). The scene of Ruth in the field of Boaz indicates the courtesy of men towards women in that early Hebrew life.

The polygamy of Solomon necessitated separate apartments or dwellings for his wives (1 Kings vii. 8), or sub-princesses, — if many of them were only such, and not wives or concubines.² But, aside from this, no evidence appears that at any time there was among the Jews a customary separation in life between men and women in the same families.³ Such separation did exist among the Greek, Roman, and many Oriental nations after the great Persian conquests. But the family and social life of the Jewish nation seems to have been more simple and natural in the earlier than in the later portion of its history.

Note again, the freedom and activity of Hebrew women in public affairs. Miriam led the women of Israel in public rejoicings over the nation's deliverance at the Red Sea (Ex. xv. 20, 21); Jephthah's daughter went out publicly to congratulate her father on his triumphal return from battle (Judges xi. 34); the daughters of Shiloh engaged by them-

¹ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3553.

² F. W. Newman suggests that the usages of the modern court of Persia indicate that numerous women called Solomon's wives were really only hostages for the good behavior of their fathers, who were chieftains of the surrounding heathen, and tributary to him. — *Haley's Discrep. of the Bible*, p. 296.

³ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, p. 3553.

selves, but in sight of others, in sacred dancing at a yearly religious feast (Judges xxi. 21); women of Israel came out of their cities with songs and triumphal marches to meet Saul and David as they returned from the defeat of the Philistines (1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7); Deborah was a judge, prophetess, and sacred poetess in Israel, and of high distinction in public service (Judges iv. 6, 14; v. 7); Hannah offered a remarkable prophetic song in the house of the Lord (1 Sam. ii. 1-10); and the public office of inspired prophetess was held in the earlier day, at least, by the four, Miriam, Deborah, Huldah (2 Kings xxii. 14), and Noadiah (Neh. vi. 14). The career of Jezebel (1 Kings xviii. 13; xxi. 25; 2 Kings ix. 7), — Phœnician princess and wife of Ahab — in the government of Israel, and that of her daughter Athaliah (2 Kings xi. 3), as queen of Judah, illustrate the active part in public life which was sometimes allowed to women among the Hebrews.

This summary shows more prominence given to women in the former than in the latter part of Biblical Jewish history. No such array of heroines in public or conspicuous life appears in the later as in the earlier period. The prophetesses, Anna and the four daughters of Philip, do not bear so prominent a part as Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah long before. Priscilla privately assisted in expounding the word of God to Apollos, but Huldah had a more public position at Jerusalem, and taught king Josiah and Hilkiah the high-priest in important public concerns, in the presence of a small company of men (2 Kings xxii. 14; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22). In the songs of the temple at Christ's coming Simeon bears a more public, and Anna a more private part. But Miriam in her time sings for the nation, and Deborah is high over all of her generation as prophetess, poetess, chieftainess. These facts are indices of the earlier prominence and superior freedom of woman among the Hebrews.

7. The freedom accorded to woman in modern civilized, Christian society. This has more resemblance to that of the earlier Hebrews than of the primitive Christians. In the

age of the latter, customs, enjoining woman's silence and seclusion, were deemed binding which now in civilized society would be regarded as useless, tedious, and injurious. A woman now need not conceal her face at the approach of men, though female modesty yet reigns. In Christian congregations no close and high partitions between men and women are now necessary; and women in such assemblies need not keep their faces hidden from speaker or audience. No unjust suspicions are now excited if a woman walks abroad without a veil, nor need she wear one now to show due submission to her husband. She may occupy the best part of her own house, and not yield it to him, while she lives in the kitchen; she is not debarred the acquaintance of gentlemen that visit at her own home; she may teach her own children, and is often appointed the teacher of others'. Young women may pursue the same studies as young men, recite in the same classes, and a woman may teach them all. Women may now mingle, veiless, and with head uncovered, in the social circle with numbers of men, even if the assembly conclude with a religious service.

All these liberties are the opposites of certain inconvenient and evil practices which belong to Moslemism and heathenism rather than Christianity. The missionaries who promulgate Christianity where these practices exist, deem them an incumbrance, though not sinful, and patiently wait for better customs to supplant them.¹ The tendency of both Hebrew piety and the Christian faith has always been towards freedom from such ancient and Oriental manners. The Old Testament command, "Forsake not the law of thy MOTHER" (Prov. i. 8; vi. 20), was at once an index of the superiority of the Hebrew faith, and a lever of reformation for woman in all surrounding society. That faith labored for her just place and position. What was lost through Persian sway during the centuries between Solomon and Christ, Christianity early began to regain. Again, in the Middle Ages woman suffered loss; for example, Jewish Rabbis, after the temple

¹ Land and Book, Vol. i. p. 37.

service had passed away, excluded her voice from public religious song,¹ though the ancient Hebrews, the apostles, and Christian fathers approved of her taking vocal part in that mode of worship (Ex. xv. 20, 21; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7; Eph. v. 19-22; Col. iii. 16-18). As religion retrograded woman and her services became less and less important. The great Reformation was a revival of her worth and freedom. Her liberty — including more use of speech and less of veil — has always been one of the fruits of the Christian religion;² and even the religion of nature, where but feebly developed, has shown tendencies to like results.

IV. The principle of man's headship and woman's helpmate relation to him are permanent and obligatory; while woman's veiling and her silence are but customs, binding only as showing loyalty to the principle. The principle is based on a changeless distinction between the two sexes. The customs the apostle enjoined as a token and conservator of woman's modesty, and of her fealty to man. Like other customs they have now lost much of their significance and binding authority.

1. The divinely appointed place for man in the marriage union is given thus: "The head of the woman is the man" (1 Cor. xi. 3). Equally ordained of heaven is the place of woman: "And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him" (Gen. ii. 18). The marriage relation and the office of each party in it respectively, remain permanent; for the two correlated natures of man and woman never change.

In the English translation the relation and duties of the wife to her husband are indicated by the four following words, or by their derivatives, — to submit, subject, obey, and revere. The places where they are found are these: the first, in Eph. v. 22 and Col. iii. 18; the second, in 1 Tim. ii. 11 and 1 Pet. iii. 1; the third, in 1 Cor. xiv. 34 and Titus ii. 5; and the fourth, in Eph. v. 33. But the Greek reduces

¹ Rothschild, *Littell's Living Age*, Vol. cxxix. p. 138.

² *Hawks's Egypt and Remains*, p. 146.

all these to two original words; *ὑποτάσσω* for the first three classes, and *φόβω* for the last one. They are to be further reduced by dropping the first word, "submit," in Eph. v. 22. Alford says the oldest manuscripts reject it, and Jerome says the Greek rejected it in his day. But the same idea is substantially carried by the word "submitting" in the previous verse. And that happily defines the submitting of wives to their husbands: "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God" (Eph. v. 21). It is not bondage, but the due observance of our obligations one to another according to the relations that we hold,— the wife observing her duties to her husband as his helpmate, and he his duties to her as head, leader, provider, protector. The same word and idea are in the following: "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder, yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility" (1 Pet. v. 5).

The harshness or hardness in the words "submit," "subjection," "obedience," is in the sounding, and not in the meaning. The wife has no peculiar "subjection" to her husband to observe, except to answer to all her obligations to him with whom she is in marriage covenant, he the head, she the helpmeet. The "reverence" enjoined is, due honor to him in this relation. Another passage explains 'submision': "That ye submit yourselves unto such, and to every one that helpeth with us, and laboreth" (1 Cor. xvi. 16). This implies showing respect to such persons, following their advice, and acting in accordance with their wishes so far as right.¹ "Nothing is more natural than submission to the good."² If husbands love their wives as enjoined, and act accordingly, subjection is not servitude, but partnership. This helpmeet relation is fully and emphatically taught: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands" (Eph. v. 22); "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (Gen. iii. 16); "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord" (Col. iii. 18); "That they may teach the young women to be obedient

¹ Lange, 1 Cor. p. 359.

² Dr. Hodge.

to their own husbands" (Titus ii. 4, 5); "Likewise ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands" (1 Pet. iii. 1); "For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord" (1 Pet. iii. 5, 6). The Bible makes nothing clearer than the duty of the wife's proper submission or adherence to her own husband. And since a wife should be a wife everywhere we look for no change. The propriety of the "subjection" is inherent in the relation of the two natures to each other.

Their diversity of duties is partly expressed thus: "Let every one of you in particular so LOVE his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she REVERENCE her husband" (Eph. v. 33). Love from the husband; reverence from the wife. In such "love" is care, protection, reverence, headship; in such "reverence" is love, adherence, yielding for protection, "help" rendered to the "head." The obligation to such love and such reverence, based on *principle*, will last while the marriage relation lasts.

2. The apostle Paul taught the obligation of woman in his time to have her head veiled in the religious assembly (1 Cor. xi. 5, 6). In the phrase, "With her head uncovered dishonoreth her head," the word "uncovered" means "unveiled"; and in "Let her be covered," the last word means "veiled."¹ Removed from Oriental life, it is now nearly universally believed, that woman is released from the duty of wearing the veil in churches. An occasional exception exists. One of the American Episcopal bishops has near lady relatives who regard the primitive direction as binding still, and scrupulously wear the veil in religious assemblies. But why the almost universal change from the practice that prevailed in the New Testament period? Because veiling the head is a changeable custom, not always needed. Why did the apostle require it? Because then and there woman's freedom from "shame" (1 Cor. xi. 6) — her reputation and

¹ Lange, 1 Cor. p. 224.

modesty — demanded it ; and because “ woman is the glory of the man ” (1 Cor. xi. 7), receiving her place and higher honor by her relation to him, and thus reflecting his honor. Man is unveiled ; she should be different — veiled. If he is king, she is queen,¹ and her queenly radiance and modesty are fitly joined.

3. What was the divine design in that age of symbols, in requiring the *silence* of woman in the churches? Chiefly, to give token of her modest and retiring nature, and of her acceptance of her appointed relation to man. To the Corinthians the apostle says : “ It is not permitted unto them to speak, but to be in subjection ” (1 Cor. xiv. 34). “ But ” shows contrast : breaking silence by speaking was casting off the symbol of their relation to man. “ It is a shame for a woman to speak in the church ” (vs. 35), because there it was the violation of her symbolic profession of virtue, modesty, and faithfulness. “ Did the word of God come forth from you ” (vs. 36)? Are you the authority to change customs and symbols? To Timothy the apostle says : “ Let the women learn in silence, in all subjection ” (1 Tim. ii. 11). The implication is that “ subjection ” then required silence. “ I suffer not the woman to teach, nor yet to rule over the man, but to be in silence ” (1 Tim. ii. 12). A woman’s public teaching was then an approach to ruling over the man, and belonged to the same category. “ To be in silence,” meant not attempting to rule, or to be the “ head.” “ For Adam was first formed, then Eve ” (vs. 13) ; hence Adam was to be the “ head,” and Eve “ a help meet for him ” (Gen. ii. 18). At that time her silence was necessary to her acknowledgment of her relation. But what was the principle? “ Subjection.” What the custom? “ Silence.” The silence was enjoined for the subjection, and not subjection for the silence. To suppose that silence were the superior object, and subjection only tributary to it, were folly like assuming that man was made for the sabbath, and not the sabbath for man. The speaking “ involved a sort of intercourse with men on

¹ Dr. Hodge.

the part of women, and a renunciation of their dependence upon their husbands."¹

Further, there is a close connection between the *silence* enjoined in the fourteenth chapter (vs. 34), and the *veiling* required in the eleventh (vs. 5, 6). The veiling nearly compelled silence in large assemblies. Miss Maria A. West gives ample testimony concerning the necessity of drawing aside the veil, among Turko-Armenian women of this day, for their distinctness of utterance in reading and speaking, and of the flush of shame that mantles their faces when first they do this in the presence of their teachers.² Mrs. Capt. R. Burton, long a resident in the Orient, speaks of the little respect or consideration that would be felt in Syria for a Christian woman with a "bare face."³ Another author says, "A Persian on hearing of distant lands where all the women went unveiled would set them down as dead to all shame and virtue."⁴ The Grecian and Roman classics show that, judged by our standard, an *excessive* silence was required of woman in those nations at the opening of the Christian era. Sophocles exclaims: "O woman, silence is an adornment to women";⁵ Euripides says: "Silence and discretion are most beautiful in woman, and remaining quiet within the house";⁶ Plautus: "A good woman is silent always rather than talking";⁷ and Democritus: "Honor belongs to a woman who speaks little."⁸ These authors refer to woman's silence at *home*, not in assemblies, for she was not in them. But the apostle enjoins it in churches and *not* in homes. He is more liberal than the poets and philosophers of his time; yet he requires enough silence of women to protect their character and reputation for virtue and modesty. The early fathers also guarded Christian women against such dress,

¹ Lange, 1 Cor. p. 296.

² Romance of Missions, pp. 654, 655.

³ Inner Life of Syria, Vol. i. p. 223.

⁴ Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria, by George Dennis, Vol. i. p. 287, note.

⁵ Soph. Aj., 293.

⁶ Eurip. Heracl., 476; Spiess's Log. Sper., pp. 282, 362.

⁷ Plaut. Rud., iv. 4. 70.

⁸ Democr. Ap. Stob., 441. 30; Wetstein's Nov. Test., Vol. ii. pp. 163, 164.

coloring of the hair, and exposure of the face as would give them resemblance to the vicious of their sex.¹ Tertullian says: "To blush if he see a virgin is as much a mark of a chaste man as of a chaste virgin if seen by a man."²

4. But the veiling and silence requisite in the apostolic age to indicate woman's nature and virtue are not now necessary for those purposes, except in the Orient. Strict veiling among us is no longer insisted upon. Why insist on absolute silence? The apostle says, "I suffer not a woman to teach" (1 Tim. ii. 12). He spoke of public teaching. The private was allowed — Priscilla joined her husband in teaching Apollos (Acts xviii. 26). Public teaching broke the proper silence. But women may teach both sexes now, and cause no reproach, or violence of propriety. The basal *principle* of woman's office as helpmeet has in no wise changed. But two *customs*, veiling and silence, once expressive of the principle, have, as formerly observed, passed away. In some well-conducted institutions of learning female instructors of classes embracing both sexes of adults, turn often from language, science, and literature to teach Bible lessons and to conduct religious services with those same pupils. Not even Moslems would object to the teaching, if it could be done without exposing the female countenance. A company of men and women meet socially in a parlor; the women with bonnets and veils laid aside. Probably no such scene was ever witnessed in the apostolic age. Women in that circle may properly speak at times so as to be heard by all at once. Some of them may there give disquisitions on science, art, or manners. But turn that secular meeting into a prayer-circle, and why may they not as well be heard? Woman needs still to consult decorum, modesty, her own retiring nature, her place as helpmate and not head. Beyond that, why seal her lips? She need not sit now with face veiled and voice silent, and her own knowledge withheld, to show deference to either

¹ Tertullian, *Ant. Nic. Lib.*, Vol. xi. pp. 304-322; Vol. xviii. pp. 176, 177; Clement of Alex., *Ant. Nic. Lib.*, Vol. iv. p. 277.

² *Ant. Nic. Lib.*, Vol. xviii. p. 157.

men or women. Customs once required as signs and symbols would now be *bondage*. Laying upon woman now and here all the ancient or the modern Moslem habits of living in these respects, were equally preposterous and cruel with imposing on us under the new dispensation the ancient rites and ceremonials of Judaism. Truth, by developing symbol into substance, and type into antetype, makes us free.

5. But most biblical scholars have assured us that the command of "silence" is as imperative now as in olden time. They reason thus: The woman is to be in subjection (1 Cor. xiv. 34) to the man; the head of the woman is the man (1 Cor. xi. 3); the woman is not to rule over the man (1 Tim. ii. 12). This principle they claim to be fundamental, given for all time and for all men. In this they are perfectly correct. They claim, secondly, that divine instruction required in the apostolic age woman's silence in the churches as a part of her deference and subjection to her "head"—to man. In this they are also correct. The error, we think, is not in interpretation, but in logic. Yet, criticisms have generally been in respect to interpretation. Confident of the two preceding premises, authors and teachers have made the deduction that the silence of women is equally obligatory *now*. This conclusion is not necessitated, because not all things are binding now that were binding in the apostolic age. We have instanced three conspicuous Scripture cases of exception: The washing of feet, anointing the sick with oil, and the veiling of women in churches. None of these are now binding as they were in the days of Christ. So, woman's absolute silence in churches is not now binding. Change in society has given greater liberty in custom without infraction of principle. "The Bible lays down no exact and complete system of moral rules. What other religions partially undertake by their tedious codes it often sums up in the simple principles of love to God and our neighbor. And it sometimes devolves on us to decide what love prescribes."¹ In respect to the application of each Scripture

¹ Prof. J. Henry Thayer, Andover Theol. Sem.

command we are unselfishly to inquire whether there is any just limitation by custom, class, circumstance, clime, or time. Christ gave the command, "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor" (Matt. xix. 21). Francis of Assisi, not regarding the limitation of class and circumstance, exemplified and taught the literal fulfilment. Origen and others failing to note the limitation of the letter by the spirit, are reputed to have rendered literal obedience to another verse of the same chapter (Matt. xix. 12). Paul's direction, "Seek not a wife" (1 Cor. vii. 27), unless limited by its time and circumstances of persecution and corruption would lead to undue celibacy. He, to some extent, discouraged marriage in his time, while the rule of life encourages it. The Saviour's command, "Swear not at all" (Matt. v. 34), must be limited by the kind of oaths—the private and profane, and not the civic, being forbidden. Paul's direction not to go to law except before saints (1 Cor. vi. 1) must have some limitation in time, class, or circumstance. He does not forbid all appeals to just and Christian tribunals though the judge be not a Christian. Jesus's command, "Resist not evil" (Matt. v. 39) has its limitation in revenge, and does not abrogate the administration of justice by the proper authorities. The direction of both Peter and Paul to the saints to salute each other with a kiss (1 Pet. v. 14; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26) is given to more churches, and as much without exception, as the direction to women to keep silence in the churches; yet its literal observance would be an offence in English or American society, and its substantial observance is fulfilled in any country by the customary cordial greetings that prevail there. The Saviour said, "In what place soever ye enter into an house, there abide till ye depart from that place" (Mark vi. 10). Christian ministers in modern civilized society do not consider that command binding now, because of the change of custom and propriety. In like manner, when Paul directed that women veil themselves, keep silence, and teach not, those requirements were limitable by the customs and proprieties

of existing or similar society. The premise of principle relating to woman's "subjection," and that of fact relating to her "silence," do not logically demand her absolute silence now. If both premises were *permanent moral principles*, then would silence still be imperative. But the premise of fact has changed because custom has changed. The principle must be maintained, and such customs may be allowed as do not endanger the principle.

6. Practical exegesis tells us not to insist upon or expect a uniformity of manners and customs in all countries and ages alike. Bishop Whately has said, "Instead of precise *rules*, it (the gospel) furnishes sublime *principles* of conduct. Our Lord and his apostles . . . laid down no *set of rules* for the conduct of a Christian. They laid down Christian *principles* instead; they sought to implant Christian *dispositions*."¹ It would only have extended his thought to have added, — The principles they did lay down were *permanent*, and the rules often *transient*. Miss West, long a resident of the East, in reasoning with a native Armenian Christian preacher, aptly puts it thus: "Many of the people confound principles with rules. Now, you know that rules should be made like leather, to bend to circumstances. But principles lie at the very foundation of things; and if you sacrifice them, you sacrifice everything."² Principle is involved in woman's acquiescence in her relation as helpmate. But veiling her face is a shifting rule, binding only so far as necessary to express acquiescence in the principle. Her silence in the presence of men and in churches is also, — is it not? — a variable rule, needing observance only so far as to sanction and sustain the principle.

7. There is in modern Christian society no special danger of woman's lack of fidelity in her office as helpmate. In Paul's day there was. But now she is in more danger of not laying hold of all her opportunities for usefulness which the manners of our age allow, and which her education — more

¹ Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul, pp. 151, 152.

² Romance of Missions, p. 53.

wide-spread than that of man, in that more of her sex are graduated from our schools — qualifies her to embrace. It was Saturday, the last day of the week of prayer in January, when four American missionary sisters and one brother were gathered for their daily noon season of united supplication in their native tongue for the outpouring of God's spirit upon the people of Harpoot. Two missionary brethren had gone out to labor among the villagers of the plain. The one brother left at the station while leading the meeting urged that the four sisters should take an active part. They hesitated; they had never done it in man's presence. They ventured now, and God apparently approved. That very day an Armenian sceptic, who had been accustomed to put Aristotle in the place of the Bible, a man of wealth and influence, while sitting in his office, was suddenly, as by a mighty rushing wind, overwhelmed with a conviction of his sinfulness before God, and he soon became a meek and laborious servant of Christ.¹ How preposterous to suppose that those women were immodest, or irreverent to their husbands in their act of prayer! How much greater the danger that other sisters like them, all over Christendom, will fail to embrace such golden opportunities for good! Miss West holds religious meetings with the Armenian women in destitute parts of Turkey and Syria. Often a number of men linger around the door to pick up a few spiritual crumbs that fall from the table. She denies them admittance, not because of Turkish scruples, but of the American interpretation that women are not to teach religion in the presence of men. A new missionary comes to the field, preaches to the natives, and Miss West translates to them his sermon. She does it so well that an Armenian delegation visit her, and beseech that she will come down and preach to them sermons of her own. She says, nay; because the Book says, "Let your women keep silence,"² though she evidently suspects there is some error in the interpretation or logic of the application.²

8. The perpetuity of a law depends upon its reason. If

¹ *Romance of Missions*, pp. 581, 582.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 606, 606, 657.

the reason remains the law continues. Hence the meaning or binding nature of a command may be ascertained, if doubtful, by consulting the reason for its existence. Blackstone says, "The most universal and effectual way of discovering the true meaning of a law, when the words are dubious, is by considering the *reason* and *spirit* of it; or the cause which moved the legislator to enact it. For when this reason ceases, the law itself ought likewise to cease with it. An instance of this is given in a case put by Cicero."¹

Professor Moses Stuart in giving biblical instruction often quoted the expressive phrase: *Ratione manente manet ipsa lex*. The reason for woman's office as helpmate, and not head, ceases not, nor ever will in the mortal state; hence the office, and requirement for acquiescence in it, continue. The reason why woman should closely veil her face in public has ceased in Christian countries, and the requirement has ceased. So the reason for her absolute silence has ceased, and the requirement also. She does not now bow to the restraint of a thick veil, she need not now maintain silence to maintain her modesty, or to symbolize her submission. Why, then, always be silent? The reason for humility and Christian affection among brethren has not been set aside, nor ever can be; and the requirement of these virtues is still in force. The reason for washing one another's feet, as expressing that humility and affection has been set aside, and also the obligation to perform that act. The command is satisfied with such other conduct as is expressive of fraternal fellowship and of "preferring one another" (Rom. xii. 10). So the requirement of woman's silence is satisfied with a modest behaviour and a cheerful adherence to her office as wife in the marriage state.²

¹ Commentaries, Vol. i. p. 61.

² More than five years since Rev. Dr. R. W. Patterson of Chicago applied to this subject the legal principle that the law continues while the reason continues, and ceases when the reason ceases. But his use of this axiom was to show the permanent obligation of woman's silence, in that she ever will be in subjection to man. The present writer, only a few days previous, in another publication, applied the same axiom to the same subject. Neither could have

V. Man's headship and woman's partnership with him as wife, will always maintain distinctions in their callings and conduct while the two natures continue. Some principles are settled in the divine economy for mankind. Man and woman are fitted for different service in the main. The inherent laws of the two natures are not mutable like the customs of speech. Every true woman desires her husband to be her leader and protector, and in general he is fitted for that place. It is usually his calling that supports the family. If she is conscious of better education and talent than her husband has, still, it is her nature to recognize him as head, and herself as helpmate. Her help may often consist in being wiser than he. But her choice is to make him the hero, though herself be the heroine. In public affairs she wishes him to go forward, and without special reason will not herself go in advance. Yet, rational exceptions do legitimately occur. Elizabeth Fry, providentially, was more conspicuous than her husband. But he scripturally, and in the family really, was still head. A Florence Nightingale may come from Crimean battle-fields or American hospitals, and, telling a promiscuous audience of human sufferings and wants, and of woman's work to allay them, may infuse sympathetic interest and benevolent principle into thousands of human hearts. How in our state of society can woman's relation to man be thereby unfavorably affected? No *principle* of Scripture can by that act be weakened in its hold upon the mind. Only a *custom*, once important to the principle, now unimportant unless in the Orient, is violated. With us the violation, for such a cause, is better,— is it not?— than the observance. A missionary lady who has buried her husband on his field of toil on the other side of the globe, returns to us bringing her little children. She has golden

been indebted to the other for the suggestion. But the latter employed the principle to show that the duty of woman's "proper reverence and submission remains; for marriage remains"; 'that the reasons for her veiling and her strict silence do *not* remain, and therefore the duty to observe them ceases'; and that the rule demanding her silence is now satisfied with modest, helpful, and appropriate demeanor.

words with which to tell the wonderful works of God wrought through her companion in that far-off land. She feels an incitement to do it, and multitudes of women and *men*, would gladly hear her. Does any real *principle* demand that the men be excluded? No! It is only an old, or Oriental *rule*, by which we need not be governed. In yielding to this apparently providential call, she may so do it that neither her spirit nor act shall violate the modest and retiring nature peculiar to her sex. She may do it in fulfilment of her office as helpmate of her husband; perfecting his mission by rehearsing the story of his toils and success for his **Master**.

There was an office for prophetess in the apostolic days. Daughters should prophesy as well as sons (Acts ii. 17). Both in their office spoke to "edification, and exhortation, and comfort" (1 Cor. xiv. 3). Prophetesses must have had hearers. When Paul's company came to the house of Philip, who had four daughters which did prophesy (Acts xxi. 9), it seems probable that in their small assemblies those daughters spoke. They could be heard there and remain veiled, if custom in so small a company required it. It may be that all women were at liberty to speak in churches assembled in *private* dwellings (Rom. xvi. 5). At the prayer-meeting held when Peter was miraculously released from prison, there were at least two, and doubtless more, women in the house (Acts xii. 12, 13). They could there speak and pray veiled, and yet be heard. The assemblies referred to in 1 Cor. xi. seem to have been of a more private character, such as those where the Lord's supper was observed, spoken of in the same chapter. Probably unbelievers were not present. But in the congregations named in the fourteenth chapter, where the silence of women is enjoined, unbelievers were often present (vs. 23, 24), and the congregations were doubtless larger.¹ There only two or three addressed the meeting (vs.

¹ The above view was adopted by the present writer without knowing that any other person had even considered it. When this Article was nearly all in type he learned that *Meyer*, the noted commentator, after holding other views through several editions of his work on First Corinthians, in his fifth and last

27, 29),¹ not at their seats, but from a platform in front of all. In such circumstances women might well keep silence. But in the eleventh chapter where Christ is spoken of as "head" of the church and man as "head of the woman," man is taught to have his own head uncovered when praying or prophesying, and woman to have hers covered (vs. 4-7, 10, 13). The implication is that men did pray and prophesy. Why not also that women did? Even more is said requiring women to veil their heads when praying and prophesying, than requiring men not to cover theirs. The natural conclusion is that some women did pray and prophesy in the smaller and more private assemblies. We cannot think the apostle would take the pen of inspiration and write about the right method of doing a thing when it was not to be done by any method. He spoke not of services in secret. The covering of the head was for appearance before God among fellow-beings.

But these prophetesses may have been cases of exception among women. They were to pray and prophesy only under the influence of the Spirit. And the Holy Spirit now is never the author of confusion, immodesty, or impropriety. It was under his apparent call that Elizabeth Fry spoke in promiscuous audiences. She expressed her fear that some women would be too forward, and speak when not called by the Spirit. She resolved not to resist the Spirit, and not to go farther than the Lord evidently led her. She once wrote, "I am of opinion that nothing Paul said to discourage women's speaking in the churches, alluded to their speaking through the help of the Spirit, as he clearly gave directions how they should conduct themselves under such circumstances, when they prayed or prophesied."² With equal care and prayer woman now will not transcend the proprieties of

(German) states that he has changed his opinion, and now holds that the *permission* to pray and prophesy given in the eleventh chapter pertains to the smaller assemblies, and that the *prohibition* in the fourteenth chapter pertains to the larger ones. The smaller assemblies, he implies, do not mean the family circle. A woman would not veil her face in the presence of only her husband and children.

¹ See Alford.

² Memoirs Vol. ii. p. 336.

her nature and office ; nor will she forget to be man's helpmate in religion as well as in other things. None could so well as **Mary** break the alabaster-box of ointment and anoint her Lord for his burial. In the prayer-meeting woman can often break the box of spiritual aroma, whose odor shall fill the place. Her average of ability, piety, and experience sometimes transcends that of men. No custom or propriety forbids her voice in the social circle. Why should it in the prayer-circle ? Yet, in that meeting she will appear as helpmate and not head. In the larger assembly nature will never put her so far forward as it does man. Her mind and heart would shrink from it more than his ; her voice in general will be less fitted for it than his ; her household cares will be adverse to the life of a public speaker. Cases like that of **Mrs. Fry** will be exceptions.

The views advocated in this Article being true, it follows :

1. Women should not take part or place in religious assemblies which would imply any claim of superiority or rule over men. It would violate the divine order of headship and helpmate, and would be repugnant to their own better feelings.

2. Woman's office as helpmate primarily applies to married women, yet proleptically, and by affinity of nature, to the unmarried.

3. Wearing the veil, once imperative on woman, has still its likeness in her long hair, and other slight covering of the head, symbolic of her modest and retiring nature.

4. The command to keep silence in the churches, once obligatory on woman, at least except in small private meetings, and in case of inspired prophetesses, has a modified obligation upon her still, beyond what it has on man, because of her office as wife and not husband. While her relation to man has not changed, the customs expressive of that relation and appropriate to it have partially altered, so that the same degree of silence and retirement requisite in the apostolic age is not now demanded.

5. Woman's peculiar relation to man is not now compromised or deteriorated, as it once was, by her act of teach-

ing in public, when she is qualified for it and occasion calls upon her for that service.

6. Woman's modern rational freedom has its type in her condition among the early Hebrews rather than in that of the corrupt and debasing age of Rome's decline and Greece's decay.

7. The reasons for woman's former silence are still so far in force as to make silence her general rule now in the larger assemblies.

8. The women who assume the part or place of religious teacher are under equal obligation with men to walk circumspectly, lest they bring reproach upon that sacred office.

9. Woman can never put herself to the front, and assume all the prerogatives of men in society without suffering in her own nature and in human estimation.

10. Given to women the same knowledge and culture as to men, still they will not be equally active and prominent with them as public speakers. Modesty will always enjoin upon them more retirement than upon men. Whenever reason summons woman's speech in mixed assemblies, if she allow her modesty to be infringed upon, the weight of her words will be diminished. This is made so not by custom, but by the nature of mankind.

11. Woman has certain prerogatives and privileges which men are bound to respect, and not allow to be wrested from her by any custom; and which, exercised by her, are ennobling to her character and promotive of her usefulness.

12. A woman may not be ordained to the gospel ministry unless under very rare circumstances. She can serve as missionary or evangelist under approbation without ordination. No man even should be ordained to the ministry except for life; nor until after much preparation and due probation. A man can continue his ministry and marry; a woman properly could not. Yet the providential provision is that both marry. The constant tax on strength of a faithful ministry through scores of years or to the end of life, is ordinarily more than any but a strong man can bear.

13. Both Scripture and nature attach so high importance to man's office as husband and head in the marriage relation, and to woman's as wife and helpmate, that it compels the inference of obligation upon all as a rule to assume or accept, if they may, the full responsibilities of that relation, though it involve burden and care. Paul's strictures upon seeking marriage were intended to call attention to its duties and trials, especially in the troublous times to the church then existing, and yet to come; and were incited, in part, by the fact of such corruption in society relative to the marriage relation, and in general, as to call for unembarrassed laborers in behalf of the living.

14. Notwithstanding all the restraints required by woman's modesty and her peculiar partnership with man, there remains in modern civilized life a propriety in her addressing promiscuous companies of men and women under certain circumstances, as in prayer and conference meetings, especially where she can be heard and remain sitting, — the more social the meeting the more unreserved being her participation; also in larger assemblies in exceptional cases of special fitness on her part, and special reason in the occasion. Some of these limitations apply to men, but woman's violation of them is more painful to beholders than man's like offence, because her normal nature is more refined and delicate than his. Though her exercise of this freedom may at first be repugnant to some, yet if she is wise and careful it will at length become agreeable, because it does not intrinsically violate her modesty or her relation to man.

15. Where in social religious meetings objections are known to exist against woman's taking part, it were better that she remain silent. Time and reflection will work a change sooner than her compulsion of unwilling ears.

16. It were well if such objections were withdrawn, and as much freedom given to woman in religious as in social life. In no other age of the world has she been denied more religiously than socially. This anomaly calls for attention, and for explanation by those who uphold it. Paul gave

women more liberty in religion than many of them had in social relations. With most the question is not, "Shall womanhood be abolished?" but, do true womanhood and the Bible properly interpreted, require *now* as much seclusion and silence on the part of woman as Hebrew and pagan society did in the early Christian era and centuries before? If not now in social and educational life — as by custom seems to be granted — then *why* in the religious life?

17. Women as well as men need to remember that being qualified to address one kind of audience does not imply qualification to address all kinds. Respect is due to occasion and proprieties, to time and presence.

18. Notwithstanding woman's high privilege in this age, human nature in her, as in man, will incline more to be diffident or slothful than too forward in embracing opportunities for usefulness in prayer and conference meetings.

19. There is nothing in woman's relation to man to forbid her modest exercise of the right of suffrage in church-meetings. The judgment of some women on religious questions is often superior to that of some men.

20. To interpret the Pauline command of silence as applicable only to "babbling" women, or to those of Corinth and similar society at that day, is unwarranted and mischievous to woman's cause. Some will perceive that this command had a basis in the relation of the two sexes to each other. To interpret it as modified by change of custom, and as not so rigidly applicable now as it was eighteen centuries since, will, we think, be accordant with absolute reason and the better human judgment.

21. This subject so involves custom that the whole *practical* question now is, What conduct in woman is in harmony with her relation to man, with her modesty of nature, and with the habits of virtuous society where she dwells. Scripture warrants this rational consideration.

22. One distinctive feature in this discussion is its interpretation of Scripture in the light of history — a light absolutely requisite to a correct understanding of the inspired

word, yet commonly neglected. It is hoped that many earnest and thoughtful minds hitherto in conflict on this subject may, in view of this new evidence, come into substantial agreement; though each class still hold some of its own most cherished opinions.

28. Though woman's education and ability in the future will excel those of the past, yet they will never remove her from domestic life as her chief calling. Nor in general will it be possible for her to have a higher or grander mission. Still, where in exceptional cases her greater usefulness turns her to other employments, she should be encouraged and cheered in that course. Early Christianity immensely exalted woman in ways of activity and usefulness, and that incomparable religion may be safely trusted to perfect its work with both man and his helpmate.

In the foregoing views it is believed there is perfect compatibility between the real teaching of the Scriptures, and the tendency of enlightened modern society to give woman a more prominent place in mixed assemblies, both social and religious. This we think is another instance of the wider adaptation of the Bible to human culture and development, than previously had in general been perceived. During the early stages of modern Foreign Missions, many of their founders refused a long time to ordain or even license a native ministry. At length experience suggested and then proved that the refusal was excessive caution, and a barrier to the greatest advancement.¹ Finally, it was perceived that the new method was according to the Scripture basis; for, the apostles ordained *native* teachers, pastors, presbyters, wherever they founded churches. Under the advancing sun of modern civilization woman is not to remain so silent as it became her to be in the twilight of Christianity under the shadows of paganism, and this predestined future will be fully accordant with the sacred word of God.

¹ Anderson's *History of the Sandwich Islands Mission*, pp. 23, 24; Anderson's *Foreign Missions*, pp. 326-330.